2017

Faculty Knowledge and Readiness in Reporting Student Victimization Disclosure and Title IX Compliance

Abigail Malick
University of Central Florida

University of Central Florida

STARS
Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

FACULTY KNOWLEDGE AND READINESS IN REPORTING STUDENT
VICTIMIZATION DISCLOSURE AND TITLE IX COMPLIANCE

by

ABIGAIL M MALICK
B.A. University of Central Florida 2010
M.A. University of Central Florida 2012

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Sociology
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
2017

Major Professor: Jana L. Jasinski

ABSTRACT

The U.S. Department of Education and Title IX Educational Act of 1972 shaped the way institutions of higher education address and prevent student victimizations. The law originally sought to eliminate sex-based discrimination in education but has evolved to include sexual misconduct. Since the Dear Colleague Letter of 2011, the position of institutions has changed significantly in the way they address student victimization as it relates to dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking (Rosenthal, 2017). One requirement is that institutions inform and train Responsible Employees to report when a student discloses experiencing sexual misconduct, including dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty members' knowledge of the Title IX Responsible Employee mandate, their experience with reporting student disclosures, and additional resources needed to aid faculty members with this reporting duty. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with 34 faculty members at a large research-intensive four-year university in the Southeastern United States.

The main findings relate to Responsible Employee trainings, reporting guidelines, issues that might arise for faculty during the disclosure/reporting process, and recommendations to thoughtfully and strategically engage faculty. Universities and colleges that include faculty members as Responsible Employees need to ensure that their institution is fulfilling its requirement from the U.S. Department of Education but must also do their best to prepare and support faculty so faculty can perform their reporting duties. In many cases, faculty members are

on the front line when it comes to interacting with and being in a position to help their students. They need specific measures and resources to ensure that they are able to fulfill all their various duties as faculty members, including handling a student's victimization disclosure and then reporting the incident to the Title IX Coordinator so that the university can serve its students to the best of its ability.

I dedicate this dissertation to those who work to end violence within our campuses and

communities. One day may this work not be needed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Jana Jasinski, my thesis and dissertation advisor and mentor. Without your support and guidance, I would not have been able to complete this project or the graduate program. Thank you for teaching me the value of applied work and for allowing me to grow in the field of domestic violence and violence prevention in Central Florida. To my dissertation committee members, Drs. Kathryn Branch, Liz Grauerholz, and Libby Mustaine: thank you for your patience, guidance and support throughout this process.

I need to thank my cohort and peers in the Sociology Program. To Drs. Lindsey Singer, Nicole Owens, Lauren Norman, Jenny Nguyen, and Alyssa Mullins: you have been everything to me these past years. You have allowed space for all the emotional ups and downs that comes with grad school. Thank you for your support, your love, your generosity, your company, and for the honor of calling you all lifelong friends and colleagues.

Much appreciation to my UCF colleagues and to others who have mentored me throughout my academic and professional career. To my new colleagues at OIE, Dawn Welkie, Nancy Myers, Reem Elkhaldi, Marsha Kernica, and Tonnette Harris: thank you for the opportunity to join the team and put this research to good use. To my WHPS family, Maureen Hawkins, Stephanie Spies, Pam Mills, Christine Pugh, Mari Milenkovic, Megan Chase, Lillian McMahon, Jonathan Carr, Chelsea Davis, Kayla Crawford, and Dominic Beswick: you will always be my beautiful tropic fish. Thanks for all your support along the way. Thank you to Sarah Laake, Alan Hamaoui, and Michael Freeman, I'd be lost without you.

Additionally, I thank my family. My mother, Karen Malick, who has been my champion in and out of the classroom. Thanks to my father, William Malick, for always encouraging me. To my sisters, Michelle, Christy, Debra, and Rachael: you are my strength and motivation. My brother, Jason, I miss you and love you always. To my nieces and nephews Christian, Sebastian, Samantha, Effie, Nathaniel, Gary Jr., and Sophia: may you grow up in a more loving and respectful world. And to my two girls, Robi and Mali: you are my heart and soul.

Most importantly, I would like to thank all those who participated in this research project. Thank you for your time and openness. You provided instrumental knowledge and considerations on Title IX and your responsibilities to your students.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Institutions of higher education distinguish themselves from other organizations in terms of expectations, principles, values, and core responsibilities. They are committed to "values of free inquiry, intellectual honesty, personal integrity, tolerance of diversity, and respect for human dignity" (Roark, 2014, p.5). Faculty members of these institutions are responsible for teaching and evaluating, but often they challenge, mentor, and help shape their students. College and university campuses are often considered small cities with all the components of the larger culture present, including factors such as crime and victimization (Roark, 2014). In these small cities, students experience a number of interactions and events, some of which enhance their understanding of the world while others potentially put them at risk (Van Brunt, 2012).

Although college campuses have not traditionally been known as "hot spots" for rampant violent offenses, neither are they ivory towers ensuring the safety and security to all those that inhabit their grounds (Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, & Lu, 1998). Students attending these institutions are at higher risk of experiencing certain victimizations due to their age and limited experience in living independently without supervision (Roark, 2014). The very nature and developmental stage of those aged 18-24, the traditional ages of students, may contribute to their risk of victimization (Roark, 2014). Regardless of college enrollment, young people have higher rates of victimization compared to older adult cohorts, although there are unique circumstances that students may face. Students are often away from home and parental supervision for the first time. With newfound freedom and interaction with new groups of people, they face distinct stressors.

Moreover, young students have often been untried in sexually charged environments and are without fully-formed social and personal roadmaps. Roark (1987) notes that "[students] are under peer pressure, their identities are not yet firm, their competence is not yet established, and they often have mistaken beliefs about their invincibility" (p. 368). These factors can increase students' chances of being victimized (Roark 1987). Also, given their young age and limited real world experience, students might not know if what they endured was, in fact, a crime to be reported (Roark, 2014).

In the past two decades, there have been substantial changes in institutional reporting requirements for campus victimization. Currently, all higher education institutions, both public and private, that receive federal funding under Title IV must "respond and remedy hostile educational environments" (Know Your Title IX, 2017). These institutions are responsible for keeping their respective population abreast of potential harm and incidents that have already occurred, as well as to aid victims of crime. These crimes include violent and nonviolent offenses on or near campus, credible threats of harm, and timely warnings and updates as a pattern of crime progresses (Fisher, Hartman, Cullen, & Turner, 2002; Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, & Lu, 1998; Gregory & Janosik, 2002; Gregory & Janosik, 2003).

In an effort to gather the most accurate statistics of campus victimizations, reporting regulations found in the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, Title IX of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972, and the SaVE Act have expanded the mandate to specify the college or university personnel who are required to make a

report when a student discloses victimization. Before 2012, only campus safety authorities (i.e.
campus police or security guards) were responsible for gathering information on student
victimization when a student voiced a complaint. The current legislation includes other authority
figures deemed "Responsible Employees" who must now submit a report if a student self-
discloses victimization (Department of Education, 2017). Information from these reports is used
to inform current students, faculty, staff, and parents, regardless of whether charges are brought
against the perpetrator (McNeal, 2007). According to the Association of Title IX Administration
(2017), many institutions opt to include all professors, lecturers, instructors, and adjuncts (as
well as graduate students with classroom responsibilities) as mandatory reporters. However,
institutions of education have some freedom as to how they define a Responsible Employee.

Circumstances under which students may disclose a campus victimization with a faculty
member include: being triggered by class discussion, difficulty fulfilling class requirements, or
having a limited support system. This type of disclosure can change the relationship between
faculty and student. Although the literature on student-to-faculty disclosure of campus
victimization is limited, at least one study has demonstrated that faculty have reported feeling
emotionally upset and burdened by this information, and they are unclear of their responsibility
to the student and the institution (Hayes-Smith, Richards, & Branch, 2010). Existing research,
however, does not include the impact of the recent reporting mandates. With the implementation
of this new reporting legislation, faculty members will be required to report any cases of
victimization to the institution's Title IX Coordinator. The Title IX Coordinator is charged with

reaching out to students to inform them of their rights, of services available to them, and ultimately be a part of an investigation if the student decides to move forward with the complaint (New, 2015). Noncompliance with the Clery Act and Title IX may lead to an investigation, the consequences of which can range from a fine to losing Title IV funding. Loss of federal funding would result in the institution, as well as students, being ineligible to receive funding, grants, or loans from the government. Furthermore, when a victimization is purposely not addressed or investigated, the institution loses the trust of the faculty, the student body, and their families. Loss of trust damages an institution's reputation, often resulting in further financial losses.

Investigations into noncompliance of Clery and Title IX are on the rise, resulting in loss of capital and standing for institutions, distrust of student victims, and additional stress for faculty members. To best serve and support student victims and to ensure that institutions comply with current mandates, it is essential to analyze multiple facets of this legislative evolution. This study is exploratory as it attempts to help fill the gap in research on faculty members' experience with student disclosure, as well to record viewpoints on new reporting guidelines. As mandates regarding student victimization continue to expand, it is essential to continue to study how legislation, such as the Clery Act, Title IX, and SaVE Act, impact the role of higher education institutions and their faculty in relation to the health and safety of its student body.

This timely analysis comes at the onset of regulatory changes in reporting campus victimizations. With the expansion of Title IX mandates, it is important to understand faculty

members' experiences with student disclosures, their knowledge of the new requirements, and the resources they might need in order to comply with these new responsibilities. To gauge employee knowledge of this new requirement and the support they might need to fulfill such a role, I interviewed faculty regarding their understanding of the role of a Responsible Employee, campus violence, and student victimization. I aim to explore the level of awareness faculty members currently possess, as well as the implementation of new mandates and the subsequent reporting process. Findings from this study will educate administrators responsible for implementation and enforcement of these reporting laws and assist them in ensuring compliance.

CHAPTER 2: LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Legislation dealing with student victimization and campus violence has considerably changed the relationship between institutions of higher education and the students they serve. The Clery Act, Title IX, and the SaVE Act are all intended to increase campus safety and aid student victims. To understand these laws, it is necessary to know the background of the legislation and the incidents that sparked public discourse. Over the past three decades, there have been paradigm shifts in public awareness of campus victimization and the way institutions of higher education are held responsible for administrators' handling of these incidences. The Clery Act was first passed in 1990 after the murder of a freshman in a campus dormitory. It has since been amended to expand and help clarify its requirements in the pursuit of campus crime disclosure. Likewise, Title IX, originally enacted in 1972 to advocate for gender equality and tackle sexual harassment and abuse, has been amended following the Penn State scandal in 2011 to include college or university employees as mandated reporters. With these legal expansions, it is important to understand the climate, as well as significant events that have altered both legislation and public perception, in order to effectively implement and ensure compliance of all those impacted.

The Clery Act

Before 1988 less than four percent of institutions of higher education made available their crime data to the public (McMahon, 2008). During the 1980s more media attention was paid to the issue of campus violence, with one particular story receiving a significant amount of

attention due to the brutality of the attack and the activist work of the victim's parents (Jennings, Grover, & Pudrzynska, 2007). The Clery Act was instituted after the brutal attack and murder of a young college freshman, Jeanne Ann Clery, which occurred in 1986. Clery was attending Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, when Josoph Henry, a fellow student, attacked her while she slept. Clery was beaten, raped, and strangled. Neither Jeanne nor her parents were made aware of the fact that there had been 38 violent campus crimes reported in the three years leading up to the murder (Katel, 2011). Clery's parents believed this to be a grave injustice and founded Security on Campus, a nonprofit 501c(3) dedicated to preventing violence, substance abuse, and other crimes on college and university campuses. Security on Campus also offers assistance to the victims of these crimes and lobbies for legislation to increase campus crime disclosure (Security on Campus Inc., 2014). Originally known as the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act (20 U.S.C. §1092(f)), as a part of the Higher Education Act of 1965, President Bush signed the Clery Act into law in 1990.

The Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act of 1990 (S. 580), of the Student Right-To-Know and Campus Security Act, states that "students and employees of institutions of higher education should be aware of the incidence of crime on campus and policies and procedures to prevent crime or to report occurrences of crime." In order to create uniformity in reporting procedures, data collection began on September 1, 1991. Congress mandated that institutions compile an Annual Security Report that includes (a) current campus policies regarding procedures and facilities for students and others to report criminal actions or other emergencies

7

occurring on campus and policies concerning the institution's response to such reports, (b) current policies concerning security and access to campus facilities, (c) current policies concerning campus law enforcement, (d) programs available to students and employees that describe reporting procedures, (e) prevention programs available to students and employees, (f) crime statistics, (g) a statement regarding local police agencies and off-campus crime, (h) crime statistics of victimless crimes (liquor law violations, drug abuse violations, and weapons possession), and (i) current policies on possession, use, and sale of alcoholic beverages, as well as illegal drugs.

The criminal offenses reported in the crime statistics include (a) murder, (b) rape, (c) robbery, (d) aggravated assault, (e) burglary, and (f) motor vehicle theft. The campus community most often receives this information through email communication and the Annual Security Report posted on the institution's website. The institution must also annually submit its campus crime statistics to the U.S. Department of Education, which is compiled by campus authorities using the FBI's Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook (UCR). Institutions are required to include three years' worth of campus crime statistics and security policies. In addition to creating and distributing this report, institutions must inform the campus community of threats in a timely manner. Initially, the Clery Act only required the collection of criminal offenses that were committed on campus, any building or property owned by the institution, and any building or property owned or controlled by a student organization recognized by the institution.

Title IX Legislation

Title IX is a federal law enacted in 1972 that prohibits discrimination in education programs, activities, and employment on the basis of sex. Title IX states, "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" (Department of Education, 2017). Although Title IX is perhaps best known in the context of gender equality in athletic programming, its reach is far greater. "At its core, Title IX is about balance, equity, and fundamental fairness. It is both a sword and a shield, and when implemented properly, a holistic response to sexual misconduct" (Smith & Gomez, 2013, p.1). The law applies to all forms of sexual discrimination, including sexual harassment, sexual misconduct, and sexual violence. It covers harassment and victimization committed by school employees, students, or non-employee third parties against students, faculty, or staff members (Smith & Gomez, 2013). Both Title IX and the Clery Act apply to all institutions of higher education, public and private, participating in Title IV federal student financial aid assistance program and are enforced by the U.S. Department of Education (34 CFR 668.46) (Security On Campus, Inc., 2014). The Clery Act and Title IX overlap, as both laws include violent victimizations, although the Clery Act includes more types of victimizations while Title IX guidelines deal with victimizations based on sexual discrimination and harassment.

Legislative Amendments

Since their enactments, the Clery Act and Title IX have been amended to expand certain requirements to serve more students and to assist administrators in compliance. In 1991, under the Higher Education Technical Amendment of 1991 (Public Law 101-542), the 102nd Congress changed the Clery Act's initial collection point from September 1, 1991 to August 1, 1991, and changed the crime statistic reporting from school year to calendar year format (Security On Campus, Inc., 2014). A year later, the Higher Education Amendments of 1992 (Section 486(c) of Public Law 102-325) required all institutions participating in federal student aid programs to craft a statement of policy on sexual assault. Institutions must disclose and distribute information on their campus sexual assault programs, education, notifications, and sanctions. Also, this information must include information on what steps to take once a sexual assault has occurred (Katel, 2011; Security On Campus, Inc., 2014). In 1996 the U.S. Department of Education issued a Dear Colleague Letter that addressed the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) as it relates to the reporting of crime statistics, disciplinary procedures of on-campus crimes, and filing a complaint alleging non-compliance with the Clery Act. A Dear Colleague Letter is an official correspondence that is sent by the Department of Education to provide new policy changes or to clarify existing policies.

In 1998, the law was amended again to expand reporting requirements, and the name was changed from the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act to the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Katel, 2011; Security On Campus, Inc., 2014). That same year the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 (Section 486(e) of

Public Law 105-244) expanded the crimes that an institution must include in its campus crime statistics to include manslaughter, arson, and arrest of persons referred for campus disciplinary action for liquor law violations, drug-related violations, and illegal weapons possession. Definitions of on and off campus geographic areas were also added to increase clarity. An incident is considered to have taken place on campus if it is owned or controlled by the institution, within the same reasonably contiguous geographic area, e.g. sharing a sidewalk or used to meet or support the institution's educational purposes (such as residence halls, administrative buildings, and academic buildings). Lastly, the amendment expanded the requirements to report hate crimes and added a provision for a public crime log. The crime statistics reported to the U.S. Department of Education are compiled using the Federal Bureau of Investigation's (FBI) definitions listed in the Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook (UCR), Hate Crime Data Collection Guidelines, and the UCR National Incident-Based Reporting System (NIBRS) for sex offenses. In addition, institutions are required to inform the campus community of a "significant emergency or dangerous situation involving an immediate threat to the health or safety of students or employees occurring on the campus," e.g. a bomb threat or sexual predator (Security On Campus, Inc., 2014).

In 2000, the 106th Congress added another requirement to the Clery Act via the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Section 486(e) of Public Law 105-244). This requirement mandates that institutions notify students, faculty, and staff as to where they can obtain a registry of sex offenders who are a part of the campus community (Katel, 2011;

Security On Campus, Inc., 2014). The Clery Act was not changed again until 2008. These changes followed the high-profile tragedies at Eastern Michigan University and Virginia Tech. In December 2006, Laura Dickinson was murdered in her dorm room while attending Eastern Michigan University. The police reports indicated that the investigation was regarded as a homicide, as Laura Dickinson was sexually assaulted before being strangled. However, university administrators insisted that there was no reason to suspect foul play. It was only when Orange Taylor III, also a student, was arrested that the university notified the campus that Dickinson was murdered, more than two months later. Many found it suspicious that Taylor's arrest took place one day after the deadline to withdraw and receive a full refund for classes and housing. This cover-up resulted in the termination of the university's president, vice president for student affairs, the director of public safety, and chief of police, and a fine of $350,000 for the Clery Act violations (Walters, 2013). Then in April of 2007, Seung-Hui Cho murdered 32 victims and injured 25 others on the campus of Virginia Tech (Virginia Polytechnic) (Davies, 2008). The shooting spree began at 7am in one of the campus dormitories and continued after Cho had a chance to go home, change, and email a video to the NBC network. The next round of shootings started at 9:40am in another part of campus after Cho chained the exit doors. Throughout this event, no emergency warning was dispersed to the campus community, as the earlier killings were believed to be an isolated incident. This failure to notify the campus community resulted in a $15,000 fine for the Clery violation (Davies, 2008).

Amendments to the Clery Act, in response to these events, have added further provisions for higher educational institutions. The 2008 Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110-315) included policies regarding emergency responses, hate crime statistics, whistleblowers, and reporting requirements of foreign institutions. Due to the Virginia Tech killings, the Clery Act was amended with a statement clarifying campus emergency response and immediate warnings. It also expanded hate crime statistics to include larceny-theft, simple assault, intimidation, and vandalism. In response to the Dickinson case, campus security officials are now required to disclose information on any partnerships or understandings with state or local police. Furthermore, a provision was added to protect victims of crime, "whistleblowers," and others from retaliation. Lastly, the amendment clarified that foreign institutions are exempt from reporting obligations and allows the U.S. Department of Education to consult with the U.S. Department of Justice about developing and disseminating a "best practices" resource on campus safety and emergencies.

In 2011, the Handbook for Campus Safety and Security Reporting was revised by the US Department of Education to clarify the new requirements of the Clery Act (Department of Education, 2017). Institutions complained that the original guidelines were unclear and there was little technical or financial assistance for schools to implement data collection, training, and policies regarding campus crime and victimization. The handbook helped improve the comprehensibility and increased available resources to help schools comply with the law. The U.S. Department of Education also issued another Dear Colleague Letter in 2011, announcing a

new emphasis on addressing sexual harassment, which includes sexual violence. One of the most impactful components of the letter was Title IX's new guideline for investigating cases. The letter requires that colleges and universities use a preponderance of the evidence standard when investigating sexual harassment and sexual violence cases. Cases carried out in the legal system have a "beyond a reasonable doub"' standard, meaning that no other logical explanation can be derived from the facts except that the defendant committed the crime. In contrast, a preponderance of the evidence means the defendant more than likely committed the crime.

In 2013, President Obama signed a bill that strengthened the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Senate Bill 47, Section 304) and imposed new obligations on institutions of higher education under the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act (SaVE Act). The SaVE Act increases transparency, accountability, education, and collaboration. It requires disclosure in the annual campus crime statistic report of incidents of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. The law also sets a minimum standard for disciplinary procedures covering the aforementioned crimes. Institutions of higher education are required to offer students and employees education and prevention programs on domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Lastly, SaVE establishes a collaboration between the U.S. Departments of Justice, Education, and Health and Human Services to collect and disseminate best practices for establishing prevention programs and services for victims.

In 2014, the Clery Act continued to evolve as the U.S. Department of Education published the regulations for the Violence Against Women Act Amendments. These changes,

which include new reporting requirements, student discipline requirements, and expansions to mandate sexual violence awareness for students and employees, are addressed in the 2014 "Questions and Answers on Title IX and Sexual Violence" document issued by the Office for Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education. In addition, crime statistics reported under the Clery Act now include domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. At the same time, "national origin" and "gender identity" were also added to the hate crime categories. Institutional policies include provisions on a victim's right to seek or not to seek assistance from law enforcement and campus authorities, as well as institutional responsibilities regarding no contact, restraining, and protective orders. The law also sets a standard for investigation and student disciplinary proceedings in cases of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. Lastly, this legislation mandates that institutions offer new students and employees "primary prevention and awareness programs" that discuss and distinguish rape, acquaintance rape, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. These forms of programming are meant to aid the campus community in recognizing dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking while preventing future victimizations.

Title IX expanded the responsibilities of university personnel to go beyond the college or university campus. The Clery Act stipulates that campus security authorities and local law enforcement are responsible for collecting reported incidences, but under Title IX more personnel will be included in order to obtain a more accurate record of certain campus victimizations. Title IX legislation now includes a section on reporting by "Responsible

Employees." A Responsible Employee is defined as any employee: (a) who has the authority to take action to redress sexual harassment/misconduct; (b) who has been given the duty of reporting incidents of sexual harassment/misconduct or any other misconduct by students to the Title IX coordinator or other appropriate designee; or (c) who a student reasonably believes has this authority or duty.

