Students for Access to Fair Education:
Sexual Assault on College Campuses

PPDE 580 Final Presentation by: Marianna Jordan and Joelle Montier

The Problem: *Where We Are Today*

- Inaccurate statistics on prevalence
  - Nationwide and context specific to college campuses
- Underreporting and/or lack of reporting
- Inconsistent definition of sexual assault
- Existing incentives for universities to underreport
- Cultural challenges
  - "Toxic masculinity"
  - Party culture, Greek life, normalization

Our North Star

We envision a future in which all genders have positive and fulfilling experiences within their educational institutions, free from sexual harassment and assault.

- Occurrence accuracy
  - Improve accountability when a report is made

- Culture change
  - Create strong, healthy relationships where boundaries and norms are supported and enforced within peer networks

- Educational component
  - Create a consistent definition of "sexual assault"
  - Dismantle myths about sexual assault and rape

- Survivor support
  - Prioritize victims' safety; increase support services and protection

Traditional Policy Process: *Where has it failed and why?*

- Title IX (1972) and sexual violence: legal and cultural history
- 2011: "Dear Colleague Letter" (Obama administration)
  - Debate about ensuring victim protections and adequate due process
  - Lack of guidance; confusion for institutions; problem persists and survivors are left without appropriate supports in place
- 2017: Proposed Title IX revisions (Trump administration)
  - Obama-era policy reversals

Traditional Policy Process: *Continued*

- Most college sexual assault prevention programs are ineffective at reducing sexual violence
  - Programs aimed at knowledge/attitudes not sufficient
  - Single session (limited outcome changes) vs. longer programs
  - Single gender audience approaches more effective than mixed
  - Training programs can reinforce traditional gender beliefs
- Affirmative consent policies
  - Misguided policy process: the verdict is still out

Traditional Policy Process: *Success Examples*

- Changing Campus Culture Initiative (Ohio, 2015)
- "Safe Dates" (middle- and high-school students)
- "Shifting Boundaries" (middle school students)
- U.S. Violence Against Women Act (1994)

Key Stakeholders

- Coalition building is critical
  - University administrators, faculty, and board members
  - Nonprofit partners within local contexts
  - National fraternity and sorority umbrella organizations
  - Domestic violence advocacy groups
  - Student activists, survivors, and allies
  - Parents
  - Police

Social Innovation Process I: *Needs Assessment*

- Entire campus community to be involved in policy development process
- Three-pronged approach
  - **Targeted Interviews**
  - **Mandatory Survey**
  - **Focus Groups**
- Aggregating data in a consolidated final report
- *Questions to consider*: Do findings differ depending on the size of the institution? In urban vs. rural settings? Depending on the size of the Greek scene? In relation to the ratio of male/female students? Among others...

Social Innovation Process II: *Design*

- Utilizing a collective impact framework (five key conditions)
- Incorporate relevant nine principles of prevention to address:
  - **Policy**
  - **Support**
  - **Communication**
  - **Operations**
  - **Partnerships**
- Strategies should address multiple intervention components and effect multiple settings

Social Innovation Process III: *Pilots*

- Testing & continuous research phase utilizing lean experimentation
- Backbone support organization (SAFE) manages the pilots process
  - Small-scale experimentation: Organizing chapters (comprised of three institutions)
  - Provide organizations with:
    - Monthly training and support calls
    - Customized workshops to address institutional needs
    - Experts trained to assist with improved reporting and compliance standards
  - Communications component:
    - A/B testing

Social Innovation Process IV: *Scaling/Diffusion*

- Focus on **impact:** storytelling and data collection
- Outreach efforts through SAFE
  - Demonstrated success: other universities to adopt their own plans
  - Community organizing techniques: Showing up for Racial Justice
- KIPP example: framework for success that is adaptable to specific contexts
  - Our framework will emphasize 1) robust peer networks; 2) full-cycle communication and accountability; and 3) victim support

Key Metrics and Learning Objectives

- Increase in reporting (Year 1, Year 2, Year 3, etc…)
- Increase in survivor services
- Satisfaction with survivor services
- Reduction in communication pathway disconnects
- Survey measuring consistent definition of sexual assault
- Stronger peer networks among male students
  - Ex: increased ongoing bystander intervention trainings

Financing the Plan

- SAFE utilized to coordinate activities, facilitate data collection, and provide support to all partners
- Foundation (or High Net Worth Individuals) best suited to fill this role; will finance during pilot phase
  - Commitment to women's rights, interest in sexual assault prevention
  - Poised for innovation (not beholden to taxpayers or donors)
  - Providing commitment up front; costs embedded within university structures over time

Conclusion: *Further Ideas to Explore*

- Beneficial conditions for diffusion:
  - Current political climate contributing to increase in action & dialogue
  - Institutional failure thus far to properly address the proliferation of sexual assaults on college campuses
- Combination of techniques/models:
  - Collective impact frameworks
  - Community organizing
  - Social movement building
- Utilize learnings from successes and failures of traditional policy process to create a new social innovation process

Sources

1. "A Systematic Review of Primary Prevention Strategies for Sexual Violence Perpetration." *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Pergamon, 7 June 2014, www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1359178914000536.
2. "Campus Sexual Assault: Suggested Policies and Procedures." *AAUP*, www.aaup.org/report/campus-sexual-assault-suggested-policies-and-procedures.
3. Campus Sexual Violence, edited by Elizabeth Schmermund, Greenhaven Publishing LLC, 2016. ProQuest Ebook Central, https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/socal/detail.action?docID=5413180.
4. Cleveland State University Receives 100 Percent Score from State of Ohio for Efforts to Change Campus Climate (2016, Dec 13). *US Fed News Service, Including US State News.*
5. Jones, Robb. "Understanding How and Why Title IX Regulates Campus Sexual Violence." *UE*, United Educators Insurance, 2015, Understanding How and Why Title IX Regulates Campus Sexual Violence.
6. LaBore, Kathryn, "Yes Means Yes But Does It Work?: An Empirical Investigation on the Performance of Affirmative Consent Policies on Heterosexual Sexual Assault Scenarios" (2018). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1147.
7. Stirgus, Eric. "Proposed Changes in How Colleges Investigate Assault Cases Draw Fire." *Ajc*, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution, 2 Apr. 2019, www.ajc.com/news/local-education/proposed-changes-how-colleges-investigate-assault-cases-draw-fire/TxEfSn9zbR5jMYX9J6UGvI/.
8. Swartout, K. M. (2013). The company they keep: How peer networks influence male sexual aggression. *Psychology of Violence, 3*(2), 157-171.
9. Tinkler, Justine E., et al. "Communicating About Affirmative Consent: How the Threat of Punishment Affects Policy Support and Gender Stereotypes." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, vol. 33, no. 21, Nov. 2018, pp. 3344–3366, doi:10.1177/0886260518798356.
10. Triplett, Matthew. "Sexual Assault on College Campuses: Seeking the Appropriate Balance Between Due Process and Victim Protection" *Duke Law Journal* 62, 2. pp. 487-527.

Thank You!

Questions?