

Fall 2020

A Content Analysis of Institutions of Higher Education's Sexual Assault Policies: Assessing Response to Sexual Assault in Georgia

Brianna Williams

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd>



Part of the [Domestic and Intimate Partner Violence Commons](#), [Gender, Race, Sexuality, and Ethnicity in Communication Commons](#), [Policy Design, Analysis, and Evaluation Commons](#), [Public Policy Commons](#), and the [Women's Health Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Williams, Brianna, "A Content Analysis of Institutions of Higher Education's Sexual Assault Policies: Assessing Response to Sexual Assault in Georgia" (2020). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 2177.

<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/etd/2177>

This dissertation (open access) is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies, Jack N. Averitt College of at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION'S SEXUAL ASSAULT POLICIES: ASSESSING RESPONSE TO SEXUAL ASSAULT IN GEORGIA

by

BRIANNA CHANTE WILLIAMS

(Under the Direction of William A. Mase)

ABSTRACT

Sexual assault is a public health concern that must be systematically addressed. The existence of a comprehensive sexual assault policy and compliance with federal regulations can guide institutions of higher education in responding to and preventing sexual assault on campus. Federal laws hold institutions accountable for providing a safe environment for students. The purpose of this qualitative content analysis was to assess compliance with federal policy and assess the response to sexual assault by IHE in Georgia. Data from the National Center for Education Statistics was utilized to identify Georgia's institutions receiving federal aid during 2018-2019. Using a proportionate stratified random sampling method, publicly available secondary data from 29 institutions were sampled. A content analysis was utilized to identify themes and gaps amongst institutions. NVivo, Excel, and a pre-existing coding document were used to analyze and code all documents. The study limited participants to IHE that offered classes on a physical campus in Georgia. Results showed that 79% of sampled institutions published a sexual assault policy. Gaps found across sexual assault policies included variability in reporting options, disciplinary procedures, definitions, and resources. Compliance with federal law varied across institutions, with certificate institutions less likely to comply. The study's results highlight the variability of sexual assault response and federal law compliance across institutions. Although the results are not generalizable, findings can be used to identify common elements found in policies across institutions in Georgia and can aid in improving response to sexual assault.

INDEX WORDS: Institutions of higher education, Rape, Rape myths, Sexual assault, Sexual misconduct, Campus sexual assault policies, Content analysis, Social-ecological model, Title IX, Clery Act

A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION'S SEXUAL ASSAULT
POLICIES: ASSESSING RESPONSE TO SEXUAL ASSAULT IN GEORGIA

by

BRIANNA CHANTE WILLIAMS

B.A., Spelman College, 2013

M.S., Georgia State University, 2015

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Georgia Southern University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH

JIANN-PING HSU COLLEGE OF PUBLIC HEALTH

© 2020

BRIANNA CHANTE WILLIAMS

All Rights Reserved

A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION'S SEXUAL ASSAULT
POLICIES: ASSESSING RESPONSE TO SEXUAL ASSAULT IN GEORGIA

by

BRIANNA CHANTE WILLIAMS

Major Professor:
Committee:

William A. Mase
Helen Bland
Amber Culpepper

Electronic Version Approved:
December 2020

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my father and mother, Jerry Williams and Gwendolyn Chandler, and my siblings Kendra Williams, Nicole Williams, Latoya Williams, Sade Williams, and Kendrick Chandler. I would also like to dedicate this dissertation to my many nieces and nephews, who are striving to Excel in this world. Growing up as a black queer woman from the Bronx, obstacles were constantly placed in my path due to my skin color and sexual orientation. Despite these obstacles, my parents and siblings have uplifted me and pushed me to be the best version of myself, no matter how the world chose to view me. I would like to thank my Fiancé for putting up with me on the many sleepless nights where I felt like I could not write another word. You have supported me as if you were writing a dissertation yourself. I am forever grateful for your love and patience. To my friends who have turned into my family, thank you so much for supporting me, loving me, and cheering for me on the sidelines. As my doctoral program nears the end, the biggest lesson I have learned is that greatness is on the other side of fear! Thank you all for caring for me, wholeheartedly throughout this process.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Above all, I want to give praise and honor to God! My faith in God and God's favor has given me the wisdom, strength, and guidance to finish school. God has provided the support systems needed to uplift me and keep me going. Without God, none of this would be possible.

To my Atlanta mother, Patricia McTaggart, thank you! I am so grateful to have crossed paths with such an amazing woman in my lifetime. You are one of a kind!!

To my dad, you are the light of my life. My best friend! You are my saving grace, and I could not have finished my program without your support. Forever, your red apple.

To my sister Kendra, You are my rock, my backbone, and just simply my everything. Your spirit is unmatched. From the cradle to the grave, you will always be my number one lady. I cherish you forever.

To my Fiancé, Niyoke, thank you. No matter what I had to do, you were always a few steps behind me, providing support and encouragement in every way possible. I could not think of a better person to travel to the finish line with!

To my friends turned sisters, Brianna Pointer, Jolisa Beavers, and Toni Degree, I love you! Thank you for being great friends to me in your own ways. During your support meant everything to me!

To my committee, Dr. Mase, Dr. Bland, and Amber Culpepper thank you for your time and dedication. Your patience and guidance have made this process amazing. You have challenged me and have helped to make my dissertation as strong as possible. Thank you for your expertise!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	3
LIST OF TABLES	6
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	7
Statement of the Problem.....	10
Purpose of Study.....	11
Research Questions.....	12
Delimitations.....	13
Assumptions.....	13
Critical Terms.....	14
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	17
Epidemiology- Sexual Assault Rates in the United States and Georgia.....	17
Sexual Assault in Georgia.....	18
Sexual Assault on Campus in the United States.....	18
Sexual Assault and Intersectionality.....	19
Federal Policy in the United States.....	20
Clery Act.....	20
The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.....	21
Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE Act).....	22
Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972.....	23
New Title IX Change.....	25
Dear Colleague Letter.....	25
Q & A on Campus Sexual Misconduct.....	25
Standards of Proof.....	27
Title IX Coordinator.....	27
Resident Assistant.....	28
Campus Policy and Compliance with Federal Mandates.....	28
Sexual Assault Programs.....	29
Bystander Programs.....	29
Men Centered Programs.....	32
Women Centered Programs.....	32
Barriers to Sexual Assault Disclosure.....	33
Fear of Reporting to Campus Officials.....	34
Access and Awareness of Campus Resources.....	34
The Role of Social Support and Perception of Sexual Assault.....	35
Student’s Response to Campus Action.....	35
Overview of Conceptual model.....	36
Summary.....	37
3 METHODOLOGY.....	38
Purpose of the Study.....	38
Sample and Data.....	39

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria.....	39
Sample.....	39
Qualitative Method.....	41
Instrumentation.....	41
Content Analysis.....	42
Content Categories.....	43
Pilot Coding.....	43
Intra-rater Reliability.....	45
Data Collection.....	46
Data Analysis.....	46
Saturation.....	47
Ethical Considerations.....	47
4 RESULTS.....	48
Research Question #1.....	48
Research Question #2.....	50
Research Question #3.....	53
Research Question #4.....	55
Research Question #5.....	56
Research Question #6.....	57
Research Question #7.....	57
Research Question #8.....	58
Research Question #9.....	70
Research Question #10.....	71
Research Question #11.....	72
Research Question #12.....	73
5 DISCUSSION.....	74
Summary of Findings.....	74
Intrapersonal Factors of Influence.....	74
Interpersonal/Relationship Factors of Influence.....	75
Organizational/Institutional Factors of Influence.....	77
Community Level Factors of Influence.....	78
Policy Level	78
Recommendations and Implications for Future Research.....	81
Strengths and Limitations.....	84
Conclusion.....	84
REFERENCES	86
APPENDICES	
A INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER.....	96
B INSTRUMENTATION-CODING DOCUMENT.....	97
C CONTENT CATEGORIES AND DEFINITIONS.....	110
D SAMPLE, STRATA, AND SAMPLE CALCULATION.....	112

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1: Institutions of Higher Education Characteristics.....	48
Table 4.2: Existence of a Sexual Assault Policy	49
Table 4.3: Type of Sexual Assault Mentioned in Policies.....	50
Table 4.4: Definition of Sexual Assault.....	53
Table 4.5: Variances of Sexual Assault Definitions.....	54
Table 4.6: Mention of Sexual Assault Education and Awareness Programs.....	56
Table 4.7: Mention of Sexual Assault Prevention Programs.....	56
Table 4.8: Mention of Bystander Intervention Programs.....	57
Table 4.9: Mention of Risk Reduction Programs.....	58
Table 4.10: Compliance with Clery Act.....	61
Table 4.11: Compliance with Clery Act Disciplinary Proceeding Requirements.....	62
Table 4.12: Compliance with Clery Act Requirements.....	62
Table 4.13: Statistics for Sex Crimes.....	63
Table 4.14: Compliance with VAWA and SaVE Act.....	64
Table 4.15: Compliance with VAWA and SaVE Act Disciplinary Proceeding Requirements..	66
Table 4.16: Mention of Rights and Protections for Survivors and Accused.....	67
Table 4.17: Compliance with Non-discrimination Notice.....	68
Table 4.18: Title IX Coordinator Information on the Official Website.....	69
Table 4.19: Compliance with Title IX.....	69
Table 4.20: Diversity in Policies, Programs, and Resources.....	70
Table 4.21: Reporting Options Articulated to Students.....	71
Table 4.22: Standard of Evidence Used.....	72
Table 4.23: Sanctions Mentioned at Institutions.....	73

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Sexual assault is a public health epidemic that continues to impact the well-being of students on university and college campuses. Although research varies extensively on the incidence rate of sexual assault, it is still considered a significant problem for students. Many studies have concluded that approximately 20-25% of women will experience a sexual assault offense during their matriculation through college (Holland & Cortina, 2017; Potter, Edwards, Banyard, Stapleton, Demers, & Moynihan, 2016; Schwartz, McMahon & Broadnax, 2015). Other studies, including a study conducted by the White House Task Force, found that one in five women reported being sexually assaulted while attending an institution of higher education (Hartmann, 2015; Muehlenhard, Peterson, Humphreys, & Joxkowski, 2017; The White House, 2014).

According to Potter et al., (2016), studies show that approximately 8% of men attending a college or university reported experiencing some form of sexual assault while enrolled. Researchers from another study concluded that approximately 6.1% of males reported being sexually assaulted while in college (Hartmann, 2015). Furthermore, in a campus sexual assault study, researchers surveyed 1,375 men and 5,466 women attending two universities in the Midwest and the South. Results revealed that 13.7% of undergraduate women reported being sexually assaulted during their time in college (Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2007). Although there are inconsistencies in the incidence of sexual assault amongst men and women attending institutions of higher education, researchers have concluded that this is a problem that must be combated.

Measuring the impact and understanding the prevalence of sexual assault in the United States can be difficult due to the variability of the legal definition of rape and sexual assault across all 50-states (Kruttschnitt, Kalsbleek, & House 2014; Lopez-Baker, McDonald, Schissler, & Pirone, 2017; Muehlenhard, Peterson, Humphreys, & Jozkowski, 2017). The definition of consent, the legal age to consent, what is considered force, and what constitutes penetration all vary by state (House et al., 2014). Historically, the definition of sexual assault used in research has also varied. Some definitions of sexual

assault refer to unwanted penetrative and non-penetrative acts, whereas other scholars have used the term more broadly to include coercion, verbal pressures, incapacitation, and intimidation (Munro-Kramer, Dulin, & Gaither, 2017; Muehlenhard, et al., 2017). The inconsistencies of what is viewed as a sexual assault have several implications on sexual assault policies, survivor reporting rates, and the accuracy of the statistical prevalence of sexual assault.

According to Mayall and Gold (1995), significant differences were found in the prevalence of sexual assault when a broad definition is used as opposed to a narrower definition. Narrowing the definition of sexual assault can underestimate the prevalence of such cases on campus. A study conducted by Forke, Myers, Catalozzi, and Schwarz (2008) utilized 390 male participants and 520 female participants. The definition of sexual assault used to guide the survey questions did not include incapacitation but did include coercion and other acts of pressure. Results showed that 15.6% of the female participants reported experiencing sexual assault during their time in college, and 27.2% of the male participants reported being victimized (Forke et al., 2008). In a 2007 study conducted by Kilpatrick, Resnick, Ruggiero, Conoscenti, and McCauley, a national survey of 5,001 female college students was employed. The definition of sexual assault in this study did not include non-penetrative occurrences. Results showed that 5.15% of participants reported experiencing a completed rape (Kilpatrick et al., 2007).

Broad definitions can also skew or overestimate the prevalence of sexual assault. A 2010 study conducted by Palmer, McMahon, Rounsaville, and Ball utilized 370 undergraduate participants attending a private institution (M=175, F=195). In this study, sexual assault included physical force, incapacitation, touching, kissing, coercion, and intercourse. Results showed that 34% of the female participants reported having experienced an unwanted sexual experience (Palmer et al., 2010). School officials must decide on how to define sexual assault and what factors constitute a sexual assault. Deciding on whether unwanted kissing, touching, verbal assault, non-penetrative acts, coercion, or other actions constitute a sexual assault can impact the policies that are created and campus official's willingness to respond.

The State of Georgia currently does not have a single definition of sexual assault. However, the State of Georgia does provide a legal definition of rape, statutory rape, sodomy, aggravated sodomy, sexual assault by persons with disciplinary authority, sexual battery, aggravated sexual battery, stalking, and aggravated stalking. For this study, sexual assault is defined as unwanted touching of a sexual nature, including oral sex, sexual intercourse, anal sex, or sexual penetration with a finger or object (Krebs, Linquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2007). Sexual assault includes rape, which is unwanted sexual activity, including intercourse, obtained through force or incapacitation, as well as sexual battery, which refers to unwanted sexual touching or contact obtained by force or incapacitation (Muehlenhard et al. 2017).

Survivors of sexual assault experience numerous adverse health effects. A study conducted by Burgess and Holmstrom (1974) introduced the term rape trauma syndrome, which is a group of emotional, psychological, and physical reactions that are reported by survivors of a completed rape or attempted rape. More recent reports show that the effects of sexual assault on survivors include depression, anxiety, post-traumatic stress disorder (Choudhary, Smith, & Bossarte, 2012; Lindquist, Crosby, Barrick, Krebs, & Settles-Reaves, 2016; Krebs et al., 2007; Santiago, McCall-Perez, Gorcey, & Beigel, 1985; Ullman, Townsend, Filipas, & Starzynski, 2007) and diminished sexual and physical health among survivors (Jozkowski, Peterson, Sanders, Dennis, & Reece, 2014; Santiago, et al., 1985). Other effects of sexual assault include the development of sleeping and eating disorders, weight change, increased suicide rates, increased likelihood of alcohol and substance abuse, revictimization, and the transmission of sexually transmitted diseases and infections (Hartmann, 2015). Survivors of sexual assault may also see a negative impact on their academics due to lack of focus and increased absences.

Due to the nature of this offense, government officials and institutions of higher education have taken measures to combat sexual assault and protect students. Federal laws such as the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act), The Campus SaVE Act, The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, and Title IX hold universities

accountable for protecting students against acts such as sex discrimination, stalking, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual harassment, and sexual assault.

Statement of Problem

Although awareness of sexual assault on campus has increased, little is known about how individual institutions combat sexual assault. Sexual assault policy, reporting options, preventative and awareness programs, sanctions, and standards of proof for evidence are specific to each institution, therefore making information inconsistent and protocol ineffective (Simms, 2018). It is important to note that the University System of Georgia (USG) is comprised of a network of 26 institutions of higher education in Georgia. The Technical College System of Georgia is comprised of 22 technical institutions.

Although federal law influences sexual assault policy and response on campus, it still falls short of protecting students from sexual assault offenses. According to Lopez-Baker, McDonald, Schissler, and Pirone (2017), in 2014, 91% of colleges and universities reported 0% of sexual assault incidences, which is in contrast to sexual assault prevalence reports. Preceding this report, 41% of colleges and universities did not report any sexual assault claims in five years (Lopez-Baker et al., 2017). Thus far, federal law and campus policy have not been able to adequately address underreporting and low usage of campus resources (Lopez-Baker et al., 2017). Even with the current resources provided by campus officials, students are underutilizing campus support. Research surrounding disclosure of sexual assault shows that there is a concern regarding disclosure rates and a need to look closer at the various factors that impact reporting. Survivors who experience a sexual assault are less likely to disclose the incident to a formal authority than to a close friend or another informal support (Linguist, Crosby, Barrick, Krebs, & Settles-Reaves, 2016). According to the National College Women Sexual Victimization study, researchers concluded that two out of three survivors decided to confide in a friend and disclose a sexual assault incidence rather than seek help from formal authority (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Lindquist et al., 2016). According to other national studies, results showed that approximately 2-11% of college sexual assault survivors reported the incidence to law enforcement officers (Holland & Cortina, 2017). Furthermore, merely 0%-5.3% of sexual assault survivors utilized campus support to file a formal sexual

assault complaint (Holland & Cortina, 2017). Institutions must provide confidential reporting options to allow students the option to disclose a sexual assault anonymously.

According to researchers, the context and culture of the campus have an impact on the student's ability to disclose or report a sexual assault (Lindquist et al., 2016). Results from a study, which utilized a sample of students attending four different Historically Black Colleges & Universities (HBCUs), showed that cultural barriers exist within the African American community that prevents them from reporting a sexual assault. According to Lindquist et al., (2016), African American students were more likely to follow a code of silence and not disclose a sexual assault to protect their privacy. African Americans also exhibited extreme distrust of formal authority such as law enforcement and campus supports and were more likely to confide in informal support, such as a friend (Lindquist et al., 2016). Results also showed that the type of institution attended has an impact on sexual assault risk and prevalence (Lindquist et al., 2016).

Previous sexual assault prevention studies have typically focused on a universal approach to discussing policy, preventative programs, and procedures, but rarely take into consideration the gender, cultural differences, and historical backgrounds that exist amongst students attending various institutions (Wooten, 2017). Student willingness to report a sexual assault is also impacted by the race of the survivor and perpetrator (Wooten, 2017). Institutions of higher education must consider race/ethnicity, culture, and gender when producing and disseminating policies, programs, and resources to students on campus.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to conduct a content analysis of written sexual assault policy material to identify gaps between and among institutions of higher education in Georgia. A content analysis of the official campus website and publicly available policies found in the annual security reports, student handbooks, university rules, and other related policy documents was employed to identify available sexual assault content such as available programs, resources, and sexual assault awareness, prevention, and risk reduction information readily available to students across institutions. Results from this study can provide recommendations for a more comprehensive sexual assault policy that can fill the

gaps between each institution. This study examined campus policy and available programs and resources to assess whether each institution is following the mandates and recommendations outlined by the Clery act, The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, The SaVE Act, and Title IX. This study also assessed whether policies and programs are tailored to serve the general student population or if these resources acknowledge gender, race, and different sub-cultures, such as the African American community and the LGBTQ+ community. This study aimed to identify the reporting options available to students. Lastly, this study aimed to identify the standard of proof utilized by each institution as it relates to sexual assault claims on campus.

This study is significant because few studies have examined compliance with four different federal mandates (Clery act, The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, The SaVE Act, and Title IX) regarding institutions of higher education. This study also examined unique factors related to sexual assault policy on campus, such as the standard of proof. Findings from this study can be used to provide recommendations for a comprehensive sexual assault policy. This study also offers a comprehensive baseline of programs and resources found across a sample of institutions of higher education in Georgia. This study is significant because results will help to identify the definition of sexual assault utilized at institutions of education in Georgia and assist with identifying publication of sexual assault policy on campuses in Georgia.

Research Questions

1. Does each institution have a sexual assault policy?
2. What gaps exist in sexual assault policies across institutions of higher education in Georgia?
3. How does each institution of higher education define sexual assault?
4. Does each institution provide sexual assault education and awareness programs?
5. Does each institution provide sexual assault prevention programs?
6. Does each institution provide bystander intervention programs?
7. Does each institution provide risk reduction programs?

8. Are institutions of higher education in Georgia in compliance with federal regulations as outlined in the Clery Act, The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, SaVE Act & Title IX?
9. Do policies and programs at each institution consider gender, race, and cultural differences?
10. What are the reporting options available to students?
11. What standard of proof is utilized during student disciplinary procedures to investigate sexual assault claims on each campus?
12. What sanctions are in place for students found responsible for sexual assault?

Delimitations

The study sample utilized colleges and universities in the State of Georgia, receiving federal aid. This study excluded colleges and universities that were solely online and did not have a physical campus where students attended class. This study also excluded Georgia Southern University. To avoid any potential conflict of interest, Georgia Southern was utilized as a pilot for this study.

Assumptions

1. Institutions of higher education within the University System of Georgia utilize the same sexual assault policy.
2. Institutions of higher education within the Technical College System of Georgia utilize the same sexual assault policy.
3. Each institution outside of the University System of Georgia or the Technical College System of Georgia has its own unique sexual assault policy.
4. Each institution provides access to resources related to sexual assault prevention, awareness, and risk reduction on its official website.
5. Each institution provides sexual assault prevention programs and resources to students.
6. Each institution complies with the regulations and mandates of federal policy.
7. Each institution has a dedicated Title IX coordinator to address sexual assault claims.
8. Each institution has at least one reporting option for students to report a sexual assault.

9. Each institution publishes crime statistics in their Annual Security Report.

Critical Terms

1. Alcohol facilitated sexual assault- unwanted sexual contact occurring when the survivor is unable to consent due to incapacitation caused by the voluntary consumption of alcohol or other drugs.
2. Awareness programs- audience-specific or community-wide initiatives, strategies, or programs aimed at increasing participant knowledge, sharing resources and information to prevent violence and promote safety.
3. Bystander programs- programs designed to assist bystanders with playing a role in promoting a safe and healthy community by helping them to overcome barriers to intervening, take action to assist and intervene, and providing bystanders the knowledge and resources necessary to identify safe and effective intervention options.
4. Clery Act- a federal act that requires colleges and universities to disclose reported criminal activity on campus and requires institutions of higher education to develop policies and programs for crime prevention.
5. Coercion- persuading someone not to do something or to do something against their will using force, intimidation, or threats.
6. Consent- words or actions that demonstrate a knowing and voluntary willingness to engage in sexual activity that is mutually agreed upon. Consent cannot be gained by force, intimidation, or coercion.
7. Drug facilitated sexual assault-unwanted sexual contact that occurs when the survivor is unable to provide consent due to incapacitation after she/he had been given a drug without her/his awareness or consent.
8. Forcible sex offenses- any sexual act directed against another person, forcibly and/or against that person's will; or not forcibly or against the person's will where the victim is incapable of giving consent. Forcible sex offenses include forcible rape, forcible sodomy, forcible fondling, and sexual assault with an object.

