

The Culture of Respect CORE Blueprint Program

Findings from a **National Pilot Study**

Allison Tombros Korman and
Sarice Greenstein



**Culture
of Respect**
Ending Campus
Sexual Violence
A NASPA Initiative

Acknowledgments

The CORE Blueprint Pilot Program is a keystone Culture of Respect project, one which tested a foundational organizational belief: the critical importance of engaging all campus stakeholders in a comprehensive, coordinated framework to help end campus sexual violence. Culture of Respect would sincerely like to thank the following for their contributions to making this pilot a success:

- the 14 trailblazing participating institutions, who are truly committed to fostering a Culture of Respect;
- Jennifer Panagopoulos for her tremendous insights, guidance, and hard work;
- NASPA staff members Melissa Dahne, Jessica Hopp, Kevin Kruger, Amelia Parnell, and Alexis Wesaw for their contributions and guidance;
- Culture of Respect cofounders Sandi Haber Fifield and John Fifield; and
- the Culture of Respect Advisory Board.

Copyright © 2016 by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, now known or hereafter invented, including electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, information storage and retrieval, or otherwise, except as permitted under Section 107 and 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without the prior written permission of NASPA.

NASPA does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, age, gender identity, gender expression, affectional or sexual orientation, or disability in any of its policies, programs, and services.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sexual violence on college and university campuses in the United States occurs at a rate that is both alarming and unacceptable. Stemming the tide of this violence requires a sustained nationwide effort. To address this problem, Culture of Respect launched a yearlong, 14-institution pilot program grounded in the Culture of Respect Engagement Blueprint (CORE Blueprint), a six-pillar evidence-based framework that guides institutions in how to respond to and prevent campus sexual violence. The CORE Blueprint Program is unique in that it supports institutions of higher education in implementing a coordinated, comprehensive, multistakeholder approach that aims to shift campus culture toward one that is free from sexual violence. The program was designed to build participants' capacity to make meaningful changes to campus policies and services, while engaging campus stakeholders in an ongoing process of feedback and reflection.

The results of the program evaluation demonstrated that participating pilot institutions successfully implemented targeted policy and programmatic changes. The use of a multistakeholder team was critical to their success; each institution set objectives based on the CORE Blueprint's recommended practices and worked across institutional divisions to achieve them. Pilot institutions made especially notable strides in enhancing support services for survivors and improving efforts to provide multitiered education to students, faculty, and staff. The results of the CORE Blueprint Pilot Program suggest it is an effective model for addressing campus sexual violence that can be adopted by diverse institutions of higher education across the nation.

The CORE Blueprint Program is unique in that it supports institutions of higher education in implementing a coordinated, comprehensive, multistakeholder approach that aims to shift campus culture toward one that is free from sexual violence.

INTRODUCTION

Sexual violence in colleges and universities is a devastating problem from which no campus is immune: 1 in 5 female and 1 in 16 male students spend their college years reeling from the physical, emotional, and psychological trauma that follows a sexual assault (Cantor et al., 2015; Krebs, Lindquist, Berzofsky, Shook-Sa, & Peterson, 2016; Washington Post–Kaiser Family Foundation, 2015). For students who experience sexual violence, the goals of the higher education experience—unleashed potential, self-determination, and unfettered societal contribution—can be thwarted by this trauma. Thus, sexual violence prevents institutions of higher education (IHEs) from realizing their mission and may derail students from reaching their academic, professional, and personal goals.

In recent years, there has been a growing spotlight on sexual violence on U.S. college and university campuses. This has resulted in responses that are well-intentioned but too frequently siloed: state and federal legislative action, increased public dialogue, a surge of advocacy for survivors' rights, and the development of myriad prevention programs for college students. Meanwhile, IHEs are struggling to remain compliant with federal regulations (Richards, 2016). Few resources exist to support administrators and other campus stakeholders who are responsible for the challenging work of envisioning and implementing a coordinated response and prevention strategy. Culture of Respect is committed to filling that gap by supporting IHEs in providing evidence-based and actionable solutions to the problem of campus sexual violence.