This change for naming Responsible Employees follows the scandal at Pennsylvania State University (Penn State) in which the assistant football coach, Jerry Sandusky, was charged with 52 counts of child molestation (Saul, 2016). In June 2012, Sandusky was convicted of 45 counts of sexual abuse and sentenced to 30-60 years in prison. The individuals that Sandusky abused were children from the charity that he organized, The Second Mile. The scandal broke in 2011, although it is believed that his criminal acts began sometime in the 1970s. The investigation revealed that throughout the years some reports of suspicious activities were made, although the police were never involved. The administration's failure to report suspected child abuse to law enforcement created a national news story lasting several months. The university's president, vice president, and athletic director were charged with obstruction of justice and failure to report child abuse in 2013 as a result of this cover-up. In addition, Joe Paterno, the beloved head football coach, was terminated after it was discovered that he reported suspicions of child abuse to school administrators but did not take further action. In 2016, a final report was issued by the U.S. Department of Education for Clery violations with a fine of 2.4 million dollars (New, 2016). This fine is by far the most significant issued by the U.S. Department of Education

for Clery Act violations. The drawn-out legal hearings and ongoing news coverage helped foster a national conversation on issues of sexual violence, rape culture, and administrators' responsibilities (Dowler, Cuomo, & Laliberte, 2014).

These Title IX changes have been held as a victory in campus reporting; however, some have voiced concern. Harshman, Puro, and Wolff (2001) criticize the requirement to report matters that are simply referred for disciplinary action. They find it troublesome that an institution and its personnel are now responsible for collecting sensitive data from students that have to be reported, even if no criminal charges are pressed. This legislation asks non-security administrators to assess threat levels and aid in students' safety. To make that shift, they argue time and funding must be dedicated to aid in campus awareness campaigns and providing educational resources for faculty and staff members on the guidelines for the Clery Act and Title IX (McMahon, 2008).

The Association of Title IX Administration (ATIXA) (2017) provides some suggestions on reporting guidance and policy implementation. The organization states that the legislation would allow an institution to exclude some professors and professional staff from reporting, although this action would be taking a more minimalist approach and could potentially open the institution up to future investigations and disciplinary actions. The ATIXA suggests that institutions of higher education include all employees as mandatory reporters and provides a policy template for colleges and universities to use. It is recommended that Responsible Employees report any student disclosure that could be considered sexual harassment, including

gender identity discrimination. Since Title IX does not have the same geographical restrictions as the Clery Act, any crime that falls or could fall under Title IX should be reported even if it is committed off campus grounds. The "Questions and Answers on Title IX and Sexual Violence" report issued by the U.S. Department of Education explains that students must be provided with their options as to pursuing a legal case or conduct proceedings, although a victim has the right not to move forward or participate in a Title IX investigation, as well as services available to victims. This decision shall be discussed and determined by the student and Title IX coordinator at the institution, not by a Responsible Employee.

To assist colleges and universities in this effort to address and prevent gender-related violence, the White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault was formed, and their report entitled "Not Alone" was released in 2014. The report provides institutions of higher education basic guidelines for addressing sexual assault cases, conducting campus climate surveys, and creating a national reporting system. It is meant to be another resource to clarify expectations placed on institutions of higher education, a way to emphasize the federal government's commitment, and to address student victimization, especially gendered crimes.

Recently, under the Trump administration, there has been new attention brought on Title IX and the handling of sexual misconduct cases by colleges and universities. On September 22, 2017, the Department of Education released a Dear Colleague Letter rescinding the April 4, 2011 DCL and the April 29, 2014 Q&A on Title IX and Sexual Violence issued by the Office for Civil

Rights. The letter highlights the work done by colleges and universities to address sexual

discrimination.

In the forty-five years since the passage of Title IX, we have seen remarkable progress toward an educational environment free of sex discrimination. That progress resulted in large part from the vigorous enforcement of Title IX by the Office for Civil Rights at the Department of Education. The Department remains committed to enforcing these critical protections and intends to do so consistent with its mission under Title IX to protect fair and equitable access to education.

The letter also states "[t]he 2011 and 2014 guidance documents may have been well-intentioned,

but those documents have led to the deprivation of rights for many students—both accused

students denied fair process and victims denied an adequate resolution of their complaints."

Even with these letters being withdrawn, schools are still moving forward with their

policies and procedures with minor changes. This September 2017 letter was accompanied by a

Q&A on Campus Sexual Misconduct that provides clearer guidance on the changes adopted.

These include twelve questions and answers regarding the handling of Title IX investigations

with no edits to the Responsible Employee mandate. Given these expansions and changes of the

law, researchers can follow how reporting mandates unfold and track victimization reports that

come from various sources. Training and support that mandated reporters receive can also be

assessed and altered to help ensure that faculty understand their role and responsibilities and can

effectively assist students after a victimization disclosure. Lastly, researchers should work to

understand the impact that these training and new responsibilities have on teaching and

mentoring students.

CHAPTER 3: LITERATURE REVIEW

Campus Victimization

The topic of campus crime and student victimization has been extensively researched in the past two decades (Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, & Lu, 1998; Hart, 2007; Whitaker & Pollard, 2014). Most studies of victimizations experienced by college students are conducted through self-reported surveys rather than analyzing police reports. Self-reported data include both crimes reported to the police, as well as those not reported. The questions in self-reported surveys inquire about victimizations experienced at various points in time – lifetime, since beginning school, in the past twelve months, etc. (Baum & Klaus, 2005; Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, & Lu, 1998; Gardella et al., 2015; Sinozich & Langton, 2014). This is especially important when discussing gendered crimes, such as the ones included in Title IX (dating violence, sexual violence, and stalking), since they often go unreported and are considered by many scholars to be "the dark figure" of crime (Lewis & Fremouw, 2001; Rennison, 2014; Richards, Branch, & Hayes, 2013; Sabina & Ho, 2014; Swope, 2012).

Student victimization researchers often include acts of physical violence, sexual violence, stalking, psychological abuse, and threats of violence to fully understand the spectrum of harmful acts that students might experience (Kilpatrick, 2004; Mayhew, Caldwell, & Goldman, 2011). Moreover, certain types of victimization are more difficult than others to measure, such as dating violence, sexual violence, and stalking, as individuals might not identify these incidents as actual crimes. To account for this, researchers ask questions regarding certain behaviors and

interactions in order to assess more accurate victimization rates (Kilpatrick, 2004; Mayhew,

Caldwell, & Goldman, 2011). These studies have examined a number of different factors,

including the rate of victimization of various crime, differences between on-campus and off-

campus victimization rates, help-seeking behaviors, as well as reporting and disclosure rates.

One of the first nationally administered victimization surveys of college students was

conducted by Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, and Lu (1998). Their study is noteworthy since much of

what was known regarding campus victimization before this point came from case studies and

anecdotal data. Fisher and colleagues (1998) measured a wide range of victimizations

experienced by students using questions modeled after those used in the National Crime

Victimization Survey (NCVS). They found that from a study sample of twelve colleges, 37% of

students experience at least one type of victimization while attending higher education. A later

study using data from the NCVS estimated that traditional college students experience about

460,000 victimizations of violent crimes each year (Hart, 2007). At one large Southeastern

university, approximately 22% of students experienced a robbery, theft, burglary, fraud, physical

assault, battery, or sexual assault (Jennings, Grover, & Pudrzynska, 2007) In addition, almost

half of these students (46%) indicated having known someone who had been the victim of a

crime on campus while attending the university. Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, and Lu (1998) found that

larceny was the most common form of victimization reported by respondents. The results of the

aforementioned Victimization Survey found that younger-aged adults experience theft at a higher

rate compared to groups of other age ranges (Ringel, 1997). Among violent crimes, however, simple assaults were the most common victimization.

Age differences are not the only major factor when considering student victimization. Location, gender, and student status are among factors often analyzed in these studies. From 1995-2002, male college students were twice more likely to be victims of overall violence than female students (Baum & Klaus, 2005). Of the students that were victimized, 58% of the crimes were committed by a stranger, 93% of crimes occurred off campus, and 72% occurred at night (Baum & Klaus, 2005). Fisher, Sloan, Cullen, and Lu (1998) stress the need to distinguish between victimization on and off campus to better understand risk factors and victimization rates of these distinct locations. In their study, the rate of violent crime off campus was 1.2 times higher than the on-campus rate, and the rate of theft on campus was 2.1 times higher than the off-campus rate. Researchers examining campus victimization have consistently found that victimizations on campus are less common compared to victimizations that occur off campus (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Hart & Miethe, 2011; Nobles, Fox, Khey, & Lizotte, 2013). This is an important factor to consider when examining the Clery reporting laws, but not requirements put forth in Title IX. The Clery Act only requires crimes committed on campus, property owned by the institution, and properties adjoining the institution's property to be included in the Annual Security Report. Title IX, on the other hand, does not include location restrictions, simply that the victim and/or perpetrator be affiliated with the institution.

Researchers of student victimization also do comparable studies between students and non-students in the same age range to understand unique threats the students might face (Hart, 2007). Female non-students were 1.5 times more likely than female college students to be a victim of a violent crime. Male students and non-students were equally likely to be a victim of a violent crime. Generally, results inform us that students might be at a lower risk of victimization, although there are certain crimes students are more likely to encounter. Also, there are differences in the reporting rates between students and non-students that need to be taken into consideration. The subsequent section closely examines much of the aforementioned research, followed by a discussion on victimization disclosure and the implications that this new legislation might have on campus victimization research.

Dating Violence, Sexual Assault, and Stalking

Students experience lower rates of robbery, aggravated assault, and simple assault compared to non-students of the same age (Baum & Klaus, 2005); however, rates of dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking are higher for students (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Hart, 2007; Sampson, 2002). The most common forms of abuse experienced by college students are psychological or emotional and can include insulting, yelling, swearing, or doing something to spite a romantic partner (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). Estimates of dating violence among college students range from 10-50% (Amar & Gennaro, 2005; Barrick, Krebs, & Lindquist, 2013; Kaukinen, Gover, & Hartman, 2012). Rates of dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking are often much higher when researchers use self-reported victimization

23

surveys rather than examining officially reported data (Baum & Klaus, 2005; Fisher, Daigle, Cullen, Turner, 2003; Hart, 2007; Sinozich & Langton, 2014).

Gender is a significant factor when analyzing student victimization. Dating crimes in which women are targets of abuse are generally referred to as "gendered crimes," since females are mostly at risk of becoming a victim of one of these crimes. Males also experience victimizations of dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, although their rates tend to be lower (Kaukinen 2014); Rennison & Welchans, 2000). When inquiring about gendered crimes, Wilcox, Jordan, and Pritchard (2007) found that 35% of undergraduate and graduate female students experienced physical assault, sexual victimization, and/or stalking while enrolled. Even when a female student isn't a direct victim of a gendered crime, she is often exposed to such crimes. The 2011 College Dating Violence and Abuse Poll found that 52% of college females knew a friend who has been in an abusive relationship (Knowledge Networks, 2011). Both their age and the college environment increase the chances that a female will be assaulted. Females, ages 18 to 24, are at the highest risk of experiencing an attempted or completed sexual assault (Black et al., 2011; Sabina & Ho, 2014; Sinozich & Langton, 2014).

When examining gendered crimes on college campuses, it is important to examine various aspects, such as race, gender, and sexual orientation. Females of color attending historically black colleges and universities (HBCU) experience similar rates of dating violence to their student peers at non-HBCU schools (Barrick, Kerbs, & Lindquist, 2013). The HBCU Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study of undergraduate females at four schools found that 64.7%

experienced at least one incident of physical violence, sexual violence, verbal abuse, or controlling behavior in a twelve-month period. Of the sample, 63.7% have experienced controlling behavior, 13.8% have been threatened, and 17.8% have been physically assaulted in the past twelve months (Barrick, Kerbs, & Lindquist, 2013).

Sexual orientation is another highly relevant factor that is often included in victimization studies. Sexual minority students experience significantly higher rates of dating violence victimization (30.3%) compared to non-sexual minority students (18.5%; Edwards et al., 2015). Victimizations can have both physical and lasting psychological consequences. In heterosexual relationships, females and males experience dating violence at similar rates, although the forms of abuse and seriousness of victimization differ (Straus & Gozjolko, 2014). Within heterosexual abusive relationships, females are more likely to experience sexual assaults, whereas males are more likely to be victimized by psychological abuse. The rates of physical abuse were similar among males and females (Harned, 2002). Although rates of physical abuse were similar between the two groups, it should be noted that the impact on females was more severe compared to males (Harned, 2002). Females from two private institutions of higher education in the South were screened using the Abuse Assessment Screening tool for physical injury and found that nearly half (48%) of the sample reported experiencing some form of injury from a partner in the past year and 39% experienced more than one incident. The most commonly reported injuries were scratches, bruises, welts, black eyes, swelling, busted lip, soreness, sprains, or pulls. Less than half of those injured sought health care for injuries, and even though victims reported significantly higher rates of depression and anxiety compared to non-victims,

25

less than 3% of victims saw a mental health professional (Amar & Gennaro, 2005). Likewise, in a sample of 1,150 college students, 82% of women and 87% of men reported experiencing psychological aggression from an intimate partner, often resulting in mental health issues as well (Harned, 2002).

More serious forms of dating violence usually include sexual violence, although dating violence implies a current or former romantic relationship between the victim and perpetrator (this relationship does not necessarily exist with sexual assaults). Results for the National College Women Sexual Victimization Survey indicated that 36% of rapists were classmates, 34% were friends, 24% were current or former romantic partner, and acquaintances accounted for 3% of perpetrators (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). Females in college are, in fact, more at risk for experiencing a sexual assault than any other age group of people in the United States (Hart, 2007; Jennings, Gover, & Pudrzynska, 2007). Studies estimate that 20-25% of females experience a completed or attempted sexual assault during their undergraduate career at a college or university (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Sampson, 2002). Nearly a quarter (24.1%) of females experience some form of sexual assault during their very first semester at school (Jordan, Combs, & Smith, 2014). Koss and colleagues (1987) conducted an earlier study surveying college students on sexual assault and found that when forced kissing, touching, oral, and penetrative sex were included, 54% of female student participants experienced some form of sexual assault.

In victimization studies that compare students and non-students, some studies have found that non-student females within the same-age range experience similar or even higher rates of sexual assault compared to students. Sinozich and Langton (2014) used the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) to compare the rate of sexual assault victimizations of students and non-students from 1995-2013 and found that the rate of sexual assault was 1.2 times higher for non-students than for students. However, when examining attempted sexual assault, there is no significant difference between these two groups. These statistics could suggest that efforts made by institutions of higher education, such as prevention programming, are making an impact (Sinozich & Langton, 2014). The similarity between dating violence studies and sexual abuse studies also exist in the sexual minority population. Sexual minority students also experience significantly higher rates of sexual assault compared to non-sexual minority students. Sexual minority students are 2.32 times more likely than heterosexual students to experience a sexual assault (Edwards et al., 2015). Regardless of sexual orientation or sexual experience, female students are 2.20 times more likely than male students to experience a sexual assault (Edwards et al., 2015).

Alcohol is used in half of sexual assault cases involving students (Abbey, 2002). The effects alcohol can have in social situations impair communication about sexual intentions, enhance misperception of sexual intent, and increase the aggressive behavior (Abbey, 2002). Additionally, a weapon is used in about 10% of sexual assaults experienced by young females (Sinozich & Langton, 2014). Regardless of drug or weapon use, only 16% of sexual assault victims seek out assistance from victim services agencies (Sinozich & Langton, 2014), and only

approximately 10% of female students who have been sexually assaulted and/or raped report to police (Fisher, Daigle, Cullen & Turner, 2003).

Lastly, stalking is another victimization that female students are more likely than males to experience. According to Mechanic (2002), "[s]talking has been described in the literature as intense, pursuit-oriented behavior targeted toward an individual, often a love object or former intimate, who experiences such behaviors as intrusive, invasive, and even threatening" (p.31). On average 10% of females attending an institution of higher education will experience stalking during their educational career (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Mustaine & Tewksbury, 1999). Similar to dating violence and sexual violence, sexual minority students reported significantly higher rates of stalking victimization (53.1%) compared to strictly heterosexual students (36.0%; Edwards et al., 2015). Victims of stalking usually know their perpetrator, although their previous relationship is not always a romantic one (Zona, Sharma, & Lane, 1993). When the perpetrator is a previous partner, the stalking can escalate quite rapidly as they often have intimate knowledge of victims' schedules and addresses of family members and close friends of their victim. Victims can experience a variety of emotional, physical, and financial consequences due to this form of victimization (Campbell & Longo, 2010). Female stalking victims tend to cope with these incidents by ignoring or avoiding their assailant, while male stalking victims confront their stalker. Likewise, only half of stalking victims report being stalked to campus authorities or to the police (Campbell & Longo, 2010).

Although the rate of victimization varies across demographics, the victims often experience post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), anxiety, and depression (Campbell, Dworkin, & Cabral, 2009; Lindquist et al., 2013; Zinzow et al., 2011) regardless of age, race, or orientation. Moreover, many can have lasting physical effects, such as sexually transmitted infections (STI) (Lonsway & Rennison, 2013; Stroka & Clark, 2013) and unintended pregnancy (Linden, 2011). Dating and sexual victimization can often leave students feeling vulnerable and place unnecessary burdens upon them throughout their educational careers (Romeo, 2001). "Many college women carry the heavy burden of victimization with them to class each day" (Branch, Hayes-Smith, & Richards, 2011, p.56).

Students may not make formal reports of gender victimization to campus authorities for a variety of reasons. Close to half (44%) of student victims of sexual assault do not report because they do not wish their family to find out. The belief that a victimization is a private matter is another reason not to involve authority figures (Sinozich & Langton, 2014). Some students believe that reporting a victimization to a campus authority will then force the authority figure's hand to press criminal charges (Karjane, Fisher, & Cullen, 2005), do not view themselves as a victim (Schwartz, 2000), or fear not being believed (Sable, Danis, Mauzy, & Gallagher, 2006). Fear of retaliation by the assailant (Lonsway & Rennison, 2013) is another reason victims hesitate to report their victimization. This fear can be viewed as a credible threat as most victims of gendered crimes know their perpetrator.

Despite college students experiencing high rates of gendered crimes, reporting rates remain low for dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Thus, it is important to consider other forms of disclosure. If students are disclosing victimizations but are not likely to report the victimization to campus authorities, then researchers can examine why victims disclose, how they disclose, and to whom they disclose. This information can be used in several ways to better serve and protect student victims. When a student does disclose a victimization, there are opportunities for the student to receive services and support. If a student discloses to a Responsible Employee, such as a faculty member, that employee is required to inform the institution's Title IX Coordinator, who can then reach out to the student and provide them with options in moving forward. Options available to the victim include going to the police and reporting the crime or going through less formal systems, such as the school's conduct system. This can result in changing classes, changing residence halls, or the perpetrator being suspended or expelled. Lastly, the student can choose not to pursue a case against the perpetrator but will still be given a referral to victim service and counseling services. Likewise, administrators can use this research on student disclosure to establish policies and procedures for mandatory reporting to ensure the institution is in compliance with current Title IX mandates. Findings on student disclosure should be used and integrated into Title IX training offered to Responsible Employees, including faculty members.

Theoretical Framework of Disclosure

Much of the literature on victim disclosure focuses on obstacles of disclosure rather than the process of disclosure (Browne, 1991; Orchowski & Gidycz, 2012; Vrij, Nunkoosing, Paterson, Oosterwegel, & Soukara, 2002). According to Ruback, Greenberg, and Westcott (1984), victims of crime have four general options. They may 1) seek a private solution, 2) reevaluate the situation so that the event is not defined as a victimization, 3) disclose the victimization, either formally or informally, or 4) do nothing. For an individual to disclose a victimization, it is necessary for them to first identify themselves as a victim (Browne, 1991). Theoretical frameworks on disclosure often come out of social psychology (Sylaska & Edwards, 2014). These theoretical frameworks have been used to explain disclosure of gendered crimes by researchers and advocates to explain the disclosure process, as well as barriers to reporting. Even though the following frameworks are often used to examine gendered crimes when it comes to disclosure, the conceptualization applies to other types of victimization as well. Within a theoretical framework of disclosure, the ecological model, survivor theory, and process model can be used to understand student disclosure.

Ecological Model – The ecological model includes four systems: personal history, microsystem, exosystem, and macrosystem (Heise, 1998). At the individual level or personal history, the ecological model focuses personal characteristics such as knowledge, attitudes, values, and self-concept. The microsystem considers interactions between the individual and influencers, such as family members, peers, or cultural affiliations. The exosystem consists of the

31

environment in which the individual resides, i.e. neighborhood, community, or campus. The

macrosystem, sometimes referred to as mesosystem, includes larger influences such as the

economic, social, or political climate (Bogo, 2006). Alaggia, Regehr, and Jenney (2011) found

the act of disclosure to be a continuous process rather than a single event that is carefully

measured and influenced by intrapersonal, interpersonal, community, and policy level factors.

Likewise, the various levels can be barriers to disclosing a victimization. First, the victim must

understand that what they experienced was a criminal act in order to disclose. The victim must

then be able to disclose to those in their inner circle, often friends and family members. If they

fear that these individuals might blame or question them, the victim will often not disclose. The

victim can then disclose to the community. This can include formal reports to an institution, such

as a college or university, or to the police. It is likely that a victim will only file a report if they

have faith that they will be believed and that some action will be taken against the perpetrator.

The final level factor, policy, includes societal pressures and influences. With this, the victim

might stay quiet about their victimization if the political climate or societal norms encourage

victim-blaming behaviors.

Survivor Theory – Survivor theory is developed from feminist theory and is used to

describe when a victim or survivor of a victimization actively engages in help-seeking behavior,

it can be considered the opposite of learned helplessness theory (Sylaska & Edwards, 2014).

Victims must first recognize that the abuses they experienced are undeserved, then actively seek

out assistance from informal and formal resources (Gondolf & Fisher, 1988). This might not

occur after an initial incident of gendered violence, as it is common for victims to blame themselves or believe that the incident was not serious. Students can fall into self-blaming behavior because of their lack of experience or misunderstanding of the law. Once a victim begins to define the incident as a victimization, then they are likely to disclose to individuals in their inner circle, as well as professionals (Sylaska & Edwards, 2014). This help-seeking behavior happens over a period of time rather than in a single event (Liang, Goodman, Tummala-Narra, & Weintraub, 2005).