9. Incapacitated sexual assault- unwanted sexual contact that occurs when the survivor is unable to provide consent or stop the act due to drugs, alcohol, incapacitation, or sleep.
10. Non-forcible offenses- any unlawful, non-forcible sexual intercourse, including incest and statutory rape.
11. Population-specific services- survivor-centered services that address the safety, health, economic, legal, housing, workplace, immigration, confidentiality, or other needs of survivors of dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, or sexual assault, and that are designed for and target a specific underserved population.
12. Prevention programs- research-based programs intended to prevent sexual assault, rape, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking through the promotion of healthy behaviors that encourage bystander intervention and seeks to change social norms and behaviors positively.
13. Responsible employees- a responsible employee is any employee who has the authority to take action to reduce sexual harassment or sexual assault, who has been given the duty to report to appropriate school officials about incidents of misconduct, sexual harassment, or sexual assault by students, or who a student could with reason, believe has this authority or responsibility.
14. Reduction programs- The Violence Against Woman Reauthorization Act defines risk reduction programs as programs designed to increase survivor empowerment and decrease bystander inaction to promote safety and help individuals and communities address conditions and situations that perpetuate violence. Risk reduction programs aim to reduce risky attitudes and behaviors and avoid victimization.
15. Sexual assault- unwanted touching of a sexual nature, including oral sex, sexual intercourse, anal sex, or sexual penetration with a finger or objects. Sexual assault includes rape, which is unwanted sexual activity, including intercourse obtained through force or incapacitation, and sexual battery, which refers to unwanted sexual touching or contact obtained by force or incapacitation.

16. Rape- the penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ of another person, without the consent of the survivor.
17. Sexual harassment- includes unwelcome sexual advances, unwanted contact of a sexual nature, unwanted conduct based on sex, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature by an employee, by another student, or by a third party.
18. Stalking- engaging in the course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to fear for their safety or suffer considerable emotional distress including, acts in which the stalker directly, indirectly, or through third parties, by any action, method, device, or means follows, monitors, observes, surveils, threatens, or communicates to or about, a person, or interferes with a person's property.
19. Title IX- a federal law that prohibits discrimination based on sex in education programs for schools or institutions receiving federal funding.
20. Title IX coordinator- a person who is appointed by the institution to ensure that the university or college complies with Title IX as well as to address sexual assault complaints.
21. Office for Civil Rights- The Office for Civil Rights for the Department of Education provides guidance to assist institutions of higher education in complying with Title IX.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this literature review is to provide an overview of sexual assault on campus, the history of federal policies and laws put in place to protect students, standard of evidence, sexual assault programs, disclosure rates, and factors that play a role in sexual assault disclosure such as rape myths, culture on campus, support, and content and availability of programs and resources. Lastly, the theoretical framework used to guide this study will be discussed.

Epidemiology- Sexual Assault Rates in the United States and Georgia

According to the 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, 18.3% of women living in the United States reported experiencing rape at some point in their life (Center for Disease Control, 2014). Furthermore, more than half of the women raped in the United States (N=51.1%) reported being assaulted by someone they knew, such as a partner (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014). The NISVS reported that approximately 13% of women had been pressured into having sexual intercourse, and 27.2% reported experiencing some form of nonconsensual sexual contact (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014). Of reported survivors of rape in the United States, 79.6% of women reported experiencing rape before age 25, and 42.2% reported experiencing rape before the age of 18 (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014).

According to the 2010 NISVS, 4.8% of men in the United States reported being forced to penetrate someone against their will. Additionally, 6% of men reported being coerced into having sex (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014). Furthermore, 27.8% of male rape survivors reported experiencing rape at ten years old or younger (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014). Of this population, 52.4% of men reported being raped by someone they knew or an intimate partner, while 15.1% reported being assaulted by a stranger (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014).

Reports from the 2010 National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey estimated that 22% of black women in the United States experience some form of rape during their lifetime (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014). Furthermore, 18.8% of white women and 14.6% of Hispanic women

reported a rape at some point (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014). 1 out of 59 (1.7%) of men who reported a rape in the United States were White (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014). 31.6% of men who experienced a rape reported their race as multi-racial (non-Hispanic), and 26.2% reported their race as Hispanic (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2014).

Sexual Assault in Georgia

According to the Georgia Bureau of Investigation (GBI), there has been an upward trend in Georgia's number of reported sexual assault cases. According to the GBI, 2,684 rapes were reported in 2017 compared to 1,934 rapes reported in 2013.

Sexual Assault on Campus in the United States

According to the 2018 census, 76.8 million people living in the United States were enrolled in school (United States Census Bureau, 2019). Of those enrolled in school, 18.9 million were enrolled in college (United States Census Bureau, 2019). Additionally, 4.1 million students were enrolled in graduate school in 2018 (United States Census Bureau, 2019). Of the college population, 54% of students reported their race as non-Hispanic white, 19% reported being Hispanic, 16% reported being black, and 9% of the college population reported being Asian (United States Census Bureau, 2019).

In more recent years, growing attention has been given to the topic of sexual assault on college and university campuses. Due to this growing concern, the federal government has mandated that higher education institutions receiving federal funding must employ sexual assault prevention measures on campus. Despite these mandates and prevention and awareness efforts from student activist groups, community organizations, college administrators, and the media, sexual assault prevalence on campus has not declined over the years. According to Hanson and GIdycz (1993), the prevalence of sexual assault on campus varied between 5% and 22%.

Consequently, students have begun to demand that more evidence-based policies and procedures are implemented on campus due to mistrust in the way colleges and universities have been responding to sexual assault claims. According to Walker (2018), the number of colleges and universities under investigation for mishandling sexual assault claims on campus has increased by 9% from 2014 to 2017. In

2017, schools under investigation by the Office for Civil Rights totaled 496 compared to 55 in 2014 (Walker, 2018).

For college officials to reduce sexual assault on campus and investigate claims more effectively, there should be a clear understanding of what constitutes consent and what is considered a sexual assault. Students should understand the different forms of sexual assault, be aware of when it occurs, and be informed on how to report the offense. Without a clear definition of sexual assault, students will continue to underreport these instances and may not understand the punishment imposed on them if they were to commit the act. There is no standard definition of sexual assault used in the criminal justice system or on college and university campuses in the United States. An offense that is considered a sexual assault in one state can be considered a simple battery or a lesser charge in another state, depending on the definition used to define sexual assault. Varying definitions of sexual assault make it difficult to report and combat crime and make prevalence rates inconsistent.

Sexual Assault and Intersectionality

Studies show that different demographics of college students may be at a greater risk of experiencing sexual assault based on factors such as sexual orientation, race, and gender. According to Worthen and Wallace (2017), Black women are at higher risk for sexual assault than Asian and non-Hispanic White women. Researchers also concluded that bisexual women experience sexual assault just as often or more than heterosexual women (Hines, Armstrong, Reed, & Cameron, 2012; Murchison, Boyd, & Pachankis, 2017; Worthen & Wallace, 2017). Research surrounding campus sexual assault policy and programs shows that heteronormative relationships are the focus of most educational programs, leaving subpopulations of students vulnerable and uneducated (Worthen & Wallace, 2017). Unique factors, such as homophobia and LGBTQ stigma, exist within the LGBTQ community and can impact students' willingness to seek help or participate in prevention programs. Also, in the African American community, the perception of racial biases, fear of systematic racism, and cultural stigmatism, play a role in the willingness to seek help from mental health facilities as well as influences willingness to report a rape (Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen, 2002; Linqvist, et al., 2016). Sexual assault policy and programs

must aim to reduce stigma and provide students with resources to prevent violence and sexual assault (Murchison, et al., 2017). Programs and policies that focus on intersectionality can help educate and target a diverse group of students on campus (Worthen & Wallace, 2017).

Federal Policy in the United States

Clery Act

In 1990, Congress passed the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act, an amendment to the Higher Education Act of 1965 (Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act, 1990). Title I of the Student Right-to-Know Act requires that all institutions of higher education receiving federal funding under Title IV disclose annual graduation rates of certificate or degree-seeking full-time students (Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act, 1990). Title IV (student assistance) extends the Pell grant program and revises program eligibility for students (Higher Education Amendments, 1986). Under the Student Right-to-Know Act, institutions must provide graduation rates of student-athletes, including information on race and sex (Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security, 1990). Under this act, institutions are also required to provide students, students' parents, high school coaches, and guidance counselors of students receiving federal aid, information on graduation rates (Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security, 1990).

Title II of the 1990 Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act, the Campus Awareness and Campus Security Act (Clery Act) came about after Jeanne Clery, a college student, was found sexually assaulted and murdered by another student while on campus (Hartmann, 2015; Subotnik, 2018). During this time, Congress found that the incidence rate of violent crimes had risen on some college campuses, and there was no comprehensive database containing campus crimes (Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security, 1990). Government officials stated that students and employees should be informed of crime statistics and the policies and procedures to prevent and report a crime (Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security, 1990). The Campus Awareness and Campus Security Act requires each eligible institution of higher education participating in any program under Title IV to prepare, publish, and distribute an annual security report to all current students and employees (Student Right-to-Know and

Campus Security, 1990). The annual security reports should contain the institution's campus security policies and campus crime statistics (Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security, 1990). The annual security report must include statistics about crimes such as murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglaries, and motor vehicle theft (Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security, 1990). The annual security report should contain current campus policies regarding procedures on how and where to report criminal activity and emergencies on campus (Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security, 1990).

The Campus Security Act also requires institutions to make timely reports on crimes reported to campus security or local officials and to provide crime reports to students and employees promptly (Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security, 1990). Under the Clery Act, institutions should also describe the type of programs designed to educate students and employees about crime prevention (Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security, 1990).

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act

The Violence Against Women Act of 1993 was introduced to combat violence and crimes against women on the streets and in homes (Violence against Women Act, 1993). Under this act, grants were provided to state and local governments to implement rape prevention programs to reduce sexual assault against women (Violence Against Women Act, 1993).

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 amended the Clery Act to mandate that institutions receiving federal funding compile statistics for incidents of dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking (United States Department of Education, 2017). Institutions must also include policies, procedures, and programs on these incidents in the annual security reports (United States Department of Education, 2017). The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 also amended the Violence Against Women Act of 1993 to add or expand definitions of several terms used in the act, including culturally specific services, which are community-based services that offer culturally relevant and linguistically specific services and resources to culturally specific communities (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, 2013). The 2013 act also includes terms such as personally identifying information concerning survivors of dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, or sexual

assault (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, 2013). The act also includes the term underserved populations, which is defined as populations that face barriers in accessing and utilizing victim services because of religion, sexual orientation or gender identity, or geographical location (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, 2013).

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (2013) requires institutions of higher education participating in any program under Title IV (federal financial aid) to develop and distribute a policy aimed at the prevention of domestic violence, stalking, sexual assault, and dating violence. Policy at institutions of higher education must address educational programs that promote rape, domestic violence, sexual assault, and dating violence awareness (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, 2013). Institutions are also required to provide incoming students and new employees with primary awareness and prevention programs (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, 2013). These programs must adhere to the following; include a statement that the institution of higher education prohibits the offenses of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, define consent in reference to sexual activity, provide options for bystander intervention, provide risk reduction information, and provide ongoing prevention and awareness campaigns (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, 2013). The programs must also provide information on possible sanctions and disciplinary procedures, provide reporting information, provide information on sexual assault policies and procedures, and provide complaint filing procedures and protection measures for complainants (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, 2013).

Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE Act)

More recently, the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act was signed into law (2013). Under this act, institutions must protect the confidentiality of survivors reporting criminal threats or violence (Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act, 2013). Institutions participating in federal aid such as Pell grants, federal loans, and work-study programs are mandated to include a statement of policy regarding their current programs to prevent domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence, as well

as the procedures the institution follows when such offenses are reported (Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act, 2013).

Under the SaVE Act, institutions of higher education must have a policy that includes; education that promotes awareness of the offenses; institutional disciplinary procedures and potential sanctions or protective measures; procedures survivors should follow after an offense occurs; information about how the survivor's confidentiality will be protected; the written notification about on-campus and community services available for survivors; and the written notification regarding options for changing academic, living, transportation, and working situations, regardless of whether or not they choose to report the crime (Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act, 2013). Education and awareness programs for incoming students should include the legal definition of consent, sexual assault, rape, stalking, domestic violence, and victim protection orders (Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act, 2013). Additionally, postsecondary institutions that publish annual security reports must also offer training for students, employees, faculty, and staff (Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act, 2013).

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972

Title IX prohibits discrimination based on sex at federally funded institutions and establishes that no person in the United States should be excluded from education programs or activities on the basis of sex (United States Department of Education, 2020). Under the provisions of Title IX, students have the right to attend an institution that is free of sexual harassment and sexual assault (United States Department of Education, 2020). According to the Supreme Court, the two main objectives of Title IX are (1) to prevent federal money from flowing to institutions that deny students access to educational opportunities based on sex and (2) to provide individuals with protection against sex discrimination (United States Department of Education, 2020). Institutions are required to adopt and publish grievance procedures for addressing sexual assault claims and must disseminate the information to students and employees (United States Department of Education, 2020). Additionally, the institution must appoint at least one Title IX coordinator to address sex discrimination complaints and designate responsible employees (United States Department of Education, 2020).

Under Title IX, survivors of sex discrimination, including sexual assault, have the right to receive support from their institution, whether they choose to file a formal complaint or not (United States Department of Education, 2020). Individuals may also file a civil lawsuit and pursue criminal prosecution against the alleged perpetrator (United States Department of Education, 2020).

Under Title IX requirements, the notice of nondiscrimination should be published on the institution's official website and should mention that the institution does not discriminate based on sex (United States Department of Education, 2020). The nondiscrimination notice should mention that any complainant or 3rd party can report sexual harassment at any time, including non-business hours, by utilizing the Title IX coordinator's contact information (United States Department of Education, 2020). The nondiscrimination notice should also provide information on the Title IX coordinator, including the name, phone number, e-mail address, and office address of the appointed coordinator (United States Department of Education, 2020). The nondiscrimination notice should also inform students where to file complaints concerning Title IX, such as the Title IX office and the Office for Civil Rights (United States Department of Education, 2020). The notice should be easily accessible and readily available. As such, it should be displayed throughout the school and made available on the school's website (United States Department of Education, 2020).

Historically, no Title IX regulations have addressed sexual harassment as a form of sexual discrimination (United States Department of Education, 2020). Instead, sexual harassment has been addressed under a series of guidance documents such as the withdrawn Dear Colleague Letter on Sexual Harassment and the Questions and Answers on Campus Sexual Misconduct (United States Department of Education, 2020). Through engaging key stakeholders in discussions around Title IX, the Department of Education found that institutions were unclear on whether the guidance was or was not legally binding (United States Department of Education, 2020). After further investigation, the Secretary of Education concluded that problems exist with the current Title IX regulations, including the use of broad definitions of sexual harassment, lack of adequate notice, and lack of consistency regarding the evidence standard (United States Department of Education, 2020).

New Title IX Change

Due to the inability of current regulations to adequately address sexual assault and sexual harassment, new regulations were proposed to provide clarity to institutions (United States Department of Education, 2020). The newly proposed regulations would define sexual harassment and what constitutes sexual harassment under Title IX, specify the conditions that warrant the institution's response to allegations of sexual harassment, and establishes procedures that must be implemented in the institution's grievance procedures to ensure a fair and reliable outcome (United States Department of Education, 2020). The new regulation also mandates that institutions provide clear and accessible options for reporting sexual harassment incidents and require institutions to offer supportive measures to survivors such as no-contact orders and dormitory or classroom reassignments (United States Department of Education, 2020).

The new regulations went into effect on August 14, 2020. This study will rely on the guidance of the Q & A 2017 and the regulations outlined in the Clery Act, The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, The SaVE Act, and Title IX (prior to the August 2020 changes) to assess compliance with federal mandates.

Dear Colleague Letter

On April 4, 2011, the Dear Colleague Letter (DCL) was issued by the Office for Civil Rights to provide guidance and standards to schools receiving federal funding (United States Department of Education, 2011). The DCL outlined the requirements set forth under Title IX on sexual assault and sexual violence. The DCL has since been withdrawn and, in the interim, has been replaced by the 2017 Q & A (United States Department of Education, 2017).

Q & A on Campus Sexual Misconduct

Under Title IX guidance, the Q & A provides revised sexual harassment guidance for institutions receiving federal funding (United States Department of Education, 2017). The Q & A discusses the institution's responsibility for addressing sexual misconduct, describes what constitutes an equitable

investigation, clarifies evidence standards, and provides guidance on the appeal and outcomes process (United States Department of Education, 2017).

Under the Q & A, institutions must comply with the mandates under the Clery Act and Title IX (United States Department of Education, 2020). Institutions are required to address sexual assault claims, conduct a fair and timely investigation, and appoint a Title IX coordinator (United States Department of Education, 2017). Each institution must also designate other employees as responsible employees, who will assist the students with connecting with the Title IX coordinator (United States Department of Education, 2020). Under this guidance, institutions have the flexibility of choosing between the preponderance of the evidence standard or the clear and convincing evidence standard (United States Department of Education, 2017). Additionally, institutions must adopt and publish grievance procedures that provide a timely, equitable, and impartial resolution of sex discrimination complaints, including sexual misconduct (United States Department of Education, 2017). Under the Q & A, the Office of Civil Rights evaluates whether an institution's grievance procedures are prompt and equitable if; (1) the institution provides notice of the grievance procedures, which includes how to file a complaint; (2) if the institution applies the procedures to complaints filed by students or 3rd parties; (3) the institution ensures an adequate, impartial and reliable investigation, including allowing either party the opportunity to present witnesses and additional evidence; (4) establishes a prompt time frame for the complaint process; (5) notifies each party of the outcome of the complaint; and (6) the institution should assure that the institution will take measures to prevent the recurrence of sexual misconduct (United States Department of Education, 2020).

Furthermore, institutions must also provide individual services while the sexual assault or sexual harassment investigation is pending (United States Department of Education, 2020). Services include counseling, modifications of class schedules, campus escort services, restrictions on contact between the survivor and the accused, increased security, and other similar services (United States Department of Education, 2020).

Standards of Proof

According to the U.S Department of Education (2020), each institution has the discretion to apply the preponderance of the evidence standard or the clear and convincing evidence standard. Under the 2008 administration, institutions receiving federal funding were mandated to use the preponderance of the evidence standard when resolving sexual assault and harassment complaints, which is the standard used when resolving civil litigation (United States Department of Education, 2020). Under the preponderance of the evidence standard, there must be evidence that supports the likelihood of the complaint occurring more than not (Wiersma-Mosley & DiLoreto, 2018). The clear and convincing standard of evidence states that it is highly probable or highly certain that sexual assault or harassment occurred (Wiersma-Mosley & DiLoreto, 2018). This flexibility in the required standard of evidence under federal law makes it even more difficult to standardize how institutions respond to sexual assault. It is important to cross-examine sexual assault policy across a range of colleges and universities to assess how institutions respond to sexual assault claims and their preventative measures. Furthermore, this research will examine which recommended standard of proof is utilized by each institution when investigating sexual assault claims.

Title IX Coordinator

In 2001, the Office for Civil Rights mandated that schools must have a Title IX coordinator to address sexual assault claims and ensure that institutions receiving federal funding comply with Title IX regulations (United States Department of Education, 2015; Wiersma-Mosley & DiLoreto, 2018). Some responsibilities of the Title IX coordinator include monitoring outcomes, coordinating grievance procedures for resolving complaints, identifying patterns, responding effectively to complaints, and assessing the impact of sexual assault on campus culture and climate (United States Department of Education, 2015). The Title IX coordinator should be fully trained and knowledgeable of all Title IX mandates and must ensure that all students, parents, staff, and employees are informed of their rights under this law (United States Department of Education, 2015).

The Dear Colleague Letter: Title IX Coordinators urges campuses to designate and fully support an appointed Title IX coordinator to ensure that Title IX violations do not occur (United States Department of Education, 2015). Title IX coordinators should understand campus policies and procedures and play a role in updating policy to ensure compliance with Title IX (United States Department of Education, 2015). The role of the Title IX coordinator must be clear and visible to the campus community. Allowing the community visibility into the Title IX coordinator's roles and responsibilities helps build trust and relationships between the coordinator and students (United States Department of Education, 2015). The Office for Civil Rights requires colleges and universities to post their Title IX coordinator's name and other contact information, grievance procedures, and Title IX policy on their campus website's homepage.

Resident Assistants

Colleges and Universities have found ways to leverage the help of responsible employees, such as resident assistants (RAs), to assist survivors of sexual assault. Under Title IX and the Clery Act, responsible employees are mandated to disclose a sexual assault to the college or University (United States Department of Education, 2017). RAs are essential because they have unique relationships and connections with students based on their roles and duties within the resident halls. RAs should be knowledgeable of campus and federal policies and resources, as well as their duties. According to Holland and Cortina (2017), RAs serve as role models and confidants and are integral in intervening and assisting during crises and enforcing campus regulations and policies. Resident assistants are also responsible for identifying a problem, responding effectively and timely, providing referrals for professional services, and making reports to formal authority (Owens, 2011; Holland & Cortina, 2017).

Campus Policy and Compliance with Federal Mandates

In 2015, researchers conducted a nationwide policy analysis to assess whether institutions of higher education comply with federal mandates (Richards, 2016). Results showed that 95% of institutions of higher education had a Title IX policy, and 85% implemented a separate policy to address sexual assault and violence (Richards, 2016). Results also showed that 65% of IHEs included their sexual assault

policy in the student handbook, but only 3% mandated that students acknowledge receipt and understanding of the policy (Richards, 2016). Additionally, 61% of institutions of higher education offered sexual assault and violence prevention programs (Richards, 2016). According to Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen (2002), four-year private non-profit and public institutions of higher education have progressed in developing explicit sexual assault policies. In contrast, smaller institutions such as for-profit, are behind in developing and making sexual assault policies accessible.

