



Engaging College Campuses Focus Group Summary

December, 2014

Engaging College Campuses Focus Group Summary

OVERVIEW

A two-hour focus group of staff members from Vermont colleges was held on October 21, 2014 at Vermont Technical College in Randolph, Vermont to provide assessment data, reflection, and response in support of the formulation of a Statewide Prevention Plan to address Sexual and Domestic Violence. This focus group is one source of information for a statewide planning process to establish a multi-year plan to prevent sexual and domestic violence in Vermont, undertaken by the [Vermont Department of Health, Division of Maternal and Child Health](#), and the [Vermont Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence](#), with funding from the [Centers for Disease Control Rape Prevention and Education program](#).

The statewide planning process responds, in part, to the September, 2013 recommendations and report made by the [Vermont Governor's Task Force on the Prevention of Domestic and Sexual Violence](#). The report recommends seven actions, including to "Strengthen Vermont college campuses' response to prevention of domestic and sexual violence by providing: a) tools for planning ongoing, multi-component education; b) materials targeted to Vermont's college students; and c) best practice prevention topics and support resources."

To inform the statewide prevention plan and to advance the recommendations of the Governor's Task Force report, the College Campuses Focus Group engaged participants around the forming question "How can Vermont colleges integrate, sustain, and institutionalize domestic and sexual violence prevention?" The notation "SV/DV" is used throughout this report to refer to sexual and domestic violence.

METHODOLOGY

Focus Group Participants

Twenty-six individuals from eleven colleges participated, representing half of Vermont's 22 higher education institutions. Participants were identified by college representatives serving on the State Prevention Plan Advisory Team, as well as through a college email list created and maintained by the Vermont Commission on Women. An open invitation letter was sent to all names on the list. More targeted outreach was also used to ensure broad representation from campuses across the state.

Participants came from the Vermont Agency of Human Services, Vermont Commission on Women, Association of Vermont Independent Colleges, and the National Association of Campus Public Safety. The range of participants represented a variety of kinds of academic institutions (public, private, technical), from six of Vermont's fourteen counties, and included campuses ranging in size of student body from approximately 500 to more than 15,000 students enrolled. Each campus was represented by one to four individuals, and the group included staff members from college administrative offices and President's offices, Student Affairs, Student Life, Health and Wellness, Public Safety, Human Resources, Residence Life, and campus Women's and

Gender Centers. Some individuals also hold roles on campuses as educators, faculty, instructors, coaches, and student advisors.

A complete list of attendees is included in *Appendix C*.

Agenda & Facilitation

In advance of the focus group, an advisory team that included members of the Statewide Prevention Plan Advisory Team from college campuses met by conference call to discuss proposed focus group topics, identify critical issues that participants might have concerns about, and suggest processes that would support focus group facilitation. This advisory team received a list of potential discussion topics and questions via email in advance of the conference call, and provided essential guidance in the formulation of the focus group agenda.

At the Engaging College Campuses Focus Group, participants joined a series of structured, timed small group discussions. Discussions used prepared prompts and questions to guide informally facilitated dialogue among participants. A facilitator in each group introduced the discussion topic and key questions, and encouraged multiple speakers to participate during each time period. A note taker volunteered within each discussion circle to capture key topics, questions, and themes on chart paper. Three concurrent discussion circles took place, each lasting fifteen to twenty-five minutes, with six to twelve participants in each. Each circle (“Red,” “Blue” and “Yellow”) met a total of four times. In the first (opening) and last (closing) circles, participants were assigned to a circle with the same or slightly varied discussion prompts, and the same group of individuals met together both times.

During discussion rounds two and three, each circle discussed a different topic related to preventing sexual and domestic violence on college campuses, and participants self-selected which discussion to join. Discussion topics in circle two focused on: *Engaging Men in Prevention Efforts, Bystander Approaches to Prevention, and Policies to Support SV/DV Prevention*. Circle three focused on engaging key stakeholders, with groups discussing: *On Campus Partners, Community Partners, and Campus Administrators*. The project evaluator introduced each discussion topic, timed groups, and coded each page of notes for consistency and organization. A detailed agenda, including discussion topics, facilitator guidance, and prompts is included in *Appendix B*.

Notes from all discussion circles were transcribed as written. The complete transcription is provided in *Appendix A*. Once transcribed, data analysis included a word count analysis to surface significant themes that may have emerged across discussion circles. For example, while “Bystander Approaches” was discussed in detail within one group on that topic, this topic emerged in a variety of discussions on a variety of themes.

RESULTS

Who is seen as integral to SV/DV prevention?