Process Model – The process model, or transtheoretical model (TTM), focuses on behavior assessment and the stages of behavioral change. The stages range from pre-contemplation, contemplation, preparation, action, and maintenance (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1994). With gendered violence or other sensitive victimizations, the victim goes through a process. Precontemplation occurs when the victim does not identify as a victim or the incident as a crime. When the victim recognizes a problem or views these behaviors as abuse, although they are not ready to share this, they are in the contemplation phase. Preparation indicates planning to whom to disclose, when the disclosure will occur, and how they want to disclose a victimization. Disclosure happens (action) once the victim comes to terms with ending the situation or relationship and when the benefits of disclosure outweigh the perceived benefits of nondisclosure. When a victim has disclosed they have acknowledged the victimization occurred and the relationship or situation is unhealthy and unwarranted.

These three frameworks (ecological, survivor, and process) all examine the roles of internal and external factors related to the disclosure process. The survivor and process frameworks both establish the victim as an active agent in the disclosure process, and both the ecological model and process theory highlight various levels of interactions when navigating the disclosure process (Sylaska & Edwards, 2014). These frameworks provide context when studying the disclosure process, as well as barriers to disclosure. In addition, it is useful to view disclosure as a continuous process that victims must undertake. This understanding of disclosures can aid policy makers and those who work with student victims to best serve their students through the process of reporting and investigating.

Student Disclosure

Students may disclose a victimization to an informal or formal source. Informal sources can include family members, friends, and coworkers while formal sources may include law enforcement, legal representatives, medical care providers, or mental health counselors (Sabina & Ho, 2014). Some victims will disclose to both informal and formal sources, but rarely will victims only disclose to formal sources (Starzynski, Ullman, Filipas, & Townsend, 2005; Ullman, 2010). According to the National College Women Sexual Victimization Survey conducted by Fisher and colleagues (2003), 88% of victims disclosed a sexual victimization to a peer, 10% disclosed to a family member, 4% disclosed to an official campus authority, and only 1% disclosed to a counselor.

Some could argue that faculty members would constitute an informal source of disclosure. However, with the new regulations regarding victimization reporting discussed in the following section, faculty members are swiftly moving into the role of a formal resource. In addition, to be consistent with the previous literature, the term disclosure refers to discussing a recent or previous crime victimization to an informal or formal source, while reporting strictly refers to a formal report being made with a formal agency, such as police or campus security (Fisher, Daigle, Cullen, & Turner, 2003; Orchowski & Gidycz, 2012).

As advisors, teachers, and mentors, faculty may be among the first individuals to whom a student will confide after being victimized. As students are often away from home and their informal support group, they might trust a faculty member in order to gain an adult's guidance and support (Richards, Branch, & Hayes, 2013). Faculty may also be the first to detect changes in a student's behavior that stem from a victimization. In a study conducted by Richards, Branch, and Hayes (2013), 42% of their sample of 261 faculty members from two institutions received a student disclosure of crime victimization. Among these faculty, 27% received multiple disclosures. In 2009 Branch, Hayes-Smith, and Richards interviewed thirty faculty members who had received at least one student disclosure of intimate partner violence and/or sexual violence. Of these 30 participants, 27 of whom were women, 93% reported receiving multiple student disclosures throughout their career. In this sample of faculty, 77% reported that the student disclosure came from a current student rather than from a former student. Possibly most importantly, "31% of the participants felt that the last student who had disclosed to them was in

35

crisis at the time of the disclosure" (Branch, Hayes-Smith, & Richards, 2011, p.62). Student

disclosures can be prompted by a class discussion and can occur more often in certain

disciplines, such as criminal justice, criminology, social work, sociology and women's studies

(Branch, Hayes-Smith, & Richards, 2011). However, this is not always the case. As Richards,

Branch, and Hayes (2013) found, only about a third of their sample that had received a student

disclosure was teaching a course on crime, victims, or gender issues, signifying the importance

of all faculty receiving training on campus victimization and student disclosure since these

incidences can occur in any class. Victimizations most likely to be reported are sexual assault,

assault, theft, intimate partner violence, and stalking (Richards, Branch, & Hayes, 2013). These

disclosures usually take place outside of the classroom, during office hours and in the faculty

member's office (Branch, Hayes-Smith, & Richards, 2011; Hayes-Smith, Richards, & Branch,

2010).

Faculty reported some negative personal consequences that resulted from student

disclosure (guilt, anger, sadness, helplessness). However, when they received previous training

on student victimization and were aware of resources to share with the student, they recalled

feeling empowered and able to help (Hayes-Smith, Richards, & Branch, 2010). In addition,

faculty members (42%) were unsure of their responsibility after students disclosed, or the

intention behind the disclosure. Even the reason behind the student disclosure can be unclear.

Only 32% of faculty members are asked for leniency or extra time for class requirements when a

student discloses being victimized (Richards, Branch, & Hayes, 2013). These findings indicate

that faculty members would benefit from training on student disclosure and clear guidelines for their responsibilities (Kaukinen, 2014).

Since many institutions of higher education are including faculty as Responsible Employees, it is essential to examine if faculty members understand their new responsibility as mandatory reporters, their experiences dealing with student disclosures, and what resources they need in order to fulfill this new role, as well as their other responsibilities as faculty members.

CHAPTER 4: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Role of Faculty Members

Faculty members are responsible for educating their students, serving the institution that employs them, and building upon knowledge in their field. The role of faculty has progressed throughout the past half century. There have been various stages of faculty responsibility in the evolution of the American institution of higher education (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006), which include scholar, teacher, developer, learner, and the current stage of networker. The scholar was the holder of knowledge. During the 1950s and early 1960s, the art of teaching was assumed to be a natural skill rather than a craft that needed to be practiced and developed. With the stage of the teacher, there emerged an emphasis on teaching effectiveness. In this stage of developing and supporting teachers within the profession, institutions began to offer workshops, colloquia, and financial incentives for developing effective teaching strategies. The 1980s brought the stage of the developer, a period where educators saw a shift from teaching development as optional to a more standard practice. To help aid professors, many institutions of higher education established centers for teaching and faculty development. This laid a sustainable foundation of continued commitment, instead of relying on outside funding and grants, to fund short-term projects aimed at faculty development. According to Sorcinelli and colleagues (2006), the stage of the learner has been one of the most dramatic paradigm shifts in the context of higher education. In the 1990s, the pedagogical standard, coined "the sage on the stage," began to shift more toward a faculty's role as a "guide on the side" (King, 1993). The

traditional standard where faculty members imparted knowledge by a method of lecture, creating

an academic distance between the professor and pupil, now shifted to where some faculty saw

their role as that of an advisor, someone to assist and occasionally guide by a method of class

discussion and student involvement. The current stage is that of the networker, with a furthered

expectation for faculty and administrators to network with other institutions in order to address

current and future institutional problems. This emphasis on teaching, development, and

networking is only a portion of their responsibilities within their profession. These changes in

role responsibility encourage faculty to find innovative methods to present information and

engage students. These relationships allow faculty to work together to develop and share new

ways of reaching students (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006).

Throughout the stages of faculty role responsibility, there have been more requirements

placed upon faculty with regard to teaching effectiveness, as well as being engaged in scholarly

research (Ouellett, 2010). The role of a faculty member has evolved from being centered around

scholarship to a shared emphasis on teaching, research, and service (Clark, 1986). As a part of

their traditional job expectation, faculty at institutions of higher education are expected to

perform multiple roles within their professions, such as a teacher, academic advisor, research

supervisor, and mentor (Hayes-Smith, Richards, & Branch, 2010). In their role as an educator,

they both inform and challenge students to think more critically of the world around them by

developing their analytical reasoning (Nilson, 2010). The relationship between professor and

student has also changed as faculty members are expected to reach students on a different level.

This academic mentoring can sometimes lead to a closer personal relationship, compared to more traditional student-professor relationships. Relationships between faculty and students can be important, as students are often removed from their parents and other adult figures that comprised their adult support system back home (Richards, Branch, & Hayes, 2013). As such, students might look for guidance, support, and comfort from these new relationships. With this movement toward integrating teaching and mentoring, there are challenges to creating a relationship between faculty and student. Faculty members need be fair in the way they approach and evaluate students. They also have many more of these relationships to tend to as student enrollment has been and continues to be on the rise. According to the U.S. Department of Education, student enrollment increased 11% between 1991 and 2001. This increased even more rapidly between the years 2001-2011 as enrollment went up by 32%, with 21 million students enrolled in degree-granting institutions of higher education (2015).

One way to deal with rising student enrollment is through offering online classes. This mode of teaching is different from that of face-to-face classes and has been changing and evolving as more institutions rely on online classes. In 2002, less than one-third of institutions of higher education agreed that online education was critical to their long-term success, whereas in 2012, 70% of administrators answered in the affirmative (Allen & Seaman, 2013). Online learning has certain advantages and disadvantages that are crucial to dealing with student disclosure. Online classes allow time for students to be thoughtful in their postings, with the knowledge that a record is being made of all communications (Haythornthwaite, 2006).

However, in electronic communications, the intent or reaction to a message is not easily deciphered.

In face-to-face classes, professors rely on and respond to students' tone as much as their words. They can also read the body language of the class to gauge interest, as well as discomfort, when a particular topic is discussed (Cares, Hirschel, & Williams, 2014). Teaching online classes can add additional stresses to faculty as they are responsible for monitoring students' comments, which can be posted at any time. These comments are not usually disclosures of victimization – but they can be, indicating that a student is in danger. Students might also engage in victim-blaming behavior, attacking one of their peers. Since students post and reply to their classmates at any time throughout the day, faculty might not be able to address issues promptly (Cares, Hirschel, & Williams, 2014).

Along with an increasing number of online classes is the number of non-tenure positions. Increasing the number of adjunct positions is another way that institutions of higher education are meeting the demands for higher student enrollment (Burgan, 2006). Two-thirds of the faculty members are off the tenure-track, and three-fourths of new hires are either adjuncts or visiting positions (Kezar, 2012). This hiring trend is expected to continue (Burgan, 2006). Adjunct faculty members receive less training and support and lack job security (Burgan, 2006; Kenzar, 2012). They often adjunct at multiple institutions of higher education or are gainfully employed elsewhere and adjunct for extra income. This means that adjuncts are often separated from campus life and sometimes even separated from their own academic departments, as many

departments do not have the office space to house adjunct faculty. This lack of connection could lead to a lack of mentorship and knowledge of resources for both faculty and students. These disjointed appointments make it less likely that adjunct faculty will know what to do if a student discloses a victimization (Burgan, 2006).

The size and emphasis of an institution affect the responsibilities of faculty members. Requirements as to teaching schedule, publishing, service within the community, and serving on academic committees can depend on the type of institution (Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981; Clark, 1986). Within institutions of higher education, there are teaching colleges and research institutions. These classifications are based on the amount of outside grant funding the institution receives, graduate programs, and the number of students that receive their doctorate from said institution (Bakken & Simpson, 2011). Typically, faculty members have a heavier teaching load within teaching colleges, often teaching three or four classes in a single semester. Faculty members from these types of institutions are likely to receive more resources and support when it comes to teaching and student mentoring (Bakken & Simpson, 2011). When faculty are provided teaching-related resources and encouraged to invest their time in developing mentoring relationships with students, students may feel comfortable sharing personal details with faculty.

Faculty at research institutions are expected to engage in current research projects and are often assigned a lighter teaching load to compensate for the time needed for their research work. The American Association of University Professors (2017) notes that although these faculty might teach fewer classes, the faculty-to-student ratio tends to be higher compared to teaching

institutions. This emphasis on research may make faculty less inclined to become involved in campus activities or volunteer for committees if these activities do not contribute to becoming tenured (Burgan, 2006). Likewise, faculty at these institutions might not know of reporting requirements or services available to victims.

According to Clark (1986), faculty members receive inconsistent guidance as to how to allocate their time, based on their multiple responsibilities in their role of professor. Professional development is becoming increasingly important to higher education. Institutions of higher education are under new pressures from parents, students, and legislators to ensure graduation and to prepare students for successful careers, while also keeping them safe (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy, & Beach, 2006). Faculty members need support from their colleagues, departments, administrators, and presidents in order to address these issues in the classroom and handle student disclosures. Administrators should foster an environment that supports and values both teaching and research. At the same time, they should provide faculty with appropriate resources that allow them to serve their students, as well as the institution (Ouellett, 2010). These resources should include clear guidelines as it relates to reporting student victimization disclosure (Fisher, Hartman, Cullen, & Turner, 2002; McNeal, 2007), as well as interacting with the individual student and the class as a whole. A lack of resources and support can place faculty under unnecessary stress or strain when completing their role expectations.

Role Strain

Role theory states that an individual's behaviors are influenced by the expectations of his or her role (Biddle, 1986; Goffman, 1959; Goode, 1960; Merton, 1957; Turner, 2002). A role is made up of expected behaviors rather than actual behaviors or actions. These expected behaviors come from shared ideas and values based on the actors within a role system. Likewise, these actors in the role system reinforce these role expectations and police themselves (Peeke, 1980). Since a role is made up of expected behaviors, an individual cannot occupy a role. An individual can occupy a status or a position of which there are expectations (Gross, Ward, & McEachern, 1958). Individuals make sense of their own behaviors, as well as the behaviors of others, based on their perception of these social roles (Turner, 2002).

The term "role strain" refers to discordance in an individual's role or roles. This occurs when an individual has difficulty meeting the expectations within a particular role or between roles (Goode, 1960; Merton, 1957). The more roles an individual has, the more likely it is that the individual will experience role strain (Goode, 1960). Role strain can be used to describe the strain of conflicting expectations within a single role or conflicting behavioral expectations across multiple social roles, such as the conflicting expectations that might arise in order to balance work and home life. This can cause distress and a feeling that one cannot fulfill role expectations. This occurrence is problematic for the person, an institution, and for society.

Sources of role strain may originate with the individual or with the expectations of a role. In some cases, an individual may not feel able to successfully meet role expectations because he

44

or she does not accept, or is not committed to, the underlying values that justify the expectations. Role expectations may contradict an individual's values or call upon one to behave in an undesirable manner or at an unavailable time. For example, lawyers operating under the rules of confidentiality may be privy to information they are professionally required to keep confidential but personally feel compelled to reveal. Role strain can be a consequence of social arrangements that create a situation in which an individual experiences strain. In this case, the source of the strain resides with the role expectations. An individual may experience role strain when expectations associated with a role are incompatible, competing, or ambiguous. An individual may want to fulfill expectations but is unable to do so due to a lack of clarity of expectation.

To fulfill the status of faculty, an individual learns to perform the following role expectations: lecturing, mentoring, and researching. Goffman (1959) suggests that individuals play out their role much like an actor plays a role on stage, and these actions and behaviors are role performance. Within any role performance, there are expected actions or behaviors. A faculty member might feel comfortable performing the set of behavioral expectations, although role strain can occur when faculty are expected to handle situations they have not been prepared to perform. Similar to Hayes-Smith, Richards, and Branch (2010), this use of role strain is examining strain within the role of faculty as it relates to student self-disclosure. They found that faculty experience role strain after a student discloses a victimization because they are unsure of their role set and their responsibilities to the student, as well as to the institution.

The theory of role strain has been used to better understand the experiences and occupational stresses. Scholars have examined the competing demands in the workplace, home, or elsewhere and have found strain between the various roles a person occupies. More specifically, the theoretical framework of role strain has been used when examining the various expectations within the role of faculty (Boardman & Bozeman, 2007; Elliott, 2008; Lease, 1999). With the role of faculty there are competing responsibilities, such as that of lecturer and researcher. Boardman and Bozeman (2007) found that academics who split their time between faculty members' responsibilities and university research centers experienced a great amount of role strain. This was especially true for those faculty members that were on the tenure track as they were navigating the tenure process and were also more likely to overextend themselves. Role strain has also been used to examine strain between various roles. Elliott (2008) surveyed university faculty about their work and family life and found that caring for a dependent, either a child or elderly adult, was the primary cause of strain. Factors within the faculty role that caused strain included a lack of resources and support. This can be linked to unclear responsibilities and a lack of support needed to successfully fulfill the role of faculty member.

Moving beyond academics, role strain has also been found in other professions that require mandated reporting (Manzo-Mattucci, 2005; Reyes, Rudman, & Hewitt, 2002; Roback & Shelton, 1995; Wooten, Kim, & Fakunmoju, 2011). Steinberg, Levine, and Doueck (1997) surveyed 907 psychotherapists across the United States on being a mandated reporter of child maltreatment. They found that these professionals experienced role strain when needing to report suspected cases of neglect. Social workers are also considered to be mandated reporters of child

maltreatment, which include neglect and abuse. This responsibility can create role strain when a professional attempts to assist a family and is forced to betray the trust they have built with a family in order to protect children in the home (Wooten, Kim, & Fakunmoju, 2011). Likewise, a faculty member that works with students might be forced to report an incident or disclosure in order to help protect their student, even if the student does not want this report to be made.

Role strain can be a consequence of social arrangements that create a situation in which an individual experiences strain. In this case, the source of the strain resides within role expectations. If role strain goes unacknowledged within higher education, faculty and administrators will experience burnout at a higher rate and students will be denied the education and support they need in order to graduate and be gainfully employed (Boardman & Bozeman, 2007). In addition, if faculty experience role strain within their new role as mandatory reporters they may advise students to not disclose victimizations or simply not report these disclosures when they occur. This will put the institution at risk of being investigated and fined by the U.S. Department of Education and ultimately void the intent of the law, which is to support and serve victims of gendered crimes.

The responsibilities within the role of a faculty member are not intended to cause role strain, but Hayes-Smith, Richards, and Branch (2010) have found that to be the case. This can have serious policy implications, for more guidelines are being implemented to broaden the responsibilities of faculty, like the Title IX expansion on mandated reporters. It is essential to

47

gain an understanding of faculty members' experiences of student disclosure of victimization and

the resources that will enable them to successfully manage this new responsibility.

CHAPTER 5: METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

The current study is aimed to fill a gap in the literature by identifying the extent to which student disclosure of victimization affects faculty and how faculty feel about being considered mandatory reporters through regulatory guidelines of Title IX. This research enhances the campus victimization and reporting literature in several ways. Even though student victimization is being increasingly studied, little is still known about student disclosure and how disclosures impact the relationship between faculty and students. Since beginning this project in 2016, there have been one dissertation and two thesis publications involving the Responsible Employee mandate. The first, a quantitative study of Title IX Coordinators working at small private universities, examines coordinators' experiences and challenges, including challenges of working with faculty members (Paul, 2016). The second is a case study of three faculty members' experience of making reports to the Title IX Office in a Southern university (Carron, 2016). The third examines the perspective of students, faculty, and administrators of a Midwestern university on the Responsible Employee mandate (Rosenthal, 2017). The current study adds to this new pool of research on the Responsible Employee mandate by interviewing faculty members who have varying degrees of exposure and experience with Title IX's Responsible Employee mandate, then follows with policy and procedural recommendations for training faculty members.

This research was designed to be exploratory, with the use of semi-structured interview questions to allow faculty to share based on their level of knowledge and experience. Faculty who had previously received a student disclosure of victimization discussed the details of the disclosure. Faculty who received a disclosure after the mandate recounted the process of working with the Title IX office and their relationship with the student during and after the disclosure. Faculty who did not have the experience of a student disclosure shared the Title IX training they had received and how they understood the reporting process. Lastly, faculty who were still unaware of the Responsible Employee mandate shared their initial thoughts on the mandate and discussed strategies of how to best continue the process of educating and training faculty members regarding their responsibility.

The study examined the following research questions:

RQ1: Do faculty members know they are mandated reporters?

RQ2: How do faculty members view their new role as mandatory reporters of student disclosure?

RQ3: What resources do faculty members feel they need in order to serve and refer students?

Population of Interest

This research was conducted at a Southeastern 4-year public research university with over 50,000 students. The university offers over one hundred bachelor's, master's and doctoral degrees. Faculty members who are tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure-track were eligible to participate in the study. This includes faculty, adjuncts, and graduate students with teaching

experience. The participant eligibility was determined to be faculty members, teaching at a designated university, and listed as the instructor of record. These individuals are all considered Responsible Employees, as the university defines a Responsible Employee to include all university professors, lecturers, instructors, adjuncts, or graduate students with classroom responsibilities. These individuals are required to contact the Title IX Office or fill out a report online if a student discloses experiencing a victimization.

Sampling Strategy

This study used a convenience sample. Snowball sampling was first utilized, where a handful of informants were identified and recruited to locate faculty members to be invited to participate in the study. Snowball sampling is a recruitment method often utilized in explorative research, although it is non-representative (Berg, 2009). These informants included mentors and head of the university's faculty center. Informants were provided a Call for Participants, and interested participants were asked to email me directly. The second phase of participant recruitment included contacting department chairs and program directors with a request for a Call for Participant to be emailed to the faculty members within that department or program. In the third and final phase, I directly emailed faculty from departments and programs that were not already represented in the sample. Wanting to ensure a diverse representation of faculty, I emailed faculty of departments like Biology, Business, Education, Engineering, History, and Theater. In most cases, I used a strategy to email every fifth or tenth faculty member listed on the department's website, depending on the size of the department. I also made the decision to target

51

faculty based on demographic diversity. With this, I specifically included male faculty members and those appearing to be Asian, Black, and Hispanic when department pages included faculty profile pictures. This email was a personalized interview request and served to be the most successful method used to obtaining participants. Recruitment began in February 2016 after obtaining approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB). The first two phases lasted from February 2016 through July 2016; then in August 2016 I transitioned to the third phase of emailing faculty members directly until March 2017, when the last few interviews were being arranged. In total, I sent out 156 interview requests to both department/program heads and to faculty members. This does not include the emails sent out through the faculty center's list serve and those sent from informants. Interviews took place over a twelve-month period, April 2016 through April 2017, with 34 completed interviews.

Data Collection Methods

This study was qualitative, with data from semi-structured, open-ended interviews. Interviews are appropriate when conducting exploratory research, as the researcher is in the process of understanding a phenomenon and thus requires more flexibility to shift topics and ask follow-up questions. Interviews took place face-to-face on campus or over the phone. Most interviews, thirty-one, took place face-to-face on the university campus and three were conducted over the telephone. The open-ended interview schedule consisted of twenty-two questions, although the questions asked often depended on interview flow and the faculty member's knowledge of Title IX.

