

Sexual Violence Prevention at Historically Black Colleges and Universities throughout Georgia

By

Katie Dight

A paper presented to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Public Health in the Department of Maternal and Child Health

Approved by:



(First reader)



(Second reader)

Sexual violence as a public health problem

Sexual violence (SV) is a public health problem of epidemic proportions in the United States. SV is defined by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) as:

“Any sexual act that is perpetrated against someone's will. SV encompasses a range of offenses, including a completed nonconsensual sex act (i.e., rape), an attempted nonconsensual sex act, abusive sexual contact (i.e., unwanted touching), and non-contact sexual abuse (e.g., threatened SV, exhibitionism, verbal sexual harassment).” (Basile & Saltzman, 2002).

One in five women in the US reported experiencing rape in their lifetime; one in 71 men reported experiencing rape (Black et al., 2011). Approximately one in 20 men and women reported experiencing some other type of SV apart from rape in their lifetime (Black et al., 2011). It is imperative to note that these statistics are likely much higher in reality, as the vast majority of rapes go unreported to law enforcement officials. The US Department of Justice estimates that sexual assaults are one of the most underreported violent crimes, with an average of 60% of assaults not being reported. A variety of reasons can be attributed to the underreporting of SV, including fear of the perpetrator, shame and humiliation, self-blame, anxiety over not being believed, and a lack of trust in the criminal justice system (Truman & Planty, 2012; Du Mont, Miller, & Myhr, 2003).

The consequences that result from SV include physical, mental, emotional, and financial repercussions. Among the individuals who experienced a completed rape since their 18th birthday and reported non-fatal injuries as a result, 31.5% were women and 16.1% were men. An estimated 105,187 females and 6,526 males between the ages of 10-24 received medical care in emergency departments as a result of rape between 2004-2006 (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2006; Gavin et al., 2009). About 32,000 pregnancies occur annually as a result of rape; 20% of female victims filing for a protective order from their intimate partner reported a pregnancy that resulted from rape (Holmes et al., 2005). In addition to the health-related tolls SV takes on its victims, the financial consequences are staggering and affect both the victim and their community as a whole. The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) estimates that the US spends approximately \$450 billion a year on crime victimization costs, with \$127 billion of the total costs associated with SV (NIJ, 1996). Costs include children's educational attainment and their resulting job attainment, women's ability to work and a subsequent loss of income following an assault, and the total

medical costs that overwhelm the health care delivery system (MacMillan, 2000; Anda et al., 2004; Dolezal, McCollum, & Callahan, 2009).

Sexual violence on college campuses

SV at colleges and universities has recently garnered increased attention, as statistics show the problem is particularly prevalent on campuses. In January 2012, President Barack Obama established the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, which aims to provide schools nationwide with the resources necessary to decrease SV on campus (The White House, 2014). A 2010 national survey showed that 37.4% of female rape victims were raped between the ages of 18-24; 19% of the surveyed undergraduate women reported experiencing an attempted or completed sexual assault since the beginning of college (Black et al., 2011). There are many risk factors that are specifically related to campus victimizations, including gender attitudes, the role of male peer support, and substance abuse, particularly alcohol (Carr & VanDeusen, 2004).

A variety of issues particular to campus settings negatively impact victims of sexual assault and the response to such acts of violence. The Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network (RAINN) reports that common problems include a lack of proper, comprehensive response protocols, inadequate or nonexistent sexual assault prevention training and response, and underreporting the full extent of sexual assaults by the schools, which places them in noncompliance with the standards set by the Clery Act and its amendment, the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE Act) (RAINN, 2009). The Clery Act was enacted following the rape and murder of Jeanne Clery in 1986. The Act is a federal law requiring colleges and universities to issue formal annual reports on crimes committed on campus. These Annual Security Reports must be published on a school's website. Additionally, the Act mandates through the Victim's Bill of Rights that schools must report on the educational programming on campus, disciplinary procedures, and rights afforded to victims who file sexual assault complaints (Brinn & List, n.d.). The SaVE Act amended the Clery Act and focuses specifically on sexual assaults that occur on campus. Under the SaVE Act, schools must report on a broader array of sexual assault acts and simultaneously work to improve the complaint process so that it operates in a victim-centered capacity. Schools can receive federal resources if they provide education and awareness campaigns on campus (Know Your IX, n.d.)

A 2005 NIJ study by found that many of almost 2,500 colleges surveyed did not have or could not produce campus sexual assault guidelines. For those colleges that are able to deliver such guidelines, the policies often lack crucial information on reporting options and consequences for perpetrators (Kargen, Fisher, & Cullen, 2005). In the 2005 survey, 40% of the schools provided some sexual assault training, although it was typically directed towards security personnel and resident hall staff (Kargen et al., 2005). Out of these programs, less than one third incorporate information on acquaintance rape, despite the fact that 73% of rapes occur between non-strangers and 38% of rapists are friends or acquaintances with the victim (Kargen et al., 2005; Catalano, 2007).

Recent calls to action by the federal government to address sexual assault on campus have increased attention to the problem. At the time of this paper, 55 schools nationwide were specifically named by the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault for violating student rights in their failure to report the assault and many more campuses are being investigated in regards to their current sexual assault procedures (2014).

Sexual assault on HBCU campuses

Research into SV victimization rates suggests that there are disparities between different races and ethnicities. Non-white women are more likely to experience SV than white women; African American women are specifically more likely to experience physical violence than white women (Barrick, Krebs, & Lindquist, 2013). However, research regarding sexual assault prevention programming typically focuses on research samples with a majority of white participants and therefore may not be as applicable or effective when addressing SV prevention in settings with a majority of non-White women, such as HBCUs (Barrick et al., 2013).