Focus group participants named a variety of individuals, groups, entities, organizations or roles who are viewed as key actors, whether agents of or consumers of, campus-based SV/DV prevention activities.

Table 1. Key actors in campus-based SV/DV prevention activities		
Agents of Prevention Messages and Activities	Consumers of Prevention Messages and Activities	Both Agents and Consumers
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrators & College Presidents • Faculty/Staff • Coaches • Campus Safety Departments • Risk Management Staff • Residence Advisors • Families & Parents • Alumni • Community-based Organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Year Students • Transfer Students • First Generation Students • Queer students • “At-risk” and “Of concern” students, • Graduate Students • Middle & High Schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Athletes • Student leaders • Student groups/ Organizations • Peer advocates • Male students engaged in prevention campaigns (e.g. 1 in 4, White Ribbon)

What Laws/Policies Shape SV/DV Prevention?

Discussions included attention to numerous policies and laws related to SV/DV. Policies and laws are viewed as motivators for campuses to improve practices, and/or come into compliance with federal or state standards. Participants also noted the role of campus-based policies in governing student conduct, establishing norms, and setting behavioral expectations. Such policies were most often described with regard to intervention activities. Only college Mission Statements were referenced as a tool for prevention, contextualizing the values of “community” and “extended family” that an institution might invoke in efforts to engage students in dialogue about SV/DV prevention. Participants expressed a need for training and funding to fully implement new expectations.

Table 2. Policies that influence campus-based SA/DV prevention activities	
External (State/ Federal) Policies	Internal (Campus-Based) Policies
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Title IX • Violence Against Women Act • Vermont Statute 311A • Clery Act 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional Mission Statements • Student Codes of Conduct and established rules • Sexual misconduct policies and procedures • Campus judicial processes

Identified Needs and Wishes

Participants were prompted to answer a variety of questions related to “What tools, resources, or actions are needed to advance SV/DV prevention on college campuses?” The following items emerged either as summative statements that gather several key comments under one shared idea, or are refinements of statements made by single individuals that were generally supported by a larger group:

1. Effective prevention program models and curricula that work with campuses of different sizes are wanted. There is a desire for resources that are vetted and evaluated, and can be shared by programs across campuses.
2. There is interest in engaging men and in employing bystander approaches—but both topics remained at a surface level about how to approach these issues. Participants seemed to want more tools, resources, and support to deepen this work.
3. Broad support across stakeholder groups from administrators and faculty to coaches and residence advisors within each campus is highly desired.
4. There was an expressed wish for dedicated, trained staff on each campus to manage prevention efforts.
5. Collaboration and opportunities to strengthen a network of colleagues was a common wish: Within individual campuses, between students across campuses, and between SV/DV campus partners statewide.
6. There continues to be high interest in systems, policies, training, and resources related to intervention, support, reporting, and advocacy when incidents of SV/DV occur.
7. There is a desire for a statewide strategic framework to link student retention and academic success to freedom from SV/DV; participants desire leadership by campus administrators to make this connection and support efforts to address it.

Significant Themes

A scan and word count analysis of discussion transcriptions generated several macro themes, listed alphabetically:

Admin (12): Viewed as needing training in order to give consistent messages and use leadership in supportive ways.

Alcohol (6): Concerns expressed about the role alcohol plays in campus culture, and how this relates to preventing incidents of SV/DV.

Athletes/Athletics/Coaches (16): Seen as a distinct, reachable population with unique prevention needs and leadership potential; some concern that they are “targeted” as likely perpetrators of SV/DV.

Bystander (16): High interest in these strategies, but ambiguity about how to do them well—for whom are they most effective? Concerns expressed included “How are bystander programs conveying prevention practices and not situational interventions?”

Culture (9): References to “campus culture,” “alcohol culture,” “competitive culture” and “hook-up culture;” Sense that the “culture” of college supports SV/DV and needs to change.

Faculty/ Staff (19): Are messengers, need training, are seen as difficult to engage but integral to addressing issues.

Men/Male (6): Interest in addressing prevention to male students, but few specific strategies were named or discussed other than national campaigns such as White Ribbon.

Orientation/ First Year (19): Viewed as a ripe time for outreach and engagement; the time most consistently being used for prevention activities.

Peer Advocates (6): Peer-to-peer strategies are viewed as successful, but there is a belief that these programs require resources.

Social Norms (4): Social norming campaigns are a tool campuses would like to make better use of.

Train/ Training/ Trainings (42): Topics related to training (for students, campus administrators, faculty and staff, law enforcement, and other partners) occurred more frequently than any other word group or theme. Training is viewed as a core tactic to prevent and address SV/DV on college campuses.

