

Running Head: CAMPUS EFFORTS AROUND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

ARE WE “RE”ADY TO HELP? ASSESSING THE CAMPUS CLIMATE AND  
FACULTY/STAFF’S KNOWLEDGE, CONFIDENCE, AND READINESS TO ENGAGE IN  
CAMPUS EFFORTS AROUND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

By

CHELSEA JACOBY

A dissertation submitted to the

Graduate School of Education

Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Graduate Program in the Design of Learning Environments

Written under the direction of

---

Angela M. O’Donnell, Chair

---

Jordan Draper, Committee

---

LaMont Rouse, Committee

---

Sandra Tomlinson-Clarke, Committee

New Brunswick, New Jersey

May 2020

## CAMPUS EFFORTS AROUND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

### Abstract

Campus climate surveys are an essential tool used by Institutions of Higher Education (IHEs) to prevent/respond to campus sexual violence. Rather than surveying all campus stakeholders, these assessments primarily target only students, which can limit the understanding around possible areas of improvement and the campus climate as a whole. The intent of this survey research was to explore faculty/staff perceptions of the campus climate and the extent to which they were: knowledgeable about Title IX and current structures/procedures to address/respond to incidents of sexual violence; confident in their ability to navigate disclosures; and willing to engage in campus change efforts surrounding sexual violence. Statistical analyses revealed that the majority of participants: performed well on all constructs relative to actual knowledge; felt comfortable navigating disclosures of sexual violence; and expressed both positive perceptions of the campus climate and interest in learning more about preventing/addressing sexual violence. Significant differences were found between Responsible Employees (RE) and Not Responsible Employees (Non-RE) on all constructs related to their perceptions of personal knowledge, awareness, confidence, and the overall campus climate, with REs generally responding with stronger agreement. No significant differences in actual knowledge were found between REs and Non-REs, despite most having received training on the topics and being responsible for properly handling these issues. The findings identified both strengths and potential gaps in institutional efforts and offered insight on how the IHE could improve the way it educates, engages with, and prepares faculty/staff to effectively navigate disclosures of sexual violence. The study's original inventory also offers IHEs a comprehensive campus climate survey that supports data collection specifically from faculty/staff. This tool and the study's overall findings may be of particular interest to those charged with overseeing the creation/implementation of institutional policy, and campus-wide training/education around TIX compliance and sexual violence prevention.

## CAMPUS EFFORTS AROUND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As my doctoral journey comes to a close, it is important for me to recognize those in my life whom without their constant guidance, love, and support, this achievement would never have been possible.

To my cohort – My oh my has this been a wild ride. Through the highs and lows and the laughs and the tears, we have grown together in ways I never could have imagined. We are forever bonded together through these shared experiences, and frankly, I would not have wanted to have gone through all of this with any other group of people. You have each made an invaluable impact on my life and I could not have made it to this point without you.

To my dissertation committee – Thank you for the patience and support you have shown me in this process, especially Jordan. You have challenged me to be a better scholar and person, all while navigating your own responsibilities. Your sacrifice and unwavering support have not gone unnoticed and I thank you for helping me achieve this success.

To my family – If I had a dollar for every time you have said to me “I’m so proud of you,” I would probably have a pretty fair chance at paying off my student loans. You have continuously encouraged me to make any dream I have had a reality, including the attainment of this degree, and you have been there every step of the way. Your love and support have always been unconditional, and you have never stopped believing in me. For that, I am incredibly grateful and only hope to continue to make you proud.

To my partner, Taylor – From day one when you dropped me off at my GSE orientation to when my doctoral robes arrived in the mail, you’ve been my rock, my shoulder to cry on, and my number one cheerleader. You believed in me and encouraged me to keep going, even when all I wanted to do was give up. You have been a critical part of this journey, and I cannot put into words just how thankful I am to have had you by my side through it all.

**Table of Contents**

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES .....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Purpose .....	5
Research Questions .....	5
<b>CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW .....</b>	<b>7</b>
History of Title IX.....	7
White House Task Force .....	11
Campus Climate Surveys .....	11
Content Found in Campus Climate Surveys .....	13
Overview of Findings Reported by Campus Climate Surveys .....	14
The Silenced Topic.....	16
Federal Mandates Surrounding Education & Training on Title IX .....	18
Common Educational Approaches .....	19
Responsible Employee Training .....	20
Efficacy of Sexual Violence Training .....	22
Faculty and Staff Campus Climate Surveys.....	24
Limitations of Campus Climate Surveys .....	26
<b>CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>29</b>
Design.....	29
Setting.....	29
Participants .....	29
Measures.....	29
Assessing Role & Presence/Perceived Effectiveness of Training .....	30

## CAMPUS EFFORTS AROUND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

Assessment of Knowledge.....	31
Actual Knowledge .....	32
Perceived Knowledge .....	34
Confidence .....	35
Campus Climate and Readiness to Engage.....	36
Demographics .....	38
Data Collection Procedure .....	39
Protection of Participants.....	40
<b>CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....</b>	<b>42</b>
Sample .....	42
Research Question Results .....	47
Research Question 1 .....	47
Research Question 2 .....	52
Research Question 3 .....	54
Research Question 4 .....	59
Research Question 5 .....	61
<b>CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>65</b>
Efficacy of RE Training .....	65
Actual and Perceived Knowledge .....	66
Perceptions of Confidence.....	70
Training and Education .....	71
Readiness to Engage.....	72
Campus Climate and Reporting .....	75
Limitations .....	80
Implications & Future Directions.....	82

## CAMPUS EFFORTS AROUND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

Conclusion.....	85
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT .....</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: INSPIRATION FROM PREVIOUS LITERATURE &amp; OTHER SURVEY INSTRUMENTS .....</b>	<b>122</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: ACTUAL KNOWLEDGE VIGNETTES WITHIN SURVEY .....</b>	<b>123</b>

## CAMPUS EFFORTS AROUND SEXUAL VIOLENCE

### LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Participant Demographics (N=190) .....	44
Table 2 Received Responsible Employee Training Offered by RBGU .....	45
Table 3. Responsible Employee Training Specifics .....	46
Table 4. Perceived Efficacy of Responsible Employee Training .....	47
Table 5. Participants' Actual Knowledge .....	49
Table 6. Selections on Most Appropriate Person to Whom to Report.....	50
Table 7. Participants' Knowledge of Behaviors Under TIX.....	51
Table 8. Participants' Knowledge of the Role of a RE.....	51
Table 9. Participants' Perceived Knowledge .....	53
Table 10. Participants' Level of Awareness of Available Campus & Community Resources Specifically Related to Sexual Violence Response at RBGU .....	54
Table 11. Participants' Responses Regarding their Level of Confidence .....	55
Table 12. Participants' Responses Regarding the Receipt of Student & Colleague Disclosures..	57
Table 13. Actions Taken After Receiving a Student Disclosure .....	58
Table 14. Actions Taken After Receiving a Colleague Disclosure .....	59
Table 15. Participants' Readiness to Engage in Campus Change Efforts .....	60
Table 16. Participants' Interest in Attending Workshops/Trainings & Associated Topics .....	61
Table 17. Perceptions of RBGU's Campus Climate.....	63

## CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Colleges and universities, collectively referred to as institutions of higher education (IHEs), serve as excellent examples of microcosms. IHEs often reflect many of the same social structures, culturally-based expectations of social conduct, and patterns of interaction that we see in the larger society (Sweet, 2001). The topic of sexual violence and discrimination has been discussed for almost fifty years yet continues to be a growing concern nationwide (Hill & Kearl, 2011; Mansell, Moffit, Russ, & Thorpe, 2017). Similar to the broader context of society, these matters have been identified as some of the most pervasive issues impacting IHEs (Edwards, Moynihan, Rodenhizer-Stampfli, Demers, & Banyard, 2015; Fedina, Lynne-Holmes, & Backes, 2018; Fisher et al., 2000; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Krebs et al., 2007).

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (“Title IX”) states that, “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (United States Department of Education, 2015a, para. 2). Under Title IX (TIX), all IHEs that receive federal funds are required to try and prevent, mitigate, and resolve issues involving and resulting from sexual violence. According to the 2001 Guidance from the United States’ (U.S.) Office of Civil Rights (OCR) and Department of Education (DOE), sexual violence refers to “physical sexual acts perpetrated against a person’s will or where a person is incapable of giving consent due to the victim’s use of drugs or alcohol, age, or presence of an intellectual or other disability” (OCR, 2001, p. 1). A number of different acts fall into the category of sexual harassment and violence including rape, sexual assault, dating and domestic violence, sexual coercion, sexual exploitation, and gender-based discrimination and harassment (Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; VAWA, 2013). Findings from various campus



climate surveys have repeatedly found that on average one in five undergraduate women and 7% of males experience sexual violence during their time on a college campus (Cantalupo, 2014; Cantor et al., 2017; Krebs et al., 2007; Krebs et al., 2016). These rates of victimization are both public health (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2014; Office on Violence Against Women [OVW], 2015) and social justice concerns society as a whole, but in particular faculty, staff, and students on college campuses (OVW, 2016, p. 19).

In this cultivated microcosm of college campuses, students – particularly incoming first year students – are coming from social and learning structures where they rely primarily on parents or guardians for guidance, support, and mentorship. Despite being in a new environment, students are likely turn to administrative or professional staff for emotional and tangible support. Studies, including the *#LiveLikeLions Campus Climate Survey* at Ruth Bader Ginsburg University [pseudonym], support this notion and show that students report experiences of sexual violence to administrative and professional staff on campus. As such, the individual receiving the disclosure may be the victim/survivor's first point of contact in the process. The quality of that experience can have a tremendous impact on the victim/survivor's perceptions of the incident and whether a victim/survivor obtains access to services and/or chooses to pursue accountability for the perpetrator of the assault (DePrince et al., 2017; McCaskill, 2014; Starzynski, Ullman, Filipas, & Townsend, 2005; Ullman & Filipas, 2001; Ullman & Peter-Hagene, 2014). The responses from those receiving such personal, intimate, and traumatic admissions make a difference. For example, OVW (2016) shows:

Having students who feel comfortable reporting sexual assault on campus enables campus and/or local law enforcement to deal with serial perpetrators and helps victims

heal from trauma, stay in school, and feel confident in the IHE handling of the assault. (p. 8)

One of the priorities of IHEs should be to ensure that the individuals on campus to whom students report, whether informally or formally, are comfortable receiving those disclosures if/when the students are ready to seek assistance.

Ruth Bader Ginsburg University (RBGU) is one IHE that is an example of a microcosm bound by OCR compliance. The OCR continues to monitor compliance with TIX and issue guidance to institutions of higher education from 2011 to present. The guidance contains directions for the creation of a TIX Coordinator on each campus and requires clear training requirements for all students, faculty, and staff with additional training required for mandated reporters. IHEs have the autonomy to decide who at their institution are required to serve in a mandated reporting capacity. Some implement a blanket policy that requires all employees to report incidents of sexual violence, while others are more selective of who they consider to be “Responsible Employees” (REs).

At RBGU, individuals in supervisory roles and individuals with direct contact with students as part of their role are commonly identified as REs. These individuals have two main responsibilities: they must report all information/incidents of sexual violence to the Office of TIX and they must receive training every three years for compliance. This training provides an overview of TIX: what, how, and to whom they must report information regarding sexual violence, and how to best navigate disclosures from students that ensures autonomy while also meeting reporting obligations. It is not currently known the extent to which faculty and staff at RBGU – including those in RE roles – are knowledgeable, confident, and willing to handle these sensitive topics and situations.

While training can impact an individual's ability to respond effectively, an institution's training to members of the campus community neither ensures its effectiveness nor guarantees that there will be a translation from policy and procedure into changed behavior (Hill & Silvia, 2005). These factors can ultimately impact the campus climate for the better or worse as "it is a majority of individuals who together make up a campus community, setting community norms, establishing campus culture, and potentially creating change" (OVW, 2015, p. 9).

IHEs attempt to get a pulse of their campus community by using tools called campus climate surveys. These surveys are intended to measure attitudes, perceptions, awareness of resources, victimization rates, and a variety of other factors. More often than not, the population to which IHEs predominantly disseminate these surveys to are undergraduate students. However, sampling only this group leaves major gaps in understanding the overall climate of a campus (Graham, Mennicke, Rizo, Wood, & Mengo, 2018). Given the important role that faculty/staff play on campus and the overall impact their knowledge, confidence, and level of engagement can have on the campus climate, particularly around issues of sexual violence, it is important that these elements be formally explored. Additionally, more information is needed about the role faculty and staff in particular play in the response to sexual violence in the lives of students (Wood et al., 2017). In spite of this, no validated measure currently exists to survey faculty and staff at IHEs. As a result, it is currently unknown the extent to which faculty and staff, particularly those in RE roles at IHEs, including RBGU, are knowledgeable, confident, and able to effectively handle these sensitive topics and situations. Nor is it understood how the faculty/staff perceive the campus overall climate or the extent to which they are engaged in campus change efforts.

The literature, outlined below, describes the history and evolution of TIX and sexual violence and the growth and implementation of campus climate surveys on campuses of IHEs. Demonstrated in this review is the gap in literature around campus climate surveys that specifically target the perceptions of faculty and staff at IHEs, and how their knowledge of TIX and confidence around navigating disclosures impact the overall campus climate. Wood et al. (2017) stressed that, “a natural extension of campus climate work is to explore the role, perceptions, and experiences of faculty, administration, and staff addressing sexual assault, dating/domestic violence, sexual harassment, and stalking prevention, intervention, and reporting issues on their campuses” (p. 1264).

### **Purpose**

Due to the lack of depth and breadth within current literature around this topic, the intent of this survey-based research study was to determine the extent to which faculty/staff at RBGU are: knowledgeable about Title IX, sexual violence, and structures/procedures in place to address and respond to incidents of sexual violence; confident in their ability to receive disclosures of sexual violence and to respond appropriately; and willing to engage in efforts on campus surrounding sexual violence prevention and response. The study also examined the perceptions of faculty/staff regarding their campus climate overall.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions guided this quantitative study:

- To what extent are RBGU faculty/staff knowledgeable about TIX, sexual violence, and structures/procedures in place on campus to address and respond to incidents of sexual violence at RBGU?

- How do faculty/staff perceive their level of knowledge regarding college processes, reporting procedures, and resources available to them, their colleagues, and students to address and respond to TIX incidents at RBGU?
- To what extent are RBGU faculty/staff confident in their ability to receive disclosures of sexual violence and appropriately respond?
- To what extent are faculty/staff willing to engage in change efforts on campus surrounding sexual violence prevention and response?
- How do faculty/staff perceive RBGU's campus climate in regard to issues surrounding sexual violence?

To answer these questions, RBGU faculty/staff completed an anonymous survey that was intended to measure their knowledge (actual and perceived), confidence, and readiness to engage in campus efforts to address sexual violence, as well as their perceptions of the overall campus climate. This study's findings helped to inform the campus climate through the lens of faculty/staff members, identify potential gaps in institutional response, and provided insight as to how the IHE's administration can improve the way it prepares faculty/staff to navigate disclosures, respond to incidents of campus sexual violence, and influence the campus climate as a whole.

## CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

### History of Title IX

Throughout and following the Civil Rights Era (1954-1968), sizeable adjustments took place in the social structure of the U.S. Many of the changes during this time directly impacted both the political and social mobility of women and the structure, function, and regulation of public education. One particularly significant event was the enactment of Title IX (TIX) of the Education Amendments of 1972, in which the federal government overtly recognized and prohibited discrimination on the basis of sex in public institutions that receive federal funding. However, TIX is a fluid document that continues to evolve.

In the years following the enactment of TIX, Congress battled frequent attempts to weaken the legislation. While schools received federal funding, TIX applied only to the educational programs that actually received any of those financial resources. Despite President Ronald Reagan's veto, Congress passed two pieces of legislation – the Civil Rights Remedies Equalization Act (CRREA) of 1986 and the Civil Rights Restoration Act (CRRRA) of 1987 – that intended to extend TIX to all educational institutions' programs/activities and not just the few that directly received federal funds (Galles, 2004). Additional legislation involving TIX began to emerge in the 1990s, particularly around sexual harassment.

Several Supreme Court decisions were helpful in solidifying TIX, in particular *Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools*, 503 U.S. 60 (1992), which mandated that sexual harassment a form of discrimination barred by TIX. Discussion around schools' liability involving sexual harassment took place in *Gebser v. Lago Vista Ind. School District*, 524 U.S. 1011 (1997) and in *Davis v. Monroe County Bd. of Education*, 526 U.S. 629 (1999). In both rulings, the Supreme Court held that schools were only liable if they had Actual Knowledge of the harassment and

failed to respond appropriately. Conversely, in places of employment, the legislation states that employers are considered liable if they know or reasonably should have known about the harassment by supervisors/coworkers. These outcomes were meaningful because they indicated that schools were not held to the same standards of liability as employers and adults/employees were afforded more protections than children/students. This inequality was eventually modified in the various forms of guidance provided by the U.S. Department of Education (DOE).

In the years following the 1972 legislation, Congress entrusted the DOE's Office for Civil Rights (OCR), formally known as Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) with enforcing TIX regulations in institutions that receive federal funds. This guidance and enforcement closely resembles many of the educational reforms that took place following the report *A Nation at Risk* (1973), as well as the letter of the law following *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954). Particular similarities exist in terms of the use of accountability measures and the inclusion of ambiguous verbiage.

Regularly, OCR publishes "Dear Colleague" letters (DCL) as a means of ensuring that institutions and the general public understand how the decisions, such as those around TIX, apply to all institutions of learning, including IHEs (Hepler, 2013; U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). These documents are essentially guidelines for institutions to follow, rather than a prescribed formula for how they can adjust their own policies and practices to enhance civil rights protections and uphold their legal obligations (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.). Similar to *Brown v. BOE*'s decision which states that efforts to desegregate schools must be done with "all deliberate speed," OCR states that in cases involving sexual harassment institutions must offer resolution options that are prompt and equitable. In addition, according to OCR's 2001 Guidance, a Responsible Employee (RE) includes any employee:

Who has the authority to take action to redress sexual violence; who has been given the duty of reporting incidents of sexual violence or any other misconduct by students to the Title IX coordinator or other appropriate school designee; or whom a student could reasonably believe has this authority or duty. (Notice of Employee, Peer, or Third Party Harassment, par. 2)

OCR indicates that schools must ensure that REs know how to respond appropriately to reports of sexual violence and that they are obligated to report this behavior to appropriate school officials (OCR, 2014). However, the guidelines do not specify who exactly at the institution should fulfill the role of REs. The ambiguity of the guidance extends much further than these examples and affords schools the autonomy to dictate how best to implement the legislation based upon their particular institution. However, with increased autonomy and ambiguity comes an increased opportunity for institutions to derive their own interpretations of their intended responsibilities, which could end up doing the students an injustice and as a result increase their risk of litigation, especially after the dissemination of the Dear Colleague Letter in 2011.

Under President Barack Obama's administration, there were targeted efforts that demonstrated a broad, comprehensive response to strengthen TIX guidance and reduce violence against women. Examples of various initiatives include but are not limited to: adding protections for transgender students and sexual assault victims to the statute; repealing a President George W. Bush-era policy that allowed schools to rely solely on unscientific surveys to "prove" a lack of interest in starting a new women's sport (Quinlan & Gibbs, 2017); and issuing a pivotal DCL from OCR in 2011. This particular DCL placed IHEs on notice and demanded they do better to resolve students' reports of sexual assault and protect their rights throughout the process. As a result, students, now feeling more empowered, began filing more complaints through the OCR



against their institutions that allegedly mishandled their TIX cases. In addition, dozens of accused and/or disciplined students sued their IHEs claiming that their own rights had been violated (Saul & Taylor, 2017). This movement also highlights the difficulty for schools to fulfill their responsibilities and be held accountable when the guidance/regulations around how to carry out their practices change with turnover of federal administration and the distribution of each guidance.

On September 7, 2017, President Donald Trump's Secretary of Education, Betsy DeVos, issued interim guidance which withdrew the guidance in the 2014 letter and signaled a shift in policy when it came to federal enforcement of regulations governing campus sexual assault (Camera, 2017). In the letter's aftermath, some members of Congress, civil rights groups, TIX advocacy groups, and others working on issues of campus assault expressed concern over the future of TIX regulation and associated protections. Some individuals, such as former Vice President Joe Biden, who spearheaded the "Its On Us" campaign against sexual violence, argued that the Trump administration is single-handedly responsible for systematically dismantling TIX. Biden went as far as issuing a Public Service Announcement (PSA) in response to DeVos' interim guidance. In the "It's On Us" (2017, September 19) PSA, Biden said the following:

The U.S. Department of Education, under new leadership, is working to roll back the protections under TIX that we worked so hard to put in place. We cannot let that stand.

So don't give up, speak out, and demand that your school continue to make progress.

