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Executive Summary

Prevention Working Group

General Considerations

1. An enhanced commitment to prevention is needed; in fact, prevention should be a sustained, organizational priority. Response and infrastructure are important yet these efforts cannot be the sole focus.

2. A coordinated, multidisciplinary, multifaceted approach to prevention is needed, considering three elements of the program, including timing of application, format of delivery, and focus of University population groups.

3. Prevention efforts must be regularly repeated over time – not just implemented once or randomly.

4. Prevention activities should engage the entire University community. Targeted outreach remains important, but cannot be the sole focus.

5. The preventive efforts should be inclusive of the diversity of the University community and be integrated with efforts to improve the climate for under-represented and marginalized groups.

6. More collection and integration of data on incidence and incident characteristics is needed. A greater commitment to program evaluation should be applied.

7. Greater coordination of prevention efforts is needed. Substantial coordination challenges exist; this enhanced coordination is deemed particularly challenging with respect to strategic planning, funding, data collection, and communicating organizational commitment to prevention activities.

8. Our proposed timeline recognizes that organizational, cultural, and climate changes require time to make substantial, lasting change; these efforts should be commenced as soon as possible.

Specific Considerations with Suggested Implementation Schedule

1. Establish a central Office of Prevention in the Division of Student Affairs with appropriate staffing and funding. Two full-time prevention specialists should be hired to lead this office by planning, creating, coordinating, and evaluating a comprehensive prevention program across Grounds on an ongoing basis.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 1.
2. Plan and implement a multifaceted sexual violence prevention program that would build on, integrate, and go beyond the efforts currently underway across the University.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 5.

3. A conceptual framework for prevention efforts is needed. Prevention efforts should articulate and work to realize a positive vision of respect, ethics, health, and safety in students’ interpersonal relationships. This recommendation builds on the concept that effective programs build on students’ positive values and predispositions to act ethically and responsibly.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 3.

4. The University prevention program should combine educational programming that is coordinated, centrally-planned and theory- and evidence-driven, with experimental and innovative programming that allows for student, staff, and faculty input.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Years 3-5.

5. Develop a prevention-oriented education program that addresses the problem of sexual misconduct in a way that contributes to students’ and other University personnel intellectual, moral, and personal development. We recommend that such a program be developed and eventually required of all students.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 3.

6. Methods should be developed for evaluating program outcomes and for determining the effectiveness and suitability of program components. The prevention program should be supported by continuing research efforts, investigating the incidence of sexual misconduct, its risk factors, and the situations that concentrate risk in the University community.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 3.

7. An important part of effective knowledge creation and application is the active exchange of ideas across different fields and with diverse groups of scholars, experts, and practitioners working in different institutions.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 5.

8. The University should further strengthen its efforts to address wellness and safety as values in a coherent and proactive manner in the admissions process, on the University’s website, and in communications with students, prospective applicants, parents, and the community.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Years 1-3.
9. Attempt to aggregate and de-conflict data pertaining to sexual violence (and other crimes) at and around UVa from various reporting points, and make this data readily available and accessible on the UVa Police website, or another suitable website.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 3.

10. For the admissions process, consider adopting an application essay question that messages safety as an important value.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 1.

11. Create a committee within the Admissions Office which uses a systematic and defined process for additional screening of any applicant with concerning issues in the application.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Years 1-3.

12. Ensure that all matriculating students complete post-admission, online training on any number of issues relating to student wellness, safety, and sexual violence. This training should happen before the school year begins. Appropriate University resources should be provided to insure that this training is completed.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 3.

13. The reporting process detailing sexual violence occurrence for members of the University community must be standardized and widely publicized to all members of the University community.

    Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 3.

14. While alcohol-related factors do not play a primary role in the occurrence of sexual violence, inappropriate use does represent a risk issue in these situations. Enhanced educational programs which increase awareness of alcohol and other intoxicating substances, their mode of delivery, and potential impact on the person are also important issues for consideration.

    Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 3.

15. The BASICS program (Brief Alcohol Screen and Intervention for College Students) is a valuable program, useful in the identification of and assistance to the student with a potential alcohol problem. Sustained support, including funding, of this program as well as others is strongly encouraged.

    Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 1.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 1.

17. In addition to the educational programs, we recommend study of potential changes to student culture, including residential life, which would help prevent sexual violence by mitigating risk-associated behaviors. This concept includes environmental and cultural considerations.

   Suggested Implementation -- Completion by Year 3-5.
Recommendations

Prevention Working Group

1. Recommendation 1 (SWG 1, 2, & 3): Centrally-coordinated Prevention Program -- A centrally-coordinated sexual violence prevention program is needed. This program would build on, integrate, and go beyond the efforts currently underway across the University. We believe that a skillfully planned and implemented, multi-faceted prevention program will pay rich dividends in safety and the quality of University life generally, that it will positively affect student recruitment and retention, and that it is critical if UVa is to assume a position of leadership in this area.

2. Recommendation 2 (SWG 1 & 2): Conceptual Framework for Prevention Efforts -- Prevention efforts should articulate and work to realize a positive vision of respect, ethics, health, and safety in students’ interpersonal relationships. This recommendation builds on the concept that effective programs build on students’ positive values and predispositions to act ethically and responsibly, cultivating knowledge and skills for ethical relationships and healthy intimacy, rather than focusing on (and inadvertently perpetuating the salience of) negative stereotypes, attitudes, and behaviors.

3. Recommendation 3 (SWG 1 & 3): Current Prevention Efforts Provide Basis for Enhancement and Expansion -- We recommend extending and enhancing the prevention programs that are already in operation across the University. Consistent with the finding that effective programs are multifaceted, reaching students in diverse ways to provide “varied and layered” educational experiences, we consider the diversity of current prevention programs an asset to be built upon. Significant factors to be considered include event-focused awareness campaigns, Green Dot, peer educational efforts and programs, programming focusing on men’s issues, and the development and teaching of appropriate courses.

4. Recommendation 4 (SWG 1 & 3): Combination of Centrally-Planned, Theory- and Evidence-Driven Programming and Student- and Faculty-Created, Experimental and Innovative Programming -- The University prevention program should combine educational programming that is centrally-planned and theory- and evidence-driven, with programming that is student- and faculty-created, experimental and innovative.

5. Recommendation 5 (SWG 1 & 3): Development of an Effective Educational Program, Combining Voluntary and Mandatory Components -- An important element currently lacking from the University’s prevention portfolio is a prevention education program that addresses the problem of sexual misconduct in a way that contributes to students’ and other University personnel intellectual, moral, and personal development, and that is long enough and intense enough to have a lasting effect on behavior. We recommend that such a program be developed and eventually required of all students.
6. **Recommendation 6 (SWG 1 & 3): Evaluation of Outcomes** -- Methods should be developed for evaluating program outcomes and for determining the effectiveness and suitability of program components. The prevention program should be supported by continuing the research which has begun into the incidence of sexual misconduct, its risk factors, and the situations that concentrate risk in the University community.

7. **Recommendation 7 (SWG 1): University Prevention Efforts Should Include Scholarly Interchange** -- An important part of effective knowledge creation and application is the active exchange of ideas across different fields and with diverse groups of scholars, experts, and practitioners working in different institutions. In the early stages of program development, we expect University employees charged with designing and planning the University’s prevention program to seek inspiration from active researchers in the field and from programs at institutions with leading sexual violence prevention programs in place.

8. **Recommendation 8 (SWG 1 & 2): Address Safety as a Value for Potential Applicants** -- The University should further strengthen its efforts to address safety as a value in a coherent and proactive manner in the admissions process, on the University’s website, and in communications with students, prospective applicants, parents, and community.

9. **Recommendation 9 (SWG 2 & 3): Timely, Accurate, and Repeated Data Collection and Reporting of Sexual Violence** -- Attempt to aggregate and de-conflict data pertaining to sexual violence (and other crimes) at and around UVa from various reporting points, and make this de-identified data readily available and accessible on the UVa Police website, or another suitable website, in a consistent and sustainable fashion.

10. **Recommendation 11 (SWG 1 & 2): The Admissions Process -- The Application Essay** -- Consider adding an application essay question that messages safety as an important value.

11. **Recommendation 12 (SWG 2): The Admissions Process -- The Application Process** -- Rather than maintaining an informal process, create a committee and a clear process within the admissions office that additionally screens any applicant with a concerning issues in the application.

12. **Recommendation 13 (SWG 2): The Admissions Process -- Post-admission, Prior to Matriculation** -- Require all matriculating students to complete post-admission, online training on any number of issues relating to student safety and sexual violence; this approach is similar to the current required alcohol awareness module. This training should happen before the school year begins.

13. **Recommendation 14 (SWG 3): Reporting Process for Victims of Sexual Violence** -- Once a sexual violence event occurs, the ability to easily, safely, and appropriately report the event to the University is mandatory. Reporting options for members of the University community must be standardized and widely publicized to all members of the University
A significant barrier to complete and accurate reporting is that victims and their informal contacts still do not understand reporting options.

14. **Recommendation 15 (SWG 4): Educational Focus on Alcohol Use / Other Intoxicating Substance Misuse and Sexual Violence** -- Excessive and inappropriate use of alcohol and other intoxicating substances does contribute to an increased risk of sexual violence. While alcohol-related factors do not play a primary role in the occurrence of sexual violence, inappropriate use does represent a significant risk issue in these situations. Appropriate, safe, and legal consumption of alcohol is an important part of health education and general preventive health issues. Furthermore, an awareness of other intoxicating substances, their mode of delivery, and potential impact on the person are also important issues for consideration.

15. **Recommendation 15 (SWG 4): Support and Treatment Programs for the Alcohol Misuser / Abuser** -- The BASICS program (Brief Alcohol Screen and Intervention for College Students) is a valuable program, useful in the identification of and assistance to the student with a potential alcohol problem. This program is listed on the National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices as a valuable and effective tool to assist in matters of substance misuse and abuse. Additional support, including funding, of this program as well as others is strongly encouraged.


17. **Recommendation 17 (SWG 5): Additional Infrastructure Considerations** – Several features of the University Safety Working Group warrant additional consideration, including the University Ambassador (escort) service and Emergency Phone system.

18. **Recommendation 18 (SWG 5): University Hospital Sexual Violence Reports** -- Provide the data to the appropriate Medical Center leadership for review and subsequent action. A summary of incidents reported in the UVa Hospital is included in the reference material section.
Discussion of Recommendations

**Recommendation 1 (SWG 1, 2, & 3): Centrally-coordinated Prevention Program** -- A centrally-coordinated sexual violence prevention program is needed. This program would build on, integrate, and go beyond the efforts currently underway across the University. We believe that a skillfully planned and implemented, multi-faceted prevention program will pay rich dividends in safety and the quality of University life generally, that it will positively affect student recruitment and retention, and that it is critical if UVa is to assume a position of leadership in this area.

The prevention activities we recommend are consistent with and necessary to the University’s central mission of developing “the full potential of talented students from all walks of life” and serving “the Commonwealth of Virginia, the nation, and the world by developing responsible citizen leaders and professionals.” They further the University’s “commitment to a vibrant and unique residential learning environment,” and put into practice its “unwavering support of a collaborative, diverse community bound together by distinctive foundational values of honor, integrity, trust, and respect” (UVa Mission Statement).

Student and other University personnel are concerned with safety and value programs that aim to prevent sexual violence on Grounds; furthermore, effective prevention requires significant organizational commitment and effort. It is strongly suggested that a greater effort to reduce the incidence of sexual violence and misconduct in our community will accomplish the following important goals: [1] improve the experience of students and other personnel at the University; [2] avert the needless suffering and traumatization experienced by violence and misconduct victims; [3] prevent the socialization of some University members in destructive and criminal behaviors associated with perpetration; and [4] foster greater social and moral development for students that will carry over into their future careers, families, and communities, positively influencing the lives of others beyond the University.

The characteristics and features of this coordinated prevention program include the following:

- **Office of Prevention:** The organizational priority and importance of prevention to the mission of the University should be reflected in the creation of an office to plan, create, coordinate, publicize, track, and evaluate a comprehensive prevention program across Grounds on an ongoing basis. Such an office would work with the Deans of Students, Elson Student Health Center, Maxine Platzer Lynn Women’s Center, Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life, student organizations, Athletics, and academic departments and centers that offer relevant programming and curriculum. This office could not be housed within any of these areas as it will need to advocate and operate effectively at the University-wide level. Given the distribution of stakeholders regarding the issues it will address and the solutions it will create and facilitate, it might be appropriate for oversight of this office to be partly the
function of an advisory board consisting of constituency representatives and relevant experts and practitioners from across Grounds.

- **Design of Prevention Program:** The design and planning of a comprehensive prevention program is itself a large undertaking that will require appropriate staffing and funding. We recognize that University resources are impacted by the needs of compliance and ensuring appropriate response when sexual violence occurs, but if “institutions are only devoting resources to response, they will always be responding to sexual violence” (ACPA 2015, p. 13). Adequate resources must be allocated for prevention as well. Our EverFi consultant estimates that 8 FTE are needed for prevention on a campus of 20,000 students, along with a programming and operating budget of $9.75/student.

- **Evaluation and Planning of Program Development:** Despite recent advances, prevention efforts are still sorely limited by a shortage of staff and resources in virtually all areas. We recommend hiring two, full-time trained prevention specialists in the very near term to lead the strategic planning and design process needed to develop the program, in consultation with relevant specialists and stakeholders on Grounds. Sexual violence prevention must be a focus of comprehensive strategic planning at UVa, as it has been at several of our peer institutions. The ideal individuals to lead this process would have previous campus prevention experience as well as relevant teaching (and possibly research) experience in an allied field like public health or applied medical anthropology; these individuals could be affiliated faculty with academic departments.

- **University Leadership Articulation of Commitment to Prevention Efforts:** A commitment to prevention and safety should continue to be articulated by University leaders in public statements. We applaud President Sullivan for her steadiness of focus on the opportunity and need for constructive change to improve student safety at the University, amidst the turning controversy surrounding news reporting on campus rape. While this controversy around reporting can be divisive, ensuring the safety of all students is a value that unites the University community. It can serve as a touchstone for our attempts to improve it.