APPENDIX A *TRANSCRIPTION OF FOCUS GROUP NOTES*

Circle #1:

When you think of efforts to prevent SV/DV on your campus, what is SUCCEEDING and how do you know? What do you WISH was happening on your campus?

- “Alcohol culture on campus is the root of so many problems. Need to change this deeply imbedded culture”. A problem especially in the living areas.
- FY orientation- needs to have a focus on healthy relationships and consent. Doesn’t go far enough presently. Needs to continue into Reds Halls
- Middlebury is working with male teams in season. Locker room talks; bystander training with leaders
- SMC has had series of lunch and learn with staff and faculty.
- Staff and faculty need to be trained to get their support efforts- How can they be trained?
- “hook up” culture is very focused on heteronormative relationships. How can we change this type of focus? Where does this leave queer students?
- Strengths of policies- VAWA, Clery, Title IX and 311 and others forces everyone to take ownership of problems- not just one group’s problem, by everyone’s. Needs broad based approaches and solutions.
- Lyndon- public safety met with coaches and teams to send clear message that SA won’t be tolerated. Coaches are beacons on campus and looked upon as leaders. Hard to enforce rules if they don’t what they are. Communicate clearly about expectations.
- Students don’t know procedures. Work to demystify process, right to have advocate, describe internal procedures; what happens if...advertise what process looks like if you have been a victim of SA.
- Inform perpetrators that there is a process in place and that there are consequences.
- 3 legged stool- education/ prevention; enforcement; consequences. Used as planning reference for each leg of the stool
- Judicial process- send clear message to peers
- Issues discussed at FY Orientation
- Small community, not many reports
- Wish to create a culture where students can come forward
- Small groups (8-12 students) with messaging of non-tolerance (for acts of SV/DV?)
- Campus safety + Res Life lead discussions
- Not where we want to be! Long way to go. Ongoing
- Challenges with alcohol culture
- Building relationships with on campus students
- FY Orientation on healthy relationships and consent with Network agency
- Wish for programming directed to males; have spoken to athletic teams
- Bystander intervention across class levels
- Need help from campus colleagues
- Wish to broaden conversation to not be heteronormative

- Wish for involvement on the part of faculty; buy-in to see it as their issue
- VAWA/ Clery Act provide regulations that bring more people in to the work
- Place for coaches, other staff to understand consequences of non-compliance
- Wish to have students more aware of processes, victims' rights
- Educates potential perpetrators as well- dissuade?
- Challenges in maintaining consistency in sanctioning-me (?)
- Orientation/ small groups "Protect One Another"
- Ongoing education
- Prevention piece + "what do you do if. . ."
- Communication/ education re: expectations
- All students receive "bystander training"
- Working in liaison with SACT/Barre
- Received grant
- Starting bystander campaign, intense training
- Tested random sample on campus to evaluate training- student more likely to intervene
- RA trainings on SV/DV> educating them on what to look for and getting referrals
- Massive overhaul of Title 9 procedures and processes, new investigation process, sexual misconduct sanctioning panel, training for all new faculty and staff
- Always room for more hands-on training
- Get more faculty and staff involvement
- Campus culture- faculty/ staff reluctance; culture of corps of Cadets @ Norwich
- Need more collaborative student effort- student driven,
- "like to see game players setting rules for the game"
- Orientation- positive response with SV/DV prevention
- Anecdotal responses- students want to share examples
- More RA trainings- prevention + reporting- Increase in 3rd party reporting
- HOPE Works- bystander training for RAs, campus
- Focus on athletes and 1st year students- required to attend programs> creates buzz about various issues on campus
- Articles in school paper
- Changing culture around competitiveness
- New sexual misconduct policy- procedures + response- all students required to do online training
- Focus groups to identify school-specific needs
- Climate survey? Not implemented, but interested
- Integrated services: face to face communication with all 1st years
- National college health assessment- most students aware of sv prevention programs
- Instantaneous feedback after bystander trainings
- Want more coach involvement and initiative- want more savvy public safety who are more involved
- Resources for athletics at non-NCAA level?
- Bringing men into conversation

Circle #2

Yellow Circle #2: Engaging Men

How are men being engaged in campus prevention activities? What is working well? What is needed?

