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1. Introduction

“Sexual assault is a nation-wide problem and needs immediate action so that we can ensure a safe campus for all students, support sexual assault victims, implement anti sexual-assault tactics and accountability, among the many recommendations that prevent sexual assault on all campuses.”

– Anonymous survey respondent

The Oregon Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence (OCADSV) is pleased to present this “Toolkit on Campus Intimate Partner Sexual Violence,” created in collaboration with domestic and sexual violence response programs and college/university campuses across Oregon, and with support from the Verizon Foundation. This toolkit speaks both to college and university campuses and to community-based advocacy programs – in customized sections – enhancing knowledge for successful collaboration. Informed by the White House recommendations, Title IX, and other relevant law and policy, it is intended to support effective campus/community partnership regarding student experiences of intimate partner sexual violence (IPSV). The toolkit aims to better equip campuses and programs to comply with applicable laws, promote safety and self-determination for students, and foster a campus climate free from sexual violence.

While campus sexual assault has recently experienced a significant and much-needed increase in attention and policy development, sexual violence that occurs specifically within intimate partner or dating relationships is often not recognized, poorly understood, and inadequately addressed. For these reasons, we have chosen to focus our efforts on this particular issue. We have prioritized consideration of rural communities and campuses, and schools that support higher percentages of students from marginalized groups (students of color, LGBTQ students, disabled students, immigrant and international students, students affected by poverty, older/returning students, etc.), in recognition of the barriers presented by lower funding, remote location, and the effects of oppression.

Sponsorship

We are grateful to the Verizon Foundation for funding the creation of this toolkit, from stakeholder meetings around the state to printing and publicity to an instructional webinar to be available in recorded form on our website.

Our mission and work

OCADSV promotes equity and social change in order to end violence for all communities. We seek to transform society by engaging diverse voices, supporting the self-determination of survivors, and providing leadership for advocacy efforts. Our membership is made up of the nonprofit hotlines, shelters, culturally specific programs, drop-in centers and advocacy services around Oregon that provide vital support to survivors of domestic and sexual violence. Member programs are organized in seven geographic regions across the state. We provide training and technical assistance, engage in systems advocacy, and support multidisciplinary efforts to develop effective policy. These activities promote awareness of sexual assault and domestic violence, enhance systemic responses to survivors, families and communities, and support innovative approaches to ending domestic and sexual violence.

This toolkit has also benefited from input by the NW Portland Indian Health Board, Oregon Law Center, the Oregon Sexual Assault Task Force, Portland State University, Reed College, Willamette University, and anonymous survey responses from several dozen students, professors, employees, advocates, counselors and other community members. We offer deep appreciation for the time they took in sharing their experience and expertise.

We extend our gratitude to all the organizations that participated in stakeholder meetings and other efforts in support of this project:

**Member programs**
- Center Against Rape and Domestic Violence (Region 3, Corvallis)
- Klamath Crisis Center/Marta’s House (Region 5, Klamath Falls)
- Portland Women’s Crisis Line (Region 2, Portland)
- Women’s Safety and Resource Center (Region 4, Coos Bay)

**Colleges and universities**
- Klamath Community College (Region 5, Klamath Falls)
- Oregon State University (Region 3, Corvallis)
- Portland Community College (Region 2, Portland)
- Southwestern Oregon Community College (Region 4, Coos Bay)

How to use this toolkit

We suggest all audiences read Sections 1-5 (extending through page 12), which provide context and support the development of shared language and understanding. Following, please read the Section that best fits your role, whether related to campus work or community-based programs. Finally, all should familiarize themselves with Section 8’s resources, training, and further reading.
2. Definitions

To build bridges toward effective collaboration, it is important to understand some common terms used to describe intimate partner violence. It may also be useful to review the legally codified definitions specified in both Title IX and the Clery Act. Community partners should be aware that each campus develops its own policies containing definitions of sexual violence based on relevant law, and should refer to the appropriate sexual misconduct or harassment policy. In this toolkit (and with its member programs) the Coalition employs the following definitions:

**Sexual violence (SV)** is “any nonconsensual sexual act, or any act where ‘no’ is not a viable option for any person involved (due to coercion, drug/alcohol use, physical or mental incapacitation, threats, or violence, etc.).” Sexual violence covers a broad spectrum of unwanted behaviors, including voyeurism, use of sexual language, exposure to or forced participation in pornography, birth control sabotage, sexual harassment, incest, commercial sexual exploitation or trafficking, sexual assault, and rape. In the 2007 “Campus Sexual Assault Survey,” author C.P. Krebs emphasized, “rape isn’t about sex, at least not in the sense of being motivated by sexual attraction or an uncontrollable sexual urge.” Instead, perpetrators use sexual violence as an act of power and control over another person. According to the University of Minnesota Duluth, “rape is experienced by the victims as an act of violence… Gratification [for the perpetrator] comes from gaining power and control.” We recognize that these definitions differ from Oregon's statutory definitions of rape, sodomy, sexual abuse, unlawful sexual penetration, etc. Also, while sexual violence occurs within both intimate and non-intimate relationships, this toolkit addresses only the former.

**Domestic violence (DV)** is a pattern of coercive tactics that can include verbal, physical, psychological, sexual, economic, and/or emotional abuse, used by one or more people against another, with the effect of establishing and maintaining power and control in the relationship. Oregon statute defines domestic violence as abuse between family or household members, or partners in a dating relationship.

---

Intimate partner violence (IPV) or dating violence, a subset of domestic violence, occurs when any of the above behaviors are taking place specifically within an intimate or dating relationship. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the term describes “physical, sexual, or psychological harm by a current or former partner or spouse. This type of violence can occur among heterosexual or same-sex couples and does not require sexual intimacy.”

Intimate partner sexual violence (IPSV) is “any unwanted sexual contact or activity by an intimate partner.” IPSV is sexual violence in the context of a dating or intimate partner relationship, and is the focus of this toolkit.

