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ABSTRACT

1 in 5 women in institutions of higher education experience an attempted or completed sexual assault every year. Sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming is one of the main ways colleges and universities attempt to address this issue. The purpose of this exploratory qualitative pilot study is to evaluate the development and implementation of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming, looking specifically at facilitators and barriers for prevention staff, what they experience as preventionists, and how COVID-19 has impacted these essential programs. Ten preventionists were recruited from the Campus Advocacy and Prevention Professionals Association for 90-minute interviews. Results of the thematic analysis indicate that participants felt resources, administrative bureaucracy, and institutional buy in were important facilitators if they were accessible and barriers if they were not. Participants experiences with respect from faculty and upper administration varied depending on their job title and more than half of participants had personal experiences with sexual and interpersonal violence prior to their career in prevention. However, all participants felt confident in their ability to do their job well despite any barriers they may experience. The COVID-19 pandemic highlighted existing resource and budgetary issues that existed within their offices and increased stress about furloughs and budget cuts. The results of this study create a strong foundation for future research into best practices for the development and implementation of campus-based prevention programming. Additionally, the results of this study demonstrate the importance of including prevention staff when developing campus, state, and federal policies on sexual and interpersonal violence.
CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION

Gender-based violence is recognized as a global human rights issue (UN Women, 2019). This term, gender-based violence, encompasses a variety of behaviors from sexual assault to groping to sexual harassment (Higgins, et al., 2019). It happens in every country in the world at such alarming rates that it can be hard to comprehend unless gender-based violence has impacted a person directly. According to the United Nations, 35% of women globally experience some form of gender-based violence every year, which is roughly 1.3 billion people (UN Women, 2019). On college campuses in the United States, 1 in 5 women experience attempted or completed sexual assault (Sundstrom, et al., 2018). The phrase “1 in 5” is so prevalent in the field of campus-based sexual violence prevention it can be easy to forget that “1 in 5” is 20%, which translates to about 10.4 million women annually, according to the 2018 census (United States Census Bureau, 2018). These numbers speak to the nation-wide epidemic that is campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence and the ways in which prevention professionals are set against enormous challenges.

The following chapter is focused on breaking down what makes campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming uniquely challenging. The chapter begins by describing the difference between public health prevention programming and programming on a college campus. The next section will examine sexual and interpersonal violence in the general population, followed by an overview of violence on college campuses. The last section describes the theoretical framework used in this study.
Prevention Programming

Prevention programming is a form of intervention used to bring awareness to an issue, educate on the causes of the issues, and prevent its occurrence or reoccurrence (O’Connell, Boat, & Warner, 2009). There are four levels of prevention in public health: primordial, primary, secondary, and tertiary (Center for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], n.d.). Primordial prevention has to do most often with policies about the issue at the federal or state level. Primary prevention is focused on community level education and awareness building around an issue (CDC, n.d.). Secondary prevention most often has to do with screening or testing for the presence of an issue and working to stop further spread, and tertiary prevention is focused on preventing further spread of the issue and its occurrence in the future (CDC, n.d.). These levels of prevention most often follow an infectious disease model but have been adapted for social and behavioral health issues as well (O’Connell, et al., 2009). The socio-ecological model reflects these levels of prevention and intervention with non-disease related public health issues (CDC, n.d.). Prevention programming for socio-behavioral issues do not fit easily into these levels of prevention. They would most likely be categorized as primary and secondary prevention efforts because of their focus on educating at risk populations and identifying risky behaviors already present in the community (O’Connell, et al., 2009). However, there is disagreement on how to define programs by these prevention definitions, as most socio-behavioral programs do not easily fit into these definitions (O’Connell, et al., 2009).

For the purpose of this paper, programming and interventions will be used interchangeably to account for language discrepancies in the literature and differing programming models. The professional fields that intersect most directly in this study are higher education and student affairs, and public health. Each field has a language preference and bias for what works for institutions of higher education (IHE),
sometimes without clarification. This language discrepancy will be expanded upon in the following chapter as it contributes to the gaps in the literature.

Prevention program development can manifest in different ways depending on the health topic. Many fields that create and implement prevention programming have their own frameworks that address behavior change and education on a health topic. For instance, mental health professionals have different frameworks for addressing mental health issues in their community than a medical professional would address an outbreak of infectious disease. However, despite these variations most programs follow a similar iterative structure loosely based on a logic model (Pope, Finney, & Bare, 2019). A logic model is a type of program development tool that succinctly and visually represents your program’s resources or inputs, the activities of your program, the program’s outcomes, and the program evaluation (Pope, et al., 2019). The variation within that structure depends most heavily on the program’s content and the population the program is intending to serve (Pope, et al., 2019).

**Programming on college campuses.** College campuses and universities are a population unlike any other. College students encompass a diverse range of socio-ecological identities, they are condensed into a relatively small location for short periods of time over 4 to 6 years (McMahon, Steiner, Snyder, & Banyard, 2019a). The majority of enrolled students live, work, and eat on these campuses then leave for months at a time throughout the academic year (Long, 2012). The rules and social dynamics of college campuses do not mirror any community they are likely to encounter after they leave because of the ways in which colleges and universities are accountable to specific state and federal laws (Richards, 2019). The academic and social pressure combined with the developmentally appropriate identity development for 18-26-year old students, creates interpersonal tension that can result in high-risk behavior that diminishes after
they graduate (Balsa, Homer, French, & Norton, 2011; Lee & Sher, 2018). The demographics of a college student population also changes every year with a new incoming class. These factors make programming on college campuses uniquely challenging for the staff who are responsible for implementing these programs (Long, 2012).

As previously discussed, what is considered programming in IHE often does not follow a single field definition, such as public health, and thus lacks clarity when other disciplines, such as student affairs, get involved (O’Connell, et al., 2009). Any event held by a college campus staff, faculty, or student member can be categorized, colloquially, as a program (Long, 2012). These programs do not have to follow a logic model or have any desired outcome for the population they are targeting and may in fact be developed and implemented by students (Long, 2012). These programs can have the sole desired outcome of “fun.” This is not to diminish the value of fun, but to present the issue of including prevention programming under the umbrella of student affairs practices when the expectations for those program outcomes do not line up. There are some fields, such as student affairs, student success, and wellness centers, who have evidence-based programs and theoretical frameworks from which those staff can develop their programs. However, each discipline can have different programming outcomes based on their field. As a result, it is unclear which model is best to use specifically for campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming given how the topic (and the practitioners) overlap in other disciplines.

**Sexual Assault and Interpersonal Violence**

There is no single definition of sexual assault for the United States judicial system. States may differ on what they call sexual assault (for instance, they may call it sexual battery as Florida does) and what legally constitutes an assault (RAINN, 2020). However, a common
thread across many state sexual assault laws is the focus on the forced or coerced penetration of a person’s body by another’s body part or object (RAINN, 2020). Some states have language around consent that is embedded in definitions of rape or incest, but college campuses are often where consent is formally defined separately from the outcome of violence. To complicate state laws further, there are often separate laws for domestic violence and incest, despite the fact these can all happen within a relationship context (Krantz & Garcia-Moreno, 2005). As illustrated in the table in Appendix 1, state law and campus policy do not always encompass the same language and the variations between these forms of policy can make defining rape and consent on college campuses difficult, especially from a prevention programming perspective.

Interpersonal violence can manifest in a variety of ways in any type of relationship, but federal policy and state laws can restrict this definition to current or former romantic partners or cohabiter of the same household. The people in these relationships do not always have to be romantically involved, married, or have been together for an extended period of time since abuse can occur at any time in a relationship (Krantz & Garcia-Moreno, 2005). However, what constitutes a relationship protected by domestic violence laws varies from state to state. There are also different kinds of abuse such as physical and sexual abuse, but interpersonal violence can also include emotional abuse, where a person experiences consistent bullying that undermines their self-esteem and self-efficacy (Krantz & Garcia-Moreno, 2005). Emotional and mental abuse is often seen as encompassing similar behavior such as gaslighting (Krantz & Garcia-Moreno, 2005). Emotional and mental abuse isolates and undermines a person in such a way that they are dependent on the abuser (Krantz & Garcia-Moreno, 2005). The victim questions their experience because they only have the abuser’s viewpoint as a reference, and the abuser controls every aspect of the victim’s life (Krantz & Garcia-Moreno, 2005). Gaslighting is
a particular kind of emotional and mental abuse that is subtle and manipulative in its manifestation (Krantz & Garcia-Moreno, 2005). A person is who is being gaslit is told their experience is wrong, inconsistent, or all in their head (Krantz & Garcia-Moreno, 2005). However, despite the evidence of how damaging mental and emotional abuse can be, state laws may not include this type of abuse in their definitions of domestic violence.

In America, as many as 1 in 5 women experience a form of interpersonal violence at some point in their lives (UN Women, 2019). Globally, the rate is increased to 1 in 3 women, as there are still many countries where domestic violence has not been outlawed (The World Bank, 2018). In 1995, Hillary Clinton proclaimed that women’s rights are human rights (Riles, 2002). Since then the United Nations has included ending violence against women as part of their Sustainable Development Goals, though not much progress has been made in this regard worldwide (UN Women, 2019). However, on the individual state level, there has been movement towards creating sustainable frameworks for addressing sexual and interpersonal violence. The Prevention Institute in California, for instance, proposes a health equity focused approach to addressing domestic violence. In their approach, domestic violence is part of a larger web of health inequities, such as economic inequality and housing insecurity (Prevention Institute, 2017). From this starting place, preventionists can then work collaboratively with community partners who are working to address these health inequities to holistically address interpersonal violence in communities (Prevention Institute, 2017). This approach reframes what constitutes violence prevention as part of a greater system aimed at dismantling all health inequities; developing community infrastructure is violence prevention and violence prevention encompasses workforce development goals (Prevention Institute, 2017). Violence preventionists can have the coordinated support of organizations that address each root cause of sexual and
interpersonal violence once the silos are removed from health education and community development interventions. This would move everyone towards greater health equity and safety.

**Sexual violence on college campuses.** Institutions of higher education have slightly different expectations when it comes to responding to sexual violence allegations than in other communities. This is due, in part, to the residential status most students hold while enrolled in college. The history of colleges in the United States is rooted in the concept that schools act “in loco parentis,” meaning that schools act in place of parents (Henning, 2007). This means that schools, specifically residential universities, adopt the responsibility of caring for students as a parent would, including having discretion over how to punish students for poor conduct while they are enrolled. The 1961 federal court case Dixon v. Alabama officially ended the “in loco parentis” doctrine on college campuses in order to create due process for students (Henning, 2007). However, the spirit of this doctrine has not been eradicated. The relationship between student and institution seems to mirror that of a parent and child in the nonreciprocal nature of their relationship; the school provides everything the student needs to live and thrive while on campus and the student eventually graduates (Henning, 2007). The “in loco parentis” history of college campuses is part of the reason why, when increased attention was given to the sexual and interpersonal violence students were experiencing on campus, there was a rush to address the issue by using university disciplinary systems.

In 2011, the Department of Education and the Office of Civil Rights issued a Dear Colleague Letter expanding the definitions and jurisdiction of Title IX, a federal policy prohibiting gender discrimination in institutions receiving federal funding (Sharoni & Klocke, 2019). Former Vice President Joe Biden then created a task force in 2014 to address what the Obama Administration considered a growing epidemic of women experiencing sexual and
interpersonal violence in IHE (Sharoni & Klocke, 2019). These amendments occurred in conjunction with the expansion of the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE) section of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA), which amended the Jeanne Clery Act in 2014 (Cadaret, Johnson, Devencenzi, & Morgan, 2019). The Clery Act of 1990, also known as the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, is a federal statute that was passed after Jeanne Clery was raped and murdered in her dorm room (The Clery Center, n.d.). This federal policy requires campuses to publish an Annual Security Report reflecting the crimes that have occurred on and around campus (The Clery Center, n.d.).

The Campus SaVE Act requires college campuses to be transparent about the nature of sex crimes that occurred on their campus and in the surrounding areas, as well as statistics on dating/domestic violence, sexual harassment, and stalking (Cadaret, et al., 2019). The Clery Act and Campus SaVE also require that a summary of the campus sexual misconduct polices and procedures be included in their annual security reports, released every October (McMahon, Wood, Cusano, & Macri, 2019b). As a result, between 2011 and 2013, campuses saw a dramatic shift in the expectations the federal government had for how they handled incidents of sexual and interpersonal violence.

Title IX is a federal policy that prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex for institutions that receive federal funding (McMahon, et al., 2019b). The 2011 Dear Colleague Letter expanded definition of gender discrimination in Title IX to include sexual assault, sexual harassment, dating and domestic violence, and stalking (McMahon, et al., 2019b). This put the onus on college campuses to recognize and address inequities in their student’s access to educational programs and resources (Wiersma-Mosley & DiLoreto, 2018). Institutions of higher education are now forced to recognize that sexual and interpersonal violence is happening on
their campus under threat of losing their federal funding (Wiersma-Mosley & DiLoreto, 2018). These changes to Title IX and VAWA recognize that gender discrimination prevents a large segment of a campus population from having equal access to their education (Wiersma-Mosley & DiLoreto, 2018).

Within each piece of legislation that came out between 2011 and 2014 came the explicit charge to prevent the recurrence of reported instances of sexual misconduct (McMahon, et al., 2019b). However, the residential nature of college campuses creates a unique challenge for creating and implementing sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming. The purpose of a residential campus life experience is often to establish a sense of belonging on campus, so it becomes a student’s “home away from home” (Stephens, Brannon, Markus, & Nelson, 2015). This sense of being at home on their campus can be positively correlated with academic achievement and graduation for students across different demographics (Stephens, et al., 2015). Students who live on campus also feel a sense of freedom from their parents and often view being at college as a time to experiment and take risks they might not have otherwise taken (Dworkin, 2005). While risk taking and experimentation is developmentally appropriate for emerging adults, the four-year college experience might prolong their period of development past where it is beneficial to students (Dworkin, 2005).

Experimentation and risk taking around alcohol and other drugs, identity and religious affiliation, and sexuality are common in a residential campus environment (Dworkin, 2005). To a certain extent, these behaviors are expected and encouraged among college students for fear of feeling “left behind,” “inexperienced,” or “prudish” (Balsa, et. al., 2011; Dworkin, 2005). This belief about college can pose a challenge to student affairs professionals who have been working to keep students engaged and healthy throughout their college experience and prevention
professionals who have to mitigate these risk factors for perpetrating sexual violence (Long, 2011; Ehlke, Kelley, & Braitman, 2019). There is nothing in the literature to say that college campuses cause sexual and interpersonal violence directly. However, one could make the argument that residential college campuses, the media and expectations around going to college, and the developmental age of the typical college students may increase the risk factors for both perpetration and victimization (Rich, Utley, Janke, & Maldoveanu, 2010).

Given the increased likelihood for college women experiencing sexual violence while in college (up to three times more likely than the greater population), it would follow that federal policies to address this issue would have guidelines for prevention (Rich, et al., 2010). The Campus SaVE Act amendments to VAWA is one of the few laws that have specific and prescriptive language around prevention and education in their mandates for colleges and universities (RAINN, 2020). These mandates include intentional awareness and education efforts on the part of the college or university to define consent and prohibited behaviors, signs of abuse, and skills for bystander intervention in instances of potential harm (American Council on Education (ACE), 2014). However, these mandates do not provide much in the way of guidelines for how to prevent sexual violence on college campuses or how to program on those topics.

Preventionists are legally mandated to create programs, messaging, and awareness initiatives to address the occurrence of sexual and interpersonal violence on their campuses, but are rarely given the necessary resources they need to stay in compliance with these laws (McMahon, et al., 2019b). As a result, prevention staff often have to rely on programming histories at their current institution, utilize their general knowledge of prevention and/or programming, or turn to the literature for suggestions on how to specifically address campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence (Clay, Pederson Seebeck, & Simmons, 2019).
An unexplored area in the literature is whether there was an increase in the hiring or the creation of education and prevention staff positions on college campuses after these mandates were passed. A scan of the relevant literature suggests this may be the case given the increase in published articles on this topic over the last decade. Both the possible increase in prevention staff as well as the increase in research on this topic highlights a reactive response in the field of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention within a relatively short period of time. The result is the lack of cohesion in the field around programming content and structure and the lack of evidence-based practices.

Evidence-based programming standards would provide a baseline for what kind of intervention structures and content would be effective in meeting program outcomes for staff that are legally compliant. An issue that may contribute to the lack of evidence-based practices is the inconsistent sexual misconduct policy definitions of consent (McMahon, et al., 2019b). The Campus SaVE Act and the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) Dear Colleague Letter mandate that colleges and universities educate their campuses on the definition of consent and provide a sexual misconduct policy that includes (among other things) the definitions of consent and prohibited behaviors (ACE, 2014; Ali, 2011). However, it is unclear whether these policies were developed with the expertise of people who specialize in sexual and interpersonal violence prevention. Furthermore, there is little research on whether sexual misconduct policies have an impact on prevention efforts or student reporting numbers (McMahon, et al., 2019b). There is more research needed to determine whether legal mandates and sexual misconduct policies are helping or hurting prevention efforts on college campuses.
The Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF) is an implementation science theoretical framework for contextualizing the factors that go into developing and implementing programs and interventions (Atkins, et al., 2017). Implementation science is the study of developing and implementing an intervention; including evaluating what makes an intervention effective (Eccles & Mittman, 2006). The TDF combines many of the constructs used in other behavior change and implementation models in order to put them under one framework, which can be used in conjunction with other theories (Atkins, et al., 2017). The benefit of TDF is that it focuses on the factors that influence the strong foundation from which evidence-based interventions are built by looking at what influences the people who develop and implement them.