The organization "It's On Us" ([www.itsonus.org](http://www.itsonus.org)) has sparked significant student activism, comparable to what the U.S. saw during the Civil Rights Era, and it has supported efforts to hold schools and government officials accountable. Along with this initiative, Biden established the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (WHTF).

**White House Task Force**

The WHTF was established in 2014 by President Obama with the intent of strengthening federal enforcement efforts, addressing some of the problems with current legislation such as the Jeanne Clery Act (1990), and providing schools with recommendations and resources to help reduce sexual violence on college campuses (McMahon, Stepleton, & Cusano, 2016; WHTF, 2014a). Just months after its establishment, the WHTF released their first report, stating “We are here to tell sexual assault survivors that they are not alone. And we’re also here to help schools live up to their obligation to protect students from sexual violence” (WHTF, 2014a, p. 2). The creation of the WHTF prompted increased pressure be placed on IHEs in regards to being both proactive and accountable for various forms of sexual violence on campus (Cantalupo, 2011; Duncan, 2014; Silbaugh, 2015; WHTF, 2014a). This report contained initial action items for IHEs to carry out, one of which was to “identify the problem” through the use of campus climate surveys.

**Campus Climate Surveys**

Campus Climate surveys are institutionally-specific measures that are used to gauge students’ beliefs and experiences about race, gender, and sexual orientation (Henry, Fowler, & West, 2011, as cited in Wood, Sulley, Kammer-Kerwick, Follingstad, & Busch-Armendariz, 2017). However, campus climate surveys have evolved and expanded beyond demographic areas to explore prevalence, rates and incidences, knowledge, and attitudes/responses relative to sexual violence (Wood et al., 2017). This evolution has been prompted by multiple factors including but not limited to the implementation of the WHTF and its recommendations for IHEs, and the enacted pieces of legislation including Title IX of 1972, the Jeanne Clery Act (1990), and the Clery Act’s associated Campus SaVE Act and VAWA amendments (Wood et al., 2017). The

spirit and goals of these pieces of legislation are similar in that they embody the effort and desire to eliminate sexual violence and establish safe learning environments on campus. This is done by promoting institutional accountability, transparency, and survivor confidentiality, as well as enforcing prevention education and reporting requirements (Garrett, 2016). Solovay and Winter (2015-16) argue that, “By enforcing these laws, universities can drive the culture change that discourages sexual violence” (p. 33). Additionally, this evolution has been fueled by the “growing interest among researchers, advocates, and lawmakers in responding to the needs of victims on campus and in holding schools accountable to their obligation to protect students from sexual violence” (McMahon, Stepleton, & Cusano, 2016, p. 1).

Campus climate surveys offer IHEs the ability to collect information about community perceptions, knowledge, and attitudes relevant to sexual violence; help uncover unreported crimes and victimization rates; evaluate the impact of policy changes and program improvements and identify changes over time through survey data when regularly administered; tailor prevention and response efforts to survey findings; and demonstrate commitment among the IHE to address sexual violence and build trust among community constituents at all levels (McMahon et al., 2016; McMahon et al., 2018a; Moylan et al., 2018; WHTF, 2014b). Campus climate surveys are deemed by the Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women (OVW), the OCR, and the WHTF as an essential tool to prevent and respond to incidents of campus sexual assault. The rationale is that the more IHEs have a clear understanding of the climate around sexual violence as it actually exists on their campuses, the better a position they are in to effectively address the gaps in institutional response, improve the way they protect their students, and prevent and respond to incidents of campus sexual violence (Cantalupo, 2014; McMahon et al., 2018a,b; McMahon et al., 2016; OVW, 2016; Wood et al., 2017). The depth and breadth of

climate surveys often differ among IHEs due to their large scope and their institutional support and use (Wood et al., 2017).

**Content found in campus climate surveys.** Based on the current literature, there is no shortage of existing campus climate surveys for IHEs to choose from when deciding to implement them. Research conducted by Wood et al. (2017), used descriptive variables to evaluate the content of 10 different climate surveys that are in the field-testing phase and/or their findings are in the peer review process. The surveys evaluated by Wood et al. (2017) are as follows: Association of American Universities (AAU, 2015), Administrator-Research Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3), Campus Attitudes Toward Safety (C.A.T.S.) out of the University of Kentucky, Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium (HEDS, 2015), iSpeak from Rutgers University (McMahon et al., 2015), It's On Us Hopkins from John Hopkins University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology's (2014) Community Attitudes on Sexual Assault Survey (CASAS), the WHTF's Promising Practice Examples for a Campus Climate Survey, University of Chicago's (2015) Sexual Misconduct Survey: Attitudes, Knowledge, and Experience, and the Sexual Violence and Institution Behavior Campus Survey out of University of Oregon (2015).

Among the surveys analyzed, Wood et al. (2017) examined and compared a variety of constructs and found (among various other findings) that all measures were distributed through web-based mechanisms, contained anywhere between 10-to-30 questions, took participants on average 10-30 minutes to complete, and cost from \$500 to \$113,420. Most surveys asked about student knowledge of reporting and help-seeking procedures on campus and the extent to which students received this information in trainings or public awareness materials about sexual violence. Questions regarding attitudes and perceptions relative to bystander intervention, peer experiences, and the general campus climate/safety were also prevalent (Wood et al., 2017). All

surveys specifically inquired about participants' experience with past victimization of sexual assault, contextual and reporting information about victimization, and the assessment of university service and response to reported victimization (Wood et al., 2017).

These findings were echoed by Moylan, Hatfield, and Randall (2018), who through an extensive search identified 105 climate survey reports during the 2015-2016 academic year. Of the reports identified, Moylan et al. (2018) too found that most campuses asked follow-up details of students who experienced sexual violence victimization ( $n=101$ , 96.1%), including questions regarding the relationship with the perpetrator(s), whether the perpetrator was another student, the location of the assault, and the use of alcohol leading up to the assault. These questions are all consistent with recommendations from the WHTF (2014b). Other factors were compared, such as the methodology, the response rate, where/by whom the survey was conducted, and information pertaining to the survey's content and findings (Moylan et al., 2018). Moylan et al. (2018) found that most surveys were conducted in 2015 ( $n=90$ , 85.7%), which was shortly after the WHTF issued its recommendation. Only a few schools assessed and reported students' perpetration of sexual violence behavior ( $n=6$ ). However, almost all campuses asked questions related to student knowledge of campus resources ( $n=98$ , 93%), perceptions of the campus climate and safety ( $n=102$ , 97.1%), and attitudes related to sexual assault ( $n=91$ , 86.7%) (Moylan et al., 2018).

**Overview of findings reported by climate surveys.** Data collected from climate surveys shows that the prevalence of sexual violence at IHEs across the U.S. to be both pervasive and staggering (Fedina, Lynne-Holmes, & Backes, 2018). The data from institutional surveys around the incidence and prevalence of sexual violence against college students, particularly women, has remained relatively consistent since the mid-1980s and showed varying rates of attempted and

completed sexual assault experienced (Wood et al., 2017). On average between 20-25% of women report experiencing sexual violence (Cantalupo, 2014).

For example, the American Association for Universities (AAU) in 2015 organized a consortium of 27 colleges and universities who agreed to distribute the Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct. This collaboration resulted in the collection of data from over 150,072 students and represents one of the largest surveys on sexual assault and sexual misconduct to date (Cantor et al., 2017). Findings of this study revealed that 26.1% of female college seniors and 11.7% of student respondents across all of the universities reported experiencing nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force, threats of physical force, or incapacitation since they enrolled at their institution (Cantor et al., 2017). These findings are similar to those from the College Sexual Assault study, which in 2016 reported a rate of sexual assault of 19.8% among females and 7% among males since entering college (Krebs et al., 2016).

In October 2019, the AAU released an updated report following up to their 2015 survey. The survey obtained 181,752 respondents, which consisted of 108,221 undergraduate and 75,531 graduate and professional students from 33 different IHEs. Twenty-one institutions that participated in the 2015 iteration of the survey also participated this time around, which allowed for important trends to be identified (Cantor et al., 2020). Some improvements that were acknowledge were relative to students' increased knowledge regarding what constitutes sexual assault and misconduct, how to report it, and available resources for victims. In addition, the AAU (2019) survey showed the following:

The rate of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or inability to consent increased from 2015 to 2019 by 3 percentage points for undergraduate women, 2.4

percentage points for graduate and professional women, and 1.4 percentage points for undergraduate men. (par. 3)

The disparity in the prevalence among different categories of students was identified among all participating institutions (AAU, 2019).

Research has shown that in general, women, undergraduates, non-heterosexual, and transgendered students experienced higher rates of sexual violence, with more mixed findings for race (Krebs et al., 2016; Moylan et al., 2018). Researchers such as Wolitzky-Taylor et al. (2011) also found race to have an impact as minority students were identified as a population more likely to experience sexual violence, but less likely to contact officials regarding their assault.

The #iSpeak campus climate survey administered in Fall 2014 by Rutgers University-New Brunswick found that 77% of students who disclosed an incident of sexual violence told a close friend while 11% reported to an on-campus resource (McMahon et al., 2015). Of the campus climate surveys identified through the systemic review conducted by Moylan et al. (2018), findings also revealed that students most often disclosed to friends and family. This finding is consistent with existing literature on victim help-seeking behavior in that the mean percentage of students who told no one about their assault was 27.3 (SD=17.7,  $n=85$ ). Overall, the findings from Moylan et al. (2018) showed that on average, more than a quarter of survivors did not disclose their experience formally or informally. Despite its prevalence among these populations, and within society in general, it is not unusual for victims' experience(s) with sexual violence to go unreported.

### **The Silenced Topic**

Sexual violence has been referred to as a “hidden issue” due to the silence that surrounds this topic on both individual and organizational levels (Paludi, Nydegger, DeSouza, Nydegger, &

Dicker, 2006). Decades of research show that victims rarely report sexual assault to law enforcement. In addition, many victims do not access formal services (e.g. counseling or crisis centers); the prevalence of the issue is underrepresented in the statistics commonly collected (McCaskill, 2014; McMahon et al., 2016; Wood et al., 2017; WHTF, 2014a,b). Literature reveals that around 80% of sexual assault victims on college campuses do not report the assault for a variety of reasons including but not limited to: the victim not considering it “serious enough”; embarrassment; fear or lack of knowledge about officials’ reactions to such reports and how they may be treated; and perceiving that nothing would be done about it (Binder, Garcia, Johnson, & Fuentes-Afflick, 2018; Cantalupo, 2011; Cantor et al., 2017; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Sinozich & Langton, 2014; Walsh et al., 2010). These perceptions are echoed through the AAU climate survey where the percentage of students who thought it was very or extremely likely that the university would take a report of sexual assault or misconduct seriously varied from 46% to 77% (Cantor et al., 2017; OVW, 2016). A study by Sulkowski (2011) found that college students indicated greater intent to report concerns about violence when they trusted the university support system (e.g., campus police, administrators). However, aside from institutional trust, a critical factor that could influence lower reporting rates is whether individuals are knowledgeable about where and to whom a report should be made, or what resources are available to them (Cantalupo, 2011; Paludi et al., 2006).

This explanation is supported by findings from Cantor et al. (2017), who reported that roughly a quarter of participants indicated they “generally believed” they were knowledgeable about the sexual violence and misconduct resources accessible to them through their institution. Additionally, McMahon et al. (2015) found through data from both the climate survey and associated focus groups that although students believed the university would handle their report



correctly and were willing to disclose their experience to them, they did not know the proper reporting procedures and policies on sexual violence (McMahon et al., 2015).

Further, Mansell et al. (2017) found that “the odds of a person not knowing what resources were available to report harassment and not having training were six times the odds of those who had training and did not know what resources were available” (p. 3). Because the stigma and potential unfamiliarity with available reporting structures/resources, campus climate surveys may be better equipped to assess the prevalence and scope of sexual violence than reported numbers (Moylan et al., 2018; WHTF, 2014a, b), and help identify gaps in knowledge among members of their community.

### **Federal Mandates Surrounding Education and Training on Title IX**

Under TIX, all institutions that receive federal funding are required to try and prevent, mitigate, and resolve issues involving sexual assault, violence, and gender-based discrimination and harassment (Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972). Educational initiatives are a common way to try and adhere to TIX mandates, particularly through The Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act, also known as SaVE Act. The SaVE Act was an amendment added to the 2013 iteration of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA; 2013), which requires all incoming students and employees to undergo training for sexual violence awareness and prevention.

Under VAWA, new students and employees are mandated to complete “primary prevention and awareness programs” that promote awareness of rape, acquaintance rape, dating and domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Specifically, VAWA (2013), as cited by Solovay (2015-2016), said that training programs must include:

(a) A statement explaining that the institution prohibits the crimes of dating or domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking as defined under the Clery Act; (b) Clear definitions of these crimes, along with that of consent in reference to sexual activity, in the applicable jurisdiction; (c) “Safe and positive” options for bystander intervention an individual may take to “prevent harm or intervene” in risky situations; (d) Recognition of signs of abusive behavior and how to prevent potential attacks; and (e) Procedures victims should follow if they have been impacted by any form of rape, sexual assault, dating/domestic violence, and/or stalking. (p. 33)

OCR also states that training offered to employees should also incorporate practical information, such as how to identify harassment and to whom as it should be reported (OCR, 2001, p. 13). “These components are meant to increase awareness among students, staff and faculty of sexual violence, teach them how to identify dangerous situations, lay out best practices for responding, and increase their competence in fulfilling any applicable reporting responsibilities” (Solovay, 2015-2016, p. 33).

Many campuses struggle to comply with this mandate, partly because they have been given little direction from the U.S. DOE regarding the implementation of prevention programs (Newlands & O’Donohue, 2016). The lack of guidance and standardization around this type of training results in individualized (often inconsistent) institutional implementation.

**Common educational approaches.** Training on sexual violence offered by educational institutions can range from having participants read a brochure or watch a film/media presentation, to organizing social norming campaigns or completing academic courses for credits (Brecklin & Forde, 2001; DeGue et al., 2014; Paul & Gray, 2011). Frequently employed strategies include interactive or didactic-only in-person presentations, or online e-learning modules lasting from 30-60 minutes (Brecklin & Forde, 2001; DeGue et al., 2014; Pilgram &

Keyton, 2009; Preusser, Bartels, & Nordstrom, 2011). In 2005, nearly 300 colleges and universities used asynchronous electronic delivery mediums to address sexual violence (Pilgram & Keyton, 2009) and with the increase and improvement of technology and specificity of OCR's requirements, it can be assumed this number has increased since then. Participants are also commonly presented with self-report forms to complete prior to and following the program to obtain measures of attitudinal and behavioral change. Some interventions also include a follow-up assessment at a later date (Paul & Gray, 2011). The target population most often receiving these forms of training on sexual violence is students. Mandated reporters, or "Responsible Employee" (RE), are most likely to receive training among the faculty/staff population.

**Responsible Employee Training.** According to the U.S. DOE and the OCR Revised Sexual Harassment Guidance: Harassment of Students by School Employees, Other Students, Or Third Parties (2001), a RE includes any employee:

Who has the authority to take action to redress sexual violence; who has been given the duty of reporting incidents of sexual violence or any other misconduct by students to the Title IX coordinator or other appropriate school designee; or whom a student could reasonably believe has this authority or duty.

Institutions have the autonomy to decide who is considered and trained to be a RE. Some IHEs mandate all faculty/staff to be trained REs, while others elect to tactically decide who must fulfill the role.

At RBGU, REs generally hold supervisory-level roles (including directors, deans, provosts, Board of Trustees, and advisors to recognized student organizations), interact with students directly as part of their job responsibilities, and/or are employees that students would

reasonably assume would be able to provide help or support. REs at RBGU are required to participate in training every three years to maintain compliance. Training is offered both in-person, which is the preferred and recommended option by the IHE, and online through a third-party vendor.

The in-person training lasts approximately one hour and covers topics including: the prevalence of incidents on campus; obligations RBGU must uphold under TIX and the IHE's associated policies; behaviors protected under TIX; reporting obligations for REs (what, when, and how to report); how to tactfully navigate disclosures in a trauma-informed way; what happens after a TIX report is made; what rights students have in the process; and resources and resolution options available to students.

The online option typically takes about 30-minutes to complete and covers similar content to the in-person program, with slight difference. The online program does not speak to what happens following the submission of a TIX report; how the IHE will handle it; or the available resolution options available for students to utilize should they wish. It does however provide an overview of why individuals perpetrate, the power of primary prevention, and how to be an active bystander, whereas the in-person training does not. This is not dissimilar to how other IHEs disseminate their RE training.

In a study conducted by Hopkins (2018), which surveyed 144 Title IX Coordinators from 32 different IHEs, 53.6% of institutions indicated that training for REs was provided via online programs, 25% of IHEs provided training in-person, and 21.4% of IHEs indicated "other." According to the data collected by Hopkins, the training objectives predominantly targeted in RE training "related to the RE appropriately responding to a student, explaining the RE's legal duty to report, citing the information the student must be informed of, and responding to requests for

confidentiality” (Hopkins, 2018, p. 34). The lack of both research in this area of education/training and standardization in training practices could result in ineffective learning opportunities and leave faculty and staff devoid of pertinent knowledge and confidence regarding these issues.

### **Efficacy of Sexual Violence Training**

The literature encourages college campuses to endorse multi-modal prevention approaches (DeGue et al., 2014; Jozkowski & Ekbias, 2015; Nation et al., 2003; Peterson & Buelow, n.d.; Pilgram & Keyton, 2009). Yet, findings of an extensive systematic review reveal that nearly one-third of interventions utilized a single mode of delivery. In half of the studies examined, participants were exposed to an intervention/training for a total of 1 hour or less, and over 72 percent of the interventions contained only a single session (DeGue et al., 2014). Moreover, only three interventions explicitly included content designed for specific racial/ethnic groups. Not a single IHE evaluated programs that targeted sexual minority populations (DeGue et al., 2014). Lastly, findings show the effects of these programs generally diminish over time (Breitenbecher, 2000), from moderate effects immediately post-intervention, to limited effects 4–6 weeks following the intervention (Flores & Hartlaub, 1998). This demonstrates only a temporary impact from the programming (Paul & Gray, 2011).

IHEs are advised to employ sexual violence interventions that show, “the best evidence for the largest impact on actual rates of sexual violence and incorporate a quality-improvement orientation in which data on stakeholder satisfaction and outcomes are constantly collected and evaluated” (Newlands & O’Donohue, 2016, p. 2). Furthermore, all instructional design processes stress the importance of evaluation of each learning objective to determine training effectiveness (Dick, Carey, & Carey, 2004; Kirkpatrick, 1994; Mager, 1997; Pilgram & Keyton, 2009).

However, as previously mentioned, the effectiveness of sexual violence training is rarely rigorously evaluated (Pilgram & Keyton, 2009; Hopkins, 2018).

To this point, 51.9% of the institutions that responded to the Hopkins (2018) survey stated that they evaluate their RE training to some degree. Evaluation efforts were primarily focused on obtaining information regarding participants' reactions to the training, predominantly through reaction sheets and observations. Additionally, 84.6% of these institutions indicated that they also evaluate the participants' learning following the training: 44% of participating IHEs utilized pretest-posttest assessments, 11.1% utilized observations; and 55.6% utilized "other" methods (Hopkins, 2018). There were limitations to this study, however, including a low response rate, which the researcher indicated "clearly influenced the ability to draw generalizations from the findings" (Hopkins, 2018, p. 43). Participants had to self-disclose their training/assessment practices, which might not contain fully accurate information. Finally, the survey instrument used contained questions that offered only fixed responses, which did not allow respondents to specify when choosing "other." This feature therefore limits the understanding of how a large portion of IHEs offer training and whether the effectiveness of the trainings, such as assessing participant learning, are actually rigorously evaluated. While some training programs, such as those created by EVERFI, are rigorously assessed, and the issue then becomes the specific evaluation methods and outcomes of many programs are rarely revealed.

One such training provider is EVERFI, which is a leading technology company which offers comprehensive online awareness and prevention education tools. Programs developed by EVERFI are designed for users ranging from K-12 to higher education to corporate compliance and cover topics such as alcohol abuse prevention, Title IX, diversity, and harassment prevention (EVERFI, 2018). In addition to implementing these programs, EVERFI measures their

programs' effectiveness and helps clients understand how to implement their own effective ongoing prevention and awareness education programs. This type of data could be invaluable to other institutions. However, neither EVERFI's evaluation procedures nor results are publicized.

Regardless of the audience the training is intended for, the value of the training must be questioned when institutions are moving forward without clear guidelines, expectations, or standards on how to provide training on sexual violence. IHEs should offer training and education on sexual violence and measure its efficacy in the following ways: participants' reactions to the training; whether participants gained the necessary knowledge, skills, and confidence to adequately identify potentially sexually violent behaviors; and how to receive and respond to disclosures of sexual violence. The data collected should then be publicized and used to inform future improvements. One way to possibly assess this training among faculty and staff and to establish a baseline pulse of the community is to disseminate a campus climate survey to this population.