Sexual Assault Programs

In addition to federal policy, sexual assault programs are intended to help reduce and prevent sexual assault and violence on and off campus. Previous research has identified four primary categories of content addressed in sexual assault prevention programs (Anderson & Whiston, 2005). Sexual assault preventative programs should be informative, review prevalent facts, statistics, and rape myths, and bring awareness to the consequences of sexual assault (Anderson & Whiston, 2005). Sexual assault prevention and awareness programs should be empathy-based and help participants develop compassion for sexual assault survivors (Anderson & Whiston, 2005; Lonsway, 1996; Schewe, 2002). These programs should also be socialization-focused, meaning that they should examine gender role stereotyping and examine societal messages that influence rape and sexual assault (Anderson & Whiston, 2005). Lastly, sexual assault prevention programs should include risk reduction education, which will help teach specific strategies that students can utilize to reduce their risk of sexual assault (Anderson & Whiston, 2005; Gidycz, Lynn, Rich, et al., 2001).

Bystander Programs

Since the enactment of Title IX and other federal policies, many institutions of higher education have employed different sexual assault prevention and awareness programs on campus. However, even with the implementation of these programs, the rates of sexual assault on campus is still concerning (Burn, 2009). According to researchers, one way to combat sexual assault is to emphasize the importance of educating and leveraging bystanders' help. College and university campuses offer a unique social environment, which provides students with a setting to intervene before a sexual assault occurs

(McMahon, 2010). Bystanders can be taught how to identify signs of a potential sexual assault, how to seek help and speak out against rape myths and social norms that perpetuate violence, and how to advocate and provide empathy and support for survivors of sexual violence (Burn, 2009; Kettrey, Marx, & Tanner-Smith, 2019). There are many benefits to incorporating the bystander program when attempting to reduce sexual assault instances on campus. Bystanders possess the potential to decrease sexual assault rates on campus by shifting and creating healthy community norms, increasing their colleagues' sense of urgency and responsibility for intervening, and serve as role models for encouraging change (Burn, 2009; McMahon, 2010).

Previous research suggests that effective violence prevention programs help dismantle harmful social norms (Ahrens, Rich & Ullman, 2011; Casey & Lindhorst, 2009; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Foubert, Brasfriend, Hill, & Shelley-Trembley, 2011; Swift & Ryan-Finn, 1995). Through educating, training, and mobilizing potential bystanders, bystander prevention programs aim to shift social norms regarding sexual violence and assault (Reed, Hines, Armstrong, & Cameron, 2014). Instead of viewing men as perpetrators and women as victims, which further perpetuates rape myths, the bystander program enlists men and women alike as potential helpers who can both assist students who have experienced sexual violence as well as prevent violence from occurring (Burn, 2009; McMahon, 2010; Reed et al., 2014).

Latane and Darley, 1970 developed a situational model that includes five steps or processes that a bystander experiences before deciding to intervene to prevent or stop a sexual assault (Burn, 2009; Latene & Darley, 1970; Moschella, Bennett & Banyard, 2018). The situational model proposes that the decision to intervene is not as simple as one may think, and obstacles at any of these steps may hinder the bystander from intervening (Burn, 2009; Latene & Darley, 1970). First, the bystanders must notice that the event is occurring. Next, the bystander must interpret the situation as an emergency, a risky situation, or a problem (Burn, 2009; Latene & Darley, 1970). The third step in the five-step model is to take responsibility for acting or intervening (Burn, 2009; Latene & Darley, 1970). The fourth step in bystander intervention is to decide how to assist in the situation. The fifth and final step is to choose to act and intervene (Burn, 2009; Latene & Darley, 1970).

Research shows that there are barriers that exist that may prevent a bystander from intervening. In social settings, bystanders may be distracted or intoxicated and may not be aware of the situation unfolding (Burn, 2009). Another barrier to intervening is the bystander's willingness to take responsibility. Bystander willingness is influenced by the views and relationship between the bystander and the potential survivor and perpetrator (Burn, 2009). Social norms and beliefs also present potential barriers to intervening. Rape myth acceptance and miseducation of what constitutes sexual assault may cause a bystander to miss the opportunity to intervene. It is essential to educate students on sexual assault to improve their chances of identifying the event.

According to Burns (2009), cultural and gender differences exist in bystander intervention. Research shows that men tend to accept rape myths more than women. Gender differences also exist due to the nature of the situation. For example, men are more likely to intervene if they can display heroic behavior (Burns, 2009; Eagly & Crowley, 1986; Leone, Parrott, Swartout, & Tharp, 2016). Gender can have an impact on program effectiveness. Identifying differences that impact sexual assault prevention programs can help institutions shed light on the subpopulations that do not benefit from traditional programs. Suppose institutions choose to incorporate a bystander intervention program. In that case, there needs to be an emphasis on gender differences, social norms, educating the community, and providing resources and options for bystanders to assist.

Although the bystander program has successfully changed many students' attitudes on rape and turned them into conscious bystanders, the program has a few limitations. Bystander intervention programs can accrue high expenses due to training and resource costs needed to implement it (Kleinsasser, Jouriles, McDonald, & Rosenfield, 2014). Another limitation of a bystander intervention program is the group setting. Bystander programs that focus on group discussions can hinder a participant's willingness to participate or respond honestly (Kettrey, et al., 2019; Kleinsasser et al., 2014). Another limitation to implementing bystander programs is the complexity of administering the program, especially on large campuses. Students must find the time to participate in the program, and schools must keep in mind students' schedules and willingness to participate (Kleinsasser et al., 2014).

One approach aims to reduce the limitations of implementing bystander programs on campus. The “Take Care” bystander intervention program is an online program that utilizes videos, images, and vignettes to change rape myth attitudes and teach participants how to stop a potential sexual assault (Kleinsasser et al., 2014). An online bystander intervention program could be useful in helping universities eliminate some of the limitations of an on-campus intervention program (Kleinsasser et al., 2014). An online program is easier to administer to a large group of students, requires fewer resources, specialized training will not be necessary, and few individuals need to be hired to teach the program (Kleinsasser et al., 2014).

Men Centered Programs

Aside from bystander intervention programs, most sexual assault prevention programs specifically target women and, in doing so, play a role in reinforcing rape myths (Cassel, 2012). Risk reduction programs that focus solely on how women can prevent sexual assault reinforces the idea that the survivor is the one to blame and should take measures to protect themselves (Stewart, 2014). Therefore, programs that exclusively target men are necessary to deconstruct the male-dominant norms in society and on campus (Stewart, 2014). Men only programs can help debunk these social norms by showing that men are an integral part of preventing sexual assault (Stewart, 2014). Men are also survivors of sexual assault, so educating men on identifying and preventing sexual assault is essential. Programs that target men and help them personalize sexual assault issues bestow a sense of responsibility for the problem and help men show empathy for the survivor (Stewart, 2014).

Women Centered Programs

One of the most common strategies to aid women in reducing their sexual assault risk has been implementing sexual assault prevention programs (Hanson & Gidycz, 1993; Yeater, Hoyt, & Rinehart, 2008). Although solely targeting women in sexual assault prevention programs can enforce rape myths and stereotypes, it is still essential to incorporate women-centered programs. Although significant progress has been made in identifying male aggressive behavior and other factors that increase the chances of female victimization, the results of these studies have yet to produce a practical solution for

eliminating men's sexually aggressive behavior (Yeater et al., 2008). Even with the implementation of men centered programs, women still run the risk of encountering men who did not participate in these programs. Thus, research and the development of programs that identify skills and behaviors that can help women reduce their risk remains necessary.

There are inconsistencies in research on the need and effectiveness of mixed-gender programs or female-centered and male-centered programs. Evidence suggests that mixed gender programs inhibit participation and honest feedback (Vladutiu, Martin, & Macy, 2011). Contradicting results from other studies show that mixed gender programs improve male empathy towards survivors, decreases acceptance of rape myths in men, and alters women's attitudes towards sexual assault and rape (Anderson & Whiston, 2005; Yeater et al., 2008; Daigneault, Hebert, McDuff, et al., 2015).

Barriers to Sexual Assault Disclosure

Due to the unique campus atmosphere, students have an array of programs, campus support, and reporting options at their disposal compared to other sexual assault survivors. Although these supports exist, many students choose not to report a sexual assault or rape. The below section provides insight into factors that contribute to sexual assault disclosure rates.

Research shows that barriers to reporting a rape or sexual assault exist. Survivors may choose to confide in a close friend or peer rather than reporting the assault. Some reasons why sexual assault survivors may not seek help from authorities include shame and embarrassment, believing that the assault was their fault, and avoidance of public humiliation (Lindquist et al., 2016; Simms, 2018). According to Spencer, Mallory, Toews, Smith, and Wood (2017), some reasons why students choose not to report a sexual assault to law enforcement include distrust in authority and the justice system, lack of understanding what constitutes a sexual assault, believing the incident was not serious enough to involve the police, lack of evidence, fear of not being believed, fear of being blamed, and fear of retaliation from the accused. Also, survivors may receive more support and positive responses from informal support than from formal authority, such as campus officials (Holland & Cortina, 2017).

On campus, sexual assault offenses are most common amongst acquaintances. Students may not report a sexual assault due to the proximity of their offenders. The survivor may share classes, dormitories, the library, social environments, and other common spaces with the accused, making retaliation possible if the survivor chooses to report the offense. According to Simms (2018), due to many offenders receiving little to no punishment when accused of sexual assault, survivors are at risk for future encounters with this person on campus.

Fear of Reporting to Campus Officials

Although the reasons for not reporting a sexual assault to campus officials may be similar to why students choose not to report the incident to police, other factors exist. In a study conducted by Spencer et al., (2017), a diverse sample of students answered questions regarding their reasons for not reporting a sexual assault to their institution. Results showed that 95% of participants did not report their sexual assault to campus officials. Results also showed that 29% of participants reported believing that the incident was not serious enough, and 14.1% did not report the incident because it did not happen on campus (Spencer et al., 2017). Students also reported that they were not aware of campus reporting procedures and have never been educated on where to report the incident (Spencer et al., 2017). Results showed that 19.1% of participants did not report a sexual assault incident because they were not aware of or provided information on the available campus resources and reporting policies. Further research shows that women and those who self-identify as transgender are less likely than men to believe that reporting a sexual assault to campus authority would have any benefits (Worthen & Wallace, 2017). Students should be provided with alternative campus options for reporting a sexual assault, including anonymous reporting options and access to trusted, responsible employees.

Access and Awareness of Campus Resources

Although reporting protocols and campus resources exist, students are not always aware or have access to these supports. According to Walsh, Banyard, Moyhahan, Ward, and Cohn (2010), barriers such as hours of operation, proximity, and service fees can hinder students from accessing available resources. Also, lack of information such as where to go for assistance, knowledge of campus resources and location

of support centers, or knowledge of how supports can be helpful, can hinder reporting and use of campus supports (Walsh et al., 2010).

Previous studies have shown that many students lack the fundamental education of sexual assault and their rights under federal law and lack the trust in authority needed to prevent or report a sexual assault. Results from previous studies also show that the lack of understanding of federal sexual assault policies such as the Clery Act and Title IX directly impact their willingness and ability to seek help from campus officials, whether the assault occurred on campus or elsewhere.

The Role of Social Support and Perception of Sexual Assault

There are stereotypes about sexual assault and rape that can impact how students view what constitutes a sexual assault and ultimately impact their support or lack thereof for survivors. Rape myths can also impact the policies and programs implemented on campus. The acceptance of rape myths can influence the school's response to claims of sexual assault. Rape myths are defined as prejudicial, stereotyped, or false beliefs about rape, rape survivors, and rapists (Burt, 1980; Kamdar, Kosambiya, Bansari, Verma, & Kadia, 2017; McMahan, 2010). Studies show that the more rape myths are accepted and passed on, the less likely it is for someone to intervene in a potential sexual assault (McMahan, 2010). College students who believe that a survivor wants sexual attention may be less likely to intervene or report a rape or sexual assault. Rape myth acceptance serves as a factor that aids in silencing the survivor and justifying the perpetrator's actions. Sexual assault awareness and prevention programs should educate students about rape myth acceptance and its effects on sexual assault perception.

Student's Response to Campus Action

In the United States, institutions of higher education have been faced with an increase of student activist groups as well as an influx in student protests on campus. Students have started to demand that their voices are heard and rights are protected against violent acts, including sexual assault and rape. Utilizing resources such as media outlets, social media, blogs, and activist support, students have mobilized to speak out against sexual assault on campus. In 2018, students gathered together to protest the reportedly ineffective sexual assault policy at the University of Maryland, Baltimore County (Baurer-

Wolf, 2018). College officials allegedly failed to adequately respond to rape reports by two different students attending the university (Baurer-Wolf, 2018). The alleged lack of effective response and support from police and campus officials has led to unwanted media attention, a federal lawsuit, and campus protest.

Similarly, students at Georgia Tech participated in walkouts and protests to demand change in sexual assault policy after college officials suspended a female student for verbally assaulting a male student who was found not responsible for rape (Davis & McCaffrey, 2016). Other institutions of higher education such as Ohio University, Spelman College, Columbia University, Morehouse College, Princeton University, Stanford University, and Swarthmore College have all been at the center of controversy and student protests due to their allegedly inadequate sexual assault policy and alleged mishandling of sexual assault reports filed by students.

Overview of the Conceptual model

The Ecological Model was developed in 1977 by Urie Bronfenbrenner. The Ecological Model is a multi-level framework of influence that describes how individuals' characteristics and the environment work together to impact and influence human development and behavior. According to Bronfenbrenner (1977), the levels of influence under the Ecological Model include; the micro System (the immediate environment in an individual's life such as home and family), the meso System (the relationship between different microsystems in an individual's life), the Exo System (a setting or decision that indirectly impacts an individual), the macro System (cultural environment in which the person lives), and the Chrono System (the dimension of time in which the person is developing).

The Ecological Model was turned into a theory in 1988 by researchers. The Social-Ecological Model has been used in health to understand the different individual, intrapersonal, organizational, community, and policies that impact health behaviors (Kasteren, Lewis, & Maeder, 2020). According to Glanz (2008), the Social Ecological Model states that community, organizational, individual, interpersonal, and policy factors should be considered when implementing health promotion programs

and interventions. Factors such as campus policies and programs can impact health behavior, behavioral choices, and lifestyle (Glanz, 2008).

The Social-Ecological Model was applied in the content analysis of the official campus website, annual security reports, student handbooks, sexual assault policies, and university rules to identify different factors that can prevent sexual assault on campus. Assessment of the policies, programs, and community resources available to students can provide further insight into how institutions of higher education in Georgia are responding to sexual assault on campus. Examples of programs and resources available for students will be provided from the lens of the Social-Ecological Model. The Social-Ecological Model will help identify common programs, resources, and information that are implemented or distributed at each level of influence across institutions.

Summary

Institutions of higher education have a responsibility to ensure that policies, programs, resources, and information on student's rights and protections under federal law are made available. IHE must ensure that the institution's crime statistics are published and disseminated to students and employees. The implementation of awareness and prevention programs and resources is essential to protecting students. The policies and programs implemented can have an impact on sexual assault reporting rates and prevalence. Sanctions imposed on students found responsible and the standard of evidence used can also impact sexual assault disclosure rates and prevalence.

Reporting options and leverage of responsible employees on campus can help or hinder students' ability to report a sexual assault. It is important for institutions of higher education receiving federal funding to ensure that they comply with federal mandates and recommendations to increase awareness and decrease sexual assault incidences on campus. Colleges and universities should consider cultural, gender, and racial differences when implementing programs and resources on campus to ensure subpopulations are targeted and included. The increase in sexual assault reported incidences in Georgia shows a need for more comprehensive prevention and awareness programs. This study aims to analyze how higher education institutions, specifically in Georgia, respond to sexual assault on campus.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This chapter will discuss the population and sample, the methodology used, research design, recruitment methods, instrumentation, data collection and procedures, data analysis, and ethical considerations. A descriptive content analysis of sexual assault published and publicly available material, such as the official campus website, annual security reports, student handbooks, policy documents, and university rules, was employed. The methodology mentioned above has been utilized by previous researchers when attempting to identify how colleges and universities present their prevention and awareness information to students on campus (Schwartz, McMahon, & Broadnax, 2015).

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to conduct a content analysis of publicly available written policy documents, the annual security report, the official campus website, and program material to identify gaps within a sample of college and university sexual assault policies and procedures in Georgia. A content analysis was conducted to identify the available awareness, educational, risk reduction, and prevention methods employed by each institution to address sexual assault. This study aimed to identify the available resources and programs but did not aim to identify programs or resources' efficacy.

Published policies and information regarding the institution's sexual assault programs and resources were identified to address whether institutions were following the mandates and guidelines outlined by federal policies such as the Clery Act, The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, the Campus SaVE Act, and Title IX. Programs and policies were also assessed to identify the targeted audience and accessibility. Sexual assault related policies and documents were analyzed to identify the institution's disciplinary proceedings, the standard of proof utilized by each institution, and the available sanctions related to sexual assault claims on campus. Lastly, this study aimed to identify the different options available to students to report a sexual assault offense. Essentially, this study aimed to assess the response to sexual assault from institutions of higher education in Georgia in hopes of finding systemic solutions that will aid in improving response across institutions.

Sample and Data

Public, private non-profit, and private for-profit institutions of higher education in Georgia were selected to participate in the study. Data from the 2019-2020 National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), drawn from the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) survey, was utilized to identify each institutions' website information, type of institution (public or private, HBCU or non-HBCU, tribal institutions, etc.), campus housing, campus setting, student demographics, enrollment size and level of institution (four-year institution, two-year institution, or certificate). The National Center for Education Statistics is the primary entity at the federal level that collects and reports data on education in the United States.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion criteria limited the sample to institutions of higher education that have a physical campus located in Georgia where classes are held. Sampled institutions were also required to receive federal funding. Institutions receiving federal funding must adhere to the mandates and recommendations outlined by federal legislation such as the Clery Act and Title IX.

Institutions where classes are taught solely online were excluded. Additionally, to avoid any potential conflict of interest, Georgia Southern University has been excluded from the sample and was utilized for pilot testing before the content analysis was employed across the sample.

Sample

The sampling method aimed to draw a stratified representative sample of institutions of higher education in Georgia that receive federal funding under Title IV. This study utilized proportionate stratified random sampling.

Data from the National Center for Education Statistics was utilized to identify Georgia's institutions receiving federal aid during the academic year 2018-2019. The trend generator on the NCES website is a tool that allows the user to filter the data for specific information. The trend generator was modified by state to only include institutions in the State of Georgia (N=146) that were eligible to award federal student aid for the 2018-2019 academic school year.

The data generated did not identify which institutions held classes online and which institutions held classes on a physical campus. To identify how many institutions (N=146) qualified to be sampled in the study, institutions were identified on the NCES website and logged on an Excel spreadsheet. Columns were added on the spreadsheet to include the institution's name, type of institution, campus housing offered, physical campus in Georgia, degree type, student population, gender enrolled, race enrolled, and website information. Next, institutions offering campus housing were identified. According to the NCES, 57 institutions in the sample offered campus housing. Next, the additional 89 institutions that did not offer campus housing were identified. The NCES website was searched to identify whether these institutions offered classes on campus or solely online. A further search of the official campus website was initiated to verify whether each institution held classes on a physical campus. After excluding two online-only institutions, the final number of qualified institutions was 144 (n=144).

Once the eligible institutions were identified, a stratified method was employed. Institutions were stratified by level of institution (certificate, two-year institutions, four-years or more) and type of institution (public, private non-profit, and private for-profit institutions). This stratified method ensured that institutions from traditional and non-traditional institutions were represented in the sample. The method of stratifying the institutions was chosen based on the results from a national study on sexual assault policies at institutions of higher education in the United States. Results showed that four-year public (82.2%), four-year private nonprofit (70.4%), and two-year public (59.4%) contained a sexual assault policy, whereas all other institution types fell below 50% (Karjane et al., 2002). Studies show that smaller institutions, such as for-profit, are behind in the development and accessibility of sexual assault policies.

Institutions were grouped in the following stratas: four-year or more private non-profit institutions, four-year or more public institutions, four-year or more private for-profit institutions, two-year private non-profit institutions, two-year public institutions, two-year private for-profit institutions, certificate private non-profit institutions, certificate public institutions, and for-profit certificate institutions. Once the institutions were separated into stratas on an Excel sheet, the number of institutions

within each stratum was identified and logged on the spreadsheet. Next, the sampling fraction (n/N) was utilized to identify the proportion of institutions from each stratum to be included in the sample. The sample size from each stratum was divided by the population (144). Institutions were then randomly selected from each stratum. The final sample included 29 institutions. Additional institutions did not need to be sampled due to saturation being reached during the study.

Qualitative Method

Qualitative methods were employed to address each research question. A case study methodology (Trochim, Donnelly, & Arora, 2016) was utilized to gain an in-depth understanding of unique responses to sexual assault on campus implemented by institutions of higher education receiving federal aid in Georgia. This case study utilized a descriptive content analysis of publicly available written policy documents and resources. The purpose of a content analysis is to identify themes or major ideas in a set of documents, such as policies (Trochim et al., 2016). A content analysis of the official campus website, annual security reports, student handbooks, policy documents, and university rules was employed to identify the existence of programs, resources, and sexual assault awareness and prevention information readily available to students across institutions of higher education in Georgia.

The content analysis also included identifying reporting options and published sanctions. A content analysis of available programs was also employed to identify the targeted audience, accessibility of programs, and type of programs available (bystander programs, men-centered programs, woman-centered programs, mixed-gender programs, risk reduction programs, and awareness programs, prevention programs).

Instrumentation

This qualitative study utilized content analysis as a measurement tool. A four-step process was utilized to identify and employ the use of existing instruments. This process included: (1) identify a study with similar objectives and study aims with a validated instrument (2) compare study objectives with previous policy analysis to ensure a good fit for this current study (3) determine the copyright permissions of the instruments utilized, and (4) assess and adapt the instrument.

Content Analysis

Content analysis is a scientific method used in quantitative or qualitative research to study the content of communication (Berelson, 1952; Kracauer, 1952; Prasad, 2008). Content analysis was first introduced in 1952 by Berelson, who defined content analysis as a research technique for the systematic, quantitative, and objective description of the content of communication. The definition has since been expanded to include qualitative studies. According to Stone, Dunphy, Smith, and Ogilvie (1966), a content analysis refers to any method for assessing the relative extent to which specified attitudes or themes permeate a given message or document.