The Theoretical Domains Framework has 14 domains and 84 constructs, as illustrated in Table 1. However, many of those domains are not directly related to this study. The domains I will be focusing on in this study include knowledge, skills, professional role, beliefs about capabilities, social influences, and goals. These domains were chosen because they speak to the gap in prevention program evaluation and are useful for laying the groundwork for future research into this topic. I will be using the constructs within these domains to guide my interview guide and codebook development. However, the TDF is not useful in providing suggestions for outcomes or theoretical analysis since it does not have an accompanying theory behind the framework (Atkins, et al., 2017). Therefore, the TDF is most useful as a lens through which a person can look at the influences on program development and implementation (Lynch, et al., 2017).

Campus-based sexual violence prevention programming is unique in that there is no single professional field that recognizes it as their purview. Public health, higher education,
social work, and student affairs have all been cited as fields that inform campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming in the literature (Moylan, 2016). However, each of these professions has different and unique guidelines, standards, and policies for developing and implementing prevention programming (Long, 2012; Fischer, et al., 2016).

As mentioned in the previous section, student affairs and public health have different definitions of what a program on a college campus entails. Looking at program development and implementation can provide a particularly useful viewpoint from which to look at campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programs as a whole instead of through one particular professional viewpoint.

The TDF is useful in that it is not limited by a theory rooted in one field, but encompasses most behavior change models into one framework. The Theoretical Domains Framework is being used instead of the more commonly used implementation science framework RE-AIM (Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation, and Maintenance), because the TDF is focused on the interpersonal factors that impact a program whereas RE-AIM is focused on the program itself. The TDF and the relevant constructs will be used to create questions for the interview protocol and a priori codes for the codebook, as will be described in the methods section.

**Aims of The Study**

This study has two aims; to evaluate the development and implementation of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming and to address the gap in the literature on this topic. I am interested in whether the staff who are expected to address the growing epidemic of campus-based violence have the resources and support they need to program with the degree of effectiveness the law requires.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Construct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Knowledge (An awareness of the existence of something)</td>
<td>Knowledge (including knowledge of condition/scientific rationale. Procedural knowledge Knowledge of task environment)</td>
<td>8. Intentions (A conscious decision to perform a behavior or a resolve to act in a certain way)</td>
<td>Stability of intentions Stages of change model Trans-theoretical model and stages of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Skills (An ability of proficiency acquired through practice)</td>
<td>Skills Skills development Competence Ability Interpersonal skills Practice Skill assessment</td>
<td>9. Goals (Mental representations of outcomes or end states that an individual wants to achieve)</td>
<td>Goals (distal / proximal) Goal priority Goal / target setting Goals (autonomous / controlled) Action planning Implementation intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Social/Professional Role and Identity (A coherent set of behaviors and displayed personal qualities of an individual in a social or work setting)</td>
<td>Professional identity Professional role Social identity Identity Professional boundaries Professional confidence Leadership Organizational commitment</td>
<td>10. Memory, Attention and Decision Processes (The ability to retain information, focus selectively on aspects of the environment and choose between two or more alternatives)</td>
<td>Memory Attention Attention control Decision making Cognitive overload / tiredness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Beliefs about capabilities (Acceptance of the truth, reality, or validity about an ability, talent, or facility that a personal can put to constructive use)</td>
<td>Self-confidence Perceived competence Self-efficacy Perceived behavioral control Beliefs Self-esteem Empowerment Professional confidence</td>
<td>11. Environmental Context and Resources (Any circumstance of a person's situation or environment that discourages or encourages the development of skills and abilities, independence, social competence, and adaptive behavior)</td>
<td>Environmental stressors Resources / material resources Organizational culture /climate Salient events / critical incidents Person x environment interaction Barriers and facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Optimism (The confidence that things will happen for the best or that desired goals will be attained)</td>
<td>Optimism Pessimism Unrealistic optimism Identity</td>
<td>12. Social influences (Those interpersonal processes that can cause individuals to change their thoughts, feelings, or behaviors)</td>
<td>Social pressure Social norms Group conformity Social comparisons Group norms Social support Power Intergroup conflict Alienation Group identity Modeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Beliefs about Consequences (Acceptance of the truth, reality, or validity about outcomes of a behavior in a given situation)</td>
<td>Beliefs Outcome expectancies Characteristics of outcome expectancies Anticipated regret Consequents</td>
<td>13. Emotion (A complex reaction pattern, involving experiential, behavioral, and physiological elements, by which the individual attempts to deal with a personally significant matter or event)</td>
<td>Fear Anxiety Affect Stress Depression Positive / negative affect Burn-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reinforcement (Increasing the probability of a response by arranging a dependent relationship, or contingency, between the response and a given stimulus)</td>
<td>Rewards (proximal / distal, valued / not valued, probable / improbable) Incentives Punishment Consequents Reinforcement Contingencies Sanctions</td>
<td>14. Behavioral Regulation (Anything aimed at managing or changing objectively observed or measured actions)</td>
<td>Self-monitoring Breaking habit Action planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This includes their perspectives on existing support, guidelines, and policies for developing and implementing sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming. There is debate in the sexual violence prevention field, and in many helping professions, about whether guidelines help or hurt intervention implementation (Moylan, 2016; Fischer, et al., 2016). That topic is outside the scope of this study, though it may come up during the interviews. The TDF constructs being used in this study will help identify what is currently happening in the field that supports or hinders professional staff in developing and implementing programs. The TDF will also help identify areas in the program development and implementation that is helping or hurting these programs from becoming evidence-based or best practice in the field. These are two areas where further research would be necessary in order to know if that is the case. However, the Theoretical Domains Framework will be useful in providing the specific language to guide future studies.

**Conclusion**

Institutions of higher education are accountable to their students and federal law. They were historically required to be responsible for students as a parent would, but now agree that each will take care of the other. However, the harm that occurs while students are enrolled in college has reached epidemic levels, specifically when it comes to sexual and interpersonal violence. Students enrolled in colleges and universities are three times more like to experience sexual and interpersonal violence than the general population. The changes to federal policy in response to this issue have made colleges and universities directly accountable to their most vulnerable students. Campuses must now adjudicate and prevent sexual and interpersonal violence or risk losing their federal funding.
The increase in research around campus-based prevention programming after these laws were passed indicate that IHE were in a hurry to be in compliance with these laws. However, like anything done in a hurry, there are gaps in the research about whether the efforts of prevention professionals have worked to address sexual and interpersonal violence on their campuses. 

Under the current system and in the current literature it is difficult to know what works and why from year to year on a single campus, let alone a campus in a different state.

The lack of evidence-based programming in this field is alarming given the amount of people impacted. Again, 20% of women enrolled in colleges and universities experience sexual and interpersonal violence annually, though the number is likely higher. The current literature is missing research that considers the entire field when looking at prevention programming practices as well as how those programs were developed. Additionally, the literature does not look at the training, skills, knowledge, and professional identity of the staff member who developed and implemented that program. These two factors are crucial in moving the field towards more evidence-based programs and comprehensive research. As it stands now, it is too difficult to know what works or not and there are too many people at risk to not try to figure out why.

The following section is a review of the current literature on this topic. The literature review takes into consideration the significance of sexual assault as a nation-wide public health issue but focuses on campus-based prevention programming. The review looks first at prevention programming as it currently stands in the field both what is being done and what is missing. It then looks at the lack of research into the staff behind the development and implementation of prevention programming, as this is a significant factor in program fidelity. The latter half of the literature review is focused on the research on program content and the disagreements therein.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

Every year, 1 in 5 women in institutions of higher education (IHE) experience an attempted or completed sexual assault (Sundstrom, et al., 2018). The impact of sexual violence ranges from dropping out of school, experiencing increased mental health difficulties, or increased high-risk behaviors (Sundstrom, et al., 2018). Sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming is one of the main ways colleges and universities increase awareness of gender-based violence and attempt to educate students on harmful behaviors that increase the likelihood of perpetration (McMahon, et al., 2019b). In order to understand the gap this study is attempting to address, an overview of the existing literature on campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming is needed.

This literature review will present the ways in which campus-based prevention programming research is relatively disorganized. This disorganization is particularly evident around which aspects of prevention programming needs to be focused on in order to improve program outcomes. One of the causes of this unfocused research is the lack of a large evidence-based prevention programming pool from which prevention professionals can draw. The issues that follow, such as inconsistent usage of theoretical models or agreement on effective programming content, can arguably stem from not having a foundational programming base. This study will explore what is currently happening in the field of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention and what prevention professionals feel they need in order to both program more effectively and know their programs are preventing violence.
Sexual and interpersonal violence prevention on college campuses is not a new problem for students attending school. The field of campus-based violence prevention, however, is relatively new to the higher education setting (McMahon, et al., 2019b). The attention on addressing sexual assault in IHE was increased in the last decade in large part due to the expansion of Title IX, a federal policy that prohibits gender discrimination in institutions receiving federal funding, to include sexual violence (McMahon, et al., 2019b). With new regulations came new pressure for campuses to follow the guidelines set forth by the Office of Civil Rights (OCR), which includes, the responsibility of campuses to take steps to mitigate the recurrence of violence on their campus once a report has been filed (Ali, 2011).

The literature around programming efforts in this field is scattered and confusing. This may be due to IHE reacting quickly in order to stay in compliance with federal law (Brubaker & Keegan, 2019). As a result, the literature reflects the responsive nature of the field as a whole; it is disorganized and occasionally contradictory. For example, there are equally compelling studies about bystander intervention training that claim the gender composition of the audience does not have an impact on program efficacy and ones that claim a single-gender audience are best for meeting both short term and long term programming goals (Gibbons, 2013; Brown, Alexander, & Rothenberg, 2015). Similarly, there does not seem to be agreement in the body of research around whether sexual assault and interpersonal violence are separate and unique forms of gender-based violence or if sexual assault is a form of interpersonal violence (Bonar, et al., 2019).

The literature relevant to this study on prevention program development and implementation is challenging because of the lack of existing guidelines or implementation expectations from which programs can draw a general structure (DeGue, 2014a). The other issue
is that a large segment of the literature is still researching how sexual assault occurs at such a high rate on IHE and who is at risk for victimization. While that is a discussion parallel to this one, it should be noted that the baseline disbelief by large segments of the population that sexual assault is as prevalent as it is directly impacts what topics are researched and where researchers in this field are forced to put their efforts (Brubaker & Keegan, 2019). The recent changes to Title IX by former secretary of education Betsy DeVos, are an example of how prevention professionals’ time is wasted trying to convince stakeholders that a problem exists instead of researching how to more effectively prevent and respond to this problem. For instance, the changes to Title IX provide the option to raise the standard of evidence from “preponderance of evidence” to “clear and convincing” (Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972, 2020). This higher standard of evidence is not the norm for most grievance procedures on college campuses, including plagiarism (Standler, 2012). Campus advocates have interpreted this proposed change as an attempt by DeVos to change the process in favor of the respondent (or accused) since it is already difficult to “prove” sexual assault (Campus Advocacy and Prevention Professionals Association (CAPPA), 2019). Advocates have also suggested this change implies that sexual assault requires a higher standard of evidence than other grievances because of false reports and the impact those reports would have on the respondent (CAPPA, 2019).

Title IX and campus policy is an important aspect of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming, but these programs are not necessarily beholden to federal regulations. Therefore, it is important to note how they are interconnected and informed by one another and how they operate separately. The rigor of campus-based prevention programs is one area where it is evident that the presence of federal guidelines, while imperfect, can have an impact on programming.
Evidence-based Programs

Evidence-based work in public health refers to decisions, interventions, policies, and/or programs that are made or created using the best available, recent peer reviewed research (Gottfredson, et al., 2015). In particular, a program is considered evidence-based when it has been created, implemented, tested, replicated, and reviewed and results in the desired outcomes (Gottfredson, et al., 2015). It is important for work in public health to be evidence-based because of the sensitive nature of public health topics and the diversity of communities in which public health professionals operate (Gottfredson, et al., 2015). Professionals should use the best available research to inform what interventions are used and why they are best way to meet the public health ethical goals of health equity and beneficence.

The rigorous process through which programs become evidence-based necessarily takes time. However, programs have to be implemented in the meantime, so professionals who develop programs and interventions often turn towards the research, the history of the issue they want to address, and their own experience when implementing a program (Woodbury & Kuhnke 2014). This comparatively informal process has been called “evidence-informed” (Woodbury & Kuhnke, 2014). There does not seem to be agreement in the literature about which process for program development best suits the populations they are intended to serve (Woodbury & Kuhnke, 2014). Some of the disagreement seems to be, in part, rooted in whether qualitative data is considered as rigorous a method of program evaluation as quantitative data (Woodbury & Kuhnke, 2014). However, evidence-based programs often become the cornerstone of programming efforts because of their ability to be replicated and are often generalizable (Gottfredson, et al., 2015). For a new field such as campus-based sexual and interpersonal
violence prevention, not having a variety of established evidence-based programs available could hinder a professional’s ability to be effective and to evaluate that effectiveness.

Sexual assault prevention programs for IHE have two evidence-based programs from which professionals can draw. The first type of evidence-based program is bystander intervention training and the other is Men Can Stop Rape. Bystander intervention training is a form of sexual and interpersonal violence prevention that focuses on educating and empowering bystanders on how to intervene if they see a violent or potentially violent situation (Sundstrom, et al., 2018). This type of training is meant to address what is commonly called “the bystander effect,” a phenomena that entered the conversation around sexual and interpersonal violence after numerous people witnessed the brutal rape and murder of Kitty Genovese in 1964 and did nothing to help her or stop the attack (Manning, Levine, & Collins, 2007). On college campuses, students are commonly required to go through a various forms of bystander intervention training that is intended to mitigate the bystander effect at parties or at public events (Sundstrom, et al., 2018). Students are given basic education about sexual and interpersonal violence, what it is and how it can manifest, and then are given three ways to intervene if they see something potentially dangerous (Palmer, et al., 2018). They can distract the perpetrator, delegate to a group of people or an authority figure, or directly confront the potential perpetrator on their own (Palmer, et al., 2018). Organizations such as Green Dot and Bringing in the Bystander have partnered with IHE to bring comprehensive, evidence-based trainings to high perpetration risk populations such as athletes and Fraternity and Sorority life members (Palmer, et al., 2018). Though these programs differ in their curriculum, the basic structure of bystander intervention training remains the same.

Men Can Stop Rape is another organization that brings an evidence-based curriculum to campuses that focuses on preventing perpetration. The program itself started as a dating violence
prevention program in middle and high schools before being implemented on college campuses. The program is a series of 45-minute presentations each on a different topic, including sexual violence and the dynamics of healthy relationships (Hillenbrand-Gunn, Heppner, Maunch, & Park, 2010). As mentioned previously, there is evidence to suggest that intensive, single-gender interventions have a long-term effect on participant’s behavior (Gibbons, 2013). The purpose of focusing on male single-gender sessions is that aspects of masculine socialization are considered a risk factor for the perpetration of a variety of sexual and interpersonal violence behaviors (Voller & Long, 2010). That being the case, the most upstream form of campus-based sexual assault prevention would be a single-gender program focused on addressing high-risk beliefs or behaviors in men before they reach college.

One aspect of masculine socialization in the United States includes holding hostile beliefs about women and gender roles in general (Voller & Long, 2010). Some indicators of hostile or sexist beliefs are objectifying women, believing that women have a role in society to serve men, rape myth acceptance, such as “women play hard to get for attention,” and sexual entitlement (Canan, Jozkowski, & Crawford, 2018). These beliefs about men and women in relation to sexual activity, when mixed with alcohol and group norms that enforce or reward these beliefs, create an environment in which rape is perpetrated and, in some cases, supported and encouraged (Canan, et al., 2018). In a widely cited study by Liask and Miller in 2002, 63% of the 1,882 men surveyed self-reported acts that met the legal definition of rape but did not consider themselves to be rapists. They described using force both verbal and physical, coercion, and incapacitation due to drugs or alcohol to obtain sex (Liask & Miller, 2002). This study supports more recent research into the behaviors of men on college campuses and their behaviors towards and attitudes about women. The curriculum of Men Can Stop Rape is meant to help redefine what it means to
be a man and how men should behave towards women that reduces rape myth acceptance, hostile beliefs about gender roles, and reduce competitive behaviors that contribute to both hazing and sexual violence.

In looking at available evidence-based programs for prevention professionals, bystander intervention training and Men Can Stop Rape programming is not enough to address the complex issue of campus sexual assault. There needs to be effort put into establishing a variety of prevention programs as evidence-based in order to avoid harming the perceived rigor of the field as a whole.

**Theory-based Programming**

Programs that are evidence-informed can often draw from existing theoretical models for behavior and implementation in order to improve their programming outcomes. However, the literature has shown that comparable programs on similar campuses do not use the same theory or model when developing their intervention (McMahon, et al., 2019b). The result is a lack of understanding around whether a program works, which population is it most effective with, and why it succeeds or fails in meeting its objectives. It is unfortunately uncommon for a sexual assault prevention program to have a theoretical or curricular foundation, making it difficult to measure effectiveness or establish fidelity (McMahon, et al., 2019b; DeGue, 2014a). However, the literature has shown that certain programs have attempted to use theoretical models or curriculums in their program development in order to address this issue in the field.

The complex determinants of perpetrating sexual assault create a need for various types of prevention and intervention programs. While bystander intervention is an action-oriented training that addresses cultural beliefs that reinforce rape myth acceptance, other programs are focused on changing social and cultural norms (Giraldi & Monk-Turner, 2017). These programs
use a variety of interpersonal theories to structure their curriculum. The theories used range from social psychology, social cognitive theory, belief system theory, to gender and feminist theory. They are being used to address different complex determinants of sexual assault, each of which could be its own intervention, such as empathy building, reducing victim blaming, decreasing aggression towards women, managing alcohol consumption, consent education, and creating new group and social norms (Paul & Gray, 2011; Foubert, Godin, & Tatum, 2010; Abbey & McAulsan, 2004). One weakness of the research on sexual assault perpetration is the wide variety of theoretical frameworks that are being use for programming.