Stalking is “a course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to feel fear.” Stalking behaviors often include harassment, threats, surveillance, and other forms of unwanted contact. Stalking may be perpetrated by dating or intimate partners, family members, acquaintances, strangers, etc.

---

3. Campus climate and culture

When considering students’ experiences of intimate partner sexual violence, it is crucial that we understand the campus climate regarding dating relationships, sex, gender, and power. The White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault recommends conducting a campus climate survey, and even supplies a template and guidance to assist with this process. A group called ARC3, Administrator Researcher Campus Climate Consortium, has compiled and provided additional instruction on campus climate surveys, available for free download.

The climate survey can examine a wide variety of issues on campus. How are students interacting with one another? What types of dating and sexual behaviors are encouraged or normalized, and what behaviors result in sanctions – or don’t? How does the school communicate policies, expectations and responsibilities with students and other constituents? How does the school ensure that students are informed regarding their rights and the resources available to them? What happens when a student speaks out about rape or sexual assault, and what happens to a student or other community member who commits sexual violence? For campuses and community-based programs working in collaboration, reflecting on these questions may provide insight and help shape a comprehensive plan for fostering a safe and empowering campus climate. The University of Michigan Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center report, “Understanding the Perpetrator,” states:

“Cross-cultural studies of rape and studies of rape-prone versus rape-free campus cultures identify the following factors as contributors to sexual violence:

- Sex-role socialization
- Rape myths
- Lack of sanctions for abuse
- Male peer group support
- Pornography
- All-male membership groups such as fraternities and sports teams.”

---

Campuses that proactively and consistently engage students in exploring a nuanced understanding of gender and healthy relationships will provide a foundation of safety for students. During our stakeholder meetings some campus administrators expressed frustration that dispelling socialized myths regarding gender, dating, and sexual violence fell so heavily on their shoulders; in a perfect world, young people would be raised in ways that challenge rather than confirm damaging or violent gender dynamics, and would arrive at college ready to engage appropriately as young adults. While we can recognize the need for better prevention strategies in early education, in the meantime we must work with what we have.

Because men commit the majority of sexual violence (against victims of all genders) and yet people of any gender can be victims or perpetrators of sexual violence, our efforts at prevention must address students of all genders. The American Association of University Professors writes: “While education and prevention efforts typically focus on women, the most likely victims of sexual assault, campuses should also direct education toward men, the most likely perpetrators. Education and training programs for men have the potential to change the culture of the campus with respect to sexual violence of all forms.” Such shifts are necessary across the world of higher education in order for schools to be in compliance with Title IX requirements regarding protection from gender-based discrimination and Clery requirements for prevention education, as well as to provide a truly empowering learning environment for all students.

There is a lingering belief that strangers pose the greatest danger of sexual assault; yet studies have shown that as many as 80% of student survivors of sexual violence knew the person who assaulted them. This research underscores our commitment to supporting campuses in examining how relationship dynamics influence student experiences and likelihood to report sexual violence.

---

Geography, resources and other considerations

“Institutions of higher education differ in many ways; these differences have significant impacts on how students experience intimate partner sexual violence, and how a school should respond. Some campuses are residential and others serve students who live throughout their communities. Larger or metropolitan area schools may have access to more resources, or already have partnerships with local programs that serve individuals affected by sexual violence. Similarly, students in urban areas may have more options for accessible services than individuals in rural settings, where transportation and limited funding pose significant barriers. Another common challenge for rural campus life is lack of diversity amongst faculty and staff, which may present additional barriers to the process of student disclosure and support if students do not feel represented among campus personnel. All schools should consider their policies regarding number of free counseling visits, student options for sexual assault response, access to sexual assault nurse examiners, and availability of temporary emergency housing for student survivors. It is important for schools and community-based programs to think collaboratively about each of these and other dynamics that may present barriers to the best possible response to students, in service of fostering a supportive campus climate.

“Sexual assault survivors often need a variety of services, both immediate and long-term, to help them regain a sense of control and safety. While some schools may be able to provide comprehensive trauma-informed services on campus, others may need to partner with community-based organizations.”

– White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault

4. Laws, compliance and reporting

Laws governing campus response to student experiences of sexual violence include Title IX, the Clery Act, Dear Colleague Letters, Office on Civil Rights guidance, and (in Oregon) House Bill 3476 on advocate privilege, Senate Bill 759, and other administrative laws. According to the Clery Center for Security on Campus, “institutions should have policies that are in compliance with both Title IX and Clery. For example, policies should address possible supports and interim measures the institution can implement to help ensure the safety of someone reporting and have disciplinary procedures that ensure a prompt, fair, and impartial process.” Based on these laws, schools must have a response to sexual violence that is independent of law enforcement and civil or criminal legal proceedings; the latter may or may not occur in conjunction with campus procedure. Students who experience sexual violence may report to the school, to law enforcement, or to both. They also have the right to file a complaint with the Federal Department of Education, and/or to file civil suits against the school and private parties. This section is meant to provide a high level summary of applicable laws. Though they are not binding, a summary of recommendations from the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault is also included in this section. Guidance on specific measures schools can take will be explored in Section 6.

Title IX – it’s about gender-based discrimination

This federal civil rights law originated in 1972 and prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in educational programs and activities receiving federal funding (from pre-school through higher college and university levels). Title IX prohibits gender-based harassment, including sexual assault, and applies to students of all genders. Schools must proactively ensure a learning environment free from sexual harassment and assault, reduce the impacts of such assaults, and work to prevent repeat offenses. Schools must protect student survivors of sexual violence from the necessity of sharing space (such as dorms or classrooms) with the offender, and must protect students from retaliation by any party. Title IX also requires each institution to appoint a Title IX coordinator, to inform students who that is, and offer interim support and protections (such as changing dorms, accompaniment to classes, etc.; see Section 6 for more specific recommendations) independent from any campus adjudication process that may or may not result from a student’s report. The Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights (OCR) is charged with enforcing Title IX. Learn more about Title IX on the government’s informative website, NotAlone.gov, and at knowyourix.org.

