EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

CHAPTER ONE. JOINT WELCOME: Edward K. Shupp and Alison Kiss.

Edward K. Shupp, Chief of Police at Lehigh University, welcomed attendees, including many leaders of campus safety efforts. He thanked Connie Clery and her family for their work in presenting this summit.

Alison Kiss, Executive Director of Security on Campus, Inc., thanked Lehigh University for hosting this summit, and Securus GPS and Allied Barton Security Services for their sponsorship.

CHAPTER TWO. WELCOME: Alice Gast.

Dr. Alice P. Gast, President of Lehigh University, welcomed participants to the summit. She acknowledged that issues such as threat assessment, emergency response, alcohol and drug abuse, and sexual violence are difficult to talk about, don’t have simple solutions, and are highly linked to one another. She thanked SOC for turning a great loss into a force for change, noting a tremendous difference in approach since its founding in 1987. She highlighted Lehigh University’s commitment to working for the safety of its community and collaboration with the city of Bethlehem and noted that Proceeding in Partnership could set the standard for the next generation of college security practices.

CHAPTER THREE. WELCOME: Constance B. Clery.


Mrs. Clery identified the conference as a celebration, bringing together SOC and Lehigh University. She recounted how her daughter Jeanne loved Lehigh and her friends there and how Jeanne’s brutal rape and murder by a student she did not know led to the Clery family’s efforts to create state legislation and then to six federal laws to protect students and their families. She stated that the work continues with leaders such as Vice President Biden, Dartmouth’s President Kim, and Proceeding in Partnership’s keynote speaker, the University of Rhode Island’s former President, Dr. Carothers. In Mrs. Clery’s words, “Jeanne’s life wasn’t in vain, and [people] are working together to save student lives.”

CHAPTER FOUR. WELCOME: Zane David Memeger.
Melissa Lucchesi, SOC’s Outreach Education Coordinator, introduced Zane David Memeger, United States Attorney, Eastern District of Pennsylvania. He contrasted an earlier time when campus safety and security were of less concern with the present, in which the Clery Act has raised awareness and activity. Memeger explained that the Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act was introduced into the U.S. Senate in part because of the growing concern about sexual violence among college students. He emphasized that colleges didn’t need to wait for its passage; they could take immediate action to improve the reporting of sexual assaults and services to victims and recognized the summit as part of the dialogue that needs to continue to ensure students a safe environment.

CHAPTER FIVE. KEYNOTE ADDRESS: Dr. Robert Carothers.

Alison Kiss introduced Dr. Robert Carothers, President Emeritus of the University of Rhode Island. She joked that her New England high school friends used to speak of it as “You Are High,” given its reputation as a major party school.

Dr. Carothers agreed with that characterization as a good description of the URI he came to lead in 1991. He presented the story of how he and his administration worked to change a culture of heavy alcohol use and all its consequences. His approach was to make systematic changes in the availability and use of alcohol across the entire campus community using all of the tools at his disposal. Dramatic changes didn’t happen overnight or without significant opposition. Even so, a research group on assessment and evaluation began to build robust longitudinal evidence about change in the entire student environment, effective strategies were ranked by the influential 2002 report on college drinking by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, and change did begin to occur. Dr. Carothers explained that URI is a case study in how determined leadership using evidence-based strategies can change what is often seen as an intractable problem.

CHAPTER SIX. PANEL DISCUSSION ON ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS: Stacy Andes, George W. Dowdall, Peter Lake, Dan Riley, Joshua Scheffer, and John W. Smeaton.

Alison Kiss introduced moderator Joshua Scheffer who asked each of the panelists to present a short statement. Dr. John Smeaton, Vice Provost of Student Affairs at Lehigh University, identified alcohol abuse as the single greatest threat to student health and safety and discussed how partnerships have been a key part of Lehigh’s response. Lehigh collaborated with five other universities, the American Medical Association, and the Harvard School of Public Health in the “A Matter of Degree” program to assess what environmental changes might lessen alcohol abuse on campus. He explained how Lehigh works closely with the city of Bethlehem, joined a learning collaborative with 32 other universities, and, under the leadership of President Alice Gast, continues to seek ways to reduce this health and safety risk.
Peter Lake, professor at Stetson University College of Law, outlined changes in law affecting college alcohol and drug prevention. He noted that federal courts have generally been an unfavorable place for bringing student injury claims, while state courts have varied tremendously in how they deal with alcohol issues. He explained that state law tends to tether responsibility for safety to buildings, so many students who move from campus into the community are moving away from areas of responsibility. Federal leadership on this issue focuses on the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (EDGAR Part 86), but that doesn’t connect to recent science about environmental management. Lake emphasized that colleges should be incentivized to use scientific prevention methods.