Parents of college-aged students, who were alarmed by the high rate of sexual assault on college campuses, founded Culture of Respect in 2013. With a team of public health and violence prevention researchers from New York University and Columbia University and experts in advocacy, student affairs, higher education policy, and law, they created the Culture of Respect Engagement Blueprint (CORE Blueprint), a six-pillar strategic road map that engages students, parents, faculty, administrators, health professionals, athletes,

and other campus stakeholders in implementing the leading practices to shift campus culture to one that is free from sexual violence. Understanding that each campus maintains a diverse student population and unique infrastructure, systems, and traditions, a “one-size-fits-all” approach to campus sexual violence cannot be the answer. The CORE Blueprint is prescriptive in its broad strategy while being flexible in specific implementation, and its distinctive combination of approaches can be tailored to fit the specific needs and diversity of particular IHEs.

This report presents the results of the 1-year pilot program implemented with 14 IHEs, including its process, benefits, challenges, and lessons learned, which will be applied to improve future program implementation. These findings also offer the field of higher education a model of “what’s working” to address sexual violence. At a time when there is much to learn about effective campus strategies, the results of the pilot suggest the CORE Blueprint Program model is effective in working with IHEs to address this pervasive problem.

BACKGROUND

The CORE Blueprint Pilot Program commenced in May 2015, guiding campus stakeholders in creating and implementing a plan for change based on the CORE Blueprint and its accompanying assessment, the CORE Evaluation. The CORE Evaluation is a detailed survey that allows administrators to benchmark their institution's efforts in meeting CORE Blueprint standards.

Participating Institutions

After the organization's launch, more than 150 IHEs engaged with Culture of Respect and the CORE Blueprint; Culture of Respect invited these institutions to enroll in the pilot. During the recruitment phase, Culture of Respect actively searched for a diverse set of IHEs, in order to test the belief that the CORE Blueprint could be effective for any type of institution. The 14 institutions enrolled in the pilot ranged in size

from small (fewer than 1,000 students) to very large (42,000+ students) and in population served: three Hispanic-serving institutions, one Asian American-/Native American-/Pacific Islander-serving institution, two religious institutions, one women's college, and one institution serving deaf and hard-of-hearing students. There were a total of five private and nine public IHEs (see Table 1 for a complete list).

Table 1. Participating Pilot Institutions

California Polytechnic State University <i>San Luis Obispo, CA</i>	Sacred Heart University <i>Fairfield, CT</i>
California State University, San Bernardino <i>San Bernardino, CA</i>	Scripps College <i>Claremont, CA</i>
California State University, Northridge <i>Los Angeles, CA</i>	The College of New Jersey <i>Ewing Township, NJ</i>
Ferrum College <i>Ferrum, VA</i>	The State University of New York at New Paltz <i>New Paltz, NY</i>
Framingham State University <i>Framingham, MA</i>	The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley <i>Rio Grande Valley, TX</i>
Menlo College <i>Atherton, CA</i>	University of Northern Iowa <i>Cedar Falls, IA</i>
Pomona College <i>Claremont, CA</i>	University of Wisconsin-Madison <i>Madison, WI</i>

Program Goals and Design

The participating IHEs (“pilot participants”) assigned at least one project lead (the Title IX coordinator in nearly half the institutions) to manage the programmatic effort on the institution’s behalf. Culture of Respect Executive Director Allison Tombros Korman led the program with support from Project Coordinator Sarice Greenstein. The report presents program components around three overarching goals:

1. *Support IHEs in adopting a **multistakeholder approach** to address campus sexual violence.*

→ **Campus Leadership Team (CLT).**

Culture of Respect asked each participating IHE to establish a CLT that included (at minimum) the Title IX coordinator as well as representatives from the administration, faculty, and the student body. Culture of Respect encouraged additional stakeholders to


participate and provided a tool to help participants think holistically about identifying relevant stakeholders. Culture of Respect expected the CLTs to meet regularly throughout the year.

2. *Facilitate the use of an **innovative six-pillar framework** (see Figure 1) using the latest public health research, expert guidance, and promising and emerging practices.*

→ **CORE Blueprint.** This resource was the basis for all participants’ efforts to address sexual violence.