It is difficult to compare different theory-based programs for several reasons: the first of which is that theoretical models are built with their own internal structure (Nilsen, 2015). This structure is meant to be used to as a foundation for the program content and inform the person implementing the curriculum on benchmark behaviors that indicate whether a participant is progressing through the expected behavior change (Nilsen, 2015). Certain models or frameworks can be used in conjunction with one and other, but it can make it a challenge to evaluate the program outcome since many theoretical models have evaluation metrics built into their structure (Nilsen, 2015). If two programs are using different theoretical models for behavior change, it can create too many variables if they were to be compared. It would be like comparing red and green apples: though they are the same general type of fruit, the individual differences between them can overwhelm their similarities. For sexual assault prevention programming, the variables that highlight program differences makes it difficult to compare program outcomes across campuses. In fact, much of the research addresses the fact that, historically, sexual assault prevention programming has not been rooted theory; so many professionals attempt to address this gap through creating their own theory-based prevention programming (Paul & Gray, 2011).
A commonly used theoretical model in sexual assault prevention programming is the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB). The TPB is a behavior change theory that focuses on how our individual beliefs and intentions to engage in a type of behavior intersects with our perception of those beliefs in relation to our social surroundings or other people (Ajzen, 1991). These beliefs and perceptions then interact with our perception of control over changing those beliefs and our intention to change our behavior as a result. The TPB is used frequently in developing bystander intervention trainings since the constructs around a person’s beliefs about a behavior and their perceived control over both the beliefs and the behavior impacts whether the person follows through on the behavior or not (Ajzen, 1991). For participants experiencing low bystander efficacy, for example, this model can be a helpful way to frame intervening in potentially risky situations (Sundstrom, et al., 2018). There are other theoretical models that are also used to address a particular attitude or behavior, but it is unclear if they impact participant’s behavior long term since there is often no follow up, tracking, or booster sessions to reinforce what was initially learned (McMahon, et al., 2019b).

Sexual assault is a complex topic that is often not given the breadth or depth needed to illicit real change in student’s behavior. The lack of consistent theory-based programming creates a messaging, fidelity, and effectiveness issue for prevention professionals across multiple campuses.

**Evaluation Methods for Programming**

The most commonly used tool for understanding the effectiveness or efficacy of a program or intervention is thorough evaluation of a program’s outcomes (Gottfredson, et al., 2015). As mentioned in the previous sections, one aspect of establishing a program as evidence-based is using an evidence-based evaluation method to determine if you met your programming
goals or outcomes (Gottfredson, et al., 2015). An issue that is evident in the literature and within best practice is a prevention professional’s inability to use evidence-based evaluation methods without having created a program within the theoretical model or framework for that evaluation method. It is therefore common for prevention professionals to use anecdotal or informal evaluation tools such as short assessment surveys or by asking participants for feedback (Paul & Gray, 2011). These informal tools, used outside of a greater theoretical framework or implementation model, does not provide any data that can be used to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the prevention programming on that campus (Clay, et al., 2019). In other words, there is very little data with which a person can determine if they are actually preventing assault.

The exception is bystander intervention training, which is an evidence-based curriculum and embedded within it are evaluation tools or metrics to determine the program’s effectiveness (Sundstrom, et al., 2018). These evaluation tools, however, are focused on previously established barriers to intervention such as rape myth acceptance or bystander efficacy (Sundstrom, et al., 2018). Understanding how rape occurs and who is a possible victim or perpetrator of sexual violence is a main component of bystander intervention training (Bessette, 2015). Rape myth acceptance is a set of beliefs or assumptions about how rape occurs or who is the victim of sexual violence (Yapp & Quayle, 2018). The type of rape myths some participants believed were that women lie about being raped to get attention or because they regret the sexual experience (Palm Reed, Hines, Armstrong & Cameron, 2015). Other myths included, women playing hard to get when they said “no” or the witnessed behavior (such as grabbing or pinching) is not potentially harmful and is a form of flirting (Sundstrom et al., 2018). Both men and women ascribed to many of these rape myths, though men were more likely to express the fear that women make rape accusations as a form of revenge (Seabrook, Ward, & Giacarrdi, 2016).
Bystander intervention is impacted by a bystander’s adherence to rape myths because they are less likely to intervene or see witnessed behavior as problematic if they believe that the person is not in danger (Rich, et al., 2010). The belief that rape is something that does not happen frequently or is often lied about leads bystanders to believe they do not have to intervene (Hahn, Morris, & Jacobs, 2016). Researchers suggest that trainings focus on debunking rape myths and move participants towards having a more nuanced understanding of how rape occurs and how bystander intervention is an effective prevention method. This training focus will also allow bystanders to feel capable of identifying when someone is potentially in a harmful situation, improving their overall feeling of empowerment to act.

Bystander intervention training participants disclosed that lack of bystander efficacy is one of the barriers to intervening in potential sexual or interpersonal violence situations (Exner & Cummings, 2011). Bystander efficacy is defined as both the individual’s perceived efficacy to prevent the situation and the perception of the intervention itself as being effective in preventing violence (Exner & Cummings, 2011; Haikalis, Leone, Parrott, & DiLillo, 2018). Other disclosed barriers related to bystander efficacy are the bystander’s or the potential victim or perpetrator’s gender and alcohol consumption (Sundstrom et al., 2018). The recommendation for overcoming the perception of bystander efficacy, and other barriers to intervention, is to connect the bystander’s perception of the situation, the intent to do something about it, and knowledge with action (McMahon et al., 2019b). By formatting bystander intervention trainings under this recommendation in the future, bystanders might be more likely feel empowered to act in high-risk situations (Palmer, et al., 2018).

Evaluating rape myth acceptance or bystander efficacy using previously existing tools (such as the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale) to determine program effectiveness is
problematic because it does not take into account confounding factors that contribute to rape culture as a whole (DeGue, 2014a). This means that only one risk factor for perpetrating sexual assault is addressed through a program, though the program as a whole might be considered a success if there is a measurable decrease in participant’s acceptance of rape myths after the training and in follow up studies. While this is not necessarily an issue with bystander intervention training or programs as a whole, this is a demonstrable issue with the tools prevention professionals have in order to assess their programming efforts.

**Professionalism and Training**

One significant gap in the literature that is study will attempt to address is how prevention staff are trained, educated, or certified to develop and implement programming. There is not much in the literature about staff expectations or professional guidelines for prevention programming. The literature does cover the experiences of response staff at community crisis shelters. Research in this area points to common experiences of vicarious trauma, burnout, and high turnover (Cummings, Singer, Hisaka, & Benuto, 2018). These experiences are common in advocates, mental health and social workers, and intake staff at domestic and sexual violence centers (Cummings, et al., 2018). While this is an important and significant area of research, it is not the concern of this study.

A recent study addressed a similar gap in the literature regarding the experiences of campus victim advocates. Like prevention programming staff, colleges and universities are unique compared to other communities and therefore require specific research. Brubaker and Keegan’s (2019) article does provide some comparable experiences between advocates and prevention professionals, though the positions function differently under Title IX. As mentioned previously, after the 2011 revisions to Title IX were implemented, campuses quickly created
positions and updated policies in order to be compliant with Title IX (Brubaker & Keegan, 2019). However, these updates did not provide sufficient outlines for advocates that met the needs of students while staying compliant with Title IX (Brubaker & Keegan, 2019). Campus advocates are under a different umbrella of scrutiny than community-based advocates are because campus policy, federal and state law, and student needs are all expected to be followed and met (Brubaker & Keegan, 2019). If advocates fail to meet any of the job expectations (or are perceived to not meet the expectations) then they are at risk of having a complaint filed against them with the Office of Civil Rights.

Brubaker and Keegan’s (2019) article is the beginning of an important conversation about the role campus advocates have among sexual violence response professionals. Brubaker and Keegan’s study is one of the few articles in the literature that attempts to look at campus-based sexual assault professionals from a professional development perspective. The article explores feelings of professionalism and expertise as well as how certification might help or hurt the field. However, advocates and prevention programming staff are different and therefore Brubaker and Keegan’s study can only help so much in determining what prevention staff might experience in their positions. The subject of this current study is not focused specifically on staff professionalism and training, but it is one aspect of that will be covered.

Risk Factors and Protective Factors

Sexual assault perpetration is a complex issue and one that has many interconnecting behaviors that contribute to the existence of the problem. Many prevention programs are inherently flawed in their structure because they only focus their messaging on one aspect of sexual assault. DeGue, (2014a) noted the ineffectiveness of single dose programming in addressing the risk factors for perpetration and McMahon et al. (2019c) noted that program
length, dose and capacity is an area of prevention programming that needs to be addressed. Furthermore, programs that are focused on building awareness or are focused on risk factors for victimization can miss crucial opportunities to educate students on what causes rape (Gibbons, 2013). As Gibbons, (2013) points out, these types of programs are predicated on the idea that people believe rape myths or perpetrate sexual violence because they are unaware or misinformed about what it is. By extension of this logic, awareness-building programs are prevention programs even if they are not directly impacting a person’s behavior.

Comprehensive and curricular programs are more detailed in their messaging and, by extension, are more expensive and time consuming to implement (DeGue, 2014a). These intentionally developed programs have content, program length, audience, and dosage worked into their evaluation plan to determine if they are meeting their program outcomes (DeGue, 2014a). One common thread within the literature is that single-dose programs without supplemental information or boosters are not effective in creating long-term change in their participants (DeGue, 2014a; Clay, et al., 2019; Paul & Gray, 2011). However, despite the increased effectiveness of comprehensive programming, they are used less widely because they require dedicated staffing (Clay, et al., 2019). Comprehensive programming (and the tools imbedded in their development) would also ensure program fidelity after the curriculum was finalized (DeGue, 2014a). However, other barriers exist to proper prevention messaging. One barrier noted in the literature is how to reach the intended population (Clay, et al., 2019). It is common for sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programs to address a topic generally to account for programming restraints on time and campus resources (McMahon, et al., 2019b; Clay, et al., 2019). However, one aspect that makes a program evidence-based is reaching the population the program is intended to serve (Gottfredson, et al., 2015). There does not seem to be
agreement in the literature on which messages need to be addressed to which population. For instance, should consent messaging be targeted at groups at risk for perpetration or groups at risk for victimization? What purpose would each program serve to meet the program objectives? However important questions such as these are for the research, flexibility is not an option for programmers who are limited in their campus resources included available time to reach students in the academic year (Paul & Gray, 2011).

Based on the evidence in the literature, it would just be as impactful for programmers to address protective factors for not perpetrating sexual violence or being victimized while in college and empower that population to change social norms in their communities (Tharp, et al., 2012). However, the lack of agreement around programming content is a barrier to a systemic shift in the field towards balancing both risk and protective factors in programs.

Content Implementation

The content of sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming tends to vary as much as the programming structure. Again, while this is not the focus of this current study, it should be noted that programming content is one area that is heavily researched without much consensus in the field. Program content can first be broken into several categories such as prevention topics (i.e. risk and protective factors), awareness messaging (i.e. sexual violence prevalence, advertising campus services, educating on campus policies), and solidarity building (i.e. events such as the Clothesline Project and Project Unbreakable) (Brown, et al., 2015). What differentiates these programs by their content is the program outcome, even if the outcome is not explicitly or intentionally articulated.

Program content that focuses on protective factors range from educating on health masculinity, lowering rape myth acceptance, and understanding the dynamics of healthy
relationships are common for preventionists (Tharp, et al., 2012; McMahon, et al., 2019b). Healthy masculinity is a relatively recent messaging shift away from educating just on perpetration risk factors in men to include support for men in their gender and sexual development (Claussen, 2019). Healthy masculinity messaging includes; dynamics of healthy relationships, emotional expression, medically accurate sex education, and friendship and intimacy (Claussen, 2019; Healthy Masculinity Action Project, 2014). These are important topics to cover on college campuses, however, they often suffer from the same implementation difficulties mentioned previously. These topics are suggested by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for sexual assault prevention programs; however, it is a relatively new content area and lacks the evidence-based structure to be implemented consistently.

The literature does not address the glaring barrier to consistent messaging in the field, the definition of prevention terms. This issue was mentioned in a previous section, but needs to be restated here because the majority of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programs are centered on defining behaviors and educating students on how to identify these behaviors in themselves and others (Clay, et al., 2019; DeGue, 2014a, Paul & Gray, 2011). When looking at the literature, authors use a variety of terms to describe the focus of their prevention program: these include calling it power-based personal violence, sexual and interpersonal violence, gender-based violence, sexual violence, sexual assault, sexual misconduct, and rape prevention (McMahon, et al., 2019b; Bonar, et al., 2019; Gibbons, 2013; DeGue, 2014a; Berke, Leone, Hyatt, Zeichner, & Parrott, 2019; Sundstrom, et al., 2018, Rich, et al., 2010).

Furthermore, each state has its own definition of consent that is then reflected in the campus’s sexual misconduct policy but written to reflect the needs of the campus population (McMahon, et al., 2019a). The CDC recommends educating on many of the content topics
mentioned as effective evidence-informed practice, but the lack of agreement around what these terms mean within the field creates a barrier to evaluating consistent and effective messaging in prevention programs.

**Addressing the Gaps in the Literature**

The purpose of this exploratory qualitative pilot study is to begin the conversation about what makes campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming effective. One of the aims of this study is to evaluate the development and implementation of campus-based prevention programs for professionals. Another aim is to address the gap in the literature described in this chapter. Many of the parallel topics identified in this review will likely come up during the interviews, but they each could be their own focused study. One area worth looking into further is collecting and evaluating common practices within the field to assess if they meet the standard for evidence-based practices. This could validate current efforts while expanding the available programming pool and increase the rigor of prevention programming. Another topic for research is the composition of the field itself. Who is working on campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention? What is their background and how is that impacting the work or field as a whole? The last area where research is most needed is how the field as whole uses and defines common terms. Term definition, and by extension behavior identification, is the most common prevention programming content area in the literature, but professionals use different terms to describe the same things. This creates confusion within the literature itself and could be a barrier to effective campus-based prevention messaging.

**Conclusion**

The literature on campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention is disorganized and contradictory. The definitions of the work itself are inconsistent and there is a
small pool of evidence-based programs that help guide prevention professionals on what works for college students. As a result, many of the programs implemented on college campuses are not theory-based or different theories are used to implement similar programs and therefore cannot be evaluated against each other to determine effectiveness. Often structural issues in the development of the programs themselves create evaluation issues, such as lacking clear program outcomes and inconsistent or non-existent evaluation methods. Some of these issues are rooted in basic inconsistencies on how to define certain common terms or lack of intentional usage of certain common terms within the field. The field of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention is both new and not new to prevention work, but it is struggling to demonstrate effective prevention models and meet the greater prevention objective of ending sexual and interpersonal violence on college campuses. Much of the literature around campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention is focused on evaluating program outcomes, as presented in this chapter. A beginning step would be to explore what who develop and implement prevention programming experience and ask what should be researched in the future.
CHAPTER THREE:

METHODODOLOGY

The purpose of this exploratory qualitative pilot study is to begin the conversation about what makes campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming effective. For the purpose of this study, sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programs is defined as any program with the goal of educating on and/or preventing sexual and interpersonal violence, which includes but is not limited to, contraception and safe sex, healthy relationships, safe drinking habits, and support for marginalized identities/populations.

The interviews were focused on program development and implementation from a staff perspective and was guided by the Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF). This study explored, what are the perceived barriers and facilitators to the development and implementation of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programs for prevention staff and what changes would campus prevention staff make to overcome existing barriers? This study was also seeking to understand, what are the experiences of campus staff who develop and implement sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programs in their role as preventionists? Lastly, how has COVID-19 impacted the development and implementation of essential prevention programs for institutions of higher education?

While there are limitations to this study, the results can help support and guide future research in campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming from a development and implementation perspective.
Study Design

Qualitative in-depth interviews were used to explore and understand the experiences of staff developing and implementing prevention programs on four-year residential colleges and universities.

Theoretical Framework. In order to gain an understanding of the experiences of campus prevention staff in the development and implementation of sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programs, this qualitative study design used the Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF) (Atkins et al., 2017). The TDF was explained in detail in Chapter 1, however it is relevant to address in this chapter how the TDF constructs were used in relation to data collection and analysis. The TDF is a framework that consists of 14 domains and 84 constructs that encompass many of the possible influences in the development and implementation of a program or intervention. The TDF is not a theoretically based framework and is therefore more flexible in how the constructs and domains can be used in research. Therefore, only six domains and select constructs from within those domains were used in developing the interview guide and codebook as shown in Table 2: knowledge, skills, social/professional role, beliefs about capabilities, goals, and social influences. The other domains address topics that are outside the scope of this study, such as behavioral regulation. This framework will aid in understanding the facilitators, barriers, and staff experiences in their roles as prevention programmers.

Sample and Recruitment

The study population was recruited from the Campus Advocacy and Prevention Professionals Association (CAPPA) listserv consisting of about 900 advocates and prevention professionals from across the country.
The target sample size, given the length and depth of the topic, was 15-25 participants in order to reach data redundancy (Bernard, Wutich, & Ryan, 2010). However, only 10 participants were recruited for this study. The level of variability between campus cultures and populations as well as staff position expectations means that data saturation was unlikely for this pilot study.
(Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006). To be eligible for this study, participants had to be a full-time staff member (hours equally or exceeding 37.5 hours a week), past their probationary period (>90 days or >6 months). The position requires them to spend equal to or more than 40% of their work week developing and/or implementing campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming on their campus, as defined by this study. The study participants must be English speaking and must give consent to participate in the study.

Participants were eligible for this study if; their college or university does not receive federal funding, their position is an outside contracted position with no programming requirements, their position expectations are to participate in prevention programming, but not develop or implement them, and if their position is considered (partially or in full) faculty and has faculty teaching requirements.