- Athletics- captive audience required to attend events (incl. bystander training)
- Engaged coaches- buy in from them with conversations in locker room
- Great response from coaches (“win” for them to not have players in judicial review)
- Talk about masculinity, have students define and think about it in an intellectual, cultural, critical way; help work through stereotypes together
- Try to help athletes separate relationships and sports competition
- Assuming shared responsibility among faculty to educate
- First year seminar, faculty, coaches, President
- Backlash with athletes- feel like they’re being targeted with programming ?
- Peer advocates for Change: PAC man- to get men involved, white ribbon campaign, football players engaged and info at football games
- 20-25 hours of training for student leaders- programming has affected (+) change
- 1 in 4 chapter- male peer educators: healthy masculinity, how to support survivors, etc. Reach Greek Life + classes, present @ conference, tabling, TBTN
- Programming helps men realize they can (+ have been) victimized
- Step out/ speak out event to talk about DV- led by students
- Support from across campus is helpful
- Learning to deconstruct gender + masculinity in academic setting
- Broaden conversations about Violence Against Women
- Dialogues- debunk myths, engage differently

Blue Circle #2: What Policies, Strategies?

What policies, strategies, or approaches frame/ guide work on your campus? How is it going? What policies are tools that help you do the work? What policies are barriers to your efforts?

- Peer to Peer, Faculty/Staff involvement- important!
- Literature pre-arrival on campus
- Define what healthy behavior look like
- Be realistic about the role of alcohol
- Use metaphor of campus as “family” with a code of conduct, guiding mission
- Refocus with revision of policy to include new imperatives/ language
- First semester= greatest risk- use mandatory class as a strategy to address behavior prevention
- 6 credit diversity requirement in curriculum
- Couple with curricula that require this subject matter
- “Sex fest” event- make education fun, take it out of the box
- One size does not fit all

- To get students to function as one student body
- Deal with student tendency to want to try to test rules/policies/ limits
- Bystander intervention is more of interest to students- they can participate in prevention
- Faculty Involvement in student experience
- Understand the impact of their role to support students in need
- Their involvement could be key in student having a better experience

Red #2: Bystanders

What does “bystander approach” mean on your campus? What messages do students and staff need to hear about bystander roles? What is working well and what isn’t?

- Fear of speaking out
- Making actions concrete, lots of language options, looking at scenarios
- Social responsibility to peers
- Works better for freshman, more open than upper classmen
- Roleplaying helped students, rotating roles. Different groups/ teams
- Green Dot
- Faculty and staff being primary messengers
- Home grown personal advice sometimes does more harm than good
- Smaller schools may be restricted financially or with too few staff- what do you do then?
- Athletes are more visible than problematic
- Ask students who they respect
- Collecting data after bystander training
- Engaging faculty is not easy when it involves something outside of their specific area
- Mix up training so athletes are with other student population
- Is the bystander more about prevention or intervention?
- Make students comfortable so they will make instances known
- Social conflicts- how to address that
- Students listen to students
- Build skills in stepping up
- First generation students have a number of weak skills, so being a solid bystander doesn’t take place until sophomore/ junior years
- Campus Clarity
- Social norming- real representatives on campus
- Make sure the questions asked of students are those that they will answer and not refuse to respond
- UVM uses Step Up, as their bystander program. Middlebury is using Green Dot; Barbara and Noreen received training.
- Middlebury- bystander approaches- using concrete examples, offering language options, what does it really look like? Walking through familiar scenarios. What is your obligation to peers? This worked: speed role play with partners- switch and take turns in reach role.

- Trained staff and faculty; Be wary of home grown bystander approaches that result in victim blaming. Make sure people have a common language, common tools. Recue # of messages- systemize messaging.
- Engage athletes and broader base of students. Avoid burdening leaders. Middlebury is polling students to hear who they listen to and respect. Casts a wider net and engages more students.
- Start with people who are already on board
- Adapt to specific audience
- There were mixed feelings about segmenting the audience. Strengths to mixing audience up so everyone can learn from others. More in favor of a shared learning experience.
- VTC- Geoff- feels that it's most effective with first years as they are more open. Scenario based is best approach. Consider financial barriers for smaller schools, how do you get people on board, how can these tools be adapted to speak to specific campuses?
- Using a social norms campaign to drive bystander engagement
- Key messages- increase comfort level with stepping up; what is a safe community?; interpersonal skills
- Keep in mind that 65% of students at VT schools are first generation college students. Face barriers because they have so much to cover in first year; often they are also caretaker so f their family (Johnson College)
- Middlebury is using an online tool to do 6 month follow up- Campus Clarity- think about it <https://home.campusclarity.com/>