According to researchers, content analysis can be used to (1) describe trends in the communication content; (2) describe patterns of communication; and (3) check communication content across standards (Berelson, 1952; Prasad, 2008). According to Holsti (1968), through a content analysis, the researcher will be able to draw conclusions about the sender of the message, the characteristics of the messages, and the impact of the content or communication on the targeted audience. Inferences can be made from the content of items such as documents, surveys, focus groups, or interview questions. Content analysis allows for the systematic sorting and comparison of items to summarize them. The researcher must identify content to analyze as well as its source or method of communication that is relevant to answering the outlined research questions (Prasad, 2008).

According to researchers, the unit of analysis should be selected, categories should be developed, content should be sampled, and the reliability of coding should be checked (Prasad, 2008; Stempel, 1989). To conduct a content analysis, Prasad (2008) outlines the six steps researchers should follow to ensure an objective, systematic analysis. Researchers should (1) formulate the research questions; (2) select the sample and content; (3) develop content categories; (4) code the data (5) prepare a coding schedule and pilot testing; and (6) summarize and analyze the data.

In a study conducted by Karjane et al. (2002), researchers employed a content analysis of published reports such as the annual security report, student code of conduct, student handbooks, university rules, and each institution's official website. Fisher (2002) developed a validated coding

instrument to analyze sexual assault content and policies from participating institutions. The instrument's purpose is to identify available sexual assault programs and resources and assess whether institutions comply with federal mandates, such as the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Act. This instrument also identifies each policy's goals and the different forms of sexual assault addressed in each policy. To ensure reliability, the original instrument was pilot tested by two expert coders amongst fifty-five randomly selected colleges and universities, which produced an average interrater reliability of 0.96 (Karjane et al., 2002).

This study replicated the instrument and utilized the categories that were created and pilot tested in this 2002 study. The instrument was modified to fit the objectives of this study. The content analysis will be outlined below.

Content Categories

According to Prasad (2008), content categories are categories specifically developed for content analysis and coding. The content categories should be developed to effectively answer the study research questions and be developed based on scientific literature (Prasad, 2008). According to researchers, content categories must contain words, paragraphs, or themes that are mutually exclusive and only belong in that particular category (Chadwick, Bahar, & Albrecht, 1984; Prasad, 2008). Content categories must also be clearly defined and must identify what information will be coded in the category. For the purpose of this study, the following categories were utilized: additional policies aimed at reducing sexual assault on campus; compliance with federal mandates and regulations; existence and publication of the institution's policy for sexual assault; and resources available on campus and within the community for victim's safety, health, confidentiality. Before finalizing the content categories, Georgia Southern University was utilized as a pilot to test each category.

Pilot Coding

Once the initial content categories were identified, they were entered into NVivo 12 as nodes. The rules for each category was entered and saved. Subcategories for each content category were created in preparation for the pilot testing. Once all content categories and subcategories were entered into

NVivo, publicly available documents for the pilot institution were identified by searching the institution's website or through an internet search. The institution's annual security report, housing community guide, student code of conduct, content from the official website, and sexual assault policies and documents were uploaded into NVivo 12 for analysis. For the purpose of this study, the units of analysis were words, sentences, and paragraphs. The units of observation were the written/published policy documents, annual security reports, student handbooks, student code of conduct, housing policies, university rules, and other related policies and documents.

A pre-existing content-coding instrument developed by Fisher (2002) was utilized to code each document. The coding instrument contained ten sections, which are as follows; content analysis of the annual security report; coding for sexual assault policy; existence and publication of the institution's policy for sexual assault; reporting procedures articulated to the victim; resources available on campus, and within the community for the victim's safety, medical, health, and confidentiality; student judicial system/ disciplinary procedures; compliance with the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013; compliance with the SaVE Act; compliance with Title IX; and diversity and inclusion within the institution's sexual assault policies and programs. All sections and questions from the coding instrument were recorded on an Excel coding sheet. The purpose of the Excel coding was to ensure that each institution's answers could be easily identified and filtered for further analysis. The source of where the information was found for each question was also documented on the Excel sheet. The Excel sheet included a tab for reporting rates of sexual offenses for each institution. Institutions were also coded on the Excel sheet to protect the identity of each institution. Institutions were color-coded by institution type and degree.

Coding section one on the Excel sheet contained the coding instrument for the content analysis of the annual security report. Questions were color-coded to indicate which questions were from the pre-existing study (yellow) and which questions were created for the purpose of this study (green). Section two contained the coding for the sexual assault policy. Section three contained coding for the existence and publication of the institution's policy for sexual assault. Section four contained coding for reporting

procedures. Section five contained coding for the resources available on campus and within the community. Section six contained coding for student disciplinary procedures on campus. Section seven contained coding for compliance with the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. Section eight contained coding for compliance with the SaVE Act. Section nine contained coding for compliance with Title IX, and section ten contained coding for diversity and inclusion in policies and programs.

After the excel sheet was created and all the pilot documents have been uploaded into NVivo, a coding schedule was determined. Once a coding schedule was established, coding of the pilot's documents began. First, the annual security report was analyzed to identify compliance with federal policy. The annual security report was also analyzed to identify crime statistics and definitions, reporting options, existing programs, risk reduction, education and awareness information, and safety features on campus. Words, sentences, and paragraphs within the annual security report were coded into their respective content categories. Next, the sexual assault policy was identified and coded in NVivo. The student code of conduct, official website, and other policy documents were coded in NVivo. Once all documents were coded in NVivo, the coding instrument was utilized to extract additional codes from the data. After all of the questions have been answered on the coding instrument, the answers were then recorded on the excel sheet. The coding of the pilot was replicated a week later to increase confidence and ensure consistency of coding.

Intra-rater Reliability

According to Mackey and Gass (2005), intra-rater reliability is a measure of whether one researcher or coder assesses or judges the data the same way at two different points in time. Utilizing a test-retest method, the researcher determines a schedule and a time interval where data will be coded and recoded (Mackey & Gass, 2005). A coding comparison query was used to calculate the percentage agreement and the Kappa coefficient in NVivo. Percentage agreement and Kappa coefficient are used to measure intra-rater reliability. According to Mackey and Gass (2005), a simple percentage agreement is the ratio of the coding agreements during the test-retest over the coder's coding decisions.

The documents for the pilot were coded one week apart to assess intra-rater reliability. Using NVivo, two different projects or data sets were created for the pilot (project A and project B). The purpose of coding the same documents in two different projects is to ensure that a comparison can be made during the test and retest. Once the pilot was coded during the test and retest, a coding comparison query was run in NVivo. All coded files in project A and project B were selected. Once the coding comparison query was completed, the results showed the Kappa coefficient, the percentage of agreement, and the percentage of disagreement for each document.

The results from the coding comparison query were exported into an Excel file. Exporting the results to Excel will allow the researcher to get an average coefficient and percentage agreement across the entire data set. The average Kappa coefficient across the pilot data set was .96, which is considered high agreement. The average percentage agreement was 98%, and the average disagreement percentage was 2%.

Data Collection

After the completion of the pilot study, documents for the sampled institutions were collected. Data from each institution were collected through a search of the institution's official website, internet search, and a search of various department of education websites. Due to time constraints, only publicly available documents were collected for analysis. Once documents for each institution were collected, they were printed and coded with the designated institution code (IHE001-IHE029). Hard copies of all documents were stored in a file cabinet. Electronic folders were also created to store the documents. Once all documents have been collected, they were uploaded into NVivo for analysis.

Data Analysis

Consistent with the study by Karjane, Fisher, and Cullen (2002), to analyze the data, three principles were followed: (1) multiple forms of data were utilized whenever possible; (2) a hard copy and electronic copy of raw data from each institution were organized in a secure database and; (3) a tracker of evidence that supports each conclusion and allows researchers to trace the supporting evidence back to the source(s) was maintained.

Qualitative analysis software was used for the analysis. NVivo 12 Pro is a qualitative data analysis software that allows for collecting, organization, analyzing, and visualization of data. Data from a range of documents, PDFs, and Excel files can be imported and analyzed. NVivo allows researchers to code data in terms of theme nodes, which is the coding of themes found in the data or relationship coding. All nodes were color-coded for visual interpretation in NVivo and given a description of when to use the code and what is included in the code. All documents were coded into the respective categories.

Saturation

Additional institutions were not sampled due to saturation reached during the analysis of 29 sampled institutions.

Ethical Considerations

According to the Belmont report, ethical studies must consider respect for persons, beneficence, and justice (Trochim, Donnelly, & Arora, 2016). Respect for persons is achieved through this study by ensuring that all institutions were treated as independent and that each institution's interest and integrity are protected. This study ensured equity was achieved by allowing all institutions that receive federal aid and offer classes on campus in Georgia have an equal opportunity of being sampled for the study.

In evaluating the potential risk to subjects, this research will ensure that the identity of sampled institutions remains confidential. Institutions will remain indirectly identifiable, which means that institutions' identity will be known to the researcher but will be protected through a coding system and kept on a master list. Confidentiality will be maintained during and after the study. The identity of each institution will not be shared to protect the privacy of all sampled institutions. To ensure confidentiality is addressed, the data was cleaned to remove the institution's identifiers, such as the name of the institution, website, and geographic location in Georgia. The original data set with identifying information was stored in a separate protected file. Details such as whether or not the institution is all male, all female, HBCU or traditional, and level of the institution remained in the data set.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This chapter presents the findings of the content analysis. Demographic descriptive statistics are presented to provide a summary of the sample used in this study. Lastly, the results from the content analysis will be presented. Excerpts from the content analysis will be presented to support the results.

As shown in Table 4.1, the study sampled 29 qualified institutions. One institution (3%) was a four-year private, for-profit institution. Nine institutions (31%) included in the study were four-year private, not-for-profit institutions. Five institutions (17%) were four-year public institutions. The study also included one (3%) two-year private for-profit institution and one (3%) private, not-for-profit institution. The study also included four (14%) two-year public institutions. Additionally, eight (28%) private-for-profit certificate institutions and one (3%) public certificate institution were included in the study. Out of the sample, there were five HBCUs and 24 traditional institutions of higher education. Of the total number of institutions sampled, 14 institutions (48%) provided on-campus housing. Lastly, five of twenty-nine institutions were a part of the University Systems of Georgia. Four of twenty-nine institutions were a part of the Technical College System of Georgia.

Table 4.1*Institutions of Higher Education's Characteristics*

Institution type	Sample size	% represented in the study
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	1	3%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	9	31%
Four year or more public institutions	5	17%
Two year private, for profit institutions	1	3%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	1	3%
Two year public institutions	4	14%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	7	28%
Certificate public institutions	1	3%
Total institutions	29	

Research Question #1. Does each institution have a sexual assault policy?

The content analysis assessed the existence of a sexual assault policy or policy with a similar title such as sexual misconduct policy, sexual offense policy, Title IX policy, sexual harassment policy, etc.

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 mandated that institutions of higher education receiving federal funding disclose their policies and programs to prevent dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault. Results showed that 23 of the sampled institutions published a sexual assault policy or policy with a similar title. Results showed that six of the institutions sampled in the study did not contain any sexual assault policy in their publicly available published documents. Furthermore, out of eight institutions that offered certificate degrees only, five institutions (63%) did not have a published sexual assault policy. Out of nine private, not-for-profit institutions, one institution (11%) did not have a published sexual assault policy available in their documents. Table 4.2 provides the percentage of institutions per institution type that had a sexual assault policy available in their publicly available documents. The table also provides examples of the most common names used to title policies for sexual assault. The title “sexual assault policy” was not found across institutions.

Table 4.2

Existence of a Sexual Assault Policy

Institution type	Existence of sexual assault policy	Name of policies
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	Sexual harassment policy
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	90%	Sexual misconduct policy
Four year or more public institutions	100%	Sexual misconduct policy
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%	Sexual harassment & misconduct policy
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%	Sexual harassment policy
Two year public institutions	100%	Sexual harassment & misconduct policy
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	57%	Title IX policy
Certificate public institutions	0%	N/A

For the institutions with a published sexual assault policy, the type of sexual assault mentioned in their policies was identified (see table 4.3). Results showed that 69% of the institutions with a published sexual assault policy mentioned penile rape and other forms of vaginal intercourse. Additionally, 59% of institutions mentioned other forms of sexual intercourse, including anal and oral sex. Other forms of sexual assault mentioned in policies included incest, acquaintance rape, date rape, and generic terms (such as sexual assault or sexual violence). Further analysis of the existence of sexual assault policy showed that 23 of 29 institutions mentioned stalking in their sexual assault policies. Additionally, 17 institutions

(59%) mentioned sexual harassment in their sexual assault policies, whereas six institutions (21%) contained a separate sexual harassment policy in addition to their sexual assault policy. Four-year public and four-year not-for-profit institutions were more likely to contain a separate sexual assault policy.

Table 4.3

Type of Sexual Assault Mentioned in Policies

The type of sexual assault mentioned	% of institutions that mentioned the term
Penile-vaginal rape—sexual intercourse	69%
Other forms of vaginal intercourse—mouth, tongue, hand, or the introduction of a foreign object into the genitals of another person	69%
Sexual contact/forcible fondling/sexual battery-unwanted touching of intimate body parts	62%
Other forms of sexual intercourse—anal or oral penetration with penis, mouth, tongue, hand, fingers, or the introduction of a foreign object	59%
Incest- non-forcible sexual intercourse between persons who are related to each other	55%
Acquaintance rape—rape by a non-stranger, which could include a friend, acquaintance, family member, neighbor, or co-worker	28%
Date rape—rape by someone the victim has been or is dating	10%
Generic terms used—not specific types noted/mentioned/listed: sexual assault, sexual offense	7%
Gang acquaintance /date rape—rape by more than one person, at least one of whom is known to the victim	0%

The content analysis also assessed the location of the sexual assault policy. Results showed that 34% of the sexual assault policies were published in the institution's annual security report. Results also showed that 66% of the sexual assault policies were published on the institution's official website. Additionally, 35% of the sexual assault policies were identified in the publicly available student handbook or code of conduct.

Research Question #2. *What gaps exist in sexual assault policies across institutions of higher education in Georgia?*

The Type of Sexual Assault Mentioned

There is a lack of consistency across institutions as to what constitutes a sexual assault. Results showed that the terms and definitions mentioned in sexual assault policies varied across institutions. For

example, although acquaintance rape occurs on campus more often than stranger rape, 72% of institutions did not mention this form of sexual assault in their policies. Additionally, institutions that offered certificate degrees only were less likely to have a published sexual assault policy and less likely to define the sexual assault terms in their existing policies.

Goals and Terms Mentioned in the Policy

The existence of policy goals was identified. Results showed that all institutions that had a published and publicly available sexual assault policy mentioned the policy's goals. The term used by each institution to refer to a person who has experienced any form of sexual assault was also examined. Results showed inconsistency in the terms used across institutions. Results showed that 18 institutions referred to someone who experienced a sexual assault as a victim. Five institutions referred to a person who has experienced a sexual assault as both a survivor and a victim. Four-year not-for-profit institutions were the only category that included the term survivor in their sexual assault policies.

The content analysis also examined if the policy mentioned who was covered. Results showed that 22 institutions mentioned that their sexual assault policy covered students, faculty, and staff. One institution did not mention who was covered under the policy. Furthermore, results showed that 82% of institutions that mentioned who was covered under the policy mentioned that the policy covered third parties, visitors, contractors, or vendors.

Reporting Options and Procedures

According to the Clery Act, institutions must provide reporting options for someone who has experienced a sexual assault or other crimes. Campus security authorities or responsible employees provide additional access to reporting, including the ability to report sexual assault confidentiality. Although institutions are mandated to provide information on CSA or responsible employees, results showed that 17% of institutions did not provide any information on who to contact, outside of campus security or local police, in case of a sexual assault.

Previous studies also show that survivors of sexual assault did not report the sexual assault offense because they were unaware of how to report. Results showed that 48% of institutions with a

published sexual assault policy included reporting procedures. Of the 11 institutions, 82% provided contact information that included telephone numbers, 24 hours statement for contact, and contact office/person address. The remaining institutions provided phone numbers and addresses for reporting but did not provide a 24-hour statement. The University Systems of Georgia's sexual assault policy provided a further breakdown of the type of reports students may file on campus. The breakdown of reporting options included institutional reports, confidential reports, anonymous reports, and law enforcement reports.

Lastly, the sexual assault policy was analyzed for confidential or anonymous reporting options and amnesty when reporting. Results showed that 21 of 29 sampled institutions (72%) provided options for anonymous reporting. Of this total, nine institutions (43%) mentioned anonymous reporting procedures in their sexual assault policy. Results also showed that 90% of institutions mentioned confidential reporting options. However, confidential reporting procedures were only mentioned in 37% of the sexual assault policies. Results showed that 48% of institutions provided amnesty options for students who report a sexual assault. However, only 57% of the institutions provided the information within their sexual assault policies. Information on amnesty was also found in the student handbooks, annual security reports, and published on the official websites.

Policies that may Encourage Reporting of Campus Sexual Assaults

Various institutions provided additional policies within their sexual assault policy to prevent or reduce sexual assault and other sexual offenses on campus. Results showed that there are inconsistencies in the policies implemented on campus. The most common policies found within the sexual assault policies included a social media policy. The goal of the social media policy is to reduce stalking and harassment that occurs virtually. Institutions also included a weapons policy within their sexual assault policy, which prohibits the use of weapons on campus. Additional policies found within sexual assault policies included bullying policies, drug and alcohol policies, retaliation policies, suicide policies, and threats and violence policies.

Mention of Rape Myths and other Barriers

Results showed that 10% of institutions provided information on common reporting barriers, including fear of retaliation, proximity to the perpetrator, fear of consequences, and confidential concerns. The three institutions' sexual assault policy also stated that although these barriers exist, it is still important to report a sexual assault and seek assistance. Most institutions did not provide rape myth information or information on barriers students face with reporting a sexual assault to formal authority.

Research Question #3. *How does each institution of higher education define sexual assault?*

According to the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, institutions of higher education receiving federal funding must define dating violence, stalking, domestic violence, and sexual assault. The State of Georgia does not provide a single definition of sexual assault. Results showed that 83% of the participating institutions defined sexual assault. Furthermore, 3% of institutions utilized Georgia's legal definition of sexual contact as a means to define sexual assault. In contrast, 17% of institutions that defined sexual assault utilized the legal definition of rape and other forcible and non-forcible acts as defined under the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Reporting System. Consistent with previous research, results showed variances in the definition of sexual assault across institutions, including variances in the mention of forcible and non-forcible offenses. Results also showed that institutions offering certificate degrees were less likely to define sexual assault in their policies. Results showed that 14% of certificate programs defined sexual assault, and only 50% of those institutions mentioned non-forcible offenses (see table 4.4). Certificate public institutions did not define sexual assault.

Table 4.4

Definition of Sexual Assault

Institution type	Defined sexual assault	Mention of forcible acts (rape, fondling)	Mention of non-forcible acts (incest or statutory rape)	Includes coercion, force, incapacitation, lack of consent
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	89%	100%	75%	100%

Institution type	Defined sexual assault	Mention of forcible acts (rape, fondling)	Mention of non-forcible acts (incest or statutory rape)	Includes coercion, force, incapacitation, lack of consent
Four year or more public institutions	100%	80%	40%	80%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year public institutions	100%	100%	75%	75%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	14%	75%	50%	100%
Certificate public institutions	0%	0%	0%	0%

Results also showed that 20% of institutions within the University Systems of Georgia utilized the same definition of sexual assault. In contrast, 80% of the institutions within the University Systems of Georgia utilized a different definition of sexual assault. Results showed that all institutions within the Technical College System of Georgia utilized their own definitions of sexual assault, although they are a part of the same system. Examples of variances in the definition of sexual assault utilized across institutions within the University Systems of Georgia and the Technical College System of Georgia have been provided in the form of excerpts extracted from policy documents (see table 4.5).

Table 4.5

Variances of Sexual Assault Definitions

IHE code	University Systems of GA	Technical College System of GA	Definition of sexual assault mentioned
IHE011	YES	NO	“An umbrella term referring to a range of nonconsensual sexual contact, which can occur in many forms including but not limited to rape and sexual battery.”
IHE012	YES	NO	“In Georgia, Sexual Assault is defined under O.C.G.A. 16-6-5.1 as sexual contact” that is perpetrated by “a person who has supervisory or disciplinary authority over another individual.”
IHE013	YES	NO	“An umbrella term referring to a range of nonconsensual sexual contact, which can occur in many forms including but not limited to rape and sexual battery.”
IHE014	YES	NO	“Any sexual act directed against another person, forcibly and/or against that person’s will; or not forcibly or against the person’s will where the victim is incapable of giving consent, as well as incest or statutory rape.”
IHE015	YES	NO	“Includes a number of different offenses meeting the definition of rape, fondling, incest, or statutory rape as used in the FBI’s UCR system.”

IHE code	University Systems of GA	Technical College System of GA	Definition of sexual assault mentioned
IHE018	NO	Yes	“Sexual Assault: any of the following acts: penetration, no matter how slight, of the vagina or anus with any body part or object, or oral penetration by a sex organ, without consent. Sodomy: Oral or anal sexual intercourse with another person: forcibly OR not forcibly or against the person’s will (non-consensually) in instances where the Complainant is incapable of giving consent because of age or because of temporary or permanent mental or physical incapacity. Sexual Assault with an Object: to use an object or instrument to penetrate, however slightly, the genital or anal opening of the body of another person: forcibly and/or against that person’s will.”
IHE019	NO	Yes	“Sexual assault is non-consensual sexual contact. At times, sexual assault is committed by someone who knows the victim and may be termed ‘acquaintance’ sexual assault.
IHE020	NO	Yes	“An offense classified as a forcible or non-forcible sex offense under the NIBRS uniform crime reporting system of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.”
IHE021	NO	Yes	“An offense that meets the definition of rape, fondling, incest, or statutory rape as used in the FBI’s UCR system.”

Research Question #4. Does each institution provide sexual assault education and awareness programs?