In the largest survey to date of undergraduate students on HBCU campuses, a 2008 study found that 9.7% of female students experienced a completed sexual assault since entering college (Krebs et al., 2011). This number is significantly lower than the rates of sexual assault at traditionally white institutions (TWIs) (13.7%). This difference may be associated with the lower levels of drinking on HBCU campuses compared to TWIs (Krebs et al., 2011). However, substance use still plays a key role in many of the assaults, as nearly 76% of victims of incapacitated assault were drinking prior to the assault and approximately 23% of all victims of forced sexual assault were drinking prior to the attack (Krebs et al., 2011). However, because

alcohol use is not as prevalent on HBCU campuses as TWIs, prevention programming must not focus solely on this risk factor but rather investigate the other possible risk factors impacting SA and HBCUs (Barrick et al., 2013). Other key risk factors that may correlate with a woman's experience with SV include childhood victimization, mental health status, and sorority membership status (Barrick et al., 2013). Barricks et al. (2013) found that the majority of respondents knew their assailants and that despite overall lower alcohol consumption rates, more victims and perpetrators were drinking prior to the assault.

The rates at which female students at HBCUs reported assaults to law enforcement and local rape crisis centers were extremely low; between 9.9-3.4% and 13.9-7.6%, respectively (Krebs et al., 2011). Reasons for not reporting an assault included the belief that it was not serious enough to warrant a report, fear of retaliation from the perpetrator and/or peers, and guilt and self-blame over the incident (Krebs et al., 2011).

I identified studies related to SV and HBCUs by searching electronic databases, reviewing reference lists of articles, and consulting with experts in the field of SV and/or HBCUs in GA. Articles were limited to those published in English. I applied the search to Articles+ (2000-Present), Google Scholar (2000-Present), and PubMed (2000-Present). The last search was conducted on September 16, 2014. I used the following search terms to retrieve all related studies: historically black colleges and universities; historically black colleges; historically black universities; HBCUs; sexual assault; sexual violence; rape; sexual assault response; campus sexual assault; sexual assault response guidelines; and sexual assault response protocols.

This paper describes a survey, conducted under the auspices of the Georgia Network to End Sexual Assault (GNESA) to gain a better understanding of the types of services and programs available on HBCU campuses, as well as to gain further insight into how key staff and faculty perceive the problem of sexual assault and their own ability to respond to the issue.

Method

Title IX coordinators (five), Deans of Students (five), Human Resources and Student Affairs staff (one and six, respectively), and Student Affairs staff (six), and lead counselors (two) from seven HBCUs throughout Georgia. Respondents were emailed with a request to participate in a 28-question survey (Appendix A). No incentives were offered. Participants were staff at one of the seven schools identified in Georgia as an HBCU. The schools contacted were Morehouse

College, Spelman College, Clark Atlanta University, Paine College, Fort Valley State University, Savannah State University, and Albany State University. Staff and their contact information was available on each institution's website. A total of 19 surveys was distributed, 17 of which were sent directly to the respondent from GNESEA and two of which were forwarded to school staff members identified by the Deans of Students as appropriate respondents to the survey. Originally, only the Title IX coordinators and Deans of Students were invited to participate but when response rates were lower than initially anticipated, Human Resources and Student Affairs staff were also asked to participate.

Title IX coordinators and Deans of Students were sent an initial recruitment email that described the survey and were provided with a hyperlink to the survey website. The confidentiality of the respondents was emphasized and each respondent was given the opportunity to decline to complete the survey or to leave questions unanswered. Respondents were asked to include their contact information and the name of their school. The respondents were asked to complete the survey within a month from receiving the initial email and it was estimated that the 28-question survey would take between 10 to 15 minutes to complete. Approximately two weeks after the initial invite to complete the survey was sent, all participants were sent a follow-up email, encouraging them to participate in the survey. A week after the first follow-up email was sent, each participant received a personalized email explaining the survey and its objectives. A week after this second email was sent, all participants were telephoned, although the success rate of speaking directly with a person (rather than leaving a voicemail or message with an employee in their department) was extremely low at 9%. At this point, one participant spoke directly with staff at GNESEA but declined to participate in the survey and asked that the information shared not be used in describing the survey results.

The overall response rate for survey completion was 15.79%. The three survey responses were from different schools from different geographical locations. Two of the respondents self-identified as lead counselors in their school's counseling department and one respondent was listed on the school's website as the Title IX coordinator.

Assessment

The web-based survey was cross-sectional and included contact information for the respondent and the type of school (public or private). Personal perception questions were used to

identify respondents' observations of the severity of SV on campus, the level effectiveness of the schools' sexual assault programs, and the level of personal and institutional compliance with Title IX, the Clery Act, and the SaVE Act. Questions on the types of resources and programming available were used to elicit data on specific strategies at each school (Appendix B).

GNESA felt that it was important to distinguish among programs and activities, depending on whether they were intervention-based, prevention-based, or awareness-raising. Intervention-based programs focus on victims who have experienced or are experiencing sexual assault, whereas prevention-based programs focus on risky behaviors that may increase the possibility of perpetrating SV or experiencing SV as a victim. Prevention activities focus on changing systems, beliefs, or processes and interventions are conducted in response to an urgent need, such as counseling or medical attention. Raising awareness regarding campus sexual assault, while useful in and of itself, should not be considered a prevention technique, despite common mislabeling of awareness as such.