Interviews allow researchers to ask clarifying questions and participants to provide a more comprehensive picture, compared to a questionnaire survey. In addition, the interview schedule was semi-structured with open-ended questions, which unlike structured interviews, provides the participant some flexibility in leading the conversation (Berg, 2009). With semi-structured interviews, the researcher has a list of questions he/she intends to ask. More often than not, participants are asked and answer the same questions, although the researcher may ask for clarification, adjust the language or wording of a question, or ask a completely new question if the situation so warrants (Berg, 2009). Before applying for IRB approval, I conducted an initial practice interview with a faculty member, who also served as an informant, to help clarify question wording and the order in which questions were asked. This process allows researchers to pre-test their questions and adjust the interview schedule to ensure a level of consistency throughout the study (Berg, 2009). This process allowed me to restructure the interview schedule as the discussion on Title IX felt abrupt to both myself and my practice partner. We discussed the possibility of a participant not knowing anything about Title IX, and then I structured the schedule in a way that flowed more naturally, in my opinion.

As stated previously, interviews were arranged to take place in an agreed upon location on the university campus or over the telephone. Of the thirty-one face-to-face interviews, all but three took place in the participant's private on-campus office. Interviews lasted between 23 to 65 minutes long, with an average of 39 minutes. Interviewing continued until saturation was reached, when no new information, insights, or understandings were found (Merriam, 2009). Participants received an Informed Consent form, approved by the IRB, and provided oral consent

to be interviewed. Participants who were interviewed face-to-face received a hard paper copy, and those interviewed over the telephone were emailed the form as an attachment the day of the scheduled interview. All interviews but one were audio-recorded, with one participant preferring that I only take notes. When the audio-recorder was not in use, it was stored in a locked file cabinet while sensitive materials were still on the device. Once the audio files were downloaded onto my private, password-protected computer, the files were transcribed into a word document. The audio files were deleted from the audio-recorder and computer once the files were transcribed. I transcribed the interviews in one word document, totaling 498 pages, with the average transcribed interview being 15 pages. Participants were not asked their names during the interview, although some provided this information. Transcriptions did not include this information, and all participants were assigned pseudonyms. Interview transcriptions were then uploaded to the NVivo database and then electronically coded by the researcher. NVivo is a qualitative data-management package that assists researchers with coding interview transcriptions.

Analytic Strategy

A symbolic interactionist framework informed the analytical strategy. This framework was appropriate because faculty members were asked how they interpret the meaning and the role of their work, as well as their interactions with students. They then were asked as to their thoughts of the Responsible Employee mandate and their sense of if and how this duty alters their relationship with students.

Blumer (1969) established the methodological position of symbolic interactionism and stated that its analysis rests on three pillars:

The first premise is that human beings act toward things on the basis of meanings that the things have for them....The second premise is that the meaning of such things is derived from, or arises out of, the social interaction that one has with one's fellow. The third premise is that these meanings are handled in, and modified through an interpretative process used by the person in dealing with the things he encounters (Blumer, 1969, p2).

This strategy allows the researcher to form inquiries prior to interviews that build on previous research. Analysis began by first going through each transcript and conducting line-by-line coding. This process was done using NVivo and coding each line of the transcript using a word or two. This beginning process is completed with no preconceived codes or patterns (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

I examined the data, asking specific questions. This occurs multiple times to ensure that the analysis is meticulous. To make sure conclusions are not hastily reached and to let the evidence speak for itself, themes and findings were established once all the data were examined (Berg, 2009). Emerging themes were highlighted while going through each line. After primary themes had been established, interview transcripts were compared to discover commonalities and sub-themes. After completing line-by-line coding, I performed axial coding to discover sub-themes. Axial coding entails reassembling data that was segmented during the line-by-line process (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Again, I used NVivo during this process to help identify themes by identifying commonly used words and to highlight potential themes and patterns. Once this process was completed, I was left with the major themes discovered. These themes

included: talking about teaching, knowledge/thoughts about Title IX, experiences with students disclosing, what participants think they would do if a student disclosed, feelings about reporting mandate, training, and recommendations.

Since I suspected that not all participants would have received training on Title IX, I first asked about their duties and teaching styles. Then we moved to discuss their thoughts about student victimization and if a student had ever discussed being victimized to them. This was done before asking specifically about the Responsible Employee mandate in case disclosures had been made without reporting the incident. I wanted to discuss the participant's feelings and experiences before transitioning into the mandate. This proved to be a beneficial route as I experienced some participants becoming more cautious when Title IX was introduced. Once I asked about Title IX and about any training participants had received, I was surprised that they had questions for me. With their questions about the Responsible Employee mandate, I created a list of recommendations for the Title IX office and those responsible for training and assisting faculty.

Sample Characteristics

In this study, I conducted thirty-four interviews with faculty members. These interviews took place between April 2016 and April 2017. I interviewed eighteen women and sixteen men, with a racial and ethnic breakdown of twenty-three White, two African American/Black, three Asian, and six Hispanic individuals. Participants' ages ranged from 27 to 65 years old, with an average age of 44 years old. Their teaching experience at their current university ranged from

being in their first year to 27 years, with an average of 10.5 years of teaching experience. The

breakdown of faculty titles is as follows: 1 Dean, 7 Chair/Directors, 3 Full Professors, 4

Associate Professors, 7 Assistant Professors, 3 Associate Lecturers, 2 Lecturers, and 7 Adjuncts.

With this sample including administrative faculty, tenured/tenure tracked faculty, lecture and

adjunct faculty members, the findings will examine differences between the groupings:

administrative faculty, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty.

Table 1: Sample Characteristics

Name	Gender	Race/Ethnicity	Age
Judith	Woman	White	39
Gloria	Woman	Hispanic	54
Beth	Woman	White	33
Rose	Woman	White	42
Cristina	Woman	Asian	27
Lindsay	Woman	White	29
Chris	Man	White	52
Geoff	Man	White	45
Adam	Man	White	65
Jennifer	Woman	White	29
Heather	Woman	White	31
Jonathan	Man	White	47
Walter	Man	African American	51
Richard	Man	Hispanic	56
Ali	Man	White	53
Stephanie	Woman	White	42
Mark	Man	White	48
Gabriel	Man	Hispanic	46
Luke	Man	White	41
Juan	Man	Hispanic	48
Dustin	Man	White	32
Sarah	Woman	White	63
Lauren	Woman	Asian	43
Michael	Man	White	51
Carrie	Woman	White	32
Keith	Man	White	41
Rachel	Woman	White	37
Mariah	Woman	African American	44
Emma	Woman	White	58
Ida	Woman	Hispanic	39
Jackie	Woman	White	32
Cameron	Man	Hispanic	51
Kayla	Woman	Asian	44
Brian	Man	White	47

Reflexive Statement

Being able to study domestic violence and student victimization has been the focal point of my graduate career. I first came to this notion to study Title IX and the Responsible Employee mandate during the Obama administration. In 2014, when I first discussed wanting to do a project related to Title IX, the Not Alone: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault had been issued and the It's On Us campaign had just been launched. It was an exciting time for those who work on campus violence prevention and those who studied student victimization. Being on the forefront of the Responsible Employee mandate, I wanted to examine how this policy was being implemented and how faculty members see their role in these efforts to address and end sexual assault on college campuses.

The reason I chose faculty members was two-fold. One, I believed that the faculty members that I worked with thought this is an important topic and I wanted to see if this held true in other fields. Second, I had worked in the academic side of violence prevention efforts for three years at that point in time and wanted to better understand if and how faculty members could be engaged. I decided to interview faculty members and examine their knowledge of the Responsible Employee mandate, see what they thought about their inclusion, and to ask what resources they would need to be effective change agents.

It should be noted that my own feelings of the Responsible Employee mandate and those expressed by my committee are complicated. We've discussed potential issues of avoidance by faculty members by simply announcing to their students to not discuss these specific topics with

them, faculty members taking it upon themselves to investigate or to attempt to intervene, or more generally faculty members saying the wrong thing because they do not know what to do or how to handle such a situation. Regardless of the challenges that might be faced with this reporting mandate, I and my committee were more interested in how to support and educate mandated reporters.

As a self-identified feminist, activist, and researcher, it was important to present myself in a way that was as neutral as possible. This proved somewhat difficult when interviewing those with whom I had opposing views, although more so with faculty members who seemed to be in agreement with my personal opinions. First, with regard to those who had opposing viewpoints, it was not that surprising that most of my participants reported viewpoints that were positive of the Title IX changes within the past five years. I imagine that faculty members who hold no opinion or disagree with the shift taking place on campuses across the country would simply not respond to my interview request. That was mostly true, although one participant introduced himself to me by saying that he was going to set me straight. In this way, I felt oddly insignificant in the role of researcher. Near the end, however, we did have more of a conversation, and he was at that time more willing to clarify and answer follow-up questions. Even though I felt slightly more on edge in that situation, it was in the interviews with faculty members who "loved" my topic that I had to learn to alter my behavior. With these individuals I found that I added too much of myself, my experiences, and my viewpoints to the conversation.

Early on in the study I realized I had to actively restrain myself. This was realized through listening to my post interview recordings and while transcribing the first four interviews.

This is a topic that I continue to be passionate about. In fact, I interviewed for a Title IX position nearing the end of this process. I believe the changes throughout the past six years have challenged and encouraged institutions of higher education to be actively involved in addressing and preventing sex and gender based crimes. I hope that the current and future leadership in the U.S. Department of Education does not cower away from these challenges.

CHAPTER 6: THE ROLE OF FACULTY

The role of a faculty member is often extensive, as responsibilities go far beyond teaching and assessing students' work. These duties often include researching, publishing, serving on institutional committees, and service within the community. When interacting with students in the classroom, faculty are expected to be engaging, available, professional, and hold certain cultural competencies. These traits develop over years of teaching, and the level of skill depends greatly on the individual. Even though individual traits or characteristics vary widely in faculty in general and the participants specifically, there are still common themes with regard to teaching style, interactions with students, and views of their responsibilities. These views of responsibilities also determine the participants' willingness to serve as Responsible Employees. Of the 34 participants I interviewed, the duties discussed centered on the act of teaching or conveying information. A few discussed research and publishing requirements, and three participants shared about their committee or community involvement as a faculty member, but most discussed their teaching styles and student engagement.

Faculty Responsibilities

The faculty I spoke with shared similar role responsibilities, according to their institutional title. Their titles ranged from a Dean, Department Chairs, Full, Associate, and Assistant Professors, Associate Lecturers, Lecturers, and Adjuncts. The majority were either Assistant or Associate Professors. While conducting the analysis portion of this study, it was discovered that participants could be easily grouped into categories based on their titles, and that

these grouping represented differing viewpoints and recommendations of participants. These

groupings include: administrative faculty, full-time faculty and part-time faculty. There are eight

administrative faculty members – Gloria, Chris, Jonathan, Ali, Stephanie, Mark, Keith, and

Emma. Full-time faculty members include fourteen participants – Geoff, Heather, Walter,

Richard, Gabriel, Dustin, Sarah, Lauren, Michael, Carrie, Rachel, Ida, Kayla, and Brian. Part-

time faculty consists of lecturers and adjuncts, since many of their trainings and access to

resources are limited. There are twelve participants in the latter category – Judith, Beth, Rose,

Cristina, Lindsay, Adam, Jennifer, Luke, Juan, Mariah, Jackie, and Cameron. In most cases

Instructors would be grouped as full-time faculty members, although these participants had more

in common with their adjunct colleagues when it came to their knowledge of departmental or

university policies.

As participants described their roles, I asked follow-up questions regarding their teaching

load and interactions or connection to their students. Administrative faculty indicated having less

time in the classroom, sometimes only teaching classes when they can carve a time slot from

their already busy schedule. Ali is currently teaching one class in the fall and spring semester,

although the first year-and-a-half after becoming the chair of his department, he did not teach at

all. Gloria, a program director, shared that she does not get much student/faculty interaction due

to her administrative responsibilities, adding that most of her meetings with students are to

address problems or special circumstances. "I have to deal with … issues with advising, or

personal issues, or they've got issues with another of our faculty." These interactions are, of

course, important in assisting students who are dealing with a problem or difficulty they are experiencing, although Gloria shares they are different than having a student in your class and getting to know them over an entire semester. Stephanie's experience as a department chair is unique as students apply to her program with less than 50 acceptances each year. She knows all the students in the program, but her time with them is limited. These students are taught by a handful of faculty and attend class with the same cohort over the course of two years. "It's very small, very close knit. I think we tend to know our students a whole lot more than any other [faculty]." Like Gloria and the other administrative faculty, Stephanie has to balance her time with students with her other administrative duties.

Service and research came up in only a few interviews, including administrative and full-time faculty. Most participants discussed their teaching load, and Carrie and Dustin included the tallying of accepted publications, as a concern of being tenure-track. Although once tenure is received, faculty responsibilities do not dwindle at all. While being on a research load, Gabriel teaches only two classes in the fall and spring semesters. He additionally chairs an internship program for his department. This duty ensures face time with students to discuss internship placement and policies within the department, as well as with the students attending his class. Although he enjoys this time with students, his time is divided among other duties as well. "You know, of course, our roles are always split between three different things: teaching, research, and service. So, those are my obligations - heavier, probably, on the research. But once you get tenure, then they just start piling on the service, and I am choking on it right now. I'm on like

64

fifteen different committees." Faculty shared about serving on hiring committees, diversity

committees, policy committees, and institutional program evaluation groups. Sarah also voiced a

concern that faculty members belonging to marginalized populations – women, African

American, Latinx are disproportionately asked to volunteer their time to serve on committees,

which can hurt their ability to successfully receive tenure. These experiences were not always

seen as a negative though. Participants shared learning a great deal about the inner workings of a

university and the hiring process. Two participants, Mark and Heather, connected their

knowledge of Title IX and the reporting requirements of faculty to committees that they served

on as committee members, where they often receive in-depth information on targeted subjects.

Cristina, who is in her first semester of teaching as an adjunct faculty member, shared that she

was honored to be asked to sit on a policy committee. It should be noted that this does not benefit

Cristina in any way other than providing an opportunity from which to learn and to add to her

CV. On the surface, these differing viewpoints might be due to the number of committees faculty

are asked to join and how these committees conflict with other responsibilities.

When discussing responsibilities or duties of the role of faculty member, it is not

surprising that role strain presented itself. Participants' various responsibilities cause faculty to

slice their time and focus among teaching, research, and service. This strain was seen even more

clearly in interviews with full-time faculty. I suspect this might be due to their high level of

interaction with students and their other responsibilities. Administrative faculty, on the other

hand, have a choice as to if and when to teach, which they often do because they miss this

relationship. Part-time faculty members teach a limited number of classes, which needs to be balanced within their other life responsibilities. This can be compared to Boardman and Bozeman's study (2007) of faculty members who experienced role strain when dividing their time between research centers and teaching responsibilities.

Teaching Styles

While discussing teaching and teaching styles, participants likewise had some differing viewpoints. With teaching, fifteen participants are on a 3-3 load: teaching three classes in the fall, then again in the spring, and having the choice as to teaching summer classes. Four lecturers have a 4-4 load. Chairs, directors, and adjuncts are likely to teach one class a semester or every other semester. Regardless of their teaching load, most participants had experience teaching online as well as face-to-face, and their opinions tended to be definitive. Along with her fellow participants, Mariah prefers interacting with students face-to-face. "Most of the time, electronic communication cannot tell you the full story. Probably because of my background …, but I can much more readily see students' faces to know if they're having troubles then try to read the tea leaves in emails." Even though Gloria teaches most of her classes online, she still prefers those that are face-to-face. "The classroom, for me, is intoxicating," so she will on occasion teach an honors seminar to ensure she does not lose that connection with students. Gabriel echoes this point, "… like online, I just feel the alienation. It's too severe. I don't get to know my students. I think that teaching is based on a relationship, and it's harder to make a solid relationship in the ether." While 85% of participants expressed a negative opinion of online classes, one shared her

66

new appreciation of teaching exclusively online. Rose has been teaching online for several years now. She did so with resistance when she went from teaching face-to-face to having to translate her teaching goals, lectures, and her open personality to an online platform. To create a relationship with students and a sense of community between students, Rose has found it demands greater effort on the front end of the semester, but it can be just as rewarding. In fact, when comparing both modes, Rose finds that students divulge more of their personal experiences online as compared to face-to-face classes. Cristina appreciates that as an adjunct faculty member with a full-time position outside of the university, she can add content and respond to student inquiries on her schedule. "I guess my main responsibility is responding to students … I get notifications on my phone and can answer questions or post prompts during my day elsewhere."

After discussing the modes in which participants teach, participants described their teaching styles. Sarah explains the ways she prefers teaching with,

My ideal would be to have them read the information first, come to class, I talk about it a bit, [and] we discuss. That's how people learn better. I like that face-to-face interaction, and them having-face to-face interaction with other people in the class. I set up a lot of different kinds of things like that … I might take the time to talk a little bit, put them into groups, have them in that for a little bit, bring them back and talk some more. Just a variety of things. They do debates; they do presentations.

Most participants preferred some proportion of lecture and discussion, but this was not always consistent, and the breakdown of techniques seemed to vary based on individual preference rather than discipline or the role breakdown. Dustin, a full-time faculty member who has been teaching for two years, said he is still figuring out his teaching style. "I come in and give some

background about whatever the day's topic is. I'll start talking, and I rely a lot on the students to ask questions. I have an idea of where I want them to go [and] what I want them to get out of it at the end of the class." Another full-time faculty, Michael uses what he calls laugh instruction, which is the use of humor and silliness in his lectures. "I think students get more out of it. I enjoy entertaining and educating at the same time. I enjoy engagement with them, asking them questions, putting them on the spot, letting them off easy, and having a good time with them. It becomes an integrative exercise for all."

Richard, another full-time faculty, allows tensions to build and encourages dialog amongst his students. "My teaching style is kind of provocative. I weave current events, especially current events that are controversial in society, into the lecture material so that I try to tie them to whatever the course is about so that the students see that this is not just some abstract material that they're learning; it actually has real world relevance." Others, like Juan, who is part-time faculty, are content focused and stay on topic. "My teaching style, I would describe as being primarily lecture-driven but with a healthy dose of other things kind of mixed in." Depending on the size of the class, Juan's students will work together in small groups four or five times during the semester, but it is primarily lecture-driven. These various styles are of all faculty who can be classified as social science faculty members and demonstrate the differing ways to interact and educate college students.

Mariah, a faculty member outside of the social sciences, uses a great deal of discussion in her face-to-face classes. When Mariah teaches, she does not lecture. In fact, she tries to not speak

for longer than three minutes at a time. "If I talk for three minutes, they're going to talk. I'm very interactive. We are going to discuss. I don't lecture. We're going to discuss. That's really the way I approach my classroom." Admittedly, this takes a great amount of work and focus. "I always say it's like doing improv because you never know what they're going to say, but the students are so appreciative of that. Plus, just lecturing, lecturing, lecturing. They check out. Their attention span isn't like that." Luke, a lecturer who teaches mostly large introductory science classes, has a set curriculum that students need to master to be successful in their upper-level classes down the line. This means that he does not often become close to students and is not able to learn their name unless the student makes an effort and attends office hours. Like Sarah, Carrie will often use exercises or media examples to supplement her lectures. Providing this time and facilitating a discussion can also aid faculty in building a connection with students, along with encouraging students to give feedback or get help with understanding class content. This facilitation can aid in assessing students' adaptation of skills-based classes. Two participants, Emma and Heather, both teach future mental health counselors, and they both discussed the importance of demonstrating a skill rather than being able to recite a definition or theoretical concept. When Emma teaches a theory class, she uses role-play "to give students feedback, and to help them develop the kinds of skills that they're going to need for a clinical practice."

Of the participants, the faculty who saw students during office hours taught classes like statistics, data analysis, theory, and methods throughout various disciplines. Even though Carrie teaches three different classes a semester, she sees most of her students from a skills-based

course. "I do have a relationship with my students where they feel like they can come talk to me regarding class material, especially with data analysis. I have students at my office all the time, asking for help." Carrie's students have told her that she is easy to talk to and is approachable. This characteristic is not only useful when seeking help with an assignment but can also encourage a student to disclose personal difficulties, including victimizations. Twenty-six participants spoke to me about their attempts to get students to visit them during office hours or to make an appointment. "It might also be that they're just earlier in their college career, and they don't realize that you can actually talk to a professor – and it's fine," said Geoff. Chris talked extensively about the differing techniques he has used to encourage students to come to his office hours for help, including offering points. "Starting a year ago, I require my students to come in for a one-on-one interview with me at the start of the semester. They get 100 [points] if they come in and a zero if they don't." Starting these habits early in a student's career can significantly increase their likelihood of creating bonds with faculty members, creating a network of individuals that students can go to in a time of need.

Student Concerns and Disclosures

As participants described their relationship with the students they teach and mentor, many of them expressed a sense of protectiveness over them and viewed students as children. Walter compared this reporting requirement to when he taught as an elementary school teacher. "I always went back to, 'You're protecting children. You're protecting our babies, and it's very difficult.'" He sees his college students as the children he taught many years ago and has the

same feeling of protectiveness toward them. Walter adds that the older he gets, the more "kid-ish" students appear. Jonathan relates this to the parental coddling of young people. In his experience, students rely on their parents much more than when he began his career over a decade ago. He asks, "How many of them know where to take their car to get the oil changed? How many of them know what to do when they have a flat tire? Or something, call mom or dad ... They are definitely more kids now than they were back then." This need for assistance or guidance can alter the relationship between faculty and student. Participants made the connection between students needing more guidance and faculty being charged with taking an active role in keeping students safe.

These discussions can go far beyond needing guidance or advice about a class requirement. Echoing other research, faculty receive numerous student disclosures for a variety of reasons (Lamport, 1993). The list includes students sharing victimizations such as incest, rape, attempted rape, fondling, relationship physical abuse, relationship emotional abuse, sexual harassment, identity theft, battery, burglary, robbery, and property damage. Throughout his career, Gabriel has had several students report a car robbery or a stolen computer. In these cases, a request was being made for extra time to complete an assignment or retake an exam. In the previous year, Dustin had a student share that "his apartment got robbed and his roommates were dealing drugs. Their apartment got broken into, and everything got taken. He was having a tough semester, and he ended up dropping my class."