**Recommendation 2 (SWG 1 & 2): Conceptual Framework for Prevention Efforts** -- Prevention efforts should articulate and work to realize a positive vision of respect, ethics, health, and safety in students’ interpersonal relationships. This recommendation builds on the concept that effective programs build on students’ positive values and predispositions to act ethically and responsibly, cultivating knowledge and skills for ethical relationships and healthy intimacy, rather than focusing on (and inadvertently perpetuating the salience of) negative stereotypes, attitudes, and behaviors.

The characteristics and features of this conceptual framework include the following:
• Conceptual Focus: The University prevention program should use a conceptual framework and language that does not overemphasize legal categories of criminal conduct like rape, assault, and harassment. To the extent possible, it should foreground positive ethical values such as respect, responsibility, safety, trust, and mutual care. It should promote students’ exploration of their own values, aspirations, and the moral aspects of their own identities. It should also be centered in notions of health: health of the body, healthy relationships, healthy gender identities, healthy community (DeGue 2012a, 2012b).

• The Concept of Honor as it Relates to Prevention: Stakeholders at the University have spoken to ways that adapt the Honor idea of the University as a “community of trust” by extending it to gender violence prevention. This strikes us as consistent with the finding that effective prevention programs are culturally relevant; they are “sensitive to and reflective of community norms and cultural beliefs” (DeGue 2014, p. 357). Purely as a prevention concept, we like the idea of promoting an expanded interpretation of the “community of trust” as one of interpersonal safety, respect, and ethics.

• Students and other stakeholders should be engaged wherever possible as partners in achieving the shared aim of creating a safe and inclusive campus social environment distinguished by respect of all University members, with a special focus on modeling respect in interactions with students new to the community and strengthening the basis for trust among all students. It is especially important to engage the student leaders of fraternities, athletic teams, and other organizations that sponsor high risk activities by high-impact programs that will motivate and train them to lead, active ongoing efforts (not one-off events) within their own organizations towards achieving these aims.

• The Concept and the Importance of Diversity: The conceptual framework and language of prevention on Grounds should be inclusive of the diversity of the University community, and prevention programming should go hand in hand with efforts to improve the climate for underrepresented and marginalized groups.

Recommendation 3 (SWG 1 & 3): Current Prevention Efforts Provide Basis for Enhancement and Expansion -- We recommend extending and enhancing the prevention programs that are already in operation across the University. Consistent with the finding that effective programs are multi-faceted, reaching students in diverse ways to provide “varied and layered” educational experiences (ACPA 2015, p. 5), we consider the diversity of current prevention programs an asset to be built upon. Significant factors to be considered include the following:

• Event-focused Awareness Campaigns: Event-focused awareness campaigns, while not sufficient in themselves for preventing sexual misconduct and violence, are effective in increasing knowledge of strategies for risk awareness and reduction, and in publicizing more in-depth resources for helping prevent violence and supporting survivors.
• Green Dot: Green Dot at UVa, the bystander intervention education program, was launched only last month and should continue to be supported to facilitate as wide a basis of participation as possible.

• Peer Education – Existing and Suggested: Existing peer education programs should be strengthened. Better supervision and training is needed by the student volunteer peer educators who operate “One in Four” and “One Less”—the two programs focally concerned with sexual violence prevention. These volunteers currently receive limited or no training in facilitation and motivational methods. The one-time discussion sessions that these two programs provide are used by many student organizations, as well as by fraternities for compliance under Fraternity Organization Agreements as one of their three mandatory annual trainings (on hazing, alcohol, and sexual misconduct). These programs should be enhanced and developed into a tiered, developmentally sequenced set of offerings that avoid repetition and numbing when audiences receive the same presentation multiple times. Currently many students who participate undergo the same program year after year. This approach instead allows students to build productively on their participation in prior sessions. These programs would also benefit from improved follow-up, including collection and analysis of participant feedback and the development of additional means of assessment.

• Programming and Men’s Issues: Programming around men’s issues, which at present is limited to the “Men’s Leadership Project” (MLP) described above, should be expanded. There is also room for strengthening and expanding MLP itself, which is a valuable and unique program nationally.

• Development and Teaching of Appropriate Courses: The teaching of relevant courses across Grounds should be encouraged. Existing courses should be made more visible by listing on a common website (ideally, that of the prevention office). To promote the creation of new courses (and related curricular initiatives), course development funding could be offered though a small grants program.

Recommendation 4 (SWG 1 & 3): Combination of Centrally- Planned, Theory- and Evidence-Driven Programming and Student- and Faculty- Created, Experimental and Innovative Programming -- The University prevention program should combine educational programming that is centrally-planned and theory- and evidence-driven, with programming that is student- and faculty-created, experimental and innovative. It is more likely that a professionally-designed program developed on the basis of accepted theories, research findings, and expert knowledge will produce desired behavioral outcomes effectively and efficiently. But there can be disadvantages when a program is externally developed without local content and overly centralized, rigid, or dependent on a single set of ideas. It has been found that effective programs engage students, as well as staff and faculty, as active contributors in a shared project of change (e.g., producing a culture of safety, trust, and respect). Thus, it is important that there be enough flexibility in the program to allow those students and other University personnel who
want to take an active role in solving this real-world problem to do so, on the understanding that such problem-solving often motivates very deep, active learning and facilitates experimentation and innovation.

Faculty must also need to be engaged by the program -- not just as consumers of professionally-produced educational content, but as content producers, researchers, and educators in their own right. Open-endedness is consistent with a comprehensive planning process and strategic objectives. But it is fundamental to the University’s spirit of discovery that open inquiry, experimentation, and innovation be actively encouraged on prevention topics, and it is this that will provide for the University, in time, to become a leader in this area.

Prevention programs, including educational approaches, should focus on all members of the population. Targeted interventions and outreach are important, but they cannot be the sole prevention focus. Interventions should regularly and repeatedly target all undergraduates, all graduate students, all staff, and all faculty. Overcoming barriers to complete and accurate reporting requires widespread learning and cultural change.

Prevention efforts should be managed with a tactical calendar of regular and repeated milestones. Milestones should be established and coordinated at top administrative levels. Annual milestones should be associated with a single responsible individual or office. Disclosure of results relative to milestones should be mandatory and regularized. Coordination problems and ad hoc communication efforts are important barriers to complete and accurate reporting.

**Recommendation 5 (SWG 1 & 3): Development of an Effective Educational Program, Combining Voluntary and Mandatory Components** -- An important element currently lacking from the University’s prevention portfolio is a prevention education program that addresses the problem of sexual misconduct in a way that contributes to students’ and other University personnel intellectual, moral, and personal development, and that is long enough and intense enough to have a lasting effect on behavior. We recommend that such a program be developed and eventually required of all students. A program that is required is the only way to reach every student; we cannot expect that students will otherwise “simply know” how to avoid and discourage sexual misconduct and violence, without education to prepare them to do so. Prevention educators at other colleges and universities note that mandatory programs do not elicit resentment when required courses are well-designed and when they encourage peer discussion of topics like sexual ethics, gender identity, and relationship health that are very interesting to students because they affect them personally; and they have also said that their own schools have successfully instituted prevention education requirements that receive high scores in participant surveys (Kilmartin and Berkowitz 2005; Capraro interview).

One suggested approach to such an educational program is based on a recent discussion involving UVa students and the Chair of SWG 1. In this vision, students would choose from a menu of options for meeting the prevention requirement. Relatively standard options would be
shorter and easier, but there would also be more experimental, creative program options, perhaps requiring a greater commitment of the students’ time. Examples of the latter might include an optional, prevention-focused discussion section added by an instructor to a regular academic course on a related topic (the special section would meet, say, five or six times over the course of the semester); an in-person training workshop that would provide knowledge and skills for students who wished to create and lead prevention programs of their own for student near-peers; or co-creating and co-leading a student-designed alternative program after undergoing the training workshop and meeting other requirements. Every first year student might be required to choose two programs, each consisting of 3-5 one-hour sessions, with high-risk students like athletes and Greeks choosing one program more. In the student’s later years, two or three advanced programs might be required in order to graduate; these could include the training workshop and other pathways by which highly motivated students could assume leadership roles in prevention themselves. Research findings suggest that education program components should be predominantly in-person, as opposed to online, and include pedagogically effective, interactive activities such as role-playing and communications skills exercises. The program should include opportunities for involvement by University graduate students. Though the social worlds of graduate students and undergraduates are in many ways separate, the graduate students are often regarded by undergraduates as “relatable” near-peers whose experience and leadership would be valuable in discussions of topics like masculinity, femininity, and sexual misconduct prevention. There appear to be many graduate students who are interested in the goal of reducing sexual misconduct and violence, and who would be willing to undergo relevant training to participate in prevention education activities. This vision is presented merely as an illustration of a way of organizing prevention education in such a way that it reaches students at different times and allows a mix of standardization and flexibility.

The parameters of any one program would be consonant with the findings of prevention effectiveness research: content culturally relevant, format lively and varied, pedagogical strategies effective and engaging (i.e., including active learning and role playing, not only monologic delivery), messages positive (e.g. to men: not “don't rape” but “how do you live your values as a man in an intimate relationship?”). Such a course would engage students in preventing sexual misconduct and violence in the context of topics like healthy masculinities and femininities; hyper masculinity; sexual ethics and respectful intimacy; “consent as a process;” the variety of social norms conveyed in peer expectations, organizational cultures, and event framings; men’s and women’s wellness including alcohol and drug abuse, and the idea of the University as a “community of trust, respect, and safety” for all members. Variant versions of such a program might be tailored to particular campus communities like newly matriculating students, residence halls, student organizations, and academic programs and majors; they may also include content designed to be relevant to specific identity categories such as women or men of color, international students, immigrant students, LGBTQ students, students with disabilities, and sexual misconduct survivors.
In addition to a universal requirement, intended to reduce sexual misconduct and violence in the whole population, the University should develop high-impact mandatory educational programs for individuals belonging to at-risk groups like fraternity members and athletes, as well as individuals who exhibit risk factors like alcohol abuse or have been the subject of misconduct complaints (Capone et al. 2007).

**Recommendation 6 (SWG 1 & 3): Evaluation of Outcomes** -- Methods should be developed for evaluating program outcomes and for determining the effectiveness and suitability of program components. The prevention program should be supported by continuing the research which has begun into the incidence of sexual misconduct, its risk factors, and the situations that concentrate risk in the University community.

**Recommendation 7 (SWG 1): University Prevention Efforts Should Include Scholarly Interchange** -- An important part of effective knowledge creation and application is the active exchange of ideas across different fields and with diverse groups of scholars, experts, and practitioners working in different institutions. In the early stages of program development, we expect University employees charged with designing and planning the University’s prevention program to seek inspiration from active researchers in the field and from programs at institutions (e.g. the University of New Hampshire, University of Michigan, Michigan State, and Emory) with leading sexual violence prevention programs in place.

Sexual violence prevention must be a focus of comprehensive strategic planning and outcome evaluation at UVA, as it has been at several of our peer institutions. While we should not follow other institutions blindly, assuming that what works in another institution will be appropriate for the University of Virginia, neither should we proceed in a vacuum of knowledge about promising efforts being undertaken elsewhere. As a first step, we recommend conducting site visits to 3-5 campuses with long-established, successful prevention programs, as well as bringing to Grounds a number of experienced practitioners and prominent researchers for public symposium presentations and extensive additional consultations with those involved in the design and planning process on Grounds.

We also recommend organizing a regular series of events, or ongoing interdisciplinary expert/faculty workshop that would bring together those already working on prevention-related research across Grounds, in areas like alcohol and substance abuse prevention science, violence prevention science, relationships and socio-emotional learning, cultural change, curriculum development, and the ethnography of youth and campus cultures in sociology and anthropology.

Such exchange of knowledge provides a sound way forward to a position of sustainable leadership as the University develops its own experience and capacity in the effective reduction of the incidence of sexual misconduct and violence.

**Recommendation 8 (SWG 1 & 2): Address Safety as a Value for Potential Applicants** -- The University should further strengthen its efforts to address safety as a value in a coherent and
proactive manner in the admissions process, on the University’s website, and in communications with students, prospective applicants, parents, and community. While parents and students may once have presupposed that college is an unusually safe place, it is no longer realistic or even helpful to maintain such assumptions. In addition, this year’s application numbers suggest that interest in attending UVa has been impacted by recent negative -- and much inaccurate -- press coverage related to safety at UVa...thus, it is important that UVa have a strong, proactive and transparent position on safety as a value, as a priority, and as a mission.

Specific features of this recommendation include the following:

- Increase transparency for parents and prospective students with respect to issues related to safety and sexual violence. (8/2015)

- Support training for University Guides to prepare for questions about sexual violence and other safety and preventive issues. (9/2015)

- Increase transparency on issues of safety on the university’s website, including the admissions website. (8/2015). The following websites of peer institutions are potentially useful:

  - Consider the University of Michigan (http://dpss.umich.edu/) and Georgetown (https://police.georgetown.edu) -- both institutions have “safety alerts” placed on their Police Department websites, posting certain crimes (e.g. sexual assault, bias-related incident, burglary) prominently and quickly. These websites also have quick links to daily/weekly/monthly crime logs so that students and parents can understand at a glance what crimes may occur on campus and with what frequency.

  - Consider University of Michigan’s Admissions page for Health and Safety where there is direct mention of their values regarding sexual assault prevention, and they give the topic equal billing with campus safety, health services and counseling. We suggest linking directly to UVa’s Sexual Violence page (http://www.virginia.edu/sexualviolence/) from an admissions page so that students and parents do not have to “hunt” in order to see that UVa is already thoughtfully addressing this important topic. If information is difficult to find, parents and students may infer that assistance is hard to find as well. See screenshot taken from this admissions webpage at University of Michigan: http://admissions.umich.edu/life-michigan/health-safety.

  - University of Pennsylvania Police Department (http://www.upenn.edu/life-at-penn/safety.php) offer some nice features including Department of Public Safety.

Admissions webpage, Univ. of Michigan: http://admissions.umich.edu/life-michigan/health-safety
“Top 10 List”, along with information on a service called “Penn Guardian” which allows students to register their cell phones with the Department of Public Safety to provide information rapidly in case of emergency.