→ **CORE Evaluation.** The CORE Evaluation is a survey of more than 100 questions that spans all six pillars. CLTs completed the CORE Evaluation at the start of the program period. This assessment had a dual purpose to (a) help campus stakeholders identify gaps in their sexual violence prevention and response efforts, and (b) provide a baseline in order to

Figure 1. The CORE Blueprint Six-Pillar Framework



benchmark each institution's policy and programming improvements throughout the year. At the conclusion of the pilot year, the CLTs reconvened to administer the CORE Evaluation as an endpoint assessment.

→ **Individual Implementation Plan (IIP).** With support from Culture of Respect staff ("program staff"), each CLT analyzed the CORE Evaluation baseline results. The results informed the development of each CLT's IIP, a detailed, goal-driven action plan that aligns with the six pillars of the CORE Blueprint.

3. Provide **professional development** for campus stakeholders, preparing them to make actionable changes across all six pillars.

→ **Webinars.** Culture of Respect offered webinars throughout the year to support participants' professional development in key areas.

→ **Peer-led learning and discussion.** Culture of Respect provided participants with access to a listserv of the project leads to facilitate information sharing and relationship building across the group.

→ **Technical assistance.** Program staff provided web-based kickoff meetings, debriefings, referrals to key resources, and additional support both off- and on-site.

Evaluation Design

To maximize learning from the pilot, Culture of Respect engaged Jennifer Panagopoulos, president of Xero Associates, who has more than 25 years of experience conducting social science research and a specialty in campus sexual assault. She advised on the development of a program logic model that guided program implementation and the subsequent evaluation design. Program staff worked with Panagopoulos to design data collection tools that assessed the extent to which pilot participants implemented each program component as intended, and the degree to which each component met the needs of pilot participants (see Table 2). Program staff used the CORE Evaluation as the main measure of institutional outcomes. Each item contained a 4-point scale that asked participants to report to what extent the recommendation was part of institutional policy and the degree to which they fully implemented each policy. Program staff also administered a brief end-of-year survey to verify outcomes as reported via the CORE Evaluation and assess satisfaction. Pilot participants reported their institution's successes using a revised IIP form converted into a collaborative Google Sheets format. Program staff collected the data and worked in conjunction with Panagopoulos to analyze and interpret the process and outcomes data.

Table 2. Program Evaluation Design

Goal	Component	Data Source(s)	What Was Measured
Support a multistakeholder approach	Campus Leadership Team (CLT)	Stakeholder worksheet	Number of members, diversity of campus participation
		End-of-year survey	Frequency of meetings, CLT effectiveness
Innovative six-pillar framework	Individualized Implementation Plans (IIPs)	IIP submissions, revised IIP submissions	Policy changes and programmatic improvements
	CORE Evaluation	Baseline and endpoint for each institution	Policy changes and programmatic improvements calculated with gain-score analysis
Provide professional development	Kickoff meeting	Program records	Attendance, satisfaction, usefulness
	Webinars	Program records	Number of webinars offered, attendance, topic areas covered
		End-of-year survey, postwebinar surveys	Satisfaction, usefulness
	Peer-led learning	E-mails sent using internal listserv, end-of-year survey	Satisfaction, participation
	Staff support	End-of-year survey	Satisfaction

Data Management and Analysis

At the end of the program period, Panagopoulos analyzed the data and compiled a detailed report. Program records included IIP forms, webinar attendance data, and CLT worksheets. Program staff collected survey data, including the end-of-year survey and the CORE Evaluation, online via Survey Monkey and analyzed it using Microsoft Excel as well as Survey Monkey. The results of the end-of-year survey are reported raw and contain a complete data set from all 14 institutions. Program staff analyzed the qualitative data reported through IIPs using a basic data display tool that organized objectives around the six pillars; they analyzed data only for those institutions that submitted revised forms ($n = 9$). Panagopoulos calculated a percentage change score for each question on the CORE Evaluation, dividing the difference between baseline and endpoint averages by the baseline average. Items with greater than 20% change

are reported in Tables 3, 4, and 5. Closely related items were reported together using an average percent change. Topic areas that showed little or no positive change are reviewed in the results section. Because of the sample size of the complete data set, Panagopoulos did not test change scores for significance. Culture of Respect staff extracted highlights from Panagopoulos' data analysis into this report.

RESULTS

Process Results

This section addresses each component of the pilot program (as outlined in Table 2), with a focus on (a) the extent to which participating institutions implemented each component as intended and (b) participants' experiences with each component. Culture of Respect will use these results to inform and improve the next implementation of the CORE Blueprint Program.