Under federal policy, institutions must provide primary prevention and awareness programs to prevent sexual assault, domestic violence, stalking, and dating violence. Results showed that 83% of sampled institutions provided sexual assault education and awareness programs (see table 4.6). Certificate only private and public institutions were less likely to provide sexual assault education and awareness programs to students and employees (57%). Programs mentioned included sexual assault awareness seminars, programs mandated during student orientation, educational videos, online programs, and programs and campaigns provided during sexual assault awareness month. Results showed that 34% of institutions mentioned providing sexual assault education and awareness programs through an online learning tool such as an educational video, HAVEN, or Everfi-on-Line courses. According to IHE010, “the HAVEN (Helping Advocates for Violence Ending Now) is an educational module designed to recognize the various forms of sexual violence, how to prevent sexual violence, and how to help a friend who has experienced interpersonal violence.”

Table 4.6*Mention of Sexual Assault Education and Awareness Programs*

Institution type	Mention of sexual assault education and awareness programs
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	78%
Four year or more public institutions	100%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%
Two year public institutions	100%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	57%
Certificate public institutions	0%

Research Question #5. Does each institution provide sexual assault prevention programs?

Per the Clery Act, institutions must provide primary prevention programs to students and employees. Primary programs may include providing prevention tips or strategies, programs, or initiatives to stop sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking before it occurs. Results from this study showed that 24 institutions (83%) mentioned the implementation of prevention programs in their publicly available documents. Four-year institutions and two-year institutions provided sexual assault prevention programs at a higher rate than certificate only institutions. Public certificate only institutions did not mention providing any prevention programs, whereas private for-profit certificate programs mentioned prevention programs at a rate of 57%. According to IHE005, "Graduate & undergraduate student organization are committed to addressing strategies for sexual assault prevention through community building, discussion about healthy relationships, education about sexual assault and consent, and the promotion of active bystander strategies. Prevention programs mentioned across institutions included seminars, online modules and programs, and campaigns. Results showed that three two-year public institutions mentioned that prevention programs were available upon request but did not mention any specific programs in their policies or other documents. Table 4.7 provides a breakdown of the existence of prevention programs mentioned by institutions per institution type.

Table 4.7*Mention of Sexual Assault Prevention Programs*

Institution type	Mention of sexual assault prevention programs
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	100%
Four year or more public institutions	100%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%
Two year public institutions	100%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	57%
Certificate public institutions	0%

Research Question #6. Does each institution provide bystander intervention programs?

Results showed that 21 institutions (72%) provided bystander intervention programs. Results showed that 89% of four-year non-profit institutions provided sexual assault bystander programs. Furthermore, 29% of certificate for-profit institutions provided online bystander program options to students. Table 4.8 provides the percentage of institutions per institution type that mentioned the existence of bystander programs provided to their campus community. Results showed that certificate only institutions mentioned the existence of bystander programs less than four-year and two-year institutions.

Table 4.8

Mention of Bystander Intervention Programs

Institution type	Mention of sexual assault bystander programs
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	89%
Four year or more public institutions	100%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%
Two year public institutions	100%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	29%
Certificate public institutions	0%

Research Question #7. Does each institution provide risk reduction programs?

According to the Clery Act, institutions must provide training or programs that describe positive options for bystanders to intervene and provide risk reduction programs or information. Results showed that 72% of institutions provided risk reduction programs. Results showed that 67% of four-year non-

profit institutions provided risk reduction programs. Certificate only institutions were less likely to provide risk reduction programs (see table 4.9).

Table 4.9

Mention of Risk Reduction Programs

Institution type	Mention of risk reduction programs
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	67%
Four year or more public institutions	100%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%
Two year public institutions	100%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	43%
Certificate public institutions	0%

Research Question #8. Are institutions of higher education in Georgia in compliance with federal regulations as outlined in the Clery Act, The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, SaVE Act & Title IX?

Compliance with the Clery Act

Publication of an annual security report

Per the Clery Act regulations, institutions must publish an annual security report that contains the institution's crime statistics and their crime and safety-related policies and statements. Results showed that 78% of private for-profit institutions published a publicly available annual security report (two certificate institutions did not publish an annual security report). Results showed that 80% of private, non-profit institutions published a publicly available annual security report, whereas two four-year institutions did not. Lastly, 90% of public institutions provided an annual security report. One public certificate-seeking institution did not provide an annual security report.

Disclosure of crime statistics

According to the Clery Act, institutions must disclose the last three years of crime statistics for crimes that occurred on campus, on public property within or immediately adjacent to the campus, and in or on non-campus buildings or property that the institution owns or controls. Crime statistics must be

published annually by October 1st. For the purpose of this study, data was collected before October 1st; therefore, this study will consider the last three years of crime statistics to be 2016, 2017, and 2018. Results showed that all private for-profit four-year institutions and private for-profit two-year institutions in the study provided crime statistics for the last three years for crimes that occurred on-campus, in a non-campus building, and crimes that occurred on public property. Results also showed that 86% of the certificate-seeking private for-profit institutions provided crime statistics for the last three years, whereas 14% provided statistics for the prior two years only (2016 & 2017). Furthermore, 14% of the private for-profit certificate level institutions provide crime statistics for on-campus only, whereas 86% provided crime statistics for on-campus and public property only.

Results showed that 78% of private, not-for-profit four-year institutions provided crime statistics for the prior three years. Additionally, 89% provided crime statistics for crimes occurring on-campus, in a non-campus building, and crimes that occurred on public property. Results showed that the two-year not-for-profit institutions provided crime statistics for the prior three years for crimes that occurred on-campus and on public property.

According to the results, 80% of public four-year institutions provided crime statistics for the prior three years for crimes occurring on-campus, in a non-campus building, and crimes that occurred on public property. Results showed that 100% of the public two-year institutions provided crime statistics for the prior three years. Furthermore, 50% of the public two-year institutions provided statistics for crimes occurring on-campus, in a non-campus building, and crimes that occurred on public property. Lastly, the public certificate institution provided crime statistics for the previous three years for crimes occurring on-campus, in a non-campus building, and crimes that occurred on public property.

Timely warnings

According to the Clery Act, institutions must also issue timely warnings and emergency notifications to the campus community (see table 4.10). Results showed that private for-profit

four-year and two-year institutions provided a policy for issuing timely notifications to students and employees. Results showed that 57% of private for-profit certificate institutions provided a timely warning policy. All private, not-for-profit institutions provided a policy for issuing timely warnings. All public institutions, except for one certificate institution, provided a statement of policy for issuing timely warnings.

Missing student notification

Any institution with campus housing must issue a missing student notification policy. Out of the sample, 14 institutions provided on-campus housing. Results showed that 86% of the institutions that provided campus housing issued a missing student notification policy.

Mention of Campus Security Authorities

According to the regulations of the Clery Act, institutions must identify their campus security officials. Results showed that 67% of private for-profit institutions provided information about reporting to campus security authorities or responsible employees on campus. Results showed that 90% of private, not-for-profit institutions provided information on CSAs. Furthermore, 90% of public institutions participating in the study provided information on CSAs.

Drug and alcohol policy and programs

The Clery Act also mandates that institutions provide a drug and alcohol policy to students and employees. Institutions are also required to provide drug and alcohol awareness and prevention programs. Results showed that 89% of private for-profit institutions provided a drug/alcohol policy and programs. Results showed that 100% of private, not-for-profit institutions provided a drug and alcohol policy but only 90% provided drug and alcohol awareness and prevention programs. Furthermore, 90% of public institutions provided an alcohol and drug policy and provided information on awareness and prevention programs. Table 4.10 provides the percentage of institutions per institution type that mentioned timely warnings, drug and alcohol programs, a policy prohibiting the use of drugs and alcohol, a missing student notification, and the mention of Campus Security Authorities.

Table 4.10*Compliance with Clery Act*

Institution type	Timely warning	Drug/alcohol abuse programs	Policy prohibiting drugs/alcohol	Missing student notification	Mention of CSA
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	100%	89%	100%	89%	89%
Four year or more public institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year public institutions	100%	100%	100%	50%	100%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	57%	86%	86%	0%	57%
Certificate public institutions	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

According to the Clery Act requirements, institutions must inform students on procedures to follow if they experience a sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking. Results showed that 97% of institutions in the study mentioned having a disciplinary procedure to resolve sexual assault claims on campus. Results showed that 86% of certificate, private for-profit institutions provided information in their policies on a disciplinary procedure. The Clery Act mandates that institutions provide procedures on what to do if a sexual assault occurred. Institutions must also mention the importance of preserving evidence. Institutions must also provide information on resources on campus and within the community as well as options for changing living, academic, or work situations. Results showed that certificate only institutions were less likely to comply with Clery requirements. Table 4.11 provides the percentage of institutions per institution type that provided information for disciplinary proceedings, procedures

on what to do if a sexual assault occurred, procedures for preserving evidence, and mentioned providing a prompt, fair, and impartial investigation.

Table 4.11

Compliance with Clery Act Disciplinary Proceeding Requirements

Institution type	Mention of disciplinary proceedings	Mention of what to do if a sex offense occurred	Mention of preserving evidence	Mention of prompt, fair, and impartial investigation
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	100%	100%	89%	100%
Four year or more public institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	0%
Two year public institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	86%	57%	43%	57%
Certificate public institutions	100%	0%	0%	0%

Results showed that certificate institutions were less likely to mention counseling, mental health, victim advocacy, legal, visa, and immigration assistance (see table 4.12). Results showed that private for-profit certificate institutions mentioned support services at a rate of 57% as compared to four-year and two-year institutions. Certificate institutions also provided protective measures such as changing academic or work situations at a lower rate than four-year and two-year institutions. Results also showed that four-year non-profit institutions complied at a slightly lower rate than four-year private for-profit institutions and two-year institutions. Table 4.12 also provides the percentage of institutions per institution type that provided information on their investigation timeline, sex offender information, and appeal procedures.

Table 4.12

Compliance with Clery Act Requirements

Institution type	Investigation timeline	Counseling, mental health, victim advocacy, legal, visa, and immigration assistance	Options for changing academic, living, Transportation and working situations	Sex offender notice	Appeal
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	89%	89%	89%	89%	100%
Four year or more public institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year public institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	57%	57%	57%	57%	71%
Certificate public institutions	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Compliance with the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (VAWA)

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 includes amendments to the Clery Act. Institutions are required to disclose statistics on dating violence, sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking. Results showed that 79% of the sampled institutions provided statistics for rape. Results showed that 14% of institutions provided statistics for sexual assault. Additionally, 97% of institutions provided statistics for dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, and other sex offenses. Table 4.13 provides statistics for 2016-2018 on rape, sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, and other sex offenses, as mentioned in each institution's annual security report or other documents. The table is color-coded to separate each type of reported offense for visual purposes.

Table 4.13

Statistics for Sex Crimes

IHE code	Institution type	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018	2016	2017	2018
		Rape			Sexual assault			Dating violence			Domestic violence			Stalking			Sex offenses		
IHE001	Four year or more private, for profit institutions	0	0	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
IHE002	Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IHE003	Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	0	0
IHE004	Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	9	8	10	1	3	0	1	0	0	6	6	6
IHE005	Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	8	11	6	N/A	N/A	N/A	3	6	8	13	19	11	19	23	10	5	10	15
IHE006	Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IHE007	Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IHE008	Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	0	0	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	3	1	0	1	1	2	0	2	2	1	2
IHE009	Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	N/A	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0
IHE010	Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	0	1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
IHE011	Four year or more public institutions	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
IHE012	Four year or more public institutions	2	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	6	1	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	2	1
IHE013	Four year or more public institutions	5	3	11	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	7	17	1	2	0	4	10	11	1	6	10
IHE014	Four year or more public institutions	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A	0	N/A	N/A
IHE015	Four year or more public institutions	18	17	12	N/A	N/A	N/A	4	3	1	4	17	12	9	3	11	9	9	8
IHE016	Two year private, for-profit institutions	3	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	0
IHE017	Two year private, non-profit institutions	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A
IHE018	Two year public institutions	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IHE019	Two year public institutions	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IHE020	Two year public institutions	0	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IHE021	Two year public institutions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	0
IHE022	Certificate private, for-profit institutions	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A
IHE023	Certificate private, for-profit institutions	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IHE024	Certificate private, for-profit institutions	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IHE025	Certificate private, for-profit institutions	N/A	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	0	N/A	0	0
IHE026	Certificate private, for-profit institutions	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IHE027	Certificate private, for-profit institutions	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IHE028	Certificate private, for-profit institutions	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
IHE029	Certificate public institutions	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 also required institutions to disclose programs implemented on campus to prevent sexual assault, stalking, dating violence, and domestic violence. Primary awareness and prevention programs must also be provided to incoming students and new employees. Institutions must also provide ongoing awareness and prevention campaigns. Under the VAWA, institutions must also define consent, dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, and protection measures. The SaVE Act also required that institutions define rape. Results showed that certificate only institutions were less likely to comply with regulations mandated under the VAWA or SaVE Act. Table 4.14 provides information on the existence of mandated programs such as prevention and awareness programs for new employees and students and ongoing awareness and prevention campaigns. Table 4.14 also shows compliance with the existence of mandated definitions per institution type.

Table 4.14

Compliance with VAWA and SaVE Act

Institution type	Prevention and awareness programs	Ongoing awareness and prevention campaigns	Rape	Dating violence	Domestic violence	Stalking	Consent	Protection orders
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	100%	67%	67%	89%	89%	100%	89%	11%
Four year or more public institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	20%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%
Two year public institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	50%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	57%	29%	29%	57%	43%	43%	43%	29%
Certificate public institutions	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%

According to the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, institutions were also required to implement and disclose their procedures for responding to sexual assault, dating violence, stalking, and domestic violence. According to the VAWA and the SaVE Act, institutions were also required to provide students a statement informing them that reporting is an option. Results showed that 89% of four-year non-profit institutions mentioned reporting as an option. Results also showed that 57% of certificate institutions mentioned reporting as an option. Under federal regulations, institutions must also provide students with information about obtaining an order of protection or no-contact orders. Results showed that four-year non-profit

(67%), two-year non-profit (0%), private certificate (86%), and public certificate institutions (0%) did not fully comply with providing information on protection orders. This study identified training options available to students, bystanders, or individuals involved in the disciplinary process. Results showed that certificate institutions provided information about training at a lower rate than larger institutions. Under the VAWA and the SaVE Act, institutions were also required to inform students of protective measures such as escort services. Results showed that certificate institutions provided information regarding protective measures at a lower rate than four-year or two-year institutions. Table 4.15 provides the percentage of institutions per institution type that provided information on optional reporting, protective orders, training, and protective measures on campus.

Table 4.15

Compliance with VAWA and SaVE Act Disciplinary Proceeding Requirements

Institution type	Mention that reporting is an option	Mention of protection orders	Mention of training	Mention of protective measures (escorts, etc.)
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	89%	67%	100%	100%
Four year or more public institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%	0%	100%	100%
Two year public institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	57%	86%	57%	57%
Certificate public institutions	0%	0%	0%	0%

Institutions must also provide the accused and the survivor the right to have others, including an advisor of their choice, present during the disciplinary proceedings and disclose the standard of evidence used to resolve claims. The SaVE Act mandated that institutions provide information about how the survivor's confidentiality will be protected, provide students a written notification about on-campus and community services available for survivors, and a written notification regarding options for changing

academic, living, transportation, and working situations, regardless of whether or not they choose to report the crime. Results showed that four-year private for-profit institutions, four-year public institutions, two-year private for-profit, and two-year public institutions complied with the mandates regarding rights and protections articulated to survivors and the accused. Results showed that certificate only institutions complied at a lower rate than other institutions. Table 4.16 shows the percentage of institutions that provided information on rights and protections in their policy documents.

Table 4.16

Mention of Rights and Protections for Survivors and Accused

Institution type	Mention of rights for accused	Mention of right to advisor	Mention of survivor rights	Mention of protecting confidentiality	Mention of written notifications
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%
Four year or more public institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year public institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	57%	57%	57%	57%	57%
Certificate public institutions	100%	100%	100%	0%	100%

Title IX

Under Title IX requirements, the notice of nondiscrimination should be published on the institution's official website. Results showed that 77% of four-year non-profit institutions provided a non-discrimination notice on their official website, whereas the remainder 23% of four-year non-profit institutions provided a non-discrimination notice in their policy documents. Results showed that 43% of private certificate institutions provided a non-discrimination notice on their official website, whereas 43% provided the notice in their policy documents, and 14% did not provide a non-discrimination notice.

Furthermore, the non-discrimination notice should mention that the institution does not discriminate based on sex (United States Department of Education, 2020). Results showed that 89% of the non-discrimination notices from four-year non-profit institutions mentioned that the institution does not discriminate based on sex. According to results, 86% of the non-discrimination notices from private certificate institutions mentioned that the institution does not discriminate based on sex. The nondiscrimination notice should also mention that any complainant or 3rd party can report sexual harassment at any time, including non-business hours, by utilizing the Title IX coordinator's contact information (United States Department of Education, 2020). Results showed that only 20% of four-year public institutions provided a reporting statement within their non-discrimination notice. Table 4.17 provides results from each institution type about the existence of a non-discrimination notice on the official website, a statement within the non-discrimination notice that states that the institution does not discriminate based on sex, and a reporting statement.

Table 4.17

Compliance with Non-discrimination Notice

Institution type	Non-discrimination notice	Institution does not discriminate	Reporting statement
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	0%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	77%	89%	0%
Four year or more public institutions	100%	100%	20%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	0%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%	100%	0%
Two year public institutions	100%	100%	0%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	43%	86%	0%
Certificate public institutions	100%	100%	0%

Institutions must also provide information on the Title IX coordinator, including the name, phone number, e-mail address, and office address of the appointed coordinator on their official website (United States Department of Education, 2020). Institutions should also inform students where to file complaints

concerning Title IX, such as the Title IX office (United States Department of Education, 2020). Results showed that four-year private for-profit institutions, two-year for-profit institutions, and two-year non-profit institutions provided all required information on their official website regarding Title IX coordinator. (see table 4.18).

Table 4.18

Title IX Coordinator Information on the Official Website

Institution type	Existence of a Title IX coordinator	Title IX coordinator's name	Title IX coordinator's email address	Title IX coordinator's phone number	Title IX coordinator's office address
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	89%	78%	78%	78%	67%
Four year or more public institutions	100%	100%	80%	80%	20%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year public institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	75%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	57%	43%	43%	57%	57%
Certificate public institutions	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%

The official website must also inform students of their options to contact the Office of Civil Rights. The official website should also provide students with the Title IX coordinator's roles and duties, information on responsible employees, and student disciplinary procedures, including sanctions. As shown in Table 4.19, two year private, for profit institutions complied with all requirements. Four-year private for-profit institutions and certificate institutions provided the required information on their official websites at a lower rate than the other institution types.

Table 4.19

Compliance with Title IX

Institution type	Title IX coordinator's roles and duties provided	Mention of responsible employees	Grievance procedures	Possible sanctions	Office of Civil Rights
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	0%	100%	0%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	67%	78%	56%	44%	67%
Four year or more public institutions	80%	100%	80%	60%	60%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Two year public institutions	100%	100%	100%	75%	25%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	29%	57%	57%	29%	0%
Certificate public institutions	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%

Research Question # 9. Do policies and programs at each institution consider gender, race, and cultural differences?

Results showed that four-year institutions provided policies, resources, or programs that target subpopulations such as the LGBTQ community, men only, or women-only programs. Two-year or certificate institutions did not mention any programs or resources tailored to a subpopulation. Table 4.20 provides the percentage of institutions per institution type that mentioned programs, resources, or policies tailored to a specific subpopulation and not the general campus community. Table 4.20 also provides direct quotes from the institution's policies and documents.

Table 4.20

Diversity in Policies, Programs, and Resources

Institution type	Mention of subpopulations	Example of diversity in programs or policies
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	"Policy for Transgender Students and Employees on Campus"
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	78%	"Men Stopping Violence workshops on campus."

Institution type	Mention of subpopulations	Example of diversity in programs or policies
Four year or more public institutions	40%	"The Safe Space program is a three and a half hour training for faculty, staff, and students who are interested in learning about gender and sexual identity, homophobia, heterosexism, and how they can provide support and work toward being an ally for the LGBTQ+ community."
Two year private, for profit institutions	0%	N/A
Two year private, non-profit institutions	0%	N/A
Two year public institutions	0%	N/A
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	0%	N/A
Certificate public institutions	0%	N/A

Research Question #10. *What are the reporting options available to students?*

Institutions are required to provide information on reporting options, such as campus security or responsible employees. This study analyzed the different reporting options mentioned across institutions. Results showed that the university police department, local police department, 911, office of the Dean of Students, and Title IX Coordinator were amongst the most frequently mentioned reporting options provided on campus. Results also showed that certificate only institutions provided less reporting options than two-year or four-year institutions (see table 4.21).

Table 4.21

Reporting Options Articulated to Students

Reporting options	Four year or more private, for profit institutions	Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	Four year or more public institutions	Two year private, for profit institutions	Two year private, non-profit institutions	Two year public institutions	Certificate private, for-profit institutions	Certificate public institutions
No mention of who to contact	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	14%	0%
University police department/security office	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	14%	100%
Local police department	100%	78%	100%	100%	100%	100%	29%	0%
Police (911)	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	71%	0%
Office of the Dean of Students/VP for Student Affairs	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%	100%	0%	0%
Department of Student Housing	0%	89%	80%	100%	0%	17%	0%	0%
Department of Athletics	0%	56%	60%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Student/university health services	0%	56%	80%	100%	0%	33%	0%	100%
University counseling centre	0%	67%	80%	100%	0%	67%	0%	0%
Academic advisor	100%	78%	100%	100%	0%	67%	43%	0%
Title IX coordinator	100%	89%	100%	100%	100%	100%	43%	100%
Victim assistance/victim advocacy services	0%	67%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Campus ministries	0%	56%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Ombudsman	0%	11%	40%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Human resources	100%	89%	100%	100%	0%	67%	29%	100%
Director/ manager of institution	100%	89%	60%	0%	0%	50%	57%	100%

Research Question #11. What standard of proof is utilized during student disciplinary procedures to investigate sexual assault claims on each campus?

Results of the content analysis showed that 72% of the sampled institutions adhered to the preponderance of the evidence standard when investigating sexual assault or misconduct claims on campus. Results also showed that one institution (3%) adhered to the clear and convincing standard of evidence. Additionally, six institutions (21%) did not mention a criterion used throughout their disciplinary process. One institution (3%) did not mention a disciplinary process for resolving claims on campus. Table 4.22 provides the breakdown of the standard of evidence across institution type. Results showed that preponderance of evidence was mentioned more frequently across institutions.