### **Faculty and Staff Campus Climate Surveys**

The findings from campus climate surveys specifically targeting faculty and staff, or any other population aside from students, are extremely limited. The identified findings from will be discussed here.

As part of a conference presentation, O'Connor, Steiner, Cusano, and McMahon (2019, January) examined campus staff's knowledge of whether they were mandated reporters, and how this related to their knowledge of how to assist survivors of sexual violence. Using multiple regressions, staff who were aware of their mandated reporter status were compared to those who were not aware of their status. The outcome variables were their knowledge of how to assist survivors of campus sexual violence and dating violence, and their awareness of available

resources. Data reflected that staff who were aware of their mandatory reporter status were more knowledgeable about how to help sexual assault survivors compared to those who did not know if they were mandated reporter ( $p < .001$ ), and had greater awareness of local/campus resources ( $p < .005$ ). Although not explicitly stated, one plausible explanation for increased awareness of mandatory reporter status and resources could be a result of receiving training. Similar findings were noted in a separate study done by Emory University (2015).

In 2015, Emory University disseminated a comprehensive campus climate survey to their faculty and staff. At the time, this had not previously been done at any other institution. Since no model survey existed, Emory developed its own inventory by drawing on examples set forth by the WHTF and other universities that published their student survey questionnaires. The overall purpose of the survey was to “capture employees’ experiences with sexual harassment and training in sex discrimination, knowledge of Title IX, and comfort with guiding students and colleagues through the disclosure process” (Emory University, 2015, p. 1). Emory obtained roughly a 20% response rate ( $N= 2290$ ) and garnered some noteworthy findings: the administrators of the survey found significant differences in knowledge of Title IX depending on whether the faculty staff member reported having received training. Among those who had received training, 89% of faculty and 71% of staff indicated that they were knowledgeable of Title IX and what it protects. Sixty-four percent of faculty and 46% of staff who were not previously trained knew this information. Among the respondents trained, 46% of faculty and 36% of staff knew of the campus’ Title IX Coordinator and how to contact them. For the respondents who were not trained, 12% of faculty and 13% of staff knew of the Title IX Coordinator and how to contact them. More than 80% of the faculty and nearly half of the staff said they had receiving training to address issues of sexual misconduct. Yet, even among



respondents who reported receiving training only a minority were “very comfortable” with guiding a student or a colleague through the university’s disclosure process, while 38% of faculty and 49% of staff did not feel comfortable at all guiding a student through a disclosure process.

It is important to note that the inventory Emory used contained only self-reported measures which may not be completely accurate. In addition, it is important for future researchers to examine respondents’ actual level of knowledge as opposed to perceived level of knowledge they may be conflated. If at the end of the day those who have received training are not knowledgeable of key learning objectives (e.g. what is Title IX, who to report incidents to, etc.), and do not feel comfortable navigating the IHE’s disclosure process, how effective and beneficial can one deem that training to be? One must also consider that while it is important to offer comprehensive training to those in mandated reporter/RE roles, those individuals are not the only ones who receive disclosures from students. Regardless of role, the employee’s knowledge and comfort navigating the disclosure process can ultimately impact not just the student’s experience, but the campus climate as a whole.

### **Limitations of Current Climate Surveys**

As evidenced by the research of both Wood et al. (2017) and Moylan et al. (2018), extensive variations exist among campus climate surveys and related findings. Moylan et al. (2018) found that many campus climate reports suggested that survey instruments were modified from the original instrument, often without including the full question wording. Therefore, it could not be ascertained the extent to which sexual violence questions were altered. Furthermore, campuses varied in how they chose to report the survey results, including collapsing or disaggregating types of sexual violence and reporting an overall rate or sub-group rates only.

Additional areas where deviations were commonly noted include how sexual violence was assessed overall, and also timeframe (i.e. since enrolling at the institution, within the past 12 months, the current academic year, etc.) and response options (i.e. broad definition of sexual violence, drop-down list of behaviors, etc.). Together, these factors barred researchers' ability to compare or summarize trends in sexual violence prevalence. According to Moylan et al. (2018), "The variation in measurement of sexual victimization limits the ability of campuses, students, and researchers to make comparisons and raises concerns about unscientific measurement likely to produce inaccurate estimates of prevalence" (p. 447). Fedina et al. (2018) also note factors influencing variations in findings as well including:

Research design (longitudinal vs. cross-sectional studies, reporting time frame measured), differences in sampling strategies (i.e., small samples vs. larger samples, convenience vs. random sampling and nationally representative samples), different sample characteristics (i.e., underclassmen vs. upperclassmen), the measures used (SES and other behavior-based measures), and variability in the constructs and definitions for sexual victimization. (p. 87)

While various limitations exist in the implementation and analysis of campus climate surveys, these limitations should not deter IHEs from issuing them. On the contrary, by implementing these types of inventories, especially to populations, such as employees, IHEs could demonstrate a commitment to understanding the holistic climate on campus and work towards developing institutional prevention and response strategies that address all members of the campus community. Wood et al. (2017) emphasized this idea by writing, "National dialogue about these forms of violence on campus has been further opened; it is our obligation to use this momentum to work toward improved prevention and intervention efforts to increase campus and

community safety” (p. 1264). This is in line with recommendations put forth by McMahon et al. (2016), who stated that researchers may want to focus on the following findings: Awareness of campus resources; Understanding of the campus’ adjudicative process; Perception of sexual violence as a problem on campus; and Perception of the campus’ response to sexual violence. There is a considerable amount of research in these areas exists pertaining to students, “a natural extension of campus climate work is to explore the role, perceptions, and experiences of faculty, administration, and staff addressing sexual assault, dating/domestic violence, sexual harassment, and stalking prevention, intervention, and reporting issues on their campuses” (Wood et al., 2017, p. 1264). As such, Wood et al. (2017) stresses that, “More information is needed about the role faculty in particular play in the response to sexual violence in the lives of students” (p. 1264). The next chapter outlines how the strengths and weaknesses in the current literature guided the methodology developed for this study.

### CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

#### Design

An exploratory survey research design was used to collect the necessary quantitative data to answer the aforementioned research questions.

#### Setting

Ruth Bader Ginsburg University (RBGU) [pseudonym] is a mid-sized public IHE in the Northeast United States which serves a community of approximately 7,400 students and over 1,200 full-time faculty and staff. Known for its highly selective admissions, RBGU is recognized as one of the nation's top comprehensive colleges and has maintained its status among the top-ten highest four-year graduation rates among all public colleges and universities (RBGU, n.d.).

#### Participants

As of October 4, 2019, there were 1,214 full-time professional faculty ( $n=829$ ) and staff ( $n=385$ ) at RBGU, according to data from RBGU's Center for Institutional Effectiveness. Given the population size, the predicted and anticipated sample size for this study was between approximately 121 to 182 participants if a 10-15% response rate were to be obtained. However, the ideal sample size for this estimated population was estimated to be approximately 293 participants when using a confidence level of 95% and a 5% margin of error. All members within the target population were invited and had equal opportunity to participate in the study by completing the online survey.

#### Measures

The survey measurement tool was inspired by previous literature and created to assess the extent to which faculty/staff at RBGU are: (a) knowledgeable about TIX, sexual violence, and resources available on campus to address and respond to incidents of sexual violence; (b)

confident in their knowledge and ability to receive disclosures of sexual violence and respond accordingly; and (c) willing to engage in campus change efforts surrounding sexual violence prevention and response. Additionally, the instrument was designed to better understand how faculty/staff perceive the campus climate in regards to issues surrounding sexual violence. A variety of previously used inventories largely influenced this study's measurement tool (Edwards et al., 2015; McMahon et al., 2018c; McMahon & O'Connor, n.d.; Mansell et al., 2017, among others) and the WHTF *Not Alone* toolkit (WHTF, 2014b). However, modifications were made to allow for the instrument to be more aligned to the research questions, and the particular campus community being examined. The instrument was broken down into the following content blocks: Informed consent; Responsible Employee (RE) role/training; Actual Knowledge; Perceived Knowledge; Confidence; Campus climate & Readiness to Engage; and Demographics. See Appendix A for complete questionnaire and Appendix B for details on which questions were inspired by each piece of literature.

### **Assessing Role and Presence/Perceived Effectiveness of Training**

Question 2 of the survey asked participants to indicate whether they were identified by RBGU as a RE, and was followed by question 3, which asked whether the participant received RE training through RBGU. If the participant answered "no" for question 3, they skipped right to question 8. If the participant answered "yes," questions 4-7 were displayed and the participant was prompted to answer. Questions 4 and 5 inquired when the participants most recently received training (in terms of academic year), and the manner to which the training had been completed (online, in person, both, or other). Then, using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *very unhelpful* to 5 = *very helpful*), questions were asked about the extent to which participants found the training to be helpful in providing them with the knowledge (Q6) and confidence (Q7) to

fulfill the role and expectations associated with being a RE. Questions 6 and 7 were modeled after the faculty and staff instrument created by McMahon and O'Connor (n.d.). The inventory created by McMahon and O'Connor was essentially a healthy compilation of questions from both the Rutgers iSpeak campus climate survey (McMahon et al., 2018c), the Campus Community Readiness to Engage Measure (Edwards et al., 2015), and the Awareness of Campus Services Scale (McMahon, Stepleton, & Cusano, 2014). The intended purpose of McMahon and O'Connor's (n.d.) inventory was to assess the perspectives of student affairs professionals on their ability to fulfill their role as REs and their overall readiness to change related to campus sexual violence. The objectives of their research (although unpublished), closely resemble those of the current study. This made the inventory ideal to draw inspiration from. Previous literature also suggested that, "effectiveness of the training should be measured using case-based questions and behavioral identification measures" (Pilgram & Keyton, 2009, p. 237). These methods were incorporated into the overall inventory and were used to also assess participants' level of knowledge.

### **Assessment of Knowledge**

Modifications to *The Adolescent Perceptions of Wrongfulness Scale and Self-Report of Taking Action* (Katz et al., 2011) were used to measure two separate constructs: participants' "actual" and "perceived" knowledge. Each of these established measurement tools contain 16 items and are scored on 5-point Likert-type scales, to assess how wrong the participant perceives the scenario to be (1 = *not wrong at all* to 5 = *very wrong*), and the likelihood of them taking action to stop the behavior (1 = *very unlikely* to 5 = *very likely*) (Katz et al., 2011). The scenarios used by Katz et al. (2011) were derived from examples used in *Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP) Playbook* (Katz et al., 2011) and were meant to represent situations that students may

encounter in their schools and communities including sexual violence, racism, and general violence. Although the measure was designed to assess perceptions of adolescents, one can presume that if the measure was understood by adolescents, it should be equally understood by adults. Similar to other researchers (Zhang, 2015), these measures were chosen as a framework, but included only scenarios that focused on contexts of sexual violence and placed emphasis on the knowledge component rather than perception of wrongness. Other measures did not relate to research questions of this particular study.

***Actual Knowledge.*** Per recommendations from the WHTF (2014b), questions that directly assessed participants' knowledge were considered to be better than perception-oriented questions. Research demonstrates that people are not always good at estimating or understanding what they know about a topic and often times can conflate their true level of knowledge. As such, questions included in this measurement tool explicitly measured participants' "Actual Knowledge," and were embodied through four originally constructed vignettes.

Based upon the researcher's previous experience as a TIX Investigator, and now TIX Coordinator, unique and original vignettes were created for the purpose of this measurement tool. The goal was to encompass some of the behaviors from which individuals are protected under the federal amendment, specifically sexual assault, dating violence, and sexual harassment. Once the vignettes were established, they were appraised for face validity by the former TIX Coordinator at a mid-size, public IHE in the Northeast U.S., who has expertise in both practice and research around TIX. Minor adjustments were made in terms of verbiage. The vignettes were then implemented into the final measurement tool.

Each vignette (Q8-11) (Appendix C), asked participants to indicate whether they believed the behavior described in each scenario should be reported to an administrator at RBGU.

Based on the content found within vignettes 1-3 (Q8-10), the submission of a report to a college official would be warranted, whereas Vignette 4 (Q11) would not need to be reported. The use of vignettes was found within the *Not Alone* toolkit (WHTF, 2014b). The vignettes used within this survey also closely resemble the approach used by Katz (2011), and particularly, Jozkowski and Ekbria (2015) who, “aimed to assess participants’ understanding of sexual assault prevention content and their ability to apply it to real-life scenarios” (p. 99).

Participants were also asked to identify the primary person to whom they would report any of the behaviors discussed in the vignettes if they felt it was necessary (Q12). A mixture of eight individuals/offices on campus were provided for participants to choose from, along with the option to select “Other” (which included a textbox for them to explain the selection of this choice). Participants demonstrated their knowledge if they accurately chose that they would report to the TIX Coordinator for the incidents described.

Lastly, there were three additional questions included in the inventory to assess participants Actual Knowledge (Q13-Q16). Question 13 was a multi-select question that contained a list of various behaviors and asks participants to identify which are not protected under TIX. Question 14 asked participants to specify individuals at RBGU who are afforded rights and resources under TIX. Participants demonstrated their knowledge of the scope of TIX if they indicated “Academic Integrity” and “Hazing” are not protected behaviors and if they choose “All of the above” for question 14. Question 15, borrowed from Rutgers’ Staff Survey Instrument (McMahon & O’Connor, n.d.), was the final question in this category and required participants to choose the statement that best describes the role of a RE. The appropriate answer was, “To report all cases of suspected sexual violence against a RBGU community member to college officials.” While previous literature has highlighted the benefits of measuring the extent



of Actual Knowledge, this study will also incorporate participants' level of Perceived Knowledge.

***Perceived Knowledge.*** Participants' individual perceptions of their overall knowledge of the workings of TIX was assessed through the inclusion of two questions on the survey. Question 16 included five statements for participants to answer using a 5-point Likert-scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) regarding their Perceived Knowledge of available resources, reporting procedures, and duties relative to the institution. Examples were drawn from the Rutgers iSPEAK climate survey (McMahon et al., 2018c) and include, "If someone from RBGU experienced any form of sexual violence, and reported it to me, I know where they can receive help on campus," "I am aware of and understand RBGU 's procedures for dealing with reported incidents of sexual misconduct," and "I'm familiar with the obligations RBGU has to meet under Title IX and other Federal regulations."

Question 17 asked participants to use the provided scale to indicate their level of awareness of the function of a variety of campus and community resources specifically related to sexual violence response at RBGU. Previous researchers asked this question to investigate sexual harassment knowledge (Mansell et al., 2017), using slightly different verbiage and offering broad questions such as, "Are you familiar with on-campus resources?" to which participants selected "yes" or "no." For the purposes of this study, the response options to the question were modified to better align with the Awareness of Campus Services Scale created by McMahon, Stepleton, & Cusano (2014), which was used within the Rutgers Staff Survey Instrument (McMahon & O'Connor, n.d.) and the Rutgers iSpeak campus climate survey (McMahon et al., 2018c). The specific campus and community resources listed (total of nine included) were modified to reflect those particularly relevant to RBGU. A 5-point Likert-scale (1 = *not knowledgeable at*

*all to 5 = extremely knowledgeable*) was used rather than a dichotomous option to better assess the extent of participants' perceived level of knowledge of each of the specific resources. These changes were made to ensure institutional specificity since the use of campus-specific scales was recommended to better understand the needs of the campus and to help develop a meaningful action plan with the results (McMahon, Stepleton, & Cusano, 2016).

**Confidence.** The extent to which faculty/staff felt confident in their knowledge of TIX, reporting procedures, and navigating the disclosure process was also explored. The purpose of this was to anecdotally assess the effectiveness of the RE training offered by the institution. The presumption was that if the training was effective, and faculty/staff completed the training, they should be confident in these particular areas especially when compared to those not currently serving in a RE role. However, findings from other campuses found this to not always be the case (Emory College, 2015). As such, participants' answers to these questions can help draw attention to potential limitations to on-campus education and training initiatives and identify areas of strength and improvement.

For example, question 18 asked, "If I received information from a student about an incident they experienced involving sexual violence, I feel confident in my ability to..." and included four statements for participants to rate their level of agreement on a 5-point Likert Scales (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). These statements were reflective of those in Rutgers Staff Survey Instrument (McMahon & O'Connor, n.d.) and include, "Effectively handle receiving the student disclosure," "Refer that student to appropriate resources on campus," "Go to the proper place to make a report on behalf of the student," and "Effectively relay to that student what happens after a report has been made to the college." A fifth statement – "Fulfill

my role as a Responsible Employee” – is displayed, only if the participant indicated earlier that they were identified by the institution as a RE.

**Campus Climate and Readiness to Engage.** A portion of the survey focused on participants’ individual readiness to engage in campus initiatives and programs targeted at responding to campus sexual violence and the campus climate as a whole. Specifically, question 19 was a matrix-style question containing five statements from the WHTF *Not Alone* toolkit (2014b) that measure these factors. Examples of statements included in the survey are, “I think I can do something about preventing sexual violence on campus,” “I think I can do something about addressing sexual violence on campus,” and “I want to learn more about preventing and addressing sexual violence.” Participants were asked to use the provided 5-point Likert Scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) to respond to each of the statements.

Question 22 was structured similarly to question 19 and used the same Likert-scale, but contained six statements modified from Edwards et al.’s (2015) Campus Community Readiness to Engage (CCREM) tool that are relative to participants’ perceptions regarding the overall campus community in relation to sexual violence. The CCREM affords researchers the possibility of data collection that can serve as an indicator of how the engagement, the commitment, and the activity of a campus to address sexual violence, changed over time (Edwards et al., 2015). This was important to include in the current study because the level of engagement, commitment, and activity among faculty/staff can have an impact on the campus climate and therefore should also be measured. Examples of questions included are, “Campus community leaders are supportive of improving efforts to address sexual violence,” and “The majority of the campus community supports policies targeted at addressing sexual violence.”

Following the same structure, question 23 was a matrix-style question that used the same Likert-scale and was inspired by Rutgers' iSpeak Campus Climate Survey (McMahon et al., 2018c) and the WHTF *Not Alone* toolkit (2014b). The question included seven statements regarding how RBGU might handle a reported incident of sexual violence and asked participants to respond using a 5-point Likert Scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Types of statements incorporated into this question include, "RBGU would take the report seriously," "RBGU would support the person making the report," and "RBGU would handle the report fairly." These types of questions can help capture the extent to which there is trust and confidence in current institutional policies and practices and identify possible areas of improvement based on public perception.

In examining faculty and staff's readiness to engage further, participants were prompted to answer a question (Q20) through a dichotomous yes/no format about whether they were interested in attending a workshop offered by the institution on topics of TIX and sexual violence. Answering *yes* to question 20 would demonstrate a participant's willingness to engage and prompted an additional question to appear (Q21) using display logic, which contained a variety of educational topics. Participants were asked to choose all of educational topics that they were interested in learning about. Questions from the Rutgers' iSpeak Campus Climate Survey (McMahon et al., 2018c) were included, which examined whether they received any disclosures of sexual violence since working at RBGU from any students (Q24) and/or their colleagues (Q29). If they responded *yes* to either, they were asked how many disclosures they received (Q25 for students/Q30 for colleagues), what actions they took after receiving the disclosure(s) (Q26 for students/Q31 for colleagues), whether they believed the response they provided to their most recent disclosure was helpful (Q27 for student/Q32 for colleague), and whether they felt

comfortable discussing the situation with the student (Q28) or colleague (Q33) that disclosed to them. Questions 27/28 and questions 32/33 also spoke to participants' level of confidence in navigating disclosures, another factor explicitly examined in this study. It is known that students disclose their experiences with sexual violence to faculty/staff, but at this time, since the TIX Office primarily oversees student cases and concerns, the extent to which faculty/staff receive disclosures from their colleagues is not currently known. As such, questions pertaining to this research and those included on the survey focused predominantly on student disclosures/processes. However, questions 29-33 were included to help understand if/how many faculty/staff received disclosures from their colleagues, how faculty/staff perceived the encounter, and sought to determine if this was something that the Office of TIX should explore deeper moving forward.

**Demographics.** Questions 34-41 pertained to participant demographics all of which were borrowed from Rutgers Staff Survey Instrument (McMahon & O'Connor, n.d.) but slight modifications were made to make the questions more inclusive and specific to the RBGU campus. For example, in terms of inclusivity, additional options were included for participants to choose from regarding gender including "non-binary" and "prefer to self-describe." RBGU specific questions included pertained to participants' primary role at RBGU (faculty, staff, or other); how long they have worked at RBGU; and whether their role required them to have direct contact with students, and if so, what percentage of their time is dedicated towards that contact. Additionally, demographic questions also inquired about participants' current tenure status, and whether the participant was an advisor to a recognized student organization (since all advisors are also REs). The work of Edwards et al. (2015) also inspired the inclusion of question 40 which asked through the use of a dichotomous yes/no answer choice, "Does your primary

role/job responsibilities at RBGU inherently put you in a position to receive disclosures from victims/survivors of sexual violence?” Similar to Edwards et al. (2015), this question was incorporated in efforts to identify a possible correlate of perceptions of readiness.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

Following IRB approval, an exploratory survey research design was employed for this study and an online survey research protocol was utilized to collect quantitative data from both Rutgers University and Ruth Bader Ginsburg University. Upon receipt of IRB approval, an Excel spreadsheet containing complete employee profiles of all 1,214 full-time professional RBGU faculty and staff was provided to the researcher by RBGU’s Center for Institutional Effectiveness. This contact information was necessary for participant recruitment.