**Recommendation 9 (SWG 2 & 3): Timely, Accurate, and Repeated Data Collection and Reporting of Sexual Violence** — Attempt to aggregate and de-conflict data pertaining to sexual violence (and other crimes) at and around UVa from various reporting points (UVa Police, SARA, CAPS, Women’s Center), and make this de-identified data readily available and accessible on the UVa Police website, or another suitable website. An example is data describing occurrence of sexual violence as reported to the City of Charlottesville and University of Virginia Police Departments; this information is depicted on schematics compiled from these law enforcement records (see SWG #5 report in Appendix E and Crime Analysis Mapping in Appendix F). The data spanned multiple years and provided information regarding victims, suspects, victim/suspect relationship, types of crimes, locations, day of the week, times, alcohol use, delay in reporting, and much more. This data should be carefully analyzed and consistent metrics for future data collection should be established so trends can be identified and tracked on a yearly basis. For the purposes of our working group, appropriate data should be linked to UVa websites, including the admissions page. When data is difficult to find, students, applicants, and parents may erroneously conclude that the University wishes to hide such information or that the University is not adequately addressing or prioritizing the issue.

Availability of the data also would allow students to be proactive and potentially avoid risk. More broadly and importantly, follow-on groups or subject matters experts need to analyze this data to make more granular recommendations regarding future best practices as this data best illustrates the nature and magnitude of the issue. (8/2015 with continual updates/improvements).

UVa should collect and maintain reporting data and survey data on incidence, and all data should be coordinated and centrally managed. The effects of prevention programs can only be fully understood with systematic data. The university should develop a plan for regular and repeated dissemination of summarized and de-identified incidence data.

Reporting data and survey data on incidence must be collected and analyzed regularly and consistently within years and across years. Incidence, trends, and prevention program effectiveness can only be understood with standardized and comparable data. We recommend organizational commitment to program evaluation over time.

Assign the responsibility, authority, and accountability to a University entity to collect, integrate, process, analyze, and distribute information from all the sources that receive reports of sexual violence against members of the University community. This information is a valuable, relatively untapped resource for on-going prevention, culture, and response efforts.
Consider adding an application essay question that messages safety as an important value. A draft of a potential question might resemble the following:

The University of Virginia Honor System is the nation's oldest student-run honor system and one of UVa’s most cherished institutions. Meanwhile violence including sexual assault is a concern nationwide including on college campuses. Comment on how UVa’s honor ideals could be embraced to help address this potential issue including from the perspective of the: (i) victim, (ii) accused, and (iii) institution.

This approach would not only highlight the importance of safety in general and the prevention of sexual violence in particular but also link these concepts to an established, honored, and valued feature of the University, honor and the Honor System.

Rather than maintaining an informal process, create a committee and a clear process within the admissions office that additionally screens any applicant with a concerning issues in the application. (9/2015) It is noted that the value of background checks and related applicant pool-wide investigations is very limited and concerning. Thus, these widespread evaluations are not recommended. Rather, a focused, systematic process of review is needed if an issue of concern is noted in an application.

For transfer students, require “Dean’s Letters” from previous institutions, specifically including all previous universities or colleges attended by the transfer student, not just an interim community college. The goal is to reduce the likelihood of “whitewashing” prior dangerous behavior. Background checks may also be required. (6/2015)

Consider an alumni interviewing program, or other in-person events, in an effort to create more face-to-face interactions in the interview/admissions process. (Ongoing)

Recommendation 13 (SWG 2): The Admissions Process – Post-admission, Prior to Matriculation -- Require all matriculating students to complete post-admission, online training on any number of issues relating to student safety and sexual violence; this approach is similar to the current required alcohol awareness module. This training should happen before the school year begins. For more specific recommendations on training programs, we found the “Preventing Sexual Violence on College Campuses: Lessons from Research and Practice” paper, (prepared by the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault) quite informative. For example of such a program, see online education in sexual assault prevention offered by Everfi based in Washington DC (www.everfi.com). (5/2016)

Recommendation 14 (SWG 3): Reporting Process for Victims of Sexual Violence -- Once a sexual violence event occurs, the ability to easily, safely, and appropriately report the event to the University is mandatory. Reporting options for members of the University community must
be standardized and widely publicized to all members of the University community. A significant barrier to complete and accurate reporting is that victims and their informal contacts still do not understand reporting options.

**Recommendation 15 (SWG 4): Educational Focusing on Alcohol Use / Other Intoxicating Substance Misuse and Sexual Violence** -- Excessive and inappropriate use of alcohol and other intoxicating substances does contribute to an increased risk of sexual violence. While alcohol-related factors do not play a primary role in the occurrence of sexual violence, inappropriate use does represent a significant risk issue in these situations. Appropriate, safe, and legal consumption of alcohol is an important part of health education and general preventive health issues. Furthermore, an awareness of other intoxicating substances, their mode of delivery, and potential impact on the person are also important issues for consideration.

A majority of second-, third-, and fourth-year students (i.e., non-first year students) do not receive ongoing alcohol education. A subset of these students, including fraternities, sororities and varsity athletes do receive some form of education yet a large portion of the remaining student body is not appropriately educated with respect to alcohol and its health effects, both short- and long-term.

Age- and experience-appropriate education must be provided on an ongoing basis. In addition, a stronger focus can be considered during high-risk periods of alcohol and other substance misuse, such as the “Block Party,” “Fourth-year Fifth,” Halloween, and the Foxfield races in the spring; furthermore, high-risk populations at high-risk periods, i.e., first-year students in the first week / first month of the fall semester, can also be educated and supported appropriately regarding these risk behaviors.

As is appropriate in other areas of prevention programs, including educational sessions, a multi-faceted, multi-tiered awareness program is necessary. Furthermore, a larger and more robust discussion is needed for first-year students, likely lead by the resident assistant or other peer educator, within the first several days of their arrival at the University.

**Recommendation 15 (SWG 4): Support and Treatment Programs for the Alcohol Misuser / Abuser** -- The BASICS program (Brief Alcohol Screen and Intervention for College Students) is a valuable program, useful in the identification of and assistance to the student with a potential alcohol problem. This program is listed on the National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices as a valuable and effective tool to assist in matters of substance misuse and abuse. Additional support, including funding, of this program as well as others is strongly encouraged.

The University is in need of an improved means of identifying students with alcohol problems. Furthermore, an improved means of supporting these students with respect to the substance abuse is needed.
Student and University community awareness of alcohol support and treatment programs is needed. Current efforts are not centralized, thus coordination of public relations, student awareness of services provided, etc is needed.


**Recommendation 17 (SWG 5): Additional Infrastructure Considerations** – Several features of the University Safety Working Group warrant additional mention, including the University Ambassador (escort) service and Emergency Phone system. These programs include the following:

- University Ambassador program coverage – develop a method to evaluate and correlate ambassador coverage to reduced risk of sexual violence. Subcommittee 5’s understanding is that the University of Pennsylvania ambassador program depends on a staffing level that provides essentially line-of-sight coverage. Is that needed near UVa?

- Emergency phone signage and simplicity of operation – Safety Working Group report, page 8, recommends next steps to include “Examine all interior (e)phones and create consistency in signage and type of phone.” Subcommittee 5 recommends extending this initiative to include exterior blue light phones. Facilities Management’s electrical distribution group is considering an assessment of the exterior blue light phone units and could include data gathering toward this goal.

**Recommendation 18 (SWG 5): University Hospital Sexual Violence Reports** -- Provide the data to the appropriate Medical Center leadership for review and subsequent action. A summary of incidents reported in the UVa Hospital is included in the reference material section.
1. What are the characteristics of a successful sexual violence prevention program? Is there evidence that certain approaches are more successful than others and how robust is that evidence? Based on these considerations, what might the University of Virginia consider to augment its current prevention programs?

2. What can be done in UVa’s initial contacts with future applicants to convey the significance of a safe campus culture? What if anything can be done in the admissions process to reduce the likelihood of admitting a violence-prone student?

3. Is it known whether an active sexual violence prevention program affects the reporting of sexual violence, either positively or negatively? What role should student and advocacy groups play?

4. Not every sexual assault involves alcohol, but alcohol abuse can be a contributing factor and is an issue in its own right. How can the University better handle the issues surrounding alcohol? Are there other issues of drug use and abuse that should be considered?

5. What environmental changes (changes in physical infrastructure or transportation, for example) are most likely to be effective in preventing sexual violence?
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Methodology
Prevention Working Group

At the initial meeting of the Prevention Working Group (PWG), the members were queried as to their area(s) of interest and expertise as related to the prevention of sexual violence. Based upon the stated interests and abilities, the PWG was separated into five Sub-working Groups (SWG), aligned with the five elements of the PWG charge. The five SWG were created, including:

Sub-working Group #1 – Prevention Programs
Sub-working Group #2 – Admissions
Sub-working Group #3 – Reporting & Student Advocacy
Sub-working Group #4 – Alcohol & Drugs
Sub-working Group #5 – Infrastructure

The PWG met biweekly with preset agenda items. PWG members attended the various meetings, in person and via teleconference. Focused and free discussion was entertained at each meeting. In addition, the exchange of information was encouraged across all five SWG; any PWG member was able to attend any SWG meeting. In PWG meetings, each SWG reported on its progress with commentary provided by the entire working group.

Each SWG was assigned a chair, a co-chair, and members. Each SWG met at intervals determined by their membership. The SWG chair and co-chair remained in communication with the PWG Chair and Administrative Lead Personnel as needed / as appropriate.

Preliminary and final reports were prepared by each SWG and submitted to the PWG Chair and Administrative Lead Personnel. PWG preliminary and final reports were developed, based upon the SWG reports. Final PWG report was provided to the entire Prevention Working Group for review prior to the final meeting on April 27, 2015. At this meeting, the final report was discussed and edited as appropriate.

At the final PWG meeting, the Chair and Administrative Lead Personnel recognized the considerable effort, work, and time expended by its members in the development of this report.

The PWG final report was presented / submitted to President Sullivan and the Ad Hoc Committee on Climate and Culture on April 30, 2015.
Schedule of Meetings
Prevention Working Group

- **February 4, 2015** -- Prevention Working Group (PWG) #1
- **February 16, 2015** – PWG #2
- **March 2, 2015** – PWG Town Hall Session
- **March 4, 2015** – PWG #3
- **March 16, 2015** – PWG #4
- **March 25, 2015** – Preliminary Report to Ah Hoc Group
- **March 31, 2015** – PWG #5
- **April 13, 2015** - PWG #6
- **April 27, 2015** – PWG #7
- **April 30, 2015** – Meeting with Ad Hoc Group
- **Weekly / as needed** -- PWG Sub-Work Group Meetings
- **As needed** – Meetings with other Working Group Chairs
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Sub-working Group #1 – Prevention Programs

Submitted April 17, 2015
Chair: Ira Bashkow
Co-Chair: Nicole Thomas
Members: Milton Nichols, Diane Charles

Background
In February 2015 our Subgroup was charged with answering the following questions:

What are the characteristics of a successful sexual violence prevention program? Is there evidence that certain approaches are more successful than others and how robust is that evidence? Based on these considerations, what might the University of Virginia consider to augment its current prevention programs?

To answer these questions we sought and reviewed research on causes of sexual violence and the effectiveness of programs to reduce its incidence in university settings.
We interpret sexual violence prevention as strategies and activities for preventing the occurrence of sexual and gender-based misconduct, including but not limited to sexual harassment, sexual assault, intimate partner violence, date rape, target rape, and gender-based coercion and interpersonal violence.
In addition to meeting several times to share perspectives and knowledge, the work of our Subgroup consisted in:

1. gathering information on the University’s current prevention efforts including event-focused awareness programs, bystander intervention programs, risk awareness and reduction education programs, ongoing peer education programs, and academic courses and research;
2. reviewing the prevention research literature including peer-reviewed articles, books, and organizational reports;
3. interviewing sexual violence prevention researchers, experts, and practitioners;
4. consulting with relevant experts on-Grounds;
5. circulating preliminary recommendations to on-Grounds experts and stakeholders and receiving their feedback; and
6. holding a discussion of prevention strategies and recommendations with undergraduate students.¹

¹ A list of research sources and experts consulted is given in Appendices C and D.
Research Findings
We found that there is a considerable body of research available to guide prevention efforts. This includes new high-level reviews of primary studies produced by the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (DeGue et al. 2014), the Presidential Task Force on Sexual Violence Prevention in Higher Education (ACPA 2015), and other research groups (e.g., Jewkes et al. 2014), partly in response to the White House’s 2014 “call to action” to protect students from sexual assault. The available evidence does not provide validation of a single solution that is universally applicable, and only a limited number of primary studies have evaluated the impact of specific interventions on rates of occurrence of sexually violent behavior using rigorous methodologies involving randomization or long-term follow-up (DeGue 2014, p. 356). Nevertheless, the large number of quantitative and careful qualitative studies that have been conducted over the last forty years does provide an adequate basis for generalization “about the characteristics of effective prevention strategies,” particularly when interpreted in light of other fields of public health prevention science such as alcohol and drug abuse (DeGue et al. 2014, p. 356; DeGue et al. 2012; Tharp et al. 2012; Nation 2010; Vivolo 2010). We believe that the following points are supported by existing research:

1. Students are concerned with safety and value educational and other programs that aim to prevent sexual violence on campus (Garcia 2012).

2. Effective prevention requires organizational commitment and effort. It is unrealistic to expect that students, faculty, and staff will “simply know” how to create a campus social environment free of sexual and gender-based misconduct and violence in the absence of well-designed education, concerted effort, and organizational support (Brown 2015, p. 5). Sexual violence is a problem that is longstanding and widely distributed in populations in the U.S. and elsewhere (Ellsberg 2014). Although there is evidence to suggest that “primary prevention efforts may be best targeted at younger populations—before college,” the University of Virginia (and universities generally) cannot assume that students’ previous schools will provide this experience (De Gue 2014, p. 356).

