



## COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA

GOVERNOR TERRY MCAULIFFE'S TASK FORCE ON  
COMBATING CAMPUS SEXUAL VIOLENCE  
*CHAIR ATTORNEY GENERAL MARK HERRING*

NOVEMBER 11, 2014, 9:00 AM  
NEWCOMB HALL, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA  
NEWCOMB GALLERY

### PREVENTION SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

**DRAFT to be formally approved at December 15, 2014 meeting**

**Members Present:** Emily Renda (Subcommittee Chair), Fran Bradford, Angel Cabrera, Leah Cox, Brandon Day, Dorothy Edwards, Tom Kramer, Christopher Ndiritu, Frank Shushok, Jr., Rosemary Tribble, Kristi VanAudenhove

**Staff Present:** Lisa Furr, Kay Heidbreder, Rachel Levy, and Deitra Trent

#### **Presenters on Prevention:**

**Introduction to the Scope of Prevention:** Kristi VanAudenhove/ Kate McCord- Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Action Alliance and Dr. Dorothy Edwards- Green Dot

**Primary Prevention Panel Speakers:** Dr. Deborah Wilson, Associate Athletic Director, Intercollegiate Athletics at George Mason University; Ric Chollar, Associate Director, LGBTQ Resources, George Mason University; Dr. Chris Kilmartin Professor of Psychology, University of Mary Washington;

**Secondary Prevention Panel Speakers:** Susie Bruce, director the Gordie Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, University of Virginia; Mary Anne Sprouse- Director-Wellness, Alcohol, and Violence Education and Services, George Mason University

**Tertiary Prevention Speaker:** Dr. Gene Deisinger, Deputy Chief of Police and Director, Threat Services Virginia Tech Police Department

#### **Meeting Summary**

**Subcommittee Chair Emily Renda called the meeting to order at 9:25 am** and welcomed committee members. Committee members, staff and invited presenters introduced themselves.

Emily Renda detailed the agenda for the day highlighting the committee's ability to be flexible with time. The meeting was started with Kristi VanAudenhove and Kate McCord grounding the committee in what prevention is and specifically primary prevention. They shared a power point covering the introduction of prevention work. Highlighted was evidence informed practice- while building awareness is important, it alone doesn't lead to change. They encouraged the committee to look at the root causes of sexual violence

and asked that the conversation include those as well as the risk and protective factors. Kate McCord introduced the Social Ecological model. Their power point was handed out.

Dr. Dorothy Edwards presented on prevention. She spoke about risk reduction- prevention promotion. The culture change's aggregate total is the need to fix the assumptions about the issue. She suggested the committee must focus on the gender divide by engaging men while engaging everyone. The work should get at what's wrong by focusing on what's right. To effectively change, people need adequate process time, motivation to change and the change must be manageable. Bystander training helps move people incrementally from reactive to proactive. She said paradigms must be changed to avoid alienating audiences who have traditionally been discouraged from engaging with this issue.

Dr. Debbie Wilson from George Mason has done work with the National College Athletics Association on addressing sexual assault and intimate partner violence. Coaches are able to put together cultures in a short period of time with organizations that change each year. All who come into the group already have history and exposure to sexual assault. Coaches and upperclassmen give the messages. Are we training people to listen? Her power point will be available.

Ric Chollar from George Mason pointed out that the cultural interventions look different for different members of the campus community. The LGBTQ community has different issues with sexual assault. Ric encouraged the committee to look at the intersection of oppressions.

Dr. Chris Kilmartin from Mary Washington stated that the moral issue is a bad entry point. It's better to look at what we can do better. Rather than "let's talk about rape"- "let's talk about you". Approaching men about their conceptions of masculinity and what it means to be a man are more useful points of entry to a conversation about rape and sexual assault than to lead with those topics. He said the attitude we want to develop in men already exists but it's "closeted". He also pointed out that in military sexual assaults 53% are of the victims are men. Arts aren't being used often enough to communicate prevention messages. His power point will be available.

At 11:40, the committee broke for 20 minutes and to get the food for a working lunch.