Recruiting participants through CAPPA consisted of first receiving approval from the research committee to post recruitment materials to the listserv. Once approved, study recruitment advertisements posts were submitted at regular intervals during the recruitment phase. Participants could choose to respond publicly or privately to the recruitment posts, as well as ask questions of both the researcher and the CAPPA research committee before agreeing to participate in the study. Individual reminders were sent to participants through email once they agreed to be interviewed. A $5 Starbucks gift card was offered as an incentive for participating in the interviews. If more than 25 CAPPA members volunteered to participate, quota sampling would have been conducted to ensure there is a diverse sample institution type. The quota sampling would have been based on institution type (public or private) and size. This would result in 6 sets, ~4 interviews per set. However, this procedure was not necessary since only 14 CAPPA members responded.
**Data collection.** Semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with staff who met my inclusion criteria within the CAPPA listserv. The interviews were recorded over GoToMeeting lasted about 90 minutes.

A version of the interview guide was developed and piloted in October 2019 as part of a class project, which further informed the efficacy of semi-structured in-depth interviews to answer the research questions. The piloted interviews and debriefing afterwards helped identify areas of modification regarding the drafted interview guide, coding, and the clarity of the research questions. The current iteration of interview guide was reviewed, modified, and piloted with two campus programming staff who did not meet my inclusion criteria. These pilot participants were chosen because of their experience in developing and implementing campus-based programming and did not impact recruitment for the study. The piloted interviews provided insight into the framing of the questions, the flow of the questions, the construction of the probes, and the cultural competency of the interview.

An institutional demographics form was sent to participants to be completed prior to interview. This form served the purpose of collecting necessary contextual information about the college or university in which the staff member works. The interview guide and demographics survey results can be seen in the Appendices.

**Data Analysis and Reporting**

**Transcription and coding.** All interviews were audio recorded through GoToMeeting and transcribed following a transcription protocol. The transcription protocol was created using a sample transcription protocol as a guide from Powers (2005). This guide outlined different areas on transcribing the interview verbatim including but not limited to spelling, grammar, sounds, pauses, overlap in speech, and tone as well as the formatting the transcript and information as to
the organization of the transcripts within files and storage of files. The audio recordings of the interviews were uploaded to the transcription software Otter and edited to match the transcription protocol.

A codebook was created using the Theoretical Domain Framework (TDF) and the research questions as a guide. The codes matched the six domains used to develop the interview protocol, with emerging subcodes that match the constructs within the six domains and common themes. The transcriptions were imported into Atlas.ti and coded within the software.

**Reporting.** Once the transcripts are coded, the frequency of each code and subcode for were generated through Atlas.ti software. These code frequencies were used to develop a thematic analysis of the data collected from participants. The results of the data analysis are presented in the results chapter of this thesis. Suggestions for future research based on the thematic analysis are presented as part of the discussion section.

**Study Strengths and Limitations**

This study had some limitations. The first of which is that the sample size was too small (n=10) and not representative of all types of institutions of higher education and thus was generalizable to all campus-based preventionists. However, this study does pose questions that establish possible avenues for further in-depth research. Additionally, this study was conducted to fulfill the requirements of a University of South Florida, Masters of Science in Public Health degree and was therefore limited by the timing and expectations of the thesis requirements. The coding and analysis were done by one researcher. Interrater reliability was not calculated in this study as a result. However, the data findings will be compared with similar studies from the literature and topics presented at conferences improve credibility.
Ethical Considerations

**Risks and benefits.** This study is considered to result in minimal risk of harm to the interview participants, meaning that the risks accompanying this study are the same as what people face in their daily lives. However, participants disclosed personal experiences with violence when discussing their professional experiences. Therefore, the researcher made it clear that they could stop the interview at any time or skip any questions they did not feel comfortable answering. There was no direct benefit to the participants for participating in the study.

**Privacy and confidentiality.** All personally identifiable information was anonymized in the transcriptions and the data analysis. Personally identifiable information includes (but is not limited to): names of the participants, coworkers, offices, and the institutions of higher education; names of programs unique to a campus; incidents well known to a campus. Names of participants and the IHE for which they work were associated with a Source ID in the records, recordings, questionnaires, and notes of the researcher and in the password protected USF Box account associated with the researcher. Any email communication between the researcher and participant was deleted.

**Informed consent.** Prospective participants were provided with study design, details, purpose, and expectations with their demographics questionnaires, which was written using the IRB Social-Behavioral Adult Consent template. The researcher was available by phone or email to answer any questions about the study design prior to scheduling the interview and/or leading up to the scheduled interview. Participants were then asked to provide consent to participate and to be recorded prior to the beginning of the interview.

**Study intent.** This study was intentionally designed to meet the IRB definitions of program evaluation. As discussed in the strengths and limitations section, this is a small pilot
study intended to explore what is currently happening in the field of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention from the perspectives of those working on this issue and is not generalizable. The data analysis is intended to provide a functional benchmark of programming facilitators and barriers and suggestions for future research and evaluation if published or disseminated widely. Therefore, this study was determined to be exempt by IRB, as seen in Appendix 5.

**Positionality.** This researcher has worked in campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention and response since 2015 and therefore has a personal stake in the outcome of this study. However, this researcher’s insider knowledge also gives her innate understanding of the field and helped facilitate rapport with study participants, easing the flow of the interviews, and added a layer of depth to the thematic analysis of the data.

In summary, this chapter described the methodology for this study as it was implemented during July and August of 2020. The following chapter will present the results of the study research questions: 1) what are the perceived barriers and facilitators to the development and implementation of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programs and what changes would campus prevention staff make to overcome existing barriers? 2) what are the experiences of campus staff who develop and implement sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programs in their role as preventionists? 3) how has COVID-19 impacted the development and implementation of essential prevention programs for institutions of higher education?
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Fourteen prevention professionals responded to the recruitment email posted to the CAPPA listserv. Of the 14 preventionists who responded, only 10 completed the interview and the survey. The 10 participants filled out the campus demographics survey, which was developed to ensure there was a diverse sample of institution types. The survey also included general questions that impact preventionists but are not directly related to the research questions. Full survey results can be seen in Appendix 2, interview guide and materials can be seen in Appendix 3-6. As Table 3 illustrates, 60% of participants (n=10) were from public institutions and half of participants described their institution location as rural. Some of the participants were from institutions with multiple campus locations, and 90% of participants described their institution as predominantly White. Participants served a range of student populations with 20% of participants serving the lowest end of the spectrum (1,000-5,000 students) and 10% of participants serving the highest end of the spectrum (over 50,000 students). The most common campus size was 20,000-30,000 students with 40% of participants working on a campus within that range. The student population size of each institution did not change the amount of programming each participant was responsible for providing. Participants reported implementing multiple campus-wide events, such as Take Back the Night and programming during orientation for their entire incoming class.
Table 3. Summary of Institutional Demographics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency (N=10)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population</td>
<td>Less than 1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-5000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000-10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000-20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000-30,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,000-40,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,000-50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 50,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>Predominately White</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historically Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predominately Latinx</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Location</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban Setting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Urban Setting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commuter Only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to understand how advocacy resources are positioned within the institution because participants reported overlap between services. Seventy percent of participants identified having an advocate at their institution, one institution has a contract with a community resource to serve in a victim advocate role, and one institution does not have an advocate at all. When asked about the advocate’s employment status, 60% were employed full time and one participant identified that they acted as victim advocate when needed.
The interviews took place during July and August of 2020, which was a slow programming time for all participants, typically used for fall program planning. On May 6, 2020 the Trump administration released updated Title IX regulations with the implementation date of August 14 attached to a 2,000-page document provided by the Department of Education. The short implementation period meant that many schools were updating their sexual misconduct policies and their adjudication processes during the summer the interviews were taking place. The new regulations created an unexpected context for the interviews that could have been more thoroughly explored with more time and preparation.

**Research Question 1 (RQ1): What Are the Perceived Barriers and Facilitators to the Development and Implementation of Campus-based Sexual and Interpersonal Violence Prevention Programs and What Changes Would Campus Prevention Staff Make to Overcome Existing Barriers?**

Facilitators and barriers in program development and implementation proved complicated to identify because many factors related to the participant’s work were facilitators if they had them and barriers if they did not. This became even more apparent as three major themes emerged related to this research questions; access to programming resources, navigating the administrative bureaucracy of institutions of higher education, and gaining institutional buy in. These themes reflected many of the barriers to meeting their goals that participants described and were framed as possible facilitators if changes were made.

**Resources (staffing, time, money).** The first theme concerned how participants used and accessed resources for their work. Specifically, participants talked about staffing, time, and money as resources they needed in order to better meet their goals. Programs are dependent on resources for success. They require staff to implement, especially if the program happens more
than once or is a large, campus-wide event. They require money for food, activities, speakers, incentives such as shirts, and materials for marketing. Developing and implementing programming is also time consuming, usually requiring months of planning in advance, set up and break down time, and the program itself which can last between 60 and 120 minutes on average. All participants felt they were doing the best with what they had but felt like they could do more with additional staff dedicated to sexual and interpersonal violence prevention and more funding for programming resources.

The organizational structure of each participant’s institution was a factor in how successful they were in developing and implementing their programming. While each participant was from a different type of institution, more than half of the participants had at least two people between them and the upper administration. Though participants often spoke broadly about the upper administration at their institutions, it seemed that participants were generally referring to people in positions such as the president, vice presidents or provosts, and deans. These positions often oversee whole departments, if not the entire institution, are often the main decision-makers around departmental budgets, and often are a part of strategic planning committees. Having influence over budgets and representation on strategic planning committees means that upper administrators often have influence over what campus-wide initiatives get administrative and budgetary support. Additionally, all participants were the only staff member explicitly tasked with overseeing the development and implementation of prevention programming. Being the only staff member overseeing violence prevention for their campus or the entire institution system was a challenge participants mentioned, particularly because of how many programs they are expected to implement a year. Participants described developing and implementing anywhere between 35 and 70 programs a year, with the highest density of programming being in October.
for Domestic Violence Awareness Month (DVAM) and April for Sexual Assault Awareness Month (SAAM). October and April tend to include large campus-wide events such as Take Back the Night in addition to smaller programs (such as information/interactive tables or art displays) that occur daily or weekly throughout the month. All participants mentioned planning SAAM events nine months to a year in advance.

Half of participants described being able to implement their programs with support from student peer educators or student workers. However, these participants noted certain drawbacks to relying on students to bridge the staffing gap in their offices. For instance, students have other commitments that take up their time and they are only allowed to work a certain number of hours a week. These participants also noted that they felt it was unethical to ask students to do emotionally taxing and time-consuming work without paying them.

The tension around staffing for participants, was tied to lack of access to upper administration and the upper administrator’s understanding of primary prevention. Participants noted that the upper administration is often focused on issues around liability and staying compliant with federal guidelines when it comes to sexual and interpersonal violence programming. For some participants this means that their upper administration will put a lot of focus on a handful of prevention programs for the sake of “checking a box.” One participant noted this issue when she first started in her role:

“I think that's something that I wasn't prepared for when I came. For example, when we were doing the evaluation of Green Dot, which is kind of my first task when I came, Green Dot was made mandatory, which it's not intended to be mandatory. And I was really confused as to how that decision was made and, you know, it takes up a lot of capacity to track how many students have taken it and actually enforced the mandatory
requirement. And so, I think I really realized the difference in priorities when I was like, well, why can't we just make it not mandatory? And they're like, “well, upper admin really wouldn't go for that, it looks good to have a mandatory program, even if it's not the most effective thing.” (ID-005)

These participants noted that overly focusing on programs such as mandatory bystander intervention training or orientation programming is not in line with best practices for prevention programming since they are often single dose. It can also be time-consuming and labor intensive to implement mandatory programming for a single-person office since the program has to be offered multiple times so students have the opportunity attend. For example, one participant, who was from an institution with over 50,000 students, described a consent presentation that was mandatory for all new students:

“It was the only presentation that I gave for the fall semester last semester, or last year. The most I gave was five a day, and when I say I also have a group of peer educators that like helped me out with this stuff, so it's not just me, because five presentations a day is insane. But so five a day and the max capacity of students was 50, most of them were full. No, yeah, it was a lot, it was a lot, we had… a record year for incoming students last year.” (ID-014)

By mandating that this program be attended by all new students, this participant’s upper administration prevented her from providing additional prevention programming on other topics to sophomore, junior, and senior students for an entire semester. Best practice for prevention programming is multi-dose, voluntary, and curricular based, none of which can be achieved if a preventionist only has the resources to provide one program to one group of students in semester.
For many participants, staffing represented having the time to cover a wider range of topics, having time dedicated to reaching out to at risk populations, having time to be strategic about their prevention efforts, and having time for program evaluation. Participants saw more staffing as a way to have the time to do more than they were already doing as opposed to lessening the workload they already have. All participants had ideas about ways their prevention efforts could improve but felt they did not have the capacity to follow through on those ideas with the resources they currently had.

Money also signified possibility for participants, both in the quantity and the quality of their programs. Participants felt having a bigger budget for prevention would demonstrate the institution’s investment in ending sexual and interpersonal violence. All participants felt they were an understaffed and underfunded office, which they also noted is a common complaint from every office on every campus. They recognized that institutions of higher education (IHE) are often on tight budgets and did not want to take resources from other offices or programs. Participants were in a variety of budgetary situations that were determined by the institution’s funding source (such as land grant institutions) and the way their office was funded (such as student fees). Two out of ten participants were funded through the Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) grant. Other participants were funded through student activity fees, student health fees, or shared a budget with another office. The source and amount of their funding was a cause for stress for most participants, and all participants mentioned money as something that would help them better meet their programming goals.

Administrative bureaucracy. Administrative reporting structures in institutions of higher education often determine who is able to have access to upper administration and
institutional decision makers. In addition to having power over staffing appointments and budgets, these administrators have power over which campus initiatives get attention or support from staff, faculty and students. Therefore, it is beneficial to be able to present something directly to the upper administration and have the opportunity to explain the importance of an initiative or why something was successful. However, not having access to those decision makers can create complications or barriers for preventionists.

A theme that was common for the eight participants who were not in a director role was how little interaction they had with the upper administration of their institution. This lack of contact resulted in several barriers that were common among these participants: upper administration’s lack of understanding about what primary prevention is, lack of understanding about the preventionist’s job, and lack of adequate resource allocation. These issues can also signal to other offices that violence prevention or the preventionist role is not an essential part of the institution. As one participant described:

“I was in a meeting with the Title IX Coordinator under the Office of Institutional Equity. We have a very strained relationship with them, unfortunately. And he kept repeating that he just doesn't see the importance in prevention education, that their office can handle it.”

(ID-010)

Educating the upper administration on what primary prevention practices are and informing them about prevention efforts on campus becomes difficult and complicated when preventionists have two or three layers of staffing between them. This means they rely on their supervisors to communicate information about the development and implementation of prevention programming to decision makers in the upper administration. The participants who voiced this barrier noted that the issue was not necessarily lack of trust in their supervisor, but
more that their supervisors usually oversees more than just prevention and therefore cannot give as full and comprehensive overview of the prevention efforts on campus as the preventionist could if they were present to the upper administration directly. As one participant explained regarding her supervisor in meetings with upper administration:

“…when she would be at meetings with stakeholders, because she was the director, they would see her as the director of counseling and not as the director of wellness promotion and they would only want to talk about mental health stuff and not want to talk about the work that we were doing on the prevention side and they couldn't separate her from those things.” (ID-011)

When asked how participants communicate with upper administration, the most common response was through an annual report that the participant generates. This document would report on the amount and type of programming the preventionist put on that year, approximate program attendance, and anecdotal information or highlights from the year. Participants noted that these items included in the annual report were what their upper administration saw as indicators of success, particularly attendance. Participants did not feel that attendance at an event was a strong indicator for a successful program. When asked how participants know if a program is successful, participants split their answer into outcomes that are quantifiable for the purposes of reports or presentations to upper administration and informal outcomes, such as witnessing a moment of understanding in a student. For participants, the informal outcomes felt more meaningful as evidence they were moving towards their larger goal of ending violence on college campuses and were meaningful interactions with students in general.

“I would say is that, what feels more impactful to me is when I have a student that tells me that they have learned something, when I have a professor who seems to use the
language that I've suggested, or I have a student that comes to me and says, like, “you know, this professor responded really well” or “you'll never guess what we talked about in my, you know, history 101 class,” like, you know, things like that.” (ID-009)

Participants recognized that measurable outcomes such as program objectives and attendance are important in some ways for evaluation, but felt upper administration placed too much importance on these outcomes because of how they can be directly correlated to money spent on programming. Some participants felt this also directly impacted their job security and felt they needed to demonstrate efficacy in a way that felt like attention was being pulled away from prevention efforts and put towards awareness events that tend to draw in a lot of students such as Take Back the Night. The upper administration’s lack of understanding or full comprehension of what makes effective prevention programming combined with how inaccessible they are due to reporting structures, can result in resource allocation decisions that create additional challenges for preventionists. As one participant described:

“Our vice president for Student Affairs has said to us before that we shouldn't need swag or free food at our events. We should have good enough events that people are just going to want to come to them anyway. And so he like doesn't want to spend any money on food and t-shirts. So that which is why we don't get more money. But then I'm like, then how do we get people?” (ID-011)

However, three participants felt there were individual members of their upper administration who did care about ending sexual and interpersonal violence on their campuses. These participants noted how lucky they felt to have allies in the upper administration. Only one of those participants held a director role and had direct access to the institution’s upper
administration. This participant described having institutional support and feeling supported by her institution, which no other participants described feeling.

**Institutional buy in.** Institutional buy in refers to how invested stakeholders are in an initiative or project. The main stakeholders in institutions of higher education, from a culture change perspective, are students, staff, and faculty. This means that in order for an initiative, like ending sexual and interpersonal violence, to be successful, students, staff, and faculty all have to buy into it and participate in the initiative. However, staff and faculty often take their cues from their upper administration, who often do not buy into or fully understand prevention work. Without institutional buy in, preventionists cannot create sustainable culture change.