Students also disclose physical or psychological issues to faculty. Some of these include depression, anxiety, suicidal ideation, eating disorders, panic attacks, and low self-esteem. One young woman told Mariah that two of her roommates changed her anti-depression medications, causing her to experience an intense relapse. Keith, a department chair, shared that when he was a graduate director, he often had students discuss personal problems, stress, and class-related issues, such as needing accommodations for childcare or caring for elderly parents. Stephanie had a student disclose an emotionally abusive relationship, discussed in the following chapter, where the student was looking to change her class schedule to appease her boyfriend. Stephanie said that even though the student was 22 years old at the time of the incident, "she's still a kid who didn't know what to do and needed some guidance."

Summary

The role of faculty member seems to differ greatly based on official title and duties assigned to those titles. Participants who serve as administrative faculty have duties that include teaching fewer classes a year, while full-time faculty members' primary duties include teaching, research, and service. Part-time faculty members' duties focus much more on teaching. Participants shared many similarities regarding their views of students and their responsibilities as educators. Of faculty members who participated in the study, all reported viewing themselves as being in a position to help students. This sentiment varied somewhat as those like Cristina, Luke, and Kayla see their duties as those relating to student success in a particular class while Gloria, Richard, and Jonathan's perceived duties include caring for, challenging, and guiding

72

students. The teaching styles of participants might also influence a student's willingness to disclose a victimization or personal matter. Participants like Carrie, Gloria, and Rose all spoke about being accessible and available to students with less of an emphasis on a student being successful in their class. In the next chapter, I shift focal points from faculty wanting to help to their thoughts and experiences of training on Title IX and the Responsible Employee mandate. In addition, I examine patterns between these role differences: administrative faculty, full-time faculty, and part-time faculty.

CHAPTER 7: DISCUSSING TITLE IX

In this chapter, I discuss participants' knowledge and understanding of Title IX and the Responsible Employee mandate. Participants provided their framework of Title IX in context with their teaching and relationship with their students as it relates to their understanding of Title IX and their function as Responsible Employees. Their comments demonstrated how familiar they are with the federal law and training they have received at their university. These data answer the first research question of this study: Do faculty members know they are mandated reporters?

Knowledge of Title IX

With Title IX having a long legislative history and evolving several times since it passed in 1972, I felt it necessary to first ask participants about their knowledge or reference point before introducing the Responsible Employee mandate. Overwhelmingly, Title IX was known by participants for matters of equal access to school sports teams and college scholarships for both men and women. Some suspected their knowledge was due to their age. Stephanie, for example, noted, "Yeah, in my generation Title IX means access to athletics and sports." However, this reference point was shared by participants with a twenty-year gap between them and was similar for both men and women. Only Judith, Jennifer, and Rachel said they first thought of sexual harassment when they hear Title IX. For Judith, quid pro quo is the first thing that comes to mind. She referenced this exchange "this for that" to target student staff, graduate students, and young faculty and staff. Jennifer and Rachel said they think of sexual assault on college

74

campuses. Participants were familiar, however, with Title IX cases across the country, and a few discussed the Penn State (Saul, 2016) sexual abuse case of Jerry Sandusky in 2012 or the Baylor University (Croft, 2017) lawsuits that were filed in 2016. Columbia University was also mentioned by two participants: by Richard, as an example of a case of a university being tried in the court of public opinion, and by Carrie, as an example of a university not properly handling student complaints. Both were referencing the Columbia University student who carried the mattress on which she was allegedly sexually assaulted to protest administers' handling of the case (Taylor, 2017).

Once we discussed these first impressions and participants' familiarity with Title IX, we then moved to discuss Title IX training they have received through their employment at the university. In total, twenty-four participants have received some Title IX training, although not all their training centered around or even included the Responsible Employee mandate. Walter and Jonathan have both gone through training on Title IX, but they both state that their training was about the hiring practices and policies of the university and occurred when on a hiring committee. All the administrative faculty received previous Title IX training, nine of the fourteen full-time faculty, and six (half) of the part-time faculty participants had previously received this information. The ten participants who have not received any Title IX training or did not know of the Responsible Employee mandate were from five departments with differing titles and included two adjunct faculty, three lecturers, three assistant professors, an associate professor, and a full professor. To better understand the impact of training, participants were asked the logistics of

75

their training, what they remember of the training, including the Responsible Employee mandate, and how they are to handle student disclosures of victimization. In the next section, Responsible Employee Training includes only participants who have previously received Title IX and Responsible Employee training. I examine the types of training participants have received and what information participants can remember of the Responsible Employee mandate, in order to answer the first research question – Do faculty members know they are mandated reporters?

Responsible Employee Training

When asked about the Responsible Employee mandate connected to Title IX, twenty-two of the total thirty-four participants answered that they were familiar with the mandate. Although, Carrie and Michael initially said they had not received information about a reporting mandate, later they recalled they had in fact received training. This is an important point and is discussed further in this and Chapter Nine as to the consistency of these training and what details faculty members retain after attending a Title IX training. Regarding the first research question, it appears that some faculty members know they are mandated reporters, but not all. Considering that these are individuals who agreed to be interviewed about Title IX and the Responsible Employee mandate, I would speculate that most faculty members are uninformed about this mandate.

The twenty-two participants who have received some training about Title IX and the Responsible Employee mandate were asked to describe the training or what they remembered

and then explain in some detail the reporting guidelines as they understand them to be. In outlining how faculty have been trained on Title IX, sixteen have received training through faculty meetings, four through staff mandated training, one through a mandated faculty advising training, and one from a fellow faculty member. All faculty, except for Rose who was trained by a coworker, attended training facilitated by the Title IX Coordinator and all were completed face-to-face. These trainings took place from three years to two months prior to the interview taking place. Also, seven participants have received multiple pieces of training, while most only received a single training from the Title IX Coordinator.

When trained participants detailed information that was covered, it became apparent to me that there are some obstacles with consistency. A challenge of face-to-face training is ensuring that participants walk out of the session with the information the trainer is attempting to convey or explain. The lack of consistency was apparent when coding participants' responses to their exposure to Title IX policies. As an example, Chris and Geoff both recalled receiving this information during a faculty meeting that took place two years prior. Both men stated that the main point that was covered was appropriate conduct between students and faculty. As Geoff said, "I remember there was a lot of discussion about what kind of interactions between faculty and students were allowed." What stands out for Chris is the guidance that faculty should not have personal relationships with students, including their graduate students, which is something that Chris and his colleagues value very much as a mentor and faculty advisor. "My sense of it was that on the compliance side, … [the Title IX Coordinator's] job would be made easier if no

teachers ever talked to any student in any way, in any place, in any form." Regarding the Responsible Employee mandate, this policy was covered but did not seem as significant. Along with that, neither one could recall how to report an incident of student disclosure of victimization.

Mariah, on the other hand, went through training for faculty advisors for student organizations, and the Responsible Employee was the main point of the session. In fact, she recalls the title of the session being something like, "Let Me Tell You About Title IX and What Your Responsibility Is." Mariah expressed a positive experience and said her training was clear and concise, adding that she wishes she would have had to go through this training sooner. Unlike Mariah, Rose learned of the Responsible Employee reporting policy from a coworker in her department. During the interview, she shared that she was not provided any context of this new mandate, only her responsibility. This experience was a negative one as she left with the impression that the policy is meant to increase reporting numbers without an equal effort to address sexual assaults or help victims. Rose shared that she learned more about the policy and gained a greater context through her interview process with me than in the training she received, adding "the way it's been introduced to me was so cursory."

The faculty in Emma's department, like Geoff and Chris, received information about being a Responsible Employee from the Title IX coordinator during a faculty meeting. In this training, the Title IX coordinator discussed the Dear Colleague Letters, then the Responsible Employee mandate. "People were not all that familiar; I would say, not all that familiar with

those letters and what they meant." This proved to be somewhat problematic as faculty spent much of the session asking clarifying questions and discussing the issue among themselves. The faculty meeting that Heather attended was like the others as it's her impression that the Title IX Coordinator did not get through all the material of the training. Instead, there was a kind of debate about the merits of the Responsible Employee mandate and issues related to confidentiality. These examples demonstrate the importance of context, clarity, and consistency. For faculty members to be compliant with the Responsible Employee mandate, Title IX coordinators or those responsible for conveying this information must take great pains to ensure that participants understand their part in this policy and receive information that is most vital to them acting upon incidents of student disclosures of victimization.

The consistency of context also appears to be an issue when comparing participants' understanding of times when the Responsible Employee mandate is in effect. Three of the university staff members, Lindsay, Adam, and Cameron, shared the broadest understanding of incidences of when they need to report. This broad definition of a Responsible Employee means reporting any suspected incidents of sexual harassment, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking of which an employee is aware. As Cameron put it, "If you know something, the university needs to know about it." This includes students disclosing directly to the employee, disclosing through class discussion or a written assignment, overhearing a conversation, or disclosure from an individual with second-hand information. While Rose was under the impression that the Responsible Employee mandate includes class discussion and class activities,

79

she did not include incidents she overhears or disclosures by students who were not currently in her class. These situations somewhat conflict with the information Heather said she received from the Title IX coordinator during a faculty meeting. "The one scenario that I'm aware of in a teaching role where I might not [have to report] would be if it were an educational discussion … because the focus is educational in nature and therefore the student would not have a reasonable expectation that I was going to get them help, … then I wouldn't have a reporting requirement." Heather's understanding is the same as Sarah and Emma, who all received different training. Sarah added written class assignments to the reporting exceptions.

In this analysis of only a sample of faculty members, there are three somewhat distinct understandings of when faculty is required to report an incident. The overall finding is that faculty who are receiving Responsible Employee training are coming away with differing understanding even when receiving the same information.

Being a Responsible Employee

In addition to inquiring about the training participants received, I wanted to gauge how they felt about this responsibility. Participants were asked if the Responsible Employee mandate was, in their opinion, consistent or inconsistent with their role. All 34 shared that this duty to report student disclosures of victimization was consistent. There were several ways faculty connected to this point and their authority or duty to act on behalf of their students. A dozen participants brought up their children and the desire for their safety. Others researched, taught on

this matter, or viewed themselves as being knowledgeable about sexual discrimination. Two female participants shared personal accounts of victimizations and used those experiences as a catalyst for helping others. The majority of participants stated that they did not have any experience with student disclosures or knowledge of the Title IX process; however, they still believed this is an appropriate duty for the role of a faculty member.

With this feeling of consistency, Beth makes the comparison of college students to younger children. "I think it's important. I think it puts more responsibility on us, but we're working with students – just like elementary school teachers are mandated reporters if they think there's child abuse going on. I think it's just part of the responsibility that we have working with students. So I'm supportive of it." Beth sees herself and other faculty as being in a position to help young people when they experience these forms of victimizations. For Gloria, it comes down to the community and caring for one another. "I think it makes sense. We're all together. We're a community. There are things that we see as faculty that staffers might not see because we build that special relationship. I can see where it makes sense." Walter discusses the unique qualities of institutions of higher education. "It's not like working at a private company. … A university is supposed to be about this open and welcoming and engaging environment. … Yeah, it's not the main thing that we're charged with, but as a faculty member we're supposed to help prepare people to be responsible citizens and mature adults. Doing those things means sometimes doing what I said, kind of taking a stand, doing things that are difficult or unpleasant. That's my response, my reaction."

81

Faculty who also served as directors or chairs were more likely to focus on the policy rather than their feelings about the actual disclosure or student reaction. Emma states, "Well, I view myself as an administrator and so I think it's consistent in my role. I don't have a problem with it. Now, as a faculty member, I'm trying to think ... even when I'm teaching, I view myself as a teaching faculty member, but I'm still director of the department. So I don't find it to be inconsistent with my role, to help ensure that students are treated equitably and fairly, and they are not harmed on our campus. So I'm okay with it." Ali, who became the chair of his department within the past six months, said, "To me as a chair now, I can see that there are some gray areas. There are things that ... you don't know if they are Title IX, and where do you actually start to act? You may have a suspicion, or maybe it's just you're not sure. This is the part that's very hard to me, to find out. When it's very explicit, it's easy, but there are situations where you don't know exactly what's happening."

Although the initial response was consistent with a strong theme of responsibility to students, it quickly became clear that their feelings were more uncertain and they had several concerns. The concerns voiced by faculty centered around 1) faculty not feeling comfortable and fearful of making the situation worse for their student, 2) perceived confidentiality between faculty and student, 3) concern of retaliation of the student against themselves, and 4) the politicization of Title IX and focus on sexual assault on college campuses.

Luke, who had not known about these Title IX changes or the institution's policy regarding faculty reporting incidences of student disclosures, was supportive, "Yeah, it's

certainly consistent. I don't know. My role as a faculty member, I think, is to do my very best to make sure that students are learning the material. Obviously, if you're having some significant issue in your life, that is a significant detriment to you learning things and being a successful student." Luke expressed the desire to help but was also hesitant of interfering in his students' lives. "I don't want to go beyond my boundaries as a professor and get into their personal business or whatever." He had procedural questions and wanted there to be more guidance on how to conduct such a conversation. Similarly, Geoff who has received training about this responsibility, still expressed some hesitation. "I want to be helpful, but I know that there are professionals for that that are trained and know how to do it. It's not something I would want to do off the cuff. In that sense, it's consistent because I don't want to push away students that need help, but I feel it'd be much better to have someone trained to do it, to actually do it."

A few participants felt that going against their students' wishes could isolate or re-victimize them. "I personally ... it makes me nervous because then I feel responsible for maybe what happens with them. What they choose or [choose not to do], and then I may personally internalize that. If someone comes in and, say, I don't say anything, that I'm a reporter and they disclose information to me and then I go through the Title IX process." Jonathan circled back to the point about not feeling good about his options once a disclosure happens. "Yeah, I again I keep going back to there's a no win situation right there in the middle where you need to have a win." Even though Jonathan has not received this type of disclosure, it was clear to me that he wanted to be prepared and ready with a way to proceed.

83

Jonathan recounted a story from when he was in high school. He learned that one of his friends was being abused, and he convinced her to go to the school counselor. Even though the parent was quickly removed from the home and his friend was no longer in harm, she had problems at home, and more problems were created for her. "I don't know that I did the right thing for her. I think there is no easy answer, and I think it would be very hard for me to feel what was the right thing to do even if I did follow the checklist or if I did what I felt was right for that person in that situation, I don't know if I would ever feel like I actually did the right thing that was best for that person."

Over half of the participants shared concerns about the possibility of having to report an incident of disclosure when it goes against the student's wishes. Adam, who has received multiple victimization disclosures over his nine years of teaching, says, "I think the toughest piece is that I can't insure the student of it be[ing] anonymous. And that's hard. I think it takes a lot, particularly for a student to tell a faculty person. I understand why the rules are set the way they are. I just think they can be limiting regarding breaking confidence with the student. Particularly to help them through a process. In many ways, it feels like I shuttle them off and I'm the person they trusted to share this with." Rachel adds, "I guess I think it puts us in an awkward position in the sense that if a student feels comfortable and needs somebody to talk to, we always in the back of our mind know that we can't promise them that it's anonymous or confidential because we have our duty to report. So it becomes a situation where you're almost ... you have a student that could be potentially ready to break down or let their feelings out and then you kind

of almost have to let them know that you're actually not that trustworthy, if you will, because you have to report."

Going against students' wishes can have other unintended consequences for faculty, as well. Six participants shared the concern that a student might retaliate against their professor if they, in fact, do report a student's disclosure. Student retaliation was brought up in a few different ways. The first and most common reason was a situation where a student was upset at their professor for "reporting them." Heather was thinking back to a Title IX training her department received the previous year. "I think there were some concerns about, well, what if that upsets the student? What if they want to retaliate and things like that because they haven't been informed of this?" When Jennifer mentioned this possibility, it was in the context of having a perceived victim and perpetrator in the same class. She mentioned the possibility of the perpetrator disrupting class or going so far as threatening physical harm to the other student involved or to herself. Carrie and Michael said they could see students giving them a harsh teaching evaluation review because of their responsibility and decision to report a disclosure. It should be noted that these concerns were discussed by participants that had not yet received a student disclosure of victimization or reported anything to the Title IX office. All the same, these concerns are important to participants and need to be addressed for faculty to feel their safety and occupational positions are being protected.

Another concern noted was the politicization of Title IX. Two participants that expressed this concern had opposing viewpoints. Richard believed the inclusion of gendered crime policies

to Title IX to be a "feminist anti-male agenda." He, similar to his peers, condemns sexual assaults and believes they should be taken seriously, but his definition included forcible rape rather than the broader campus standards that sexual assault is any unwanted touching done in a sexual manner and includes behaviors that are coercive, forceful, and being under the influence or in other ways being unable to consent. When asked about his thoughts regarding consistency, Richard continues, "I don't mind. I don't mind. If someone thinks they've been sexually assaulted, which is something no one should endure, someone should take action somewhere. I'm fine with that. It's this new process that doesn't give due process to an alleged perpetrator, which is very problematic." Although Richard states that he would not hesitate in reporting to the Title IX office, it is unclear if he would think to report incidents that Richard does not see as valid.

On the other hand, Rose expressed strong feelings against having to break a student's confidence for the sake of numbers. She believed that forcing students to participate in a Title IX investigation was a way to take power and autonomy from survivors of sexual assault. "I know I'm supposed to and I just don't and, you know, call it activism, call it a personal choice, I don't really care. I'm not going to jeopardize a student's feeling of safety and security with me and the space that I have worked to create … because [someone] tells me that I'm just supposed to disclose for their statistics." In Rose's opinion, the university is putting too much emphasis or responsibility on victims and not enough on preventing and condemning acts of sexual violence.

Summary

Though participants are aware of Title IX to some extent, it is apparent that not all faculty members are receiving training on being a Responsible Employee. Twenty-two of the total thirty-four participants had received training or some amount of information related to Title IX and the Responsible Employee mandate. These trainings often took place during faculty meetings and were presented by the Title IX Coordinator. When discussing this training and their understanding of faculty members' duty to report student disclosure of victimization, it became evident that participants were not always walking away with consistent information or guidelines. Along with providing more training for faculty on the Responsible Employee mandate, there is a need for Title IX offices to provide resources and clear guidelines as to when and how to report a student disclosure of victimization. In addition to faculty simply receiving clear language and policy regarding reporting student disclosures, Title IX trainers need to address issues or hesitations that faculty and other Responsible Employees express in order to increase reporting and to ensure institutional compliance. Resources used to educate faculty, staff, and students may alleviate some of these hesitations, with the most common reported being participants not wanting to break a student's confidence.

CHAPTER 8: FACULTY CONCERNS

In this chapter I will highlight participants' experiences with receiving student disclosures of sexual harassment, including domestic/dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. It is important to understand the situation surrounding the disclosure and to learn of faculty's experiences with handling these sensitive topics. Not all disclosures discussed occurred after the implementation of Responsible Employee reporting, so the ones that are more recent will include faculty's involvement with the Title IX office or explore why the participant did not contact the Title IX office. In this study, slightly over half, nineteen participants, have at some point in their teaching careers received a disclosure from a student who has experienced domestic/dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking. Sexual assault was the most common disclosure of the three, followed by dating violence or abuse; none received a disclosure of stalking. These disclosures occurred in a number of settings for various reasons. The themes that emerged from faculty accounts of the disclosures they received were: knowing when to report, the difficulties of working with students when faculty members are somehow drawn in or connected to the situation, and faculty's experiences with being a part of the investigation. Before exploring these themes, I will outline the accounts of how or why these disclosures took place.

Reasons for Disclosures

Students disclose their victimizations to faculty for several reasons. For example, students may go to a faculty member they trust and with whom they have a personal relationship. With these disclosures, faculty act as a proxy for a parent or guardian to whom a student might

not be ready to share their victimization. Students also disclose to faculty in the process of requesting class accommodations. Among participants who have received previous student disclosures of victimization, these are the two themes that most often arose.

Students feel comfortable talking to Gloria, and they have disclosed to her many times. She finds that her student disclosures come from students who are or have been in her class and from students who were referred to her, but with whom she does not have a prior relationship. These disclosures do not often have implication for classes, such as a student disclosing to ensure special consideration or extra time to fulfill their class requirement. Students who come to Gloria simply want someone to talk to and will sometimes ask for guidance as to what they should do. In comparison, Michael finds that students visit his office to disclose abuse they experienced as a youth and to compare their experiences with the theories or data discussed during his class. These disclosures occur as a means of the student processing what they experienced, what others have experienced, or what they witnessed as children. These disclosures can be immediately following or years after the victimization, but a theme of disclosing to a trusted source or mentor is an issue that faculty will continue to have to navigate in this new era of Responsible Employee reporting.

Students may also disclose when they believe their victimization could be tied to their academic success. These interviews revealed that disclosures occur in a greater variety of disciplines (Hayes-Smith, Richards, & Branch, 2010), and these disclosures are tied directly to the student's engagement with the course or grades. The disclosure serves as an explanation as to

why the student had not been performing well in class, or the disclosure occurs when making a request for future considerations. For example, Carrie had a student disclose that she was going through the legal system while also juggling her classes. "I had a student come to me because their homework assignment was late and they mentioned to me that they were involved in some domestic issues, but the cops were already informed. She was going to have court cases, and so from there we worked something out." Carrie found this student to be very motivated and earned an A, needing minimal extensions for her assignment. When she came to Carrie's office, she brought along her court documentation and asked for a two-day extension to complete an assignment. Although Carrie's student disclosed while in the midst of her court proceedings, disclosures can occur at any time for a victim. Stephanie had a student who ended up moving back home after disclosing her relationship abuse. "I wish I had [seen it], but she had several injuries and kept explaining them away until she came in one day with a broken ankle." Once Stephanie's student disclosed the abuse, it was already decided that she would transfer schools to be closer to home. Jennifer and Gabriel have also had students who withdrew from their classes after disclosing experiencing domestic and dating violence. Many years ago, Chris had a student disclose she was experiencing domestic violence. Her disclosure was connected to the fact that she had missed a few classes but wanted to continue with the semester. Chris could not recall all the details or if she passed the class, although he is certain he would have given her extra time if that was the issue. All of these participants agreed that they would have benefited with having more training and resources before experiencing these disclosures.