Results

Table 1: Staff perceptions of SV, personal and institutional training and compliance

How do you perceive the problem of SV on your campus?		
No problem		
Slight problem		
Unsure		
Somewhat of a problem		2
Major problem		1
To what extent do you think your institution is effective in addressing the problem of SV?		
Very effective		
Somewhat effective		1
Unsure		
Somewhat ineffective		2
Very ineffective		
Not at all effective		
There are adequate resources on campus to respond to students' disclosures of victimizations.		
Strongly agree		
Agree		1
Unsure		1
Disagree		1
Strongly disagree		

There are adequate resources on campus to assist campus community members – faculty member, administration, staff members and students – to become involved with SV intervention activities.		
Strongly agree		
Agree		1
Unsure		1
Disagree		1
Strongly disagree		
There are adequate resources on campus to assist campus community members to become involved with SV prevention activities.		
Strongly agree		
Agree		
Unsure		2
Disagree		1
Strongly disagree		
I have had sufficient training in how to talk to students about SV.		
Strongly agree		
Agree		2
Unsure		1
Disagree		
Strongly disagree		
I have had adequate training in the area of SV prevention.		
Strongly agree		
Agree		1
Unsure		1
Disagree		1
Strongly disagree		
I possess proper knowledge of SV.		
Strongly agree		
Agree		2
Unsure		1
Disagree		
Strongly disagree		
I possess proper knowledge of campus resources to assist students with their personal experiences with SV.		
Strongly agree		1
Agree		2
Unsure		
Disagree		
Strongly disagree		
I possess proper knowledge of campus resources to assist students to become involved with SV prevention activities.		

Strongly agree		
Agree		3
Unsure		
Disagree		
Strongly disagree		
I have had adequate training on proper compliance of Title IX.		
Strongly agree		1
Agree		1
Unsure		
Disagree		1
Strongly disagree		
My institution is in compliance with Title IX.		
Strongly agree		
Agree		1
Unsure		
Disagree		1
Strongly disagree		
I have had adequate training on proper compliance the Clery Act.		
Strongly agree		
Agree		1
Unsure		
Disagree		2
Strongly disagree		
My institution is in compliance with the Clery Act.		
Strongly agree		
Agree		2
Unsure		
Disagree		1
Strongly disagree		
I have had adequate training on proper compliance with the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination (SaVE) Act.		
Strongly agree		
Agree		1
Unsure		
Disagree		2
Strongly disagree		
My institution is in compliance with the SaVE Act.		
Strongly agree		
Agree		1
Unsure		
Disagree		1

Strongly disagree	
N/A	1
I am familiar with the work being done by the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault.	
Strongly agree	2
Agree	1
Unsure	
Disagree	
Strongly disagree	
In the sexual assault policy development process, all campus community members were represented.	
Strongly agree	1
Agree	
Unsure	2
Disagree	
Strongly disagree	
Policies and procedures related to sexual assault are widely disseminated to all members of the campus community.	
Strongly agree	1
Agree	
Unsure	1
Disagree	
Strongly disagree	1
Policies and procedures related to sexual assault are readily accessible to all members of the campus community.	
Strongly agree	1
Agree	
Unsure	1
Disagree	
Strongly disagree	1
Collaboration between the campus and community resources related to sexual assault is consistent and collaborative.	
Strongly agree	1
Agree	2
Unsure	
Disagree	
Strongly disagree	

Policies and procedures related to sexual assault include:	
Descriptive definitions of sexual assault, rape, and other forms of sexual violence	3

Potential campus and criminal penalties that may result in regards to the accused	3
Statement prohibiting retaliation against individuals who report incidents of sexual assault	3
Statement detailing issues of the confidentiality of all involved parties	3

Table 2: Campus policies and procedures

Guidelines for how to report a sexual assault include:	
Names and contact information for appropriate campus resources	3
Where and when to report an incident	3
Indications as to what each procedure entails	3
Indications as to what the purpose of each procedure is	2
Contact information for community resources	3
Contact information for national resources	3

Table 3: Perceived barriers, additional comments

If sexual assault related programming is limited on campus, please explain the problems and barriers that exist:
<i>“For the upcoming academic school [year], we plan on focusing on this subject as a result of the WH Project to end sexual violence/assault.”</i>
<i>“Staff to coordinate activities...staff to manage the activities.”</i>
<i>“[Lack of a] comprehensive website.”</i>
<i>“[Lack of] media dissemination of information continually”</i>
<i>“[Lack of] webinars or trained staff to do continual trainings”</i>
<i>“One of the many barriers is lack of funding to provide sexual violence prevention activities.”</i>
<i>“There is a lack of buy-in by faculty, staff, and students to get involved in sexual violence prevention activities/events.”</i>
If applicable, please note any additional comments or concerns you have related to sexual violence, sexual violence prevention, and perceived barriers, or note resources that you are interested in:
<i>“[We] anticipate seeking a [grant] to assist in developing further programming to address this problem on campus.”</i>

Table 4: Programming on campus

Activity	School 1	School 2	School 3
Programming for fraternities and sororities	X		
Programming for coaches/athletes	X		
Programming for marching bands			
Programming for ROTC			
Programming for faculty/staff			
SV prevention program for female students		X	
SV prevention program for male students		X	
SV prevention program for LGBTQ identified students			
SV prevention program for graduate students			
Bystander intervention programs			X
Rallies/Speakouts projects			X
Distribution of formal campus guidelines/policies related to sexual assault for all new students			X
Distribution of formal campus guidelines/policies related to sexual assault for all returning students			
Distribution of formal campus guidelines/policies related to sexual assault for all new staff and faculty members			
Distribution of formal campus guidelines/policies related to sexual assault for all returning staff and faculty members			
Media campaigns		X	X
Orientation for incoming students	X		