3. While short online modules may serve important purposes of information dissemination, countering rape myths, and compliance with legal requirements, reviews of existing studies have “consistently found” that “brief, one session educational interventions to change awareness, knowledge, or attitudes/beliefs” do not have “lasting effects on risk factors or behavior” (CDC 2014, p. 8). As such programs form the vast majority of interventions that have been studied, this finding should be considered robust (DeGue 2014, p. 357). Effective programs involve multiple sessions over longer periods of time. They must provide enough contact hours if they are to have an effect on participants’ behavior that is lasting and transferable from the program context to daily life contexts where sexual relations and relationship violence may potentially take place (DeGue 2014, pp. 357; Tharp et al. 2012).
4. Effective programs are multi-faceted and multi-leveled, reaching students in diverse ways at different times through multiple entry points. Crucially they involve a mixture of both community specific entry points like newly matriculating students, residence halls, fraternities and sororities, student organizations, athletic teams, honors students, and academic programs and majors, and identity specific entry points such as women, men, students of color, international students, immigrant students, LGBTQ students, students with disabilities, and sexual misconduct survivors (ACPA 2015, p. 5). They also require both universal components, addressing the entire student population as well as staff and faculty, and selective components that target high-risk sub-sets like athletes, Greeks, and individuals who have been the subject of prior complaints (Humphrey and Kahn 2000; Sanday 2007; Boswell and Spade 1999; Armstrong et al. 2006; Locke and Mahalik 2005; Vivolo 2010; Vagi et al. 2013, p. 646; McCray 2014).

5. Effective programs build on students’ positive values and predispositions to act ethically and responsibly. They cultivate knowledge and communication and other skills for “ethical intimacy and healthy relationships” (ACPA 2015, p. 5; Tharp et al. 2012). By contrast, programs that center on disapproval of negative attitudes and behaviors sometimes produce negative effects including resentment, perceptions of being blamed, and unintentional reinforcement of the undesired attitudes and behaviors (Kilmartin and Berkowitz 2005, p. 80).

6. Effective programs address social norms and other forms of social influence like peer expectations, bonding practices, media images, organizational cultures, and event framings (both informal and formal) that are “factors beyond the individual level” that shape people’s behavior, complicating overly simple models of autonomously-driven behavioral choice (DeGue 2014, p. 356; Tharp et al. 2012; Adams-Curtis et al. 2004; Armstrong 2006; Cowley 2014, p. 1273). Some research points to a need to engage students in changing social norms that allow sexual violence, while other literature suggests that what is needed is primarily the correction of “norm misperceptions,” since students tend to overestimate negative expectations and behaviors on the part of their peers, underestimating the prevalence of expectations and behaviors that are healthy and positive (Boswell and Spade 1996, p. 144; Jewkes 2014, Kilmartin and Berkowitz 2005, Buelow 2015, ACPA 2015, p. 7).

7. Some research and practitioner experience indicates that the programs which are most effective for college men are gender-segregated. This facilitates men’s recognition that certain norms of masculinity are “implicated in violence,” and that “all men… have a positive part to play in helping stop violence against women” by influencing the norms of masculinity that are legitimated in their own surroundings (Jewkes 2014, p.1). But since productive “discussion of changing social norms” depends on “acknowledgment that multiple ways of being a man exist, and that men’s experiences and positions shift[,] interventions that offer simplistic and homogenous portrayals of ideal masculinity are not helpful” (p. 6). Effective programs thus address the heterogeneity and multiplicity of versions

---

2A relevant expert on this on Grounds is Patrick Tolan, as noted below.
of masculinity, including traditionally acclaimed ideals of masculinity, exaggerated (or “hyper”) masculinities that emphasize dominance over women and the capacity for violence, alternative masculinities, historical change, and aspirational masculinities associated with students’ own positive values and desired ways of expressing their gender identity (DeGue 2014, p. 358; Anderson 2008; Kilmartin and Berkowitz 2005; Locke and Mahalik 2005; Capraro interviews).

8. Effective programs are culturally relevant to students, allowing students to connect with the values, problems, and scenarios under discussion (Nation 2003). Programs should reflect and further the values of the University community in its diversity. This means the inclusion of participants in planning content relevant to specific racial or ethnic groups, such as Asian-Pacific Islander, African-American, Latino/a, and Native American; the use of language inclusive of different types of relationships, including LGBTQ relationships; and “recognition of the historical context in which sexual violence occurs in communities of color and indigenous communities” (DeGue 2014, p. 357; Brown 2015, p. 12).

9. Effective programs use effective pedagogical strategies. The format is lively and varied, and the techniques employed are engaging and active, including role playing and active learning through facilitated peer discussion and problem solving, with the goal of promoting leadership and self-awareness, as opposed to merely passive acceptance of preset, authoritative answers for recall on tests. This finding is attested by well-developed bodies of research on learning generally and on prevention research in other public health fields like alcohol and drug abuse (Nation 2003).

10. Effective programs involve ongoing evaluation of their outcomes, research toward improvement, and experimentation and innovation (Nation 2003).

11. Effective programs are sufficiently resourced and appropriately staffed (Buelow 2015).

**Efforts Already Underway Across the University**

Prevention efforts at the University currently include the following programs. (For a full inventory of relevant programs, see Appendix C to the Interim Policy on Sexual and Gender-Based Harassment and Other Forms of Interpersonal Violence, available at http://vpsa.virginia.edu/titleix-vawa.)

1. The building of a UVa-specific education module addressing issues of sexual violence, intimate partner and relationship violence, stalking, incapacitation, consent, and bystander intervention. This module consists of one online training session (35-40 minutes) to be taken by all students each year.

2. Green Dot at U.Va. is an expertly-designed bystander intervention training program that educates faculty, staff, and students on safe strategies for intervention to prevent interpersonal violence with the goal of reducing sexual violence, relationship violence, and stalking. The program engages participants as leaders and presenters on these topics. It also provides tools for promoting values of care, trust, and anti-violence throughout the
community, including by embedding two basic value statements about violence prevention in messaging about institutional values through social media and marketing, orientation, educational programming, course content and syllabi, and other communications:
(a) violence will not be tolerated on Grounds; and
(b) everyone has a responsibility to do their part to prevent violence.

3. Bystander Intervention Presentation and Facilitation for First Year Students. First year students receive an annual keynote address from an expert in bystander education as part of the first year orientation series. The address helps students understand their role in maintaining a community of care and trust, including by being an active bystander. Residence Staff hold group discussions about this information in their residence halls after the presentation, using a provided discussion and activity guide.

4. Event-focused awareness campaigns such as Hoos Got Your Back (which takes place in the first three months of the Fall semester when incoming students are the most vulnerable to sexual assault), Halloween Safety, Take Back the Night Week, and Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

5. Peer Education presentations. Four peer education programs address the topic of sexual violence prevention at UVa. The first two programs are small in scale and operate with little staff supervision or training; the latter two programs, which are administered by the Elson Student Health Center (including the Gordie Center for Substance Abuse Prevention), are larger in scale but cover a wider palette of issues related to student health, safety, and alcohol and substance abuse prevention:
(a) “One Less” is an all-female-identified group that provides informational presentations to student groups on sexual violence awareness, intimate partner violence, inter-sectionality, consent, and survivor support;
(b) “One in Four” is an all-male-identified group that offers a program on men’s role in preventing sexual violence and supporting survivors;
(c) Peer Health Educators (PHEs) offers sex positivity programming which addresses sexual health concerns, STIs, contraception, and consent;
(d) Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Team (ADAPT) members have been trained on a variety of topics related to minimizing substance abuse and hazing to reduce the incidence of sexual violence and promote a healthier environment.

6. Risk awareness and reduction education programs, including self-defense and assertiveness training courses offered by the University Police Department to both men and women.

7. The Maxine Platzer Lynn Women’s Center at UVa offers training on gender violence awareness, bystander intervention, and media awareness through its Program on Gender Violence and Social Change.

8. The Men’s Leadership Project (MLP) is a mentoring program run by the Maxine Platzer Lynn Women’s Center and Dr. Peter Sheras of the Curry School which trains undergraduate men and pairs them with seventh grade boys in Charlottesville. MLP is a primary prevention program that focuses on issues of masculinity and disrupting stereotypical norms of
masculine identity, as well as promoting pro-social behavior and leadership development in the undergraduate men and the middle school boys, giving them the opportunity to explore what it means to be a man in today’s world. This year the program is serving only eight undergraduate men, but larger numbers have been involved in the program in prior years. MLP was forced to suspend operations due to a lack of institutional funding for the past two years; it resumed operation only this year. With the hiring of an Outreach Coordinator in the Women’s Center, awareness of the program on the part of UVa students should begin to increase.

9. Academic courses related to sexual violence prevention are being taught or planned by several scholars across the University, including Richard Handler, Claire Kaplan, Kathryn Laughon, Claire Raymond, Lisa Speidel, and Denise Walsh.

10. Relevant research expertise and initiatives at the University include
   (a) Youth-Nex: The U.Va. Center to Promote Effective Youth Development, directed by Patrick Tolan of the Curry School, is a transdisciplinary center promoting healthy youth development, educational attainment, and learning. Youth-Nex also aims to prevent youth problems such as violence, physical and mental health issues, substance abuse and school failure. Many of the faculty affiliates of Youth-Nex conduct research related to promoting healthy relationships and preventing violence in youth and have expertise in areas including prevention and intervention programs for adolescents and emerging adults in these areas.
   (b) Achieving a National Standard of Excellence is a collaborative project between Nancy Deutsch of the Curry School, the organization Futures Without Violence, and Harvard University School of Law’s Gender and Violence Project which aims to formulate guidelines for creating curricula to prevent and respond to sexual assault on college campuses. The project, funded in part by The Jefferson Trust, will be developing, piloting, and evaluating a national training curriculum on best practices in law and advocacy for prevention of and response to gender based violence on campuses, with design occurring in summer 2015 and initial implementation in the 2015-2016 academic year. The UVa steering committee includes faculty, staff, administrators, students, and alumni.

Recommendations
In answer to the question of “what might the University of Virginia consider to augment its current prevention programs?” we offer the following recommendations:

Recommendation 1: A Centrally-Coordinated Prevention Program is Needed
There is need for a centrally-coordinated sexual violence prevention program at UVa, which would build on, integrate, and go beyond the efforts currently underway across Grounds. We believe that a skillfully planned and implemented, multi-faceted prevention program will pay rich dividends in student safety and the quality of student life generally, that it will positively affect student recruitment and retention, and that it is critical if UVa is to assume a position of leadership in this area.
The prevention activities we recommend are consistent with and necessary to the University’s central mission of developing “the full potential of talented students from all walks of life” and serving “the Commonwealth of Virginia, the nation, and the world by developing responsible citizen leaders and professionals.” They further the University’s “commitment to a vibrant and unique residential learning environment,” and put into practice its “unwavering support of a collaborative, diverse community bound together by distinctive foundational values of honor, integrity, trust, and respect” (UVa Mission Statement).

Consistent with the findings (#1 and #2, above) that students are concerned with safety and value programs that aim to prevent sexual violence on Grounds, and that effective prevention requires significant organizational commitment and effort, we are convinced that a greater effort to reduce the incidence of sexual violence and misconduct in our community will improve the experience of students at the University; avert the needless suffering and traumatization experienced by violence and misconduct victims; prevent the socialization of some University members in destructive and criminal behaviors associated with perpetration; and foster greater social and moral development for students that will carry over into their future careers, families, and communities, positively influencing the lives of others beyond the University.

A. The organizational priority and importance of prevention to the mission of the University should be reflected in the creation of an office to plan, create, coordinate, publicize, track, and evaluate a comprehensive prevention program across Grounds on an ongoing basis. Such an office would work with the Deans of Students, Elson Student Health Center, Maxine Platzer Lynn Women’s Center, Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life, student organizations, and academic departments and centers that offer relevant programming and curriculum, but it could not be housed within any of these as it will need to advocate and operate effectively at the University-wide level. Given the distribution of stakeholders regarding the problems it will address and the solutions it will create and facilitate, it might be appropriate for oversight of this office to be partly the function of an oversight board consisting of constituency representatives and relevant experts and practitioners from across Grounds.

B. The design and planning of a comprehensive prevention program is itself a large undertaking that will require appropriate staffing and funding. We recognize that University resources are strained by the needs of compliance and ensuring appropriate response when sexual violence occurs, but if “institutions are only devoting resources to response, they will always be responding to sexual violence” (ACPA 2015, p. 13). Adequate resources must be allocated for prevention as well. Our EverFi consultant estimates that 8 FTE are needed for prevention on a campus of 20,000 students, along with a programming and operating budget of $9.75/student. The University’s hiring of Nicole Thomas last Fall increased and improved prevention programming to student organizations and allowed the successful rollout of the Green Dot UVa program in March 2015. But prevention efforts are still sorely limited by a shortage of staff and resources in virtually all areas. We recommend hiring two, full-time trained prevention specialists in the very near term to lead the strategic planning and design process needed to develop the program, in consultation with relevant specialists and
stakeholders on grounds. Sexual violence prevention has not yet been a focus of comprehensive strategic planning at UVa, as it has been at several of our peer institutions. The ideal individuals to lead this process would have previous campus prevention experience as well as relevant teaching (and possibly research) experience in an allied field like public health or applied medical anthropology and could be affiliated faculty with academic departments.

C. A commitment to prevention and safety should continue to be articulated by University leaders in public statements. We applaud President Sullivan for her steadiness of focus on the opportunity and need for constructive change to improve student safety at the University, amidst the turning controversy surrounding news reporting on campus rape. While this controversy around reporting can be divisive, ensuring the safety of all students is a value that unites the University community. It can serve as a touchstone for our attempts to improve it.

Recommendation 2: A Positive Conceptual Framework for Prevention Efforts Is Needed

Prevention efforts should articulate and work to realize a positive vision of respect, ethics, health, and safety in students’ interpersonal relationships. This recommendation builds on the finding (#5, above) that effective programs build on students’ positive values and predispositions to act ethically and responsibly, cultivating knowledge and skills for ethical relationships and healthy intimacy, rather than focusing on (and inadvertently perpetuating the salience of) negative stereotypes, attitudes, and behaviors.

A. The University prevention program should use a conceptual framework and language that does not overemphasize legal categories of criminal conduct like rape, assault, and harassment. To the extent possible, it should foreground positive ethical values such as respect, responsibility, safety, trust, and mutual care. It should promote students’ exploration of their own values, aspirations, and the moral aspects of their own identities. It should also be centered in notions of health: health of the body, healthy relationships, healthy gender identities, healthy community (DeGue 2012a, 2012b).

B. University administrators, as well as Green Dot, etc., Executive Director Dr. Dorothy Edwards, have spoken in ways that adapt the Honor idea of the University as a “community of trust” by extending it to gender violence prevention. This strikes us as consistent with the finding (#8, above) that effective prevention programs are culturally relevant; they are “sensitive to and reflective of community norms and cultural beliefs” (DeGue 2014, p. 357). Purely as a prevention concept, we like the idea of promoting an expanded interpretation of the “community of trust” as one of interpersonal safety, respect, and ethics.

