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Learning Outcomes

• **Understand the differences** between services provided to survivors and respondents

• **Identify the ways** that providing respondent services can serve both survivors and the institution

• **Understand the national landscape** of respondent support services at institutions across the country and implications for your own campus
Introduction of Terms

Equal vs. equitable

Safety planning and risk reduction

Importance of person-first language

Stress – External events that tax our typical coping strategies

Crisis – When coping mechanisms are overwhelmed and external support is needed

Trauma – Psychobiological response that is sustained after experiencing an acute awareness of a threat to life/physical safety
Landscape Analysis Research – Survey Participants

- Participants
  - 251
- Type of Institution
  - 52% public, four-year
  - 38% private, non-profit, four year
  - 6% public, two-year
  - 2% international
- Most Represented State
  - California
- Institution Size
  - 9% from 1,000 to 4,999 students
  - 21% from 5,000 to 9,999 students
  - 23% from 10,000 to 19,999 students
  - 47% more than 20,000 students
• Nearly all (99%) of survey participants provide some sort of services
• The most common services being provided:
  – Explaining rights and assisting in the hearing process (93%)
  – Referring to on- (91%) and off-campus resources (69%)
  – Assisting in accessing interim measures and accommodations (89%)
  – Assisting in adherence to interim sanctions, maintaining boundaries, and understanding protective orders (86%)
  – Accompanying to conduct meetings or hearings (60%)
  – Operating as a liaison between other offices (53%)
  – Services to students currently being investigated, recently found responsible, or those re-entering following institutional separation
Landscape Analysis Research – Services Offered

• Equal or Equitable
  – 48% said services were “equal”
  – 43% said services were “equitable”
  – 9% said “No, and they don’t seem similar/equitable/fair”
Landscape Analysis Research – Services Offered

• Responding Parties (not reporting parties)
  – Thirty-four percent (34%) of institutions offered referrals to legal services

• Reporting Parties (not responding parties)
  – Confidential advocacy and support (51%)
  – Medical services (21%)
  – Counseling (13%)
• Very few institutions offered services to students:
  – Transferring with transcript notation
  – On the sex-offender registry upon acceptance
Landscape Analysis Research – Outreach & Education

- **Passive**: Institutions primarily educate via university sexual misconduct policy (63%) and their website (49%)
- **Active**: Thirty-eight percent (38%) inform during in-person presentations and 31% present about the topic during first-year and transfer student orientation
- **None**: Thirty-five percent (35%) of survey respondents do not educate the campus community
What We Know — And Don’t Know — About Adolescent and Adult Sex Offenders
National Sex Offender Public Website

www.nsopw.gov
What Do We Know About Adolescent and Adult Sex Offenders?
We don’t know the full population of sex abusers, thus we don’t know what percentage are registered sex offenders.

However, based on victimization prevalence research, we know that registered sex offenders are a small percentage of all sexual abusers (15+ data sources).
Not all people who abuse are the same.

Not all behaviors are the same.
What We Know About Respondents
All People Who Sexually Harm

- On campuses, schools may classify sexual misconduct as policy violations, often defined more broadly than criminal offenses.
- Some students may be accused of sexual misconduct, but not found responsible.
What We Know About Respondents

- Difference in behaviors
- Differences in those who exhibit those behaviors
- Differences in campus responses
- Services for people who have not been reported but seeking help
ABA Criminal Justice Section Task Force on College Due Process Rights and Victim Protections

Recommendations for Colleges and Universities in Resolving Allegations of Campus Sexual Misconduct, June 2017

V. (E.) Sanction

In the event of a finding of responsibility, the consensus of the Task Force is that a particular sanction should not be presumed or required. Instead, the Task Force proposes that sanctioning should be decided on an individualized basis taking into account the facts and circumstances including mitigating factors about the respondent, the respondent’s prior disciplinary history, the nature and seriousness of the offense, and the effect on the victim and/or complainant as well as the university community. The Task Force believes that a presumption of expulsion may have unintended consequences such as discouraging reporting and a finding of responsibility.
National Survey of Sanctioning Practices

- 79% do not assess the effectiveness of their approaches

- 20% collect follow-up info. from complainant to determine if they remained or graduated

- 30% gather follow-up info about students found responsible to identify if they engage in further sexual behavior problems

National Survey of Sanctioning Practices for Student Sexual Misconduct at Institutions of Higher Education, 2014: A collaboration between the University of Michigan’s Office of Student Conflict Resolution and Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, The Center for Effective Public Policy, and the Association for Student Conduct Administration.
Landscape Analysis Research – Institutional Placement of Services

- Personnel serving each party
  - Same for responding and reporting parties (48%)
  - Different for responding vs. reporting parties (52%)
- Supervision and functional area inconsistent
Landscape Analysis Research – Training

• In-house training is most common (94%)

• Consistent resources or oversight were not assessed, however institutions also utilized:
  – Online training (31%)
  – Training/certification by a national organization (41%)
  – Training/certification by a community organization (20%)
Small Group Conversation

What are the challenges to providing respondent services on a college or university campus?

What are some of the benefits?
Making the Case for Providing Respondent Services

Ensures solid outcomes for survivors

Better outcomes for respondents found not responsible

Repairing harm to the community

• Reduces likelihood of liability in case of litigation
• Impact on prevention efforts
• Prevents further retaliation or re-traumatization
Landscape Analysis Research – Recommendations

- **Training** for those providing respondent services
- Increasing access to **community resources**
- Creating a **clear definition** of equitable and equal
- Funding/conducting research for **best practices**
- Expanding the **range of students served**
- **Informing and educating** the campus community
Questions?
Next steps...
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