Discussion

Oftentimes, colleges and universities struggle to acknowledge sexual assault as a problem affecting its student body. Schools' failures in acknowledging the severity and extent of sexual violence may stem from a variety of underlying issues. Frequently, a school's perceived safety is a major point of attraction for perspective students and their families. School officials may feel pressured to underreport in order to create a sense of safety on campus, or they may be unaware of the policies regarding sexual assault reporting and how to go about successfully reporting the crimes (Hardy & Barrows, 2001). As schools continuously seek donors and students with high aptitudes, they must learn to do so in the face of demands for transparency regarding the types and quantity of campus crimes (Pan, 2012).

GNESA commends each of the respondents for identifying sexual assault as either "somewhat of a problem" or a "major problem." These responses are promising, as acknowledging sexual assault as a problem is a crucial step in taking effective action to address it. It is important that school officials understand the severity of the issue on the campus and the high prevalence rates, despite the low number of official reports. However, despite their acknowledgement of sexual assault as a problem on campus, respondents did not feel positively about the effectiveness of their schools' responses to sexual assault. Acknowledging the existence of SV on campus is an important component of addressing it, but a comprehensive formal response must be implemented and supported by campus officials if any impactful and sustainable change is to be instituted.

Responses were mixed when it came to the staffs' perceptions on the adequacy of campus programs responses to individuals' disclosures of experiencing SV. This presents several opportunities for schools in addressing these needs or uncertainties; better marketing of the types of services should be implemented, in addition to improving the existing services, as well as exploring potential programming to be incorporated on campus. In terms of the types and adequacy of resources for campus community members to become involved in programming related to the intervention of sexual assault, the majority of respondents felt their school did not offer adequate resources for the community members to become involved and one respondent was unsure the availability of programming and activities. Again, this presents schools with opportunity to better market what, if any, opportunities there are and to increase the types, effectiveness, and attractiveness of current programs to engage a wider array of its campus

community members. It is important to note the inclusion of all of the campus members, rather than focusing solely on one group (e.g. resident hall staff) over another (e.g. faculty members), as is too often the case on many college campuses (RAINN, 2009).

When questioned on the opportunities available to become involved in prevention activities, respondents were either unsure or in disagreement that there are options for campus community members. This unsureness may hint at the fact that many faculty and staff members may be unclear of the key differences between intervention and prevention activities. Increased education in reference to the need for both intervention and prevention activities must be implemented and the importance of both activities emphasized throughout the campus community in order to encourage participation by all campus community members.

When asked about their personal training in the areas of talking to students about SV and SV prevention, respondents were more confident in their ability to discuss the topic of SV (two respondents agreed, one was unsure) in comparison to their mixed perceptions on their training on prevention. These responses highlight the success the schools have in training staff on discussing about the problem, in contrast to the lack of ability to effectively discuss prevention methods and/or a general lack of clarity on the definitive characteristics of prevention. Staff felt comfortable with their knowledge of campus resources to refer victims of sexual assault to and felt similarly confident in their knowledge about how to assist students in becoming involved available prevention-related activities. However, this information should be reevaluated, as prior questions related to prevention did not indicate as much confidence in prevention-related campus activities and the respondents' knowledge on these strategies.

When analyzing the questions regarding the respondents' trainings on Title IX, Clery Act, and SaVE Act compliance, as well as the institution's compliance with these regulations, caution is warranted. Two of the respondents are lead counselors at their schools' health centers and therefore would likely have, by nature of their job, fewer trainings regarding official reporting procedures due to the confidential nature of their work. However, GNESEA feels that it is important to highlight that one respondent felt their Title IX was training inadequate and one respondent felt their school was not in compliance with Title IX. In regards to Clery Act training and institutional compliance, two respondents did not feel they have adequate trainings and one respondent did not feel that their school followed the reporting standards required by the Act. When asked about the adequacy of their SaVE Act training, one respondent agreed that it was

adequate compared to the two respondents who disagreed. One respondent agreed their institution was in compliance with the SaVE Act, one disagreed, and one did not submit an answer. All respondents agreed or strongly agreed with their familiarity with the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. GNESEA feels that this familiarity highlights the positive influence that the Task Force has on emphasizing the importance of prevention and intervention of SV on campuses. The momentum created by the Task Force should be capitalized upon, as having federal support may assist the schools in creating meaningful change on their campuses. However, it is imperative that clarity is sought in regards to the new guidelines mandated by the Task Force in order to ensure that schools and campuses are held to an equal compliance standard.

The questions regarding the sexual assault policies on the three campuses raises several concerns over their development process, accessibility, and dissemination. Two thirds of respondents were unsure of who was represented in the development process, and this may signal that these individuals or those in similar positions were not included. Based on the job positions of the respondents, GNESEA feels that it is important that these staffers (counselors and Title IX coordinators) were included in order to ensure a comprehensive approach that allows for a fair process. When questions were asked on the dissemination of the procedures, only one respondent strongly agreed that the policies are widely disseminated, one was unsure, and one strongly disagreed. If students, particularly those in crisis who may be experiencing trauma, are unsure of their options, it could lead to a lack of reporting and proper resources being made available to them. The results for inquiries on the accessibility of the policies and procedures were identical to the previous question: one strongly agreed, one was unsure, and one strongly disagreed.