Table 4.22

Standard of Evidence Used

Institution type	Preponderance of the evidence standard	Clear and convincing evidence standard	No criteria mentioned
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	100%	0%	0%
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	89%	0%	11%
Four year or more public institutions	100%	0%	0%
Two year private, for profit institutions	100%	0%	0%
Two year private, non-profit institutions	100%	0%	0%
Two year public institutions	100%	0%	0%
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	14%	14%	71%
Certificate public institutions	0%	0%	100%

Research Question #12. What sanctions are in place for students found responsible for sexual assault?

Results showed that 29% of certificate only institutions did not provide information on available sanctions in their policy documents. Results also showed that most institutions provided more than one option for sanctions that can be imposed on students found responsible for a sexual assault. The following sanctions were mentioned most frequently amongst institutions; censure/official warning, probation,

suspension, expulsion, counseling, and loss of privileges. Table 4.23 provides the percentage of potential sanctions available per institution type.

Table 4.23

Sanctions Mentioned at Institutions

Potential sanctions mentioned	Four year or more private, for profit institutions	Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	Four year or more public institutions	Two year private, for profit institutions	Two year private, non-profit institutions	Two year public institutions	Certificate private, for-profit institutions	Certificate public institutions
No mention of possible sanctions	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	29%	0%
Censure/official warning	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	43%	100%
Restitution	100%	78%	60%	100%	0%	100%	14%	0%
Probation	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	43%	100%
Suspension	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	67%	100%
Expulsion/dismissal	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	71%	100%
Eviction from student housing	0%	89%	80%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Counseling	100%	100%	80%	100%	100%	25%	14%	100%
Loss of privileges	100%	79%	100%	100%	100%	75%	14%	0%
Fines	100%	56%	40%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Parental notification	0%	44%	60%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Withhold grades, transcripts, etc.	0%	11%	80%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Attend a class or workshop that helps student understand why his/her behavior was inappropriate	0%	56%	80%	100%	100%	0%	0%	0%
Educational project—student must complete a project specifically designed to help student understand why his/her behavior was inappropriate	0%	56%	80%	100%	100%	25%	0%	0%
Combination of sanctions can be used	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	43%	0%

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

The purpose of this study was to analyze institutions of higher education's response to sexual assault on campuses in Georgia, utilizing a qualitative content analysis approach. Twenty-nine institutions in the State of Georgia receiving federal funding at the time of this study were sampled. Publicly available policy documents from each institution were analyzed to identify the existence of a sexual assault policy and the availability of sexual assault awareness, prevention, risk reduction information, resources, and programs. Publicly available documents were also analyzed to identify disciplinary procedures, evidence standards, reporting options, sanctions, diversity in policies and programs, and compliance with federal policy. This chapter will summarize major themes and interpret relevant findings in relation to the Social-Ecological Model and other relevant literature. This chapter will also discuss strengths and limitations, public health implications, and provide recommendations for future research.

Intrapersonal Factors of Influence

According to the Social-Ecological Model, there are different factors within someone's life that can impact their attitudes, beliefs, and, ultimately, their behaviors. Institutions can implement prevention and risk reduction programs that focus on changing attitudes and beliefs, which can reduce violence on campus. A study by Karjane et al., (2002) showed that 28.6% of institutions provided sexual assault prevention programs. Results from a 2015 study conducted by Streng and Kamimura showed that 60% of institutions mentioned prevention programs. A more recent study conducted by Richards (2016) showed that 58% of sampled institutions mentioned providing sexual assault prevention programs. In contrast to previous findings, results from this study showed that 83% of institutions sampled mention providing prevention programs or information to their students. Consistent with previous findings, the availability of prevention programs varied by institution type. Smaller institutions, such as certificate only institutions provided prevention programs at a lower rate than other institutions. Institutions in the study provided

primary prevention programs in the form of mandatory new student orientation programs and ongoing campaigns.

According to the Campus SaVE Act (2013), institutions must implement primary awareness and prevention programs that include risk reduction information. Although the scope of this study did not analyze the content of available programs, the existence of risk reduction programs or information was identified. Consistent with previous research, institutions implemented risk reduction programs such as self-defense training classes. Results from a 2002 study showed that 14.4% of institutions mentioned providing students access to self-defense programs such as Rape Aggressive Defense (R.A.D). Results from this study showed that 31% of sampled institutions mentioned providing a self-defense course or program to students.

Education and awareness programs should also be implemented on campus to help change beliefs and attitudes such as rape myth acceptance and victim-blaming. Online self-paced programs can be provided to students to debunk rape myths and inform students on identifying different forms of sexual assault and other sexual violence.

Interpersonal/Relationship Factors of Influence

The second level of influence within the Social Ecological Model focuses on an individual's relationships, such as family and peers, who play a direct role in increasing or decreasing the risk of violence. Previous research concluded that a large percentage of sexual assaults occur in settings where bystanders are present (Burns 2009; Moschella, Bennett, & Banyard, 2018). Bystander programs that teach students how to intervene and be active bystanders are important to reducing sexual assault and violence on campus. Research shows that bystanders are more likely to intervene if they are aware that the situation is occurring and have the tools to intervene safely (Burns 2009; Moschella et al., 2018). The SaVE Act of 2013 mandated that institutions provide options for bystanders to intervene safely. Results showed that 72% of sampled institutions mentioned providing bystander prevention programs in their published materials. Bystander programs included both online and in-person programs. Bystander tips were also commonly found posted on the institution's website or within their student handbook or sexual

assault policy. Institutions should consider the implementation of bystander options to intervene to increase reporting on campus and reduce potential violence.

Anonymous Reporting Options

Anonymous reporting options can encourage survivors, bystanders, and third parties to report a sexual assault incident to officials. Results from a previous study showed that 45.8% of institutions provided anonymous reporting options (Karjane et al., 2002). A more recent study showed that 75% of institutions provided anonymous reporting options. Furthermore, anonymous reporting options were identified at smaller institutions at a rate significantly less than larger institutions (Karjane et al., 2002; Richards, 2016). Similar results from this current study showed that 72% of institutions provided anonymous reporting options. Consistent with previous research, only 13% of smaller certificate institutions provided anonymous reporting options. Smaller institutions are still behind in providing anonymous reporting options. Institutions can implement anonymous reporting options through online forms, hotline numbers, or anonymous tip lines provided through campus police. Providing anonymous reporting options can also increase the number of crime reports that are included in the institution's Clery statistics.

Confidential Reporting Options

Confidential reporting options can increase reporting by giving students the option to come forward without having to disclose any identifying information. This also allows students to request information about resources and supports confidentially. Results from a previous study showed that 84% of institutions provided information about confidential reporting options (Karjane et al., 2002). Furthermore, 24% of institutions provided an online link for students and third parties to report an incident confidentially (Karjane et al., 2002). Consistent with previous results, this study showed that 90% of institutions provided confidential reporting options. The percentage of institutions that provided confidential reporting options increased slightly.

Amnesty Options when Reporting

According to previous research, survivors or bystanders may be deterred to intervene or report a sexual assault for fear of sanctions being imposed (Richards, 2016). Results from a previous study showed that 15% of institutions provided amnesty to students reporting a sexual assault on campus (Richards, 2016). Results from this current study showed an increase in available amnesty options. The current study suggests that 48% of institutions provided amnesty options for students who report a sexual assault. Drug and alcohol use is not uncommon amongst college and university students. According to researchers, more than half of rapes or sexual assaults experienced by college students involve alcohol use (Abbey, 2002; Kilpatrick et al., 2007). Implementing amnesty policies on campus can encourage survivors and bystanders to come forward and report a crime without fear of disciplinary actions.

Sexual Assault Support Groups on Campus

Student groups and organizations on campus can also provide support and resources to survivors of sexual assault. Student-led groups aid in spreading awareness, creating strategies for prevention on campus, and increase bystander intervention on campus.

Organizational/Institutional Factors of Influence

The organizations and institutions in which the student belongs can also impact their risk of experiencing a sexual assault or other sexual violence. Institutions can reduce the risk of violence by providing safety measures on campus. Common safety features identified amongst institutions in this study included cameras in buildings and parking lots, campus security, safety programs, emergency blue light phones, campus alarm systems, and safety training for faculty/staff and students. Institutions in the study provided additional policies such as non-retaliation policy, alcohol and drug policies, and weapons policies. Additional policies or statements provided to students can assist with increasing reporting and decreasing violence on campus.

Implementing disciplinary procedures on campus, including sanctions, can also reduce violence on campus. Previous studies showed that 46% of institutions provided the campus community with disciplinary procedures (Karjane et al., 2002). A more updated study showed that 79% of institutions

implemented disciplinary procedures on campus. This current study showed an increase in the percentage of institutions with disciplinary procedures on campus. Results showed that 97% of sampled institutions mentioned student disciplinary procedures in their policy documents. Institutions should also provide visibility into the possible sanctions that can be imposed on a student, employee, or third party found responsible for sexual assault.

Community Factors of Influence

Due to the negative impact of sexual assault on survivors, access to resources such as medical care and counseling are vital to reducing long term effects. Policy documents should clearly outline resources, on and off campus, that are available to students. Contact information for available resources should also be provided. Institutions should also provide resources that are available 24 hours, offered at no or low costs to students, and easily accessible. Previous research showed that 49% of institutions provided information about counseling services. A more recent study conducted by Richards (2016) showed that 65% of institutions mentioned access to counseling. Results from this current study showed that 90% of institutions provided information to students about available counseling services on campus or within the community. Furthermore, 90% of institutions also mentioned medical services access on campus or within the community. Additional resources mentioned across institutions also included access to legal assistance, responsible employees, escort services, and victim advocacy services. Off campus resources also included rape crisis centers and local hospitals. Overall, smaller institutions provided access to resources at a lower rate than larger institutions, which is consistent with results from previous studies.

Policy

The content analysis assessed the existence of a sexual assault policy or policy with a similar title such as sexual misconduct policy, sexual offense policy, Title IX policy, and sexual harassment policy across institutions. Previous studies showed that between 60%-85% of institutions sampled provided a sexual assault policy or policy with a similar title (Karjane et al., 2002; Richards, 2016; Streng & Kamimura, 2015). Consistent with previous studies, 79% of institutions sampled in this study published a

sexual assault policy or policy with a similar title. The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 mandated that institutions of higher education receiving federal funding disclose their policies and programs to prevent dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, and sexual assault (Violence against Women Reauthorization Act, 2013). A sexual assault policy or policy with a similar title is essential to provide students with up to date information on how the institution prevents and responds to a sexual assault on campus. Sexual assault policies are also integral in providing information on reporting procedures, options of resources for students, and student disciplinary procedures, including sanctions and resolution.

Consistent with previous studies, the existence of a sexual assault policy varied based on institution type and level. Results from a 2002 study showed that 59.4% of two-year public institutions had a sexual assault policy, whereas smaller institutions fell below the 50% mark (Karjane et al., 2002). In a 2016 study, results showed that 55% of two-year public and private non-profit institutions provided a sexual assault policy (Richards, 2016). Results from this study show that there is an increase of two-year institutions that provided a sexual assault policy, but certificate only institutions still fall short of publishing a sexual assault policy. Results from this study showed that 57% of certificate level institutions had a published sexual assault policy.

The content analysis also assessed the accessibility of existing sexual assault policies. According to Karjane et al., (2002), results showed that 38.6% of institutions' sexual assault policies were found in their annual security report, whereas 19.3% of institutions published their policies in the student handbook. Varying results from another study showed that 60% of institutions sampled provided their sexual assault policy in their student handbook (Richards, 2016). Similar to the 2002 sexual assault study, results from this study showed that 34% of the existing sexual assault policies were found in the annual security report. Institutions sampled in this study also provided their sexual assault policy within their student handbook (35%) or on their official website (66%). Results also showed that some institutions made their sexual assault policy more accessible by providing it in multiple locations such as the annual security report, student handbook or code of conduct, and their official website. According to the U.S

Department of Education and the Office of Civil Rights, policies must be widely accessible and highly visible to students. According to Karjane et al., (2002), institutions' sexual assault policy should be accessible through multiple means such as the institution's website, pamphlets, or flyers.

Although the majority of the institutions provided a sexual assault policy, the components within each policy varied. The content analysis identified recurring themes or elements present across sexual assault policies. All of the institutions with a sexual assault policy provided clearly labeled goals, overview, or scope for their sexual assault policies. This is an increase from the results from a previous study, which showed that about half of the institutions' sexual assault policies mentioned explicit goals (Karjane et al., 2002). In addition to policy goals, analyzed sexual assault policies often provided definitions and terms. Commonly found terms found across sexual assault policies included the following; allegations, accused, coercion, complainant, consent, dating violence, domestic violence, force, incapacitation, non-consensual sexual contact, non-consensual sexual intercourse, respondent, sex discrimination, sexual assault, sexual exploitation, sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, and stalking. Institutions also provided specific definitions for their disciplinary or judicial process, including definitions of standard of proof or evidence, Title IX Coordinator, sanctions, and outcome.

Institutions sampled in this study provided definitions of what constitutes a sexual assault or other terms under the sexual assault umbrella. Previous studies showed that approximately 20–25% of college students are sexually assaulted throughout their time in college. Furthermore, studies show that approximately 90% of sexual assaults were reported to be committed by an acquaintance or a friend (Allen & Meadows, 2017; Anderson & Whiston, 2005; Armstrong, Hamilton, & Sweeney, 2006; Fedina, Holmes, & Backes, 2015). Consistent with previous studies, the majority of the institutions sampled in this study did not mention or define acquaintance rape in their policy documents. Since acquaintance rape happens more often than not, institutions should consider including the definition in their policies.

Common themes found across sexual assault policies also included prohibited conduct including retaliation, information on what to do if the student or a bystander is sexually assaulted, and information on multiple reporting options and procedures, including to whom and where to report an offense and a 24-

hour reporting option, anonymous option, and confidential reporting options. Sexual assault policies also included options for assistance following a sexual assault incident, even if the student chooses not to report the incident, and a statement encouraging students to report a sexual offense. Additional themes found in sexual assault policies included information on resources on campus and within the community and supportive measures such as counseling, medical options, legal information, change of housing, work, or class schedules, escorts, and mutual restrictions between the survivor and the accused. Institutions also included drug and alcohol policies, risk reduction information, bystander intervention information, education and awareness information, and prevention information. Common themes found in sexual assault policies also included disciplinary proceedings, including the importance of preserving evidence and receiving medical attention, options for no-contact and protective orders, information on filing criminal or civil suits, options for informal and formal resolution, and information on sanctions, the standard of evidence and rights for survivors and the accused. Lastly, to encourage reporting, institutions also provided amnesty to students and information on how the institution will protect students' confidentiality.

The content analysis showed inconsistencies with definitions across institutions. Institutions also provided vague definitions of sexual assault that did not encompass the crimes that were defined in their sexual assault policies or annual security report. Definitions should be consistent and make mention of forcible and non-forcible offenses.

Recommendations and Implications for Future Research

Recommendations for Institutions

It is recommended that institutions provide their students with a well-developed and widely available comprehensive sexual assault or misconduct policy, specific to the school type and community needs. As a baseline for a comprehensive policy, the following information can be useful: statements of prohibited conduct, adequate definitions, list of available contacts for reporting, updated list of available resources, reporting options, Title IX coordinator information, and complete disciplinary procedures and sanctions. Four-year and two-year institutions were more likely to have a more comprehensive sexual

assault policy than institutions that solely offered certificate programs. Certificate only institutions that are behind in the development of a sexual assault policy can rely on guidance from the Clery Act, the Q & A on Campus Sexual Misconduct provided by the Office of Civil Rights, and the Title IX guidelines provided by the Department of Education. The University System of Georgia's (USG) sexual misconduct policy and The Technical College System of Georgia's state board policies and procedures can also be used as a foundation for certificate institutions to further develop a comprehensive sexual assault or misconduct policy.

This study also recommends that institutions provide their sexual assault policy on their official website or within one document to make accessibility easier for students and the campus community. Sexual assault policies were found in student handbooks, annual security reports, and other documents. At times, the full sexual assault policy was found to be broken down amongst multiple documents. It is essential that institutions publish their entire sexual assault policy in one document that can be distributed amongst multiple avenues such as in the annual security report, official website, or student handbook. Four-year public and private non-profit institutions, and, to a lesser extent, two-year public institutions, tended to have a more complete sexual assault policy. Even with the existence of a complete sexual assault policy, there were noticeable variations regarding thoroughness and clarity. It is also recommended that institutions include relevant definitions in their sexual assault or misconduct policies, including the definition of sexual assault and all other definitions as mandated by federal law. The University Systems of Georgia does not provide a definition of sexual assault in their sexual misconduct policy. It is recommended that the USG update their sexual misconduct policy to include a definition of sexual assault.

It is also recommended that institutions publish an annual security report. The annual security report can provide policy and procedure information to students, provide definitions, reporting contact information, and crime statistics. Institutions without an annual security report are at risk for non-compliance with federal policy. It is also recommended that institutions make their policies and documents more accessible. Some institutions required students to log in to their student portal to view

documents or available resources, while other institutions make documents available upon request. Making policies and information available on the institution's official website can be beneficial for the campus community.

This study suggests that institutions that did not provide housing were less likely to mention bystander, prevention, education, and awareness, or risk reduction programs. To comply with federal policy, institutions that do not have the resources to implement in-person programs can provide comprehensive online programs and courses such as the HAVEN. Institutions can also spread awareness or provide prevention and risk reduction information by hanging flyers or posters around the campus. It is essential that institutions provide information on programs and policies aimed at reducing sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking on campus.

To comply with Title IX, institutions are encouraged to provide a non-discrimination notice on their official website. Publishing a non-discrimination notice will ensure that the campus community is aware that the institution does not tolerate discrimination based on sex as well as ensure that reporting information such as the Title IX Coordinator is available to students. Training should also be made available to the campus community. To increase training, institutions can also provide mandatory online training programs. Lastly, institutions should also make access available to multiple reporting options, including anonymous and confidential reporting options. Increasing visibility to responsible employees on campus can aid in the increase of reporting.

Implications

Consistent with previous studies (Lopez, et al., 2017), smaller institutions such as two-year institutions and certificate institutions reported 0% incidences for rape, sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and other sexual offenses occurring on campus, on-campus property, or on public property within the last three years. Future research should further analyze factors that impact reporting rates. Certificate only institutions in this study had fewer reporting options available to students, provided fewer definitions for offenses, and did not mention programs or resources that were tailored to serve vulnerable subpopulations such as the LGBTQ+ community. This study could not determine the

correlation between reporting rates and availability or diversity of programs, procedures, or policies. Future studies can assess the availability and efficacy of programs and resources on campus. It is also recommended that this study be replicated since new regulations for Title IX were published in August 2020. Future research should analyze policy documents and assess compliance with updated regulations and federal policy.

Strengths and Limitations

One strength of the study was the use of secondary data. With time constraints, accessing and collecting available secondary data allowed for the study to be completed within a reasonable amount of time. This study also utilized NVivo pro, which provided a more accurate data analysis.

One of the most important limitations of this study was the inability to receive confirmation from institutions on their existence of documents such as annual security reports, student handbooks, sexual assault policies, or other relevant policies. Due to time constraints, the researcher was unable to collect documents from Title IX coordinators or the Dean of students to confirm documents' existence. If the documents were not publicly available, the information was not included in the study. It is a possibility the institutions that did not have documents accessible on the internet or on their official website did, in fact, have the documents available in person or by other means. The study concluded a general sense of compliance from institutions but could not confirm definitively whether additional documents, policies, or programs exist. Future studies should use multiple data collection methods such as email confirmation, surveys, or interviews to confirm whether or not documents, programs, or policies exist per institution. Another limitation of the study was the inability to have multiple coders. Multiple coders allow the researcher to assess inter-rater reliability and allow the documents to be evaluated from another perspective. Although intra-rater reliability is possible, it is still beneficial to have multiple coders for further accuracy and to reduce the data collection time. Lastly, the findings are not generalizable because they are specific to institutions in Georgia.

Conclusion

Overall, this study shows the diverse approach that institutions of higher education in Georgia are taking to respond to sexual assault. Institutions have improved their response to sexual assault on campus since the 2002 conducted by Karjane et al., and Richards' 2016 study. Institutions must continue to work towards developing a more comprehensive sexual assault policy and ensure that they comply with current federal mandates such as the Clery Act, Title IX, Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013, and the SaVE Act. Although institutions have the ability to tailor their sexual assault policies to fit the needs of the community, it is essential that they have one. The current study also suggests that institutions must continue to increase access to their annual security reports, policies prohibiting sexual assault and other misconduct, reporting links, Title IX coordinator contact information, and information about responsible employees.

Due to the variability found at each institution, a standardized policy for sexual assault could not be implemented across all institutions. Instead, institutions must adhere to the guidelines and recommendations provided by federal regulations and guidance reports as a baseline or foundation for their policies and procedures implemented on campus. Also, campus officials must engage the campus community and other stakeholders to assess community needs, barriers, and seek to improve response to sexual assault.

Lastly, previous research shows that survivors of sexual assault are more likely to report to an informal avenue, such as a friend or a peer, as opposed to reporting the incident to campus authorities or law enforcement officials. It is important that institutions work towards increasing reporting rates to officials on campus to ensure that survivors are receiving information about resources and programs on campus and within the community.