Susie Bruce from UVA spoke about alcohol and survivors. She also encouraged an evidence based approach to prevention focusing challenging misperceptions around normal behavior through gathering social norms data (regarding alcohol use, bystander intervention, and sexist attitudes) and marketing those data. Looking at social norms and social marketing, the media uses **PIE** Positive, Inclusive, Empowering. She stressed the importance of active partnerships with students. Her recommendations for us are creating a statewide training conference on adapting the social norms approach for sexual assault prevention by replicating the Virginia ABC model from 1998 and adopting UVA's NCAA's funded APPLE Conference Model. This would include no registration fee if the campus sends a team of 4-6 people including students, time set aside during the conference to plan campus implementation and each attending campus must submit an action plan for accountability. Her power point is available.

Mary Anne Sprouse from George Mason shortened her presentation so as not to duplicate what had already been said. She spoke about the need for a bottom up- top down approach that would have student involvement at all levels.

Gene Deisinger from Virginia Tech started with the idea that prevention informs response and response informs prevention. He pointed out that is true for sexual violence and threat assessment- early identification, early intervention, assess and manage. Schools need to look at the community as a whole in terms of who has access to the campus and students. He suggested that awareness needs to be built; institutions need to share information. There are policies and laws that govern threat assessment. His summary for Enhancing the Safety of our Campuses:

- Enhance integration of approaches for violence prevention, mitigation and response
- Build capacity to prevent & mitigate all threats;
- Emphasize communication, collaboration, & coordination of efforts
- Sustain multi-disciplinary approach
- Emphasize outreach & engagement
- Sustain a longitudinal perspective
- Remember our purpose

He stressed the need for communication, collaboration, coordination and capitulation of resources. There was discussion about the pros and cons of personal connections to the issues the scenario of “I know someone” vs “I’m just a good guy”. His power point is available.

Emily Renda led the committee in a discussion acknowledging that the agenda was ambitious. She asked if the committee had read the White House report on Sexual Assault. Most had. She suggested that it could be a model for the committee in addition to the NIAAA (Susie’s Presentation) model. The California Student Summit was also mentioned as an option. The intent is to match what’s being done on the federal front, but to add value by suggesting new recommendations that haven’t been covered by existing reports. There were questions about what the report would be used for and if there would be requirement of new trainings and if so which department, would there be new regulations from schools? The conversation turned to the requirement of a campus climate survey and if one is recommended. The Office of Civil Rights requires specific questions. It was noted that VCU and University of Richmond are working on a joint survey. The White House and Rutgers University are collaborating on one as well.

Fran Bradford asked who is using a tool now. Frank Shushok suggested a literature review of the various reports. The question for him is focusing on how do we move students down the path, not focusing as much on compliance. The intersection of education and compliance is complex. How to move educationally as Dorothy Edwards said from A to B not A to Z. He also asked what is a campus’s first encounter on the subject is it one that doesn’t do harm?

Emily Renda offered to look at the various reports and to compile the top three suggestions. The committee will then see if they agree on these top priorities.

Dorothy Edwards suggested looking at the commonalties and pitfalls.

- 1) Does Bystander intervention models over estimate student capacity? It needs to meet students where they are, looking at the barriers to peer involvement. There is no training that can make peer pressure and adolescence disappear. She said the committee needs to talk about obstacles and normalize and then create multiple solutions.
- 2) Peer Educators Research is mixed about effective change. Student organizations, peer educators and presentations by faculty have different outcomes. Gender discussions help men prepare for

more advanced discussions. We need to talk long term about patriarchy and short term about reduction of assaults.

Emily Renda suggested a top down bottom up response to address the issue. Dorothy Edward's suggestion was to train faculty and staff then upperclassmen and then freshmen.

Brandon Day wants to make the work specific to each campus. Sexual misconduct policies of each school are different, for example, is there an alcohol and drug amnesty policy to encourage students to report without fear of getting in trouble?

Rachel Levy reminded the committee that the work of all the other subcommittees could be found on the Taskforce's website. Emily Renda pointed out to the committee of the task of balancing compliance and prevention as well as prevention and response. Brandon said that sexual assault is right in front of students. He highlighted the need for the information to be digestible, not to dumb it down but to make it accessible. Chris Kilmartin said compliance is not enough, best practices are needed because the population turns over so frequently. Fran Bradford commented on the different levels of maturity of students as well as the schools differing levels of experience working on this issue.

Kristi VanAudenhove said that some campuses have a wealth of knowledge on this topic and that they need to not reinvent the wheel while trying to tweak the work for their specific campus.

Debbie Wilson asked for clear and measurable goals. We need research; don't know what works and what goes into what works. What are the commonalities?