When participants were asked about institutional buy in, they all emphatically agreed that it is necessary for the success of their programs. However, all participants struggled to articulate how they gain buy in from stakeholders that are not already engaged in the conversation about ending sexual and interpersonal violence. Three participants mentioned relating their work to the values of their institution to help cultivate buy in from reluctant stakeholders. Generally, participants felt that students bought into the prevention efforts happening on their campus. Since students are also the main target population of prevention programming, it makes sense that they would be the easiest population from which preventionists can garner support. Participants were mixed on staff engagement since programming is not often geared toward staff, but they felt staff would be supportive if asked to participate. Faculty were the hardest stakeholders to engage for all participants, though all noted individual faculty members who supported their work. As one participant described:

“…at this point, it's been formally stated that my program should serve students, faculty, and staff. But it's been more of like students that want to get engaged. Faculty and Staff
engagement is kind of minimal. So that our target is really all students. But it always tends to be the people who are already interested, um, who may have already been impacted by these issues or are already in a field related to our work that we get the most engagement from. But we target, you know, the whole school, incoming students, returning students, and future students.” (ID-001)

Some participants felt that overcoming the faculty engagement barrier was tied to upper administration buy in. They noted that faculty felt disconnected from the work around ending sexual and interpersonal violence for a variety of reasons, including feeling like it is not their job or they did not feel it was a problem on campus at all. One participant noted that it became easier to engage faculty after the president of her college announced an initiative to make everything on her campus co-curricular and attached a mandate that academics collaborate with the student life where her office is located.

“The new president is really pushing it. Also, now they know that like, I'm a good write off as their co-curricular, right. So like, all the faculty members are like, “dammit PRESIDENT really wants us to do more with the student life aspect of things, like I’ll just invite ID-009 to one of my classes this term and then I can check that off for PRESIDENT”…And so, you know, it's like, not necessarily the best motivation to get what I want, but like, I'm reaching populations that are not going to come to my programming otherwise, you know, hopefully I'm changing the way that some of us become humans and professionals.” (ID-009)

Some participants felt upper administration buy in would help them overcome multiple barriers around programming that they cannot overcome on their own. For example, participants who are not in director roles do not have control over their budgets or staffing appointments.
Furthermore, these participants are not in the meetings where they would be able to advocate for their programming needs. Participants felt that a bought in upper administration would invest in prevention by increasing the staff size, increasing the office budget, and attend the prevention programs that are open to staff and faculty. Participants also intimated that the upper administration can create requirements or mandates for staff, faculty, and student engagement in a way that participants could not in their role. For many participants buy in came down to feeling supported by the institution and feeling like the institution cared about ending sexual and interpersonal violence. For all participants, buy in was a crucial factor that indicated success.

“Honestly, if someone is working in a university system that does not buy in to what they're trying to do, I don't think that they're going to be truly successful. I think that they would be successful in the sense of like, we'll put in some basic messaging campaigns or like some basic events or whatever, and people will attend. But like, true culture shift can't happen without buy in.” (ID-004)

Participants felt that students generally bought into and were supportive of their programming. However, several participants noted that they struggled to engage certain marginalized populations with their programming. As mentioned above, nine out of ten participants identified their institution as predominantly White, which participants identified as a barrier when trying to reach students of color. Additionally, seven out of ten participants self-identified as White or White presenting. These participants noted this as a particular barrier because they recognized that it can be difficult for students of color to trust White preventionists. One participant described an interaction with a Black coworker:

“He's like, “my population is the one that needs you and in you, they don't see an ally.”

And I said to him, “I'm going to do everything I can to show them that I am gonna be
their ally, but I get that the color of my skin is going to turn a lot of them off, like I appreciate that and I'm going to do what I can to work around that.” (ID-009)

Participants recognized that there is a need to reach these high-risk populations, while also acknowledging that it can be challenging for White preventionists to do this in a sensitive way. All participants recognized the importance of creating inclusive programming, but also felt it was important to recognize their racial privilege and how that impacts the work they do on their campuses. All participants shared their strategies for how they are attempting to reach marginalized groups on their campuses. Some participants have gotten to know student leaders while others have partnered with their diversity and inclusion office to collaborate on certain initiatives. Participants felt these were fruitful efforts, though they recognized that it could be a barrier they cannot completely overcome towards gaining buy in from these student populations.

**RQ2: What Are the Experiences of Campus Staff Who Develop and Implement Sexual and Interpersonal Violence Prevention Programs In Their Role as Preventionists?**

The characteristics of the study participants were not formally collected as part of the data collection processes, though some participants mentioned their gender during their interview. All participants disclosed that they used either she/her or they/them pronouns in the interview or in their email signature. One participant identified as multiracial and bilingual, speaking English and Spanish. These facts are important to include because participants felt they contributed to their professional experiences and how they were perceived in certain space such as presenting a program to students or interacting with staff and faculty at their institution.

There were three major themes that emerged around participants’ experiences in their role: experiences around respect in their role, their lived experiences with sexual and interpersonal violence, and their overall confidence in their ability to do the job.
Participants’ job titles impact how they are treated. As mentioned previously, eight out of ten participants did not have a director role, which impacted their access to upper administration and their ability to advocate for the resources they need to program effectively. Participants’ titles also impacted how much respect other staff and faculty gave them as experts in sexual and interpersonal violence. Participants who had a coordinator role or was lowest in the reporting structure felt they were taken less seriously than their supervisors. This was most acutely felt by participants who had been in in the field five or more years and were in coordinator roles (which are typically positioned lowest in the reporting structures). One participant was completely new to the field, having just graduated with her masters, and was in her first professional role out of grad school. However, even this participant recognized that she had limited power over institutional change because of how far removed she is from the upper administration.

Participants in coordinator roles talked extensively about their concerns for their job security, but this came up most consistently around COVID-19 which will be covered in the next section. However, COVID-19 seemed to exacerbate stressors participants already had for their job security. Several participants talked about being worried they would have their budgets cut or lose their funding. There was a difference between how participants in director roles felt about their job versus participants in coordinator roles in relation to power within their institution. The participants in director roles did not express the same amount of powerlessness the other participants did with regards to changing institutional structures or policies. Three out of ten participants laughed when asked, “Do you think you could change the structure of your office or campus policy?” These participants had recently experienced changes to their office structure without their input and did not feel the changes were for the better. As one participant said:
“…as a lowly program coordinator, you know who is pretty far removed from most people with decision making ability, and also, as a program coordinator, that is one of a staff of 15, you know, that have other priorities, I don't think so. I can raise up my concerns, but you know, they might not always get to where they need to be.” (ID-014)

Additionally, the length of time the participants had been in the field contributed to feelings around their job expectations and their power within the institution. Eight participants had worked in sexual and interpersonal violence prevention for more than 5 years, either in the community or on campuses. These participants most consistently referred to themselves as subject area experts. Half of participants felt they were overqualified for the job they were in as it was written in their job descriptions. When asked if she felt her job description matched the work she was doing and her professional training, one participant responded:

“Oh, mmm, no. Specifically like the level I’m at, I think for like how long I've been doing the work, it's like, I'm overqualified and I'm not saying that to like, you know, like, brag or anything, but like, really, what I'm doing is a director position at the least. But it's certainly not titled that way or, like paid that way. I would say in a lot of ways, the job description like is a simplified version of what I'm doing.” (ID-012)

These participants were responsible for more than prevention programming, including supervising student staff and managing budgets and grants. All participants had at least a master’s degree, two were pursuing Ph.D.’s, and one participant has her Ph.D. and was teaching faculty at a previous institution. Participants referenced their academic backgrounds and work experience as evidence for being topic area experts and as one of the reasons they should be treated with respect by faculty and upper administration.
Some participants served as victim advocate either as part of their job or to support advocacy staff as needed. These participants spoke about feeling excluded from the campus sexual misconduct policy updates their institutions were doing in response to the new Title IX regulations. Advocates often provide support for student going through a Title IX investigation and preventionists are required to provide educational programming on the campus policy definitions of sexual harassment and sexual misconduct. However, participants were struggling to be invited into conversations about updates to their institution’s sexual misconduct policy, which increased their feelings of not being respected as topic area experts by upper administration. One participant explained how they were able to engage with policy updates around the new regulations:

“I had to like, claw my way into it, essentially. And then basically only got in because I had an ally faculty member that was on the committee. So it was very like strategic, I would say, I think yeah, like once I got in the room, there were places that like I could argue, because I am an expert on so much of what we were talking about and that wasn't immediately considered up front, which is wild to me, right? Because as people who work in direct client work in interpersonal violence on a campus like we know, we work with Title IX, probably more than anyone else other than Title IX. And so it's wild to me that that wasn't immediately considered when like forming one of these committees and when I've been talking to folks like through the listserv or at other schools, like very few survivor advocate type people were considered for these types of committees is what I've, I think that I've gathered, I don't have data for that, but it seems to be the sense I'm getting.” (ID-006)
Participants disclosed other instances of feeling disrespected in their job that were not directly related to their job title. These participants talked about being belittled by coworkers or members of faculty for being perceived as young and female. One participant talked about how she is often mistaken for a student by faculty and other members of staff, despite having worked at the institution for over five years. Some participants also disclosed experiences of gender-based discrimination or tokenization in by members of their campus or administration.

“My first week in my role, as I was in my introduction presentation, these administrators had my resume and, obviously, and they came up to me afterwards. I was like, they find it very interesting that you have all of this practicum internship experience, but nothing full time, was asking me about my age. I had one comment on my lipstick color saying it was hard for them to focus because I just kept looking at my lips. And so how do we implement this programming, while not only having it validated, but also having myself validated as just a human being?” (ID-010)

Participants talked about these instances of disrespect with similar levels of frustration as when they talked about not having enough resources to program effectively. For many participants, these issues were connected to institutional buy in and upper administration support.

**Personal experiences with sexual and interpersonal violence.** A theme that emerged throughout the interview process, was that all participants had been impacted by sexual or interpersonal violence in some way. Six out of ten participants had either experienced violence directly or supported someone who had recently been harmed. These were formative experiences for participants and influenced their educational and professional decisions in the years following. These experiences also impacted how participants perceived programming barriers.
Half of participants disclosed being a survivor of sexual violence or interpersonal violence, four participants experienced this while they were in college. This disclosure came in response to one of two questions in the interview; “What did you know about sexual and interpersonal violence before starting in your position?” or “How did you get into this career?” However, participants who disclosed these experiences emphasized how their work in this field following those experiences helped shaped their personal narratives about their experiences and helped them process what happened. When asked how she got into her career, a participant responded:

“I think like a lot of people do. I was really angry at the system and wanting to change the system. And…I was sexually assaulted in 2008 in a college situation. And it was before the Dear Colleague Letter, it was before Title IX is what it is now. And there wasn't any support and I ended up transferring schools…And so I decided to do it full time and make it work and, um, my anger and my like, frustration with the system is still there, but now I feel like I know how to better like fight against the system because I'm in it all the time. And it's helping me like it's been really, like, soul fulfilling to be able to like help other survivors and help change policies and help change procedures and help make things easier for people, like that is the most like fulfilling work that I could have ever imagined doing.” (ID-011)

These participants talked about how their experiences with violence inspired them to change things for the better so student would have an easier time than they did. One participant went back to work at the institution in which they were harmed with the goal of changing the campus culture for the better. Participants in this study were selected because their primary role is in prevention programming. However, half of participants in this study have worked in
advocacy at a community organization or for their campus. Additionally, all participants mentioned it is common for students to disclose personal experiences with sexual and interpersonal violence during or after a program, meaning participants are often in response positions for students even if this is not their primary role.

Confidence in their ability to do the job. All participants demonstrated confidence in their ability to develop and implement programming and were able to recognize how their skills contributed to that success. About half of the participants were new to their current role as a campus-based preventionist, but that did not impact their knowledge about the subject area or their confidence in their ability to do the job well. Confidence was also a key skill that participants believed contributed to successful prevention programming.

“And I think that that ultimately is what it really comes down to related adaptability and flexibility is the confidence that you're going to get through it. And that you're going to get your audience through it too, right, because you have some accountability to your audience when you're doing prevention work to get them through this really tough stuff. And so what does it look like to be confident that you're going to get everyone there, even if it's messy, even if it's weird, even if it's awkward, even if it, like, makes people mad at you, you know, you just have to have the confidence that you're going to get yourself there.” (ID-004)

The specifics of what preventionists should have confidence in varied between participants, but common themes were; confidence in the topic area, confidence with presenting and facilitating in front of an audience, and confidence when speaking to others about the topic area. For the participants who have been in the field for five or more years, confidence also translated to being comfortable with being the topic area expert in a room. As noted above, nine
out of ten participants were the only violence preventionist on their campus, so they were often
the only topic area expert on the campus. Participants noted that skills such as confidence take
time and practice to develop, which was noted as an area that they would like to see changed. In
response to a question about how one develops necessary skills, one participant explained:

“Practice? It’s so unfortunate. It's one of those things where like, I can teach someone
how to be a good facilitator, I can't teach them how to remove their ego from a situation.
I can, like, tell them to do it and I can give them examples but it's like public speaking
like the more you do it, the better you become at it and it really just takes time and
practice and humility and those are not things that I think we as a society are not good at
anymore. I think we're so used to instant gratification that when we're not immediately
good at something, we just give up on it. But it's important as preventionists that we take
the time to curate that and to learn how to be the best preventionists that we can be by
being humble and empathetic and open minded and all of those things.” (ID-011)

When probed, participants spoke about how much of what they learned about presenting
and facilitating programming came from practice and being open to feedback from students.
These participants said they would like to see more facilitation training available for new
prevention professionals, so they could practice in a low stakes environment.

Other skills that participants noted as important for program success were; creativity,
flexibility, approachability, empathy, and being a good communicator. These skills were
described by participants who had been in the field for five or more years as learned and
developed over time and/or trained into them by skilled mentors. The mentorship aspect was
especially important to three participants who felt supported by previous supervisors.
“I'm a huge, huge advocate and cannot yell loud enough about mentoring down and the importance of doing that and I have been lucky to have amazing mentors in my life and I try to do that as much as possible, whether it's a college student working for me or…a young professional that I encounter, or I teach graduate classes, um, for a couple different schools and so the professionals that I encounter the young professionals that I encounter in that way I just have learned so much from those people in my life that I just really tried to emulate what was given to me in that way, with people that I encounter.” (ID-008)

Other participants felt they learned some of the above-mentioned skills through trial and error, though all participants noted that some of the skills they mentioned can be innate characteristics common to people drawn to the field. They noted those characteristics as skills nonetheless because the participants felt they were important to successful programming.

**RQ 3: How Has COVID-19 Impacted the Development and Implementation of Essential Prevention Programs For Institutions of Higher Education?**

The COVID-19 pandemic caused most institutions across the United States to move temporarily to a virtual work from home model for staff, faculty, and students until it was safe to reopen campuses. All participants but one were working from home at the time of the interview. The participant who was working from their campus office had just recently moved back to campus but had been working from home until then. All participants went remote during March 2020, usually around the institution’s spring break. Some of the most common themes that came up for participants around COVID-19 were technology, stress about their job expectations and furloughs, and how to handle large events virtually.

**Insufficient technology and technological skills for remote work.** For the majority of participants, students left campus and were told not to come back with some exceptions for
international students and students with exceptional circumstances. Participants were told with similar abruptness not to come back to campus once it went remote. This created some significant barriers for participants who were not set up to work from home in the same way their office on campus was set up. More than half of participants were given a short window of time to get as much as they needed from their office and were told not to come back to campus. One participant disclosed she was immunocompromised and lived with someone who is in a high-risk group for COVID-19, so was grateful to be working remotely. However, she did not have reliable internet or technology at home and found the transition challenging.

Other participants struggled to transition their lineup of SAAM programs to the virtual format. All identified the technological skills necessary to make the transition to virtual as a learning curve that they were just starting to get used to at the time of the interview. A concern that the majority of participants voiced about continuing to program is whether they would be overwhelming students, either with content or contributing to “Zoom fatigue.” Zoom-fatigue is a catch-all term that participants used to describe feeling exhausted or overwhelmed by using their computer and teleconferencing software constantly. Participants recognized that students were receiving a large and constant onslaught of information about COVID-19 from their institutions and from the news but were unsure how to do their job effectively without contributing to the issue. One participant talked about how this impacted her personal life:

“It's been interesting, I think the thing that I struggle with is, like personally, I don't use a lot of technology. I know that I'm getting very like Zoomed-out and just over the computer like, at the end of the day I like I don't want to do another thing online. And like, for me specifically, it's really hard like Fridays, because I have, I'm Jewish. And so I have to like zoom into my Shabbat services. And I'm like, I don't want to spend another
minute in front of a computer. And so I feel like why would students want to spend another minute in front of the computer? So there's some kind of like a mental disconnect for me where I'm like, “how do I do this programming when I know this isn't actually helpful for anybody to continue to sit in front of a computer?” (ID-011)

Other participants noted that the content of their programming had to move away from primary prevention and focus instead on supportive messaging. These would include messages for victim/survivors or infographics about how to stay safe in quarantine with an abuser.

Participants did note that the transition to virtual work and programming had some positive outcomes for their work and the institution as a whole. All participants noted that they were forced to find accessible ways to present social media content and virtual programming by the shift in format from primarily in-person to virtual. These accessibility considerations included captions, providing recordings of live programs, and sound and color adjustments.

“I think definitely I learned a lot about, like accessibility and to me, that's been really cool. That's my favorite part about all of this, honestly, is that now there's no reason for us to say, “you have to come in person.” There's no reason for us to say we can't put closed captioning on something, there's no reason for us to say that like we don't know the right colors to use for function and contrast issues for folks who are have trouble seeing well and so that's me, I'm really excited to keep those lessons once we go back to seeing people as humans, are seeing people in human form I guess. And it's really kind of strengthened my like advocacy for accessibility and for making sure that we're thinking through all the different ways that somebody might engage in something.” (ID-011)

Participants believed that they would be able to continue to implement these accessibility considerations once they are able to program in-person again. For other participants, the shift to
virtual created the opportunity to update outdated systems to a virtual or online format. One participant talked about how she used to have paper program evaluations but was able to create online evaluation forms that she will be able to use for her in-person programming in the future.