Circle #3

Blue Circle #3

Administrators: How to engage, unique needs & challenges

- Consistency- 311A helps this across VSC system, better regionally, instituting models for multiple campuses (best practices)
- Statewide campus climate survey (example)
- Federal law will cause administrators to feel as though they HAVE to do something
- Larger campuses may be able to model for smaller schools about best practices
- Need for admin to be trained by outside consultants
- This may trickle down, create structure for trainings
- Admin are viewed as leaders in key issues on campus, need to take a stand
- Presidents also looking to cabinets/ Board of Trustees for buy in
- Can help to get buy in from President first
- Needs/ Challenges for Admin
- Role of admissions in communicating accurate #s to incoming students/ families
- Start with trainings on Title IX/ Dear Colleague/ compliance
- Personally invite admin/ cabinet to fac/staff training on related issues

- Thinking about accessibility of trainings
- Including a survivor story
- Pie charts to show data
- Faculty may be more easily reached through union rep
- Acknowledge that DV/stalking impacts people/peers in the work place
- Importance of educating risk management staff
- How to “tell the story” so admin will get it
- Based in law compliance, parent reactions/ expectations, student retention (academic impacts)

Red Circle #3

On Campus Resources (Safety, Residence Halls, Campus Life, Academics, Women’s Centers)

- Student Life- but bigger issue- trying to get task force of faculty/staff/students to look at policies and procedures, trainings, etc
- Deans enthusiastic to bring faculty into this, VP supportive, New Pres response- encouraging
- Multi-disciplinary group- counseling, deans, res life, “student of concern” meetings to talk about SV/DV, alcohol; collaboration to support students
- Res Life, public safety, 1st years, academic support- collaborative on “red flag” – preventative work, joint training, open communication
- For 1st years, orientation and info disseminated
- Connection between res life and personal counseling> confidentiality? Can be disservice, want to best serve students
- Collaboration is key!!!
- Student hotline- training for advocates (confidential)- getting lots of calls, very beneficial, accessible (Midd Safe + Confidential Advocates for Prevention of Sexual Violence); 24/7 when school is in session- students apply and interview to be advocates.
- Peer advocates
- “Comfort foods” night at popular dining hall with Midd Safe peers to do outreach about who they are, services they provide
- Peer advocates for change, also have phone line
- Want more resources- someone with job to focus on sexual violence prevention, \$, staffing
- More support from elsewhere on campus, not all on just a few staff
- How to change some traditions to have more space for this work, and willingness to change?
- Defining roles and expectations in more concrete ways to hold folks accountable.
- SMC- personal counseling, res life, women’s center are programming forces and partner to bring speakers, panels, local orgs and training
- Has a student- of-concern multi-disciplinary group to focus on at risk students; Collaborate to make sure students aren’t falling through the cracks; Different parts of campus touch the same students; Seen as a preventive mechanism

- Lyndon has something very similar called Red flag. Good relationship between res life, public safety, student life and first year experience. Working to improve relationship between res life and counselling services. Confidentiality shouldn't get in the way of helping students of concern.
- Champlain- often falls to student life. Trying to change this by increasing awareness that this is a problem that belongs to the whole community. Pulling together a task force/work group from across campus to look at whole picture and involve staff and faculty. Hoping that committee work will "count" as committee work for faculty in order to be taken seriously. There is a new president and so far feel that they have support for the task force work.
- Middlebury- student hotline; peer advocates staff SV hotline 24/7. Confidential; 12 student volunteers who are extensively trained. A lot of info calls and what ifs. Meet weekly with advisors. Connects to Women Safe. Barbara does all training. They are certified through state, apply, and interview. Called Mid-Safe
- Castleton has a program similar to Middlebury

What do you need more of?

- Resources, a position with this as the priority, focus on SV prevention to design trainings; larger spread of support; willingness to change to shift to new focus on bystander interventions; changes to orientations that are steeped in unhealthy traditions; make it important, a priority by leadership; define roles more clearly and in more complete ways; set clear expectations for participation and inclusion.

Yellow # 3

Community Connections/ What resources, supports, etc would encourage greater collaboration?

- Grants specific to SV/ misconduct
- Training opportunities and collaboration on training
- ID key stakeholders in community and on campus, and meet regularly: PDs (Police departments), administrators, community agencies
- Campuses coordinate with SAR Teams ?
- Engage with Middle School, High school trainings
- Dedicated resources (staff, programming) to build collaboration
- Statewide support for Title IX coordinator on each campus
- Encourage/ empower student groups to collaborate with community agencies
- Build strong relationships with law enforcement
- Create positive interaction between LEO's and students.