Participants were recruited using both convenience and modified snowball sampling techniques. The convenience sample of RBGU faculty and staff was recruited directly via an email sent through the Qualtrics survey software. This email described the purpose and brief description of the study, a request for their participation, and a link that took the reader directly to the survey housed within Qualtrics Survey Software (Qualtrics, Provo, UT).

The modified snowball sampling technique consisted of two separate emails sent to the IHE’s Assistant Vice Presidents (AVPs) and Academic Provosts and Deans— one at the launch of the survey requesting that they encourage faculty/staff in their individual portfolios to complete the survey, and a reminder email sent at the beginning of the second week the survey was active. Participants were also recruited through a full communications campaign, including advertising the survey throughout the RBGU campus with flyers and online through several social media platforms including Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and RBGU Today webpage.

Participants had access to the survey through their computers and mobile devices such as smartphones and tablets. The survey was completely anonymous, so no identifying information, including participant IP addresses, was collected. The survey took participants about 15 minutes to complete. The brevity of the survey was important since using a brief instrument that takes less than 15 minutes to complete has been shown to yield a higher rate of return (Creswell, 2015).

The survey was administered beginning on January 24, 2020 and was active for just over two weeks. Throughout the data collection phase, one reminder email was sent to participants on January 31, 2020 who had not yet completed the survey. The survey was closed on February 12, 2020. Participants were required to finish the entire survey in one sitting as they did not have the ability to return to the survey once they exited the survey window. Completed electronic surveys from participants were returned directly to the researcher via Qualtrics Survey Software. Following the close of the survey, data were exported from Qualtrics and downloaded into a .csv file. Through this data collection procedure, various measures were put in place specifically to protect any individual who chose to participate in the study.

### **Protection of Participants**

The survey was administered electronically and no identifying information was collected. Upon clicking the survey link, participants were directed to the study's consent form constructed from the template provided by Rutgers University, which detailed the study procedures and the expectations laid out for them as a participant. Participants were instructed that by clicking the *I consent* option below they indicated that they were at least 18 years old, were a current full-time faculty or staff member at Ruth Bader Ginsburg Univ., have read and understood this consent form, and agreed to participate in this research study. If participants did not consent, they simply

hit the “I do NOT consent” option, which directed them to the end of the survey. Participants could also exit the web browser to excuse themselves from participation entirely. In order to access the survey content, participants were required to choose “I consent.” The question relative to informed consent required a response of “I consent” to move forward and access the rest of the survey content. However, all other survey questions were optional to answer meaning participants were able to skip a question and continue with the survey if they wished to do so.

For those who consented to participate, they had the option to complete the survey on any smart device (i.e. phone, tablet, computer, etc.) that had access to Wi-Fi or cellular data. Completed surveys were sent directly to the researcher via Qualtrics Survey Software to help avoid real or perceived coercion of any kind from RBGU or its administration. All data were stored within Qualtrics survey software, which is password-protected. Upon the completion of the data collection, the data were downloaded and stored electronically on the researcher’s password-protected computer. Data has not, and will not, be made publicly available. Participants were not able to access their data once the survey was complete. All raw data collected will be destroyed based upon the timeline/guidelines laid out by Rutgers University’s research standards.

Lastly, there were no foreseeable risks in participating in this survey beyond those incurred in daily life. The survey could have been completed at any time during the period in which the survey was open, and in the comfort of the participant’s own environment. Participation in the study was voluntary and participants had the opportunity to exit the survey at any time (without penalty) if desired. Additionally, the survey was anonymous meaning no identifiable information was collected when completing it. These factors minimized both perceived coercion and the risk involved with participating in research.



## **CHAPTER IV: RESULTS**

The purpose of this survey-based research study was to determine the extent to which faculty/staff at a mid-sized public IHE in New Jersey were: knowledgeable about TIX, sexual violence, and structures/procedures in place to address and respond to incidents of sexual violence; confident in their ability to receive disclosures of sexual violence and to respond appropriately; and willing to engage in efforts on campus surrounding sexual violence prevention and response. The study also examined the perceptions of faculty/staff regarding their campus climate overall. In this chapter, the findings pertaining to each research question and subsequent statistical analysis are discussed.

### **Data Analysis**

Data collected from the participants through the Qualtrics survey were exported into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and uploaded into SPSS. Based on previous literature that recommended that data collected from climate surveys be examined within and across groups (McMahon, Stapleton, & Cusano, 2016), the initial layer of analysis involved grouping participants into two separate groups: those who identified themselves as a Responsible Employee (RE) and those who did not (Non-RE). From there, basic descriptive statistics were calculated, and inferential statistical analyses were conducted using REs and Non-REs as the comparative groups.

### **Sample**

Participants recruited for this study included any individual who was a current, full-time, professional faculty or staff employee at RBGU, over 18 years old, and fluent in English. The total sample consisted of 191 participants, which was calculated to be a 15.6% response rate. One person chose “I do NOT consent” and was immediately brought to the end of the survey. No

data were collected from this participant. Thus, the individual was removed from the data set and the final sample resulted in 190 participants ( $n=149$  staff,  $n=38$  faculty).

Table 1 displays the demographics of participants. The data analysis revealed that the majority of respondents identified as staff members (78.4%) and female ( $n=119$ , 62.6%), and indicated that their roles involved direct contact with students ( $n=169$ , 88.9%). Question 39, “Approximately what percent of your job involves direct contact with students?” was only shown to those who said they had direct contact with students. Technically, the answer choice of ‘0%’ is redundant and could be removed in future iterations of the survey. However, of the participants who indicated their role at RBGU did involve direct student contact, 21 also chose 0% when asked to approximate the percent of their role that involves contact with students. These results are conflicting and unclear at this time. Although there was a small number of faculty respondents ( $n=38$ ), most of them (63%) indicated that they were tenured. There was also a large variation between how long participants worked at the institution. Length of employment ranged from less than a year ( $n=16$ ) to 21 or more years ( $n=23$ ), with a large portion of participants (40%) indicated that they were employed at RBGU for between 1-5 years, and the majority (51.5%) having worked for the IHE between 6 to 21 or more years. In addition, 17.4% of participants reported that their primary role at the IHE involved the provision of services or programs related to sexual violence, while 80% had no connection and 2.6% reported they were not sure.

**Table 1***Participant Demographics (N=190)*

	<i>n</i>	Percent
Gender of Respondents		
Female	119	62.6
Male	61	32.1
Prefer not to answer	7	3.7
Prefer to self-describe	2	1.1
Non-binary	1	.5
Primary Role at RBGU		
Staff	149	78.4
Faculty	38	20.0
Other	3	1.6
Length of Employment at RBGU		
< 1 year	16	8.4
1-5 years	76	40
6-10 years	36	18.9
11-15 years	19	10
16-20 years	20	10.5
21 or more years	23	12.1
Responsible Employee (RE) Status		
RE	128	67.4
Non-RE	62	32.6
Direct Contact with Students in Role		
Yes	169	88.9
No	21	11.1
% of Role Involving Direct Student Contact		
0%	21	11.1
< 25%	35	18.4
25-50%	37	19.5
51-75%	39	20.5
> 75% but < 100%	37	19.5
No Answer	21	11.1
Involved with Delivery of SV Services/Programs		
Yes	33	17.4
No	152	80
Unsure	5	2.6
Advisor to Recognized Student Organization		
Yes	34	67.4
No	156	32.6

Notably, 67.4% ( $n=128$ ) indicated that they were identified by RBGU as a Responsible Employee. Those who chose “no” or “I don’t know” ( $n=62$ ) to being a RE were collapsed into one group “Non-RE” to simplify the analysis. Of the 128 participants who indicated they were a RE, their responses to whether they received RE training through RBGU varied, despite it being a requirement for REs. A little over 100 participants said they had, while others said they had not ( $n=8$ ) or they didn’t remember ( $n=10$ ). Answers to this question also varied for those who were Non-REs, but far fewer people completed the training ( $n=8$ ) than not (Table 3). As shown in Table 3, nearly 95% of all participants who stated they completed the training, indicated they did so within the past three years, with the highest attendance being in 2019-2020. The most common method of training (73.5%,  $n=86$ ) was through in-person sessions.

**Table 2**

*Received Responsible Employee Training Offered by RBGU*

	Have you received Responsible Employee training offered by RBGU?			Total
	Yes	No	I don't remember	
RE	110	8	10	128
Non-RE	8	47	7	62
Total	118	55	17	190

**Table 3***Responsible Employee Training Specifics*

	RE	Non-RE	Total	Percent
Year most recently trained				
2014 - 2015	1	0	1	.9
2015 - 2016	2	0	2	1.7
2016 - 2017	3	0	3	2.6
2017 - 2018	14	4	18	15.3
2018 - 2019	25	4	29	24.6
2019 - 2020	65	0	65	55.1
Mode of most recent training				
In-person training	80	6	86	73.5
e-Learning modules (Online)	29	2	31	26.5

*Note.* This includes only those that stated they had received training ( $n=118$ ).

Participants who indicated that they received RE training through RBGU were prompted to answer questions relative to how effective the training was at providing them the knowledge/understanding and confidence in fulfilling the role of a RE. This question was scored on a 5-point Likert Scale. On average, participants stated the training was “moderately” (3) and “very effective” (4) at providing the necessary knowledge/understanding and confidence with mean scores of  $3.88 \pm .629$  and  $3.69 \pm .722$  respectively.

**Table 4***Perceived Efficacy of Responsible Employee Training*

	Mean $\pm$ SD
How <b>effective</b> would you say the training was in providing you with the <b>knowledge and understanding of the expectations</b> associated with your role of a Responsible Employee and implementing the information in future situations?	3.88 $\pm$ .629
How <b>effective</b> would you say the training was in providing you with the <b>confidence in fulfilling the expectations</b> associated with your role of a Responsible Employee and implementing the information in future situations?	3.69 $\pm$ .722

*Note.* This includes only those that stated they had received training ( $n=118$ ).

Inferential statistics weren't calculated between groups for training efficacy, year trained, or method of training since the sample of Non-REs who completed training was too small for any significant differences to be determined. However, these analyses were run for the content aimed at answering each of the study's research questions. A breakdown of the analysis and findings of each research question can be found below.

### Research Question Results

In terms of statistical analysis, independent samples *t*-tests were run to compare REs to those of Non-REs for each of the constructs highlighted within each research question. These constructs include: Actual Knowledge; Perceived Knowledge; Confidence; Readiness to engage in campus change efforts; and Perceptions of the campus climate. Chi square analyses were also calculated on categorical items.

#### Research Question 1

The first research question asked, "To what extent are RBGU faculty/staff knowledgeable about TIX, sexual violence, and structures/procedures in place on campus to address and

respond to incidents of sexual violence at RBGU?” Survey questions 8 through 15 were analyzed to answer this question.

Questions 8-11 contained the individual vignettes that provided participants with four different scenarios and asked them to indicate whether they believed the information contained in the vignette warranted a report be made to a college official. Table 5 provides an overview of how participants responded to each vignette and the statistical analyses conducted to compare REs to Non-REs.

All vignettes, except for Vignette 4, contained information regarding possible sexual violence that would warrant a report to a college official. The average accuracy score for all four vignettes among all participants was 84%. Vignettes 2 and 4 resulted in the highest percent correct with 96% and 98% accuracy respectively. The question that presented greater discrepancies than others was Vignette 1. Just over 37% of all participants (REs=30, Non-REs=41) stated that they did not believe the information in Vignette 1 needed to be reported. There was a statistically significant difference between the groups ( $p < .001$ ) as most REs chose “yes” (76.6%) and most Non-REs chose “no” (66.1%). No other vignettes prompted statistically significant differences between groups. However, Vignette 3 contained the second highest number of incorrect responses from REs ( $n=22$ ) and Non-REs ( $n=18$ ), which indicates that these two scenarios created additional challenges for participants than the others.

**Table 5***Participants' Actual Knowledge*

		RE	Non-RE	Total	Percent	Chi	<i>p</i>
Vignette 1	Yes <sup>†</sup>	98	21	119	62.6	32.526	<.001**
	No	30	41	71	37.4		
Vignette 2	Yes <sup>†</sup>	125	57	182	95.8	3.389	.0656
	No	3	5	8	4.2		
Vignette 3	Yes <sup>†</sup>	106	44	150	78.9	3.526	.0604
	No	22	18	40	21.1		
Vignette 4	Yes	2	2	4	2.1	0.5607	.4539
	No <sup>†</sup>	126	60	186	97.9		

\*\**p* < .001<sup>†</sup> Indicates correct choice

Following the vignettes, participants were asked to share whom they believed the most appropriate person would be to report any information contained in the vignettes. Most participants (*n*=159) chose “Title IX Coordinator,” which is the correct answer. About 87% of REs (*n*=112) and 76% of Non-REs (*n*=47) selected this choice. No one chose “Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO)/Affirmative Action (AA) Officer,” “a colleague,” or “Academic Dean.” Responses from participants who chose “Other” included: “Dean of Students Office,” “the CARE Team” (which is also a component of the Dean of Students Office), “I am a counselor so I am bound by confidentiality not to report any of the aforementioned,” and “it depends.”



**Table 6***Selections on Most Appropriate Person to Whom to Report*

	RE	Non-RE	Total
Title IX Coordinator <sup>†</sup>	112	47	159
Public Safety/Campus Police	8	3	11
Office of Student Life	5	6	11
Administrator	0	3	3
Program Director	1	1	2
Other	2	2	4

<sup>†</sup> Indicates correct choice

Question 13 was a multi-select question which asked participants to choose all of the behaviors that were *not* protected under TIX. “Academic integrity” and “Hazing” were the two answers that should have been chosen. Most participants chose these answers correctly. Given the limited sample collected for the other answer choices, Chi-square and independent samples *t*-tests were conducted only on these two. These analyses revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between REs and Non-REs for either correct answer. This means that REs did not demonstrate more Actual Knowledge than Non-REs on this particular question. In fact, some REs chose “gender discrimination” ( $n=15$ ), “dating/domestic violence” ( $n=2$ ), and “stalking” ( $n=3$ ), whereas Non-REs did not, with the exception of 3 participants. Question 14 further explored participants’ Actual Knowledge and asked them to indicate whom at RBGU is afforded rights/resources under TIX. All members of the campus community including faculty, staff, students, and third parties are covered under TIX. With the exception of 20 participants (REs=12, Non-REs= 8) who thought only undergraduate and graduate students were protected, all participants answered this question correctly. The final question relating to participants’ Actual Knowledge was in regard to the role of a RE. The majority of participants (84%)

accurately recognized the role of the RE. However, there were 17 REs who thought reporting was only necessary if they had clear and sufficient evidence that the violence occurred ( $n=9$ ), or if the person who had been harmed grants permission ( $n=5$ ). Three REs felt that none of the statements accurately reflected the role of the RE. Additional information regarding participants' responses to these questions can be found in Tables 7 and below.

**Table 7***Participants' Knowledge of Behaviors Under TIX*

	RE	Non-RE	Total	Chi	<i>p</i>
Academic Integrity <sup>†</sup>	123	61	184	0.718	.397
Dating/Domestic Violence	2	0	2		
Gender Discrimination	15	3	18		
Hazing <sup>†</sup>	46	23	69	0.056	.813
Stalking	3	0	3		
Sexual Assault	0	0	0		
Sexual Harassment	0	0	0		

<sup>†</sup> Indicates correct choice – all other options should not have been selected.

**Table 8***Participants' Knowledge of the Role of a RE*

	RE	Non-RE	Total
To report all cases of suspected sexual violence against a RBGU community member to college officials <sup>†</sup>	111	48	159
To report cases of suspected sexual violence against a RBGU community member to college officials if you have clear and sufficient evidence that the violence occurred	9	9	18
To report cases of suspected sexual violence to college officials only if the RBGU community member who has been harmed grants you permission	5	3	8
None of the above	3	2	5

<sup>†</sup> Indicates correct choice – all other options should not have been selected.

**Research Question 2**

The second research question focused on, “How faculty/staff perceive their level of knowledge regarding college processes, reporting procedures, and resources available to them, their colleagues, and students to address and respond to TIX incidents at RBGU.” Survey questions 16 and 17 pertained to these constructs. As indicated in Table 9 below, independent samples *t*-tests revealed that REs reported being significantly more knowledgeable of factors relating to resources (both on and off-campus), and RBGU’s procedure/obligations than Non-REs. Similarly, Table 10 reflects that REs reported significantly more awareness of different campus and community resources specifically related to sexual violence response at RBGU than Non-REs. There was a statistically significant difference found between REs and Non-REs on *all* constructs related to Perceived Knowledge and awareness with the majority resulting in a *p* value < .0001.

**Table 9***Participants' Perceived Knowledge*

Statement	RE	Non-RE	t	p	df
	Mean $\pm$ SD	Mean $\pm$ SD			
If someone from RBGU experienced any form of sexual violence, and reported it to me, I know where they can receive help on campus.	4.64 $\pm$ .571	4.11 $\pm$ 0.943	4.781	<.001**	188
If someone from RBGU experienced any form of sexual violence, and reported it to me, I know where they can receive help off campus.	3.79 $\pm$ 1.234	3.35 $\pm$ 1.189	2.302	.022*	188
I am aware of and understand RBGUs procedures for dealing with reported incidents of sexual misconduct.	4.27 $\pm$ 0.820	3.31 $\pm$ 1.182	6.560	<.001**	188
I know what services and resources are available for people at RBGU who experience sexual violence.	4.38 $\pm$ 0.784	3.71 $\pm$ 1.165	4.650	<.001**	188
I'm familiar with the obligations RBGU has to meet under TIX and other federal regulations.	4.34 $\pm$ 0.766	3.71 $\pm$ 1.105	7.005	<.001**	188

\* $p < .05$ \*\* $p < .001$

**Table 10**

*Participants' Level of Awareness of Available Campus & Community Resources Specifically Related to Sexual Violence Response at RBGU*

Statement	RE	Non-RE	t	p	df
	Mean $\pm$ SD	Mean $\pm$ SD			
Center for Integrated Wellness	2.73 $\pm$ 1.202	2.16 $\pm$ 1.214	3.000	.003*	187
Dean of Students CARE Office	3.84 $\pm$ 1.085	2.84 $\pm$ 1.293	5.559	<.001**	187
Mental Health Services	3.98 $\pm$ 0.913	3.23 $\pm$ 1.137	4.945	<.001**	188
Office of Anti-Violence Initiatives	3.81 $\pm$ 1.018	3.05 $\pm$ 1.247	4.501	<.001**	188
Office of Campus Police Services	4.06 $\pm$ 0.903	3.42 $\pm$ 0.933	4.554	<.001**	188
Office of Student Conduct	3.82 $\pm$ 1.046	3.03 $\pm$ 1.145	4.721	<.001**	188
Office of Title IX	4.05 $\pm$ 0.908	3.24 $\pm$ 1.155	5.281	<.001**	188
Student Health Services	3.82 $\pm$ 0.976	3.05 $\pm$ 1.031	5.019	<.001**	188
Womanspace	3.12 $\pm$ 1.289	2.53 $\pm$ 1.376	2.87	.005*	187

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .001$

### Research Question 3

“To what extent are RBGU faculty/staff confident in their ability to receive disclosures of sexual violence and appropriately respond?” Responses to survey question 18 addressed this research question and asked participants to indicate the extent to which they agreed with multiple statements associated with the following prompt: “If I received information from a student about an incident they experienced involving sexual violence, I feel confident in my ability to...”

Participants could answer each statement using a 5-point Likert Scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). On average, REs “somewhat” to “strongly agreed” that they felt confident in effectively receiving student disclosures, referring the student to appropriate resources on campus, going to the proper place to make a report on behalf of the student, and fulfilling their role as a RE. Non-REs demonstrated less confidence in all of these areas. The average answer

provided by this group fell between “neither agree/disagree” and “somewhat agree.” The area that both REs and Non-REs felt least confident was effectively relaying to the student what happens after a report is made to the institution. Findings of the independent samples *t*-test (Table 11) showed that there was a highly statistically significant difference ( $p < .001$ ) between REs and Non-REs on all constructs relating to confidence in question 18.