---

Clery Act – it’s about crime information

Congress passed this federal consumer protection law in 1990, four years after Jeanne Clery was raped and murdered in her dorm room at Lehigh University by a fellow student she had not previously known. Ms. Clery’s parents, Connie and Howard Clery, fought for the passage of the law, and continue to be active in the work of holding campuses accountable regarding crime information. The Clery Act requires all colleges and universities receiving federal funding to disclose information regarding certain crimes that occur on their campuses, including sexual assault, dating/domestic violence, and stalking. Schools must implement strategies such as prevention and bystander intervention, timely warnings (a way to warn all people on campus of dangerous conditions, for example, an active shooter), campus security policies, and an annual security report supplying aggregate information on campus crime. Schools must also make their crime log publicly available and accessible, but may not include certain confidential information about the victim. Enforcement of the Clery Act is the responsibility of the Federal Student Aid Office of the Department of Education.

White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault – it’s about sexual violence response

This entity provides guidance on best practice for schools responding to sexual violence, especially those that receive federal funding. “The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault” presents 20 pages of easy-to-understand information detailing how schools should prevent and respond to sexual violence, and includes links to specific tools available to support schools’ efforts.

Oregon House Bill 3476 – it’s about confidentiality

This 2015 Oregon House bill created an advocate privilege for certified advocates in domestic and sexual violence programs, including those housed on campuses. (It appears Oregon is currently the only state where campus advocates are specifically referenced in an advocate privilege law.) The bill “prohibits disclosure of communications without consent of person seeking services.” This means, in general, that advocates are protected from subpoena and other requirements to disclose student/survivor information, and strengthens already existing protections laid out in the federal Violence Against Women Act. An exception to advocate privilege is if the victim is under 18 years of age, an advocate employed by a college or university must report child abuse under Oregon’s mandatory reporting law (see next section).

---

23 „Summary.” Clery Center.
27 Ibid.
Senate Bill 759 – it’s about informing students

In 2015, the Oregon legislature passed a law that requires all post-secondary institutions of education to adopt written protocols to ensure that victims of sexual assault receive necessary services and assistance. The law also requires that the institution provide plain-language information in written and internet formats to all students on victim’s rights, including rights of privacy; criminal, civil, and campus disciplinary options; and campus and community services and resources.

Reporting

The term “reporting” is used on campuses in several ways. Schools should be thoughtful and clear in differentiating between disclosure and reporting. For example, a student may tell someone about an experience of sexual assault, thinking they are simply disclosing, but the person they tell may be legally obligated to report. Campus personnel and students should understand options for disclosing and options for reporting. The Campus Reporting Options website from the Oregon Sexual Assault Task Force, found at campus.oregonsatf.org, provides guidance for students in choosing which option is safest for them.

Anonymous reporting: The student disclosing is anonymous; information about the incident may be included in the Clery annual security report as non-identifiable aggregate data, if it meets the standards.

Confidential reporting: The student may disclose to certain campus personnel confidentially (often medical or counseling staff, religious personnel, or certified advocates); schools should communicate widely and often about who is available for this type of reporting. Deidentified information about the incident may be included in the Clery annual security report, if it meets the standards. Campuses should talk to their community partners about how best to track aggregate data pertaining to confidential disclosures.

Obligatory reporting: Per Title IX schools designate obligatory reporters, sometimes known as “responsible employees.” They must report any information they receive about sexual or relationship violence to the Title IX coordinator. Schools must train responsible employees to disclose their reporting requirements. Schools should work to inform students of which campus personnel are responsible employees, and who on campus they can speak to confidentially if they prefer.

Mandatory child abuse reporting: In Oregon, college and university personnel are required by law to report child abuse (abuse of a student under 18 years of age) to appropriate authorities. Chapter 419B of the Juvenile Code of Dependency states that "Any public or private official having reasonable cause to believe that any child with whom the official comes in contact has suffered abuse… shall immediately report or cause a report to be made." It is important to clarify that community-based programs are not mandatory reporters of child abuse, and in fact reporting child abuse may violate confidentiality provisions of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA).

Law enforcement reporting: Students may choose whether or not to report to law enforcement; campuses must inform them of this option and, if requested, offer support in this process. Students may report to law enforcement without reporting to the campus.

5. **Table: comparative considerations**

Roles and resources vary. In general, the following apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>College/University Campus</th>
<th>Community-based Advocacy Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People working in campus settings and responding to students who experience sexual violence (faculty, counselors, advocates, or other campus personnel) generally approach their work from a student-centered perspective. Many campus personnel are also charged with the responsibility to promote and protect general campus safety, and therefore may take a broader philosophical approach to matters of sexual violence.</td>
<td>People providing direct support to survivors (often called advocates) generally approach their work from a perspective of empowerment and self-determination for abuse survivors. This approach is sometimes referred to as survivor-centered services, and typically involves an awareness of trauma and the impacts of oppression, in addition to direct results of interpersonal violence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Services | Campuses typically provide some combination of the following: confidential and non-confidential disclosure options, internal campus investigation, reporting to law enforcement, counseling, safety planning, support groups, temporary housing accommodations, academic adaptations such as withdrawal from classes, campus no-contact orders, protection from retaliation, and other supports. | These programs typically provide some combination of the following: hotline/crisis line, safety planning, shelter (or other short-term housing, such as motel vouchers, transitional housing, rental assistance), drop-in center, support groups, accompaniment to legal/medical/other appointments, court support, children’s programming, and referrals to a wide array of other services. |