C. Students and other stakeholders should be engaged wherever possible as partners in achieving the shared aim of creating a safe and inclusive campus social environment distinguished by respect of all University members, with a special focus on modeling respect in interactions with students new to the community and strengthening the basis for trust among all students. It is especially important to engage the student leaders of fraternities,
athletic teams, and other organizations that sponsor high risk activities by high-impact programs that will motivate and train them to lead, active ongoing efforts (not one-off events) within their own organizations towards achieving these aims.

D. The conceptual framework and language of prevention on Grounds should be inclusive of the diversity of the University community, and prevention programming should go hand in hand with efforts to improve the climate for underrepresented and marginalized groups.

**Recommendation 3: Prevention Efforts Underway Should Be Build Upon and Extended**

We recommend extending and enhancing the prevention programs that are already in operation across the University. Consistent with the finding (#4, above) that effective programs are multi-faceted, reaching students in diverse ways to provide “varied and layered” educational experiences (ACPA 2015, p. 5), we consider the diversity of current prevention programs an asset to be built upon.

A. Event-focused awareness campaigns, while not sufficient in themselves for preventing sexual misconduct and violence, are effective in increasing knowledge of strategies for risk awareness and reduction, and in publicizing more in-depth resources for helping prevent violence and supporting survivors.

B. Green Dot at UVa, the bystander intervention education program, was launched only last month and should continue to be supported to facilitate as wide a basis of participation as possible.

C. Existing peer education programs should be strengthened. Better supervision and training is needed by the student volunteer peer educators who operate “One in Four” and “One Less”—the two programs focally concerned with sexual violence prevention. These volunteers currently receive limited or no training in facilitation and motivational methods. The one-time discussion sessions that these two programs provide are used by many student organizations, as well as by fraternities for compliance under Fraternity Organization Agreements as one of their three mandatory annual trainings (on hazing, alcohol, and sexual misconduct). These programs should be enhanced and developed into a tiered, developmentally sequenced set of offerings that avoid repetition and numbing when audiences receive the same presentation multiple times. Currently many students who participate undergo the same program year after year. This approach instead allows students to build productively on their participation in prior sessions. These programs would also benefit from improved follow-up, including collection and analysis of participant feedback and the development of additional means of assessment.

D. Programming around men’s issues, which at present is limited to the “Mens Leadership Project” (MLP) described above, should be expanded. There is also room for strengthening and expanding MLP itself, which is a valuable and unique program nationally.

E. The teaching of relevant courses across Grounds should be encouraged. Existing courses should be made more visible by listing on a common website (ideally, that of the prevention
Recommendation 4: We Should Strive for a Mix of Centrally-Planned, Theory- and Evidence-Driven Programming and Student- and Faculty-Created, Experimental and Innovative Programming

The University prevention program should combine educational programming that is centrally-planned and theory- and evidence-driven, with programming that is student- and faculty-created, experimental and innovative. It is more likely that a professionally-designed program developed on the basis of accepted theories, research findings, and expert knowledge will produce desired behavioral outcomes effectively and efficiently. But there can be disadvantages when a program is overly centralized, rigid, or dependent on a single set of ideas. It has been found that effective programs engage students, as well as staff and faculty, as active contributors in a shared project of change (e.g., producing a culture of safety, trust, and respect). Thus, it is important that there be enough flexibility in the program to allow those students who want to take an active role in solving this real-world problem to do so, on the understanding that such problem-solving often motivates very deep, active learning and facilitates experimentation and innovation. Faculty, too, need to be engaged by the program not just as consumers of professionally-produced educational content, but as content producers, researchers, and educators in their own right. Open-endedness is consistent with a comprehensive planning process and strategic objectives. But it is fundamental to the University’s spirit of discovery that open inquiry, experimentation, and innovation be actively encouraged on prevention topics, and it is this that will provide for the University, in time, to become a leader in this area.

Recommendation 5: The University Should Develop an Effective Educational Program Involving a Mix of Voluntary and Mandatory Components

The most important element currently missing from the University’s prevention portfolio is a prevention education program that addresses the problem of sexual misconduct in a way that contributes to students’ intellectual, moral, and personal development, and that is long enough and intense enough to have a lasting effect on behavior. We recommend that such a program be developed and eventually required of all students. A program that is required is the only way to reach every student, and as observed above (finding 2), we cannot expect that students will otherwise “simply know” how to avoid and discourage sexual misconduct and violence, without education to prepare them to do so. Prevention educators at other colleges and universities claim that mandatory programs do not elicit resentment when courses are well-designed and when they encourage peer discussion of topics like sexual ethics, gender identity, and relationship health that are very interesting to students because they affect them personally; and they have also said that their own schools have successfully instituted prevention education requirements that receive high scores in participant surveys (Kilmartin and Berkowitz 2005; Capraro interview). While it is beyond the Working Group’s charge to develop a detailed plan for this program, one possible vision for such an educational program emerged from Ira Bashkow’s discussions with a
group of undergraduate students. In this vision, students would choose from a menu of options for meeting the prevention requirement. Relatively standard options would be shorter and easier, but there would also be more experimental, creative program options, perhaps requiring a greater commitment of the students’ time. Examples of the latter might include an optional, prevention-focused discussion section added by an instructor to a regular academic course on a related topic (the special section would meet, say, five or six times over the course of the semester); an in-person training workshop that would provide knowledge and skills for students who wished to create and lead prevention programs of their own for student near-peers; or co-creating and co-leading a student-designed alternative program after undergoing the training workshop and meeting other requirements. Every first year student might be required to choose two programs, each consisting of 3-5 one-hour sessions, with high-risk students like athletes and Greeks choosing one program more. In the student’s later years, two or three advanced programs might be required in order to graduate; these could include the training workshop and other pathways by which highly motivated students could assume leadership roles in prevention themselves. Research findings suggest that education program components should be predominantly in-person, as opposed to online, and include pedagogically effective, interactive activities such as role-playing and communications skills exercises. The program should include opportunities for involvement by University graduate students. Though the social worlds of graduate students and undergraduates are in many ways separate, the graduate students are often regarded by undergraduates as “relatable” near-peers whose experience and leadership would be valuable in discussions of topics like masculinity, femininity, and sexual misconduct prevention. There appear to be many graduate students who are interested in the goal of reducing sexual misconduct and violence, and who would be willing to undergo relevant training to participate in prevention education activities. This vision is presented merely as an illustration of a way of organizing prevention education in such a way that it reaches students at different times and allows a mix of standardization and flexibility.

The parameters of any one program would be consonant with the findings of prevention effectiveness research described above: content culturally relevant, format lively and varied, pedagogical strategies effective and engaging (i.e., including active learning and role playing, not only monologic delivery), messages positive (e.g., to men: not “don't rape” but “how do you live your values as a man in an intimate relationship?”). Such a course would engage students in preventing sexual misconduct and violence in the context of topics like healthy masculinities and femininities; hyper masculinity; sexual ethics and respectful intimacy; “consent as a process”; the variety of social norms conveyed in peer expectations, organizational cultures, and event framings; men’s and women’s wellness including alcohol and drug abuse, and the idea of the University as a “community of trust, respect, and safety” for all members. Variant versions of such a program might be tailored to particular campus communities like newly matriculating students, residence halls, student organizations, and academic programs and majors; they may also include content designed to be relevant to specific identity categories such as women or men.
of color, international students, immigrant students, LGBTQ students, students with disabilities, and sexual misconduct survivors.

In addition to a universal requirement, intended to reduce sexual misconduct and violence in the whole population, the University should develop high-impact mandatory educational programs for individuals belonging to at-risk groups like fraternity members and athletes, as well as individuals who exhibit risk factors like alcohol abuse or have been the subject of misconduct complaints (Capone et al. 2007).

**Recommendation 6: Evaluation of Outcomes**
Methods should be developed for evaluating program outcomes and for determining the effectiveness and suitability of program components. The prevention program should be supported by continuing the research which has begun into the incidence of sexual misconduct, its risk factors, and the situations that concentrate risk in the University community.

**Recommendation 7: University Prevention Efforts Should Include Scholarly Interchange**
An important part of effective knowledge creation and application is the active exchange of ideas across different fields and with diverse groups of scholars, experts, and practitioners working in different institutions. In the early stages of program development, we expect University employees charged with designing and planning the University’s prevention program to seek inspiration from active researchers in the field and from programs at institutions (like the University of New Hampshire, University of Michigan, Michigan State, and Emory) with leading sexual violence prevention programs in place. Sexual violence prevention has not yet been a focus of comprehensive strategic planning and outcome evaluation at UVa, as it has been at several of our peer institutions. While we should not follow others blindly, assuming that what works in another institution will be appropriate for the University of Virginia, neither should we proceed in a vacuum of knowledge about promising efforts being undertaken elsewhere. As a first step, we recommend conducting site visits to 3-5 campuses with long-established, successful prevention programs, as well as bringing to Grounds a number of experienced practitioners and prominent researchers for public symposium presentations and extensive additional consultations with those involved in the design and planning process on Grounds. We also recommend organizing a regular series of events, or ongoing interdisciplinary expert/faculty workshop that would bring together those already working on prevention-related research across Grounds, in areas like alcohol and substance abuse prevention science, violence prevention science, relationships and socio-emotional learning, cultural change, curriculum development, and the ethnography of youth and campus cultures in sociology and anthropology. Such exchange of knowledge provides a sound way forward to a position of sustainable leadership as the University develops its own experience and capacity in the effective reduction of the incidence of sexual misconduct and violence.
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Chair: Meg Jay
Co-Chair: Bob Tata
Members: Oliver Engebretson, Travis Larrabee, Sheryl Schwartz, van Eersel

"What can be done in UVa’s initial contacts with future applicants to convey the significance of a safe campus culture? What if anything can be done in the admissions process to reduce the likelihood of admitting a violence-prone student?"

Background- Currently at UVa Admissions

- Historically, the UVa Admission office has felt that most parents and students assume UVa is a safe space. Even after the release of the Rolling Stone article, very few applicants or parents asked questions about sexual violence, although this may reflect a hesitance about asking such questions more than a lack of concern. As a result, UVa Admissions does not include talking points about sexual violence or safety issues in their presentations to future applicants whether on Grounds or at off-Grounds locations.

- UVa admissions does not provide information regarding violence or sexual violence through the admissions webpage besides a link to the required Clery Act disclosures. In addition, nowhere on the admissions website is the value of safe space mentioned. In addition, the Admissions Prospectus does not mention safety and there are no paper handouts given to prospective students on sexual violence or safety.
• UVa Admissions uses The Common App to admit students and requires that students disclose school disciplinary infractions and criminal convictions for misdemeanors or felonies. Very few applicants “check the box” for crimes, and UVa Admissions does not perform background checks on applicants. When a student or school has reported a crime, infraction, and/or another “red flag,” if this is noticed by the Admission officer, an informal conversation happens with the Dean of Admission and then an informal conversation may happen between the Dean of Admission and the Office of the Dean of Student Affairs to decide on whether to admit the applicant.

• UVa Admission does ask additional questions in addition to The Common App, but none related to values about sexual assault or personal safety.

• UVa admission does not have any educational program (modules) that students must complete before they enroll in UVa in relation to sexual violence and safety.

**Research and Findings**

• Reviewed scholarship on the issues, including the White House Task Force Report “Preventing Sexual Violence on College Campuses: Lessons from Research and Practice,” as well Michigan’s recent sexual violence video, and UVa’s interim policy.

• Reviewed *Rolling Stone* article, the retractions, the Columbia University critique, and related information.

• Met with Greg Roberts, Dean of Admissions at UVa, to determine how UVa currently handles these issues (see Background above).

• Contacted George Stovall, Director of Institutional Assessment and Studies, for current data on UVa admission applicants for the 2015-2016 school year. Total Applications to UVa for the 2015 – 2016 school year were down for the first time since comparable data was collected in 2009. In summary, on a percentage and population basis, Regular Decision applications were down across the board: 19.7% for White women, 12.3% for all women, 9.1% for White men, and 4.1% for all men. Taken together, Regular Decision applications were down 8.3%. On analysis, the most pronounced effect has been on women applicants and for White women applicants in particular. Although this drop in applications cannot be conclusively linked to the release of the *Rolling Stone* article, it is worthy of note.

• Examined UVa Admissions website to determine how we currently message and address safety. On the UVa Admission website under the link “Parents” and then under the link “Student Health and Safety, and Wellbeing” it states:

  “The University places high priority on student health and safety. Numerous programs are in place at the University to help students maintain good physical and mental health.
From the Department of Student Health to recreational centers to programming offered by such organizations as the Gordie Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, students receive encouragement and broad support in their efforts to stay healthy and safe.”

Then follow the related links:

- Key Safety Resources
- Health Resources
- Student Support Programs
- Student Health Services
- U.Va. Women’s Center
- Clery Act Notice

- Interviewed UVa Law Dean of Admissions, Cordel Faulk. Mr. Faulk noted that, in his opinion, face-to-face interviewing had been enormously helpful to the Law School in terms of weeding out inappropriate candidates.

- Interviewed former UVa Dean of Admissions and University President John Casteen. Although Mr. Casteen doubted there was much we could do to detect violence-prone individuals, he supported more communication to prospective students and parents about what UVa was doing to address safety and sexual violence. He also advocated for more education about sexual assault once students were admitted.

- Interviewed UNC Dean of Admissions Stephen Farmer. Mr. Farmer noted that UNC does have a formal process to evaluate students with “red flags” on their applications.

- Brief interview with Jefferson Scholar Regional Coordinator.

- Met with UGuides as an admissions touch point. In contrast to the Admissions Office, UGuides has received a significant spike in inquires about sexual violence and safety (mostly pertaining to whether the University cares about this issue as opposed to concern for a specific incident).

- We reached out to Deans of Admissions at Penn, Brown, Chicago, Davidson, Georgetown, Harvard, Princeton, George Washington, Virginia Tech, and Dartmouth with little success as our timeframe conflicted with peak season for admissions.