Multistakeholder Approach

All 14 participating institutions successfully formed a team of stakeholders to manage and inform their sexual violence response efforts. Twelve of those institutions met the requirements of including an administrator, faculty member, student, and Title IX coordinator on their CLTs. The CLTs included a diverse mix of additional campus stakeholders, including representatives from campus security; student conduct; sexual assault programs offices; women's, LGBTQ (lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning), or other student interest groups; residential life; Greek life; athletics; and health and wellness centers. Notably, this was the first cross-disciplinary group of this nature for five of the institutions. Although two institutions reported that their CLTs met every week, six reported that they met less than every other month. Participants reported that the biggest success of their CLTs was the ability to collaborate across departments and increase members' understanding of the challenges of campus sexual violence response; by using CLTs, the institutions were able to advance strategies for sexual violence response.

Innovative Six-Pillar Framework

All pilot institutions completed the baseline CORE Evaluation, and 12 also repeated it at the endpoint. The two institutions that did not repeat the evaluation were unable to gather their CLT members together for its administration. Twelve participants said the evaluation was either "extremely" or "moderately" useful. This highlights the CORE Evaluation as central to the program, not only as an assessment tool, but as a component that allows campus stakeholders to see the gaps in their current approach and identify how to make improvements.

Twelve institutions submitted IIPs between October 2015 and March 2016, with the majority submitting plans in fall 2015. The two institutions that did not submit plans reported staffing challenges as the main reason for lack of participation. CLTs composed IIPs as a series of objectives across the six pillars, based on CORE Evaluation results (number of objectives ranged from 9 to 33, with a mean of 18). Half of the submitted IIPs contained at least two objectives in each pillar, a guideline set by program staff to ensure the institutions addressed each pillar. Once program staff received all the IIPs, they provided to each

"The CORE Evaluation truly gave our institution the direction we needed to accomplish our goals. In addition, working with the Culture of Respect team has been great as they provided a concrete Blueprint and constant support to our college through the process."

—Pilot Participant

institution a report that summarized the entire cohort of IIPs and provided feedback on the institution's individual IIP. In response to weaknesses identified by the participants in the format of the IIP form, program staff provided a revised version of the form that allowed for participants to report back on progress in each objective. Of the 12 institutions that originally created IIPs, nine submitted an updated version using the revised form. Seven institutions identified either the original or revised version of the IIP form as the most useful tool offered by Culture of Respect.

“The pilot program prompted our institution to evaluate and re-evaluate our campuswide efforts within an actionable framework that on the one hand provided us with some validation that we were going in the right direction, and at the same time helped us identify gaps which were preventing us still from achieving meaningful culture change.”

—Pilot Participant

Professional Development

Culture of Respect offered five webinars throughout the year that focused on the following topics: Office for Civil Rights guidance on Title IX compliance, understanding the Clery Act, engaging men on campus, addressing dating violence, and meeting the needs of students with disabilities. Participants provided positive feedback about these learning opportunities, stating that they acquired new knowledge ($n = 11$), and the vast majority ($n = 14$) indicated that in the future, skills-based trainings would be “extremely valuable.” To facilitate peer-led learning, Culture of Respect created a listserv where participants could ask questions of their colleagues; it resulted in five unique discussions related to topics such as engaging students as advocates and maximizing program efficiency with limited campus-based staffing. However, peer-led learning was one of the least utilized aspects of the program: 11 respondents indicated that they never used this feature. Despite the low usage of these components, 11 participants indicated that more opportunities to collaborate with peers would be extremely helpful.

Technical assistance activities conducted by program staff throughout the year included a series of kickoff meetings, midpoint check-in calls, feedback provided on IIPs, two site visits and in-person meetings with contacts from five institutions, and other ad hoc support via e-mail and phone calls. Participants were highly satisfied with support from program staff; many identified it as the greatest benefit of the program. One participant described Culture of Respect staff as “genuinely committed to helping institutions improve practices.”