| Confidentiality | Campuses often have some personnel who are required to share or report information, and others who are not. SB 759 requires that schools provide students with accurate and accessible information regarding their reporting options and the services available, and White House recommendations reinforce this necessity. Campuses must also provide information on community-based confidential hotlines and other services. | Programs are required under the Violence Against Women Act to maintain confidentiality with all personally-identifying survivor information. Programs generally hold confidentiality as a core value, and will not release a student’s personal information without a specific written directive from the student requesting that they do so. HB 3476, “the privilege bill,” further strengthens this practice. |

| Reporting | Campuses are required under the Clery Act to report all qualifying crimes; when intimate partner sexual violence may constitute a crime, therefore, schools must report those incidents. Title IX also requires schools to report sexual violence. Schools must communicate with students when they may need to pursue law enforcement response or adjudication against a student’s wishes, for example due to concern for community safety. Under Oregon law, all school employees not otherwise exempted by professional license are mandatory reporters of child abuse and abuse of vulnerable adults. | These programs are typically regulated primarily by various state and federal funding sources that, on the one hand, require confidentiality, and on the other, require provision of anonymous information in aggregate form. For example, most programs typically report the number of people served in a particular month or year. These programs are typically NOT statutory mandatory reporters, and in fact, are usually prohibited from sharing any information with law enforcement, child welfare, or other entities without the survivor’s express written permission. |

| Applicable Laws | Title IX, Clery Act, VAWA Amendments to Clery, Oregon HB 3476, Oregon SB 759 | Violence Against Women Act, Victims of Crime Act, Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, Oregon HB 3476 |
6. For colleges and universities

Survey summary

We asked anonymous survey respondents (students, campus staff, advocates, administrators, professors, and other community members) what campuses need to know in order to respond well to intimate partner sexual violence. They agreed campuses need to be clear about the resources available, learn from and utilize advocacy skills, and develop trauma-informed policies, procedures, and practices. Some respondents emphasized the need for practical resources (beyond kind words that can feel patronizing to some students) including financial assistance, health care, subsidized housing, options to move without forfeiting a deposit, supplemental income to make up for income that may be lost due to the assault, and free confidential legal assistance.

Survey participants emphasized that campus staff must be trained in sexual assault dynamics and response and that community-based programs are often a great resource for this sort of training. This is consistent with White House recommendations, which state that, due to the complexity of the issue of sexual violence and the ways personal bias come into play, “specialized training, thus, is crucial. School officials and investigators need to understand how sexual assault occurs, how it’s perpetrated, and how victims might naturally respond both during and after an assault.”

Also consistent with the White House recommendations, survey respondents indicated that interventions “should center around the desires of the survivor, and all options should be clearly communicated to them about their courses of action and the potential outcomes of their choices.” Campuses should provide clear information regarding what they are required to report and to whom, and what level of confidentiality the student can expect. While schools work hard to do their best under difficult circumstances, it is important to remain receptive to constructive critique; one respondent noted, “I think students often feel betrayed by their schools and fear retaliation and embarrassment about the situation and possible reporting processes.”

“First and foremost, being victim-centered means listening carefully to victims/survivors, taking seriously what survivors say they want and need, addressing the significant barriers to helping survivors, and allocating the institutional resources to accomplish all of the goals. The vast majority of the reasons survivors give for not reporting demonstrates their lack of faith in the existing responses and their attempt to avoid the negative consequences that they believe will come of reporting.”

– Nancy Catalupo, Georgetown University Law Center

33 Ibid.
Compliance and reporting

Campus response must be compliant with relevant laws as outlined in Section 4. A key mandate is that schools develop explicit policy and cultivate a campus climate of honesty in order to address this issue head on. As the White House report states, “For colleges and universities, breaking the cycle of violence poses a unique challenge. When the school tries to tackle the problem – by acknowledging it, drawing attention to it, and encouraging survivors to report – it can start to look like a dangerous place. On the flip side, when a school ignores the problem or discourages reporting (either actively or by treating survivors without care), it can look safer.” Schools have an often-overlooked, perhaps grim yet vital opportunity to educate students, parents, funders, and the broader community that, as paradoxical as it may seem, higher numbers of sexual violence reports are actually a good thing: they mean students feel safe to come forward, share their experiences of trauma, and get the support they need and deserve. A school with low or nonexistent reporting numbers is not a community where sexual violence isn’t happening; it’s a community that hasn’t ensured students can safely report when sexual violence does occur. It is a community where sexual violence happens and goes unaddressed. As the White House report stresses, while “the principle aim of the criminal system is to adjudicate a defendant’s guilt and serve justice… A school’s responsibility is broader: it is charged with providing a safe learning environment for all its students – and to give survivors the help they need to reclaim their educations.”

Confidentiality

In order to encourage student disclosure of abuse, and thereby gain the opportunity to support students in seeking justice and healing from trauma, we must provide the highest level of confidentiality possible. The White House recommendations recognize that “sexual assault can leave victims feeling powerless – and they need support from the beginning to regain a sense of control.” Therefore the report emphasizes the importance of ensuring confidentiality, stating that this practice “aims to give survivors more control over the process.”

---

36 Ibid.
37 Ibid.
38 Ibid.
39 Ibid.
Campuses may be concerned that if they do not receive all information related to certain crimes, those crimes will somehow proliferate, the danger will go unmitigated, or they may be accused of hiding and failing to respond to reports of sexual assault. In fact, the reverse is often the case. When students know which campus personnel they can trust to keep their information and experiences private, they are more likely to disclose abuse of all kinds. This increased likelihood of disclosure provides schools the opportunity to intervene and support student safety and well being, and paradoxically moves campuses toward a climate of openness about the prevalence of sexual violence. According to the White House recommendations, “a school should make it clear, up front, who on campus can maintain a victim’s confidence and who can’t – so a victim can make an informed decision about where best to turn.”