**Table 11**

*Participants' Responses Regarding their Level of Confidence*

Statement	RE	Non-RE	t	p	df
	Mean $\pm$ SD	Mean $\pm$ SD			
Effectively handle receiving student disclosures	4.35 $\pm$ 0.800	3.42 $\pm$ 1.262	6.187	<.001**	188
Refer student to the appropriate resources on campus	4.56 $\pm$ 0.684	3.95 $\pm$ 0.913	5.153	<.001**	188
Go to the proper place to make a report on behalf of the student	4.54 $\pm$ 0.731	3.47 $\pm$ 1.112	7.932	<.001**	188
Effectively relay to that student what happens after a report has been made to the college	3.95 $\pm$ 1.110	2.90 $\pm$ 1.339	5.662	<.001**	188
Fulfill my role as a Responsible Employee	4.50 $\pm$ 0.774				

\*\* $p < .001$

Given that questions 26-28 and 30-33 relating to response efficacy and comfortability were only displayed if the participant chose *yes* to having received a disclosure from a victim/survivor (Q24 for students, Q29 for colleagues), the Non-RE group didn't include enough respondents to make for meaningful statistical analyses. However, Table 12 contains the frequencies to which participants responded regarding their experience receiving disclosures and compares REs to Non-REs.

Of the 68 participants who reported that they received a student disclosure, 67 answered the question (Q25) that asked how many they had received since working at RBGU. The majority of participants ( $n=21$ , 31%) indicated that they received two disclosures from students (REs=19, Non-REs=2) over the course of their employment, and 19% ( $n=13$ ) indicated they had received greater than 15 (REs=19, Non-REs=2) from students. The receipt of disclosures made by colleagues was less frequent. Only 12% ( $n=22$ ) of participants stated that they received disclosure (s) from their colleagues since working at RBGU. The majority of participants reported that they received 1 disclosure (45%). There were 2 REs who stated they had received 9 disclosures from their colleagues, which was the highest number of disclosures reported for colleagues for both groups.

Overall, 91% of all participants indicated that they felt comfortable receiving disclosures of sexual violence from both students and their colleagues. The majority of participants reported that they felt their response after the receipt of a disclosure was helpful, but even more so for disclosures from colleagues (95.5%) than students (92.4%).

**Table 12***Participants' Responses Regarding the Receipt of Student & Colleague Disclosures*

	RE	Non-RE	Total	Percent
Student Disclosure				
Received a Student Disclosure				
Yes	56	12	68	35.8
No	71	50	121	63.7
No Answer	1	0	1	.5
Provided Helpful Response				
Yes	49	12	61	92.4
No	5	0	5	7.6
Comfortable Receiving Disclosure				
Yes	48	12	60	90.9
No	6	0	6	9.1
Colleague Disclosure				
Received a Colleague's Disclosure				
Yes	15	7	22	11.7
No	111	55	166	88.3
Provided Helpful Response				
Yes	15	6	21	95.5
No	0	1	1	4.5
Comfortable Receiving Disclosure				
Yes	15	5	20	90.9
No	0	2	2	9.1

Of note, REs may not have always assumed that role, so it is possible that the actions they stated they took after a disclosure, whether it be from a student or a colleague, related to those that took place prior to them being a position that required them to report the information. As such, it was through this lens that participants' answers to questions 26 and 31 were evaluated. The frequency to which participants engaged in certain actions after receiving a student disclosure (Q26) is represented in Table 13. The most common actions taken by both REs and Non-REs were "referred to on-campus resources," "reported to the Title IX Coordinator/Office," and "referred to off-campus resources." Participants also had the



opportunity to provide a text response for some answer choices, specifically “Did not do anything” and “Other.” Some reasons why participants stated they did *not* do anything were, “Many of these experiences occurred before both the Title IX Coordinator/Office and the CARE process were even created,” and “The incident was already being handled by the Title IX office.” Each of these responses were provided by more than one participant. Responses provided for “Other” shared similar sentiments about the student already being connected to resources. A few participants indicated that they were confidential employees (e.g. counselors, health care provider, clergy) and encouraged the student to report the incident and assisted them in processing what had occurred.

**Table 13***Actions Taken After Receiving a Student Disclosure*

Action Taken	RE	Non-RE	Total
Reported the information to Campus Police	17	1	18
Reported to the Title IX Coordinator/Office	33	1	34
Submitted a CARE Referral	18	3	21
Reported the information to the EEO/AA Officer/Office	3	0	3
Referred to on-campus resources	34	8	42
Referred to off-campus resources	24	2	26
Did not do anything	9	3	12
Other	4	4	8

In contrast, participants received far fewer disclosures from colleagues than students. None of the participants, regardless of RE role, reported their colleague’s disclosure to Campus Police, the Title IX Coordinator/Office, or to the CARE team (which is an extension of the Dean of Students Office). The action participants most frequently took after their colleague’s disclosure was to do nothing. Most often, the open-ended responses participants provided

indicated that the incident their colleague disclosed occurred when they were a child/adolescent, that it happened many years ago, and their colleague didn't want it to be reported.

**Table 14**

*Actions Taken After Receiving a Colleague Disclosure*

Action Taken	RE	Non-RE	Total
Reported the information to Campus Police	0	0	0
Reported to the Title IX Coordinator/Office	0	0	0
Submitted a CARE Referral	0	0	0
Reported the information to the EEO/AA Officer/Office	1	0	1
Referred to on-campus resources	2	0	2
Referred to off-campus resources	4	2	6
Did not do anything	10	4	14
Other	1	2	3

EEO/AA = Equal Opportunity Officer/Affirmative Action Officer

#### Research Question 4

Research question four asked, “To what extent are faculty/staff willing to engage in change efforts on campus surrounding sexual violence prevention and response?” The construct of readiness and willingness to engage in campus change efforts was assessed primarily through questions 19-21. Question 19 asked participants to indicate the extent to which they agreed with each of the statements presented. Table 15 outlines these statements and associated findings further. On average, REs responses were between “neither agree/disagree” and “somewhat agree” with each statement, while the average choice for Non-REs was “neither agree nor disagree.” There was a statistically significant difference between responses from REs and Non-REs for each statement except, “I want to learn more about preventing and addressing sexual violence.” This statement also received the highest average level of agreement from both groups. In contrast, the statement to which both groups agreed with the least was in regard to “I have

recently attended a program on sexual violence.” The statement about being involved in ongoing prevention efforts fell close behind.

**Table 15**

*Participants’ Readiness to Engage in Campus Change Efforts*

Statement	RE	Non-RE	t	p	df
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD			
I think I can do something about sexual violence on campus	3.53 ± 1.104	3.15 ± 1.006	2.3	.023*	187
I think I can do something about addressing sexual violence on campus	4.01 ± 0.904	3.61 ± 0.947	2.78	.019*	187
I want to learn more about preventing and addressing sexual violence	4.12 ± 0.878	3.94 ± 0.866	1.35	.179	187
I have recently attended a program on sexual violence	3.10 ± 1.468	2.26 ± 1.330	3.83	<.001**	187
I have been or am currently involved in ongoing efforts to end sexual violence on campus	3.14 ± 1.401	2.32 ± 1.376	3.8	<.001**	187

\* $p < .05$

\*\* $p < .001$

The survey also asked all participants if they were “interested in attending a workshop offered by RBGU on topics of TIX and sexual violence” (Q20), which 75% ( $n = 143$ ) of participants indicated they were. Participants who indicated they would like to attend a workshop/training offered by RBGU were prompted to answer question 21 which required them to select all of the topics in which they were interested in learning more. Table 16 contains the training topics listed in the order of greatest to least popularity among all participants. The top three topics were Bystander Intervention, Healthy Relationships, and Responsible Employee Training. Forty-two percent of REs and 46% of all participants stated they were interested in attending RE training, despite it already being a requirement for REs.

**Table 16***Participants' Interest in Attending Workshops/Trainings & Associated Topics*

	RE	Non-RE	Total
Participant interest in attending workshop/training*			
Yes	100	43	143
No	28	19	47
Workshop/training topics of interest			
Bystander Intervention	64	29	93
Healthy Relationships	45	14	90
Responsible Employee Training	54	33	87
Sexual Violence 101	53	19	72
Advisor Training	35	16	51
Let's Talk about Consent	30	16	46
Formal Hearing Administrator Training	30	9	39
Investigator Training	26	7	33
Other	3	3	6

\* $\chi^2(1, N=190) = .1189, p = .256$

Another answer choice that participants could select was “Other,” which included a text box that allowed them to elaborate on what topics, aside from those listed, they wanted to explore. Six participants chose this option and their recommendations included: Peer to peer education; Working with law enforcement; Training on the various resources available to those who have experienced sexual violence; What is appropriate within an office among colleagues and supervisors; and Ways to integrate content into courses in a trauma-informed way.

**Research Question 5**

The final research question was, “How do faculty/staff perceive RBGU’s campus climate in regard to issues surrounding sexual violence?” Data collected related to the campus climate can be found in Table 17, which provides a comprehensive summary of the analyses for questions 22 and 33. The concepts within both questions are similar. However, they were split up

into separate questions to ensure maximum usability for participants if they were to complete the survey on a mobile device.

The average response from all participants to the constructs asked within question 22 was  $3.85 \pm 0.31$ , which indicates participants generally did not have strong opinions regarding the climate on campus. REs most strongly agreed that “Campus community leaders are supportive of improving efforts to address sexual violence,” while Non-REs most strongly agreed with “The majority of the campus community supports policies targeted at addressing sexual violence.” The areas to which all participants regardless of RE role agreed least were “Specific resources at the college have been obtained to address sexual violence,” “Data about sexual violence on our campus are readily available,” and “Sexual violence is a problem at RBGU.”

Constructs included in question 23 garnered an average response from all participants of  $4.49 \pm 0.14$  that equates to at minimum answer of “somewhat agree,” but many participants, particularly REs, provided higher responses closer to “strongly agree.” Despite both groups responding positively, there was a statistically significant difference between REs and Non-REs level of agreement on all of the constructs except for those pertaining to the IHE taking steps to ensure the student’s privacy and safety.

Out of the 12 total constructs asked in questions 22 and 23, the average response from all participants on questions relative to the campus climate was “somewhat agree” (4.20). Independent samples *t*-tests revealed statistically significant differences between the level of agreement of REs and Non-REs with REs responding more strongly on all but five of them.

**Table 17***Perceptions of RBGU's Campus Climate*

Statement	RE	Non-RE	t	p	df
	Mean ± SD	Mean ± SD			
	Question 22				
Sexual violence is a problem at RBGU	3.52 ± 0.913	3.45 ± 0.862	0.461	.645	188
Campus community leaders are supportive of improving efforts to address sexual violence	4.35 ± 0.769	4.00 ± 0.849	2.854	.005*	188
The majority of the campus community supports programs and activities targeted at addressing sexual violence	4.08 ± 0.819	3.97 ± 0.905	0.841	.401	188
The majority of the campus community supports policies targeted at addressing sexual violence	4.19 ± 0.791	4.02 ± 0.820	1.383	.174	188
Data about sexual violence on our campus are readily available.	3.77 ± 0.871	3.39 ± 0.912	2.822	.005*	188
Specific resources at the college have been obtained to address sexual violence	4.06 ± 0.903	3.42 ± 0.933	2.766	.006*	188
	Question 23				
RBGU would take the report seriously	4.81 ± 0.465	4.55 ± 0.717	3.051	.003*	188
RBGU would maintain the privacy of the person making the report	4.65 ± 0.683	4.47 ± 0.718	1.682	.094	188
RBGU would take steps to protect the safety of the person making the report	4.65 ± 0.659	4.45 ± 0.761	1.833	.068	188
If requested by the victim, RBGU would forward the report to criminal investigators.	4.73 ± 0.636	4.34 ± 0.829	3.558	<.001**	188
RBGU would support the person making the report	4.67 ± 0.733	4.26 ± 0.808	3.527	.001*	188
RBGU would take action to address factors that may have led to the incident of sexual violence	4.43 ± 0.839	4.08 ± 0.836	2.692	.008*	188
RBGU would handle the report fairly	4.58 ± 0.800	4.19 ± 0.920	2.956	.027*	188

\* $p < .05$ \*\* $p < .001$

In summary, statistical analyses revealed that the majority of participants: performed well on all constructs relative to Actual Knowledge; felt comfortable receiving disclosures of sexual violence and that their response was helpful; and expressed both positive perceptions of the campus climate and interest in learning more about preventing/addressing sexual violence. Statistically significant differences were found between REs and Non-REs on all constructs related to Perceived Knowledge, awareness, and confidence, and their perceptions of the overall campus climate, with REs generally responding with stronger agreement. No statistically significant differences in Actual Knowledge were found between REs and Non-REs, despite most having received training on the topics and being responsible for properly handling these issues.

## CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION

The final chapter reviews the central findings from the research conducted at RBGU, discusses limitations found within the study, and proposes recommendations for future considerations and research in the context of faculty and staff-oriented campus climate surveys around TIX and sexual violence.

### **Efficacy of RE Training**

In the current study, Responsible Employees (REs) reported being significantly more confident in handling disclosures of sexual violence, referring to resources, knowing the proper place to make a report, and being aware of every campus and community resource available than their Non-REs colleagues. These findings are similar to those of O'Connor, Steiner, Cusano, and McMahon (n.d.). O'Connor et al. (n.d.) who found that staff who were aware of their mandatory reporter status were more knowledgeable about how to help sexual assault survivors and had greater awareness of local/campus resources compared to those who did not know if they were mandated reporters. REs at RBGU are obligated to complete training every three years as part of their role, which may have contributed to their higher confidence levels surrounding sexual violence as described above. When REs were asked whether they'd received training through RBGU their responses varied with 110 saying they had, while others ( $n=8$ ) said they had not or they did not remember ( $n=10$ ). There were also six REs who stated the last time they had received training was between 2014 and 2017. Both of these factors are concerning because of the required RE training schedule. Yet, some REs said they did not know if they received it, while others had let their training lapse by years. However, there may be various explanations for this. There is a chance that those individuals previously served in the role of a RE, but no longer were, and therefore would not have needed to, receive training upon the renewal period. For



example, they may have received training several years prior because at the time they had served as an advisor to a recognized student organization on campus and were considered a RE, but now they no longer served in that capacity (neither in the advisor role nor as a RE). Given the anonymity of the responses, the context around when they received training and why is currently unknown.

Participants who indicated that they completed training perceived it to be on average somewhere between “moderately effective” to “very effective,” although closer to the latter. This is positive, though there is still an opportunity for improvement. It is unclear what type of training the participant may have been evaluating (e.g. In-person, online, or both), or whether the length of time between when they completed the training and took the survey may have impacted their perceptions of the efficacy of the training. Additionally, the in-person RE training was modified over the last two years so the small group of participants who completed it prior to that ( $n = 20$ ) may have assessed a different version of the training when answering these questions. Despite participants having perceived the training to be more effective than not, it appears that there may be opportunities to improve the learning opportunity to enhance participants’ knowledge and confidence around fulfilling the role of a RE.

### **Actual and Perceived Knowledge**

Participants’ Actual Knowledge was assessed through seven different questions, four of which were scenario-based vignettes. The majority of participants (84%) answered each of the vignettes correctly regardless of their RE role. This result is promising since not all participants were REs and not all of them attended a training. Yet, they still made the correct decision regarding reporting. The hope is that they would translate that knowledge into action when

navigating possible disclosures in real life. However, some responses to the vignettes raised questions.

Out of the four vignettes, Vignettes 1 and 3 appeared to contain more variation in responses than others. Vignette 1 described a student named Richard who reported that he was not looking forward to going home for break because he would see his aunt for the first time since she assaulted him as a child. This scenario was designed to intentionally incorporate misconceptions individuals commonly have around TIX reporting. More often than not, individuals assume that if an incident happened off-campus prior to the individual being associated with the IHE, and/or the person who caused the alleged harm is not associated with the IHE, then the information would not need to be reported, even by a RE. This is incorrect for RBGU REs. RBGU applies a broader interpretation of the law and REs are trained that TIX applies to the individual student, faculty, staff, or third-party associated with a federally funded IHE regardless of where or when the alleged harm occurred. As such, this information would be something that would need to be reported to the IHE, yet 23% of REs stated they did not believe the information warranted a report.

Vignette 3 described a student, Sarah, who appeared to be involved in what some may perceive to be a toxic or controlling relationship. The vignette described Sarah as constantly checking her phone in somewhat of an anxious way and dropping whatever she was doing to meet her partner whenever they contacted her. She also recently showed signs of bruising on her chin and around her wrists. Sarah shrugged off the inquiry about her injuries stating that she was just “clumsy”; the vignette alludes to the idea that the injuries were inflicted by her partner. Almost 79% of participants stated that they believed this information should be reported. That is the appropriate response, not only because of reporting requirements, but also for the safety of

Sarah, due to the sudden escalation of behavior described in the scenario. When abusive behavior evolves from one form to another, or increases in severity, it is known as escalation (National Domestic Violence Hotline, 2018). Sarah's situation may be an example of sudden escalation as her partner's behavior seemed to transition from possibly exerting power and control in emotional or psychological ways to physical abuse. These are very tangible concerns and encapsulate what is known as dating violence according to institutional policy. However, the concerns may not be readily apparent to some.

For example, a small number of participants stated that Sarah's situation did not warrant a report, including REs ( $n=22$ ) and Non-REs ( $n=18$ ). While the rationale for why participants chose their answers is unknown since no qualitative data were collected, it is possible that some of the aforementioned misconceptions may have influenced participants' decision, as well as the misidentification of behaviors that are covered under TIX.

When asked to identify the behaviors listed that were not protected under TIX, 15 REs chose the answer "gender discrimination." Yet, TIX states, "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination," (Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972). Further, three REs selected "stalking," and two selected "dating/domestic violence" as behaviors not protected under TIX. These findings are important because all three of these behaviors are, in fact, protected under federal law. If REs are not familiar with what behaviors fall under TIX, and someone disclosed to them that they were impacted by one of them, then it is possible to assume that the RE most likely would not fulfill their reporting obligations as they would not recognize that it was something that they specifically needed to report. This may tie into the example from Vignette 3 where perhaps individuals did not perceive the behavior Sarah was experiencing as a form of

dating violence and/or did not believe dating violence was something that needed to be reported. This may also be true if the RE is unsure of what their role specifically entails.

Most REs (87%) accurately identified that within their role REs they are required “to report all cases of suspected sexual violence against a RBGU community member to college officials.” This is a positive finding, however, there were 17 REs who chose the incorrect answer. Some believed that making a report was only necessary if they had clear and sufficient evidence that violence occurred. Others thought that unless the individual granted them permission to report on their behalf, reporting was not required. Three REs also chose the “None of the above” option. Since this answer choice did not provide participants with an open-ended text box, they were unable to elaborate further. Additionally, 12 REs (and 8 Non-REs) indicated that only undergraduate & graduate students received protections under TIX, but faculty and staff are also included in those protections. This fact is explicitly stated during RE training, because it’s important that REs know who is protected under TIX and from what if they are going to be able to properly uphold their reporting requirements.

Overall, the correct responses from the entire sample of participants, including REs and Non-REs were remarkable. That cannot and should not be understated. Findings showed that the majority of participants could correctly identify the role of a RE, the most appropriate person to report concerns regarding sexual violence to and were aware of who and what behaviors are protected under TIX. This is impressive and demonstrates general knowledge regarding these topics. However, although the number of REs who answered questions incorrectly was nominal, no statistically significant difference was found between REs and Non-REs relative to Actual Knowledge overall. This indicates that there are still opportunities for more effective education. It is important to consider the possible repercussions that may ensue for the RE, the student, and

the IHE should the RE ineffectively navigate a disclosure due to their lack of knowledge and understanding. Going beyond training and federal mandates, it is crucial that the entire campus community be aware that they are protected from discrimination and harassment and deserve to thrive in a healthy living, working, and learning environment. Considering participants who are unaware of this level of protection and what they are protected from emphasizes the need to enhance this messaging to the campus community to the extent possible. This may help to improve campus efforts around both prevention of and response to sexual violence. Efforts should also be made to reinforce the role of the RE during the training, as well as between training renewal periods. Not only could this impact knowledge retention, but it may also help increase participants' confidence in navigating these matters.

### **Perceptions of Confidence**

The majority of participants (91%) who reported that they received a disclosure of sexual violence since working at RBGU also reported that they felt comfortable receiving the disclosures. With these constructs, it was interpreted that feeling comfortable receiving the disclosure was related to the individual's level of confidence. While most participants stated they felt comfortable, there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups. This is interesting because although REs did not demonstrate significantly more Actual Knowledge than Non-REs, they reported being more confident than Non-REs. The specific reasoning for this is currently unknown, but one possibility might be that REs in this study had an inflated perception of their knowledge and ability to fulfill their duties, which was reflected in their reported self-confidence.