Outcomes Results

Culture of Respect used three data sources to evaluate participating institutions' progress in the program: (a) percentage change calculations for CORE Evaluation questions; (b) self-reported improvements via an end-of-year survey; and (c) completion of objectives, as reported in revised IIPs. It is important to note that not all three data points are available for all participating institutions. All participating institutions completed the end-of-year survey, 12 administered the endpoint CORE Evaluation, and nine submitted a revised IIP form; constraints in time and staff capacity, particularly at the end of the academic year, hindered the remaining institutions in completing the revised IIPs and endpoint CORE Evaluation. Despite these missing data points, the multiple sources provide a robust picture of the program's biggest successes and challenges. The report presents the outcomes below, organized around the six pillars of the CORE Blueprint.

PILLAR 1 Survivor Support. Pilot institutions demonstrated the most success under this pillar, as shown by fruitful efforts to change policy, improve and expand services, and launch new initiatives. Ten institutions indicated that they improved the training for those who support survivors, eight said they increased access to both survivor advocates and mental health providers, and five improved accommodation options;¹ the CORE Evaluation results mirror these improvements (see Table 3). The CORE Evaluation items related to facilitating reporting showed little improvement above baseline, though program staff noted improvements in IIP data: Four institutions indicated they were able to expand reporting options for survivors. One inventive strategy by a pilot institution was to create a diagram of the reporting process, ensuring its ease of use for students.

PILLAR 2 Clear Policies. According to the end-of-year survey, institutions were most likely to have made policy changes for investigations ($n = 8$), followed by adjudications ($n = 5$) and sanctions ($n = 2$). Despite this progress, reports from participants confirmed that policy changes were a significant challenge due to bureaucratic delays. Although gains in sanctions protocols were modest (see Table 3), the percentage change for expulsion in cases of violent sexual assault, rape, or repeated sexual assaults was 19%, just shy of the 20% change threshold; this demonstrates notable positive movement. Another promising practice identified by program staff in the IIPs was an effort to provide robust training for judicial panels, including best practices in trauma-informed questioning.

¹ Accommodations are services provided to survivors to support their continued enrollment in school and their recovery from the trauma of the violence they experienced. Examples of accommodations provided to survivors include extensions for class exams and assignments, partial or full tuition reimbursement, and change of housing.

Table 3. CORE Evaluation Results: Pillars 1 and 2

Pillar	Topic	CORE Evaluation Item	Percentage Change
Survivor Support	Accommodations	Option of distance learning offered to survivors	38
		Course instructors required to provide survivors with extensions, as needed	21
	Services	Providing access to immediate medical and mental health care	20*
		Providing access to long-term medical and mental health care	63*
		Those qualified to assist survivors are trained to provide support in a culturally sensitive manner	64
		A 24/7 hotline is provided to survivors, or institution plans to implement a 24/7 hotline	49*
Clear Policies	Investigations	Investigators have prior experience working with survivors	53
		Investigators have demonstrated understanding of how to assess credibility	20
		Investigators have demonstrated understanding of the prevalence and dynamics of sexual assault in same-sex relationships	43
		Investigations policy includes a description of the information management system used to ensure confidentiality obligations	67
	Adjudications	Policy allows one level of appeal for both parties	36
		A qualified advocate is provided to both parties	30
		Any appeal of the process or the imposed sanction involves both the complainant and the respondent	41
	Sanctions	Students who are expelled or suspended have the sanction noted on their transcript	26

Note. The items with the highest percentage change in each pillar are highlighted.

* Indicates a composite score of closely related questions.

PILLAR 3 Multitiered Education. Providing training for campus faculty and staff was a significant focus for the pilot cohort; the CORE Evaluation indicated gains in providing training for campus staff at the time of hire and once per year, as well as for athletic staff and campus police. Reports from revised IIPs confirmed

these results. Though institutions reported more additional programming provided for student leaders and athletes (see Table 4), there were minimal gains in two important areas: requiring educational programming twice per academic year and engaging members of fraternities and sororities.