**Impacts of intimate partner sexual violence**

For students and other survivors of IPSV, impacts vary individual to individual. An anonymous survey respondent wrote, “each person’s experience is unique and each response to the assault is unique.” However, many students experience some or all of the following:

- Trauma responses such as sleep disturbance, hypersensitivity, hypervigilance, memory loss, depression, self-isolation, etc.
- Anger, irritability, or denial
- Difficulty studying or participating in classes, and potentially adverse impacts on academic career
- Adverse health effects
- Shame or guilt
- Fear for their safety
- Concern about losing financial aid, work study, poor grades, or not completing classes
- Concern over getting in trouble, or getting someone else in trouble
- Fear of retaliation by the alleged perpetrator or other students or community members
- Fear of running into the person who harmed them
- Fear that people will blame them or talk badly about them
- Confusion about what happened (particularly if drugs or alcohol were involved)
- Belief that what happened was somehow their own fault (especially if they were partying)

---

40 Ibid.
As quotations above from the White House report make plain, the coercion and intimidation dynamics at play in intimate partner sexual violence can undermine a student’s sense of autonomy and control over their own life. This fact illuminates the necessity of student-centered services, specifically those that are empowering to students rather than saving or rescuing them. Approaches that provide students with information about their options and allow them to guide the planning process in a supportive environment are the most effective.42 It is important that we plan with students to support their physical, emotional and logistical safety – and in the process, help repair their sense of self-determination.

**Student disclosure**

When a student is sexually assaulted, particularly in the context of an intimate partner, dating or hooking up relationship, the student may experience feelings of shame and numerous hesitations to disclosing the abuse (particularly to a school official) or may not even recognize it as abuse. Our reactions to student disclosure not only impact that particular student but will affect the overall campus climate of safety or unsafety to share information about sexual violence. So it’s vital to listen, believe, and validate survivor experiences — even if at first they don’t make sense (this can be due to the effects of trauma) or if the student was engaged in other behavior that goes against policy or is illegal (such as drug use). Some schools implement an amnesty policy, meaning students who may otherwise have been found in violation of codes of conduct (e.g., regarding drug use) may be exempt from consequences when reporting sexual violence.

Students will disclose to campus personnel with whom they feel safe, regardless of official school designation of particular point people for issues of sexual violence (e.g., Title IX coordinator, health services personnel, counselors, advocates, or campus security personnel). Some groups who may be more likely to receive informal disclosure include faculty (particularly in certain subjects that invite student self-awareness and reflection, for example), other students, women’s/LGBTQ/multicultural center staff, and in general campus personnel who are part of marginalized groups and whom students may therefore see as more trustworthy due to shared experience or identity. It is important to prepare all of these groups — not only those formally charged with the responsibility — with training and skills for responding to student disclosure.

Support and services

Responding to a student disclosure of IPSV warrants careful safety planning, and the Victim Rights Law Center has provided some very useful guidance. Various supports and remedies may be made available to students who disclose intimate partner sexual violence, depending on circumstance; these can take place independently of, before, during or after any adjudication process the student may or may not choose to pursue. Here is a short list of examples from the White House recommendations:

- Medical and mental health services, including confidential counseling
- Emergency housing or housing transfer
- Academic accommodations (increased academic support such as tutoring, postponing tests, withdrawing from classes without financial or academic penalty, pass/no pass options, etc.)
- Employment changes
- On-campus no-contact directive
- Security escort
- Accompaniment to and from classes
- Removing the alleged perpetrator from shared classes or shared housing

Peer advocates

Some schools, such as Reed College in Portland, use peer advocates:

“Another way to encourage more victims to report assaults: Provide them with people they want to talk to. By now, most colleges and universities have a professional, confidential counselor who is trained to handle cases of sexual assault. Many also have some kind of peer-to-peer sexual assault counseling program. The task force should recommend a new kind of sexual assault counseling initiative that brings these two together: counseling that is both confidential and peer-to-peer.” Reed College provides training and support, as well as a small stipend, to students who rotate response duty.

---

Safety plans should emphasize natural supports if available (those the student is most likely to lean on), close people in their life who they can trust, such as friends, family, coaches, spiritual community, clubs or groups, and staff or advocates. Title IX provides many more examples of possible supports, and grants students the right to have an advisor of their choice present throughout any campus processes (the advisor may be an advocate, friend, family member, religious or spiritual community member, etc.) as well as the right not to be in the same room with the alleged perpetrator. In creating policy and guidance for campus personnel, schools may wish to review Know Your IX’s “Common Ways Schools Violate Survivors’ Rights.” The bottom line for Title IX is that sexual violence should not deter a student from remaining engaged in and continuing their education, safely and with self-determination as to their options.

Schools should also refer to and coordinate with external supports and services such as community-based programs (see page 24), civil legal remedies such as Sexual Abuse Protection Orders (SAPOs), Family Abuse Protection Orders (FAPAs) and Stalking Protective Orders (SPOs), physical and mental health resources, culturally specific supports, etc.

---

46 “Title IX: The Basics,” Know Your IX.
Effects and barriers for specific populations

Several student groups may face additional barriers when they experience intimate partner sexual violence. Lesbian/gay/bisexual/queer students, transgender students, students of color, immigrant students, students from impoverished backgrounds, students with disabilities, students with diminished credibility due to juvenile or criminal records or histories of substance use, and others may not only be struggling with the trauma and impacts of dating violence, but with intersecting challenges as well. These may include limited English proficiency or language access, cultural and generational perspectives, social norms that differ from prevailing campus culture, isolation, added fear of their family’s or friend’s reactions, fear of being outing, fear of deportation, rational fear or distrust of campus security or law enforcement, mistrust of campus officials more broadly, etc. Students may need, and schools should plan to provide:

- Services in the student’s native language (particularly for conversations about sexual violence, bodies, feelings, trauma, and shame, the ability to communicate fluently is crucial)
- Support from someone the student can relate to, culturally
- Acknowledgement that they may fear family or friends finding out about the assault, and planning around social safety
- Validation of their fears and experiences
- Creative safety planning beyond more conventional services (e.g., if they can’t call the police, who can they reach out to in an emergency)

“Encourage colleges and universities to develop and conduct in depth campus climate surveys with students, including heterosexual men and women, but making special effort to survey LGBTQ persons and racial minorities.”