In regards to the specific content of the policies, each of the guidelines contained all of the information suggested by the 2012 AAUP report, with the exception of one school's guidelines failing to explain why a particular reporting procedure takes place. GNESEA is optimistic about this section's findings, as it is encouraging to see that these schools not only have policies available (even if not widely disseminated) and that they are robust in content. Therefore, the remaining challenges include making them more accessible and available to students, while ensuring that the steps outlined in the guidelines are truly and effectively implemented.

Respondents were positive in their perception regarding the level of collaboration between their campus and community resources regarding sexual assault. However, it would be helpful to seek input from these respective community resources to determine what their perspectives on the relationships between their agencies and the schools. A collaborative partnership is only effective when all sides feel respected, involved, and listened to in the process. Therefore, complete transparency is a necessary component if these collaborative efforts are to exist and create meaningful changes.

When questioned about specific barriers to successful implementation of different programs, the schools gave a variety of answers, ranging from the lack of funding to assist with hiring staff to manage programs, to create a comprehensive website, and to disseminate information on a continuous basis. Another concern was raised regarding the lack of trainings available to teach staff and students how to prevent SV programs on campus. There was also the issue of a lack of interest on behalf of the campus community members to become involved with activities related to sexual assault prevention. In order to address this, increased awareness of the problem is necessary as well as intentional messaging about the need for change in terms of addressing the problem. In regards to these identified barriers, it is imperative that information on evidence-based programming and rules and methods of complying with state and federal laws regarding sexual assault are widely disseminated and discussed amongst Georgia's HBCUs. Shared challenges and successes will allow school officials to better understand how this complex problem is addressed and in turn will improve and increase the conversations about SV rather than ignoring the issue altogether.

Limitations

The current findings represent a very limited sample, both in terms of the schools and the specific staff positions that responded. Four schools did not respond to the survey, so their programs are not accounted for here, nor are their faculties' perceptions on topics related to SV on campus. Therefore, it is possible that the responses discussed here are not representative of all Georgia's HBCUs. Furthermore, varying levels of knowledge and understanding of SV and related campus policies should be expected depending on the staff member's respective position at their institution. For instance, a Title IX coordinator would likely be well-versed in the specifics of the Title IX policies and guidelines implemented at the school, compared to a lead

counselor, who may be more practiced in working directly with victims of sexual assault. The low response rates leads to some speculation about those schools that declined to participate. It may be that the schools whose faculty and staff feel relatively confident about their abilities to meet their students' needs are more willing to respond, or that those schools who have had more publicized cases of sexual assault on campus were more likely to share information in hopes that it will result in increased resources and assistance from community and statewide partners.

Despite these limitations, the survey results provide data related to the types of programming available at three campuses as well as faculty members' perceptions of the problem and their ability to address the issue. The research shows that while written guidelines tend to be very robust, programming remains limited on campus. There is also a lack of strong knowledge of and compliance with the three listed laws. The survey method and data collection also illuminate some of the key difficulties related to campus sexual assault, including establishing clear communication, identifying appropriate contacts, building a sense of trust between the schools themselves as well as between the schools and community resources. Additional research is necessary to identify what resources schools may be interested in. Finally, no evidence-based curriculum related to campus sexual assault prevention has been rigorously evaluated and standardized at the time of this survey (DeGue, 2014; Bivins, personal communication, June 2014). Such a curriculum could be valuable to the Georgia HBCU system.

Program Recommendations

GNESA feels strongly that the possibility for collaboration ([about?](#)) between Georgia's HBCUs exists and should be expanded upon. However, there are clear challenges in successfully implementing such cooperative relationships. A lack of funding, clear leadership, forthright conversations, and understanding of the issues and problems at hand all impede potential success in fostering sustainable and responsible relationships that will effectively serve victims. In order to address these barriers, specific objectives and goals should be developed and delivered to better serve victims and allow for greater campus involvement in the prevention of SV. These goals should include the creation of Sexual Assault Response Teams (SARTs), increased number and quality of trainings for staff, faculty, and students, and further research conducted on the issue of sexual assault, particularly as it pertains to HBCUs.

Sexual Assault Response Teams

The National Sexual Violence Resource Center (NSVRC) defines a SART as: “a multidisciplinary interagency team of individuals working collaboratively to provide services for the community by offering specialized sexual assault intervention services” (2014). A SART is typically comprised of law enforcement officials, prosecutors, forensic examiners and oftentimes crime lab specialists, and victim advocates. GNESEA feels that campus representatives, ideally Deans of Students, Title IX coordinators, school counselors, and when available, prevention directors, should be included among the team to ensure that campus-based perspectives are taken into consideration. Additionally, due to the lack of evidence-based programming for campus sexual assault prevention, GNESEA recommends that the HBCU Sexual Assault Task Force members who are employed by the CDC join the SART as well, to ensure continuous development, implementation, and monitoring of any campus programs and activities. All SART members must be committed to a victim-centered approach, one that is comprehensive, compassionate, and dedicated to both providing intensive services for those who are experiencing or have experienced sexual assault as well as preventing future acts of SV.

GNESEA feels that a single SART that included representatives from the three schools of the Atlanta University Center Consortium (AUCC) would be particularly useful in terms of addressing any issues that may arise from having three schools located closely to one another. Specifically, Spelman College and Morehouse College are two single-sex institutions (female and male, respectively), and interactions among students are frequent. While the relationships between schools of the AUCC are collaborative in an academic nature, the schools must enter into an open and honest conversation about the problem of campus sexual assault and how it affects their respective student populations.