Circle #4:

Brainstorm Needs/ Next Steps

- Administration needs to be trained so there is a common language, to promote consistency; consistent messages from and among administration
- Systematize prevention across campus; training in best practices, communications
- All need to be trained in prevention- theory and practice; new ideas, draw on expertise in field
- Policies-Learning from other institutions, what works well and what doesn't' process/ step-by-step guide to policy review and revisions and creation
- These are old problems but we need new ways to address them; new messaging
- More emphasis on link between alcohol and SV
- UVM is doing more social norming around drinking- look at this more clearly to identify impact
- SMC making changes to 1st year orientation "Keep it Senior"- meaning parties are only for seniors with students who are of age
- More opps for students/alums to share stories about what paths you can take- if you go this way x will happen, if you get this way y will happen
- Vision of a cross state 1st year seminar with consistent content about healthy relationships, consent, etc (Sarah Warrington's idea)
- Work with alums and admissions to engage them in sending clear expectations when they're out on the road recruiting students
- Partner with local high schools to message as well
- Training administrators about issues around sexual misconduct on campus and impact on campus
- Consistent messages among faculty, staff, administrators, college and students
- We ALL need to be trained about new, next steps around prevention on campus; how best to reach out to students
- Step-by-step approach to someone who reports an assault
- Policies, guidance on process, what works/doesn't work
- Tackle the drug/alcohol culture on our campuses- NEW way of communicating with students
- Yes means Yes- drill down into this message and root cause of issue
- Statewide 1st year seminar that is requires to attend/ experience that is focused on prevention
- Focus on students- what do they want/ what will work?
- How can we use alum, admissions counselors, collaboration with local high schools to help change negative college culture?
- Teach/ Educate how to drink responsibly
- Watch out for your friend's safety
- Know where your line is
- "Keep it Senior"

- Substance free events
- Social norming is positively an eye opener for students
- Building effective curriculum to diverse student body (i.e. year, transfer, specific duration of stay; online degrees)
- Protocol development
- Peer advocate students who provide information/ training at certain times for students
- Sharing/advising best practices and training across campuses
- See trainings, victims' advocates, etc as integral factor in student academic success and graduation
- Reimagine the relationship and articulate it at leadership level
- Increased visibility and accessibility of resources
- All levels of staff (RA, Dean) should know the process and provide direction
- Social media?
- More support talking about home/ domestic violence, stalking (w/ technology)
- More programming around holidays, consider when students are going home
- Offering safe spaces and alternatives to going home
- Extend victims advocate or supports on campus to be inclusive and prepared for non-traditional cases
- Mandatory Full Time Title IX Coordinator
- Funding, better access to state \$
- Needs to be support for expectations of the laws, state or federal help? All institutions have to comply with same regulations
- Unfunded mandates! No!!
- Start at public school level with education
- Web-based seminars before students arrive on campus, including transfer and graduate students
- Sessions with parent at orientation (preaching to the choir?)
- Case management software for data "Maxient"

APPENDIX B

Campus Prevention Focus Group

October 21, 1:30-3:30

How can VT colleges integrate, sustain, and institutionalize domestic and sexual violence prevention?

Recommendation 5. Strengthen Vermont college campuses' response to prevention of domestic and sexual violence by providing:

- a. tools for planning ongoing, multi-component education;*
- b. materials targeted to Vermont's college students; and*
- c. best practice prevention topics and support resources.*

Set up: Chairs arranged in three small circles of 8-10 each, with chart pad/ easel at each; nametags with color dots on each, and sign in for attendees.

For first round, participants assigned by color group—colored dots on name tags

Agenda

1:30-1:45 **Welcome**—introduce meeting purpose, describe how it supports RPE project and connect it to TF report and ongoing campus RPE work); Introduce Rebecca

1:45-1:50 **Introduce Process**

Rebecca will introduce small group discussion process/ instructions about note taking, reminder to stay on task, encouragement to focus on prevention vs. intervention

1:50-2:05 **Circle #1 Discussion (Same for all groups)**

1. When you think of efforts to prevent SV/DV on your campus, what is SUCCEEDING and how do you know?
2. What do you WISH was happening on your campus?

2:05-2:30 **Circle #2 Discussion: Current Topics in Prevention** (Participants self-select)

Red Circle Implementing Bystander Approaches: What does “bystander approach” mean on your campus? What messages do students and staff need to hear about bystander roles? What is working well and what isn’t?

Yellow Circle Engaging Men—How are men being engaged in campus prevention activities? What is working well? What is needed?

Blue Circle Policies to Support SA/DV Prevention: What policies, strategies, or approaches frame/ guide work on your campus? How is it going? What policies are tools that help you do the work? What policies are barriers to RPE efforts?