– American Psychoanalytical Association

Sanctions for perpetrators

Many institutions fear legal consequences they imagine may stem from their response to people accused of sexual assault, and this concern is understandable. However, studies have shown that the legal consequences of not responding adequately (and risking violating Title IX or Clery laws) present a far more significant risk to colleges and universities. Research also demonstrates that sexual violence is more likely to run rampant in environments where consequences are minimal or nonexistent. Schools should therefore have firm and clearly defined policies for managing someone who has committed sexual violence; in campus terms, someone who is found responsible for violation of sexual misconduct policy. The creation of such protocols requires a very nuanced consideration of the reality that, according to Caroline Kitchener in The Atlantic, “Sweeping policies that crack down hard on perpetrators often have the unintended result of discouraging victims from coming forward.” Mindfulness toward the complexity of supporting the safety of individual students and the entire community, while imposing appropriate consequences, demands a studied approach to campus policy with as many points of view as possible represented during policy creation and implementation.

Another dynamic at play in our response to perpetrators is our own inability to believe this person may have committed such a harmful act. According to an advocate quoted by the Vermont Network Against Domestic and Sexual Violence, “We still struggle to acknowledge the often inconvenient truth that people who sexually assault others are not strangers lurking in bushes, or an isolated bad actor at a frat party – they are members of our communities. They are our neighbors, classmates, leaders, relatives, and students, and we have a responsibility to survivors, perpetrators, and ourselves to hold them accountable.” A Futures Without Violence report indicates that each response designed to promote accountability and to discourage repeat offending should contain four elements: punishment, treatment, education and monitoring. As an example of the nuance and follow-through required in considering potential response, Know Your IX emphasizes that “schools’ policies should explicitly state that if an accused student withdraws and/or transfers universities while a disciplinary complaint against him is pending, his transcript will be marked to indicate such.”

50 “Understanding the Perpetrator,” University of Michigan.
While schools are charged by law with responding to incidents of sexual violence in order to promote campus safety, it must also be noted that campuses often do not, nor should they, hold expertise in offender management, perpetrator accountability, or rehabilitation. It is crucial for school personnel to consult with and refer to relevant experts such as community-based advocates and batterer intervention programs. The North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence provides a partial list of options that may be within a school’s purview, in their paper “Guidance for Creating College & University Domestic Violence Programs and Policies.” These include:

- Changes in class schedule
- Community service
- Educational intervention
- Expulsion (should be standard but not mandatory, in order to decrease reporting barriers)
- Relocation (for example, if the perpetrator lives in the same dorm as the victim)
- Suspension from classes, sports teams, Greek life, or other activities
- On-campus no-contact order
- Restitution/fines
- Transcript entry
- Withholding of degree
- Exclusion from campus
- Revocation of alumni privileges

“Examples of less formal grievance options, always with consent of the accusing student, include: a visit to the alleged perpetrator from campus public safety as a warning; …training of a group (e.g., fraternity, athletic team) on healthy relationships; having a department chair or dean speak with an alleged perpetrator; involving peer support for a survivor’s protection and/or to help the alleged perpetrator avoid repeat offenses. These examples are not exhaustive; informal response processes will vary depending on what the survivor feels is the most appropriate course of action and what resources are available.”

– Ann Fleck-Henderson, Futures Without Violence

Finally, it bears noting that not all people who commit intimate partner sexual violence against a student will themselves be students; they may be other members of the campus community, or not. Schools should be prepared to plan for each of these scenarios, when working to support student survivors.

**Broader campus plan**

Beyond responding to individual cases of intimate partner sexual violence, campuses must create and implement plans for student and campus safety as well as sexual violence prevention and the promotion of healthy relationships. The White House recommendations remind us that, “Although every school will need to tailor a policy to its own needs and circumstances, all schools should be sure to bring the key stakeholders – including students – to the table.” A multifaceted and well-resourced collaboration will provide the most effective response to sexual violence. Some schools choose to form a behavioral integration team (BIT) or sexual assault response team (SART) that meets regularly to create and implement policy and practice on these issues. (Schools may also elect to participate in local city/county SARTs, or invite someone from that group to join the campus team; carefully consider and plan for the confidentiality implications of such collaboration.) According to a report from the University of Oregon, “It is critical that the work on these issues by all segments of the campus be fully coordinated and centrally led… The plan must be well integrated into every aspect of campus life.”

---

**Highlights from the University of Oregon recommendations (may or may not apply to other schools):**

- Comprehensive campus-wide plan
- Sustained and visible senior leadership commitment
- Central office or person with responsibility and sufficient authority
- Permanent advisory group
- Investment of adequate resources
- Monitoring and evaluation
- Campus climate surveys
- Partnership with outside programs

---
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Aspects of a broader campus plan may include:

- Comprehensive sexual misconduct policy
- Trained confidential victim advocates who provide emergency and ongoing support
- Prevention (such as workshops, trainings, social norms change, messaging, etc.)
- Bystander intervention plan and training
- Memorandum of understanding between campus and community-based program, with clearly stated roles and responsibilities (referral process, plan for staff turnover, program present at orientation and other student activities, etc.)
- Option for program or campus advocate to accompany student through reporting process
- “Amnesty” policy related to alcohol and other drug (AOD) consumption by victims or witnesses so that fear of sanction for violation of AOD policies does not discourage reporting of IPSV
- Training for school officials (including law enforcement or security personnel) on intimate partner sexual violence, other forms of abuse, and trauma-informed services
- Connections with Greek system, student life/student activities, athletics
- Connections with campus law enforcement
- Connections with academic departments
- Connections with counseling and health centers
- Connections with women's, LGBTQ, multicultural and other student centers
- Hotline and service information in all restrooms (not only women's)
- Partnerships with the community