- Consulted NCHERM’s Brett Sokolow as a nationwide expert who has worked in this field for 17 years. Most pertinent to our group, Mr. Sokolow strongly recommended requiring Dean’s Letters for transfer students, which are letters attesting to a student’s good standing upon leaving the previous school. https://www.ncherm.org/consultants/brett-sokolow/

- Tracked HB 1928 (DNA; Analysis upon conviction of certain misdemeanors) and 1785 (Campus police departments; sexual assault reporting) and learned that they were passed and
signed by the Governor. They will be effective July 1, 2015, and address collecting DNA for certain misdemeanors and campus police reporting of sexual assaults in some cases. HB 1888 (Academic transcripts; suspension or permanent dismissal from institution), concerned with requiring educational institutions to note on transcripts when a student has been suspended or expelled for poor conduct, died in committee. HB 1888 would have allowed for greater transparency as to why a student may be leaving one school and seeking admission to another.

- Reviewed select peer university admissions websites (e.g., Michigan, Penn, UNC, UC Berkeley, UCLA, William & Mary, Georgetown) to see how they address and message safety and sexual misconduct online.

- Considered possibilities and logistics of background checks. Because juvenile criminal records are sealed and background checks at such an early age have shown little predictive validity, sources agreed that background checks for all incoming students would be expensive, off-putting and unproductive. Some schools, such as UNC, do however require these for transfer students.

- Considered potential admissions questions addressing sexual violence to potentially: (i) message the importance of the issue to UVa, and (ii) possibly subtly influence behavior by having prospective students think through some issues.

- Considered and discussed post-admission online training

**Recommendations**

In support of the goal of providing an excellent education, The University of Virginia places great value on safety and wellbeing of its students. This subcommittee feels the University should further strengthen its efforts to address safety as a value in a coherent and proactive manner in the admissions process, on the University’s website, and in communications with students, prospective applicants, parents, and community. While parents and students may once have presupposed that college is an unusually safe place, it is no longer realistic or even helpful to maintain such assumptions. In addition, this year’s application numbers suggest that interest in attending UVa has been impacted by recent negative (and much inaccurate) press coverage related to safety at UVa so it is important that we have a strong, proactive and transparent position on safety as a value, as a priority, and as a mission.

The following are specific recommendations as they relate to the admissions process. This subcommittee recognizes that some of recommendations may overlap with charges and potential recommendations made by other subcommittees of the Working Group on Prevention. Our recommendations are evidence-based only to the extent that they have been drawn from conversations and comparisons with peer schools; largely they are reasonable conclusions about what more could be done to address safety in context of the admissions process.
Pertaining to our first charge—What can be done in UVa’s initial contacts with future applicants to convey the significance of a safe campus culture?—we recommend the following (with date of implementation in parenthesis):

1. Increase transparency for parents and prospective students with respect to issues related to safety and sexual violence. (8/2015)

2. Attempt to aggregate and de-conflict data pertaining to sexual violence (and other crimes) at and around UVa from various reporting points (UVa Police, SARA, CAPS, Women’s Center), and make this data readily available and accessible on the UVa Police website, or another suitable website. Late in this process, Mark Webb (SWG#5) was able to share sexual assault data depicted on over a dozen schematics compiled from University and City police records. The data spanned multiple years and provided information regarding victims, suspects, victim/suspect relationship, types of crimes, locations, day of the week, times, alcohol use, delay in reporting, and much more. This data should be carefully analyzed and consistent metrics for future data collection should established so trends can identified and tracked on a yearly basis. For the purposes of our working group, appropriate data should be linked to the admissions page. When data is difficult to find, students and parents may erroneously conclude that the University wishes to hide such information or that the University is not adequately addressing or prioritizing the issue. Availability of the data also would allow students to be proactive and potentially avoid risk. More broadly and importantly, follow-on groups or subject matters experts need to analyze this data to make more granular recommendations regarding future best practices as this data best illustrates the nature and magnitude of the issue. (8/2015 with continual updates/improvements)

3. Increase transparency on issues of safety on the university’s website, and even on the admissions website. (8/2015)

We found the following portions of websites of peer institutions to be useful:

- Consider how both University of Michigan (http://dpss.umich.edu/) and Georgetown (https://police.georgetown.edu) have “safety alerts” placed on their Police Department websites, posting certain crimes (e.g., sexual assault, bias-related incident, burglary) prominently and quickly. These websites also have quick links to daily/weekly/monthly crime logs so that students and parents can understand at a glance what crimes may occur on campus and with what frequency.

- Consider University of Michigan’s Admissions page for Health and Safety where there is direct mention of their values regarding sexual assault prevention, and they give the topic equal billing with campus safety, health services and...
counseling. We suggest linking directly to UVa’s Sexual Violence page from an admissions page (http://www.virginia.edu/sexualviolence/) so that students and parents do not have to “hunt” in order to see that UVa is already thoughtfully addressing this important topic. If information is difficult to find, parents and students may infer that assistance is hard to find as well. See below screenshot taken from this admissions webpage at University of Michigan: http://admissions.umich.edu/life-michigan/health-safety

- University of Pennsylvania Police Department (http://www.upenn.edu/life-at-penn/safety.php) offer some nice features including Department of Public Safety “Top 10 List”, along with information on a service called “Penn Guardian” which allows students to register their cell phones with the Department of Public Safety to provide information rapidly in case of emergency.

4. Require all matriculating students to complete post-admission, online training on any number of issues relating to student safety and sexual violence. This training should happen before the school year begins. For more specific recommendations on training programs, we found the “Preventing Sexual Violence on College Campuses: Lessons from Research and Practice” paper, (prepared by the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault) quite informative. For example of such a program, see online education in sexual assault prevention offered by Everfi based in Washington DC (www.everfi.com). (5/2016)

5. Support training for U Guides to prepare for questions about sexual violence. (9/2015)

6. Consider adding an application essay question that messages safety as an important value. A draft of a potential question might resemble the following:

The University of Virginia Honor System is the nation's oldest student-run honor system and one of UVa's most cherished institutions. Meanwhile violence including sexual assault is a concern nationwide including on college campuses. Comment on how UVa’s honor ideals could be embraced to help address this potential issue including from the perspective of the: (i) victim, (ii) accused, and (iii) institution.

Pertaining to our second charge—What if anything can be done in the admissions process to reduce the likelihood of admitting a violence-prone student?—we recommend:

7. Rather than maintaining an informal process, create a committee and a clear process within the admissions office that additionally screens any applicant with a red flag in his/her application. (9/2015)

8. For transfer students, require “Dean’s Letters” from previous institutions, specifically including all previous universities or colleges attended by the transfer student, not just an
interim community college. The goal is to reduce the likelihood of “whitewashing” prior dangerous behavior. Background checks may also be required. (6/2015)

9. Consider an alumni interviewing program, or other in-person events, in an effort to create more face-to-face interactions in the interview/admissions process. (Ongoing)

Other recommendations:

10. Reach out to other Admissions offices, perhaps during the summer months when Deans are more available, to continue this conversation and compare best practices. (6/2015)

11. Retain subject matter experts to put in place the above recommendations. (6/2015)

Appendix C

Sub-working Group #3 – Reporting & Student Advocacy

Submitted: April 15, 2014
Chair: Jay Shimshack
Co-Chair: Sara Surface
Members: Barbara Millar, Tammy Wincup

Background

1. Reporting of sexual violence can be broadly classified as: formal reporting to police, formal reporting to campus or service providers, and informal reporting to friends and family members.

2. There is strong evidence that sexual violence is underreported, and that underreporting is higher on-campus than off-campus. Underreporting is higher for more formal reporting than for less informal reporting.

3. There is strong evidence that the likelihood of reporting and the formality of reporting varies, often systematically, across characteristics of the incident, victim, and perpetrator.

Key evidence-based research finding: On average, primary prevention programs significantly increase reporting.

1. There exists some theory on violence reporting behavior. These theories can be interpreted to suggest that active prevention programs increase subsequent reporting relative to underlying incidence rates.

2. Existing direct empirical evidence linking prevention programs to subsequent reporting is limited, but it consistently points to increased (or at least non-decreased) reporting.
3. The only empirical evidence of US campus prevention programs lowering reporting in the short to medium run is from settings where programs or correlated changes placed blame on victims’ character or behavior.

4. The specific type, formality, and composition of how prevention programs increase reporting, however, is poorly understood and may be context specific.

**Suggestive, but not definitive, research findings** linking an active violence prevention program and increased reporting.

1. Evidence suggests the existence of several systematic barriers to accurate and complete reporting, including but not limited to: fear of not being taken seriously, concerns over social reputation, uncertainty over the incident or the expected response, concerns over confidentiality, and shame or embarrassment.

2. Evidence suggests that prevention programs, on average, change attitudes of both potential victims and perpetrators (at least in the short to medium run).

3. Scholars regularly assert that enhancing victims’ trust and knowledge will increase reporting. Most violence prevention programs work to enhance victims’ trust and knowledge.

**Recommendations**

1. *UVa prevention efforts should be managed with a tactical calendar of regular and repeated milestones.* Milestones should be established and coordinated at top administrative levels. Annual milestones should be associated with a single responsible individual or office. Disclosure of results relative to milestones should be mandatory and regularized. Coordination problems and ad hoc communication efforts are important barriers to complete and accurate reporting.

2. *UVa education and prevention programs should focus on all members of the population.* Targeted interventions and outreach are important, but they cannot be the sole prevention focus. Interventions should regularly and repeatedly target all undergraduates, all graduate students, all staff, and all faculty. Overcoming barriers to complete and accurate reporting requires widespread learning and cultural change.

3. *Reporting options for members of the UVa community must be standardized and widely publicized* to all members of the UVa community. One of the biggest barriers to complete and accurate reporting is that victims and their informal contacts still do not understand reporting options.

4. *UVa should collect and maintain reporting data and survey data on incidence, and ALL data should be coordinated and centrally managed.* The effects of prevention programs can only
be fully understood with systematic data. The university should develop a plan for regular
and repeated dissemination of summarized and de-identified incidence data.

5. Reporting data and survey data on incidence must be collected and analyzed regularly and
consistently within years and across years. Incidence, trends, and prevention program
effectiveness can only be understood with standardized and comparable data. We recommend
organizational commitment to program evaluation over time.

**Timeline:** Strategic planning, data collection, resource allocation, and demonstrated
organizational commitment for all of the above recommendations should begin in the short-run.
Significant implementation of all recommendations is feasible in the medium-run.

**Evidence:** The above background and findings are developed from academic research, institutional and research reports, other institution’s experiences and best practices, and student group experiences and best practices. Selected research references include: Fisher, Cullen, & Turner (2000); Breitenbecher (2001); Anderson and Whinston (2005); Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen (2005); Sable et al. (2006); Krebs et al. (DOJ CSA, 2007); Rothman and Silverman (2007); Sulkowski (2011); Simpson et al. (2012); Sabina and Ho (2014); Langton and Sinozich (DOJ NCVS, 2014); Yung (2015).
Appendix D
Sub-working Group #4 – Alcohol & Drugs

Submitted: April 13, 2015
Chair: Darius Nabors
Co-Chair: William Brady
Members: Brian Roy, Benjamin Gorman, Nathan Charlton, Amanda Huskin, Benjamin Rexrode

Background
Beyond Compliance – Sexual Violence Prevention Report and Recommendations for ACPA Governing Board

“A critical aspect of bystander intervention training is education about the use of alcohol in perpetrating sexual violence. In addition to raising students’ awareness of the intentional use of alcohol to increase vulnerability, it is important to educate students that someone who is highly intoxicated is unable to give informed consent to sexual activity.”

Issues / Recommendations

Student Alcohol Education:

1. Problems:
   a. Most 2nd-4th year students do not receive alcohol education
      i. Fraternities, sororities, and varsity athletes do receive some education
   b. Should be tailored to age/experience of students where possible
   c. A stronger focus on the red zones, or especially dangerous times (4th year 5th, Foxfields, Halloween, the first couple weeks of school)

2. Solutions:
   a. Educate all 2nd-4th year students
      i. Difficult in terms of resources and funding
   b. Require student groups with more than a certain (50?) number of members to undergo alcohol education
      i. We think this is more feasible in the short term
   c. Create multiple tiers or levels of education, so that students aren’t just hearing the same presentation at different times
d. Include a bigger discussion about alcohol in the first RA meetings
   i. By the time they have these discussion now they have already had 3-4 nights where they have gone out to the block party

**Basics: (Brief Alcohol Screen and Intervention for College Students) available through the Gordie Center (see Appendix F for supporting documentation):**

- Listed on the National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices

1. Problems:
   a. We need a way to anonymously report people with alcohol problems so that they can get support
   b. We need better recovery services for those who have had alcohol problems
   c. We need to do a better job of identifying high risk drinkers before they come to grounds

2. Solutions:
   a. Fund and expand the BASICS program helps cover a good number of these problems
      i. People can anonymously report and get some help
      ii. We can use data from Alcohol Wise surveys to identify high risk drinkers and ask them to self-identify for a BASICS referral
      iii. Funding a full time BASICS person would also, hopefully, leave them with some time to do recovery services.

**PR/Marketing:**

1. Problems:
   a. There are a lot of different things happening in a lot of different places. They aren’t promoted or marketed under the same umbrella and that lack of coordination makes it harder for people to see how interconnected everything is.

2. Solutions:
   a. Coordinate a communications working group between relevant parties
   b. Enlist Darden, Commerce & Public Health professors that could have a final project of creating a comprehensive marketing plan targeted toward high risk drinking and danger
      i. Student produced ideas are more likely to get the message across

Please refer to Appendix F for the Early Intervention and Recovery Support at UVa (Gordie Center)
Appendix E
Sub-working Group #5 – Infrastructure

Submitted: April 17, 2015
Chair: Mark Webb
Co-Chair: William Brady
Members: Abraham Axler, C. Joy Omenyi

Background
The University created a Safety Working Group in September 2014. Subcommittee 5 studied the resulting Final Report & Recommendations of the University Safety Working Group, dated January 9, 2015. We determined our charge to be effectively the same. Subcommittee 5 echoes the recommendations contained in the Final Report and identifies with the comment on page 3 stating:

“The Safety Working Group members felt a keen responsibility to utilize this opportunity to inventory and review existing safety resources. Many of the Committee’s findings validated work that has been accomplished by the University and through the University’s Security and General Safety Committee.”

Subcommittee 5 pursued the following research in an effort to supplement the work of the Safety Working Group.