In addition to in-person disclosures, participants also receive disclosures through written assignments. Beth has never had a student share that they were currently being victimized, although it often comes up in her classes. This occurs during the class periods discussing violence against women or domestic violence. Rose, Sarah, and Adam also shared that they have had countless students self-disclose their victimization through class discussion. Rose also noted that students in her online class are just as likely, possibly more so, to disclose online. "There is a sense of anonymity to writing something out and not having to see the immediate reaction on the faces of your peers."

In the following pages, I highlight seven incidences of disclosure and identify issues that participants have faced. The first, and possibly the most difficult, is faculty not having clarity on their responsibility and if the incident ought to be reported to the Title IX office.

Knowing When to Report

An obvious question that faculty face is knowing when to file a report with a Title IX office. As further discussed in this chapter, faculty receive disclosures through a variety of means, including a one-on-one conversation, by proxy or second-hand source, overhearing another's conversation, class discussion, and a class assignment. Furthermore, students might only provide a limited amount of information to faculty, and hence faculty members are forced to decide whether to do nothing, report what they know with doubts of the threshold of a Title IX case, or to make further inquiries of the student in order to make a more informed choice. This

mandate from the U.S. Department of Education states that Responsible Employees must report student disclosures of victimization, but further guidance needs to be provided by the colleges and universities that employ them.

This policy may seem clear, but it is not always obvious to individuals what these disclosures might include or when a report should be made. Richard shared a situation where two female students from his class approached him and disclosed that the TA (teaching assistant) assigned to the class had made them feel uncomfortable. "It was after one of my TAs (or my Teacher Assistants), who apparently knew them in some setting outside of my classroom, who wanted to pursue a romance with them. I inquired, 'What makes you uncomfortable about that?' What they told me was they're not interested, but he was persistent in wanting to pursue a romance with them." He asked if the TA had ever touched them. When they said he had not, then Richard provided the students with options, as the TA was only present on testing days. Richard believed he had taken care of the issue by offering them the option to complete their exams in another location to avoid seeing the TA. He later received a call from the Title IX office and discovered that the students had made a report about the TA. The office had reached out to Richard to inquire about his conversation with his students. He indicated that the person from the Title IX office told him the female students had disclosed to the office that things went beyond the TA showing interest. Although Richard rejects this claim, he states that the students "have been led to believe that they were somehow victimized" and then were compelled to create a story to make their claim more credible.

This example illuminates a few pieces that need to be addressed by a Title IX office. First, students share what they feel comfortable sharing or what they believe is necessary for any given situation. Richard believes that he got the full account because that is what was shared with him and he specifically asked if his TA had physically touched either student. Because of this, he did his due diligence by asking follow-up questions and states that the situation was handled. This is an issue that presented itself through many interviews, of faculty wanting to be sure of wrongdoing or the seriousness of a situation before involving the Title IX office. When faculty feel the need or believe they have the authority to assess a student's claim, then cases will undoubtedly be missed.

Another question that arose during these interviews was the mode in which disclosure was made. Throughout his career, Adam has received multiple student disclosures of victimization. His most recent disclosure occurred a year ago when a student wrote about an attempted sexual assault she had experienced. The writing assignment was to identify a significant event in her life that had either formed or changed her identity. She experienced this assault at a house party while attending a community college. Adam believes that he did not have to file a Title IX report because the incident occurred while the student was attending another institution, but he did feel compelled to check in with the student. "I felt my responsibility to, of course, get more information on that and at the same time to refer them to the resources that we have at our campus, even though it did not happen on our campus."

In both these examples, the Title IX office was not contacted by the faculty members but was eventually notified. While discussing reporting requirements with faculty who have received some amount of training from the Title IX office, it is clear that the information that faculty are leaving with is not consistently clear as to when they are mandated to contact the Title IX office with a student's concern or disclosure.

When Disclosures Hit a Nerve

This mandatory reporting mandate can place faculty in awkward positions when they have to make a report regarding a colleague, especially when that colleague holds seniority. During interviews, Rose and Judith both shared their accounts of aiding a student in making a report against their supervisors. Rose was a new faculty and had uncomfortable interactions with a more established faculty member. "I didn't know if he was being nice or, you know, it was this thing where I ended up in this really peculiar situation and realized the gravity when after a student … told me essentially that she was being so sexually harassed by this professor." Rose's student had felt so uncomfortable with his looks and comments that she began to wear baggy clothing and sweaters to attempt to hide her body. Even though Rose never shared her own experiences with this faculty member, she felt compelled to act. She spoke to the student, who at first wanted to do nothing, but then convinced her to share this experience with the EEOC. This was before the changes were made to Title IX and before disclosure guidelines were given to the faculty. For Rose, it was important that her student make the report herself, as she would have to

94

be willing to make a formal complaint. As far as Rose can remember, it took a year or so, but the faculty member was eventually fired.

Judith had a similar experience with her supervisor and a student. This was over a decade ago, and at the time it was well known that this staff member flirted with and, it was suspected, even dated his students. The mindset of the time was that if students were not complaining, then nothing could be done. Then a student came into Judith's office and asked to speak to her privately. Like the student that Rose worked with, this student was receiving unwanted advances. Judith told the student she should report his behavior. Initially, the student did not want to make a complaint; she simply wanted the behavior to end. Even though the student was preparing to graduate and would soon be out of contact with this staff member, Judith reminded her that his behavior would continue unless someone spoke up. Judith had not told this student that he had also been inappropriate with her – at one point loudly joking at a staff retreat that Judith sleeps with her students to receive high reviews. Not wanting to influence the student with her own experiences, she stayed focused on the current situation and believed this to be a compelling enough issue that action would be taken.

Since the staff member's advancements had occurred through text messages, the student had proof and was able to share that with the EEOC office. "It just was a bad situation, and the straw that broke the camel's back was the text messages because there were other rumors about a student having an affair." Soon after that meeting and as more senior administrators were pulled in to the situation, the staff member was escorted out of the building and was soon fired. Neither

Rose nor Judith filed a sexual harassment complaint on their own behalf. Although I did not ask specifically about their action or lack thereof, research has demonstrated that victims are more likely to speak out against the harassment they have experienced when they are also protecting or validating others' experiences (Cantalupo & Kidder, 2017).

Just as faculty might learn that a supervisor is being accused of sexual harassment, they also might learn that one of their students is an alleged perpetrator. Mariah shared a disclosure involving two students in her class. After noticing a behavior change in a very active student, Mariah decided to check in with the student. The student walked back to her office after class, and when Mariah asked how she was, the student burst into tears. "She had gone to a party that weekend and unfortunately had been sexually assaulted. This literally was after one of these first information sessions that we had done on Title IX. Now I'm like, 'Ah-ha.' I said, 'Have you reported it?' She said, 'I just can't. I just can't tell anyone.' Then I said, 'We have to tell someone.'" They went together to the campus security and began the process of working with the local police department to report the case. The student asked Mariah to stay with her while making the report and she did, partly because she felt it was her duty, not only as a faculty member, but as the person who persuaded her to report the assault.

The student checked in with Mariah throughout the semester and shared that the man who assaulted her, another of Mariah's students, was now harassing her. Mariah shared that it was difficult for her to know all that was going on and still needed to interact with this male student. In fact, he contacted Mariah a few weeks later, worried about his grade, and informed her that he

was dealing with pending charges, without going into detail. She met with him and advised him to seek mental health counseling for the stress he was experiencing. Mariah shared, "That took the strength of Saul to do, let me tell you, sitting there." The male student was later suspended through the conduct process and pled guilty to lesser criminal charges, as far as Mariah knew.

These three women all expressed some level of uneasiness with the detailed disclosures. It is one thing to create a policy that mandates faculty to report a student's disclosure of victimization; it is quite another situation when the faculty member is somehow involved either directly or indirectly. Resources must be accessible when these highly sensitive situations arise. When attending to the needs of the campus, administrators need to examine ways in which faculty are included and aided.

Administrative Add-Ons

A third issue that arose when discussing the Responsible Employee mandate was the additional responsibilities of faculty and staff members. Three participants mentioned that they had been involved in a Title IX investigation. Stephanie shared an account from 2015 in which a student in her program was in an abusive relationship with another student in the same cohort. "She came to us in tears and showed us a bunch of text messages that she was getting. And so, that was kind of our first introduction [to Title IX]." The student was being sent demeaning text messages from her boyfriend, accusing her of flirting with their peers. It seems that the catalyst to involve the faculty members was when he demanded that she change her lab section so that he

would not have to see her flirting with the other men in her group. This caused the student a great amount of distress, and she brought this problem to the faculty member overseeing the lab and then to Stephanie.

Stephanie first assured the student that this would all be confidential but then quickly learned that faculty cannot guarantee confidentiality. She called the student back the next day, and they discussed their options. Within a day or two, Stephanie and the student went to speak with the Title IX coordinator. She remembers the Title IX coordinator being "incredibly helpful," although Stephanie had to take a whole day away from her other duties to attend this session. It turned out that the student had requested that Stephanie join her. After having to break the student's confidence, Stephanie said it was the least she could do. In the end, the student chose not to file anything, and the boyfriend was never contacted, investigated, or reprimanded. In fact, the administration, along with the student, agreed that the best way to move forward was to accommodate the move. "So, it looked terrible to any student who was in the know, which I don't think there were a lot but there were a few, and we couldn't tell them anything, of course. It looked awful. It looked like we had punished her." The students dated off and on for the rest of the semester until they both graduated. Stephanie remembers checking in with the student a few times, but they never discussed the relationship in any detail. For Stephanie, the situation left a bad taste in her mouth. She respects the student's choice not to file a complaint and understands the constraints of the Title IX office, but there was no resolve for Stephanie.

Mark, a dean and professor, has been a part of many Title IX investigations. Throughout his 23 years of teaching, most of the incidents of sexual harassment involved a faculty member and a student. One of the most recent incidents involved a student who reported feeling uncomfortable with her mentor. The faculty member was making unwanted advances, but she was conflicted about reporting the situation. She feared that this faculty member would interfere with her upcoming international travels to show her work. Mark informed the student he was mandated to report her disclosure and that the faculty member would not be permitted to interfere with her trip. In his experience, students see faculty as holding much more power than they actually do. Mark contacted the Title IX office and filled out the initial report but stayed involved. "My job [is] done after the report is done, but the administration is very involved throughout the process." Mark has been involved in ten investigations, where the Title IX office will contact him throughout the process to gather more information. He explained that since he had a relationship with the individuals involved, they would feel more comfortable speaking to him.

Faculty members involved in filing a Title IX report, attending meetings with the police or Title IX Coordinator, and working with the Title IX coordinator to investigate or gather information are engaging in activities that are beyond the traditional role of a faculty member. Precautions must be made to protect faculty and to ensure their readiness to act in a way that follows institutional policies but still allow them to relate and interact with students in a

professional manner. These protective efforts should include physical safety measures, as well as professional standing.

Role Strain

Role strain is a consequence of feeling conflicted about or unable to meet the expectations of a particular role (Goode, 1960). The role of the faculty member has many expectations, and the Responsible Employee mandate is yet another duty placed upon faculty. The word "strain" was not used by many participants, although other words like difficult, hard, tough, and uncomfortable were commonly used as participants described their thought process or what actions they would likely take with a student disclosure of victimization. As participants did this, there was often, what I interpret as, uncomfortable laughter and multiple uses of um, uh, likes, and pauses. As an example, when Jennifer was describing the steps she would take if a disclosure occurred, she said, "Um, I think that would yeah, I think that would vary based on the kind of dynamic in that moment. Um, for instance, you know if someone was posing that they uh, oh god that would be so uncomfortable (laughter) geez." For ease of reading, quotes have been edited to remove these fillers or simply paraphrased, although I believe these fillers demonstrate the uneasiness participants feel about this duty and their comfort level with handling these cases of a disclosure.

Participants expressed feeling strain in various ways. The discussion of strain came about when discussing the list of duties that faculty already have placed upon them, and more

specifically to this study, the issues of not knowing about the reporting requirement, not wanting to get involved with students' personal lives, not wanting to violate a student's trust, and lastly, participants not knowing the outcome of a report or Title IX investigation. Although it was only expressed by one participant, I should note Richard's viewpoint. The belief that an institution should not be responsible to investigate or determine Title IX violations does not fall strictly into my framing of role strain, although this belief can cause a form of strain. This belief has been discussed in academic literature as well as through the media (Edwards, 2015; McCaughey, 2017; Swan, 2015). Because of this fact, Title IX Coordinators should be prepared for these issues and have scripted responses that might aid the discussion moving forward. This belief cannot be entirely turned around, but administrators can listen to faculty member's concerns and feelings of frustration.

The first and easiest form of strain to address is the issue of faculty not knowing they are Responsible Employees or what that responsibility entails. Mariah, who previously received Responsible Employee training as a faculty advisor, noted with certainty that the faculty in her department have no idea about this mandate and hence would not be able to fulfill this duty. This form of role strain would then only be experienced after the fact, most likely after a report to the Title IX office was not filed by a faculty member after a disclosure of student victimization was made. An aspect that Jonathan worries about is the threshold for when a report should be made. As of the time of the interview, he had not received training on the Responsible Employee mandate and provided a situation that he has had to deal with in the past. Having students that

work in the department, there are personal issues or conflicts that arise and need to be dealt with. His preference has been to work with the parties involved to find a professional way forward and to use the experience as a mentoring opportunity. He now is concerned that "somebody [will] says, well no, you're supposed to report that to the office of student conduct right away and let them handle that." Adding that, "I appreciate when situations are severe that other people handle it, but I kind of feel constrained when someone says, 'No no no, just send it on.'" In these situations, role strain can be experienced as the faculty member cannot fulfill a duty that they are not aware of.

When considering a hypothetical situation of a student disclosing being stalked, Carrie shared her discomfort and fear of being drawn into her student's personal life and problems.

I'm torn with, I don't want to be involved because it can get really messy really quickly, and there's so many steps. It's not just reporting. It's gonna be a continuous situation, versus they obviously are reaching out for a reason. If they feel like they can talk to me about it, then I should be there, because I'm choosing to work in an environment where this happens. I guess if I were to have to pick a side, I understand why we're considered Responsible Employees and I would expect it, being in a university setting. If this is gonna be my job. But at the same time, I can see why some people do not agree with this and feel uncomfortable with it and receive pushback.

As mentioned previously, confidentiality is an issue that arose in many of the interviews. Faculty share relationships with students that can be ones of mentorship and even friendship. Students who are disclosing to faculty might be doing so because they trust a particular faculty member and want to share their experience with an adult other than their parents. Participants struggle with these two viewpoints, wanting to assist the student by following reporting guidelines and

holding the student's confidence. Heather noted that this is especially true for faculty from counseling, psychology, and social work departments. "I think we have particularly strong beliefs about confidentiality and informed consent and autonomy just as a general principle, and breaking confidentiality is breaking somebody's autonomy most of the time or violating – I shouldn't say breaking, but violating their autonomy." Rachel has not received a disclosure related to Title IX, and when thinking about the steps she would take, she also worries about confidentiality. "I think it puts us in an awkward position in the sense that if a student feels comfortable and needs somebody to talk to, we always in the back of our mind know that we can't promise them that it's anonymous or confidential because we have our duty to report." In this situation, she would interrupt the student to inform them of her duty, yet she also recognizes that the student would likely shut down at that point. Geoff includes a Title IX clause in his syllabus as an attempt to avoid such a situation. "I didn't want to be in a situation where a student would reveal that information to me and expect that I would be able to keep it in confidence at that level."

Participants expressed strain through not knowing the outcome of the report they had made, especially in the event of faculty having to make multiple reports over their career and never knowing if their actions actually helped. It can be difficult when faculty members are not sure their report was received or if it is being handled by the Title IX office. Chris knows that the Title IX office cannot inform a faculty member of the progress or outcome of an investigation, although he wonders if they reach out in any way. He suspects that if faculty are not contacted at

all, they might start to believe their report is going into a "black hole," and they could become lackadaisical with their reporting. For Adam, it's difficult to know how to navigate a relationship after disclosing something so personal. "Well, I think that's the piece that's difficult with this whole thing is that uh our purview is very limited, our interaction is very limited, so I don't know if the student seeks the resources, gets the help that they need." Sarah echoes this point, "It's not that you want to get into their business. You just want to know that the next step was handled." She also is concerned that some faculty will be filling out Title IX reports all the time, either because of the topics they teach or their relationship with their students. She suggests that these faculty members might need more face time and resources from the Title IX office to keep them and their students engaged in the process. These feelings over time may serve to be a form of strain upon a faculty member.

Additional resources might also be necessary for faculty members who receive multiple disclosures. Hayes-Smith, Richards, and Branch (2010) found faculty who receive these disclosures are likely to receive multiples ones. These faculty members teach classes on topics of gender, victimization, child abuse/neglect, domestic violence, and families, within the disciplines of Social Work, Sociology, Criminal Justice, Psychology, and Women's Studies. That is not to say that faculty teaching outside of these disciplines will not receive a disclosure of student victimization, although it is important to understand where these disclosures are most likely to occur and identify faculty who might need additional resources from the Title IX office.

104

Summary

Participants' experiences of student disclosures of victimization can be of help to administrators when putting forth policies that can alter the relationship between faculty and students. With this knowledge, Title IX administrators can create best practices for training and resources for faculty. Title IX Coordinators can put into place reporting protocols and additional training materials to help avoid possible strain experienced by faculty members. It is important for faculty to understand the various ways and reasons why students disclose these experiences. As already mentioned, students can share this information with a mentor or trusted confidant, but most cases of student disclosures occur when a student needs accommodations or has been struggling to keep up. It is also necessary for faculty to understand when to report a student's disclosure. Even participants who have received training on Title IX and reporting were not consistent in reporting once receiving a disclosure. This can be accomplished by creating resources for faculty and staff members. These resources will need to be reviewed to address future issues and concerns that arise. Materials that are created should be as clear and the reporting procedures as transparent as possible to allow for faculty to be a part of the process rather than an entity that needs to be managed.

CHAPTER 9: MOVING FORWARD AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapters Seven and Eight highlight participants' knowledge of Title IX, including the Responsible Employee mandate, along with their experiences in receiving a student's disclosure of victimization. In Chapter Nine, I discuss participants' recommendations to clarify their responsibilities when these student disclosures occur and their thoughts on ensuring a campus-wide training for faculty and staff who are deemed a Responsible Employee. These recommendations are followed up with a discussion on resources that might be needed, or at the very least, are helpful in supporting faculty members with this added duty to their role. When accounting for the responsibilities that already go into the role faculty hold, it is imperative that university Responsible Employee policies and guidelines for reporting disclosures are done thoughtfully and include faculty and staff input.

Participant's first recommendation is to clarify faculty members' responsibilities and to educate the campus community. This is done by discussing the importance of university messaging and training, how students are informed of this reporting requirement, confidential sites on campus, and lastly, discussing the resources needed beyond an initial campus-wide initiative or training.

Informing Faculty Members

As stated in Chapter Seven, only twenty-two of thirty-four participants were aware of their reporting responsibility, even though they all fell within the classification of being a

Responsible Employee. Faculty and staff training is critical when considering policies to help increase reporting and providing access to resources when students experience sexual-based victimizations. "If students observe a faculty member being insensitive to a victim or if an administrator makes an objectifying comment, these behaviors are magnified by the student, who is already questioning [the commitment to addressing violence on their campus]" (Murphy & Van Brunt, 2017, p.260). Participants shared two distinct issues as they discussed the need for Responsible Employee training. The first, not wanting to make a mistake – telling the student the wrong thing or not knowing the resources available for victims; and the second, not wanting to make a procedural error. As mentioned previously, participants expressed concern over job security if a Title IX-related incident was mishandled and confusion over university guidelines.

Considering university-wide messaging, Judith and a few other faculty administrators spoke on the importance of the messenger. She believes if a priority message came from a university president, then the Title IX office would receive many more requests from departments, offices, and programs for Responsible Employee training. Another way for Responsible Employee reporting to become more visible would be to attach a notification or a Title IX widget to the university's homepage. This would be a clear and bold way to demonstrate the priority of Title IX compliance and a commitment to students' safety. Mark suggested that the Title IX office should work with the deans of the university to ensure that every college receives the same message about Title IX and the Responsible Employee mandate. Mariah also noted that this message must come from individuals seen to lead the university and set the

priorities. She suggested using faculty assemblies to promote the policy and inform faculty of their responsibilities. "I think any time you have the dean stand up and say, 'This is some information that we all need to know, so I asked [the Title IX Coordinator] to come in and just give you a quick overview' that probably goes the furthest than anything else." She suggests creating an inventory of times when colleges bring faculty together and to have a message come from a dean of that college that includes the importance of the Responsible Employee mandate and the role that faculty play in keeping our students safe.

The need for Responsible Employee training is crucial. As mentioned in Chapter Seven, participants have differing views on the training they received, but all agreed that training information needs to be consistent. While Rachel shared the opinion that in-person training from the Title IX Coordinator during faculty meetings worked just fine, others like Michael complained that the side discussions and questions made the matter more confusing and frustrating. When asked to suggest a training method that would be most helpful, participants suggested online training. Throughout the last interviews, participants mentioned an online training faculty were recently required to complete on the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA). Dustin said the online training appeared on his online account without having to register or request it, and he estimated that it took 20-30 minutes to complete. Stephanie thinks there should be several mandatory updates for faculty and staff to complete and adds that Title IX and the Responsible Employee mandate should be one of them. She also had recently completed the online FERPA training, and even though she was familiar with the

information, she still appreciated the opportunity to be refreshed. During this discussion on

recommendations, Judith also mentioned online training. She referenced the online training

students enrolling in the university need to complete. This requirement to inform students about

Title IX-related crimes comes out of the SaVE Act, and so this might serve as an opportunity,

moving beyond what is required to creating best practices by offering training to students,

faculty, and staff members.