Table 4. CORE Evaluation Results: Pillar 3

Pillar	Topic	CORE Evaluation Item	Percentage Change
Multitiered Education	Students	Mandatory programs for students include content about gender stereotypes	21
		Mandatory programs for students include content about issues of intersectionality	50
		Prevention education programming is required for student leaders	75
		Prevention education programming is required for student athletes	27
	Faculty and Staff	Faculty and staff are trained in sexual assault awareness, empathy building, and response strategies <i>when they are first hired</i>	67
		Faculty and staff are trained in sexual assault awareness, empathy building, and response strategies <i>at least once per academic year</i>	25
		Faculty and staff are trained in how to identify the warning signs of a student who has been sexually assaulted	91
		Athletic staff are trained on dispelling rape myths, bystander intervention, survivor support, and recognizing the signs of assault	57*
		Campus police and security receive mandatory training on responding to incidents of sexual assault, recognizing post-traumatic stress, and using a trauma-informed approach	55*

Note. The items with the highest percentage change in each pillar are highlighted.
 * Indicates a composite score of closely related questions.




Table 5. CORE Evaluation Results: Pillars 4, 5, and 6

Pillar	CORE Evaluation Item	Percentage Change
Public Disclosure	The institution publicizes sexual assault data beyond Clery Act requirements	60
	The institution provides clear and concise information to parents about sexual assault	34
	Communications from the institution to campus stakeholders include the publication of data and findings on investigations	116
Schoolwide Mobilization	The administration provides resources to student organizations	41
	The administration maintains a strong collaborative relationship with student organizations	50
	The administration maintains a system that allows student groups and individual students to submit comments, critiques, and new ideas regarding institutional policies	58
	Administrators seek the counsel and input of relevant community and student organizations when developing institutional policies	32
Ongoing Self-Assessment	The institution regularly administers campus climate surveys on sexual assault	40

Note. The items with the highest percentage change in each pillar are highlighted.

PILLAR 4 Public Disclosure. Participants reported an increase in communication with campus stakeholders for several topic areas: survivor support resources ($n = 10$), information about participation in the pilot program ($n = 9$), policy changes ($n = 8$), and campus sexual assault data ($n = 6$). The three items that showed a large percentage change in the CORE Evaluation (see Table 4) support these findings. Campuses also found creative ways to communicate this information: One institution incorporated data from its campus climate survey into the institution’s annual report. Another launched a strategic communications campaign around campus sexual violence.

PILLAR 5 Schoolwide Mobilization. Participants reported marked efforts to engage with student groups on campus by providing nonmonetary support ($n = 9$), increasing student group involvement in decision making around policy and services ($n = 7$), and cosponsoring events ($n = 7$). Only two institutions increased their funding of these student groups. Promising examples of collaboration include a poster campaign codeveloped by an administration and student group representatives, and the establishment of a sexual violence prevention subcommittee to increase responsiveness to students who are deaf and hard of hearing.

PILLAR 6 Ongoing Self-Assessment. Pilot institutions’ participation in the CORE Blueprint Program is a testament to their commitment to this pillar: The program requires ongoing reflection and assessment. There were other ways that institutions engaged in self-assessment beyond program requirements: All IHEs either completed a campus climate survey during the past academic year or plan to complete one in the subsequent year (see Table 5). Some participants reported additional self-assessment strategies, such as an annual review of all Title IX cases to improve service delivery, or focus groups to receive feedback from students.

DISCUSSION

These results indicate that the CORE Blueprint Pilot Program successfully helped IHEs make targeted changes to campus sexual violence policy, programming, and services. Culture of Respect offered the program at a moment in U.S history when despite public support, federal laws, and public health research all calling for campuses to take action, IHEs needed to do more to reduce sexual violence on campus. For example, a 2014 survey of 4-year institutions indicated that only 41% reported having conducted a sexual assault investigation in the previous 5 years (McCaskill, 2014). Two years later, a nationally representative survey of IHEs demonstrated that 33% still did not have a Title IX coordinator in place, a basic requirement outlined by the Office for Civil Rights (Richards, 2016). In light of such national data, the progress made by the pilot institutions is truly impressive: This report demonstrates that as a cohort, participating institutions accomplished meaningful changes across all six pillars. Progress was particularly remarkable in enhancing support services for survivors and providing training for campus employees. It is noteworthy that the significant gains in the Survivor Support pillar correspond to its emphasis in the CORE Blueprint, as well as a growing national spotlight on the experiences of survivors, particularly those who felt unsupported by their IHEs when they reported sexual violence on campus.