Additionally, all participants felt that the response they provided to the disclosure had been helpful, but this was greater for disclosures from colleagues (95.5%) than from students

(92.4%). This aligns with other findings produced from this study that showed participants felt least confident in effectively relaying to the student what happens after a report has been made to the institution. This could be why participants, regardless of role, found their response to students to be less helpful; they just may not have known what to say or how to explain the process. This is similar to the findings of the climate survey conducted by Emory University (2015) that found that only a small portion of participants indicated that they were “very comfortable” with guiding a student through the university’s disclosure process, even among those who reported receiving training. Emory University found similar findings regarding participants’ comfort level with helping colleagues navigate the process. This finding is of interest because during the in-person RE training offered at RBGU, the IHE’s process following the receipt of a TIX report is explained in a step-by-step fashion both verbally and through various diagrams/flowcharts. Further, the graphics discussed during the training are also housed on multiple webpages through the TIX Office, including the page dedicated to REs. The content is being covered during the training, but attendees still do not feel confident in their ability to relay that information once they leave. It may be beneficial to explore alternative ways to disseminate the information both during and after the training.

### **Training and Education**

Prevention educators Peterson and Buelow published a White Paper on behalf of Everfi that focused on the necessity of ongoing prevention and awareness programs for mitigating campus sexual and interpersonal violence prevention efforts. The researchers highlighted the key characteristics that inform best practices around providing this essential education (Peterson & Buelow, n.d.). Everfi argues that ending sexual assault simply cannot be accomplished without continuous, ongoing training and suggests that prevention efforts around sexual violence should

be grounded in the Nine Principles of Effective Prevention (Nation et al., 2003). Overall, these Principles indicate that effective training is (a) comprehensive; (b) includes varied teaching methods; (c) provides sufficient dosage; (d) is driven by theory; (e) provides opportunities for positive relationships; (f) is appropriately timed; (g) is socioculturally relevant; (h) includes some form of outcome evaluation; and (i) involves well-trained staff (Nation et al., 2003; Peterson & Buelow, n.d.). While these principles are used to frame best practices around prevention work with students, they generally embody overall effective learning and therefore may be beneficial for TIX staff and prevention practitioners on-campus to consider when deciding how they select, modify, offer, and/or create more effective educational opportunities.

### **Readiness to Engage**

Around 75% of all participants said that they wanted to learn more about the topic of sexual violence through a variety of trainings/workshops. This is discordant with the additional readiness to engage measure in this study regarding recent attendance in offered programs. When participants were asked if they have recently attended a program on sexual violence, on average REs said they “neither agree nor disagree” and Non-REs were between “strongly disagree” and “somewhat disagree.” The construct regarding attendance at a recent program about sexual violence was the lowest scoring for both groups out of all of the constructs assessed in that question. At RBGU, there are various educational opportunities offered throughout the academic year, which are open to the entire campus community. However, attendance is often extremely low relative to the numbers of faculty/staff. It is possible that participants’ low attendance at various educational sessions/workshops may also have influenced the feelings many shared, which was that they neither agreed nor disagreed that they could do much to prevent sexual violence. Responses for each group were also similar in regard to being currently involved in

ongoing efforts to end sexual violence on campus. These ideologies are conflicting as participants say they want to learn more about preventing and addressing sexual violence but are not engaged in the efforts to do so.

One reason why participants may have stated they were interested in participating on the survey could be due to social desirability bias. Due to self-presentation concerns, when completing surveys, particularly those inquiring about socially sensitive situations/behavior (King & Brunner 2000, as cited in van de Mortel, 2008), respondents tend to underreport socially undesirable activities and over-report socially desirable ones (Krumpal, 2013). On the survey used for the current study, participants were asked about their readiness to engage in campus efforts through questions such as, “I want to learn more about preventing and addressing sexual violence.” It is possible that given the sensitivity around the topic, participants may have responded strongly/positively even if they did not truly feel that way out of fear of how they may be perceived if they responded honestly. Since the survey measure did not include a social desirability scale, it is unknown the extent to which participants’ responses were swayed by this form of bias. In the event that participants’ positive responses were authentic, it may be advantageous for the departments who offer these workshops/trainings, such as the Office of TIX, Office of Student Conduct, and the Office of Anti-Violence Initiatives to employ more targeted recruitment of faculty/staff and marketing to enhance the awareness of the opportunity. Further, particular consideration should be given to help faculty/staff move beyond a passive approach and increase their level of engagement.

Despite the importance of engagement, there are a multitude of factors entrenched within institutional structures and processes that are counterintuitive to supporting true engagement of faculty and staff in campus change efforts (Harrill, Lawton, & Fabianke, 2015). Examples



include but are not limited to: lack of time, financial and other tangible resources; accessibility (e.g. adjunct faculty being on campus full-time); and silos that often exist between departments and divisions that stunt collaboration. Through their years of research, Harrill, Lawton, and Fabianke (2015) found that, “faculty and staff are the key to successful cultural and organizational change and that the most sustainable and impactful change comes when they are not only engaged but also are the drivers of the work” (Harrill, Lawton, & Fabianke, 2015, par. 2). A way to make the engagement in campus efforts around sexual violence prevention meaningful for the faculty might be to figure out a way to connect the educational content to their course learning objectives (Harrill, Lawton, & Fabianke, 2015). Not only could this help bridge the gap between academic and student affairs that is often seen among IHEs, it could also bring all facets of the campus community together to engage in the dialogue. Researchers have also recommended that faculty consider developing and teaching undergraduate first-year seminar courses on interpersonal violence, which would introduce students to the topic of while also incorporating prevention messaging (Graham, Mennicke, Rizo, Wood, & Mengo, 2018). Incorporating the learning in this way could also possibly meet some of the Principles for Prevention Education (e.g. sustained, on-going, comprehensive) without it feeling artificial. With regard to both faculty/staff, it may be fruitful to market trainings/workshops as professional development opportunities and/or offer incentives for participating. What is most important to consider is how IHEs can offer learning opportunities based on its campus culture that faculty/staff in turn perceive as valuable, and motivates them to develop a sense of ownership and responsibility towards preventing and effectively responding to sexual violence, and positively impacting the campus climate (Harrill, Lawton, & Fabianke, 2015).

### **Campus Climate and Reporting**

Overall, faculty and staff consistently expressed positive perceptions about the climate on RBGU's campus relative to issues of sexual violence. Concepts that garnered the most agreement among participants were, "Campus community leaders are supportive of improving efforts to address sexual violence," "If requested by the victim, RBGU would forward the report to criminal investigators," and "RBGU would support the person making the report." Sentiments with higher levels of agreement also included those relative to RBGU maintaining the privacy and safety of the person making the report. In general, the statement that received the highest level of agreement from both REs ( $4.81 \pm .465$ ) and Non-REs ( $4.55 \pm .717$ ) was that "RBGU would take a report of sexual violence seriously."

Collectively, these findings seem to indicate that faculty/staff have confidence in RBGU's ability to navigate issues of sexual violence in a way that is supportive to the parties involved and effective at addressing the concerns. This is critical because the research shows that when students trusted their university support system (e.g., campus police, administrators) they were more likely to report concerns about violence (Sulkowski, 2011). This is also important to note because earning this level of trust from campus community members can be challenging particularly at a time in society where our mainstream media is full of examples of institutional wrongdoing, specifically cases involving of campus sexual assault.

Numerous high-profile cases have seen the spotlight over the past few years, including but not limited to those at Baylor University, Columbia University, Florida State University, Stanford University, Pennsylvania State University, and Michigan State University. Cases such as these have drawn attention to instances where IHEs' personnel and/or policies/procedures may have discouraged reporting of violations, or made reporting unnecessarily difficult, blamed the

victim for their experience, and failed to implement appropriate sanctions to hold the accused accountable (Stader & Williams-Cunningham, 2017). These pitfalls are not unique to just these institutions. These types of cases have helped establish a narrative about campus sexual violence as a whole, and the role IHEs play in that. When an IHE fails to appropriately respond to reports of sexual violence, it can lead to a silencing effect that discourages future reporting and can result in what has been termed “institutional betrayal” (Stader & Williams-Cunningham, 2017).

Because of the perceptions guiding so many of these conversations taking place nationally, and just how common they have become, it is possible that even if an individual’s campus may not have been featured in the headlines, campus community members may still be hesitant to engage with their institution’s process out of fear of betrayal. This fear may also be rationalized as research has found that the trauma experienced by students can be exacerbated by the institution’s failure or inadequacy to respond because they have an expectation of safety and trust from the institution (Smith & Freyd, 2013). Impacts of the presence of institutional trust, or lack thereof, could arguably have tremendous trickle-down effects; if faculty/staff have placed trust in RBGU’s administration, perhaps that may influence students to have trust as well.

While the population for the current study was faculty/staff, their knowledge and perceptions were similar to those of students in the study conducted by McMahon et al. (2015). Data collected through campus climate surveys and focus groups conducted at Rutgers University found that although students believed the university would handle their report correctly and were therefore willing to disclose their experience to them, they did not know the proper reporting procedures and policies on sexual violence (McMahon et al., 2015). This also aligns with findings from the current study that found that both REs and Non-REs felt least confident in was in effectively relaying to the student what happens after a report has been made

to the institution. It is important that members of the community feel comfortable reporting and are willing to do so. However, that may all be for naught if neither faculty/staff nor students effectively know how to report and can describe what happens following the report. To avoid inflicting any form of institutional betrayal, whether perceived or real, it is clear that efforts must be placed in making the process of reporting and opportunity to do so more transparent and understandable for all members of the campus community. This information is currently publicly available on the Office of TIX's website, shared during trainings for both faculty/staff and students, and reinforced throughout the year in a variety of ways both in-person and electronically via social media platforms. On-going efforts should continue and further opportunities and methods to disseminate this information should be considered. While these encouraging responses should not be taken for granted, it is important not to overlook some of the negative perceptions that were reflected as well as they may offer areas of possible improvement for the institution.

**Negative perceptions of campus climate.** The topics with which all participants, regardless of RE role, agreed with the least were, "Specific resources at the college have been obtained to address sexual violence," "Data about sexual violence on our campus are readily available," and "Sexual violence is a problem at RBGU." Participants did not express agreement in either direction in regard to whether sexual violence was a problem at RBGU. The average answer among participants (both REs and Non-REs) was 3.48, which indicates that collectively they "neither agreed nor disagreed" with the sentiment. Similar to responses to other questions, the reasoning behind why participants chose their answer is unfortunately unknown given the confines of the survey format. However, it is possible that participants were not entirely aware of the prevalence of sexual violence on campus and therefore unsure of the extent to which it could

be an issue for RBGU. This possibility may be supported by the fact that another construct with which participants disagreed was that data regarding sexual violence on campus was readily available. Data such as the IHE's Annual Security Report (commonly referred to as Clery Report), which outlines the aggregate number of sexual violence crimes over a three-year span, is available through multiple RBGU websites including Campus Police. This information is not comprehensive of all reports the IHE receives regarding sexual violence because it is based upon federal crime statistics and definitions and only accounts for incidents that occurred within the Clery geography of RBGU's campus. For example, if an incident of sexual harassment was reported to the Office of TIX, it would not be counted for Clery purposes because sexual harassment is not considered a criminal offense under VAWA. However, it would be kept on record and used to identify trends and patterns. The same would apply for an incident of sexual assault that allegedly occurred at a local establishment; while the assault would rise to a VAWA offense, the incident occurred outside of RBGU's campus geography and therefore would not be counted for annual statistics for Clery, but would be counted for the Office of TIX. As such, data are available, but do not paint a full picture. During trainings/workshops offered by the Office of TIX, data regarding prevalence that is inclusive of all reports received by the Office is shared and explained to attendees. Outside of those sessions, that information is not readily accessible. At this time, efforts are taking place to provide a centrally-housed location on the TIX website to share multiple forms of data relative to sexual violence. However, the site is not yet active and that may be why participants answered "neither agree nor disagree" to the question regarding availability of sexual violence data. The distribution of information from offices managing these types of issues to the extent possible without violating privacy, is critical to increase not only awareness, but also promote public transparency. The more that members of the campus

community understand about what the Offices do and how they operate, the more opportunities there are to build trust and confidence that the institution is handling reports of sexual violence effectively and empathetically.

When asked what actions participants took after receiving a disclosure, a handful of participants chose “Did not do anything” and included a text response to provide details. One participant wrote, “Unlike some of the offices involved at RBGU. I follow-up with the student well after the reporting with concern and compassion.” Another participant had submitted, “Students had already reported incidents to AVI or the Title IX Office. I have found that students prefer seeking a restorative justice solution than proceeding with Title IX. The investigators do not prioritize the student’s privacy/private information and have been shown to mislead students in thinking they’ll obtain justice.” Both of these responses were provided by REs. It is currently unknown when these participants completed RE training or how engaged they are with current efforts through the Office of TIX. However, among the resolution options offered to students through RBGU’s *TIX Policy*, there is one that is specifically grounded in restorative justice.

Most individuals are not fully aware of what a TIX process involves or what options are available unless they themselves or someone they know has needed/utilized the services. Similarly, it makes sense that individuals who do not attend training/workshops or are actively involved on campus in other capacities relative to sexual violence may be aware that campus community leaders are engaged in these efforts or that specific resources at the IHE have been obtained to achieve them, which is what participants stated in this study. This reinforces the importance of both transparency and the need for faculty/staff to be, not only aware of, but also confident in explaining what options exist to members of the campus community and how they can best be a form of support following a disclosure. Findings showed that both students and

colleagues may disclose to faculty/staff after an experience of sexual violence, rather than going directly to an available resource, such as the TIX office. As a result, the more that faculty/staff can speak to the options and resources available to resolve the incident, the better the chances are that both they, and the victim/survivor themselves, will not see lack of options as a barrier to reporting or accessing all that is afforded to them under TIX.

Overall the findings of this study are pertinent for IHEs to consider, particularly those at IHEs who are tasked with establishing campus-wide policies and educating the campus community around both prevention and compliance efforts oversee the creation and implementation of institutional policies. Some examples include the IHE's general counsel, Title IX Coordinators, Student Conduct officers, and sexual violence prevention/education specialists. By implementing climate surveys similar to the one used at RBGU, IHEs may be afforded the opportunity to better understand the strengths and deficits that may exist within their current models of training/education, the engagement of their faculty/staff, and the current climate of their campus.

### **Limitations of the Study**

While positive and fruitful findings stemmed from the current study, it was not without some limitations. Initially, issues arose when disseminating the survey directly through the Qualtrics survey platform. When participants received the invitation to participate, their RBGU email account prompted them with a warning that the content of the email may have been spam. Some participants reached out to the researcher to confirm that the invitation to participate was not malware. It is unknown whether other participants had the same concern as well and just did not reach out to confirm/take the survey all together. This issue was addressed prior to the

reminder email being sent out, but the impact it may have had on initial outreach is unknown.

There were also issues in regard to wording of survey questions after dissemination.

Question 16, “I am aware of and understand RBGU’s procedures for dealing with reported incidents of sexual misconduct,” has two separate constructs (aware/understand) in one question. Since a participant could be aware but not understand and vice versa, this statement should be separated in the future to accurately assess the individual constructs. Question 39 was only shown to those who said their role involved direct contact with students. Theoretically, the option of 0% is redundant and could be removed in future iterations of the survey. Vignettes were multiple choice and participants had a 50/50 chance of answering the question correctly. As such, responses may or may not indicate the extent of participants’ Actual Knowledge.

Lastly, it is important to note that the sample obtained for this study may not be representative of all faculty and staff, regardless of role, at RBGU. Only 5% of the approximately 829 full-time faculty and 39% of the full-time staff participated in the study. Additionally, out of the approximately 379 REs identified at RBGU, around 34% responded to the survey. However, there is a chance this number could be higher as there were a few participants who stated they weren’t sure of their RE role. Because of these factors, along with the fact that participants were only recruited from RBGU and the inventory focused primarily on RBGU’s policies, practices, and campus climate as a whole, the results garnered through this study are not generalizable to other IHEs. Nevertheless, the findings of this study provide a framework for future research and offer implications worthy of consideration.



### **Implications & Future Directions**

Climate surveys should be implemented regularly among faculty/staff in efforts to identify themes and trends within this population. There needs to be a means to do so, though, in a valid and reliable way if meaningful data is to be garnered. The inventory used for this research was adopted from various other validated survey instruments, but once compiled, it was not validated. With this in mind, future studies should involve determining the validity of the survey measure used for this study in efforts to provide other IHEs a standardized tool to draw upon.

When finalizing the survey instrument, it may be important to consider making a few modifications. One factor to consider when finalizing a future survey instrument, aside from those already mentioned within the limitations, is that the current inventory did not contain any form of social desirability scale. As such, it is possible that participants responded to questions, particularly those relating to campus climate and readiness to engage, in ways that they believed the researcher would most want to hear. Future iterations of the survey should consider including these types of scales to counterbalance responses provided based on social perception. Additionally, the survey as it stands, is very much victim/reporter centered in terms of questions, such as, “RBGU would support the person making the report” and “RBGU would protect the privacy of the person making the report.” Participants may have different opinions on the IHE’s ability to support other individuals involved in TIX processes such as the accused/respondent, or even witnesses. As a result, it may be advantageous to modify questions to be broader, such as “all parties involved,” or have separate constructs for the different parties so that the survey overall is reflective of all parties involved in the process.

Lastly, as mentioned, vignettes were multiple choice and may not have accurately captured the extent of participants’ Actual Knowledge. It may be beneficial for future researchers

to include open-ended textboxes following each question for participants to elaborate why they believed the incident described in the vignette should or should not be reported. This recommendation could also apply to questions relating to participants' experience receiving disclosures, specifically whether they believed their response to the individual to be effective and if they felt comfortable navigating that process/disclosure. The qualitative data collected through those opened-ended responses could then be coded and analyzed for common themes and to better assess participants' level of knowledge and thought processes. This was also the case for questions 27/28 and 32/33, which did not collect qualitative data. However, it would be beneficial to better understand why some participants indicated that they were not comfortable and/or confident navigating disclosures from students and their colleagues. This information could provide further context as to where training efforts could be improved to better prepare faculty/staff to handle these situations in the future (Graham, Mennicke, Rizo, Wood, & Mengo, 2018). Establishing a comprehensive and reliable measure would support individual institutions in their data collection efforts, and in comparing and contrasting IHEs in ways similar to the AAU Campus Climate Survey does, but for faculty and staff.

Once a reliable tool has been established, it would be interesting to assess whether there may differences in participants' knowledge, confidence, readiness to engage, and overall perception of the campus climate based on demographic factors such as gender, length of employment at the institution, and even tenure status. These data could provide insight as to whether more individualized and targeted approaches may be beneficial for certain populations relative to education and training and/or interventions to improve the campus climate. Another viable option to gain further insight might be to conduct a mixed method design where the survey could be disseminated, and then followed-up with focus groups to collect associated

qualitative data regarding the topics mentioned within the survey. This option may offer a more holistic way to look at the perspectives and experiences of faculty/staff on campus. Data about these experiences should then be made readily available to the campus community and public.

IHEs should consider ways in which data about sexual violence on campus can be made readily available to members of the campus community. This recommendation is based both on the findings of the current study and those from McMahon, Stepleton, and Cusano (2016). These data may contain statistics relative to prevalence, adjudication outcomes, trainings offered, prevention efforts, and other data that pertains to the specific campus culture. Examples may include current numbers of reports/resolution processes through the Office of TIX and/or Student Conduct each semester or academic year, the IHE's Annual Security Report (ASR), and recent campus climate survey data. IHEs should also be intentional when deciding where to house this information as it is one thing to simply post the content and another to make it accessible.

Given that Non-REs also received disclosures from both students and colleagues, it may be beneficial to take note of to whom within the campus community faculty/staff indicate they would report disclosures of sexual violence. If the individuals mentioned are not currently REs, it may be beneficial to consider having them assume that role. Members of the community may believe that individual to have the authority to address sexual violence, thus why they are reporting to them. As such, they may be a great asset to ensuring reports properly reach the appropriate area.

Finally, IHEs should take time to consider how frequently their campus receives training on prevention and reporting measures around sexual violence. At RBGU faculty/staff in RE roles are required to complete training once every three years. However, the findings allude to the idea that perhaps the length of time between renewal periods should be shorter. Requiring training to

be more frequent than three years may help support retention of knowledge and confidence. Additionally, it may be advantageous to connect with REs periodically between training periods whether through inter-office mail, postcards sent home, social media campaigns, emails, or all of the above to offer refreshers/reminders on their role/where to report disclosures of sexual violence or misconduct. This may be particularly helpful in the event of transition in roles within the TIX Office.