REFERENCES

- Abbey, A. (2002). Alcohol-related sexual assault: A common problem among college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 14, 118-128.
- Anderson, L. A., & Whiston, S. C. (2005). Sexual assault education programs: a meta-analytic examination of their effectiveness. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29, 374-388. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00237.x>
- Ahrens, C. E., Rich, M. D., & Ullman, J. B. (2011). Rehearsing for real life: The impact of the InterACT Sexual Assault Prevention Program on self-reported likelihood of engaging in bystander interventions. *Violence Against Women*, 17, 760–776. doi:10.1177/1077801211410212.
- Baurer-Wolf, J. (2018, September). Students: UMBC Protects Rapists. *Inside Higher ed.*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2018/09/19/umbc-students-protest-over-sexual-assault-university-response>
- Birks, M., Chapman, Y., & Francis, K. (2008). Memoing in qualitative research. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 13, 68-75. doi:10.1177/1744987107081254
- Breitenbecher, K. H., & Gidycz, C. A. (1998). An empirical evaluation of a program designed to reduce the risk of multiple sexual victimizations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13, 472-488. doi:10.1177/088626098013004004
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *Journal of American Psychologist*, 32, 512-531
- Burgess, A.W., & Holmstrom, L.L. (1974). Rape trauma syndrome. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 131, 980-986. doi: 10.1176/ajp.131.9.981
- Burn, S. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles*, 779-792. doi: 10.1007/s11199-008-9581-5
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 217-230. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.38.2.217>
- Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act, S.128 -113th Congress (2013)

- Casey, E. A., & Lindhorst, T. P. (2009). Toward a multi-level, ecological approach to the primary prevention of sexual assault: Prevention in peer and community contexts. *Trauma Violence Abuse*, 10, 91–114. doi: 10.1177/1524838009334129.
- Cassel, A. (2012). Are you the problem or the solution? Changing male attitudes and behaviors regarding sexual assault. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research*, 17, 50-58. doi: 10.24839/2164-8204.JN17.2.50
- Center for Disease Control (2014). National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/datasources/nisvs/summaryreports.html>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2014). Preventing sexual violence on college campuses: Lessons from research and practice. Retrieved from <https://www.notalone.gov/schools/>.
- Chadwick, B.A., Bahar, H.M. & Albrecht, S.L. (1984). Content analysis. In B.A.Chadwick et.al., *Social Science Research Methods* (pp. 239-257), New Jersey: Prentice
- Choudhary, E., Smith, M., & Bossarte, R.M. (2012). Depression, anxiety, and symptom profiles among female and male victims of sexual violence. *American Journal of Men's Health*, 6, 28-36. doi: 10.1177/1557988311414045
- Daigneault, I., Hebert M., Michaud, F., Verina-Gagnon, P., Henry, A., & Porter-Vignola, E. (2015). Effectiveness of a sexual assault awareness and prevention workshop for youth: a 3-month follow-up pragmatic cluster randomization study. *The Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality*, 24, 19-30. doi: 10.3138/cjhs.262
- Davis, J. & McCaffrey, S. (2016, January). Wrongly accused of rape? Students question their expulsions from Tech. *Atlanta Journal Constitution*. Retrieved from <https://www.ajc.com/news/local/wrongly-accused-rape-students-question-their-expulsions-from-tech/BBvnT55EBWtaCHbhunSxON/>
- DeMatteo, D., Galloway, M., Arnold, S., & Patel, S. (2015). Sexual assault on college campuses: A 50-state survey of criminal sexual assault statutes and their relevance to campus sexual assault.

- Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 21(3), Aug, 227-238. doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000055>
- Eagly, A. H., & Crowley, M. (1986). Gender and helping behavior: a meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100, 283-308. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.100.3.283>
- Education Amendments Act, 20 U.S.C. §1681-1688 (1972)
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). The sexual victimization of college women. (U.S Department of Justice, Publication No. NCJ 182369). Washington, DC: U.S Government Printing Office. Mnbn
- Forke, C. M., Myers, R. K., Catalozzi, M., & Schwarz, D. F. (2008). Relationship violence among female and male college undergraduate students. *JAMA Pediatrics*, 162, 634-641. doi:
 10.1001/archpedi.162.7.634
- Georgia Bureau of Investigation: Crime statistics. Retrieved from <https://gbi.georgia.gov/services/crime-statistics>
- Gidycz, C. A., Lynn, S. J., Rich, C. L., Marioni, N. L., et al. (2001). The evaluation of a sexual assault risk reduction program: A multi-site investigation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 69, 1073-1078.
- Gidycz, C. A., Rich, C. L., Orchowski, C. K., King, C., & Miller, A. K. (2006). The evaluation of a sexual assault self-defense and risk-reduction program for college women: A prospective study. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 30, 173-186.
- Glanz, K., Rimer, B. K., & Viswanath, K. (2008). *Health behavior and health education: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). The discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for qualitative research. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 20(2):227-228. doi: 10.2307/588533
- Hanson, K. A., & Gidycz, C. A. (1993). Evaluation of a sexual assault prevention program. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61(6), 1056-1052. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.61.6.1046

- Hartmann, A. (2015). Reworking sexual assault response on university campuses: creating a rights-based empowerment model to minimize institutional liability. *Journal of Law & Policy*, 48, 287-320. Retrieved from https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/law_journal_law_policy/
- Hines, D. A., Armstrong, J. L., Reed, P., & Cameron, A. Y. (2012). Gender differences in sexual assault victimization among college students. *Violence and Victims*, 27(6):922-40. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.27.6.922
- Holland, K. J. (2019). Correlates of college women's intentions to use formal campus supports for sexual assault. *Psychology of Violence*, 5, 429-439. doi: 10.1037/lhb0000253
- Holsti, O.R. (1968). Content Analysis. In G.Lindzey & E.Aronson (Eds.), *The Handbook of Social Psychology* (2nd ed.) (Pp.596-692) New Delhi: Amerind Publishing C
- Kruttschnitt, C., Kalsbeek, W. D., & House, C. C. (2014). *Estimating the incidence of rape and sexual assault*. National Academies Press
- Jozkowski, K., Peterson, Z., Sanders, S., Dennis, B., & Reece, M. (2014). Gender differences in heterosexual college students' conceptualizations and indicators of sexual consent: Implications for contemporary sexual assault prevention education. *Journal of Sex Research*, 51, 904-916. doi: 10.1080/00224499.2013.792326
- Kamdar, Z. N., Kosambiya, J. K., Bansari, C. L., Verma, M., & Kadia, A. (2017). Rape: Is it a lifestyle or behavioral problem? *Indian Journal of Psychology*, 59, 77-82. doi: 10.4103/psychiatry.IndianJPsychiatry_78_16
- Karjane, H. M., Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T. (2002). Campus sexual assault: how America's Institutions of Higher Education respond. Final Report (NIJ Grant No. 1999-WA-VX-0008). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/196676.pdf>
- Kasteren, Y. F., Lewis, L. K., & Maeder, A. (2020). Office-based physical activity: Mapping a social-ecological model approach against COM-B. *BMC Public Health*, 20, 163. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-8280-1>

- Kettrey, H. H., Marx, R. A., & Tanner-Smith, E. E. (2019). Effects of bystander programs on the prevention of sexual assault among adolescents and college students: A systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews, John Wiley & Sons*, 15, 1-2. doi: 10.4073/csr.2019.1
- Kilpatrick, D. G., Resnick, H. S., Ruggiero, K. J., Conoscenti, L. M., & McCauley J. (2007). Drug-facilitated, incapacitated, and forcible rape: a national study. (NIJ Grant No. 219181). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/219181.pdf>
- Kleinsasser, A., Jouriles, E. N., McDonald, R., Rosenfield, D. (2014). An online bystander intervention program for the prevention of sexual violence. *Psychology of Violence*. Advance online publication. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0037393>.
- Kracauer, Siegfried (1952). The challenge of qualitative content analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 16(4), 631-64
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2007). The campus sexual assault (CSA) study (NIJ Grant No. 2004-WG-BK-0010). Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221153.pdf>
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Foubert, J. D., Brasfriend, H. M., Hill, B., & Shelley-Trembley, S. (2011). The Men's Program: Does it impact college men's self-reported bystander efficacy and willingness to intervene? *Violence Against Women*, 17, 743-59. doi: 10.1177/1077801211409728
- Latane, B., & Darley, J. (1970). *The Unresponsive Bystander*. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts.
- Leone, R. M., Parrott, D. J., Swartout, K. M., & Tharp, A. T. (2016). Masculinity and bystander attitudes: Moderating effects of masculine gender role stress. *Psychology of Violence*, 6, 82-90. doi: 10.1037/a0038926
- Lindquist, C. H., Crosby, C. M., Barrick, K., Krebs, C. P., & Settles-Reaves, B. (2016). Disclosure of sexual assault experiences among undergraduate women at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). *Journal of American College Health*, 64, 469-480. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2016.1181635

- Lonsway, K. A. (1996). Preventing acquaintance rape through education: What do we know? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 20(2), 229–265. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1996.tb00469.x>
- Lopez-Baker, A., McDonald, m., Schissler, j., & Pirone, V. (2017). Canada and the United States: campus sexual assault law & policy comparative analysis. *Canada-United States Law Journal*, 41, 156-166
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S., M. (2005). *Second language research, methodology, and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Mayall, A., & Gold, S. R. (1995). Definitional issues and mediating variables in the sexual revictimization of women sexually abused as children. *Sage Journals*, 10, 26-42. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/088626095010001002>
- McMahon, S. (2010). Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes among incoming college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 3-11. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2010.483715
- Meyer, E. J., & Somoza-Norton, A. (2018). Addressing sex discrimination with Title IX coordinators in the #MeToo era. *Sage Journals*, 26 (68), 1–28. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721718803562>
- Moschella, E. A., Bennett, S., & Banyard, V. L. (2018). Beyond the situational model: Bystander action consequences to intervening in situations involving sexual violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 33, 3211-3231. doi: 10.1177/0886260516635319
- Muehlenhard, C. L., Peterson, Z. D., Humphreys, T. P., & Joxkowski, K. N. (2017). Evaluating the one-in-five statistics. Women's risk of sexual assault while in college. *Journal of Sex Research*, 54, 549-576. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1295014>
- Munro-Kramer, M. L., Dulin, A. C., & Gaither, C. (2017). What survivors want: understanding the needs of sexual assault survivors. *Journal of American College*, 65, 297-305. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2017.1312409
- Murchison, G. R., Boyd, M. A., & Pachankis, J. (2017). Minority stress and the risk of unwanted sexual experiences in LGBTQ undergraduates. *Sex Roles*, 77, 221-238. doi: 10.1007/s11199-016-0710-2

- Murchison, G. R., Boyd, M. A., & Pachankis, J. E. (2017). Minority stress and the risk of unwanted sexual experiences in LGBT undergraduates. *Sex Roles, 77*, 221-238. doi:
- Owens EW. Doctoral Dissertation. Duquesne University; 2011. The resident assistant as a paraprofessional counselor and crisis interventionist: A study of lived experience. ProQuest UMI Number: 3443375 10.1007/s11199-016-0710-2
- Palmer, R. S., McMahon, T. J., Rounsaville, B. J., & Ball, S. A. (2010). Coercive sexual experiences, protective behavioral strategies, alcohol expectancies, and consumption among male and female college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25*, 1563-1578. doi: 10.1177/0886260509354581
- Potter, S. J., Edwards, K. M., Banyard, V. L., Stapleton, J. G., Demers, J. M., & Moynihan, M. M. (2016). Conveying campus sexual misconduct policy information to college and university students: results from a 7-campus study. *Journal of American College Health, 64*(6), 438-447. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07448481.2016.1178122>
- Prasad, B. D. (2008). Content analysis: A method in social science research. *Research Methods for Social Work, 5*, 1-20. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.1748.1448
- Reed, M., K, Hines, A., D, Armstrong, L., J, & Cameron, Y., A. (2014). Experimental evaluation of a bystander prevention program for sexual assault and dating violence. *American Psychological Association, 5*(1), 95–102. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037557>
- Richards, T. N. (2019). An updated review of Institutions of Higher Education's responses to sexual assault: Results from a nationally representative sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 34*, 1983-2012. doi:10.1177/0886260516658757
- Santiago, J. M., McCall-Perez, F., Gorcey, M., & Beigel, A. (1985). Long-term psychological effects of rape in 35 rape victims. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 142*(11), 1338–1340. <https://doi.org/10.1176/ajp.142.11.1338>
- Sarmiento, I. (2011). Rape stereotypes and labeling: Awareness of victimization and trauma. *Sage Journals*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2466/07.13.16.PR0.108.1.141-148>

- Schewe, P. A. (Ed.). (2002). Preventing violence in relationships: Interventions across the life span. *American Psychological Association*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10455->
- Schwartz, R., McMahon, S., & Broadnax, J. (2015). A review of sexual assault information on college web sites. *Health & Social Work*, 40 (4), 275-282. doi: 10.1093/hsw/hlv064
- Simms, T. (2018). Unified amnesty policies: A hope for removing the fear of reporting sexual assault on college campuses. *Ohio State Law Journal*, 79, 375-410. Retrieved from <https://kb.osu.edu/handle/1811/86383>
- Spencer, C., Mallory, A., Toews, M., Smith, S., & Wood, L. (2017). Why sexual assault survivors do not report to universities: A feminist analysis. *Family Relations*, 66, 166-179. doi: 10.1111/fare.12241
- Stempel, G.H. (1989). Content analysis. In G.H.Stempel and B.H.Westley (Eds) *Research methods in mass communications*, Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall
- Stewart, A. L. (2014). The men's project: a sexual assault prevention program targeting college men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinities*, 15, 481-485. doi: 10.1037/t00700-000
- Stone, P.J., Dunphy, D.C., Smith, M.S., and Ogilvie, D.M. (1966). *The General Inquirer: A computer approach to content analysis*, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press
- Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act, s. 580, 101st Congress (1990)
- Swift, C. F., & Ryan-Finn, K. D. (1995). Perpetrator prevention: Stopping the development of sexually abusive behavior. *Journal of Prevention in Human Services*, 13-44. doi: https://doi.org/10.1300/J293v12n02_02
- The White House. (2014, January 22). Remarks by the president and vice president at an event for the Council on Women and Girls. Retrieved from <https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2014/01/22/remarks-president-and-vice-president-event-council-women-and-girls>
- Trochim, W. M., Donnelly, J. P., & Arora, K. (2016). *Research methods: the essential knowledge base*, 2e. Delhi, India. Cengage Learning.

- Ullman, S., Townsend, S., Filipas, H., & Starzynski, L. (2007). Structural models of the relations of assault severity, social support, avoidance coping, self-blame, and PTSD among sexual assault survivors. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23-37.
- United States Census Bureau (2019). Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/library/publications.html>
- United States Department of Education (2015). Dear colleague letter: Title IX Coordinators. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/dcl-title-ix-coordinators-guide-201504.pdf>
- United States Department of Education. (2017). Questions and answers on-campus sexual misconduct. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/qa-title-ix-201709.pdf>
- United States Department of Education (2020). Title IX Regulations Addressing Sexual Harassment. Retrieved from <https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/newsroom.html>
- Violence Against Women Act, S.11, 103rd Congress, (1993).
- Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act, S.47, 113th Congress, (2013)
- Vladutiu, C. J., Martin, S. L., & Macy, R. J. (2011). College or university-based sexual assault prevention programs: A review of program outcomes, characteristics, and recommendations. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*, 12(2):67-86. doi: 10.1177/1524838010390708
- Walker, T. (2018). Fixing what's wrong with how universities adjudicate sexual assault misconduct claims: How procedural change can encourage cooperation. *Wisconsin Law Review*, 111, 18-30. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3034779>
- Walsh, W. A., Banyard, V., Moynihan, M. M., Ward, S., & Cohn, S. (2010). Disclosure and service use on a college campus after an unwanted sexual experience. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation* 11(2):134-51. doi: 10.1080/15299730903502912
- Wiersma-Mosley, J. D., & DiLoreto, J. (2018). The role of Title IX coordinators on college and university campuses. *Behavioral Sciences*, 8, 38. doi 10.3390/bs8040038
- Wooten, S. C. (2017) Revealing a hidden curriculum of Black women's erasure in sexual violence prevention policy. *Gender and Education*, 29:3, 405-417, doi: 10.1080/09540253.2016.1225012

Worthen M. G. F., & Wallace, S. A. (2017). Intersectionality and perceptions about sexual assault education and reporting on college campuses. *Family Relations*, 66, 180-196. doi: 10.1111/fare.12240

Yeater A. Y., Hoyt, T., & Rinehart, K. J. (2008). Sexual assault prevention with college-aged women: Toward an individualized approach. *Violence and Victims*, 19, 593-612.

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL LETTER

**Institutional Review Board (IRB)**

Veazey Hall 3000
 PO Box 8005 • STATESBORO, GA 30460
 Phone: 912-478-5465
 Fax: 912-478-0719
IRB@GeorgiaSouthern.edu

To: Williams, Brianna
Approval Date: August 17, 2020
Subject: Institutional Review Board Exemption Determination - Limited Review

Your proposed research project numbered **H21031**, and titled "**A Content Analysis of Institutions of Higher Education's Sexual Assault Policy: Assessing Response to Secual Assault in Georgia.**" involves activities that do not require full approval by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) according to federal guidelines.

According to the Code of Federal Regulations Title 45 Part 46, your research protocol is determined to be exempt from full review under the following exemption category(s):

Non-human subjects determination:

- G8 The project, study or evaluation does not involve obtaining information about living individuals or does not have direct interaction or intervention with individuals or their personal/private data so is not defined as human subjects research under human subjects regulations.

Any alteration in the terms or conditions of your involvement may alter this approval. *Therefore, as authorized in the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to notify you that your research, as submitted, is exempt from IRB Review. No further action or IRB oversight is required, as long as the project remains the same. If you alter the project, it is your responsibility to notify the IRB and acquire a new determination of exemption. Because this project was determined to be exempt from further IRB oversight, this project does not require an expiration date.*

Sincerely,

Eleanor Haynes
 Compliance Officer

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENTATION-CODING DOCUMENT

CODERS NOTE: THIS IS NOT A MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE LIST. BE SURE TO NOTE ADDITIONAL TYPES OF PROGRAMS, RESOURCES, OR INFORMATION SHOULD YOU FIND THEM IN INSTITUTION'S MATERIALS

SECTION 1:

Coding Instrument for the content analysis of the annual security report (Fisher,2002)

1. Does the institution have a publicly available annual security report as mandated in the Jeanne Clery Act?
0 = No, the institution does not have a publicly available annual security report
1 = Yes, the institution does have a publicly available annual security report
2. Did the institution provide their reported crime statistics as per the Jeanne Clery Act?
0 = No, Skip to Section 2, question 1
1 = Yes, as part of their annual security report
2 = Yes, but not as part of their annual security report
3 = Retrieved from DOE web site, google, or institution's official website
3. Do the reported crime statistics include the three most recent calendar years?
1= 1 year
2= 2 years
3 = 3 years
4. What is the last year of reported crime statistics?
16= 2016
17= 2017
18= 2018
19= 2019
5. What is the publication year of the annual security report?
17= 2017
18= 2018
19= 2019
20=2020
00 = Annual security report is not publicly available
6. Do the reported crime statistics include forcible and nonforcible offense statistics?
0 = No (Skip to Section 2, question 1)
1 = Only forcible (murder, rape, robbery, burglaries, sexual assault, motor vehicle theft)
2 = Only nonforcible (stalking)
3 = Both forcible and nonforcible
4 = Only Rape
5 = Something else: (write in) _____
7. Are the offenses listed in question 6 defined or identified in the annual security report?
0 = No
1 = Yes, identified different types of offenses (e.g., listed out)
2= Yes, provided a definition for the offenses
3= yes, some offenses are defined, and some offenses are listed out

4= Annual security report is not publicly available

8. Are the locations of where the offenses took place broken down as per the Clery Act?

0 = OFFENSES NOT BROKEN DOWN BY LOCATION

1 = on campus

2 = on campus, non-campus building, public property

3 = on or in a non-campus building

4 = on public property

5 = some other way

6=Location not specified

9. Does the institution have campus housing?

0= No

1= Yes

The below coding questions for section 1 have been added to include additional requirements as mandated under the Clery Act.

10. Does the annual security report include information about the current campus procedures on where to report a crime or emergencies?

0= No

1= Yes

2= Annual security report is not publicly available

11. Does the annual security report include a description of the types of programs designed to educate students and employees about crime prevention?

0= No

1= Yes

2= Annual security report is not publicly available

SECTION 2:

Coding for Sexual Assault Policy (Fisher, 2002)

1. Does the institution have a written sexual assault policy that is labeled “SEXUAL ASSAULT POLICY” or with a similar title (e.g., SEXUAL OFFENSES POLICY, SEXUAL MISCONDUCT POLICY)

0 = No (Skip to Section 2, question 7)

1 = Yes, the institution has a sexual assault policy

2= The institution has a policy for sexual assault or sexual misconduct, but it is not clearly labeled

2. Are the goals of the policy stated (e.g., overall of what the sexual assault/offenses policy is all about, what the institution will not tolerate, committed to maintaining an environment that is free from the physical and emotional threat of sexual assault, the institution will pursue disciplinary action)?