More than half of participants talked about how social media was the primary way they distributed content to students in a virtual format. Specifically, these participants used Instagram to promote live events or create passive programming for SAAM. The participants who used Instagram included social media in their comments about technological learning curves, especially because they all noted their office did not have a robust social media presence prior to COVID-19. As one participant said:

“…so trying to figure out social media and how to use that in an effective way for me, has been--it's been a learning curve and then you think you learn one and then all of a sudden it's like “okay, now you have to figure out how to post things on Instagram.” And that’s like a completely different mental, you know, animal and I think that, you know, part of the skill that I've learned is staying current beyond like the public health data, but staying current within the student sphere also. And that is obviously incredibly important for doing work with college students.” (ID-008)

One participant felt that her Instagram programming during SAAM was just as successful as her in-person programming because she was able to reach more students than she had before. Most participants felt they either did an adequate enough job continuing to put out content or felt it was below their usual standard in terms of quality or engagement. The majority of participants did recognize the importance of learning how to program on social media and felt this was a useful skill moving forward.
All participants commented on the increase in their own professional development in the virtual setting. This was due in part to necessity; they had to learn how to implement virtual programming since it was the first time all participants had navigate programming remotely on this scale. They were able to access webinars on the subject and tap into professional networks more directly for support. Some participants felt that national conferences and other professional networking opportunities were difficult because they felt the information did not apply to their campus. However, since almost all preventionists across the country were going through similar experiences of transitioning to virtual, participants found a lot of support and use in their existing professional networks, such as CAPPA, than they had previously.

**How to handle large events virtually.** By April 2020, all participants had gone fully remote without a confirmed date for transitioning back to in person. Participants had to make a choice about which programs to transition to virtual and what type of content they would continue to put out. Participants were asked who was involved in the decision to continue programming or putting out content. Six out of ten participants were part of the conversation to continue to program because the decision was made in their offices. Three participants were told by supervisors to continue to put out programming virtually, and one participant had the power to choose not to program.

The resident halls closing as abruptly created a big barrier for what each participant identified as their most busy programming month of the year, April for Sexual Assault Awareness Month (SAAM). As one participant described:

“[So] generally, SAAM for us is really busy those first couple of weeks. And then we switch gears immediately after the second week and go into finals programming because of how our academic calendar is working. And so this year, we did a lot of Instagram
posts. And we tried to make a virtual Take Back the Night work, but it just wasn't—it was so fast, the move to everything online that we didn't feel like we could do it in a way that would be well done and well received and would actually be helpful. And there were just so many unknowns going on in April that people weren't really thinking about sexual violence stuff, but they were really just kind of trying to stay safe and get that messaging out there.” (ID-011)

More than half of participants had been planning SAAM events since the fall and had a lineup of in-person events scheduled for the entire month. As mentioned previously, SAAM often includes large, campus-wide events that are well attended by students. By the time participants were interviewed, they were thinking about how they could use what they learned from virtual SAAM programming to create interactive and engaging orientation programming. Despite not knowing whether their institutions would be in person for the fall, participants had shifted their focus to developing virtual orientation and events, and trainings for staff and students.

**Stress about job expectations and furloughs.** Many institutions lost money when they had to go virtual due to resident halls closing and having to refund student fees. As a result, some positions or departments were furloughed for budgetary reasons. Seven out of ten participants expressed some concern about their job security for reasons including being relatively new to their role, not programming at the same level as before, or losing funding when student fees were waived or refunded. Many participants already had concerns about budgets and job expectations, but the uncertainty around COVID furloughs caused them to experience more stress than before.

The transition to remote work for participants brought up concerns around programming and how to fulfill their job expectations. One participant was able to choose whether or not she
continued to implement programming and made the choice not to in order to focus on orientation planning. Two participants explicitly said they felt they needed to continue to put out content because they were worried about losing their jobs or funding if they did not.

“[That] came from the Director of Health Promotion, mostly. With the encouragement to move everything online, figure out how to get all of our workshops online. It was a team effort to get them online, but that was definitely her direction. It also stems from our funding resource. And so we had, you know, we get a lot of our fees from [student activity] fees that students pay and so it has to every year go back to the SA committee, figure out, you know, how did you spend the money? And so, one of the things we had to make sure we did was continue to provide programming for students. One because that's how we're being paid to do this, and so we have a responsibility, um, and we also try to target our programming a little bit more towards the current environment with, some small tweaks, but we didn't do anything specifically related to COVID, even though we did get a couple of requests…” (ID-005)

The most pervasive feeling expressed by participants around COVID-19 was the uncertainty they felt from their institution and the COVID-19 situation in general. Participants were told different timelines for coming back to campus on a weekly basis and generally did not know what their job would look like in the coming month. This uncertainty was felt most acutely by the participants who were worried about being furloughed. One participant described waiting to hear if she was being furloughed:

“So I've been working from home since two days after [the pandemic] was announced. I was supposed to go back to work at the end--mid April, like April 17, that did not work out. I was supposed to go back to work on August 17. However, we found out that I will
be working completely remotely this fall and the only time that I can go in is to get things from my office kind of bare minimum. This is not only because I’m highly immunocompromised, but a university decision as well for faculty and staff. So yeah, for the time being, I’m working remotely, but I’ll actually find out on Friday if I’m being furloughed because my office is grant funded…” (ID-010)

All participants expressed feeling stressed about the situation but were most stressed during March and the couple of months that followed when information was being updated weekly. By the time of the interviews, most participants expressed feeling resigned to the situation and confident that they had done the best they could under the circumstances. All participants expressed having learned how to improve their programming virtually for the fall if that was needed and had new ideas for in-person programming that came from their experience programming during COVID-19.

**Additional Emergent Data**

Participants had significant observations about the field of campus-based violence prevention in general regarding the overall goal of campus-based prevention programming. When participants were asked what the desired outcome of their programming was, all participants provided mixed answers. They separated their programming outcomes from their overarching goal of doing campus-based prevention and felt very differently about these outcomes. All participants stated that their individual programming goals were to help students build necessary skills (such as communication, boundary setting, etc.), increase knowledge (around consent, healthy relationships, etc.), and start shifting the student’s attitudes and beliefs around these topics. Participants varied on the specifics of these goals, but all participants articulated some variation on the programming goals stated above. Participants then talked about
how their overall goal for doing this work was to end sexual and interpersonal violence and change the culture of their campuses. When asked what the desired outcome of her programming was, a participant explained:

“I mean, obviously, our main goal is like hoping that domestic and sexual violence but interpersonal violence is not happening at all. And also building those skills in general that students are having healthy relationships, and able to clearly define their boundaries and understanding why, we need to respect the boundaries of others. Only the end goal is like eliminating domestic and sexual violence but all those other things that come along the way in terms of having a healthier life and healthier relationships” (ID-012)

All participants noted that they would not see their overall goal met in their lifetime but were optimistic that the individual work they were doing was at least helping things move in the direction towards ending violence.

When participants were talking about these goals, they had a firm understanding of what was and was not possible given their abilities and resources. Some of the individual programming goals, such as shifting behavior, were described as more aspirational than increasing student knowledge on the topics. One reason participants felt behavior change was an aspirational goal was that it is harder to measure on college campuses than in other populations. Every four years there is a completely new batch of students, so it is hard to evaluate if the preventionist is creating sustainable change when they have to start from scratch so frequently.

The last emergent theme was how the culture of higher education in general impacted participant’s ability to do their work effectively. It is common in IHE for staff and faculty to have very little interaction unless that staff member is work is directly related to academics.
“[M]ore often than not, what I hear is, “oh, we have somebody that does that?” or somebody will be like, “oh, what did you start last year?? And I'm like, “nope, this is my fourth year, been here for a while.” I think that there was a part of me that made the assumption that going to a small campus, that siloing that wouldn’t necessarily happen, but I almost feel like it happens more because there's a perception that you don't need to do it because it is such a small campus.” (ID-008)

Participants noted it is common for staff departments to be “siloed” from each other which minimizes staff interaction and collaboration. Participants described having faculty or upper administration ask if they were new to the institution after having worked there for years. Participants cited “siloing” as creating additional barriers but did not know how to change.
CHAPTER FIVE:

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to begin the conversation about what makes campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming effective. The literature does not address which components of violence prevention programming is effective and why. The body of research on campus-based violence prevention also does not look into the makeup of the field and so does not know whether the preventionists themselves impact program effectiveness. This study cannot answer those questions. However, this study does provide some foundational data upon which future researchers can build. With “1 in 5 women experiencing sexual violence every year” still the likely statistic for institutions of higher education, it has never been more important to find out what works in prevention programming (Sundstrom, et al., 2018).

Findings

The themes that emerged from this study were both expected and unexpected, given my familiarity with the field. Participants expressed many issues that are common to institutions of higher education (IHE), such as budgetary needs, being understaffed, and feeling like the upper administration at their institutions were inaccessible (Swanger, 2018). These are issues that have gained particular attention in the last four years due to the rising cost of tuition for students (Swanger, 2018). This study places those issues into perspective by showing how essential programs are potentially impacted by wider political conversations.
Research Question 1 (RQ1): What Are the Perceived Barriers and Facilitators to the Development and Implementation of Campus-based Sexual and Interpersonal Violence Prevention Programs and What Changes Would Campus Prevention Staff Make to Overcome Existing Barriers?

**Resources (staffing, time, money).** As mentioned in the results section, facilitators and barriers can be challenging to talk about when resources are at the forefront of the conversation. Participants talked about resources for their office and their programs, such as money, time, and staffing, as facilitators if they had them and barriers if they did not. The way this issue was described by participants is summarized in Table 4, which illustrates how a resource can drastically change the preventionist’s ability to be successful in their prevention efforts. Participants had a lot to say about resources, even if they were from an institution with a relatively large budget for prevention programming. However, they acknowledged how their resource needs are common among higher education administrators.

The conversation around IHE budgets and how they are spending money is a topic that has grown in urgency in the last 10 or so years (Swanger, 2018). The Great Recession that took place between 2007 and 2009 caused a wide range of unexpected issues for institutions of higher education from which many institutions have yet to recover (Swanger, 2018). For example, IHE saw a decline in revenue due to a pattern of low student enrollment followed by a rapid surge in enrollment when the job market did not recover quickly enough to accommodate the large amount of recent high school graduates (Swanger, 2018). In recent years, the conversation about IHE spending has focused on an institution’s staff to student ratio and something called “administrative bloat” (Darnley, Rutherford, & Rabovsky, 2018).
Politicians have been particularly vocal about the issue of “administrative bloat,” the idea that the cost of tuition has increased due to institutions spending more money on hiring administrators than they spend on educational resources for students (Darnley, et al., 2018). Though the idea of “administrative bloat” causing tuition price increases is a compelling idea, the research suggests that it is not the only or even biggest factor in that equation (Darnley, et al., 2018). However, the research also suggests that the concept of “administrative bloat” can impact institutional funding and cause hiring freezes while schools manage their budget crises (Darnley, et al., 2018; Swanger, 2018). The way these political conversations impact sexual and interpersonal violence prevention became evident throughout conversations with participants.

The pervasive feeling that their budget was inadequate for their work caused an obvious strain on participants. Participants routinely mentioned time and money when they were asked, “what would help you better achieve their programming outcomes?” It also became clear that the
reason why their offices were under resourced and understaffed was not communicated to participants leaving them to feel disrespected as professionals or feeling like ending sexual and interpersonal violence was not a priority for the institution. Political critics of how institutions of higher education spend money suggest that federal policies, like Title IX, require IHE to hire superfluous staff to comply with new mandates (Swanger, 2018). However, those criticism are not consistent with some of the research on this topic and furthermore does not consider what all is involved in making campuses safer and healthier for students. This study compellingly challenge those arguments by showing how much work goes into student programming.

**Administrative bureaucracy.** Participants had strong feelings on the role upper administration played in their ability to successful develop and implement programming. This too is a common issue in higher education, especially when campus-wide initiatives are involved (Burns & Mooney, 2017). The structure of IHE are not inherently conducive to collaboration due in part to something participants mentioned called “siloing” (Burns & Mooney, 2017; Kezar, 2006). Siloing is the idea that staff departments and the offices within those departments work in a kind of isolation created by the institution’s structure (Kezar, 2006). Furthermore, staff often feel siloed from faculty, in terms of physical location, their relationships with students, and their treatment as employees of the institution, such as union membership, salary increases, and job security (Kezar, 2006). The structure and hierarchy of institutions of higher education was an important factor for participants, especially if participants felt that structure did not support the success of their programs.

In particular, their institution’s administrative structure was a barrier for participants if it limited their ability to access upper administration. As mentioned in the results, upper administrators have a large amount influence over budgets and campus-wide initiatives.
Participants perceived the upper administration at their institutions as creating additional barriers largely through lack of knowledge about what constitutes primary prevention for sexual and interpersonal violence. The literature on the impact campus leadership or upper administration, has on the success of initiatives, campus culture in general, and the allocation of resources suggests that upper administrator buy in and engagement is crucial for success (Burns & Mooney, 2017; McMahon, et al., 2019a). These studies indicate that having someone in a role who can advocate for the initiative to upper administration is key for cultivating buy in and for overall success (Burns &Mooney, 2017; Wade & Kallemeyn, 2020).

This study illustrates how campus programs are impacted when the person developing and implementing campus-wide initiatives are limited in their ability to advocate for their own programming. In particular, the barriers participants felt upper administrators created through their lack of engagement with prevention could be addressed by those administrators in leadership roles (Burns & Mooney, 2017). The literature on campus leadership suggests that power to allocate resources, staffing, and campus engagement “comes from the top” so to speak (McMahon, et al., 2019a; Burns & Mooney, 2017). This study supports participants’ belief that upper administration is the key to overcoming resource related barriers and increasing institutional buy in, both of which are key factors to creating campus-wide culture change.

**Institutional buy in.** Institutional buy in is the idea that in order for an institution to meet its goals, stakeholders at every level (for campuses that is typically staff, faculty, and students) must be invested in achieving that goal and participate in the process to get there (Skolits & Graybeal, 2007). Institutional buy in is commonly discussed around strategic planning initiatives or accreditation evaluation (Piggott & Cariaga-Lo, 2019). The literature suggests that it is necessary for buy in to come from the top down, meaning that when the upper administration,
including the president, are behind an initiative, it is easier to convince more reluctant stakeholders to participate (Piggott & Cariaga-Lo, 2019). A top down approach also means that upper administrators maintain control over how the initiative is funded and implemented, which has already been discussed as a barrier when they do not fully understand what an initiative is trying to achieve (Piggott & Cariaga-Lo, 2019).

An important factor the literature on institutional buy in highlights is how the mission, vision, and values of the institution are tied to buy in and engagement with initiatives (Wade & Kallemeyn, 2020). When initiatives align with stakeholder’s values, they can feel more connected to the work that is being asked of them (Kline & Leggat, 2014; Wade & Kallemeyn, 2020). As mentioned in the results, three participants used the mission, vision and values of their institution as a way to generate student buy in. Many institutions use their institutional mission and vision statements to create common rhetorical ground when commenting on things that impact the campus as a whole (Wade & Kallemeyn, 2020; Burns & Mooney, 2017).

However, this relationship between buy in and values could suggest that lack of buy in from individuals or institutions is related to not believing in the initiative because it does not align with their stated values. This may be another reason why participants expressed feeling like their institutions did not care about them. One would assume that ending sexual and interpersonal violence aligns with everyone’s values, however that is demonstrably not the case when looking at the literature on perpetration and programming engagement (Rich, et al., 2010). The literature on how to generate buy in suggests creating values and purpose people can relate to, so how do preventionists gain buy in from stakeholders that do not value ending sexual and interpersonal violence?
RQ2: What Are the Experiences of Campus Staff Who Develop and Implement Sexual And Interpersonal Violence Prevention Programs In Their Role As Preventionists?

**Job titles and lack of respect.** The relationship between workplace status and respect is an area of research that has not been thoroughly researched. However, the impact of workplace hierarchies and status on employees is a well-researched topic that supports the feelings participants expressed about their job titles (Liu, Zhu, & Lam, 2020). In particular, some participants felt overqualified for the job title they held and that this job title impacted how they were treated by other employees at their institution. One study on workplace status indicated that job titles impacts how employees act, specifically in how much knowledge they were expected to have; i.e. higher status employees were perceived to have more knowledge than lower status employees (Liu, et al., 2020). The participants in this study who described feeling dismissed as topic area experts were the participants who held coordinator-level job titles. Coordinator roles are often classified as entry level and are positioned lowest on an institution’s reporting structure. It is worth noting that participants all spoke with similar levels of knowledge and competence about their work regardless of their job title or years of work experience. Had participants not disclosed their professional background, it would have been very difficult to determine who was new to their role, who was a director, and who was a coordinator. This suggests that for campus-based violence prevention roles there is little to no relationship between education, years of experience, or background and job title.

**Personal experiences with sexual and interpersonal violence.** The prevalence of women who experience sexual or interpersonal violence while enrolled in college is 1 in 5, which is estimated to be low due to underreporting and inaccurate for marginalized populations (Sundstrom, et al., 2018). Half of participants disclosed experiencing sexual or interpersonal
violence, which can be expressed as 1 in 2 in order to be consistent with the writing on this topic. I expected a high proportion of victim/survivors in the participant pool, given how common campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence is and how prevalent workplace harassment is for women (Herbenick, et al., 2018). However, there is little research on the experiences of victims of crime who go on to work professionally in the prevention or advocacy of that crime. Participants in this study expressed their assumption that a high proportion of people working in the field have experience sexual or interpersonal violence, possibly while in college. Furthermore, they indicated that these experiences are likely why people go into campus prevention or advocacy.

There is, however, research on how working in response roles contributes to workplace burnout and vicarious traumatization. Workplace burnout is characterized by a variety of symptoms including exhaustion and cynicism (Gorski & Chen, 2015). However, one researcher described workplace burnout as, “the end result of a process in which idealistic and highly committed people lose their spirit” (Pines, 1994). Vicarious traumatization is a phenomenon in which responders to an event or crisis experience the symptoms of being traumatized without having experienced the event or crisis themselves (Rodgers, 2010). Vicarious trauma is common among Emergency Medical Technicians (EMTs) and crisis hotline workers, for example (Rodgers, 2010).