Examples of innovative practices implemented by pilot institutions:

- Faculty wallet card containing sexual violence information and resources
- Template for faculty to include sexual violence information in e-mail signature
- Subcommittee to respond to needs of students who are deaf and hard of hearing
- Concise diagram outlining the reporting process
- QR code to access online reporting form


The areas where institutions struggled to make progress provide valuable insight for the field. For example, despite the CORE Blueprint's emphasis on ongoing mandatory education for students, only two institutions were able to require programming twice per academic year. This speaks to the continued gap between the public's growing interest in making dedicated efforts at prevention, and the administrative, logistical, and political challenges of implementing such efforts at the institutional level. Another notable theme that emerged is that institutions were more likely

to succeed at achieving objectives that could be implemented without systemwide policy changes. Participants' reports that administrators were hesitant to codify procedures into policy, especially when it meant decreasing institutional flexibility, confirms this finding. Because bureaucratic delays are an expected challenge of working in higher education, Culture of Respect can help address this through expanding program length to allow sufficient time for policy changes to be negotiated and finalized.

Given the achievements of pilot institutions despite a difficult climate, it is important to examine the characteristics of the program design and implementation that led to its success.

- **Theory-driven.** The CORE Blueprint aligns fully with the social-ecological model (SEM; see Figure 2), encouraging participants to see how violence is sustained and how to take action at each level (Bronfenbrenner, 2005). Because the program engages participants at all levels of the SEM, it is an innovative way to bridge the gap between theory and practice.
- **Grounded in evidence-based practices.** Research about campus sexual violence is underway across the country, but there is much more to be learned. The CORE Blueprint relies on evidence-based approaches where there is research to support them, expert guidance, and promising and emerging practices where the evidence base is still developing.
- **Engages campus stakeholders and holds them accountable.** The CORE Blueprint Program requires involvement from an array of stakeholders, and the structure the program provides holds the CLT, including administrators, accountable to the objectives and deadlines set. A particular strength of this approach is that Culture of Respect is committed to working alongside administrators without using intimidation or blame. High satisfaction rates from participants confirm the success of this method (see Table 6).
- **Facilitates institutional buy-in and support.** Signing on to the pilot program required approval from an upper-level administrator; this reinforced the political and financial support for implementation from across the institution. This approach appeared to be successful,

Figure 2. The Social-Ecological Model



Note. Adapted from “The Social-Ecological Model: A Framework for Prevention,” by Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2015 (<http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/overview/social-ecologicalmodel.html>). In the public domain.

Table 6. Satisfaction and Expectations

To what extent did Culture of Respect meet your expectations?	Exceeded	Exactly Met	Partially Met
	3	8	3
How satisfied are you with the pilot program?	Very Satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied
	6	8	0
Would you recommend the program to a colleague?	Yes		No
	13		1

as 10 participants said they received sufficient support from campus leadership for program implementation; only two participants noted that insufficient financial or political support was a considerable challenge. This allowed participants to successfully advocate for campus-based staffing increases in the Title IX office and the formalizing of protocol.

Opportunities for Improvement

Program staff and participants provided detailed feedback around four core areas that Culture of Respect will use to improve future implementations of the program.

- **Refine program tools.** Despite the utility of the program’s main suite of tools (CORE Blueprint, CORE Evaluation, IIP form), there are necessary revisions to be made. The CORE Evaluation in particular was a challenge due to concerns about its ease of use, reliability, and validity. Culture of Respect will revise all three tools in the suite based on participant and program staff feedback as well as integration of the latest expert-recommended practices.
- **Enhance opportunities for peer-led learning.** Connecting with and learning from colleagues is a key component of the CORE Blueprint Program. The low usage of the intracolleague listserv indicates a gap in program implementation. For future implementation of the program, Culture of Respect will increase the number of peer-led learning opportunities and raise their visibility as a key element of the program.
- **Anticipate staffing and operational challenges.** A majority of participants identified “insufficient campus-based staff time” as a challenge. Unexpected organizational changes impacted program participation as well as the expected challenges that Title IX coordinators face in balancing administrative duties with responding promptly to student needs. This feedback, in combination with the low participation in the peer-led learning component, points to a campus-based staffing capacity challenge. In the next program cycle, program staff will issue guidelines for anticipated time required so participants can plan for campus-based staffing accordingly. Culture of Respect will also strongly suggest establishing two to three main points of contact to diffuse responsibility and ensure continuity if there is turnover.