0 = No

1 = Yes

3. How does the institution refer to the person who has experienced a sexual offense?

0 = Generic term (e.g., “those who have experienced...,” “a person who”)

1 = Victim

- 2 = Survivor
3 = Both victim and survivor
4. Whom does the policy cover?
0 = POLICY DOES NOT STATE WHO IS COVERED
1 = Students only
2 = Faculty and staff only
3 = Students, faculty and staff
5. What types of sexual assault are noted/mentioned/listed in the sexual assault policy?
1 = Generic terms used—not specific types noted/mentioned/listed: sexual assault, sexual offense
2 = Penile-Vaginal Rape—sexual intercourse (i.e., penile-vaginal) that is perpetrated against the will of the victim or occurs when she/he is unable to give consent and may involve physical violence, coercion, or threat of harm to the victim
3 = Other forms of vaginal intercourse—mouth, tongue, hand, or the introduction of a foreign object into the genitals of another person
4 = Other forms of sexual intercourse—anal or oral penetration with penis, mouth, tongue, hand, fingers, or the introduction of a foreign object
5 = Acquaintance rape—rape by a non-stranger which could include a friend, acquaintance, family member, neighbor, or co-worker
6 = Date rape—rape by someone the victim has been or is dating
7 = Gang acquaintance /date rape—rape by more than one person, at least one of whom is known to the victim
8 = Sexual contact/Forcible fondling/Sexual battery--unwanted touching of intimate body parts 9= Incest
10 = Other types of sexual offenses—e.g., indecent exposure
6. Is stalking included/mentioned in the sexual assault policy?
0 = No
1 = Yes
2 = Separate stalking policy
7. Is sexual harassment included/mentioned in the sexual assault policy?
0 = No (If Section 2, question 1 = 0 or 2, Skip to section 3, question 1)
1 = Yes
2 = Separate sexual harassment policy
3 = Institution only sent their sexual harassment policy and NOT their sexual assault policy (Skip to Section 3, question 1)
8. Are the types of sexual assault noted in question 5 defined/does the institution tell the reader of the policy the meaning of the term “sexual assault” or the meaning of the different types of sexual assault?
0 = No
1 = Yes
9. Where is the sexual assault policy found/printed?
0 = CAN NOT IDENTIFY THE SOURCE
1 = student handbook or code of conduct
2 = Annual security report
3 = Both the student handbook/code of conduct and the annual security report
4 = Other

5= Internet (only used when the information was obtained from the Internet and could not determine source)

6= Official website

SECTION 3:

EXISTENCE AND PUBLICATION OF INSTITUTION'S POLICY FOR CAMPUS SEXUAL ASSAULT (Fisher, 2002)

1. What are the specific educational programs to promote the awareness of sexual assault, rape, acquaintance rape, and other forcible and nonforcible sexual offenses that are available to the students?
 - 0= NO EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS MENTIONED (Skip to section 3, question 3)
 - 1 = General/generic mention of sexual assault/offenses educational programs/presentations to promote the awareness of rape, etc.
 - 2 = General/generic mention of personal safety programs/presentations but does not specifically say to promote the awareness of rape, etc.
 - 3 = New student orientation programs, educational programs/presentations to promote the awareness of rape, etc.
 - 4 = New student orientation educational programs/presentations but does not specifically say to promote the awareness of rape, etc.
 - 5 = Self-defense skill training
 - 6 = Date rape/acquaintance rape prevention programs
 - 7 = Student Advocate programs (e.g., student advocates against sexual violence, students against violence against women, etc.)
 - 8 = Printed sexual assault, sexual offenses, rape, or date rape, prevention materials
 - 9 = Other _____

2. Does the institution provide a description of these educational programs?
 - 0 =NO, A DESCRIPTION IS NOT PROVIDED
 - 1 = Yes, a description is provided

3. What are other types of safety and security features/programs/services that are provided by the institution?
 - 0 = NO MENTION OF OTHER TYPES OF SAFETY AND SECURITY FEATURES
 - 1 = Van/bus escort service
 - 2 = Walking escort service
 - 3 = Emergency blue light phones
 - 4 = Free phone calls on campus--cellular phone calls (i.e., no charge to press *### and get connected to police), free campus phones (e.g., the on-campus phones in the student union)
 - 5 = Electronic alarm campus-wide system to monitor intrusions into campus buildings/property
 - 6 = Surveillance cameras for buildings/parking lots
 - 7 = Lighting and grounds surveys/standards
 - 8 = Architectural design standards/routine maintenance of buildings
 - 9 = Campus police programs
 - 10 = Alcohol and drug education programs
 - 11 = Resident assistant safety and security training
 - 12 = Key card or key access to buildings
 - 13 = Residential hall security personnel on duty (e.g., 24 hours front desk services, hall and door monitors in residence halls)
 - 14 = Registration of overnight guests in residence halls
 - 15 = Generic escort service (i.e., no mention of the type of service as in codes 1 and 2)
 - 16 = Access restrictions to campus buildings and property

4. What are the sources of these educational safety and security features/programs/services information and education programs?
- 0 = NOT IDENTIFIED (Skip to section 4, question 1)
 - 1 = Housing community guide
 - 2 = Printed materials--safety brochures, posters, flyers, bookmarks
 - 3 = Content on the official website
 - 4 = Special alerts
 - 5 = Annual security report
 - 6 = Student handbook or code of conduct
 - 7 = Police Log
 - 8 = Student or school catalog

SECTION 4:

REPORTING AND PROCEDURES OPTIONS THAT ARE ARTICULATED TO THE VICTIM

(Fisher, 2002)

1. Who should/can be contacted (i.e., let know, notify) when a sex offense happens? (This DOES NOT mean to file a police report.)
- 0 = NO MENTION OF WHO TO CONTACT (Skip to section 4, question 3)
 - 1 = University police department/security office
 - 2 = Local police department
 - 3 = Police (general/generic mention)
 - 4 = Office of the Dean of Students/VP for Student Affairs
 - 5 = Department of Student Housing and Residential Education, Resident Assistant, Area Director, or Assistant Area Director
 - 6 = Department of Athletics
 - 7 = Student/University Health Services
 - 8 = University Counseling Centre
 - 9 = Academic Advisor
 - 10 = Title IX Coordinator
 - 11 = Victim Assistance/Victim Advocacy services
 - 12 = Campus Ministries
 - 13 = Ombudsman
 - 14 = Human Resources
 - 15 = Director/ manager of institution
 - 16 = Other _____

What contact information is provided for reporting a sex offense?

- 0 = NO MENTION OF CONTACT DETAILS
 - 1 = Telephone numbers given
 - 2 = 24 hours statement for contact
 - 3 = Address of contact office/person given
 - 4 = Other _____
 - 5 = Mention of reporting but no contact information provided
2. Does the institution mention access to medical care on campus or within the community?
- 0 = NO MENTION OF MEDICAL CARE
 - 1 = Yes
3. Does the institution have procedures for reporting to on-campus police?
- 0 = NO MENTION OF PROCEDURES
 - 1 = Yes

4. Does the institution have procedures for reporting to off-campus police?
0 = NO MENTION OF PROCEDURES
1 = Yes
5. Does the institution have procedures for seeking counseling?
0 = NO MENTION OF PROCEDURES
1 = Yes
6. Does the institution provide legal support or referrals for legal assistance (e.g., legal services, lawyer, law student clinic) for those who have experienced a sexual offense?
0 = NO MENTION OF PROVIDING LEGAL SUPPORT
1 = Yes
7. Is there a statement concerning the importance of obtaining a medical examination?
0= NO MENTION OF OBTAINING A MEDICAL EXAMINATION
1= Yes
8. Does the institution have a policy to allow witnesses or third parties to report a sexual assault?
0 = NO THIRD-PARTY REPORTING STATEMENT EXISTS
1 = Yes, there is a third-party reporting statement but no description of policy/procedures for reporting
2= Yes, there is a third-party reporting statement and a description of policy/procedures for such reporting
9. Does the institution have a statement notifying the student that he/she has the OPTION of notifying the appropriate law enforcement authorities?
0 = NO MENTION OF NOTIFYING STATEMENT
1 = Yes, the institution has such a statement
10. Does the institution include a statement that institutional personnel will assist the student in notifying the authorities if the student requests the assistance of these personnel?
0 = NO MENTION OF ASSISTANCE STATEMENT
1 = Yes, this statement is communicated in the respective institution's policy
11. Does the institution include a statement of the legal and disciplinary system options available to students?
0 = NO MENTION OF LEGAL AND DISCIPLINARY SYSTEM OPTIONS
1 = File criminal charges in the outside courts
2 = File civil charges in the outside courts
3= File a complaint which will be heard through the internal campus judicial system
4 = Decide not to file charges
12. Does the institution include a statement that reporting a sexual offense does not obligate the victim/survivor to pursue criminal prosecution or campus judicial proceedings?
0 = NO SUCH STATEMENT IS INCLUDED
1 = Yes, there is such a statement

SECTION 5:

RESOURCES AVAILABLE ON CAMPUS AND WITHIN THE COMMUNITY FOR VICTIM'S SAFETY, MEDICAL, HEALTH, CONFIDENTIALITY (Fisher, 2002)

1. Does the institution notify students of existing on-campus and off-campus counseling, mental health, or other student services for the person who has experienced a sexual assault/offense?
 - 0 = NO NOTIFICATION GIVEN TO STUDENTS (Skip to section 5, question 5)
 - 1 = Yes, notification to students of existing on-campus services
 - 2 = Yes, notification to students of existing off-campus/local services (Skip to Section 5, question 4)
 - 3 = Yes, notification to students of existing on and off-campus services.

2. What are the on-campus resources available for counseling, mental health, or other student services for those who have experienced a sexual assault/offense?
 - 0= NO RESOURCES OR SERVICES MENTIONED
 - 1 = Campus Law Enforcement
 - 2 = Student Health Services
 - 3 = Student Counseling and Psychological Services
 - 4 = Dean of Student's Office/VP of Student Affairs
 - 5 = Title IX Coordinator
 - 6 = Self-help groups (e.g., Survivors of Sexual Assault)
 - 7 = Academic Assistance
 - 8 = Student's Attorney General/Legal Counsel Office
 - 9 = Residential Life, Department of Residential Housing, Resident Assistant, Area Director, or Assistant Area Director
 - 10 = University Sexual Harassment Office/Officer
 - 11 = Transportation services
 - 12 = Women's Center
 - 13 = Human Resources
 - 14 =Campus ministries
 - 15= Ombudsman
 - 16= Off-campus references/referrals
 - 17= Director/manager of institution (includes "program director")

3. What are the options for the person who has experienced a sexual assault/offense in terms of the institution's response?
 - 0 = NO MENTION OF OPTIONS
 - 1 = Relocate with regard to the victim's on-campus residence assignment
 - 2 = Temporary/short-term housing for an off-campus student who has experienced a sexual assault victimization
 - 3 = Change class schedule
 - 4 = General mention of changing living situation
 - 5 = General mention of changing academic and/or work situation

4. What are the off-campus resources available to the person who has experienced a sexual assault/offense?
 - 0 = NONE MENTIONED
 - 1 = Rape Crisis Center
 - 2 = Local Police
 - 3 = County Police/Local or County Sheriff
 - 4 = Clergy/ministry
 - 5 = Women's Center
 - 6= District Attorney/Prosecutor's Office
 - 7 = Public Defender's Office
 - 8 = Local Attorneys (private)

- 9 = Local Mental Health Center
- 10 = Local Emergency Room/Hospital
- 11 = Local Psychiatric Services
- 12 = Victim Advocacy Office
- 13 = Other _____

5. What on-campus services are offered to the accused?
- 0 = NONE MENTIONED
 - 1 = Campus Law Enforcement
 - 2 = Student Health Services
 - 3 = Student Counseling and Psychological Services
 - 4 = Dean of Student's Office/VP of Student Affairs
 - 5 = Title IX Coordinator
 - 6 = Judicial Programs Officer/Disciplinary Officer
 - 7 = Academic Assistance
 - 8 = Student's Attorney General/Legal Counsel Office
 - 9 = Department of Residential Housing
 - 10 = University Sexual Harassment Office/Officer
 - 11 = Transportation services
 - 12 = Referrals
 - 13 = Help with contact to referrals
 - 14 = Institution's attorney/legal counsel
 - 15 = Other _____
 - 16= vague mention of resources and services for the accused
6. What off-campus services are offered to the accused?
- 0 = NONE MENTIONED
 - 1 = Rape Crisis Center
 - 2 = Local
Police
 - 3 = County Police/Local or County Sheriff
 - 4 = Women's Center
 - 5 = District Attorney/Prosecutor's Office
 - 6 = Public Defender's Office
 - 7 = Local Mental Health Center
 - 8 = Local Emergency Room/Hospital
 - 9 = Local Psychiatric Services
 - 10 = Referrals
 - 11 = Help with contact to referrals
 - 12 = Other _____
 - 13= vague mention of support services
 - 14= Must log in to student portal to access additional details about support services
7. Is there a statement that a reported sexual assault is kept confidential?
- 0 = NO MENTION OF CONFIDENTIALITY
 - 1 = Yes, only a confidential policy statement included
 - 2 = Yes, confidential policy statement included, AND a description of this policy is given
8. Is there a statement about anonymous reporting?
- 0 = NO MENTION OF Anonymous reporting?
 - 1 = Yes, only an anonymous reporting statement included

2 = Yes, anonymous reporting statement included, AND a description of this policy is given

9. Is there a statement about amnesty when reporting a sexual offense?
 0 = No mention of Amnesty when reporting
 1 = Yes, amnesty is mentioned
 2 = Yes, amnesty statement included AND a description of the policy is given

SECTION 6:

STUDENT JUDICIAL SYSTEM/DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES (Fisher, 2002)

1. Does the institution have a student judicial system or disciplinary procedures?
 0 = NO MENTION OF STUDENT JUDICIAL SYSTEM/DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE (Skip to section 7 question 1)
 1 = Yes, mention of having disciplinary procedures/process
 2 = Yes, mention of having a judicial system/process
 3 = Both terms in codes 1 and 2 are used in institution's materials
 4 = Yes, mention of having a grievance procedure
 5 = Yes, mention of having a disciplinary-grievance procedure
 6 = Yes, other: _____
2. Does the institution have a process to file a written complaint concerning alleged sexual assault?
 0 = NO MENTION OF FILING A COMPLAINT
 1 = Yes, mention of filing a complaint
3. Is the complainant notified of the specific procedures that will be used and the outcomes?
 0 = NO MENTION OF COMPLAINANT BEING NOTIFIED
 1 = Only told about procedures
 2 = Only told about outcomes
 3 = Told about both
4. Is there a statement that says that there is communication with the accused (e.g., a letter) notifying him/her that a written complaint has been filed?
 0 = NO MENTION OF COMMUNICATION WITH THE ACCUSED
 1 = Mention that communication is made with the accused
5. Is there a statement that the nature of the complaint will be made to the accused? That is, does the institution provide an explanation of the allegations made to the accused?
 0 = NO SUCH STATEMENT
 1 = Yes such a statement
6. Is the accused notified of the specific procedures that will be used and the outcomes after the written complaint has been filed?
 0 = NO MENTION OF ACCUSED BEING NOTIFIED
 1 = Only told about procedures
 2 = Only told about outcomes
 3 = Told about both Investigation stage
7. Is there any mention that members are subject to training or education with respect to sexual assault?
 0 = NO MENTION OF TRAINING OR EDUCATION
 1 = Yes, members are subject to training or education

8. What is the standard of proof used to determine if a sexual assault violation has occurred?
 0 = No mention of criteria
 1 = Clear and convincing standard of evidence
 2 = Preponderance of the evidence (whether it is more likely than not)
 3 = Other
9. Is there a statement that both the accuser/complainant and accused must be informed of the outcome of any institutional disciplinary proceeding brought alleging a sex offense?
 0 = NO SUCH STATEMENT MADE
 1 = Yes, both must be notified
 2 = Only the accused is notified
 3 = Only the accuser/complainant is notified
10. What are the available sanctions that may be imposed on the accused?
 0 = NO MENTION OF SANCTION(S)
 1 = General mention/generic mention that sanctions exist; e.g., “Serious punishments,” including the “very real” possibility of suspension or expulsion from the institution
 2 = Censure/Official warning
 3 = Restitution—compensation for loss, damage, or injury paid to the complainant
 4 = Probation—student can be a registered student but can not hold or participate in any activity in which the student would represent the institution or the institution recognized organizations either within or outside the institution’s community
 5 = Suspension—may not be a registered student for a certain length of time
 6 = Expulsion/dismissal—the student may never again be a registered student
 7 = Eviction from student housing
 8 = Counseling
 9 = Loss of Privileges—denial of specified privileges for a specific period of time
 10 = Fines—money paid to the institution
 11 = Parental notification
 12 = Withhold grades, transcripts, etc.
 13 = Attend a class or workshop that helps student understand why his/her behavior was inappropriate
 14 = Educational project—student must complete a project specifically designed to help student understand why his/her behavior was inappropriate
 15 = Combination of sanctions can be used
 16 = Other _____
11. Does the institution have an appeal process available to the accused should he/she be found responsible for a sexual assault offense?
 0 = NO APPEAL PROCESS MENTIONED
 1 = Yes, the institution has an appeal process
12. Are the reasons for appeal listed/described (e.g., the introduction of new evidence, the original process was biased, etc.)?
 0 = NO SUCH LIST/DESCRIPTION IS GIVEN
 1 = Yes, the reasons for appeals are listed/described
13. Is there a description of the appeal process provided?
 0 = NO DESCRIPTION IS PROVIDED
 1 = Yes, a description is provided

The below sections have been created for the purpose of this study.

SECTION 7:

COMPLIANCE WITH THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2013

1. Does the institution provide crime statistics for dating violence?
0= NO
1= Yes
2. Does the institution provide crime statistics for domestic violence?
0= NO
1= Yes
3. Does the institution provide crime statistics for stalking?
0= NO
1= Yes
4. Does the institution's sexual assault policy include information about domestic violence, stalking, sexual assault, and dating violence prevention?
0= NO SUCH POLICY EXIST
1= Domestic violence prevention
2= Stalking
3= Dating violence
4= All of the above
5= no information about prevention in sexual assault policy
6= mention of prevention methods in other documents
5. Does the institution mention that primary awareness and prevention programs are provided to incoming students and new employees?
0= NO
1= Yes
6. Does the institution define consent?
0= NO
1= Yes
7. Are options for bystander intervention provided?
0= NO
1= Yes
8. Does the institution provide risk reduction programs or information?
0= NO
1= Yes
9. Does the institution provide ongoing prevention and awareness campaigns?
0= NO
1= Yes

SECTION 8:

COMPLIANCE WITH THE SAVE ACT

1. Is the definition of sexual assault provided?
0= NO
1= Yes

2. Is the legal definition of rape provided?
0= NO
1= Yes
3. Is the legal definition of stalking provided?
0= NO
1= Yes
4. Is the legal definition of domestic violence provided?
0= NO
1= Yes
5. Is the legal definition of protection orders provided?
0= NO
1= Yes

SECTION 9:

COMPLIANCE WITH THE TITLE IX: OFFICIAL WEBSITE CONTENT

1. Does the institution have a published notice of nondiscrimination notice on the official website?
(if no, skip to question 4 of section 9)
0= NO
1= Yes
2= The institution has a nondiscrimination notice, but it is not published on the official website
2. Does the nondiscrimination notice mention that the institution does not discriminate on the basis of sex?
0= NO
1= Yes
3. Does the nondiscrimination notice mention that any compliant or 3rd party can report sexual harassment at any time?
0= NO
1= Yes
4. Does the institution have a designated Title IX Coordinator? (if no, skip to question 10 of section 9)
0= NO
1= Yes
5. Is the Title IX Coordinator's name provided on the official website?
0= NO
1= Yes
6. Is the Title IX Coordinator's email address provided on the official website?
0= NO
1= Yes
7. Is the Title IX Coordinator's phone number provided on the official website?
0= NO
1= Yes

8. Is the Title IX Coordinator's office address provided on the official website?
0= NO
1= Yes
9. Is the Title IX Coordinator's roles and duties provided on the official website?
0= NO
1= Yes
10. Does the institution provide information on designated responsible employees?
0= NO
1= Yes
11. Are grievance procedures published on the official website?
0= NO
1= Yes
12. Are possible sanctions for violation of Title IX mentioned on the official website?
0= NO
1= Yes
13. Does the official website mention the office of civil rights?
0= NO
1= Yes

SECTION 10:

DIVERSITY AND INCLUSION

1. Do policies, risk reduction, education/awareness, or prevention programs mention different races, gender, or LGBTQ community?
0= NO
1= Yes
2. Are policies or programs available specifically for sub-populations (such as the LGBTQ community, African American Community)
0= NO
1= Yes

APPENDIX C

CONTENT CATEGORIES AND DEFINITIONS

Content Categories	Category defined	Included information
Additional policies aimed at reducing sexual assault on campus	This category is for additional policies, other than sexual assault policies found in the institution's documents or on their official website that are not required by federal policy. These additional policies are related to sexual assault prevention on campus. Policies should focus on sexual assault awareness and education, risk reduction, and prevention.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weapons policies • Bullying policies • Social media policies • Cyber bullying policies • Trespassing policies • Housing policies • Harassment policies
Compliance with federal mandates and regulations	This category includes information, pertaining to compliance with Title IX, Clery Act, Campus SaVE act, and the Violence against women reauthorization act of 2013	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existence of annual security report • Definitions per the Clery act • Three most recent years of Clery statistics and locations of reported offenses • Primary prevention, awareness, bystander intervention and risk reduction trainings and programs: ongoing and for new students and employees • Alcohol and drug policies and programs • Educational programs and campaigns to promote the awareness of dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking • Responsible employees • Existence of daily crime log • Timely warning communication methods and procedures • Registered sex offender information • Missing student policy • Current campus policies regarding procedures and options for students and others to report criminal actions or other emergencies occurring on campus • Training for bystanders, responsible employees, and Title IX coordinators • Programs to prevent dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking • Information on preserving evidence and what to do if a sexual assault occurred • How the institution protects confidentiality when reporting • Disciplinary procedures & sanctions articulated to the survivor and accused • Rights of survivors and the accused • Standard of evidence • Protective measures • SaVE Act requirements • Title IX information provided to students • Title IX coordinator information • Non-discrimination notice • Office of the civil rights information • Title IX requirements • Violence against women reauthorization Act of 2013 definitions and requirements • VAWA offenses statistics • statement that the institution of higher education prohibits the offenses of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking

Content Categories	Category defined	Included information
Existence and publication of the institution's policy for sexual assault	This category includes the publication of a sexual assault policy for the institution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sexual assault policies • Sexual misconduct policies • Sexual harassment policies • Title IX policies • Sexual assault policy gaps • Additional definitions related to sexual assault prevention or awareness provided in policies related to sexual assault • Sexual assault definition • Targeted audience in policies • Victim or survivor term used in policies • Mention of different types of sexual assault and rape mentioned in policies • Who is covered under the sexual assault policy?
Resources available on campus & within the community for victim's safety, health, confidentiality	This category includes sexual assault resources mentioned in policies and documents. This does not include any programs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety features and programs on campus • Mutual aid agreements • Medical resources and information • Security and access on campus • Transportation options on campus for survivors and the accused • Interim protective measures • Off campus referrals • Sexual assault groups on campus

APPENDIX D

SAMPLE, STRATA, AND SAMPLE CALCULATION

Number of postsecondary institutions in the United States that award federal student aid
(limited by State and Level of institution)¹

Line | Bar | Table | [Modify Years](#)

Academic Year	Number of postsecondary institutions
2018-19	146
2017-18	161
2016-17	165

Notes: This table presents data items collected from Title IV institutions in the United States. Prior to academic year 2010-11, the data include only Title IV primarily postsecondary institutions.

¹ Results limited by: State (Georgia), Level of institution (Four or more years, At least 2 but less than 4 years, Less than 2 years (below associate)).

SOURCE: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), Institutional Characteristics component (final data).

Institution type	Total number of institutions	Sampling fraction	Sample size
Four year or more private, for profit institutions	7	0.048611111	1
Four year or more private, non-profit institutions	35	0.243055556	9
Four year or more public institutions	27	0.1875	5
Two year private, for profit institutions	12	0.083333333	1
Two year private, non-profit institutions	7	0.048611111	1
Two year public institutions	23	0.159722222	4
Certificate private, non profit institutions	0	0	0
Certificate private, for-profit institutions	31	0.215277778	7
Certificate public institutions	1	0.006944444	1
Total	143	1	29