GNESEA recognizes the challenges associated with creating a more integrative approach to sexual assault services but fully endorses this endeavor and will provide support when appropriate. Such a collaboration would provide the AUCC with an opportunity to become the first consortium of HBCUs to collaborate with one another in a SART between the three schools and their community agencies. In doing so, the AUCC would be able to provide a model for similarly situated schools throughout the country, HBCUs and TWIs alike.

The following has been adapted from the Office for Victims of Crime’s SART Toolkit (2011):

Build your SART	Collect data	Create a strategic plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Form a planning team. • Establish leadership and find a coordinator. • Define the SART's jurisdiction and assess it for readiness. • Identify collaborative partnerships. • Develop a budget. • Decide on membership. • Schedule the first planning meeting. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gather interagency data. • Gather community data. • Compile data reports. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop vision and mission statements. • Determine your goals, objectives, action plan, and logic model. • Create a protocol that lays out the roles and responsibilities of team members.
Determine communication standards	Hold team meetings	Monitor and evaluate your efforts
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a shared language. • Incorporate ethics into your communication standards. • Understand confidentiality issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pick the place and time. • Create the agenda. • Facilitate team meetings. • Overcome conflict. • Keep the momentum. • Conduct case reviews. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why monitoring and evaluating your approach is important. • Process, outcome, and impact evaluations. • Possible steps in implementing your evaluation. • How to keep evaluation costs down.
Sustain your SART	Know your team	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why a sustainable response is necessary. • The steps involved in developing a sustainability plan. • Why educating the public about your SART helps sustain it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advocates. • Health care providers. • Civil justice practitioners. • Law enforcement officials. • Forensic scientists. • Prosecutors. • Probation, corrections, and parole officers. • Sex offender management professionals 	
---	---	--

Trainings

Training as it relates to sexual assault prevention must be addressed on two levels. The first level requires examining the current curricula that is available, both at the individual schools as well as their counterparts nationwide. The CDC completed a systematic review of primary prevention programs and activities throughout the country, and out of the 140 strategies reviewed, only two were shown to result in significant reductions of sexually violence beliefs and behaviors. The programs identified were *Safe Dates* and *Shifting Boundaries*; two programs that were not evaluated in college populations but present an opportunity for adaptation (DeGue, 2014; Foshee et al., 1996; Taylor, Stein Mumford, & Woods, 2011). A variety of other programs, including *Coaching Boys to Men*, *Bringing in the Bystander*, and *Green Dot*, have been or are currently being evaluated to determine their effectiveness. The CDC identified key strategies to include in SV prevention curricula, including:

- “Developing organizational policies and environmental interventions to reduce risk;
- Strengthening existing policies or services on campus related to reporting and responding to sexual violence;
- Increasing negatives consequences for perpetrators; and
- Decreasing social norms that facilitate sexual violence” (DeGue, p. 6, 2014).

In addition to identifying useful and effective components of SV prevention strategies, determining ineffective methods is of equal importance. The majority of literature and current programming regarding SV focuses on one-time educational sessions for college students that increase general understanding and awareness about SV (DeGue, 2014). However, despite the heavy utilization of these programs, none of them have resulted in a sustained reduction of risk factors and behaviors (DeGue, 2014). Investing resources, including time, funds, and personnel into these strategies, is a harmful practice as it redirects these already limited assets away from proven techniques. HBCUs should engage in a rigorous monitoring and evaluation process of their current programs and stay actively involved with the findings of other curricula that may be adapted and implemented for their campuses. Adaptations may take place as campus-specific risk and protective factors will influence the program design and implementation. Local and state-level organizations must also be willing to participate in the evaluation of various programs and in assisting in the successful implementation of them on various campuses.

A second essential component of training is the integration of students with community resources. This aspect of training can be implemented through the creation of internships and volunteer opportunities at various agencies and the utilization of academically-based service courses (ABSCs). ABSCs are courses offered by higher education institutions that integrate service opportunities with the material being taught and reflected upon in class. In regards to sexual assault prevention, students would engage in a semester-long course that discusses topics related to SV, while working in a local community agency. This will increase students' understanding of the practical implications of the course material and to make a significant contribution to combat SV within the community. In order for these courses to be a success, the school must work closely with local and state-level resources to develop strategic placements that will allow for an interactive, meaningful, and engaging experience for both the student and the staff. Guest speakers from the organizations should be willing to speak on campus, either directly to the class or to a larger group of students, if the interest is there on behalf of the student population.

Conclusion

The problem of sexual assault on college campuses is an issue that must be addressed on several levels by members of the campus community as well as agencies at local and state levels. Sexual assault has estimated prevalence rates of 13.7% for TWIs and 9.6% for HBCUs, depicting the urgency of the problem. SV is a complicated problem and will take great deal of coordination, conversation, and collaboration among the different schools and their community partners. Barriers include a lack of funding, inter-campus mobilization, interagency cooperation, understanding and awareness of the problem, and evidence-based prevention programs for campus settings. However, with increased attention being focused towards sexual assault on campuses, the opportunity to act on behalf of those who have experienced or are experiencing SV or those who are at risk of facing SV is now.