### **Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which faculty/staff at a mid-sized public IHE in New Jersey were: knowledgeable about TIX, sexual violence, structures/procedures in place to address and respond to incidents of sexual violence; confident in their ability to receive disclosures of sexual violence and to respond appropriately; and willing to engage in efforts on campus surrounding sexual violence prevention and response. The study also examined the perceptions of faculty/staff regarding their campus climate overall. The data indicated that REs demonstrated more knowledge (on most factors), confidence, and readiness to engage than Non-REs in the sample. These findings are optimistic given the role that REs play in combatting sexual violence on campus, such as reporting cases to the TIX office, referring to resources, etc. Additionally, REs generally tended to hold more positive perceptions of the campus climate than Non-REs, although overall the perception among both groups was encouraging. These findings speak to the IHEs ongoing efforts regarding training/education, prevention of, and response to sexual violence. While the efforts appear successful, there is still room for improvement. As such, it is important that research in this area continue at the IHE surveyed in this study, and other IHEs around the country, in efforts to gather aggregate data, compare/contrast across institutions, and make recommendations for improvement. Efforts

should be placed in establishing a comprehensive and reliable measure to support data collection efforts to ensure the voices of faculty and staff at IHEs are heard and positive campus culture can be cultivated.

### References

- Association of American Universities. (2015). *AAU campus survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct: Key findings*. Retrieved from <http://www.aau.edu/Climate-Survey.aspx?id=16525>.
- Association of American Universities. (2019). *AAU campus survey 2019: Report executive summary*. Retrieved from <https://www.aau.edu/key-issues/campus-climate-and-safety/aau-campus-climate-survey-2019>.
- Binder, R., Garcia, P., Johnson, B., & Fuentes-Afflick, E. (2018). Sexual harassment in medical schools: The challenge to covert retaliation as a barrier to reporting. *Academic Medicine*, 93(12) 1770-1773.
- Brecklin, L. R., & Forde, D. R. (2001). A meta-analysis of rape education programs. *Violence and Victims*, 16, 303-321.
- Breitenbecher, K. H. (2000). Sexual assault on college campuses: Is an ounce of prevention enough? *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 9, 23-52.
- Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Camera, L. (2017, September 22). Trump administration rescinds Obama-Era campus sexual assault guidance. *U.S. & World News Report*. Retrieved on September 14, 2019 from <https://www.usnews.com/news/education-news/articles/2017-09-22/trump-administration-rescinds-obama-era-campus-sexual-assault-guidance>.
- Cantalupo, N. C. (2011). Burying out heads in the sand: lack of knowledge, knowledge avoidance, and the persistent problem of campus peer sexual violence. *Loyola University Chicago Law Journal*, 43, 205-266.

- Cantalupo, N. C. (2014). Institution specific victimization surveys: Addressing legal and practical disincentives to gender-based violence reporting on college campuses. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 15*, 227-241.
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2017). Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. In The Association of American Universities (Ed.). Rockville, MD: Westat.
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Harps, S., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., Lee, H., Kranz, V., Herbison, R., & Madden, K. (2020). Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. In The Association of American Universities (Ed.). Rockville, MD: Westat. Retrieved from [https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/AAU-Files/Key-Issues/Campus-Safety/Revised%20Aggregate%20report%20%20and%20appendices%201-7\\_\(01-16-2020\\_FINAL\).pdf](https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/AAU-Files/Key-Issues/Campus-Safety/Revised%20Aggregate%20report%20%20and%20appendices%201-7_(01-16-2020_FINAL).pdf)
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (2014). Preventing sexual violence on college campuses: Lessons from research and practice. Retrieved February 7, 2018 from <https://www.notalone.gov/schools/>.
- Creswell, J. W. (2015). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE.
- DeGue, S., Valle, L. A., Holt, M. K., Massetti, G. M., Matjasko, J. L., & Tharp, A. T. (2014). A systematic review of primary prevention strategies for sexual violence perpetration. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19*(4), 346-362. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2014.05.004.

DePrince, A. P., Dmitrieva, J., Gagnon, K. L., Labus, J. Srinivas, T., & Wright, N. (2017).

Expanding use of the social reactions questionnaire among diverse women. Retrieved

November 1, 2018 from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/251459.pdf>

Dick, W. O., Carey, L., & Carey, J. O. (2004). *The systematic design of instruction* (6th ed.).

New York: Allyn & Bacon.

Duncan, S. H. (2014). The devil is in the details: Will the Campus SaVE act provide more or less

protection to victims of campus assaults? *Journal of College and University Law*, 40,

443-466.

Edwards, K. M., Moynihan, M. M., Rodenhizer-Stampfli, K. A., Demers, J. M., & Banyard, V.

L. (2015). Campus community readiness to engage measure: Its utility for campus

violence prevention initiatives- Preliminary psychometrics. *Violence and Gender*, 2(4),

214-224.

Emory University. (2015). Summary report of the Emory University faculty and staff campus

climate survey 2015. Retrieved from

[http://equityandinclusion.emory.edu/\\_includes/documents/sections/title-ix/CCS-Faculty-Staff-Report.pdf](http://equityandinclusion.emory.edu/_includes/documents/sections/title-ix/CCS-Faculty-Staff-Report.pdf)

EVERFI. (2018). About Us. Retrieved January 10, 2018 from <https://everfi.com/about/>

Fedina, L., Lynne Holmes, J., & Backes, B. L. (2018). Campus sexual assault: A systematic

review of prevalence research from 2000 to 2015. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 19(1), 76-

93. DOI: 10.1177/1524838016631129

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women*.

Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from

<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/182369.pdf>



- Flores, S. A., & Hartlaub, M. G. (1998). Reducing rape myth acceptance in male college students: A meta-analysis of intervention studies. *Journal of College Student Development, 39*, 438-448.
- Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2015). *Applying educational research: How to read, do, and use research to solve problems of practice* (7 ed.). U.S.A.: Pearson Education Inc.
- Galles, K. (2004). Filling the gaps: Women, Civil Rights, and Title IX. *Human Rights, 31*(3), 16-18.
- Garrett, J. (2016, January 4). Title IX and Clery: Key differences and similarities. *Campus Law Considered*. Retrieved on March 1, 2020 from <http://www.campuslawconsidered.com/title-ix-and-clery-key-differences-and-similarities>.
- Graham, L. M., Mennicke, A., Rizo, C. F., Wood, L., & Mengo, C. W. (2018). Interpersonal violence prevention and response on college and university campuses: Opportunities for faculty leadership. *Journal of Family Violence, 34*, 189-198.
- Harrill, M., Lawton, J. A., & Fabianke, J. (2015, Fall). Faculty and staff engagement: A core component of student success. *Peer Review, 17*(4). Retrieved from <https://www.aacu.org/peerreview/2015/fall/harrill>
- HEDS. (2015). *2015-2016 HEDS sexual assault campus climate survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.hedsconsortium.org/sexual-assault-survey/>
- Hepler, C. (2013). A bibliography of Title IX of the education amendments of 1972. *Western New England Law Review, 35*(2), 441-511.
- Hill, C., & Silva, E. (2005). *Drawing the line: Sexual harassment on campus*. Washington, DC: AAUW Educational Foundation.

Hill, C., & Kearl, H. (2011). AAUW Report: Crossing the line: Sexual harassment at school.

Retrieved April 15, 2018 from <http://aauw.org/files/2013/02/Crossing-the-Line-Sexual-Harassment-at-School.pdf>.

Hopkins, C. (2018). An evaluation of the criteria used to assess Title IX responsible employee training programs at large, four year primarily residential Institutions. Theses and

Dissertations, 2855. Retrieved August 17, 2019 from

<https://scholarworks.uark.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=4409&context=etd>

It's On Us. (2017, September 19) *It's on us- Three year anniversary* [Video]. Youtube.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ADDNkV5CQeo>.

Jozkowski, K. N., & Ekbia, H. R. (2015). Campus Craft- A game for sexual assault prevention in universities. *Games for Health Journal*, 4(2), 95-106. doi:10.108.

Katz, J., Heisterkamp, H. A., & Fleming, W. M. (2011). The social justice roots of the Mentors in Violence Prevention model and its application in a high school setting. *Violence Against Women*, 17(6), 684-702. doi:10.1177/1077801211409725.

Kilpatrick, D. G., Resnick, H. S., Ruggiero, K. J., Conoscenti, L. M., & McCauley, J. (2007).

*Drug-facilitated, incapacitated, and forcible rape- A national study*. Retrieved from

<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/219181.pdf>.

Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1994). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). New York: Berrett-Koehler.

Krebs, C., Lindquist, C., Berzofsky, M., Shook-Sa, B., Peterson, K., Planty, M., . . . Stroop, J.

(2016). Campus climate survey validation study final technical report. Retrieved

November 20, 2017 from <http://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=5540>

- Krebs, C.P., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S., & Martin, S.L. (2007). *The campus sexual assault (CSA) study – Final report*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221153.pdf>
- Krumpal, I. (2013). Determinants of social desirability bias in sensitive surveys: A literature review. *Qual Quant*, 47, 2025-2047. doi-org.proxy.libraries.rutgers.edu/10.1007/s11135-011-9640-9
- Mager, R. F. (1997). *Making instruction work* (2nd ed.). Atlanta, GA: CEP Press.
- Mansell, J., Moffit, D. M., Russ, A. C., & Thorpe, J. N. (2017). Sexual harassment training and reporting in athletic training students. *Athletic Training Education Journal*, 12(1), 3-9. doi:10.4085/12013.
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). (2014). *MIT health & wellness surveys*. Retrieved from <http://web.mit.edu/surveys/health/>
- McCaskill, C. (2014). Sexual violence on campus - How too many institutions of higher education are failing to protect students. Washington, D.C.: United States Senate Subcommittee on Financial & Contracting Oversight - Majority Staff.
- McMahon, S., & O'Connor, J. (n.d.) *Campus community readiness to engage (sexual assault) survey – Follow up*.
- McMahon, S., Stepleton, K., & Cusano, J. (2014). *Awareness of Campus Services Scale*.
- McMahon, S., Stepleton, K., & Cusano, J. (2016). Understanding and responding to campus sexual assault: A guide to climate assessment for colleges and universities. Center on Violence Against Women and Children, School of Social Work, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey: New Brunswick, NJ.

- McMahon, S., Stapleton, K., O'Connor, J., & Cusano J. (2015). #iSPEAK student experiences, attitudes, and beliefs about sexual violence: Results of the Rutgers University-New Brunswick campus climate assessment. *Rutgers University School of Social Work Final Report*. 1- 46.
- McMahon, S., Stepleton, K., Cusano, J., O'Connor, J., Gandhi, K., & McGinty, F. (2018a). Beyond sexual assault surveys: A model for comprehensive campus climate assessments. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 55:1, 78-90, DOI: 10.1080/19496591.2017.1358629
- McMahon, S., Stepleton, K., O'Connor, J., & Cusano, J. (2018b). Campus climate surveys: Lessons learned from the Rutgers – New Brunswick pilot assessment. Center on Violence Against Women and Children, School of Social Work, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey: New Brunswick, NJ.
- McMahon, S., Stapleton, K., O'Connor, J., & Cusano J. (2018c). #iSPEAK Rutgers University-New Brunswick student survey. Retrieved from <http://endsexualviolence.rutgers.edu/climate-assessment/>
- Moylan, C., Hatfield, C., & Randall, J. (2018) Campus sexual assault climate surveys: A brief exploration of publicly available reports, *Journal of American College Health*, 66:6, 445-449, DOI: 10.1080/07448481.2018.1431914
- Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, A., Kumpfer, K. L., Seybolt, D., Morrissey-Kane, E., & Davino, K. (2003). What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs. *American Psychologist*, 58(6-7), 449-456. doi:10.1037/0003-066x.58.6-7.449
- National Domestic Violence Hotline. (2018). *Escalation*. Retrieved from <https://www.thehotline.org/2018/09/28/escalation/>

- Newlands, R., & O'Donohue, W. (2016). A critical review of sexual violence prevention on college campuses. *Acta Psychopathologica*, 2(2). doi:10.4172/2469-6676.100040.
- Noe, R. A. (2002). *Employee training and development* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- O'Connor, J., Steiner, J., Cusano, J., McMahon, S. (2019, January). *Campus staff as mandated reporters: Knowledge of how to help survivors of sexual violence*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Social Work and Research, San Francisco, CA.
- Office for Civil Rights (OCR). (2001). Revised sexual harassment guidance: Harassment of students by school employees, other students, or third parties. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- Office for Civil Rights (OCR). (2017). Q&A on campus sexual misconduct. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved on February 10, 2018 from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/qa-title-ix-201709.pdf>
- Office of Violence Against Women (OVW). (2015). Addressing gender-based violence on college campuses: Guide to a comprehensive model. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <http://changingourcampus.org/documents/FINAL-GBV-Comprehensive-Model-22117.pdf>.
- Office of Violence Against Women (OVW). (2016). Student action packet on campus climate surveys. Retrieved on September 29, 2019 from <https://www.justice.gov/archives/ovw/file/902101/download>
- Paludi, M., Nydegger, R., DeSouza, E., Nydegger, L., & Dicker, K.A. (2006). International perspectives of sexual harassment of college students: The sounds of silence. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1087(1), 103-120. doi: 10.1196/annals.1385.012

- Paul, L.A., & Gray, M. J. (2011). Sexual assault programming on college campuses: Using social and psychological belief and behavior change principles to improve outcomes. *Trauma Violence, & Abuse, 12*(2), 99-109.
- Peterson, K., & Buelow, R. (n.d.). Effective ongoing prevention and awareness education programs. Washington, D.C: Everfi.
- Pilgram, M., & Keyton, J. (2009). Evaluation of sexual harassment training instructional strategies. *NASPA Journal About Women in Higher Education, 2*(1). doi:10.2202/1940-7890.1032.
- Preusser, M., Bartels, L., & Nordstrom, L. (2011). Sexual harassment training- Person vs. machine. *Public Personnel Management, 40*(1), 41-62.
- Quinlan, C., & Gibbs, L. (2017, June 23). The Trump administration is systematically dismantling Title IX. *Think Progress*. Retrieved on August 11, 2018 from <https://thinkprogress.org/how-the-trump-administration-is-systematically-attacking-title-ix-21bde2f73fc6/>.
- Saul, S., & Taylor, K. (2017, September 22). Betsy DeVos reverses Obama-era policy in campus sexual assault investigations. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/22/us/devos-colleges-sex-assault.html>.
- Silbaugh, K. (2015). Reactive to proactive: Title IX's unrealized capacity to prevent campus sexual assault. *Boston University Law Review, 95*, 1049-1076.
- Sinozich, S., & Langton, L. (2014, December). *Rape and sexual assault victimization among college-age females, 1995-2013* (NCJ248471). Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rsavcaf9513.pdf>

- Smith, C. P., & Freyd, J. J. (2013). Dangerous safe havens: Institutional betrayal exacerbates sexual trauma. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 26*(1), 119–124.
- Solovay, S. (Winter 2015-16). Best practices in training and compliance around Title IX, VAWA, and the Clery Act. *The Higher Education Workplace, 7*(3), 32-37.
- Stader, D. L., & Williams-Cunningham, J. L. (2017). Campus sexual assault, institutional betrayal, and Title IX. *The Clearing House, 90*(5-6), 198-202.
- Starzynski, L. L., Ullman, S. E., Filipas, H. H., & Townsend, S. M. (2005). Correlates of women's sexual assault disclosure to informal and formal support sources. *Violence and Victims, 20*(4), 417-432. doi.org/10.1080/00098655.2017.1361287.
- Sulkowski, M. L. (2011). An investigation of students' willingness to report threats of violence in campus communities. *Psychology of Violence, 1*(1), 53.
- Sweet, S. (2001). *College and society: An introduction to the sociological imagination*. Pearson.
- [Ruth Bader Ginsburg University]. (n.d.). About [RBGU]. Retrieved February 28, 2020 from <https://rbgu.edu/about/>.
- Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, 20, U.S.C. §§ 1681 - 1688 Stat. (1972).
- Ullman, S. E., & Filipas, H. H. (2001). Predictors of PTSD symptom severity and social reactions in sexual assault victims. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 14*(2), 369-389.
- Ullman, S. E., & Peter-Hagene, L. (2014). Social reactions to sexual assault disclosure, coping, perceived control, and PTSD symptoms in sexual assault victims. *Journal of Community Psychology, 42*, 495-508.
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.) Office for civil rights – Sex discrimination. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/frontpage/faq/rr/policyguidance/sex.html>.

University of Oregon. (2015). *ARC3 survey of campus climate regarding sexual misconduct*.

Retrieved from <http://dynamic.uoregon.edu/scientists/ARC3info.pdf>

University of Chicago. (2015). *Spring 2015 climate survey materials*. Retrieved from [https://csl.](https://csl.uchicago.edu/get-involved/climate-survey-project/spring-2015-climate-survey-materials)

[uchicago.edu/get-involved/climate-survey-project/spring-2015-climate-survey-materials](https://csl.uchicago.edu/get-involved/climate-survey-project/spring-2015-climate-survey-materials)

van de Mortel, T. F. (2008). Faking it: Social desirability response bias in self-report research.

*Australian Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 25(4), 40-48.

Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, Pub. L. No. 113-4, § 304, 127 Stat. 89

Walsh, W. A., Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., Ward, S., & Cohn, E. S. (2010). Disclosure

and service used on a college campus after an unwanted sexual experience. *Journal of*

*Trauma & Dissociation*, 11(2), 134-151.

White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault. (2014a). *Not Alone: The first*

*report of the White House Task Force to protect students from sexual assault*. Retrieved

February 20, 2018 from <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/page/file/905942/download>.

White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (2014b). *Climate surveys-*

*Useful tools to help colleges and universities in their efforts to reduce and prevent sexual*

*assault*. Retrieved on September 29, 2019 from

<https://www.justice.gov/archives/ovw/page/file/910426/download>

Wolitzky-Taylor, K., Resnick, H., McCauley, J., Amstadter, A., Kilpatrick, D., & Ruggiero, K.

(2011). Is reporting of rape on the rise? A comparison of women with reported versus

unreported rape experiences in the national women's study-replication. *Journal of*

*Interpersonal Violence*, 26(4), 807-832.

Wood, L., Sulley, C., Kammer-Kerwick, M., Follingstad, D., & Busch-Armendariz, N. (2017).

Climate surveys: An inventory of understanding sexual assault and other crimes of



interpersonal violence at institutions of higher education. *Violence Against Women*, 23(10), 1249-1267. DOI: 10.1177/1077801216657897

Zhang, G. (2015). *Adolescent bystander perceptions of sexual violence scenarios*. (Master of Arts), The University of Western Ontario, Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository.

**APPENDIX A****Survey Instrument****Are We Ready To Help? – RBGU Faculty & Staff Campus Climate Survey****Standard: Informed Consent (1 Question)****Block: Responsible Employee Role/Training (6 Questions)****Standard: Actual Knowledge (8 Questions)****Standard: Perceived Knowledge (2 Questions)****Standard: Confidence (1 Question)****Standard: Campus Climate & Readiness to Engage (15 Questions)****Standard: Demographics (8 Questions)**

---

**Start of Block: Informed Consent**

**Q1 Title of Study:** Are we ‘RE’ady to help? Assessing the campus climate and faculty/staff’s knowledge, confidence, and readiness to engage in campus change efforts around sexual violence

**Principal Investigator:** Chelsea Jacoby, M.S.

You are being asked to be a volunteer in a research study. Please read this consent form carefully, and ask as many questions as you'd like before you decide whether you want to participate in this research study. You may also ask questions at any time before, during, or after your participation in this research. You are encouraged to take your time in making your decision. After you’ve reviewed this consent form, should you wish to participate in this study you can click the ‘I consent’ button, which will acknowledge your consent to participate in the study and prompt you to begin the online survey. If you wish not to participate, you can simply click the ‘I do NOT consent’ button and you will be prompted to the end of the survey and can exit the survey window.

**Who is conducting this research and what is it about?**

You are being asked to participate in a research study that is being conducted by Chelsea Jacoby, M.S., in fulfillment of her Doctoral Degree in Education through the Graduate School of Education at Rutgers University- New Brunswick. The purpose of this research is to examine the campus climate at Ruth Bader Ginsburg University (RBGU) by assessing faculty and staff’s knowledge and understanding Title IX, and comfort with guiding others through a disclosure process of sex discrimination or sexual violence, and their potential reporting responsibilities under Title IX. Additionally, this campus climate survey also seeks to evaluate attitudes around their readiness to engage in efforts targeted at addressing and responding to issues of sexual violence

on campus, as well as the reporting and college response process, with the intent of identifying possible areas of improvement.

All full-time professional RBGU faculty and staff members are invited to participate in this study, and you will be one of approximately 1,200 participants.

**What will I be asked to do if I take part?**

If you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to complete the following survey, which will only take about 15 minutes to complete. The survey will remain active for a total of two weeks (with a possibility of a third) and you must finish the entire survey in one sitting as the software will not save your responses once you exit. Completed surveys will be directly returned to the researcher via the survey software.

**What are the risks and/or discomforts I might experience if I take part in the study?**

There are no anticipated risks associated with taking part in this study. If you feel uncomfortable with a question, you can skip that question or withdraw from the study altogether by exiting the survey window.