Participants note the ease and convenience of online training, although similarly to their

preference with teaching, many do not think online training is ideal. Online training is seen as a

nuisance in Mariah's department. The shared mentality is, "I did this thing online that they said I

had to do." Click, click, click, click, click. I'm done." For Mariah, there needs to be something

more than simply a notification on a do-to list; faculty need to be brought in in a more

meaningful way. Sarah seconds this view, "I'm not much for the online. I do read a lot online. I

learn a lot online. But you make me take a test online, and I'm gonna do it the quickest way I can

to get it done. That's just being honest about it." Although this opinion was shared by many

participants, an online training addresses some of the issues presented in Chapter Eight, with

training uniformity and clarity. When faculty members in the same department, who are

attending the same training, convey a slightly differing understanding of their reporting

requirements, the need for a clear policy and procedure is essential. Having an online module

allows a university to track training completion rates, ensures that faculty and staff members

receive accurate information, and allows these employees to look back on their training if they

have procedural questions after a student disclosure of victimization is made. An online

mandatory training module may be another effort to include part-time faculty, including

adjuncts.

Once a university is on the path of educating and training all their Responsible

Employees of their duties, at that point it makes sense to offer additional training that delves

deeper into the specifics of Title IX and the Responsible Employee mandate. These sessions

would be a more appropriate place to work through scripted scenarios and the more nuanced

issues of reporting. Mark has gone through these types of sessions with training for chairs and

then for deans. He found the most helpful workshops he attended were ones where he and

colleagues were forced to navigate a situation. These scenario-based situations allowed

participants to discover they had many more questions than when they were simply told of the

policy. Another aspect of these scenarios is knowing how responsibilities might change based on

the "hat" a university employee is wearing. Lindsay's full-time role at the university is one that

allows for confidentiality, although when she is wearing the hat of faculty member, she is

classified as a Responsible Employee. "On the first day of class, I let them know what I do,

where I work, what my responsibilities are, and kind of some things that we work with. So, I try

to educate my students up front, but I don't know that people think to do that or again even know

it's a requirement." This can be especially meaningful for faculty who also see clients. Faculty in

counseling, psychology, social work, and other health professional fields will benefit from

resources explaining when they are Responsible Employees and when they are not. These

resources can be explained to both their students and clients so that individuals know when their information will remain confidential. Even though participants, especially administrative faculty, recommend offering these supplemental training sessions, most agreed they should not be mandatory. Stephanie thinks that such a requirement would be unsuccessful at a large university and suspects that faculty would be less resistant to online training they can complete on their own time.

Participants shared that the current method of the Title IX Coordinator visiting faculty members to provide this training is not the most effective means possible. Faculty members, being professionals and experts in their field, should not be expected to follow along a traditional content-based presentation without having the opportunity to discuss and clarify. This view was stated in differing degrees by Rose, Chris, Richard, Dustin, Keith, and Kayla. As it stands, this likely contributes to the feedback from participants that the content felt rushed or that in some instances the Title IX Coordinator was unable to review all the information that needed to be covered. This alternative to establishing a so called "nuts and bolts" online training that is mandatory for faculty and staff would then allow for an enriching follow-up in-person session. These in-person sessions can serve as a Q&A session, as it is apparent that faculty have questions and require more discussion which is not possible in the content-focused presentation they have been receiving.

Informing Students

Another recommendation that participants expressed is informing students of the Responsible Employee mandate. "If students don't know about this, then you're just creating more problems for us," Ida shared. As already stated, students disclose victimizations for different reasons, and as Adam, Gloria, Michael, Rose, and Sarah have all experienced, some students share this with someone they trust and who they expect will keep this information private. Participants state the importance of students knowing and understanding their reporting responsibility, which allows students to make an informed decision when disclosing to a faculty member. When asked if students know about this mandate, 88% of participants said they did not know but doubted this, and 100% of participants think students should be informed about the Responsible Employee mandate before disclosing.

The only participants that mentioned their duty to report certain types of incidents were Geoff, Lindsay, Jennifer, Adam, and Heather. Geoff and Heather included a clause about Title IX in their syllabus for students to review, although in both cases this was listed as a resource – and information related to the Responsible Employee mandate was not included. Lindsay, Jennifer, Adam, and Heather mentioned issues related to disclosure of threatened violence to oneself or anther on the first day of class. This announcement is similar to the limits of confidentiality that counselors need to provide to clients, although only Heather taught clinical classes. In summary, no participants provided specific information to their students on their duties as a Responsible Employee, even though all of the participants agreed that students should

be given this information. This finding is consistent with Rosenthal's study (2017), which includes ten participants at a Midwestern university. Even though these participants had received previous training and were aware of their duty to report (and five had made a previous Title IX disclosure report), none of these individuals included this duty on their syllabus where students could easily access the information, and only one had discussed this reporting mandate with their class.

When I asked Gloria about this, she said, "I don't know how the students are learning about this issue," then later asked if students are informed through the online module they complete when first enrolling in the university. This online module must be completed by students entering the university or a new degree program during their first semester. It includes information about sexual harassment, dating or domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. It also includes other aspects, such as bystander intervention and helpful reactions for when an individual discloses that they have experienced a victimization. Therefore, it makes sense to include information related to Responsible Employee reporting, if possible. This information would not only be beneficial to students, but it would also help alleviate participants' hesitations in reporting a disclosure of student victimization. Students who disclose a victimization to a faculty or staff member might already know of their responsibility to report the incident to the Title IX office; and if they did not have this knowledge previously, they can at least be directed to a clear university policy explaining the requirement and the reporting process.

Since it is unclear if students currently receive this information from the university, participants discussed using a Title IX/Responsible Employee clause in their future syllabi. Carrie would include this and believes the university should craft language that is required for all faculty to use. "That is something that I would highly encourage. I mean, there are so many things that we [already] have to put on our syllabus." Lauren adds that documenting this responsibility provides students with resources they might not have been aware of. "I think that would also help the students so they know where to go and what to do in those situations. Like in the syllabus, we have those mandatory statements we have to put in, so that's one of those that would be good." For Heather, who teaches subjects related to violence and victimization, an additional consideration would be for a university to offer more than one template or to allow for some alteration. This could be done by offering a short, required clause and providing additional information, such as campus and community offices that serve victims. A sample statement follows:

Title IX: Sexual harassment is prohibited at this University and is a crime. (University's name) is committed to fostering an environment in which all members of our campus community are safe, secure, and free from sexual misconduct, including but not limited to, sexual harassment, sexual assault, sex-related-stalking, dating violence, and domestic violence. Students seeking 24/7 advocacy and support can call (hotline number) or visit the website at (website) for additional information and to report sexual misconduct-related concerns. All faculty members have a duty to report incidences and disclosures of Title IX violations to the Title IX Coordinator to ensure that students are informed of their rights.

Along with informing faculty and students, another recommendation is for a university to develop and distribute resources that can assist with the reporting process. To Adam, the need for a clear policy and procedure is paramount. "We do active shooter drills, we do all sorts of things, you know. How are you going to respond if a student discloses one of these four things?" He expressed frustration that so many faculty can still not know what to do or how to interact with a student after a disclosure is made. These procedures then would not only serve to inform faculty of what to do, but also advise what to avoid. Adam feels the priority is the student, and he views this situation of a student disclosing as a radical, and at the same time incredibly vulnerable, position for the student.

Along with these policies and protocols, department and programs can assign a staff or faculty person as a Title IX Resource person. When thinking about campus-wide training, Sarah thought back to diversity training that took place at the university. At the time, university departments, programs, and offices sent a designated employee to receive extensive diversity training and that individual was then tasked with training their coworkers. Having this kind of program implemented can also assist faculty when they have questions about the reporting process. Adam agrees, "I think another thing is to know who is a designated person within the program that a faculty can go to if they have questions." Emma suspects that this person, in many cases, will be the chair or director, although she agrees that they might not always be the best suited. She does suggest having a department or program policy to notify the chair or director

when a Title IX report is made, even if they are not provided with the report detail. This can ensure that they are not thrown off or look as though they are not aware of the goings on of their department/program, and it allows them to keep track of how many disclosures their faculty members are receiving. It might encourage more resources from the university if it is found that particular departments/programs are receiving a majority of student disclosures of victimization.

Other resources that might be helpful are decision trees, checklists, posters, and office-related promotional items. Chris, Emma, and Rachel all discussed the benefit of faculty having a Title IX Decision Tree. This visual aid can serve as a guide in assisting faculty and other Responsible Employees to navigate the reporting process and provide the various campus and community resources that are available to victims. Jonathan brought up the aid of a Responsible Employee Checklist. This checklist might be available on the university's Title IX website to walk Responsible Employees through the process of reporting and provide a way to document their reporting, in case any issues of noncompliance are brought. These resources, as well as the Title IX website, should also have a list of confidential sites or offices across the university. Sarah and Cameron also suggested that posters about Title IX and reporting procedures be posted throughout the campus, including in offices and student populated locations, such as a cafeteria or student center. Posters are not an effective method to teach or train, but they can serve as a reminder and provide a way in which individuals can receive more information. A few participants, including Judith, Lauren, and Rachel, recommend the university create Title IX messaging on office supplies that can be distributed to Responsible Employees after a training

116

session. The items suggested include pens, note pads, keyboard cleaners, screen or glasses wipes, magnets, and window decals. Similar to the posters around campus, these items will not serve to train or inform faculty but can serve as a reminder so a faculty member knows where to find the necessary resources or protocols for reporting, if needed. Cameron, who is employed fulltime through the student affairs portion of the university, was able to suggest a number of items that have proven to be effective for other units. These suggestions highlight possible opportunities for collaboration between academic and student affairs offices or units within the university.

Summary

Faculty, first and foremost, need to be informed of their Responsible Employee duty and educated as to why they are being included in this reporting mandate. Participants provided several examples of how the university can inform faculty members and the campus population of the Responsible Employee mandate. One way to target faculty and staff is to require employees to complete an online module related to Title IX. This can be the start to inform employees of their duties to report and to outline the procedures taken once a report is made. Participants also expressed concern about students knowing about and understanding the Responsible Employee mandate. The consensus of participants is that students should be informed about the consequences of their disclosures and know more about the universities' Title IX policies. This situation of faculty having to break the trust of students can cause strain, as discussed in the previous chapter. The way to help remedy the concerns and hesitations voiced

by participants is through an information campaign, allowing students to come forward when and how they are ready to do so.

CHAPTER 10: DISCUSSION

This study examined the knowledge and experience of faculty members at a large public research university pertaining to student victimization and the Responsible Employee mandate. The goal was to understand how faculty feel about being considered Responsible Employees and to assess what additional resources they need in order to best serve their students. This was guided by three research questions:

1) Do faculty members know they are mandated reporters?

2) How do faculty members view their new role as mandatory reporters of student disclosure?

3) What resources do faculty members feel they need in order to serve and refer students?

This was done by interviewing 34 faculty members from various disciplines and differing titles, ranging from adjunct faculty to department chairs at a Southeastern university. Although this study is explorative and not representative, three major findings resulted from these interviews: the need for clarity as it relates to the Responsible Employee mandate, engaging faculty through a multi-tier approach, and recommendations for support and meeting compliance. These themes were further broken down and discussed based on participants' title (administrative faculty, full-time faculty, part-time faculty) to identify unique perspectives and recommendations of these groups.

Clarity and Transparency

Clarity and transparency relate to the university's policies on Responsible Employee reporting but also to the Title IX investigation process. Even though the Responsible Employee mandate comes from the U.S. Department of Education, institutions of higher education have some flexibility as to who they name as Responsible Employees. As some universities are broadening their inclusion of Responsible Employees to all employees without confidentiality (such as physicians, counselors, and pastors), others like the University of Oregon, have recently altered their policies to no longer include faculty members (Mangan, 2017). With these continuing shifts throughout the higher education landscape, it is essential to create policies that are clear, concise, and easily found. Within this sample, administrative faculty reported being the most supportive of the inclusion of faculty members as Responsible Employees. For the most part, full-time and part-time faculty were also supportive, although there were some concerns voiced regarding this additional duty.

Universities need to make this information clear and ensure that faculty members and other staff are informed (Rosenthal, 2017). This study finds that some faculty members are informed, although this depends largely on their dean or department chair's inviting the Title IX Coordinator to present this information during faculty meetings. Knowledge of the Title IX Responsible Employee mandate largely is also due to a faculty member's role. Administrative faculty seem to be more informed of the university's policies and procedures compared to full-time and part-time faculty. Not surprising was the fact that the only adjunct faculty members

who were aware of being a Responsible Employee were employed full-time in another sector within the university.

More needs to be done to ensure that all Responsible Employees are receiving the same information and are aware of resources available to them and to their students. Along with Responsible Employees knowing about the duty placed upon them, they should also receive information that relates to the reporting and investigation process. Responsible Employees that are required to report student disclosures of victimization obviously need to know how to report, but they should also be given information of what a Title IX report/investigation entails. Some faculty will want this information as it relates to policies, remedial measures offered to students, and the investigations. After conducting these interviews, however, I suspect that most faculty will not request or review these measures. Title IX Coordinators should be prepared to deal with faculty members across a large spectrum when it comes to concern for students and interest in these issues. Through these means, Title IX Coordinators can serve differing needs and interests of faculty members, while also ensuring that more faculty members are aware of their reporting duties as a Responsible Employee.

Engaging Faculty

The sentiment of engaging faculty goes beyond simply notifying them of their duties as Responsible Employees, although this is a baseline requirement. Paul's study of Title IX Coordinators amongst thirteen colleges and universities found a circular problem. Title IX

Coordinators reported feeling unsupported by the faculty members at their respective institutions, although admittedly, faculty were not being engaged in the process. "The lack of understanding by faculty comes from a lack of time to discuss Title IX with them. The Title IX Coordinators reported a difficulty in trying to reach faculty" (2016, p.115). When this engagement did occur, it was often between 5 to 25 minutes that was allowed to discuss the issues at hand. One way to ensure that all faculty members are being engaged is to create and require them to complete an online module related to Title IX and the Responsible Employee mandate. This module can serve as a type of introduction of the topic and their requirements.

Once researchers are finding that faculty members are consistently being trained on their reporting guidelines, then other methods can be used to engage and support faculty throughout the process. Participants expressed a need for buy-in of faculty members from the university and Title IX office. Faculty members are often distinguished in their fields, and some do not respond well to simply being told that they have these requirements that they must follow without question. Explaining why faculty members are included and providing scenario examples of when a faculty member is the one employee in the best position to assist a student in need will encourage faculty members to feel a part of the process (Mancini, Pickett, Call, & Roche, 2016).

Participants I interviewed are likely to be on the early adopter spectrum. These individuals readily agreed that they should act if a student is in need and reported that being a Responsible Employee was in alignment with their role as a faculty member. Even these individuals who are in agreement with this mandate still expressed hesitations and perceived

challenges to fulfilling this duty. This all points to the need for further support for faculty members to understand their responsibility but, more so, to have the readiness to act when needed. The following list provides recommendations aimed to assist institutions of higher education with engaging and providing clarity to their faculty members who are deemed to be Responsible Employees.

Recommendations

1. The university needs to identify who they include as Responsible Employees through their policies.

2. The university should develop a way to identify these employees and create a database to track the training information being conveyed.

3. The university should notify Responsible Employees of their duties, including requirements that are related to trainings to be completed. This message needs to come from a high-ranking member of the university, e.g., the university president and/or dean(s) of a college.

4. The university should mandate an online training for Responsible Employees to complete and to acknowledge their duty to report student disclosures of victimizations.

5. In addition to a mandatory online training, the university should offer supplementary face-to-face Responsible Employee workshops with scenario-based examples.

6. These measures should be a part of a university-wide campaign used to inform the entire community of Title IX changes, including the Responsible Employee mandate.

7. The university should create and distribute resources, such as decision trees and/or reporting checklists to Responsible Employees.

8. The university should create language and require faculty to include Title IX reporting and resources on their syllabi.

Limitations

There are a few limitations of this study that relate to large-scale implications. The first limitation is sample size and the recruitment process. With a sample size of 34 faculty members from one university, the perspectives are not comprehensive of all faculty members' knowledge, experiences, and opinions related to the Responsible Employee mandate from the U.S. Department of Education. Participants' perspectives should also be framed within the context of self-selection. A few of the participants who agreed to be interviewed said they did so because they recently had a Title IX issue come up or that they had strong feelings about Title IX they wanted to share. This fact is not true for all faculty members though, as half a dozen said they had no previous knowledge of the Responsible Employee mandate but wanted to learn more about Title IX. Since this study is exploratory, the findings are not representative of all faculty members' experiences. This also goes to the point that only faculty from one university were interviewed. However, this study is among only a few that explore faculty members' knowledge,

experiences, and opinions of the Responsible Employee mandate, including individuals who have and have not received previous student disclosures of victimization.

Future Research

As this study is exploratory, there is room for further research to be conducted. This can include following up at the same university a year after an online training has been implemented for faculty and staff on Responsible Employee duties and reporting guidelines. This line of research should also be duplicated across multiple universities and colleges that include faculty as Responsible Employees to be able to compare faculty members' experiences and perceptions. This should include institutions of varying size with regard to student population, location, and programs related to Title IX. Another examination could be on the various training guidelines, resources available to support faculty and staff, and reporting guidelines.

Going beyond studying Responsible Employees, research should also examine students' experiences and perspectives as it relates to Title IX and an institution's reporting/investigation process. As suggested by Mancini, Pickett, Call, and Roche (2016), future research should survey students' experiences who are connected to a Title IX office through a report from a faculty or staff member. This can be accomplished by conducting exit interviews with those students who have either made a complaint with the Title IX office or had been referred through the police or Responsible Employee reporting.

CHAPTER 11: CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to examine faculty members' knowledge of the Title IX Responsible Employee mandate, their experiences with reporting student disclosures, and additional resources needed to aid faculty members with this reporting duty. This research adds to the campus victimization and reporting literature as it ranges from faculty who have not received formal training on the Responsible Employee mandate to those who are well informed and have worked with the Title IX office with previous reporting of student disclosures of victimization. It also contributes to the literature on role strain as it relates to faculty members receiving student disclosures of victimizations and the duty to report these disclosures to their institution's Title IX office.

The main findings relate to Responsible Employee trainings, reporting guidelines, and issues that might arise for faculty during the disclosure/reporting process. First and foremost, only 22 of the 34 participants had received previous training on being a Responsible Employee. Through VAWA's 2015 renewal, colleges and universities are charges with training employees that are identified as Responsible Employees of their reporting requirements. Therefore, the very first issue is to develop a strategic plan to increase the percentage of faculty and staff who are receiving training by mandating an online Responsible Employee training. There is also a need for training consistency and a way to reference materials from the training that an online platform will be able to accomplish. As this study shows, there are inconsistencies in both the information received in the Responsible Employee trainings and in what participants recall from

these trainings. In one account two participants shared that their training had a great deal of information on proper and improper student/faculty interactions or relationships and less on the Responsible Employee reporting process, while a chair from another department said reporting requirement were the main focal point of the training. In addition, when I asked participants who had received previous training on being a Responsible Employee, three participants from the same department attending the same training all recalled slight differences as to when they were required to report a student disclosure of victimization.

In addition to a mandatory online training, participants expressed a need for supplemental training sessions to work though scenario-based examples to better prepare them to respond to a student who has disclosed to them and to understand the reporting requirements of their university. Faculty should also receive resources as to where they can refer a student who is in crisis, what the reporting process includes, and why these requirements exist so they can explain to students who might not want their disclosure to be reported. These trainings and resources will serve to alleviate issues or strain that faculty might experience with this reporting duty. This study examines the existence of strain within the role of faculty members. Faculty expressed strain in the following ways: damaging their relationships with students by breaking student confidences, the fear of student retaliation through classroom disruptions and/or student evaluations, faculty not feeling confident in fulfilling their reporting duties, and in some cases faculty experiencing strain from receiving disclosures and not knowing if their student is being helped or assisted by the Title IX office after a report has been made.

127

Universities and colleges that include faculty members as Responsible Employees need to ensure that the institution is fulfilling their requirements from the U.S. Department of Education but must also do their best to prepare and support faculty to be able to perform their reporting duties. Faculty members are, in many cases, on the front line when it comes to interacting with and being in a positon to help their students. They need specific measures and resources to ensure that they are able to fulfill all their various duties as faculty members, including handling when a student discloses experiencing a victimization and reporting that incident to the Title IX Coordinator so that the university can serve its students to the best of its ability.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Interview Questions for Faculty Members

University of Central Florida

1. What is your title?

2. How long have you been teaching at UCF?

3. How would you describe your role as a faculty member?

Knowledge of Student Victimization

4. What victimizations, if any, do you think students are at most risk of experiencing?

5. Has a student ever disclosed being a victim of a crime to you?

6. If so…

   a. How and where did this happen?

   b. How long ago was the victimization?

   c. What role did you play?

   d. Was it clear what the student's expectation was of you?

   e. How did you feel after the student disclosed?

   f. Do you feel that you were helpful?

7. If not…

   a. Has this issue ever been discussed in your department? If so, what was the context of that discussion?

   b. How do you think you would handle a student disclosure?

   c. Where would you go to receive counsel or answer questions?

Resources Available to Students

8. Where would you refer students who have disclosed? Have you worked with any of these offices?

9. Have you referred a student to any of these offices on or off campus?

Thoughts on Supporting and Reporting

10. How familiar are you with the Clery Act or Title IX as it relates to reporting campus victimizations?
    * Show participants Title IX guidelines and UCF definition of Responsible Employee
11. How are these new guidelines consistent or inconsistent with the way you view your role as a faculty member?
12. Have you received any training on reporting? If so, what did you get out of these trainings?
13. Can you explain when you would make a report and how you would do this?
    * Show participant the UCF Shield website
14. What are your thoughts of the UCF Shield website including the information presented, resources, and the reporting form?
15. What resources, if any, do you feel would be beneficial in handling student disclosure?
16. Have you ever reported something a student had disclosed to campus police or filled out a student of concern form?
17. What are your thoughts on faculty being considered mandatory reporters of campus crime and student victimization?
18. What advice would you give a new faculty member on handling student disclosures?
19. Do you have any other comments or thoughts that you would like to share about any of the topics we have discussed?