A clear need for prevention-based curricula development, implementation, and evaluation exists, and thereby presents campuses and their community partners with the chance to engage with another to create a sustainable, effective, and invaluable resource for the prevention of SV. A SART that includes campus officials, law enforcement, prosecutors, victim advocates, health care providers, and other individuals from appropriate disciplines would ensure that victim

services are executed in a comprehensive, compassionate, and effective manner. Creating a sense of community by increasing the quantity and quality of interactions between campus members and community agencies, such as ABSCs, is another effective way to ensure collaborative and significant relationships between the different parties involved. By improving methods of communication and creating situations for individuals of varying professional and personal backgrounds to work with one another, the opportunities for positive relationships to form increases significantly. With a problem that is as complex SV and one that requires attention at all levels of prevention, it is critically important that healthy and cooperative partnerships are formed and sustained between all stakeholders.

References

- American Association of University Professors. (2012). *Campus sexual assault: Suggested policies and procedures*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/report/campus-sexual-assault-suggested-policies-and-procedures>
- Anda, R., Fleisher, V., Felitti, V., Edwards, V., Whitfield, C., Dube, S., & Williamson, D. (2004). Childhood abuse, household dysfunction, and indicators of impaired adult worker performance. *The Permanente Journal*, 8(1), 30-38.
- Barrick, K., Krebs, C., & Lindquist, C. (2013). Intimate partner violence victimization among undergraduates at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). *Violence Against Women*, 19(8), 1014–1033.
- Basile, K. & Saltzman, L. (2002). *Sexual violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements*. Retrieved from: http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/sv_surveillance_definitions1-2009-a.pdf
- Black, M., Basile, K., Breiding, M., Smith, S. Walters, M., Merrick, M., . . .Stevens, M. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey: 2010 summary report* (CDC Publication.) Atlanta: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Brinn, H. & List, Y. (n.d.) *The Clery Act in detail*. Retrieved from: <http://knowyourix.org/clery-act/the-clery-act-in-detail/>
- Carr, J. & VanDeusen, K. (2004). Risk factors for male sexual aggression on college campuses. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19(5), 279-289.
- Catalano, S. (2006). *Crime victimization, 2005*. No. NCJ 214644. US Department of Justice.
- DeGue, S. (2014). *Preventing sexual violence on college campuses: Lessons from research and practice*. Retrieved from <https://www.notalone.gov/assets/evidence-based-strategies-for-the-prevention-of-sv-perpetration.pdf>
- Dolezal, T., McCollum, D., & Callahan, M. (2009). *Hidden costs in health care: The economic impact of violence and abuse*. Eden Prairie, MN: Academy on Violence and Abuse. Retrieved from <http://avahealth.org/vertical/Sites/%7B75FA0828-D713-4580-A29D-257F315BB94F%7D/uploads/%7B316BEE7E-F7BB-418E-A246-AF9BB8175CF8%7D.PDF>
- Du Mont, J., Miller, K., & Myhr, T. (2013). "The role of 'real rape' and 'real victim' stereotypes in the police reporting practices of sexually assaulted women." *Violence Against Women*, 9(4), 466–486.
- Foshee, V., Linder, G., Bauman, K., Langwick, S., Arriaga, X., Heath, J., . . . Bangdiwala, S.

- (1996). The Safe Dates project: Theoretical basis, evaluation design, and selected baseline findings. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 12(5), 39-47.
- Gavin, L., MacKay, A., Brown, K., Harrier, S., Ventura, S., Kann, L. . . . Ryan, G. (2009). *Sexual and reproductive health of persons aged 10--24 years --- United States, 2002--2007* (CDC Publication No. 58). Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Hardy, T., & Barrows, M. (2001). Campus rapes: Underreporting by schools boasting safety records. *IRE Journal*, 24(4), 16–17.
- Holmes, M., Resnick, H., Kilpatrick, D. & Best, C. (1996). Rape-related pregnancy; estimates and descriptive characteristics from a national sample of women. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 175(2), 320-324.
- MacMillan, R. (2000). Adolescent victimization and income deficits in adulthood: Rethinking the costs of criminal violence from a life-course perspective. *Criminology*, 38(2), 553-588.
- McFarlane, J., Malecha, A., Watson, K., Gist, J., Batten, E., Hall, L., & Smith, S. (2005). Intimate partner sexual assault against women: Frequency, health consequences, and treatment outcomes. *Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 105(1): 99-108.
- National Sexual Violence Resource Center. (2014). *Sexual Assault Response Teams*. Retrieved from <http://www.nsvrc.org/projects/sexual-assault-response-teams-sart-0>
- Kargane, H., Fisher, B., & Cullen, F. (2005). *Sexual assault on campus: What are colleges and universities doing about it?* No. 205521. National Institute of Justice.
- Know Your IX. (n.d.). *Understanding the Campus SaVE Act*. Retrieved from <http://knowyourix.org/understanding-the-campus-save-act/>
- Krebs, C., Barrick, K., Lindquist, C., Crosby, C., Boyd, C., & Bogan, Y. (2011). The sexual assault of undergraduate women at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(18), 3640-3666.
- Office for Victims of Crime. (2011). *SART toolkit: Resources for sexual assault response teams*. Retrieved from <http://ovc.ncjrs.gov/sartkit/develop.html>
- Pan, X. (2012). Holding campuses accountable in reporting sexual assault. *Women's Health Activist*, 37(4), 8-9.
- Rape, Incest, and Abuse National Network. (2009). *The offenders*. Retrieved from <https://www.rainn.org/get-information/statistics/sexual-assault-offenders>
- Taylor, B., Stein, N., Mumford, E., & Woods, D. (2013). Shifting boundaries: An experimental

evaluation of a dating violence prevention program in middle schools. *Prevention Science*, 14(1), 64-76.