Kay Heidbreder reminded that committee that her role is to help us remember that compliance is an important tool and a necessity. She asked if the committee should do focus groups. Debbie Wilson agreed with her that compliance is not negotiable. In the Cleary Act, athletics is the only group that includes job titles.

Frank Shushok said there are three populations where the majority of complaints initiate; Athletics, Fraternities and Cadets. What role do coaches play? He also commented that language plays an important role. What language are we using? People don't want to mess up on language. The structure needs to be new; an introduction and advanced level. Because of the variance of maturity, there needs to be a multifaceted approach.

Dorothy Edwards pointed out that labels matter. How much space do they take up? Bystanders' behaviors matter. If it's said that those bystander behaviors increase risk then are we labeling them a rapist? What are the other options? Bystanders don't have to be interventionists.

Kate McCord shared the web based resource on the Grants to Encourage Arrests and enforcement of Protective orders. The GEAP Grant has a web site "Community Defined Solutions" that can house resources and best practices.

Rose Pascarell, Vice President for University Life, George Mason University said that considering sexual violence and Just Communities- do we do curriculum infusion - intervention outside the classroom? To have an emboldened campus to do things they might not do on their own?

Emily Renda encouraged the committee to think outside of campuses- primary and secondary schools are where most of these behaviors start. A gender class in those schools was suggested.

Debbie Wilson commented that students who are victims and survivors would hear this and come forward. She said counseling centers are overwhelmed and have limited numbers of visits available for students. It's important to remember this as we encourage students to come forward. We don't want them re-victimized. In regards to counseling centers, Kay Heidbreder pointed out that community colleges might not have the same resources as four year schools do. Christ Kilmartin said that ten sessions, the average number for counseling sessions, is actually quite a lot of help. Weekly case management is not what counseling centers do. Kate McCord shared the "Not Alone" report from the White House has info on counseling issues. Debbie Wilson said that campuses must be ready to help students. Rosemary Tribble asked how do we support students who are being re-victimized. How do we help students when others report to them. How do we encourage them not to keep it a secret?

Leah Cox asked what the end result of the committee's work is. Some of what is being discussed is prevention and some is not. Can the committee be bold enough to make a difference? What is the committee required to report? Rachel Levy said the recommendations from each subcommittee will be combined and some may be acted on by the Governor or the Attorney General. This is why Emily Renda will compile the reports out there now to ensure we are capturing current work.

Emily told the committee that she'd be contacting each of them individually to get their thoughts and ideas for which direction the work needs to go.

Chris Kilmartin shared that there is a bill in Virginia for schools who accept state funds to adopt affirmative consent. He sees the "yes means yes" is important because with the response of fight, flight or freeze, forty percent of individuals freeze. The questions need to be about, "What did you do to ensure consent?" This will hold offenders accountable.

Debbie Wilson said that healthy relationships are a negotiation of healthy sexual activities. Emily urged a means of normalizing healthy relationship conversations. Chris Kilmartin added that we need to guide the conversation beyond the "what if both students are drunk" questions. Most people want to be good people and change the sexual scripts seen in the romantic comedies where male persistence pays off with sex to one that amplifies the healthy voices. Emily Renda wondered if the committee could look at media literacy and the scripts that are promoted there.

Dorothy Edwards pointed out that consent is on the response side more than prevention. The vast majority isn't causally raping by accident but rather are serial rapists. 90% are repeat offenders and 10% are getting all of the attention. Chris Kilmartin reiterated that "yes means yes" holds individuals accountable. Kate McCord said it more than stopping forcible rape "yes means yes" is about joyfully healthy sexual expression.

Rachel said she sees the committee's responsibility is to energize students. "Yes means yes" is a brand- something that is all over campuses like the stickers and bathroom stalls.

Chris Ndiritu told of ODU's work with bystanders using the "1 is 2 Many" campaign. He feels it's on "us" the students with peer to peer interaction. How do we change the culture?

Tom Kramer shared that Virginia 21 has offered to host forums.

Emily thanked everyone for the input and let the committee know that the notes and the review of reports would be out soon. The next meeting will be 9am -12pm, December 15<sup>th</sup> in Richmond at the offices of the Virginia Sexual and Domestic Violence Action alliance.

The January meeting of the full Task Force will be subcommittees reporting to each other about the work so far.

**With no further business to discuss, the meeting was at adjourned 3:10 pm.**