Reports from the White House Task Force and the University of Oregon provide recommendations in far greater depth, and the American Association of University Professors has a helpful paper on designing effective campus policy.
Partnering with community-based programs

There are many ways campuses and community-based programs can work together. A strong first step is for each entity to learn about the laws and philosophies guiding the other’s work (see table on page 12). Next the school should inventory what resources they have available on campus and consider how the community-based program’s services may augment these. Recognize that, though there may be philosophical or legal requirement differences, community-based programs can be an invaluable resource of expertise regarding intimate partner sexual violence and other forms of abuse, as well as trauma-informed services and response practices. Schools may invite program staff to train campus personnel, participate in BITs or SARTs, help during hiring processes for sexual violence related campus positions such as advocates and Title IX coordinators, etc. Some campuses may consider hosting out-stationed advocates, who are employed and supported by a community-based program and become an integral component of the campus team in responding to IPSV and other forms of abuse. Many schools place interns with programs for increased coordination as well as practical real-world learning opportunities.
7. For community-based advocacy programs

Survey summary

We asked anonymous survey respondents (students, campus staff, advocates, administrators, professors, and other community members) what community-based programs need to know in order to respond well to students experiencing intimate partner sexual violence. Respondents agreed that advocacy programs should have some familiarity with campus-relevant language (e.g., student instead of survivor; see also table on page 9), what schools can and can’t do, what the Clery Act and Title IX require of schools, students’ rights, and campus adjudication processes; they should form relationships with specific people on campus in order to better serve student survivors. Respondents want programs to know and develop partnerships with all of the schools in their service area, not only the larger or more recognized institutions. One person wrote, “In order to move campuses forward, community providers need to identify campuses as distinct communities that require a tailored approach.”

Respondents also emphasized the importance of advocacy that responds to the survivor’s particular life circumstances, beyond what some view as a typical or textbook victim (a white middle class woman with physical injuries from a male partner). Advocacy programs must be culturally responsive to people of color, immigrant or international students, transgender survivors, people in lesbian/gay/bisexual/queer relationships, people with disabilities, young people and older people, and other identities that may intersect with and affect a student’s experiences of intimate partner sexual violence. While Oregon has made improvements in this area, survey responses and reports from advocates and survivors themselves remind us that efforts toward equitable services remain a work in progress.

Respondents agreed they expect advocacy programs to fight hard for them, their rights, and their needs – in innovative and survivor-centered ways, beyond the conventional services that have been offered for decades. Developing or advocating for robust free legal services, truly affordable housing, flexible financial assistance, and genuinely youth-led outreach materials are examples of focus areas to enhance and further solidify safety. The survey responses are a grounding reminder that advocacy is not only about listening, believing and validating, but also meeting people where they are and getting creative with them.

Confidentiality

Programs and campuses sometimes have different ways of approaching and protecting a student’s information, and this can present a concern for community-based programs. However, Oregon House bill 759 and the White House recommendations have made it clear that campuses must provide confidential personnel to support student survivors and that they have to clearly inform students who these people are. Look for opportunities to support campuses as they get up to speed on policies and best practices, and encourage them to foster a campus culture of openness regarding the issue of intimate partner sexual violence more broadly.

Community-based programs may also be well positioned to advise campuses in the creation and implementation of out-stationed and/or peer advocate programming, with advocates certified as allowed by House bill 3476 providing confidential services under supervision of community-based programs.

Language and policies

For community-based advocacy programs striving to form or strengthen partnerships with campuses in support of student survivors, a vital first step is to become familiar with the laws, policies and approaches that guide campus response to intimate partner sexual violence, as well as the language campuses use to describe these issues (see laws, compliance and reporting, Section 4, and table, Section 5, for a start). For example, understanding that Title IX focuses primarily on gender discrimination, and the Clery Act governs how schools report on-campus crime information, will help advocacy programs navigate conversations with campus personnel – and improve their ability to support student survivors. Schools and programs are under differing legal requirements; we’ve found understanding these differences helps illuminate potential conflicts or misunderstandings and move toward effective collaboration.

Campus processes for responding to disclosure vary, but typically include informing a student of their rights, creating and implementing interim safety measures, connecting students with on and off-campus resources, and sometimes a campus investigation/adjudication process. (This is separate from any law enforcement reporting and ensuing investigation the student may or may not pursue.) Schools must investigate all reports of a possible Title IX violation, with or without the consent of
the victim, although they typically strive to protect the confidentiality of the victim when requested. Many schools have a judicial hearing board that deals with a wide array of policy violations on campus, including sexual violence, and will hear cases once an internal campus investigation has occurred. “In the hearing both the survivor, often referred to as the complainant or accuser, and the perpetrator, often referred to as the accused, must be provided equal opportunity to: attend and speak at the hearing, present witnesses and evidence, and have any support person (including attorneys) of their choosing present.” Both parties are then notified of the hearing’s outcome. See page 20 for more information on possible sanctions that may be used to hold accountable a person who has done sexual violence. The “Creating Change Together” toolkit provides a more detailed description of typical campus judicial processes.