2:30-2:55 **Circle #3 Discussion: Spheres of Influence** (Participants self-select)

Red Circle On Campus Resources (Safety, Residence Halls, Campus Life, Academics, Women’s Centers)

Yellow Circle Community Connections (Local programs, local law enforcement, off-campus services and supports)

Blue Circle Administrators: How to engage, unique needs & challenges

2:55-3:20 **Circle #4 Brainstorm Needs/ Next Steps** (Participants assigned by color group)

Red Circle Brainstorm Actions Steps

Yellow Circle Brainstorm Resources/ Tools Needed

Blue Circle Brainstorm Practical Needs to Do the Work

3:20-3:30 **Closing**

Invite participants to report out a concluding idea to the big group (a handful of volunteers, not everyone); describe next steps in RPE process, ways people in the room can continue to connect, ways info will be disseminated. Thanks to all for attending.

RED Circle Facilitator Guidance

Circle #1 Discussion (Same for all groups) *Facilitator Guidance: This round is intended to open the process and help everyone settle in. Try to encourage participation from everyone in the group, either “popcorn style” or by going around the circle. Do your best to steer intervention conversation back to a prevention focus.*

1. When you think of efforts to prevent SV/DV on your campus, what is SUCCEEDING and how do you know?
2. What do you WISH was happening on your campus?

Circle #2 Discussion: Current Topics in Prevention (Participants self-select)

Facilitator Guidance: The group is not limited to these discussion prompts, they are intended only as a means to keep the discussion focused and moving. Notes can encompass any broad themes, key issues identified, or big ideas the group wants to capture.

Topic: Implementing Bystander Approaches

1. What does “bystander approach” mean on your campus?
2. What messages do students and staff need to hear about bystander roles?
3. What is working well and what isn’t?

Circle #3 Discussion: Spheres of Influence (Participants self-select)

Facilitator Guidance: The group is not limited to these discussion prompts, they are intended only as a means to keep the discussion focused and moving. Notes can encompass any broad themes, key issues identified, or big ideas the group wants to capture.

Topic: On Campus Resources (Safety, Residence Halls, Campus Life, Academics, Women’s Centers)

1. How and in what areas are campus resources succeeding in SV/DV prevention efforts?
2. What would you like to see more of?
3. What is needed to strengthen relationships with on-campus partners?
4. Are there examples of creative intersections/ partnerships among campus entities that could be a good model for others?

Circle #4 Brainstorm Needs/ Next Steps (Participants assigned by color group)

Facilitator Guidance: This round is intended to be a generative brainstorm—long lists, out of the box ideas are welcome, even if they may seem impractical or intangible.

Brainstorm Actions Steps

1. When you think about SV/DV prevention efforts on campus, what are the most immediate action steps you’d like to see?
2. When you think about SV/DV prevention on campus, what could be done right away to have an impact?
3. What action steps you’d like to see, either on your campus or statewide?

YELLOW Circle Facilitator Guidance

Circle #1 Discussion (Same for all groups) *Facilitator Guidance: This round is intended to open the process and help everyone settle in. Try to encourage participation from everyone in the group, either “popcorn style” or by going around the circle. Do your best to steer intervention conversation back to a prevention focus.*

1. When you think of efforts to prevent SV/DV on your campus, what is SUCCEEDING and how do you know?
2. What do you WISH was happening on your campus?

Circle #2 Discussion: Current Topics in Prevention (Participants self-select)

Facilitator Guidance: The group is not limited to these discussion prompts, they are intended only as a means to keep the discussion focused and moving. Notes can encompass any broad themes, key issues identified, or big ideas the group wants to capture.

Topic: Engaging Men in Campus Prevention Efforts

1. How are men being engaged in campus-based SV/DV prevention activities?
2. What is working well?
3. What is needed to support SV/DV prevention efforts within this population?

Circle #3 Discussion: Spheres of Influence (Participants self-select)

Facilitator Guidance: The group is not limited to these discussion prompts, they are intended only as a means to keep the discussion focused and moving. Notes can encompass any broad themes, key issues identified, or big ideas the group wants to capture.

Topic: Community Connections (Local programs, local law enforcement, off-campus services and supports)

1. What is needed to build or strengthen relationships with community partners to advance SV/DV prevention?
2. What resources or supports are needed to support greater collaboration between campus and community partners to prevent SV/DV?
3. How can prevention advocates effectively partner across campus & community?
4. Are there specific community partners that would benefit from focused outreach or a tailored approach to engagement?

Circle #4 Brainstorm Needs/ Next Steps (Participants assigned by color group)

Facilitator Guidance: This round is intended to be a generative brainstorm—long lists, out of the box ideas are welcome, even if they may seem impractical or intangible.