Dan Riley has worked on alcohol prevention projects at universities in Arizona, Rhode Island, and Tennessee. He argued that change is not only possible, but predictable, assuming use of a combination of NIAAA tier one to three strategies. By contrast, universities that use tier four strategies, deemed ineffective, may in fact make the problem more serious. He stated that strategic planning is necessary for a campus to choose the best set of strategies for its specific needs and that it is important to move beyond good intentions toward the use of strategies that are evaluated to assess progress. He reminded participants that seeking to achieve incremental reductions may prove better than seeking to completely eliminate the problem and facing further frustration.

Stacy Andes has worked in health promotion for five years at Scranton and then at Villanova University. Her focus is nonmedical prescription drug use (NMPDU), a term recently used to talk about the emerging problem among college students. Andes acknowledged that the body of research findings does not match that of alcohol or illicit drug use, but suggested that NMPDU is second only to alcohol in prevalence and varies across campuses. She noted that a striking majority of students see NMPDU as, at best, only moderately risky, identifying that misuse of prescription drugs has very little stigma and increased access is apparent. Andes challenged colleges and universities to examine what they know about their students’ NMPDU and begin to move toward addressing the issue among their students.

George Dowdall, a sociologist at Saint Joseph’s University, raised the necessity of asking what kind impact institutions are having on college student drinking. A team member of the Harvard School of Health College Alcohol Study that provided national estimates of binge drinking, Dowdall noted that many important research findings about college drinking aren’t used effectively by colleges and universities. College drinking has been reframed as a major public health problem, but colleges often still approach it as an individual conduct problem. However, Dowdall emphasized that recent developments such as the new National Prevention Strategy and the new emphasis on viewing sexual assault (including alcohol-related sexual assault) as a violation of Title IX civil rights will help reframe the problem yet again.

After the individual presentations, audience members asked a string of probing questions. The panel discussed a number of issues, including the definition of binge drinking vs. high-risk drinking; the tendency to delay using promising practices in favor of building a
more comprehensive approach; developing a severity index or a dashboard of indicators to track progress; linking campus to community resources; the need to develop environmental responses; developing student responsibility; helping to connect planning and prevention; engaging the pharmaceutical industry and colleges of pharmacy in an effort to deal with NMPDU and the increasing availability of powerful prescription drugs on campus; the need to stop using ineffective prevention strategies; the need for data and evidence to replace “dueling anecdotes;” and the necessity of balancing student rights with important information sharing about incoming student health issues.

CHAPTER SEVEN. PRESENTATION OF THE JEANNE CLERY CAMPUS SAFETY AWARD

Alison Kiss announced that Kristin Lombardi from the Center for Public Integrity was chosen to be the recipient of the Jeanne Clery Campus Safety Award for her reporting on sexual assault on campus.

CHAPTER EIGHT. SPONSOR WELCOME: Chris Rice and Glenn Rosenberg.

Alison Kiss introduced two sponsors of this summit – Chris Rice and Glenn Rosenberg. Chris Rice is Vice President for College Solutions with Securus GPS, which provides tools for locating people in need of help. Glenn Rosenberg is Vice President for Allied Barton Security Services, who staffs over 4,000 security officers on college campuses. Both companies helped fund Proceeding in Partnership.

CHAPTER NINE. EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND ASSESSMENT: C. Ryan Akers, Darren Baxley, Jason Friedburg, and Jen Day Shaw.

Daniel Carter, Director of Public Policy at Security On Campus, introduced the panel’s moderator, Jason Friedburg, Chief of Public Safety at Bucknell University.

Jen Day Shaw, Assistant Vice President and Dean of Students at the University of Florida, said that threat assessment really starts with prevention, creating a culture of care on campus that helps recognize students, staff, or faculty who are in distress and connects them to resources. Shaw acknowledged that most universities now have response teams, in some cases different teams for students and for staff. At the University of Florida, which has 50,000 students and 13,000 employees, the vast majority of the 400 cases seen each year involve mental health issues. Each one of the cases is assigned to one of two case managers who meet with students weekly and involve family or faculty as well. Shaw explained that threat assessment is a formal evaluation of the degree and nature of a threat to a specific target with the intent of stopping it before it happens. If the fundamental question of whether danger is imminent is answered affirmatively, the case moves to the police; if answered negatively, the case moves into threat assessment. The University of Florida’s foundation is the Secret Service model (shared by the Department of Education) and the institution tries not to separate a person from campus unless
absolutely necessary. The Dean of Students’ role is to gather information and the institution monitors each case and uses behavior contracts and no contract orders.