Supporting student survivors

Student survivors likely have much in common with other groups of survivors: they may be feeling guilt, shame, self-blame; they may not immediately name their experience as abuse; they might hesitate to disclose or report; and they may show signs of trauma. In addition to these typical impacts, students often have struggles unique to their experience as students, regardless of the type of school they attend. These could include:

- Concern about losing financial aid, work study, or not completing classes
- Concerns about negative effects on their grades due to difficulties in concentrating on their studies or missing classes
- Fear of retaliation by the alleged perpetrator or other students or community members
- Fear of running into the person who harmed them (coupled with an increased likelihood, if the perpetrator is also part of the campus community)
- Fear of outing
- Fear that their parents or peers will find out
- Confusion about what happened (particularly if drugs or alcohol were involved)
- Concern about getting into trouble with the school (especially if their own behavior may have violated campus policy, for example, regarding drugs or alcohol)
- Belief that what happened was their own fault (again, especially if they were partying)
- Fear that they will not be believed

Students are also likely to use specific language to describe their experiences and relationships (phrases such as “hooking up,” for example). Programs should strive to familiarize themselves with, and use, culturally and age-relevant terms when supporting student survivors. Rather than provide language in this document that will quickly become outdated, we recommend connecting with

---
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your local campus and/or with Oregon Student Association for guidance. Of course, as is consistent with advocacy philosophy and practice, always use the words someone uses to describe their own experiences.

When an advocate is called upon to support a student survivor, it is helpful to understand what types of supports the school may be able to provide (see page 17). One of the primary goals of Title IX is that the person who did harm shoulder as much of the burden as possible in the aftermath. This is a work in progress for most institutions, but the aim and the mandate are there to ensure students who experience sexual violence can remain safely engaged in and continue their education as well as healing from trauma. It may be beneficial for programs to familiarize themselves with Know Your IX’s “Common Ways Schools Violate Survivors’ Rights.” This will help to equip programs and advocates to better support survivors in having safe and empowering experiences with the campus process.

**Partnering with campuses**

After programs develop some basic understanding of laws, policies, and practices affecting campus response, the next step may be to begin or further strengthen relationships with campus personnel. If you don’t know where to begin, try the Title IX coordinator, counseling department, dean of students, or women's or LGBTQ resource centers. Schools and programs should collectively determine what student needs may be regarding collaborative response, and then work to formalize a partnership using a memorandum of understanding. Collaborations may include some or all of the following components (though this list is far from comprehensive):

- Referral process for campus personnel to connect students with community-based program
- Program advocates out-stationed on campus
- Program staff train campus staff on intimate partner and sexual violence dynamics, trauma-informed services, etc.
- Program staff present at student orientation and other activities, in classes, at faculty meetings, etc.
- Campus personnel shadow advocates or attend advocate meetings (being mindful of varying confidentiality practices)
- Program staff participate on campus behavioral integration team (BIT) or sexual assault response team (SART) (again, planning for boundaries regarding information sharing)
- Shelter tours and other ways for campus staff to become familiar with services
- Campus staff present during advocacy training (perhaps on student experiences of sexual and dating violence)
- Partner on prevention initiatives

---

80. “Common Ways Schools Violate Survivors’ Rights,” Know Your IX.
Though partnership is a process, and sometimes history, philosophy and approach can be barriers, programs and campuses that cultivate an attitude of ongoing learning and are willing to return to the collaboration can make a significant difference in student survivor experiences and campus safety overall.
8. Resources

Getting involved

If you’d like to get involved with OCADSV, please visit our website where you can find more information about our member programs, projects, resources, webinars, training opportunities (including new campus-related trainings) and more. We coordinate several time-limited workgroups and ongoing task forces, including the Communities of Color Task Force (focused on the impacts of race and racism in domestic and sexual violence response across Oregon), and many of these are open to public/community membership.

If you are seeking additional opportunities to get involved, please visit the website of our sister organization, Oregon Sexual Assault Task Force. SATF is coordinated through several subcommittees, including the Campus Committee and the Victim Response Committee; visitors are often welcome at committee meetings. The SATF offers some campus-specific training and systems advocacy, as well as a wealth of information available via their website.

Training and technical assistance

Several government offices provide campus officials with ongoing information, training, and technical assistance regarding compliance and best practice. Some of these are:

Oregon Department of Education, Office on Civil Rights

US Department of Justice, Center for Campus Safety
  • Training for campus officials

US Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women
  • Online technical assistance for campus officials

Federal Department of Education, National Center on Safe and Supportive Learning Environments
  • Trauma-informed training for campus health center staff

84 “Responding to Campus Sexual Assault,” US Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women, accessed 11 September 2015.
Recommended reading

Listed in alphabetical order; items marked with ** are especially useful:

• Aphrodite Wounded: Support for Women Sexually Assaulted by Male Partners, Educational Resources for Professionals

• ARC3 Campus Climate Survey by the Administrative Research Campus Climate Consortium**

• Apps for Teens and College Students by TechSafety.org

• Campus Reporting Options by the Oregon Sexual Assault Task Force**

• Creating Change Together: A Guide for Rape Crisis Centers Partnering with Colleges & Universities by the Ohio Alliance to End Sexual Violence

• Dear Colleague Letter from US Department of Education**

• Ending Campus Sexual Assault Toolkit by the American Association of University Women

• Guidance for Creating College and University Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, Stalking, and Sexual Violence Prevention and Intervention Programs and Policies for Students by the North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence

• How Should Colleges and Universities Respond to Peer Sexual Violence on Campus? What the Current Legal Environment Tells Us by Georgetown University Law Center

• Intimate Partner Sexual Violence: A Train-the-Trainer Curriculum by Washington Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs**

• Know Your IX website**

• Marital and Intimate Partner Sexual Assault by Stop Violence Against Women: A Project of The Advocates for Human Rights

• Notalone.gov website (includes examples of OCR agreements and resolution letters, and research on best prevention programs, etc.)**
• Not Alone: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault**

• Questions and Answers on Title IX and Sexual Assault by United States Department of Education from the Federal Office for Civil Rights**

• Rape and Sexual Victimization Among College-Age Females, 1995-2013 by US Department of Justice

• Report of the University of Oregon President’s Review Panel