Demographic Information
1. Gender identification
2. Racial identification
3. Age

APPENDIX B: IRB APPROVAL

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1**
FWA00000351, IRB00001138

To: **Abigail M. Malick**

Date: **December 02, 2015**

Dear Researcher:

On 12/02/2015, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review:	Exempt Determination
Project Title:	Faculty Knowledge and Readiness in Reporting Student Victimization Disclosure and Title IX Compliance
Investigator:	Abigail M. Malick
IRB Number:	SBE-15-11735
Funding Agency:	
Grant Title:	
Research ID:	N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the Investigator Manual.

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

IRB Coordinator

GLOSSARY

[Dear Colleague Letter](#)

[Dear Colleague Letter 2011](#)

[Dear Colleague Letter 2015](#)

[Dear Colleague Letter 2017](#)

[Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act](#)

[Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act](#)

[Not Alone](#)

[Questions and Answers on Campus Sexual Misconduct](#)

[Questions and Answers on Title IX and Sexual Violence](#)

[Responsible Employee](#)

[SaVE Act](#)

[Title IV](#)

[Title IX](#)

[Violence Against Women Act](#)

REFERENCE

Abbey, A. (2002). Alcohol-related sexual assault: A common problem among college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Supplement,* (14), 118-128.

Alaggia, R., Regehr, C., & Jenney, A. (2011). Risky business: An ecological analysis of intimate partner violence disclosure. *Research on Social Work Practice, 22*(3), 301-312.

Allen, I. E., & Seaman, J. (2013). *Changing Course: Ten Years of Tracking Online Education in the United States*. Sloan Consortium. PO Box 1238, Newburyport, MA 01950.

Amar, A. F., & Gennaro, S. (2005). Dating violence in college women: Associated physical injury, healthcare usage, and mental health symptoms. *Nursing Research, 54*(4), 235-242.

American Association of University Professors (2017). Retrieved September 10, 2017 from https://www.aaup.org

Association of Title IX Administration (2017). Retrieved September 10, 2017 from https://atixa.org

Baker, K., & Boland, K. (2011). Assessing safety: A campus-wide initiative. *College Student Journal, 45*(4), 683-699.

Bakken, J. P., & Simpson, C. G. (2011). *A survival guide for new faculty members: Outlining the keys to success for promotion and tenure* Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, Ltd.

Baldwin, R. G., & Blackburn, R. T. (1981). The academic career as a developmental process: Implications for higher education. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 598-614.

Barrick, K., Krebs, C. P., & Lindquist, C. H. (2013). Intimate partner violence victimization

    among undergraduate women at historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs).

    Violence Against Women, 19(8), 1014-1033.

Baum, K., & Klaus, P. (2005). Violent victimization of college students, 1995-2002. NCJ 206836

    Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Berg, B. L. (2009). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* Boston: Allyn &

    Bacon, c2009; 7th ed.

Biddle, B. J. (1986). Recent development in role theory. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 67-92.

Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T., &

    Stevens, M. R. (2011). National intimate partner and sexual violence survey. *Atlanta,*

    GA:Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Boardman, C., & Bozeman, B. (2007). Role strain in university research centers. *The Journal of*

    Higher Education, 78(4), 430-463.

Bogo, M. (2006). *Social work practices: Concepts, processes, & interviewing.* New York, NY:

    Columbia University Press.

Branch, K. A., Hayes-Smith, R., & Richards, T. N. (2011). Professors' experiences with student

    disclosures of sexual assault and intimate partner violence: How "helping" students can

    inform teaching practices. *Feminist Criminology, 6*(1), 54-75.

Browne, A. (1991). The victim's experience: Pathways to disclosure. *Psychotherapy: Theory,*

    Research, Practice, Training, 28(1), 150-156.

Burgan, M. (2006). *What ever happened to the faculty?: Drift and decision in higher education*
Baltimore, Md. : Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.

Campbell, R., Dworkin, E., & Cabral, G. (2009). An ecological model of the impact of sexual
assault on women's mental health. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 10*(3), 225-246.

Campbell, J., & Longo, P. J. (2010). Stalking on campus: Ensuring security with rights and
liberties. *College Student Journal*, *44*(2), 309-324.

Cantalupo, N. C., & Kidder, W. C. (2017). A Systematic Look at a Serial Problem: Sexual
Harassment of Students by University Faculty.

Cares, A. C., Hirschel, D., & Williams, L. M. (2014). Teaching about victimization in an online
environment: Translating in person empathy and support to the internet. *Journal of
Criminal Justice Education, 25*(4), 405-420.

Carron, J. A. (2016). *An instrumental case study analysis of Responsible Employee preparedness
after participation in mandated Title IX training* (Doctoral dissertation).

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative
analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Clark, B. R. (1986). *The higher education system: Academic organization in cross-national
perspective*. Berkley and Los Anglos, CA: University of California Press.

137

Croft, J. (2017, May 17). A timeline of Baylor University sex assault accusations. CNN. Retrieved July 1, 2017 from http://www.cnn.com/2017/05/17/us/baylor-sex-assault cases-timeline/index.html

Davies, G. (2008). Connecting the dots: Lessons from the Virginia Tech shootings. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, 40*(1), 8-15.

Dowler, L., Cuomo, D., & Laliberte, N. (2014). Challenging 'The penn state way': A feminist response to institutional violence in higher education. *Gender, Place & Culture, 21*(3), 387-394.

Edwards, S. (2015). The Case in Favor of OCR's Tougher Title IX Policies: Pushing Back Against the Pushback. *Duke J. Gender L. & Policy*, *23*, 121.

Edwards, K. M., Sylaska, K. M., Barry, J. E., Moynihan, M. M., Banyard, V. L., Cohn, E. S., Walsh, W. A., & Ward, S. K. (2015). Physical dating violence, sexual violence, and unwanted pursuit victimization: A comparison of incidence rates among sexual-minority and heterosexual college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(4), 580-600.

Elliott, M. (2008). Gender differences in the causes of work and family strain among academic faculty. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, *17*(1-2), 157-173.

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of women*. Research Report. 1-39.

Fisher, B. S., Daigle, L. E., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2003). Reporting sexual

victimization to the police and others results from a national-level study of college

women. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*(1), 6-38.

Fisher, B. S., Hartman, J. L., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2002). Making campuses safer for

students: The Clery Act as a symbolic legal reform. *Stetson Law Review, 32*, 61-89.

Fisher, B. S., Sloan, J. J., Cullen, F. T., & Lu, C. (1998). Crime in the ivory tower: The level and

sources of student victimization*. *Criminology, 36*(3), 671-710.

Gardella, J. H., Nichols-Hadeed, C. A., Mastrocinque, J. M., Stone, J. T., Coates, C. A., Sly, C.

J., & Cerulli, C. (2015). Beyond Clery Act statistics: A closer look at college

victimization based on self-report data. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(4), 640-658.

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self. *Life as theater: A dramaturgical sourcebook.*

Gondolf, E. W., & Fisher, E.R. (1988). *Battered women as survivors: An alternative to treating*

learned helplessness. Toronto, Canada: Lexington Books.

Goode, W. J. (1960). A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review,* 483-496.

Gregory, D. E., & Janosik, S. M. (2002). The Clery Act: How effective is it? Perceptions from

the field The current state of research and recommendations for improvement. *Stetson*

Law Review, 32, 7-59.

Gregory, D. E., & Janosik, S. M. (2003). The effects of the Clery Act on campus judicial

practices. *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(6), 763-778.

139

Gross, N., Mason, W. S., & McEachern, A. W. (1958). Explorations in role analysis: Studies of the school superintendency role.

Harnded, M. S. (2001). Abused women or abused men? An examination of the context and outcomes of dating violence. *Violence and Victims, 16*(3), 269-285.

Harned, M. S. (2002). A multivariate analysis of risk markers for dating violence victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *17*(11), 1179-1197.

Harshman, E., Puro, S., & Wolff, L.A. (2001, July-August). The Clery Act: Freedom of information at what cost to students? *About Campus*, 13-18.

Hart, T. C. (2007). Violent victimization of college students: Findings from the National Crime Victimization Survey. In J. Sloan & B. Fisher (Eds.), *Campus crime: Legal, social, and policy perspectives* (2nd ed, pp. 129-146). Springfield, IL: C.C. Thomas.

Hart, T. C., & Miethe, T. D. (2011). Violence against college students and its situational contexts: Prevalence, patterns, and policy implications. *Victims and Offenders, 6*(2), 157-180.

Haythornthwaite, C. (2006). Facilitating collaboration in online learning. *Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks*, *10*(1), 7-24.

Hayes-Smith, R., Richards, T. N., & Branch, K. A. (2010). 'But I'm not a counsellor': The nature of role strain experienced by female professors when a student discloses sexual assault and intimate partner violence. *Enhancing Learning in the Social Sciences, 2*(3).

Heise, L. L. (1998). Violence against women: An integrated ecological framework. *Violence Against Women, 4*(3), 262-290.

Jennings, W. G., Grover, A. R., & Pudrzynska, D. (2007). Are institutions of higher learning safe? A descriptive study of campus safety issues and self-reported campus victimization among male and female college students. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education, 18*(2), 191-208.

Jordan, C. E., Combs, J. L., & Smith, G. T. (2014). An exploration of sexual victimization and academic performance among college women. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 15*(3), 191-200.

Kanik, H. (2017, October 30). UO creates new "Responsible Reporting" policy to support survivors of gender-based discrimination and harassment on campus. *Daily Emerald*. Retrieved November 1, 2017 from https://www.dailyemerald.com/2017/10/30/2487848/

Karjane, H. M., Fisher, B., & Cullen, F. T. (2005). *Sexual assault on campus: What colleges and universities are doing about it.* U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Katel, P. (2011, February 4). Crime on campuses: Are colleges doing enough to keep students safe? *CQ Researcher*, 21(5), 97-120.

Kaukinen, C. (2014). Dating violence among college students: The risk and protective factors. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse, 15*(4), 283-296.

Kaukinen, C., Gover, A. R., & Hartman, J. L. (2012). College women's experiences of dating

    violence in casual and exclusive relationships. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*,

    37(2), 146-162.

Kezar, A. (2012). *Embracing non-tenure track faculty: Changing campuses for the new faculty*

    majority. New York, NY:Routledge.

Kilpatrick, D. G. (2004). What is violence against women: Defining and measuring the problem.

    Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19(11), 1209-1234.

King, A. (1993). From sage on the stage to guide on the side. *College teaching*, *41*(1), 30-35.

Know Your Title IX (2017). Retrieved August 30, 2017 from https://www.knowyourix.org

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and

    prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher

    education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*(2), 162-170.

Lamport, M. A. (1993). Student-faculty interaction and the effect on college student outcomes: A

    review of the literature. *Adolescence*, *28*(112), 971.

Lease, S. H. (1999). Occupational role stressors, coping, support, and hardiness as predictors of

    strain in academic faculty: An emphasis on new and female faculty. *Research in Higher*

    Education, 40(3), 285-307.

Lewis, S. F., & Fremouw, W. (2001). Dating violence: A critical review of the literature.

    Clinical Psychology Review, 21(1), 105-127.

Liang, B., Goodman, L., Tummala-Narra, P., & Weintraub, S. (2005). A theoretical framework

    for understanding help-seeking processes among survivors of intimate partner violence.

    American Journal of Community Psychology, 36(1-2), 71-84.

Linden, J. A. (2011). Care of the adult patient after sexual assault. *New England Journal of*

    Medicine, 365(9), 834-841.

Lindquist, C. H., Barrick, K., Krebs, C., Crosby, C. M., Lockard, A. J., & Sanders-Phillips, K.

    (2013). The context and consequences of sexual assault among undergraduate women at

    historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs). *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,*

    28(12), 2437-2461.

Lonsway, K. A., & Rennison, C. M. (2013). *Sexual assault report*. 33-48.

Mancini, C., Pickett, J. T., Call, C., & Roche, S. P. (2016). Mandatory reporting (MR) in higher

    education: College students' perceptions of laws designed to reduce campus sexual

    assault. *Criminal justice review*, *41*(2), 219-235.

Manzo-Mattucci, N. (2005). Abuse and neglect. In Silkworth, C., Arnold, M. J., Harrigan, J. F.,

    & Zaiger, D. S. (Eds), *Individualized Healthcare Plans for the School Nurse: Concepts,*

    Framework, Issues, and Applications for School Nursing Practice (1st ed, pp169-180).

    North Branch, MN: Sunrise River Press

Mayhew, M. J., Caldwell, R. J., & Goldman, E. G. (2011). Defining campus violence: A

    phenomenological analysis of community stakeholder perspectives. *Journal of College*

    Student Development, 52(3), 253-269.

McCaughey, B. (2017, September 25). The beginning of the end for campus kangaroo courts.

New York Post. Retrieved October 3, 2017 from https://nypost.com/2017/09/25/the

beginning-of-the-end-for-campus-kangaroo-courts/

McMahon, P. P. (2008). Sexual violence on the college campus: A template for compliance with

federal policy. *Journal of American College Health, 57*(3), 361-366.

McNeal, L. R. (2007). Clery Act: Road to compliance. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in

Education, 19*(3-4), 105-113.

Mechanic, M. B. (2002). Stalking victimization: Clinical implications for assessment and

intervention. In K. E. Davis, I. H. Frieze, R. D. Maiuro, K. E. Davis, I. H. Frieze, R. D.

Maiuro (Eds.), *Stalking: Perspectives on victims and perpetrators* (pp. 31-61). New

York, NY, US: Springer Publishing Co.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation.* San

Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Merton, R. K. (1957). The role-set: Problems in sociological theory. *British Journal of

Sociology,* 106-120.

Murphy, A., & Van Brunt, B. (2017). Uprooting sexual violence in higher education: A guide for

practitioners and faculty. New York, NY: Routledge.

Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (1999). A routine activity theory explanation for women's

stalking victimizations. *Violence Against Women*, *5*(1), 43-62.

New, J. (2015, August 3). Staying confidential. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved July 15, 2017 from

https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/08/03

Nilson, L. B. (2010). *Teaching at its best: A research-based resource for college instructors.* San

Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Nobles, M. R., Fox, K. A., Khey, D. N., & Lizotte, A. J. (2013). Community and campus crime:

A geospatial examination of the Clery Act. *Crime & Delinquency*, *59*(8), 1131-1156.

NVivo (2017). (QSR International) Retrieved September 10, 2017 from

http://www.qsrinternational.com/

Orchowski, L. M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2012). To whom do college women confide following

sexual assault? A prospective study of predictors of sexual assault disclosure and social

reactions. *Violence Against Women, 18*(3), 264-288.

Ouellett, M. L. (2010). Overview of faculty development: History and choices. In Gillespie, K.

J., & Robertson, D. L. (Eds.), *A guide to faculty development* (2nd ed, pp. 3-20). San

Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Paul, C. (2016). *Navigating Title IX and Gender Based Campus Violence: An Analysis of the*

Roles and Experiences of Title IX Coordinators (Doctoral dissertation, University of

California, Los Angeles).

Peeke, G. (1980). Role strain in the further education college. *The Vocational Aspect of*

Education, 32(83), 77-80.

Prochaska, J. O., & DiClemente, C. C. (1994). *The transtheoretical approach: Crossing traditional boundaries of therapy* Krieger Pub Co.

Rennison, C. M. (2014). Feminist theory in the context of sexual violence. *Encyclopedia of Criminology and Criminal Justice,* 1617-1627.

Rennison, C. M., & Welchans, S. (2000). *Intimate partner violence*. NCJ 178247 Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Reyes, C., Rudman, W. J., & Hewitt, C. R. (2002). *Domestic violence and health care: Policies and prevention.* Binghamton, NY: CRC Press.

Richards, T. N., Branch, K. A., & Hayes, R. M. (2013). An exploratory examination of student to professor disclosures of crime victimization. *Violence Against Women, 19*(11), 1408 1422.

Ringel, C. (1997). *Criminal victimization 1996: Changes 1995-96 with trends 1993-96*. NCJ 165812 Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Roark, M. L. (1987). Preventing violence on college campuses. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 65*(7), 367-371.

Roark, M. L. (2014). Conceptualizing campus violence: Definitions, underlying factors, and effects. In Whitaker, L. C., & Pollard, J. W. (Eds.), *Campus Violence: Kinds, Causes, and Cures*. (1st ed, pp. 1-28). Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press, Inc.

Roback, H. B., & Shelton, M. (1995). Effects of confidentiality limitations on the psychotherapeutic process. *The Journal of Psychotherapy Practice and Research, 4*(3), 185-193.

Romeo, F. F. (2001). A recommendation for a campus anti-stalking policy and procedures

   handbook. *College Student Journal*, *35*(4), 514-517.

Rosenthal, J. M. (2017). *An Exploration of Responsible Employee Policies on College Campuses*

   as Directed by Title IX: What Do Victims, Faculty, and Administrators Really Think

   about the policy? (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Denver).

Ruback, R. B., Greenberg, M. S., & Westcott, D. R. (1984). Social influence and crime victim

   decision making. *Journal of Social Issues, 40*(1), 51-76.

Sable, M. R., Danis, F., Mauzy, D. L., & Gallagher, S. K. (2006). Barriers to reporting sexual

   assault for women and men: Perspectives of college students. *Journal of American*

   College Health, *55*(3), 157-162.

Sabina, C., & Ho, L. Y. (2014). Campus and college victim responses to sexual assault and

   dating violence disclosure, service utilization, and service provision. *Trauma, Violence,*

   & Abuse, 15(3), 201-226.

Sampson, R. (2002). *Acquaintance rape of college students*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department

   of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Saul, S. (2016, November 4) Penn State faces record fine in Sandusky-related case. New York

   Times. Retrieved April 20, 2017 from

   https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/04/sports/ncaafootball/penn-state-jerry-sandusky-

   clery-act-fine.

Schwartz, M. D. (2000). Methodological issues in the use of survey data for measuring and

    characterizing violence against women. *Violence against women*, *6*(8), 815-838.

Security On Campus, Inc. (2014). *Summary of the Jeanne Clery Act.* Retrieved September 10,

    2017 from http://www.secuirtyoncampus.org

Sinozich S., & Langton, L. (2014). Rape and sexual assault among college-age females, 1995

    2013. NCJ 248471 Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice

    Programs.

Smith, G. M., & Gomez, L. M. (2013). Proceedings from 2013 Annual Conference National

    Association of College and University Attorneys: Effective implementation of the

    institutional response to sexual misconduct under Title IX and related guidance.

    Philadelphia, PA.

Sorcinelli, M. D., Austin, A. E., Eddy, P. L., & Beach, A. L. (2006). *Creating the future of

    faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present*. Bolton, MA:

    Anker.

Starzynski, L. L., Ullman, S. E., Filipas, H. H., Townsend, S. M. (2005). Correlates of women's

    sexual assault disclosure to informal and formal support sources. *Violence and Victims,

    20*, 417–432.

Steinberg, K. L., Levine, M., & Doueck, H. J. (1997). Effects of legally mandated child-abuse

    reports on the therapeutic relationship: A survey of psychotherapists. *American Journal

    of Orthopsychiatry, 67*(1), 112-122.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory, 2nd Ed.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc.

Straus, M. A., & Gozjolko, K. L. (2014). "Intimate terrorism" and gender differences in injury of dating partners by male and female university students. *Journal of Family Violence, 29*(1), 51-65.

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2) development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*(3), 283-316.

Stroka, C. M., & Clark, M. M. (2013). Evaluation and treatment of STD exposure and sexual assault.*Sexually transmitted diseases.* In Skolnik, N. S., Clouse, A. L., & Woodward, J. A. (Eds.), Sexually transmitted diseases: A practical guide for primary care. (2nd ed, pp. 173-179) Springer. Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act, 20 U.S.C. 1001, Public Law 101-542 (1990).

Swan, S. L. (2015). Between Title IX and the Criminal Law: Bringing Tort Law to the Campus Sexual Assault Debate. *U. Kan. L. Rev.*, *64*, 963.

Swope, K. H. (2012). *Rape Myth Acceptance: An Exploration of Influential Factors among College Students* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University of Pennsylvania, PA.

Sylaska, K. M., & Edwards, K. M. (2014). *Disclosure of intimate partner violence to informal social support network members: A review of the literature. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 15*(1), 3-21. The Jeanne Clery Act (2008) 20 U.S.C. 1092(f).

Taylor, K. (2017, July 14). Columbia settles with student cast as a rapist in mattress art project. *New York Times*. Retrieved October 30, 2017 from https://www.nytimes.com/2017/07/14/nyregion/columbia-settles-with-student-cast-as-a-rapist-in-mattress-art-project.html

Turner, R. H. (2002). Role theory. In J. H. Turner (Ed.), *Handbook of sociological theory* (pp. 233-254). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.

Ullman, S. E. (2010). *Talking about sexual assault: Society's response to survivors.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

U.S. Department of Education (2017). Retrieved September 10, 2017 from http://www.ed.gov

Van Brunt, B. (2012). *Ending campus violence: New approaches to prevention.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013. Section 485(f)(1) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1092(f)(1).

Vrij, A., Nunkoosing, K., Paterson, B., Oosterwegel, A., & Soukara, S. (2002). Characteristics of secrets and the frequency, reasons and effects of secrets keeping and disclosure. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 12*, 56-70.

Walters, M. M. (2013). *Making campuses safer and staying out of court: Leadership practices facilitating compliance with the Jeanne Clery Act* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). California State University, Sacramento, CA.

Whitaker, L. C., & Pollard, J. W. (2014). *Campus Violence: Kinds, Causes, and Cures*. Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press, Inc.

Wilcox, P., Jordan, C. E., & Pritchard, A. J. (2007). A multidimensional examination of campus safety: Victimization, perceptions of danger, worry about crime, and precautionary behavior among college women in the post Clery era. *Crime & Delinquency 53*(2), 219 254.

Wooten, N. R., Kim, H., & Fakunmoju, S. B. (2011). Occupational stress in social work practice. *New Horizons in Management Handbook of Stress in the Occupations,* 71-87.

Zinzow, H. M., Amstadter, A. B., McCauley, J. L., Ruggiero, K. J., Resnick, H. S., & Kilpatrick, D. G. (2011). Self-rated health in relation to rape and mental health disorders in a national sample of college women. *Journal of American College Health, 59*(7), 588-594.

Zona, M., Sharma, K., & Lane, J. (1993). A comparative study of erotomanic and obsessional subjects in a forensic sample. *Journal of Forensic Sciences, 38*, 894-903.