As mentioned in the results, half of participants have worked in advocacy or currently are in a dual advocacy/prevention role. However, all participants are likely to receive student disclosures or have to respond to a student in crisis. While there is no research on how this aspect of the work impacts preventionists directly, there is research on the experiences of hotline workers, a job focused on receiving disclosures of all kinds. Hotline workers are at an increased
risk of experiencing workplace burnout and/or vicarious traumatization causing high levels of job turnover (Rodgers, 2010). This is also supported in Brubaker and Keegan’s (2019) article on campus-based advocates, which suggested advocates were at risk for stress and emotional fatigue, two components of workplace burnout. Brubaker and Keegan (2019) and Rodgers (2010) both highlight the level of emotional labor involved in doing trauma response work; labor that is required to be effective in the role despite often being unacknowledged.

Without additional research it is impossible to say if participants in this study had experienced workplace burnout or vicarious traumatization since they did not disclose and were not asked directly. However, the day to day work reality of a campus-based preventionist, combined with the additional response or advocacy work creates the conditions that could put someone at risk for experiencing burnout or vicarious trauma. The additional factor of having experienced sexual or interpersonal violence could increase that risk even more. Additionally, some participants expressed feeling frustrated or disrespected at work, which are additional risk factors for workplace burnout (Rodgers, 2010). This study illustrates the many layered components that make campus-based prevention difficult beyond what can be considered as typical workplace challenges.

**Confidence in their ability to do the job.** Participants all expressed confidence as a skill necessary to be successful in their role as preventionists. Participants also all expressed confidence in their abilities throughout the interviews, demonstrating the skill they believed professionals in their field need. What participants felt confident in varied as they all had a range of skills, expertise, and interests related to their work. An unexpected finding was how participants felt regarding their ability to change their programming outcomes. Some participants felt that they could change their programming outcomes through their actions, while others felt
that they were only a part of what outcomes their programs achieve. However, all participants felt they could influence their programs through their content knowledge and skills as facilitators. Part of the influence participants described was knowing what would work for their campus and how to stay relevant with each new class of students.

This was unexpected given how important program fidelity is for establishing a program as evidence-based (Gottfredson, et al., 2015). Program fidelity is the extent to which a program is implemented as intended (Joyce, et al., 2019). One of the gaps in campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention is the lack of evidence-based programs that preventionists can use in their work (DeGue, 2014a).

This was a gap mentioned by the majority of participants as well. Despite fidelity being an important factor for evidence-based programming, some participants felt they themselves were necessary for their programs to be successful.

However, there are studies that support the instincts of preventionists who feel they can influence their programming outcomes. A study by Joyce, et al. (2019) suggests that program fidelity can be broken into two types; fidelity to function and fidelity to core components. Fidelity to function is focused on purpose of the program with room to adapt to meet the needs of the audience. Fidelity to core components is focused on the process of implementing the program and how that is replicated in different contexts. Joyce, et al. (2019) argues that a fidelity to function approach allows for flexibility while maintaining the essential functions of the program, giving facilitators room to meet the needs of the population (even if that means changing some of the program components) while staying true to the essential function of the program. This suggests that programming about sexual and interpersonal violence might require more flexible fidelity measurements if they were to be considered evidence-based.
The characteristics of each participant’s campuses were different in ways that would prevent a general prevention program, such as Green Dot, from being successful on all 10 campuses. Many participants must create original programs, also known as “home grown” programs, in order to meet the needs of their students. While this trend towards home grown programming complicates researcher’s ability to evaluate the effectiveness of prevention programming, participants felt that their programming was effective for their students.

RQ 3: How Has COVID-19 Impacted The Development And Implementation Of Essential Prevention Programs For Institutions Of Higher Education?

In March 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic caused institutions of higher education to move to a virtual, work from home format for all staff, faculty, and students (Piotrowski & King, 2020). For the ten participants in this study, the COVID-19 related changes included residence halls closing, in person work and classes were suspended, and many staff were told to work from home if they could. These changes resulted in many students, faculty, and staff to work in conditions for which they were not properly equipped or trained. In many ways, the changes campuses were forced to make due to the COVID-19 pandemic highlighted issues that already existed and helped accelerate changes that campuses were slow to adopt.

*Insufficient technology and technological skills for remote work.* The rapid and, in many cases, mandatory switch to a virtual format highlighted any technological disparities among students, staff, and faculty (Piotrowski & King, 2020). Students who did not have computers at home or staff with limited technological skill were at a significant disadvantage under these mandates (Piotrowski & King, 2020). For example, faculty who had never taught in a virtual setting were forced to transition to an online learning format mid-way through the semester (Piotrowski & King, 2020). Participants described a range of issues that emerged when
they went remote including having slow or spotty internet, not having a computer that works well, and not being familiar with the software necessary for creating virtual synchronous and asynchronous programming.

A COVID-19 issue that seemed particular to participants and staff who implemented programming for students was navigating social media as their primary programming platform. All participants used social media, specifically the social media website Instagram, to keep students engaged with their office. Participants recognized that students were under a large amount of stress, especially in the weeks immediately following the transition to remote and tried to be more intentional with the content and frequency of the programming they put out. Students were experiencing everything from limited access to technological resources to acting as the primary caretaker in their household. Participants, who were also experiencing similar COVID-19 related stressors, felt ill-equipped to respond to student needs in a virtual environment in the same way they could previously.

However, the rapid switch to virtual did have positive outcomes for institutions. Participants described finding ways to make their programming more accessible by adding captions and being able to adjust color and fonts. Similarly, classrooms with a hybrid teaching model (meaning a mix of online and in person) were able to provide students who could not attend in person, access to their classes. Recent studies on accessibility concerns related to COVID-19 explore how some services, such as mental health care, were more able to easily adapt to the new, completely virtual world than others, such as campus programming (Taylor, Fitzsimmons-Craft, & Graham, 2020).

**Virtual programming on sexual and interpersonal violence.** One issue that became particularly relevant for participants was how safe students were at home. All participants were
aware that some students were not safe at home for a variety of reasons including, having a
gender or sexual identity their families did not know about or accept, their family is abusive, or
their partner is abusive. The quarantine procedures many cities put in place, such as stay at home
or shelter in place orders which limited trips outside the house, effectively required students in
dangerous situations to remain locked in their home with people who might be harming them
(Kofman & Garfin, 2020).

The COVID-19 pandemic caused an increase in domestic and interpersonal violence in
the United States and across the world (Rauhaus, Sibila, & Johnson, 2020). The pandemic caused
many people to lose their jobs and their loved ones, put people at risk to lose their housing, and
put additional pressure on people who were able to keep their jobs to continue working for fear
of losing that job (Rauhaus, et al., 2020). While these stressors are all individual risk factors for
domestic and interpersonal violence, there is trend in domestic and interpersonal violence
incidence spiking during times of unrest, uncertainty, or disaster (Rauhaus, et al., 2020;
Prevention Institute, 2017). This became an urgent issue for participants who were continuing to
put out programming once their institutions went remote. In particular, participants had to
navigate Sexual Assault Awareness Month (SAAM) programming throughout April 2020,
knowing that some students were sheltering in place with their abuser. For some participants it
became a question of how to do their job effectively and meet the needs of students without
knowing what the rest of the semester will look like.

Participants’ concerns about continuing to put out programming without adequate
technology or training were also related to their job expectations. As was mentioned in the
results, some participants had a say in whether they continued to put out programming, while
others felt they had to because they were afraid they would lose their job. Other participants felt
they had to continue to put out programming to support student survivors of sexual and interpersonal violence. Participants mentioned shifting some of their programming content to words of support and information about campus resources that students could access such as the campus victim advocate. All participants in some way acknowledged that their students were under strain, which they did not want to contribute to, but they did not know what their best option was.

**Theoretical Domains Framework**

The Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF) was chosen for the interview guide because it is both comprehensive and flexible. There is no formal way to use the TDF because it is primarily a collection of influences that impact the development and implementation of health interventions (Atkins, et al., 2017). However, the literature on how to use the TDF show that is it commonly used to develop interview guides for qualitative studies, as it was used here (Atkins, et al., 2017). In that way, this study fits within the anticipated scope of use for the TDF.

However, the research questions for this study are too broad for the TDF to be useful in guiding any next steps to improve campus-based prevention programming. Generally, the TDF is used to evaluate the implementation of a singular behavior change program as a way to identify which influences might have impacted the program outcomes (Atkins, et al., 2017). Instead, this study looked at what influences impact preventionists in general, without a focus on a specific behavior, program, or outcome.

This does not mean the data from this study is not useful. It does however mean that the TDF is not helpful in determining next steps for preventionists in order to address the influences this study identified. This study was attempting to address a gap in the literature, but it was unclear until now how many other gaps were present within that larger research gap. There may
be theoretical frameworks or models that would have created more structure and focus for this study, but I think the data collected from the participants is important information for continued, and more focused, research on this topic in the future.

**Impact on Campus-based Violence Prevention**

This study is the beginning of a much larger conversation about what makes campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming effective. Much of the literature on campus-based prevention is outcomes evaluation focused under relatively limited conditions such as measuring one type of program or what works on one type of campus (DeGue, et al., 2014b). While these studies are important for improving programs, there are more macro questions about the field as a whole that need to be addressed. This study is attempting to provide data that lays the groundwork for those larger questions to be asked and explored. How can campus-based prevention programs become evidence-based? How can these programs be effectively evaluated on a larger scale? Do preventionists want or need policy support or guidelines around which they can structure their programming? Can campus sexual and interpersonal violence even be prevented?

One way to begin exploring these questions is to understand what is already happening in the field. This study is the beginning of that data gathering process, but there is a lot of information that was not collected in this study as well. For example, the characteristics of participants were intentionally not collected in favor of institution demographics. However, preventionist characteristics may be important for research on how race impacts buy in for students of color. If the majority of campus-based preventionists are White, that is important information for a researcher to know.
The study results will be disseminated to the Campus Advocacy and Prevention Professionals Association (CAPPA) listserv as was discussed with the CAPPA research committee. One of the reasons CAPPA requires this of researchers who recruit from the listserv is so that CAPPA members continue to have access to research that impacts them. The results of this study can provide validation to CAPPA members and general preventionists who have experiences with any of the themes mentioned above. It is invaluable for people to know that others in similar situations have similar experiences (Lichty, Rosenberg, & Laughlin, 2018). This is why preventionists put on events like Take Back the Night, so survivors know they are not alone (Lichty, et al., 2018). In the same vein, this study can let other preventionists who are experiencing frustration with their budgets or stress about being furloughed that they are not alone in that experience.

**Study Limitations**

The small sample size for this study (n = 10) was useful for data collection and analysis, since the interviews were 90 minutes and the research questions were relatively broad. However, the small sample size means that the sample was not as diverse as it could have been in terms of both institution type and participant demographics. It cannot be said definitively that this sample is reflective of the demographics within the field of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention as a whole or CAPPA as a subset of the field.

Additionally, the institution types represented in this study are not representative of the variety of institutions of higher education with prevention programs. The institutions in this study were 90% predominately White and in the mid-range of student population size. Those participants whose campuses had a specific population type were often part of a wider university system, with the main campus being the largest and the least racially diverse. There were no
single-gender campuses represented, no military affiliated programs, and only one religiously affiliated campus. However, given how many combinations of institutional demographics are possible, it is unlikely that all possible institution types could be represented in any single study.

This study was conducted to meet the criteria of the University of South Florida’s Master of Science in Public Health thesis requirements. The interviews, coding, and data analysis were all done by one person, who has five years of experience in campus-based violence prevention and response. This could have resulted in biased interpretations and data that was overlooked.

Suggestions for Future Research

Policy, guidelines, or programming expectations. This study is the beginning of a much larger conversation about campus-based violence prevention programming that needs to be researched. One of the more pressing issues is whether preventionists want formal policies, guidelines, or expectations for their programming. Some participants mentioned guidelines or general expectations, but they were framed as tools they could use to support their conversations with upper administration. The federal policies that are in place for campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence do not have prescriptive prevention requirements, but that could change at any time. It is important to ask preventionists those questions directly so those studies can influence future policy.

Who are current preventionists? Since the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter, it is commonly believed that campuses have increased their efforts to prevention sexual and interpersonal violence and to provide adequate response services (Clay, et al. 2019; Buzo 2017). However, there is no information on how many preventionists are working for institutions of higher education (IHE) currently. Future research needs to explore whether institutions of higher education actually increased their efforts to end violence. Did campuses create new positions
dedicated to ending sexual and interpersonal violence? How many over the past 10 years? Who is currently working in those positions? These are all questions that came up during the literature review for this study that had no definitive answer. It is important to know who is working in this field and how that may impact program effectiveness. It is also important to know what institutions of higher education’s response to the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter was now that 10 years have passed.

**Best practices for home grown programs.** The majority of participants described writing their own programming, commonly referred to as “home grown programs.” However, there is little in the research on what best practices are for developing programming in this way. Are there theoretical models that consistently work best for consent programming? Bystander intervention training? Healthy relationships? What factors would a preventionist creating their own program need to consider? The results of this study show that not all preventionists come from a public health background where program development and implementation is commonly taught, but it is public health the best framing for all campus-based violence prevention program development? These are important questions if preventionists would like to expand the pool of evidence-based programming. However, these are important questions even if evidence-based programming is not the end goal. Campus-based violence prevention programs need a foundation on which they can be evaluated because it speaks to the larger question of whether sexual and interpersonal violence can be prevented at all. Best practices for home grown programs is a flexible foundation for consistent programming and evaluation across campuses.

**Perpetration and social infrastructure.** The literature on why campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence occurs at a higher rate than in the general population is relatively sparse. This may relate to the issue with common terminology described in the previous chapters.
However, a researcher could conduct a meta-analysis of the literature to determine what is known about perpetration on college campuses. It is unclear whether the information that informs prevention work is up to date. Are fraternities and athletics programs still the most high-risk populations for perpetration? Is alcohol facilitated rape most commonly reported type of assault on campuses? Is sexual violence an issue of lack of knowledge about consent, lack of skills to negotiate consent, or not caring about consent entirely? These are questions that speak to the foundational assumptions that inform much of the campus-based prevention programming currently being implemented, according to the literature. Future researchers must start by questioning whether what we know about campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence is still true and then continue to look into why it occurs.

A topic that relates to perpetration and prevention is understanding the social infrastructure of college and university campuses. Social infrastructure refers to the physical and structural elements that facilitate positive human interaction (Klinenberg, 2018). For example, on a college campus, areas like the cafeteria or common rooms are part of the social infrastructure of college life because they were built and cultivated to bring people together. One of the foundational assumptions of prevention relates to how students socialize. Do students still attend parties as their main form of socializing? Do students view socializing in class differently from socializing at a bar? What is the social infrastructure of college campuses? Does it facilitate equality and safety for all students? Is there a sexual infrastructure of college campuses (meaning physical or structural elements that facilitate sexual experiences)? There is a lot we do not know about the way college students structure their social and sexual lives, but this information is crucial to keeping prevention programming relevant to college students’ experiences.
Implications for Public Health Policy

There is little research on whether preventionists want or need policies to regulate their programming. The regulations that do exist include the Campus SaVE Act amendments to the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and Title IX. These are some of the most influential federal policies that impact campus prevention (Buzo, 2017). The Campus SaVE Act amendments to VAWA were implemented in 2014, which means preventionists have operated under these regulations for seven years. This study, and others looking at the same topic, could be especially important if the Campus SaVE Act is ever evaluated for efficacy. This might become especially relevant under the Joe Biden/Kamala Harris presidential administration, which is likely to review the updated Title IX regulations. Campus advocates heavily criticized the Title IX regulations during the public comment period, which were published with final regulations in May 2020 (Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972, 2020). In January 2021, Joe Biden mentioned counteracting the changes to Title IX Betsy DeVos made during the Donald Trump administration. Joe Biden’s history of working with advocates to develop federal policy combatting violence against women, such as his involvement with VAWA, indicates he will likely develop new policies or update existing policies during his presidency. Part of that process needs to include updated research on programming best practices and input from preventionists who have worked under these requirements for the last ten years. The work preventionists have been doing to keep campuses compliant with federal policy while working in understaffed and under resourced offices needs to be reflected in any updates to policies that directly impact them. This can only happen if the voices of preventionists are included.

The research on how institutions of higher education were impacted by COVID-19 will emerge over the next few months and years. This is especially true given that, at the time of
writing this, the pandemic is still ongoing, the COVID-19 vaccine is not widely available, and many campuses are still at least partly remote. Policies related to how institutions of higher education respond to disease or disaster are also likely to emerge to avoid some of the challenges described by participants in this study. The experiences of staff, faculty and students need to be represented in any discussion of policy that impacts institutions of higher education. Specifically, preventionists need to be included because of their unique perspective regarding student safety. There is a body of research that illustrates how domestic and interpersonal violence spike during periods of disease, disaster, and uncertainty. The knowledge, expertise, and experience of campus-based preventionists would be essential for developing a comprehensive policy for institutions of higher education response to something like COVID-19 in the future.
CONCLUSION

This study aimed to look at who is developing and implementing campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming and what they need in order to be successful, especially in times of global crisis. The data collected from this study presents a wide variety of topics that can and should be explored more deeply in future research. The broadness off the data is in some ways a response to how broad the gaps are in the literature on this topic. There are vital pieces of data missing from the research on everything from prevention program effectiveness to how many preventionists there are in the country. The reasons as to why the research has so many gaps are unclear. One possible reason is that the field of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention has only recently been formally supported through federal policy. However, even though the field of campus-based violence prevention might be relatively new, the pervasiveness of campus sexual and interpersonal violence is not. At a national level, we have been at least aware of the potential risk of experiencing sexual and interpersonal violence for college students since Jeanne Clery was raped and murdered in her dorm room in 1986. The violence she experienced resulted in the Clery Act in 1990, which means this has been a federally recognized issue for over 30 years.