Research
Synopsis
The research looked at commercially available infrastructure technologies to determine if UVa is keeping pace. Considering the actions recommended by the Safety Working Group, Subcommittee 5 believes that UVa is keeping pace with infrastructure that may deter sexual violence. The Subcommittee also looked at data generated by UVa emergency phone calls and police reports of sexual violence in an effort to identify possible physical environment changes that might contribute to reducing sexual violence. The data did not reveal shortcomings in physical environment or infrastructure. However, it is noteworthy that informed parties, such as Marge Sidebottom, are not presented with the emergency phone or police report data on a regular basis in a readily consumable format. This is a missed opportunity for prevention, culture, and response initiatives.

Widely Available Safety and Security Technologies for Higher Education
Tyco “is a leading global provider of security products and services, fire detection and suppression products and services and life safety products”\(^3\) with fiscal 2014 revenues of $10.34 billion. On March 18, 2015, Tyco’s District Manager, Jim Baker, presented a session titled

“Campus Safety and Security Technologies” at the 2015 Virginia APPA conference. The following list shows technologies available for safety infrastructure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Available Technologies</th>
<th>Notification Systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alert Systems</strong></td>
<td><strong>Notification Systems</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency phone tower</td>
<td>Paging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall mount phone in parking structure</td>
<td>Broadcast-enabled emergency phones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video cameras</td>
<td>Broadcast audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone crime reporting</td>
<td>Radio systems (primarily first responders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile phone anonymous tip</td>
<td>AM / FM radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather alerts</td>
<td>Reverse 911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Broadcast System</td>
<td>Digital signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOIP</td>
<td>Text messaging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UVa uses each of these technologies in appropriate ways. The Safety Working Group recommendations expand the use in areas with an evident need. Key concepts from Jim Baker’s presentation include:

- There is not a single technological solution
- Utilizing a layered approach to alerts and notifications increases redundancy
- Focus on simplicity, reliability, and speed
Emergency Phone Usage

The University’s Security and General Safety Committee asked the Center for Survey Research to process and summarize emergency phone call data. The UVa Police Department logs calls from the emergency phones. The following table summarizes the data for 2011 through 2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coded Response Ordered By Frequency - 2011 through 2014</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical/Service</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidental Use of Phone</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC Contacted</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locked In/Out</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Issues</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPD Contacted</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>94.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency(Non-Medical)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost/Need Directions</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency(Medical)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>99.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious Activity/Object Report</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were thirty-four calls for identifiable emergencies or suspicious activities during these four years, an average of 8.5 per year. One hundred sixteen calls were referred to the Emergency Communications Center (ECC) or University Police for response, an average of 29 per year. Combined, UVa’s emergency phone system generates less than one first responder call per week. Subcommittee 5 supports keeping the existing emergency phones in place as a redundant system to cell phones. Usage data does not imply a need to expand the emergency phone system.
Sexual Violence Police Report Data

The UVa Police and City of Charlottesville Police shared data on reports of sexual violence involving victims affiliated with UVa. Fifty-four incidents were reported from 2009 through 2014. The reports provide insight into the patterns of sexual violence. The chart below indicates that type of location differentiates fondling events from rape, sexual assault with an object, and sodomy.

Incidents of Sexual Violence Reported to the Police
Involving UVa Affiliated Victims
From 2009 Through 2014

Eighteen of twenty-six fondling incidents occur on public streets. Infrastructure likely to discourage fondling includes the ambassador program, video surveillance, and lighted pathways.

Eighteen of twenty-eight rape, sexual assault with an object, and sodomy incidents occurred in a residence. The appropriateness of extending university infrastructure into residences is questionable. It is possible that a mobile or wearable technology application will emerge that can be user selected and operated.
The next chart shows incidents by day of week and time. The farther a marker is from the center the more incidents during that time. Sunday from midnight until 3 a.m. is the most prevalent time for sexual violence in this data set. Seven fondling incidents occurred during this time as well as seven rape, sexual assault with and object, and sodomy incidents.

Sexual Violence Incidents Reported to UVa or City Police from 2009 through 2014 Involving Victims Affiliated with UVa By Day of Week and Time of Day
Viewing the information by year shows an order of magnitude variation in fondling incidents. Reports of rape, sexual assault with an object, and sodomy incidents are more consistent. Interestingly, 2014 has the fewest reports of rape, sexual assault with an object, and sodomy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidents of Sexual Violence Reported to the Police Involving UVa Affiliated Victims</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fondling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape/Object/Sodomy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last research visual provides a geographic perspective, mapping out the forty-seven events closest to UVa. Incidents are coded by type of incident and time of day. The UVa lighted pathway system and exterior blue light phones are shown for reference. The preponderance of incidents occur around the perimeter of UVa property.

Jennifer A. Heckman, GeoSpatial Manager, Facilities Management Department
Recommendations

Target completion in 2015 (first priority)

- **Data management, analysis, and distribution** - assign the responsibility, authority, and accountability to a primary and secondary University employee to collect, integrate, process, analyze, and distribute information from all the sources that receive reports of sexual violence against members of the University community. This information is a valuable, relatively untapped resource for on-going prevention, culture, and response efforts. If existing staff is unavailable for this work, consider deputizing and funding an organization such as the Center for Survey Research or creating a new position. A possible guide in this area is Steve Cooper, former CIO of the Department of Homeland Security. Steve recently spoke at the Commerce School about integrating compartmentalized, regulated, classified information following 9/11.

Target completion in 2016 (second priority)

- **University Ambassador program coverage** – develop a method to evaluate and correlate ambassador coverage to reduced risk of sexual violence. Subcommittee 5’s understanding is that the University of Pennsylvania ambassador program depends on a staffing level that provides essentially line-of-sight coverage. Is that needed near UVa?
- **Emergency phone signage and simplicity of operation** – Safety Working Group report, page 8, recommends next steps to include “Examine all interior (e)phones and create consistency in signage and type of phone.” Subcommittee 5 recommends extending this initiative to include exterior blue light phones. Facilities Management’s electrical distribution group is considering an assessment of the exterior blue light phone units and could include data gathering toward this goal.
- **UVa Hospital sexual violence reports** – provide the data to the appropriate Hospital administrators for review and subsequent action. A summary of incidents reported in the UVa Hospital is included in the reference material section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis ID</th>
<th>Victim Known to Victim</th>
<th>Suspect Known to Victim</th>
<th>Suspect Reported To</th>
<th>Victim Type</th>
<th>Incident Type</th>
<th>Suspect Type</th>
<th>Date of Incident</th>
<th>Day of Week</th>
<th>Time of Incident</th>
<th>Suspect Did Anything</th>
<th>Suspect Location</th>
<th>Victim Location</th>
<th>Victim Injured</th>
<th>Victim Age</th>
<th>Suspect Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>UVA Police</td>
<td>Firing</td>
<td>01/15/06</td>
<td>7:40</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>1/15/2006</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>Lee St</td>
<td>University Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>During exam</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>UVA Police</td>
<td>Firing</td>
<td>06/20/09</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>6/20/2009</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Lee St</td>
<td>University Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>During exam</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>UVA Police</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>01/28/11</td>
<td>9:19</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>1/28/2011</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Lee St</td>
<td>University Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>During exam</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>UVA Police</td>
<td>Firing</td>
<td>07/07/11</td>
<td>18:00</td>
<td>Thursday</td>
<td>7/12/2011</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Lee St</td>
<td>University Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>Suspect dressed in某种</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>UVA Police</td>
<td>Firing</td>
<td>12/05/11</td>
<td>22:00</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>12/6/2011</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Lee St</td>
<td>University Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>UVA Police</td>
<td>Firing</td>
<td>01/23/12</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1/24/2012</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Lee St</td>
<td>University Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>UVA Police</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>03/28/12</td>
<td>0:05</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>3/26/2012</td>
<td>WICHDIE HILL</td>
<td>Lee St</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>UVA Police</td>
<td>Firing</td>
<td>03/13/13</td>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3/13/2013</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Lee St</td>
<td>University Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>UVA Police</td>
<td>Firing</td>
<td>01/28/12</td>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>1/28/2013</td>
<td>1213</td>
<td>Lee St</td>
<td>University Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Doctors (2)</td>
<td>UVA Police</td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>06/27/14</td>
<td>0:01</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>7/12/2014</td>
<td>Lee St</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>HOSPITAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

Early Intervention and Recovery Support at UVa
The Gordie Center
BASICS Program & Budget

Early Intervention and Recovery Support at UVa

The issues:
1) A small, but vocal percent of students are hazardous drinkers.
   Results of the 2013 Health Survey of undergraduate students found that 16% of students report consuming seven or more alcoholic beverages on a typical Saturday night. However, the majority of students (59%) follow federal low-risk drinking guidelines of drinking between zero and three. Students with hazardous drinking patterns harm themselves and others when intoxicated and their high visibility leads to misperceptions about the extent of heavy drinking. Sexual misconduct, including rape and sexual assault, frequently occurs on college campuses in the context of alcohol abuse.

2) Services for students in recovery are underutilized.
   Results of the 2013 Health Survey also found that there are at least 260 undergraduate students who are addicted to alcohol or other drugs. Many of them are actively working on recovery, but some are still ambivalent about change. Attendance at the weekly Hoos in Recovery lunch meetings averages 10-12 students, which indicates a need for additional outreach and support to help these students find treatment, recover from addiction and prevent relapse.

Proposed intervention strategies:
1) Implement Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students (BASICS) program

   The BASICS intervention is a harm reduction approach for college students who experience negative consequences of their drinking. BASICS is grounded in Motivational Interviewing (MI), “a collaborative conversation style for strengthening a person’s own motivation and commitment to change” (Miller and Rollnick, 2013 p. 12). BASICS/MI provides a confidential, non-judgmental, non-labeling environment to assess personal risk, identify potential changes that could work for each student and help reduce risk for developing future problems. UVa faculty, student affairs staff, police officers and peer educators have found MI training to be extremely relevant to their work, particularly to the total advising initiative.

   The BASICS program consists of an online survey and a meeting between the student and a trained BASICS facilitator to review survey results. During the 30-minute meeting, students receive personalized information about their alcohol use and how it compares to other UVa
students’ use. The discussion focuses on exploring ways to reduce future health, social, and legal risks. Any protective strategies or reduction goals are selected by the student, not the facilitator.

Students who complete the course may be sanctioned by the University Judiciary Committee or encouraged to attend by one of the Deans on Call as a result of an alcohol-related policy violation (n=392 students in the 2013-14 academic year). However, BASICS is available for all undergraduate, graduate, and professional students at UVa who would like to learn how their alcohol use compares to others and to explore moderation strategies to reduce negative consequences. The BASICS program was first implemented at UVa though a federal grant that will end in May 2015. The UVa Advisory Committee on Alcohol and Substance Abuse has recommended that the University fully fund and implement the BASICS program.

Over the past twenty years, BASICS has been implemented in over 1,100 locations reaching over 20,000 individuals. BASICS is recognized in the federal Substance Abuse, Mental Health Services Administration’s National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/ViewIntervention.aspx?id=124) and in the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism’s review of effective programs for college students (http://www.collegedrinkingprevention.gov/1College_Bulletin-508_361C4E.pdf).

2) Increase student-led recovery support
The Hoos in Recovery (HiR) peer support program was created in 2007 and is advised and coordinated by the Gordie Center. HiR provides support for students in recovery though weekly meetings, a confidential listserv, social events and networking with other college students in recovery.

Through the support of a $10,000 grant from the Stacie Mathewson Foundation in 2013, HiR hired a student coordinator to conduct a needs assessment of HiR members and University allies, expanded meeting frequency from every other week to every week and increased the number and variety of social events.

HiR members express great enthusiasm for making the group a more visible part of the University. Students who question their substance use feel welcome at meetings and can seek guidance from those more firmly established in recovery. Alumni in recovery have stated that they may not have gone through such academic, behavioral and/or health turmoil if HiR had existed when they were students.

Funding from the current grant will end in 2015. We propose to use funds to hire a student in recovery as a student assistant to coordinate and fund social activities for the group (e.g., sober tailgates, bowling nights), schedule two meetings per week to increase access for students with class conflicts, and fund student travel to recovery-oriented workshops and conferences.
**Goals:**

1) **Increase Knowledge of recovery services**

   Through the Stacie Mathewson Foundation grant, HiR began a marketing campaign to increase awareness of the weekly meetings HiR among gatekeepers, referral resources and students in need of recovery. We plan to increase program visibility through greater use of social media with students and direct marketing to gatekeepers. We will partner with the Social Norms Marketing Coordinator in Student Health to include information about addiction risk factors and recovery services in all marketing campaigns. The BASICS coordinator will promote trainings, workshops and greater awareness and use of the MI approach at UVa which will result in more productive interventions with students in distress. The Gordie Center will implement an annual survey of recovery stakeholders to measure awareness of services and number of student referrals.

2) **Increase Awareness of true drinking/drug use norms**

   There is a great deal of research indicating college students are likely to overestimate the true extent of drinking by their peers, which in turn influences their own drinking choices. Providing accurate information on drinking norms can correct these misperceptions and reduce heavy drinking. UVa was an early adopter of the social norms marketing approach and has implemented a poster campaign in all first-year residence hall bathroom stalls since 1999. Today, UVa students are much more accurate in their perceptions of typical student drinking; however, there is still room for increased accuracy. Students who complete the BASICS program will become more accurate in their perception of UVa student drinking norms as measured by a pre/posttest survey.

3) **Provide Skills to reduce/quit drinking/drug use**

   BASICS is designed to provide a confidential, non-judgmental, non-labeling environment to assess personal risk, identify potential changes that could work for each student and help reduce risk for developing future problems. The Early Intervention and Recovery Support Coordinator will work with each student, using the structured BASICS format, to explore the students’ ambivalence about change and discuss realistic ways to reduce risk of harm. Students who complete the BASICS program will be more likely to reduce their drinking behaviors and/or use more protective behaviors as measured by a pre/post test survey.

   The Early Intervention and Recovery Support Coordinator will partner with the Women’s Center to promote trainings, workshops and greater awareness and use of the MI approach at UVa which will result in more productive interventions with students in distress. The Coordinator will partner with the Prevention Coordinator in the Office of the Dean of Students to enhance existing bystander intervention efforts to focus on early identification of alcohol or other substance abuse issues. This will increase students’ abilities to intervene
effectively with their peers. The Coordinator will track the number of trainings, workshops and consultations made to student, faculty, staff and community gatekeepers.