The White House. (2014). *FACT SHEET: Not Alone – Protecting students from sexual assault*. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/04/29/fact-sheet-not-alone-protecting-students-sexual-assault>

Tjaden, P. & Thoennes, N. (2006). *Extend, nature, and consequences of rape victimization: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. No. NCJ210346. US Department of Justice.

Truman, J. & Planty, M. (2012). *Criminal victimization, 2011*. No. NCJ 239437. US Department of Justice.

Appendix A

Hello,

The Georgia Network to End Sexual Assault (GNESA) is conducting a statewide survey of historically black colleges and universities to determine the types of programs that exist to address sexual assault interventions and/or sexual assault prevention and education. We have identified you as a campus leader who is likely to be involved with the implementation, coordination, and oversight of campus programs and activities related to sexual violence. Your feedback is greatly appreciated and will help GNESA to identify exemplary programs and to determine any gaps in services.

If you are willing and able to complete this survey, please do so by June 27th. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Katie Dight by email at kdight@gnesa.org or by phone at (404)815-5261.

Please click the link below or copy and paste the link into your internet browser. From there, you will be directed to the Qualtrics-generated survey. Your responses are voluntary and will be confidential. Responses will not be identified by individual. All responses will be compiled together and analyzed as a group.

Thank you,
Katie Dight
Prevention Intern
Georgia Network to End Sexual Assault
Office: (404)815-5261
Cell: (908)770-5790
www.gnesa.org

Appendix B

In recent years, the problem of sexual assault on college campuses has gained significant national attention. This survey will assess the capacity of historically black colleges and universities across Georgia to prevent and respond to incidents of sexual assault on campus in order to determine exemplary programs and identify any gaps in services.

This survey will take about 20 minutes to complete. Participation in this survey is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw at any time or refuse to participate. If you desire to withdraw, please close your Internet browser.

I have read and understood the above consent form and desire of my own free will to participate in this study.

- Yes
- No

What is the name of your institution?

What is the name, title, and contact email (or phone #) for the person completing this survey?

Institutional type:

- Public 4 year
- Private 4 year

How do you perceive the problem of sexual violence on your campus?

- No problem
- Slight problem
- Unsure
- Somewhat of a problem
- Major problem

To what extent do you think your institution is effective in addressing the problem of sexual violence?

- Very effective
- Somewhat effective
- Unsure
- Somewhat ineffective

- Very ineffective
- Not at all effective

In the 2013-2014 academic year, did your institution participate in the following campus activities related to sexual assault? (Check all that apply)

- Programming for fraternities/sororities
- Programming for athletes/coaches
- Programming for marching bands
- Programming for Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC)
- Programming for staff and faculty members
- Sexual violence prevention program for female students
- Sexual violence prevention program for male students
- Sexual violence prevention program for LGBTQ identified students
- Sexual violence prevention program for graduate students
- Bystander intervention programs
- Rallies/Speakouts projects
- Distribution of formal campus guidelines/policies related to sexual assault for all new students
- Distribution of formal campus guidelines/policies related to sexual assault for all returning students
- Distribution of formal campus guidelines/policies related to sexual assault for all new staff and faculty members
- Distribution of formal campus guidelines/policies related to sexual assault for all returning staff and faculty members
- Media campaigns
- Orientation for incoming students

How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

There are adequate resources on campus to respond to students' disclosures of victimizations.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

There are adequate resources on campus to assist campus community members – faculty member, administration, staff members and students – to become involved with sexual violence intervention activities.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree

- Strongly disagree

There are adequate resources on campus to assist campus community members to become involved with sexual violence prevention activities.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

I have had sufficient training in how to talk to students about sexual violence.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

I have had adequate training in the area of sexual violence prevention.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

I possess proper knowledge of sexual violence.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

I possess proper knowledge of campus resources to assist students with their personal experiences with sexual violence.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

I possess proper knowledge of campus resources to assist students to become involved with sexual violence prevention activities.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

I have had adequate training on proper compliance of Title IX.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

My institution is in compliance with Title IX.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

I have had adequate training on proper compliance the Clery Act.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

My institution is in compliance with the Clery Act.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

I have had adequate training on proper compliance with the Campus Save Act.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure

- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

My institution is in compliance with the Campus Save Act.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

I am familiar with the work being done by the White House Task Force on Sexual Assault.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

In the sexual assault policy development process, all campus community members were represented.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Policies and procedures related to sexual assault are widely disseminated to all members of the campus community.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Policies and procedures related to sexual assault are readily accessible to all members of the campus community.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree

- Strongly disagree

Collaboration between the campus and community resources related to sexual assault is consistent and collaborative.

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Unsure
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

Policies and procedures related to sexual assault include: (Check all that apply)

- Descriptive definitions of sexual assault, rape, and other forms of sexual violence
- Potential campus and criminal penalties that may result in regards to the accused
- Statement prohibiting retaliation against individuals who report incidents of sexual assault
- Statement detailing issues of confidentiality of all involved parties

Guidelines for how to report a sexual assault include: (Check all that apply)

- Names and contact information for appropriate campus resources
- Where and when to report an incident
- Indications as to what each procedure entails
- Indications as to what the purpose of each procedure is
- Contact information for community resources
- Contact information for national resources

If sexual assault related programming is limited on campus, please explain the problems and barriers that exist:

If applicable, please note any additional comments or concerns you have related to sexual violence, sexual violence prevention, and perceived barriers, or note resources that you are interested in.