**Are there any benefits to me if I choose to take part in this study?**

There are no direct, personal benefits to you for participating in this study. However, by assessing the campus climate around the topic of sexual violence and how the college addresses and responds to it, the college can gain a deeper understanding of the needs of faculty and staff and identify areas of potential improvement in regards to training/education offered to this population, and the ways to better offer support.

**Will I be paid to take part in this study?**

You will not be paid or receive any other form of compensation for participating in this study.

**How will information about me be kept private or confidential?**

Your responses will be kept completely anonymous. We will use Qualtrics Survey Software to collect and forward your anonymous responses to us. We will not receive any information that can identify you or other participants, nor will information regarding participants' IP addresses be recorded. We will download your responses to a secure file that requires a password to access. Only study staff will have access to the password.

**What will happen to information I provide in the research after the study is over?**

No information gathered from the survey results will be utilized by the college or Title IX office for the purposes of federal reporting or compliance - nor is it standard for that information to be requested by/disseminated to federal reporting/compliance agencies in general. Rather, data collected will be used for educational purposes and with the intent of identifying possible areas of improvement. Responses will be deleted from the file three years after analysis is complete and study findings are professionally presented or published. No information that can identify you will appear in any professional presentation or publication. Unidentifiable responses may also be used or distributed to investigators for other research without obtaining additional informed consent from you.

**What will happen if I do not want to take part or decide later not to stay in the study?**

Your participation is voluntary; you are free to withdraw your participation from this study at any time. You also may choose to skip any questions that you do not wish to answer and if you do not want to continue with the survey overall, you can simply exit the survey and withdraw your participation without penalty.

**Who can I call if I have questions?**

If you have concerns or questions about this research study, please contact the PI, Chelsea Jacoby, at (609) 771-3112, or via email at [jacoby@c@rbgu.edu](mailto:jacoby@c@rbgu.edu). You may also contact Chelsea Jacoby's faculty advisor, Dr. Angela O'Donnell at (848) 932-0830 or [angela.odonnell@gse.rutgers.edu](mailto:angela.odonnell@gse.rutgers.edu). If you have questions about your rights as a research subject, please contact the Arts & Sciences IRB Director at Rutgers New Brunswick/Piscataway at (732) 235-2866.

Again, your participation in this study is voluntary. You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. You have the right to change your mind and leave the study at any time without giving any reason and without penalty. If you would like a copy of this consent form please email [jacoby@c@rbgu.edu](mailto:jacoby@c@rbgu.edu). You do not waive any of your legal rights by signing this consent form.

Click on the "I consent" button to confirm your agreement to take part in the research and beginning the survey, ONLY if you acknowledge that you are currently a full-time professional faculty or staff member at RBGU, are fluent in English, are over 18-years old, have thoroughly read this information, and agree to participate in this research with the knowledge that you are free to withdraw your participation at any time without penalty.

Please choose the "I do NOT consent" option below if you do not consent to these study procedures.

☐ I consent

☐ I do NOT consent

*Skip To: End of Survey If Q1 = I do NOT consent*

**End of Block: Informed Consent**

---

**Start of Block: Responsible Employee Role/Training**

Q2 Are you currently deemed by RBGU to be a 'Responsible Employee' (or sometimes referred to as 'Mandated Reporter') based on your role?

**Responsible Employee** = According to OCR's 2001 Guidance, a Responsible Employee includes any employee: *"who has the authority to take action to redress sexual violence; who has been given the duty of reporting incidents of sexual violence or any other misconduct by students to the Title IX coordinator or other appropriate school designee; or whom a student could reasonably believe has this authority or duty"*.

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unsure

---

Q3 Have you received Responsible Employee training offered by RBGU?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I don't remember

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Q3 = Yes*

Q4 During which academic year did you most recently receive Responsible Employee training through RBGU?

▼ 2019 - 2020 ... 2014 - 2015

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Q3 = Yes*

Q5 What method did you most recently complete the Responsible Employee training offered through the college?

- ☐ In-person training
  - ☐ e-Learning modules (Online)
  - ☐ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- 

*Display This Question:*

*If Q3 = Yes*

Q6 How effective would you say the training was in providing you with the **knowledge** and **understanding** the expectations associated with your role of a Responsible Employee and implementing the information in future situations?

- ☐ Not effective at all
  - ☐ Slightly effective
  - ☐ Moderately effective
  - ☐ Very effective
  - ☐ Extremely effective
- 

*Display This Question:*

*If Q3 = Yes*

Q7 How effective would you say the training was in providing you with the **confidence** in fulfilling the expectations associated with your role of a Responsible Employee and implementing the information in future situations?

- ☐ Not effective at all
- ☐ Slightly effective
- ☐ Moderately effective

- ☐ Very effective
- ☐ Extremely effective

---

**End of Block: Responsible Employee Role/Training**

---

**Start of Block: Actual Knowledge****Q8 Vignette #1:**

When discussing upcoming holiday plans, Richard, a student you have been working with, expressed that he wasn't looking forward to go home for winter break. When asked why, he reluctantly shared that there was a family party that he was expected to attend, but wanted to avoid it at all costs because his Aunt was going to be there. He disclosed that when he was younger his Aunt took advantage of him for years without any of his family members knowing and this was going to be the first time he would have to see her since she touched him inappropriately and sexually assaulted him.

**Do you believe this information should be reported to a college official at RBGU?**

☐ Yes

← Correct Answer

☐ No

---

**Q9 Vignette #2:**

One of your students had asked to speak with you in confidence about a situation that has been going on involving them and their off-campus internship supervisor, whom is also a RBGU employee. They explained that for the past few weeks their supervisor has been increasingly testing boundaries with them, such as frequently calling them into their office for impromptu one on one meetings, gently brushing their arm or shoulder when they walked by, and frequently requesting they go out after their internship and grab a bit to eat together. Your student mentions that each time they have declined these offers and have tried and be as professional as possible in the workplace, but they've become very uncomfortable about the whole situation and aren't quite sure what to do anymore.

**Do you believe this information should be reported to a college official at RBGU?**

☐ Yes ← Correct Answer

☐ No

---

**Q10 Vignette #3:**

Over the course of the semester, you've noticed on several occasions somewhat concerning interactions between Sarah, a student you've been working with, and her partner. Sarah's partner is always with her. More often than not you see Sarah's partner make it a point to walk Sarah across campus into the Social Sciences building for class, even though the partner has class in the Education building at the same time. You pick up on the fact that Sarah is constantly checking her phone, in somewhat of an anxious way, and whenever her partner contacts her and requests she meet them, she'll immediately drop whatever she's doing and go to them. Then recently you notice Sarah with faint bruising around the corner of her chin and around her wrists. When you ask her if she's alright and what happened, she says, "I'm fine, I'm just clumsy" and quickly walks away.

**Do you believe this information should be reported to a college official at RBGU?**

☐ Yes ← Correct Answer

☐ No

---

**Q11 Vignette #4:**

While in the library one day, you overhear two students talking about a party that occurred over the weekend. They were discussing whether or not one of their friends, Taylor, had ended up hooking up with another student named Alex, who was known for “sleeping around”. The two students mentioned they remembered seeing Taylor and Alex flirting with one another at the party, and they ended up leaving together, but they weren’t sure if Taylor slept with them or not, so they were going to text them to find out.



**Do you believe this information should be reported to a college official at RBGU?**

☐ Yes

☐ No

← Correct Answer

---

Q12 If you were to report the information previously described in the scenarios to someone at RBGU, who would be the **most appropriate** person to report the information to?

☐ Program Director

☐ Academic Dean

☐ A colleague

☐ Administrator

☐ Public Safety/Campus Police

☐ Office of Student Life

☐ Title IX Coordinator

← Correct Answer

☐ Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO)/Affirmative Action (AA) Officer

☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

---

Q13 Which of the following behaviors do **NOT** fall under Title IX? Choose all that apply.

☐ Academic Integrity

← Correct Answer

☐ Dating/Domestic Violence

☐ Gender Discrimination

☐ Hazing

← Correct Answer

☐ Sexual Assault

☐ Stalking

☐ Sexual Harassment

---

Q14 Whom at RBGU is afforded various rights and resources under Title IX should they experience any form of discrimination based on sex or sexual violence?

☐ Faculty

☐ Staff

☐ Students (undergraduate & graduate)

☐ All of the above

← Correct Answer

Q15 Which of the following best describes the role of a Responsible Employee at RBGU?

- ☐ To report all cases of suspected sexual violence against a RBGU community member to college officials
- ← Correct Answer
- ☐ To report cases of suspected sexual violence against a RBGU community member to college officials if you have clear and sufficient evidence that the violence occurred
- ☐ To report cases of suspected sexual violence to college officials only if the RBGU community member who has been harmed grants you permission
- ☐ None of the above
- 

**End of Block: Actual Knowledge**

---

**Start of Block: Perceived Knowledge**

Q16 Using the scale provided, please indicate your level of agreement for each of the following statements.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
If someone from RBGU experienced any form of sexual violence, and reported it to me, I know where they can receive help on campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If someone from RBGU experienced any form of sexual violence, I know where they can receive help off campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am aware of and understand RBGU's procedures for dealing with reported incidents of sexual misconduct.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I know what services and resources are available for people at RBGU who experience sexual violence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I'm familiar with the obligations RBGU has to meet under TIX and other federal regulations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

Q17 Please use the following scale to indicate your level of awareness of the function of each of the campus and community resources **specifically related to sexual violence response** at RBGU.

	Not knowledgeable at all	Slightly knowledgeable	Moderately knowledgeable	Very knowledgeable	Extremely knowledgeable
Center for Integrated Wellness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Dean of Students' CARE Office	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mental Health Services (formally known as CAPS)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Office of Anti- Violence Initiatives	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Office of Campus Police Services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Office of Student Conduct	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Office of Title IX	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student Health Services	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Womanspace	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**End of Block: Perceived Knowledge****Start of Block: Confidence**

Q18 Please indicate your level of agreement for each of the following statements.

*"If I received information from a student about an incident they experienced involving sexual violence, I feel confident in my ability to..."*

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Effectively handle receiving the student disclosure.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Refer that student to appropriate resources on campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Go to the proper place to make a report on behalf of the student.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Effectively relay to that student what happens after a report has been made to the college.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
<i>Q2 = Yes</i>					
Fulfill my role as a Responsible Employee	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**End of Block: Confidence****Start of Block: Campus Climate & Readiness to Engage**

Q19 Using the scale provided, please indicate your level of agreement for each statement provided.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
I think I can do something about <u>preventing</u> sexual violence on campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I think I can do something about <u>addressing</u> sexual violence on campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I want to learn more about preventing and addressing sexual violence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have recently attended a program about sexual violence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have been or am currently involved in ongoing efforts to end sexual violence on campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q20 Are you interested in attending a workshop offered by the college on topics of Title IX and sexual violence?

☐ Yes

☐ No

*Display This Question:*

*If Q20 = Yes*

Q21 What topic(s) are you interested in learn more about through a training or workshop?  
Choose all that apply.

- ☐ Sexual Violence 101
  - ☐ Healthy Relationships
  - ☐ Bystander Intervention
  - ☐ Responsible Employee Training
  - ☐ Let's Talk About Consent
  - ☐ Training to become a Formal Administrative Hearing Officer through the Office of Title IX & Student Conduct
  - ☐ Training to become an Advisor to support students going through a Title IX and/or Student Conduct process
  - ☐ Training to become an Investigator for Title IX and/or Student Conduct Cases
  - ☐ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_
-



Q22 Using the scale provided, please indicate your level of agreement for each statement in regard to RBGU's overall campus community.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Sexual violence is a problem at TBGU.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Campus community leaders are supportive of improving efforts to address sexual violence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The majority of the campus community supports <b>programs &amp; activities</b> targeted at addressing sexual violence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The majority of the campus community supports <b>policies</b> targeted at addressing sexual violence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Data about sexual violence on our campus are readily available (e.g. prevalence rates specific to our community).	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Specific resources at the college have been obtained to address sexual violence.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q23 The following statements describe how RBGU might handle if a student reported an incident of sexual violence. Use the scale provided to indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
RBGU would take the report seriously	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RBGU would maintain the <b>privacy</b> of the person making the report	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RBGU would take steps to protect the <b>safety</b> of the person making the report	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If requested by the victim, RBGU would forward the report to criminal investigators (for example, the police)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RBGU would support the person making the report	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RBGU would take action to address factors that may have led to the incident of sexual violence	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
RBGU would handle the report fairly	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

---

Q24 Since working at RBGU, have any RBGU students disclosed to you they had been a victim/survivor of an unwanted sexual experience?

☐ Yes

☐ No

*Display This Question:*

*If Q24 = Yes*

Q25 Since working at RBGU, **how many** students have disclosed to you that they had been a victim/survivor of an unwanted sexual experience?

▼ 1 ... More than 15

*Display This Question:*

*If Q24 = Yes*

Q26 What action(s) did you take after receiving the disclosure from the student(s)? Choose all that apply.

- ☐ Reported the information to Campus Police
- ☐ Reported to the Title IX Coordinator/Office
- ☐ Submitted a CARE Referral
- ☐ Reported the information to the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO)/Affirmative Action (AA) Officer/Office
- ☐ Referred student to on-campus resources
- ☐ Referred student to off-campus resources
- ☒ Did not do anything (explain why) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

*Display This Question:*

*If Q24 = Yes*

Q27 Think about the most recent time a student told you they had an unwanted sexual experience, do you believe that your response was helpful to the student?

☐ Yes

☐ No

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Q24 = Yes*

Q28 Think about the most recent time a student told you they had an unwanted sexual experience, did you feel comfortable talking to them about the situation?

☐ Yes

☐ No

---

Q29 Since working at RBGU, have any of your colleagues at RBGU disclosed to you that they had been a victim/survivor of an unwanted sexual experience?

☐ Yes

☐ No

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Q29 = Yes*

Q30 Since working at RBGU, **how many** colleagues have disclosed to you that they had been a victim/survivor of an unwanted sexual experience?

▼ 1 ... More than 15

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Q29 = Yes*

Q31 What action(s) did you take after receiving your colleague's disclosure? Choose all that apply.

- ☐ Reported the information to Campus Police
- ☐ Reported to the Title IX Coordinator/Office
- ☐ Submitted a CARE Referral
- ☐ Reported the information to the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO)/Affirmative Action (AA) Officer/Office
- ☐ Referred colleague to on-campus resources
- ☐ Referred colleague to off-campus resources
- ☒ Did not do anything (explain why) \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Q29 = Yes*

Q32 Think about the most recent time a colleague told you they had an unwanted sexual experience, do you believe that your response was helpful to your colleague?

- ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No
-

*Display This Question:*

*If Q29 = Yes*

Q33 Think about the most recent time a colleague told you they had an unwanted sexual experience, did you feel comfortable talking to them about the situation?

☐ Yes

☐ No

---

**End of Block: Campus Climate & Readiness to Engage**

---

**Start of Block: Demographics**

Q34 What gender do you most identify with?

☐ Male

☐ Female

☐ Transgender male

☐ Transgender female

☐ Non-binary

☐ Prefer to self-describe (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Prefer not to answer

---

Q35 What best describes your current and *primary* role at RBGU?

- ☐ Faculty
- ☐ Staff
- ☐ Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Q35 = Faculty*

Q36 Do you currently hold tenure at Ruth Bader Ginsburg University?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

Q37 How long have you been working at RBGU?

▼ Less than 1 year ... 21 or more years

Q38 Does your position at RBGU require you to have direct contact with students?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Q38 = Yes*

Q39 Approximately what percent of your job involves direct contact with students?

▼ 0% ... 100%

Q40 In your role at RBGU, are you directly involved in delivering services or programs related to sexual violence?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Unsure

---

Q41 Do you currently serve as a college advisor to one of RBGU's Recognized Student Organizations?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

**End of Block: Demographics**

---

**END OF SURVEY**



**APPENDIX B**

## Inspiration from Previous Literature &amp; Other Survey Instruments

*Various Literature Used to Inform Current Survey Instrument*

Items on Current Inventory	Previous literature used as a framework
Q2-3, Q6-7, Q22-23, Q32-38	Rutgers Staff Survey Instrument – McMahon & O'Connor (n.d.) Edwards et al. (2015)
Q8-15	WHTF (2014b) Katz (2011) Jozkowski & Ekbria (2015)
Q16, Q18, Q25, Q20-21, Q24	Rutgers' iSpeak survey – McMahon et al. (2018c) Rutgers Staff Survey Instrument – McMahon & O'Connor (n.d.)
Q17	Rutgers Staff Survey Instrument – McMahon & O'Connor (n.d.) Rutgers' iSpeak survey – McMahon et al. (2018c) Awareness of Campus Services Scale (McMahon, Stepleton, & Cusano, 2014)
Q19	Edwards et al. (2015)
Q26-28, Q29-32	Rutgers' iSpeak survey – McMahon et al. (2018c)
Q34-35, Q37-40	Rutgers Staff Survey Instrument – McMahon & O'Connor (n.d.)
Q4-5, Q25, Q30, Q33, Q36, Q41	Unique and institution specific

## APPENDIX C

## ‘Actual Knowledge’ Vignettes Within Survey

*Actual Knowledge Vignettes and the Associated Answer Rationale*

Scenario	Should be reported?	Rationale
(Q8) When discussing upcoming holiday plans, Richard, a student you have been working with, expressed that he wasn’t looking forward to go home for winter break. When asked why, he reluctantly shared that there was a family party that he was expected to attend, but wanted to avoid it at all costs because his Aunt was going to be there. He disclosed that when he was younger his Aunt took advantage of him for years without any of his family members knowing and this was going to be the first time he would have to see her since she touched him inappropriately and sexually assaulted him.	Yes	Although Richard stated he was sexually assaulted by his aunt years ago while off-campus and when he was not currently a student, Richard is still afforded all of the rights and resources under TIX despite these factors, and the school should be aware of the sexual assault. Additionally, even though the incident happened long ago, that does not mean that Richard is not still impacted by it to the point where it may be affecting his academic success and overall wellbeing. Accommodations & resources could be offered to Richard through the institution to help mitigate the possible effects of the trauma if a report is made to college officials in the TIX office.
(Q9) One of your students had asked to speak with you in confidence about a situation that has been going on involving them and their off-campus internship supervisor, whom is also a RBGU employee. They explained that for the past few weeks their supervisor has been increasingly testing boundaries with them, such as frequently calling them into their office for impromptu one on one meetings, gently brushing their arm or shoulder when they walked by, and frequently requesting they go out after their internship and grab a bit to eat together. Your student mentions that each time they have declined these offers and have tried to be as professional as possible in the workplace, but they’ve become very uncomfortable about the whole situation and aren’t quite sure what to do anymore.	Yes	This scenario describes sexual harassment in the workplace. Both faculty/staff and students are protected from this form of behavior under TIX and the college’s <i>Policy Prohibiting Discrimination In The Workplace/Educational Environment</i> and as such this information should be reported.

<p>(Q10) Over the course of the semester, you've noticed on several occasions somewhat concerning interactions between Sarah, a student you've been working with, and her partner. Sarah's partner is always with her. More often than not you see Sarah's partner make it a point to walk Sarah across campus into the Social Sciences building for class, even though the partner has class in the Education building at the same time. You pick up on the fact that Sarah is constantly checking her phone, in somewhat of an anxious way, and whenever her partner contacts her and requests she meet them, she'll immediately drop whatever she's doing and go to them. Then recently you notice Sarah with faint bruising around the corner of her chin and around her wrists. When you ask her if she's alright and what happened, she says, "I'm fine, I'm just clumsy" and quickly walks away.</p>	Yes	<p>The scenario is describing what could potentially be a situation involving dating violence. The partner was portrayed as being somewhat controlling, Sarah was seen anxiously checking her phone, and appeared that her actions were dependent on her partner's requests. Importantly, you observed physical signs of injury, which Sarah claimed were due to her being clumsy, but given the additional context of the scenario, it is plausible that is not a completely truthful response. While this behavior may not immediately seem overly concerning, dating violence behaviors have a tendency to escalate quickly and therefore could possibly put Sarah in harms way. It would be responsible to put a report in prior to the behavior possibly escalating, and making a report would connect Sarah to the school and appropriate resources that they may benefit from, such as safety planning, No Contact Directives, a residential relocation, etc.</p>
<p>(Q11) While in the library one day, you overhear two students talking about a party that occurred over the weekend. They were discussing whether or not one of their friends, Taylor, had ended up hooking up with another student named Alex, who was known for "sleeping around". The two students mentioned they remembered seeing Taylor and Alex flirting with one another at the party, and they ended up leaving together, but they weren't sure if Taylor slept with them or not, so they were going to text them to find out.</p>	No	<p>There is nothing about this scenario that indicates the behavior that potentially took place between Taylor and Alex was nonconsensual in nature. As such, a report would not be warranted had an individual only had this information. Nor would those in a Responsible Employee capacity be required to report (even if it did rise to a Title IX concern) since the information was simply overheard, rather than explicitly disclosed to them.</p>