Outcomes:
1) **Reduce the percent of student who report consuming seven or more alcoholic beverages on a typical Saturday night from 16% to 10%.**
   The goals will be achieved within five years of full implementation of the BASICS program for those with alcohol or other drug policy violations. The Gordie Center will provide BASICS sessions for 400 students each year.

2) **Increase participation in Hoos in Recovery support programs by 200% (from 20 students to 60 or more).**
   This goal will be achieved within three years of hiring a full-time Master’s Degree-level program coordinator.

Impact
1) **Create a healthier environment for all students by decreasing number of students who experience harm due to alcohol & other drug use.**

   Funding the BASICS program and Hoos in Recovery will provide a healthier learning environment for all students since those who drink moderately or not at all are often the ones who take care of the heaviest drinking students. Data from the 2013 UVa Health Survey indicates that 75.9% of students reported at least one negative consequence of drinking in the previous twelve months including 22.2% who reported 5 or more consequences. Within five years of full implementation of the programs described in this proposal, we will reduce the percent of students who have five or more negative consequences to no more than 12.2%.

A gift of ~$2,400,000 will endow the following efforts (approximately $110,000/year):

- NEW full-time Gordie Center staff position salary & benefits to implement programs and grow UVa and community connections (~$75,000/year)
- Continue part-time Hoos in Recovery programming position for student in recovery (~$4,000/year)
- Full funding for weekly meals, social activities, student recovery conferences (~$14,000)
- Marketing budget to promote Hoos in Recovery programs (~$2,000)
- BASICS survey/feedback/scheduling software ($15,000/year)

---
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Appendix H
University of Virginia Safety Working Group Executive Summary

Safety is a top priority for the University of Virginia. In September 2014, President Sullivan charged a working group to conduct a comprehensive review and analysis of safety on and around U.Va. Grounds. The University Safety Working Group was charged with the following:

• Review safety and security on Grounds

• Deliver a report containing specific, actionable recommendations to enhance safety on Grounds

• Provide input to the joint Community Safety Advisory Committee (city-county-university) on safety concerns or suggestions for improvement

Members were appointed from the University Academy and the Health System, and included students, faculty, and staff, as well as a former member of the Board of Visitors:

Pat Hogan, EVP-COO, Chair Marge Sidebottom, director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Vice Chair

Jason Bauman, associate director of Athletics

Bill Brady, professor of Emergency Medicine and member of the Faculty Senate Policy Committee

Eric Charles, resident, Department of Surgery (and alternate Kevin Dabrowski, resident, Department of Emergency Medicine)

Hunter Craig, former member, U.Va. Board of Visitors

Nathan Demers, Dean’s Office, School of Nursing

Stephen Ernst, graduate student, School of Medicine.

Lt. Melissa Fielding, University Police Department

Cynthia Garwood, University Bookstore and member of the Staff Senate

Allen Groves, Dean of Students

Thomas Harkins, Chief Environment of Care Officer for the U.Va. Health System
Archie Holmes, Vice Provost
Kathleen Jump, Office of Emergency Preparedness*

McGregor McCance, University Communications*

Meagan McGinley, School of Medicine graduate student (and alternate graduate student Ashley Emery)

Barry Meek, associate general counsel*

Gay Perez, executive director of Housing and Residence Life

Colette Sheehy, vice president for Management and Budget

Samantha Westrum, undergraduate student CLAS

Rebecca White, director, Parking and Transportation

*Provided administrative, communication and legal support.

The working group held an organizational meeting on Sept. 26, 2014, and met on October 3, 10, 17, 24 and November 7, at which the Group reported its findings and recommendations. Subgroups had met throughout this time, often with the expertise of additional members from the University community, to review the following safety-related areas:

1. Personal Technology - review functionality and options for use of personal technology.

2. Lighting/ Walking Areas and Pathways – focus on the current enterprise-wide lighting plan and exploration of areas of concern. In addition, review areas used for walking around Grounds; identify issues and opportunities to improve the safety of the pathways (footing, lighting, tree canopy).

3. Cameras – assess placement, management, maintenance; review technology and coordination.

4. Emergency phones – examine the placement, functionality, uniformity, and use of all of the University’s emergency phones.

5. Transportation and Parking - evaluate the various modes of transportation available to the University population and the operations (times, schedules/routes, communication to patrons, etc.) of those systems. Also assess the availability of parking, the location of parking and cost, with consideration of any issues related to timing of certain shifts.

6. Emergency Communications – Evaluate the various modes of safety communication,
population served, time and ease of delivery, across University coordination of vetted messages.

As part of its review of safety best practices in higher education, five members of the Safety Working Group traveled to Philadelphia on October 20-21, 2014, to meet with counterparts at the University of Pennsylvania and Drexel University. (For the past eight years, the University of Pennsylvania’s public safety division has been named first in its sector in Security Magazine’s annual Security 500 rankings.) Safety Working Group members met with Penn’s Vice President for Division of Public Safety Maureen Rush who oversees Police, Security Services, Emergency Communications, Fire and Safety, Security Technology, Special Services, and Finance and Administration. Members looked at lighting, cameras, dispatch, and emergency phones. Members talked to security escorts in the Ambassador Program and leaders in Penn’s Public Safety Division, including Penn’s chief of police, to discuss a number of safety programs and practices at Penn and Drexel.

Additionally, the Safety Working Group invited Sophie Trawalter, associate professor of Public Policy and Psychology, Batten School of Leadership & Public Policy; and Helen Wilson, Assistant University Landscape Architect, Office of the University Architect to discuss findings from a recent survey on lighting and perceived safety. This survey led to the collection of detailed light meter readings across Grounds. Data gathered from the meter readings provided additional information for the subgroup focused on lighting.

In addition to learning about the lighting study, Safety Working Group members participated in two night tours (October 2 and October 16) to assess areas across Grounds first hand. The Working Group also received the findings of the annual Night Tours conducted by the Security and General Safety Committee on November 11 and December 8.

The Safety Working Group members felt a keen responsibility to utilize this opportunity to inventory and review existing safety resources. Many of the Committee’s findings validated work that has been accomplished by the University and through the University’s Security and General Safety Committee.

Safety Working Group Summary of Accomplishments and Recommendations

1. PERSONAL TECHNOLOGY

Membership:
Eric Charles Ashley Emery Mr. Fitz-Gerald’s Class Allen Groves Lt. Melissa Fielding Meg McGinley Hannah Rosenfield Marge Sidebottom Timmy Wang Samantha Westrum

Summary of Accomplishments:
• Identified the top three safety apps useful to student, faculty and staff; particularly those that would be user-friendly to persons with compromised cognition. The apps recommended for final procurement process are: (1) Circle of 6 (2) LiveSafe and (3) Rave Guardian.

• Fast-tracked an RFP to address the need for a safety app

**Next Steps:**

• Work with Procurement & Supplier Diversity to complete the procurement process by January 15, 2015.

• Coordinate app rollout with University Communications, Student Affairs, Student Council, Security and General Safety Committee by the first quarter 2015.

• Identify locations and install charging stations for students to recharge mobile devices around Grounds, while also taking into consideration the State Managed Shelter requirements; to be completed by the end of Spring 2015 academic term.

2. LIGHTING/WALKING AREAS & PATHWAYS

**Membership:**

Tom Harking Colette Sheehy Gay Perez Marge Sidebottom

**Summary of Accomplishments:**

• Conducted Night Tours on Oct. 2 and Oct. 16 to assess needs.

• Security and General Safety Night tour assessments: November 11, December 8.

• Replaced bulbs and trimmed tree canopy around fixtures throughout fall 2014

• Earmarked an additional $600,000 to complete Phase 2 of the Lighting Master Plan; increasing the total commitments to complete Phase 2 of the Lighting Master Plan to $946,400.

**Next Steps:**

• Complete all projects in the 2014 Lighting Master Plan now that funding has been identified. All funded projects will be completed by June 2015. Major components include:

  a. *Emmet Street*

  *North of railroad bridge on both sides; 40 new edgewater fixtures between November 2014 – June 2015*
b. Alderman Road

*East side – George Welsh Way to Whitehead, replace 17 edgewater fixtures with LED*

*West side – Gooch-Dillard to Treehouse Drive, install 25 new Bega fixtures*

c. Replace and install new lights on several major arteries, including:

- [ ] Whitehead
- [ ] Engineer’s Way
- [ ] University Avenue
- [ ] Massie Road and Crispell Drive

- Recommend that the Community Safety Advisory Committee consider safety concerns related
to lighting in several areas adjacent to the University, including:

a. Fencing beneath the railroad bridge on Roosevelt Brown – to be completed by city by
June 30, 2015.

b. Stadium Road – lighting on the U.Va. side of Stadium Road is a priority project in the
ongoing U.Va. Lighting Plan. When this project is implemented, the lighting needs for
the opposite side of Stadium Road can be determined.

- Add Additional Lighted Crosswalks to the Lighting Master Plan. Twelve locations are slated to
be completed by July 2015:

1. Newcomb Rd & University Ave
2. Emmet Street & Sprigg Lane
3. Emmet Street & Thomson Road
4. Emmet Street & Stadium Road
5. Alderman Rd & Gilmer Drive
6. Jefferson Park Avenue & Lane Road
7. Jefferson Park Avenue & Lee Street
8. University Avenue & Culbreth Road
9. Copeley Road & Lannigan Field
Leonard Sandridge Road & Darden/Ivy Gardens

Massie Rd & JPJ West

Massie Rd & JPJ East

3. SECURITY AND IP CAMERAS IN PUBLIC PLACES

Membership:
Lt. Melissa Fielding Marge Sidebottom Sgt. Rick Sandridge

Summary of Accomplishments:

• A full assessment of existing infrastructure and proposals for cameras in Central Grounds and North Grounds has been completed and is ready for immediate implementation.
• ITS named a project director to help coordinate the various components to provide a camera network to resolve connectivity issues by first quarter 2015. Next Steps:
• Implement the revised University camera policy in January 2015.
• If necessary, create and implement legal agreements with private businesses and property owners to define responsibilities and limitations regarding UPD access to private cameras by January 2015.
• Repair and/or replace 20 currently inoperable cameras that are critically positioned along Rugby Road, Carruthers Hall, etc. immediately.
• In first quarter 2015, determine the appropriate enhanced technology for the camera systems at the monitoring station in order to resolve the current issues preventing the station from connecting to approximately 20 existing cameras and to forestall future issues of increased camera capacity.
• In first quarter 2015, implement the U.Va. Camera Master Plan, which includes 30 new cameras for the U.Va. Medical Center and 50 to 60 cameras for the Academic Grounds. Locations for all proposed cameras have been identified. (Some of these new cameras will upgrade and/or replace one or more existing cameras, ultimately enhancing and reducing the University’s total camera inventory).

4. EMERGENCY PHONES

Membership:
Lt. Melissa Fielding Marge Sidebottom John Flood Sgt. Rick Sandridge

Summary of Accomplishments

• Conducted a physical and operational inspection of all phones on and off Grounds
Next Steps

- Explore and implement technology (if possible) for remote ephone testing/inspection;  
  - In Spring 2015, determine with vendor whether current phones (analog) support technology  
  - or need replacement with digital phones;  
  - If feasible to proceed, implement pilot in FY 2014-15.

- In January 2015, review with students an already created graphic that displays the various  
  kinds/models of ephones in use at UVa.  
  - By April 2015, work with students to create short video on emergency phones

- Examine all interior phones and create consistency in signage and type of phone by June 2015

- Develop ephone guidelines by January 2015; retrofit phones if necessary

- Utilize phones that provide strategic opportunity for adding cameras by June 2015.

5. PARKING & TRANSPORTATION

Membership:
Rudy Beverly Bill Brady, MD Eric Charles Ruby Curnish Kevin Dabrowski Ashley Emery Lt. Melissa Fielding Tom Harkins Megan McGinley Becca White

Summary of Accomplishments:

- Fully reviewed existing program resources – including SafeRide, Charge-a-Ridge, Buddies on  
  Call (pending), UTS, CAT, fixed and on-demand Hospital Employee Shuttles, on-demand hospital Walking Escorts, and Student Watch.

- Reviewed after-Hours Parking Options on University Academic Grounds and hospital lots and  
  garages.

- Hospital administration now provides point-to-point, on demand, 8 PM – 4 AM car service for  
  individuals returning to their cars. Next Steps:

- Expand parking and transportation options after 5 p.m. by January 2015.

- Expand communications regarding after hours options for transportation and parking by  
  January 2015.

- Geo-code student residences and align service options to 90%
• Evaluate service area alignment of SafeRide and UTS service areas to geocode of student residential data by January 2015.

• Evaluate residential densities tied to undergraduate, graduate, and professional student groups by June 2015.

• Target service areas to 90% of student populations by June 2015.

• Hire a consultant by January 2015 to help P&T complete an evaluation by first quarter 2015 of:
  • After-hours transportation options (including UTS, SafeRide, hospital transportation, and taxi charge-a-ride)
  • Opportunities to streamline, share resources, and combine efforts (in terms of technology, service areas, etc.) and
  • Possibility of providing self-operating point to point on demand service or provide additional information about preferred taxi providers.

• Reassess actions and re-evaluate new issues each spring.

7. EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS SUBGROUP

Members:
Anthony de Bruyn McGregor McCance Eric Swensen John Flood Kathleen Jump Jeremy Harris Tom Harkins Marge Sidebottom

Summary of Accomplishments:

• Conducted annual due diligence of all components of UVa.’s Emergency Notification System including:
  • UVa alerts (sign-up system for text messaging and e-mail)
  • UVa Mass email
  • LCD and LED screens in classrooms, auditoria, public locations
  • Paging system where utilized
  • Outdoor siren warning and public address system
  • Alerts that appear on UVa Homepage
  • Desktop alert for classrooms & individual desktops (opt-in)

Next Steps

• Consider changing the U.Va. Alert notification from the current choice of “opt-in” to an automatic enrollment system from which students, faculty and staff would choose to “opt
Convene group from Human Resources, Student Affairs, IT, University Communications and Emergency Preparedness to review feasibility and stakeholder concerns; recommend a decision by June 1, 2015.

- Continue to review all elements of the Emergency Notification System annually.