Brainstorm: Resources/ Tools Needed

1. When you think about SV/DV prevention efforts on campus, what resources or tools are needed?

2. When you think about SV/DV prevention on campus, what could be done right away to have an impact?
3. What are some tools or resources you'd like to see, either on your campus or statewide?

BLUE Circle Facilitator Guidance

Circle #1 Discussion (Same for all groups) *Facilitator Guidance: This round is intended to open the process and help everyone settle in. Try to encourage participation from everyone in the group, either "popcorn style" or by going around the circle. Do your best to steer intervention conversation back to a prevention focus.*

1. When you think of efforts to prevent SV/DV on your campus, what is SUCCEEDING and how do you know?
2. What do you WISH was happening on your campus?

Circle #2 Discussion: Current Topics in Prevention (Participants self-select)

Facilitator Guidance: The group is not limited to these discussion prompts, they are intended only as a means to keep the discussion focused and moving. Notes can encompass any broad themes, key issues identified, or big ideas the group wants to capture.

Topic: Policies to Support SA/DV Prevention

1. What policies, strategies, or approaches frame/ guide work on your campus?
2. What policies are tools that help you do the work?
3. What policies are barriers to RPE efforts?
4. Are there policies you would like to see enacted or enforced?

Circle #3 Discussion: Spheres of Influence (Participants self-select)

Facilitator Guidance: The group is not limited to these discussion prompts, they are intended only as a means to keep the discussion focused and moving. Notes can encompass any broad themes, key issues identified, or big ideas the group wants to capture.

Topic: Engaging Campus Administrators

5. What are the unique needs & challenges administrators face in institutionalizing SV/DV prevention?
6. What resources or supports from SV/DV programs, practitioners, "the field" do campus administrators need?
7. How can prevention advocates effectively partner with campus administrators?

Circle #4 Brainstorm Needs/ Next Steps (Participants assigned by color group)

Facilitator Guidance: This round is intended to be a generative brainstorm—long lists, out of the box ideas are welcome, even if they may seem impractical or intangible.

Brainstorm: Practical Needs to Do the Work

4. When you think about SV/DV prevention efforts on campus, what practical supports are needed?
5. When you think about SV/DV prevention on campus, what could be done right away to have an impact?
6. What are some basic, practical actions or resources you'd like to see, either on your campus or statewide?

APPENDIX C ATTENDEE LIST

Name	Title	Institution
Dru Roessle	Policy & Planning Manager	Agency of Human Services Central Office
Kimberly Jessup	Advisor to the President	Association of Vermont Independent Colleges
Linda Olson	Faculty	Castleton State College
Melinda Mills	Faculty	Castleton State College
Amy Bremel	CHANGE Coordinator	Castleton State College
Kirsten Isgro	Instructor	Champlain College
Carol Moran-Brown	Assistant Vice President for Student Life	Champlain College
Judy Morgan	Associate Vice President of Administration & External Affairs	College of St. Joseph, Rutland
Karen Madden	Director of Academic Support Services	Johnson State College
Erin Rossetti	Director of Student Life	Lyndon State College
George Hacking	Director of Campus Safety	Lyndon State College
Noreen Pecsok	Director of Physical Education	Middlebury College
Barbara McCall	Director of Health and Wellness Education	Middlebury College
Kim Vansell	Director	National Center for Campus Public Safety
Jennifer Livingston	Coordinator of Student Programs	NECI
Melanie Boggs	Coordinator of Student Services	New England Culinary Institute

Paula Gills	Interim EO/ER Officer	Norwich
Jay Wisner	HR Director	Norwich
Robert Vallie (RJ)	Department of Public Safety	Saint Michael's College
Dawn Ellinwood	Vice President for Student Affairs/Dean of Students	Saint Michael's College
Julia Berberan	Director of Center for Women and Gender	Saint Michael's College
Catherine Welch	Assistant Dean of Students/Director of Student Life Outreach and Assessment	Saint Michael's College
Jes Kraus	Executive Director of Human Resource Services and Affirmative Action	University of Vermont
Sarah Warrington	Director of Women's Center	University of Vermont
Lilly Talbert	Program & Communications Coordinator	<u>Vermont Commission on Women</u>
Geoffrey Ankuda	Resident Director	Vermont Technical College
Kim Swartz	Director of Preventive Reproductive Health	VT Department of Health
Bethany Pombar	Prevention Specialist	VT Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence

* *Individuals names in BOLD facilitated discussion groups.*

This report was prepared by Rebecca Gurney, MPH, focus group facilitator.