- **Extend program length.** Many of the recommendations in the CORE Blueprint include systemic, institutionwide changes that are challenging to implement within the 1-year program period. Many institutions indicated they wished they could have executed their IIPs over a longer time period—10 institutions said it would be “extremely valuable.” In response, Culture of Respect will expand the next program cycle to 24 months to allow ample time for implementation and wide-scale change.

Limitations

Several elements limit the strength of these evaluation results. First, because of the nature of the evaluation design, this report cannot determine to what extent other factors influenced institutions’ success. Second, reliability and validity limitations of the CORE Evaluation minimize the strength of the outcome results. In the future, more robust evaluation efforts will address each of these limitations: A larger sample size and more complex evaluation design will allow Culture of Respect to report factors that influence institutional success, and a revised version of the CORE Evaluation will improve the accuracy and depth of outcome results. Finally, the outcome results are limited in scope because they rely solely on self-report, which potentially impacts reliability, and because a more rigorous evaluation design is required to examine the program’s greater health impact (i.e., incidence of sexual violence on campus).

Conclusion

The impressive results of this pilot study offer a comprehensive, effective approach to addressing campus sexual violence that Culture of Respect can expand to IHEs across the country. After decades of inaction, the national climate is ripe for enacting meaningful changes on college campuses that can impact millions of students. Successes on the campus level can and should help guide a national response that supports all survivors and works to prevent sexual violence by shifting the culture in our social, political, and educational institutions.

NEXT STEPS

After completing the pilot program, Culture of Respect is applying the successes, challenges, and lessons learned to the next phase of programming. Program staff altered the program model not only by integrating constructive feedback from pilot participants, but also by considering how to scale up the program model to meet the demand in the field.

In 2017, Culture of Respect will offer the CORE Blueprint Program through a user-friendly online platform that allows for enhanced communication with participants and integrates the skills-based training pilot participants identified as a need. New programmatic efforts include the following:

Revised and updated CORE Blueprint and CORE Evaluation. Culture of Respect has updated and expanded the CORE Blueprint to reflect new and emerging evidence, federal guidance, and new tools and resources it has developed since the inaugural publication in 2014. Feedback from the pilot informed a revised CORE Evaluation that more precisely measures an institution's efforts, is more reliable, and is easier to administer.

Culture of Respect Collective. This is a new and improved version of the CORE Blueprint Program, translated into an online format and thoughtfully scaled up to reach a larger group of IHEs.

CORE Constructs. A suite of guides organized around the six pillars of the CORE Blueprint to supplement its implementation. These guides include downloadable resources, tools, and templates that can be adapted to meet specific institutional needs.

For more information about accessing these tools, please visit the [Culture of Respect website](#).

REFERENCES

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). Ecological models of human development. In M. Gauvain & M. Cole (Eds), *Readings on the development of children* (4th ed., pp. 3–8). New York, NY: Worth.
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). *Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct*. Retrieved from https://www.aau.edu/uploadedFiles/AAU_Publications/AAU_Reports/Sexual_Assault_Campus_Survey/AAU_Campus_Climate_Survey_12_14_15.pdf
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2015). The social-ecological model: A framework for prevention. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/overview/social-ecologicalmodel.html>
- Krebs, C., Lindquist, C., Berzofsky, M., Shook-Sa, B., & Peterson, K. (2016). *Campus climate survey validation study final technical report* (Bureau of Justice Statistics Research and Development Series). Retrieved from <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ccsvsfr.pdf>
- McCaskill, C. (2014). *Sexual violence on campus: How too many institutions of higher education are failing to protect students*. Retrieved from <https://www.mccaskill.senate.gov/SurveyReportwithAppendix.pdf>
- Richards, T. N. (2016). An updated review of institutions of higher education's responses to sexual assault: Results from a nationally representative sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1177/0886260516658757
- Washington Post–Kaiser Family Foundation. (2015, June 12). *Survey of college students on sexual assault*. Retrieved from <http://apps.washingtonpost.com/g/page/national/washington-post-kaiser-family-foundation-survey-of-college-students-on-sexual-assault/1726>

111 K Street NE, 10th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20002
Phone: (202) 265-7500
Web: nasma.org
cultureofrespect.org



**Culture
of Respect**
Ending Campus
Sexual Violence
A NASPA Initiative