What preventionists want and need in order to be successful in their work is complex and, in many ways, as diverse as the campuses in which they work. The participants in this study are all knowledgeable and capable preventionists who know when their programs make an impact on their students. However, their larger goal of ending sexual and interpersonal violence felt elusive and maybe even impossible. At the heart of many participant’s concerns was whether
they could truly create culture change that moves their campus closer to ending violence. This study provides foundational data that future researchers can use to inform more focused studies. We need to know whether it is possible to prevent millions of people every year from experiencing sexual and interpersonal violence while they are in college. We need to create campuses where violence is not tolerated, and this study is the start of figuring out how to make that a reality.
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Appendix A: Campus Policy and State Statute Definitions of Sexual Assault

Table A1. Sexual assault laws by state and corresponding university policy definition of sexual misconduct.

These states were chosen because of their state school size and the perception of the state’s political voting history. California was chosen specifically because their affirmative consent laws created a cultural shift around affirmative consent in police language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Definition of Rape</th>
<th>State College or University Policy Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>· Sexual intercourse with a member of the opposite sex, where either:</td>
<td>Alabama State University: This policy applies to same sex and heterosexual sexual assault and rape. Sexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● The offender uses forcible compulsion;</td>
<td>assault is defined as any unwanted touching of a sexual nature. This includes but is not limited to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● The victim is incapable of consent by reason of being physically helpless or mentally</td>
<td>2. Unwanted kissing, touching or fondling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>incapacitated;</td>
<td>3. Penetration with a finger or a foreign object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● The offender is 16 years of age or older and the victim is less than 12 years old.</td>
<td>4. Rape (vaginal or anal intercourse, oral – genital contact)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Crime Definition Statute Ala. Code § 13A-6-60 and § 15-20A-4 (definitions); Ala. Code §</td>
<td>These acts constitute sexual assault when they are attempted or committed through force, threat, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13A-6-61 (rape in the first degree); Ala. Code § 13A-5-6 (prison sentencing); Ala. Code §</td>
<td>intimidation, when the perpetrator has been informed that his/her actions are unwanted: or by taking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13A-5-11 (fines)</td>
<td>advantage of the victim’s incapacity or helplessness caused by alcohol or other drugs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rape is defined as “unlawful sexual intercourse by force or deception.” A person is responsible of rape in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the first degree when one intentionally engages in sexual intercourse with another person without consent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>· Sexual battery means oral, anal, or vaginal penetration by, or union with, the sexual</td>
<td>Florida State University: Sexual Violence: Includes any sexual act performed without the consent of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>organ of another or the anal or vaginal penetration of another by any other object;</td>
<td>the Affected/Reporting Party (or when the Affected/Reporting Party is unable to give consent). Rape, sexual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>however, sexual battery does not include an act done for a bona fide medical purpose.</td>
<td>battery, and sexual assault are sexual violence prohibited by this policy and Florida criminal law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Crime Definition Statute Fla. Stat. § 794.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>· Sexual intercourse or unnatural sexual intercourse with a person, by force and against his</td>
<td>UMass Amherst: Sexual Misconduct is defined as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>will, or by threat of bodily injury.</td>
<td>1. Engaging in a sexual act with another person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>· Crime Definition Statute</td>
<td>a)-by forcing the other person to participate in a sexual act without consent or by threatening or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● MASS. GEN. LAWS. ANN. ch. 265, § 22</td>
<td>coercing the other person, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b)-by placing the other person in fear that any person will suffer imminent bodily injury, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c)-having substantially impaired the ability of the other person to appraise or control their own conduct by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>administering or employing alcohol or other drugs without the knowledge or against the will of the other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Engaging in a sexual act with another person when that other person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a)-is incapable of understanding, or for any reason including intoxication, is unaware of the sexual act,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or b)-is physically incapable of resisting or communicating either consent or unwillingness to participate,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>or c)-is under the age of 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The essential determination of whether an offender is guilty of rape lies in the outrage to the victim’s person and the feelings of the victim of the rape.

Any sexual penetration, however slight, is sufficient to constitute rape.

**Crime Definition Statute**
Cal. Penal Code §§ 261, 261.6, 263, 263.1, 269, 288.7

| California | An offender commits the crime of rape by engaging in sexual intercourse with another person who is not the offender’s spouse under any of the following circumstances:

- Where the victim is incapable of giving consent because of a mental disorder or developmental or physical disability, and this is known or reasonably should be known to the person committing the act;
- Where the act is accomplished against a victim’s will by means of force, violence, duress, menace or fear of immediate and unlawful bodily injury on the person or another;
- Where the victim is unable to resist because of any intoxicating or anesthetic substance, or any controlled substance and the offender knew or reasonably should have known of the victim’s condition;
- Where the victim was unconscious of the nature of the act and this was known to the offender.
- Where the victim submits under the belief that the offender is someone known to the victim other than the offender, and this false belief was intentionally induced by the offender’s artifice, pretense or concealment;
- Where the act is accomplished against the victim’s will by threatening to retaliate in the future against the victim or any other person, and there is a reasonable possibility that the offender will execute the threat;
- Where the act is accomplished against the victim’s will by threatening to use the authority of a public official to incarcerate, arrest, or deport the victim or another person, and the victim has a reasonable belief that the offender is a public official.

In the context of the crime of rape, California law does not specifically define “sexual intercourse” (although the term “sexual intercourse” is defined in the specific contexts of certain other crimes). Instead, the legislature broadly construes what kinds of acts constitute rape. The statutes contain the following information:

- All forms of nonconsensual sexual assault may be considered rape.
- The essential determination of whether an offender is guilty of rape lies in the outrage to the victim’s person and the feelings of the victim of the rape.
- Any sexual penetration, however slight, is sufficient to constitute rape.

**California State University System: Sexual Misconduct.** All sexual activity between members of the CSU community must be based on Affirmative Consent. Engaging in any sexual activity without first obtaining Affirmative Consent to the specific activity constitutes Sexual Misconduct and is a violation of this policy, whether or not the conduct violates any civil or criminal law. Sexual activity includes but is not limited to kissing, touching intimate body parts, fondling, intercourse, penetration of any body part, and oral sex.

- Affirmative Consent means an informed, affirmative, conscious, voluntary, and mutual agreement to engage in sexual activity. It is the responsibility of each person involved in the sexual activity to ensure Affirmative Consent has been obtained from the other participant(s) to engage in the sexual activity. Lack of protest or resistance does not mean Affirmative Consent, nor does silence mean Affirmative Consent. Affirmative Consent must be voluntary, and given without coercion, force, threats or intimidation.

- The existence of a dating or social relationship between those involved, or the fact of past sexual activities between them, should never by itself be assumed to be an indicator of Affirmative Consent. A request for someone to use a condom or birth control does not, in and of itself, constitute Affirmative Consent.

- Affirmative Consent can be withdrawn or revoked. Consent to one form of sexual activity (or one sexual act) does not constitute consent to other forms of sexual activity. Consent given to sexual activity on one occasion does not constitute consent on another occasion. There must always be mutual and affirmative consent to engage in sexual activity. Consent must be ongoing throughout a sexual activity and can be revoked at any time, including after penetration. Once consent is withdrawn or revoked, the sexual activity must stop immediately. Affirmative Consent cannot be given by a person who is incapacitated. A person is unable to consent when asleep, unconscious or incapacitated due to the influence of drugs, alcohol or medication so that the person could not understand the fact, nature or extent of the sexual activity. A person is incapacitated if the person lacks the physical and/or mental ability to make informed, rational decisions.

- Whether an intoxicated person (as a result of using alcohol or other drugs) is incapacitated depends on the extent to which the alcohol or other drugs impact the person's decision-making ability, awareness of consequences, and ability to make informed judgments. A person's own intoxication or incapacitation from drugs or alcohol does not diminish that person's responsibility to obtain Affirmative Consent before engaging in sexual activity. A person with a medical or mental disability may also lack the capacity to give consent. Sexual activity with a minor (a person under 18 years old) is not consensual, because a minor is considered incapable of giving consent due to age.

- It shall not be a valid excuse that a person affirmatively consented to the sexual activity if the Respondent knew or reasonably should have known that the person was unable to consent to the sexual activity under any of the following circumstances:
  - The person was asleep or unconscious;
  - The person was incapacitated due to the influence of drugs, alcohol or medication, so that the person could not understand the fact, nature or extent of the sexual activity;
  - The person was unable to communicate due to a mental or physical condition.

- It shall not be a valid excuse that the Respondent believed that the person consented to the sexual activity under either of the following circumstances:
  - The Respondent’s belief in Affirmative Consent arose from the intoxication or recklessness of the Respondent;
  - The Respondent did not take reasonable steps, in the circumstances known to the Respondent at the time, to ascertain whether the person affirmatively consented.
Appendix B: Institution Demographics

Table A2. Complete results of institutional demographics survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency (N=10)</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Population</td>
<td>Less than 1000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000-5000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,000-10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10,000-20,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20,000-30,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,000-40,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40,000-50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 50,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution Type</td>
<td>Predominately White</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historically Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predominately Latinx</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single-Gender</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Online Only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Affiliated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research University</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tribal College or University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Location</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Urban Setting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Urban Setting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Information</td>
<td>Commuter Only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than 25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25% - 50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50% - 75%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75% - 90%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More Than 90%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Programs</td>
<td>Active Greek Program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active Athletics Program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active Student Government</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diverse Selection of Student Clubs and Organizations</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty and Staff Sponsored Student Programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does The Institution Have a Sexual Misconduct Policy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Language about Sexual and Interpersonal Violence</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First Prevention Specialist and I am in My First Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Your Institution Have A Victim Advocate Position</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through County Crisis Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Employed By University</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is The Victim Advocate Employed Full Time?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am Available When a Victim Advocate is Needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes But By Our Local Rape Crisis Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Interview Guide

**Introductions:** (verbal consent script)

**Opening general questions**
1. Name and position title
2. Where is your office located within your institution?
3. What is the reporting structure for your position?
4. Does your position serve more than one role on campus?
   a. What amount of time are you expected to develop and implement prevention programming?

**COVID-19**
1. Are you working remotely right now?
   a. For how long have you been remote?
   b. Did students have to leave campus? When? Were there any exceptions?
2. What kind of programming have you been doing since you went remote?
   a. Who was involved in making the decision to continue to program or put out content?
3. What did SAAM look like this year compared to last year?
4. Have you developed and implemented remote or virtual programming before?
   a. If yes: What, if anything, is different this year compared to previously?
   b. If no: How has it been for you to put on digital or virtual programming for the first time?
      i. Is there anything you would implement again once you return to in-person programming?
      ii. Is there anything notable that didn’t work or was a misstep?

**Professional role**
1. How long have you worked in campus-based sexual assault prevention?
2. How did you get into this career?
3. What degree(s) do you currently hold or are actively seeking?
4. Did you do any educational programs or trainings to prepare you for your career?
   a. If yes: Please describe them and how they helped prepare you.
   b. If no: What kind of support do you get from your institution to continue your professional development?
5. Do your work expectations match your training and professional expectations?

**Knowledge**
1. What did you know about sexual assault prevention programming before starting your current position?
   a. Probe: Does that knowledge aid in your programming efforts?
2. How did you fill any information gaps in order to be successful in your position?
3. What did you know about sexual and interpersonal violence before starting in your position?
   a. How has your understanding changed since then?
Skills
1. Describe what skills you think are necessary (in yourself or other people) for successful prevention programming on your campus?
   a. Probe: How does one develop those skills?
2. How do you know if a program is successful?
   a. Probe: What factors do you think contribute to a program’s success?
3. What skills have you developed in your experience programming?
4. What areas do you wish you could develop in more?

Beliefs about capabilities
1. To what extent do you think you uniquely impact the outcome of your prevention programming?
   a. Probe: Do you think you could change the outcomes of your programming? Why?
   b. The structure of your office? Campus policy?
2. Do you believe you need the campus to buy into your programming?
   a. Probe: How do you gain that buy in?

Social influences
1. What is the campus community’s response to your programing?
   a. Probe: Staff? Faculty? Students?
2. How would you describe the campus community’s understanding of sexual and interpersonal violence?
3. Do you believe that stakeholders understand your programming?
   a. If yes: How do you keep them involved/engaged/updated on your work?
   b. If no: How do you provide avenues towards understanding?

Goals
1. What is the desired outcome of your programming?
   a. Probe: How do you determine if you met your desired outcome?
2. Are your programming outcomes formally or informally generated?
   a. Probe: Who is involved in that process?
3. Who is your target programming population?
4. What would help you better achieve your programming outcomes?

Closing
Thank you so much for your participation. Your answers provide a lot of insight into your work and your institution as a whole. My next steps are to transcribe your interview and remove all identifiable information about you or your institution. Would you like a copy of the transcription once I am done? My plan is to disseminate the results of my study through the CAPPA research committee’s monthly research update, so keep an eye out for that. If you want me to send it to you directly, just let me know and I will send it along. Do you have any questions? You are welcome to email me at any time if you have any questions or concerns about this study. Thank you again for your participation!
Informed Consent to Participate in Research – Verbal Consent
Information to Consider Before Taking Part in this Research Study
Title: Evaluating the Development and Implementation of Campus-based Violence Prevention Programming
Study # 001000

Overview: You are being asked to take part in a research study. The information in this document should help you to decide if you would like to participate. The sections in this Overview provide the basic information about the study. More detailed information is provided in the remainder of the document.

Study Staff: This study is being led by Robyn Manning-Samuels who is a masters student at the University of South Florida, Tampa (USF). This person is called the Principal Investigator. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Dinorah Martinez Tyson. Other approved research staff may act on behalf of the Principal Investigator.

Study Details: This study is being conducted at USF in order to meet the requirements for a Masters of Science in Public Health. The purpose of the study is to explore the barriers and facilitators to the development and implementation of campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming for prevention professionals. Additionally, this study seeks to understand the experiences of prevention professionals in their role and how the current COVID-19 pandemic has impacted these essential programs. This exploratory, qualitative pilot study consists of a brief institutional demographics survey and a 90-minute interview with the PI.

Participants: You are being asked to take part because you are a member of CAPPA and are working in campus-based violence prevention. As a CAPPA member you are uniquely situated to speak on the subjects this study is interested in exploring.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation is voluntary. You do not have to participate and may stop your participation at any time. There will be no penalties or loss of benefits or opportunities if you do not participate or decide to stop once you start. Your decision to participate or not to participate will not affect your job status, employment record, employee evaluations, or advancement opportunities.

Benefits, Compensation, and Risk: We do not know if you will receive any benefit from your participation. You will be compensated with a $5 Starbucks gift card for your participation. This research is considered minimal risk. Minimal risk means that study risks are the same as the risks you face in daily life.

Confidentiality: Even if we publish the findings from this study, we will keep your study information private and confidential. Anyone with the authority to look at your records must keep them confidential.
EXEMPT DETERMINATION

June 16, 2020

Robyn Manning-Samuels
912 W Henry Ave.
Tampa, FL 33604

Dear Ms. Manning-Samuels:

On 6/15/2020, the IRB reviewed and approved the following protocol:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application Type:</th>
<th>Initial Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRB ID:</td>
<td>STUDY001000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Type:</td>
<td>Exempt 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Evaluating the Development and Implementation of Campus-based Violence Prevention Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding:</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The IRB determined that this protocol meets the criteria for exemption from IRB review.

In conducting this protocol, you are required to follow the requirements listed in the INVESTIGATOR MANUAL (HRP-103).

Please note, as per USF policy, once the exempt determination is made, the application is closed in BullsIRB. This does not limit your ability to conduct the research. Any proposed or anticipated change to the study design that was previously declared exempt from IRB oversight must be submitted to the IRB as a new study prior to initiation of the change. However, administrative changes, including changes in research personnel, do not warrant a modification or new application.

Ongoing IRB review and approval by this organization is not required. This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these activities impact the exempt determination, please submit a new request to the IRB for a determination.
Appendix F: Recruitment post for CAPPA forum

Subject line: Participants needed for Campus-based violence prevention programming study

Body:
Hello CAPPA members!
I am writing to recruit 15-25 participants for my masters thesis study, “Evaluating the Development and Implementation of Campus-based Violence Prevention Programming.” Study #1000 (this study is IRB exempt). I will be recruiting participants until July 10, 2020 or until I reach my maximum number of participants. Interviews will take place via video conferencing or phone.

Study Aim
This exploratory, qualitative study will evaluate the perceived facilitators and barriers to the development and implementation of campus-based violence prevention programming at institutions of higher education. It will also seek to understand the experiences of prevention staff as they develop and implement these programs. Finally, this study will explore the impact COVID-19 has had on essential programming for institutions of higher education.

Eligibility
Participants must be a full-time staff member at an IHE (hours equal or exceeding 37.5 hours a week), past their probationary period (>90 days or >6 months). Their position requires them to spend equal to or more than 40% of their work week developing and/or implementing campus-based sexual and interpersonal violence prevention programming on their campus, as defined by this study. Participants must be English speaking and must give consent to participate in the study.

Privacy
Participants can contact the researcher directly if they wish to participate in the study. Any personal or institutional identifiers will be removed from data that is shared with members of the thesis committee, thesis support staff (such as writing editors), or in any materials created for dissemination. The demographics survey will be sent to participants prior to their scheduled interview and be completed on Google Forms. Though the survey collects email addresses, this is only to ensure that I am matching survey responses with the correct interview and this information will be removed from any data that is shared. A $5 Starbucks will be sent to study participants directly by the researcher after interview for completing the survey and the interview.

Time Commitment
The survey is expected to take between 5 and 10 minutes. The interview is expected to take 90 minutes.

Preparation
Prior to the interview, participants should complete a short institutional demographics survey.

Risks and Benefits
There are no known risks associated with participation in this study.
Results Dissemination
A summary of the aggregated results of the study will be distributed via the Campus Advocacy and Prevention Professionals Association listserv via the Research Committee’s monthly research update.

Contact Information
If you have any questions or would like to participate in the study, please email Robyn Manning-Samuels at robynmanning@usf.edu.

Thank you so much for your help!
Best,
-Robyn