Darren Baxley, Deputy Chief and Associate Director of the University of Florida Police Department, discussed how ordinary public events on campus can turn into emergencies. His department has developed best practices to deal with celebrations or spontaneous events, with particular attention to training, planning, and establishing important relationships well before needed. Baxley highlighted how an understanding of First Amendment rights can be combined with reasonable restrictions and locations for gatherings and reasonable expectations for behavior and speech. A unified command system model guides emergency response and crisis teams, using a tiered system to respond to events.

C. Ryan Akers, Assistant Professor of Crisis Preparedness Management at Mississippi State University, deals with the four principal functions of emergency management—preparation, prevention, response, and recovery—for the state’s 82 counties. Events that develop from abnormal weather patterns or extreme atmospheric conditions pose challenges to university staff without training or experience in this area. Mississippi has experienced between 33 and 40 billion-dollar weather disasters since 1980, including Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, as well as other hurricanes, tornadoes, and flooding. Akers explained that survival of F4 or F5 tornadoes requires advanced preparation, including evacuation, shelter, and communications plans. Straight-line winds also pose threats to some institutions. It is likely that these types of hazards will increase and that the storms of spring and summer 2011 will become the new norm. Although campuses have been very fortunate so far, but Akers purported that institutions will eventually sustain serious damage. Key issues for higher education are a lack of strategic planning and inadequate budgets and Akers slides listed a series of best practices that universities should review.

Jason Friedberg opened the floor for comments and questions, beginning with his own about how smaller schools could develop behavioral threat assessment. Other discussions included circumstances under which a student should have a mandated separation from campus; how long monitoring should continue; protection of the privacy of information on student conduct; the need for preplanning and strategic thinking about event management; what information can be shared without violating FERPA; the need for sharing resources with low resource communities; responding to noncampus or nonlocal emergencies; and creating mutual aid agreements among campus and state law enforcement.


Melissa Lucchesi, Outreach Education Coordinator at Security On Campus, introduced moderator Kiersten Feeney White, Assistant to the Vice President for Student Life and Director of Community Standards at Saint Joseph’s University.
Michelle Issadore, Executive Director of School and College Organization of Prevention Educators (SCOPE), addressed effective prevention strategies initiatives. She explained that these initiatives must manifest the “seven C’s”; they must be cogent, community-wide, collaborative, concerted, consistent, comprehensive, and centrally planned. She emphasized that prevention on college campuses shouldn’t be directed solely at student and it should be mandated and have consistent messaging. She noted that prevention could benefit from better assessment and from better planning.

Michelle Garcia, Director of the Stalking Resource Center at the National Center for Victims of Crime, examined the connection between stalking and sexual assault. Stalking rates are higher for college than for general populations, and appear similar to those of sexual violence. Victims and offenders most often know each other and may have dated. Stalking often is connected to sexual violence. Research on undetected rapists has demonstrated that while the vast majority of men are not offenders, those who do are committing premeditated rape against their victims and often have continued contact. Garcia stated that bringing stalking into the picture would help validate a victim’s experience, provide opportunities for intervention and prevention, and help to hold offenders accountable.

Paul Cell, Chief of Police at Montclair State University, discussed sexual assault response teams (SART) and the need to put energy into a university’s response to crimes of violence. He emphasized that developing a SART requires individuals to become experts in what they do, and to “check [their egos] at the door,” and instead focus on the needs of the victim. Montclair State University’s SART is composed of three groups: law enforcement, medical/forensic, and advocacy. Their team looked at whether judicial boards have the kind of training necessary to understand victim response and recognized the need to examine offender behavior, understanding that offenders try to separate the potential victim from her friends. Cell stated that very university should have a SART, which requires little money but a lot of cooperation, and called on participants to be the voice of what is now a “voiceless crime.” He called for law enforcement to look to organizations like Security On Campus as partners in that effort.

John Lowery, Associate Professor at Indiana University of Pennsylvania, focused on the response of institutions of higher education to reports of sexual violence. He highlighted that major change in this area resulted from the “Dear Colleague” letter from the U.S. Department of Education’s Office of Civil Rights. The letter states the expectation that institutions need to employ a “preponderance of the evidence” standard (as opposed to a “beyond a reasonable doubt” standard) when hearing sexual assault cases. The letter was controversial in part because it was released before the public had an opportunity to comment. The letter also implies that both alleged victim and alleged perpetrator be given the same rights and opportunities in the process. The letter advises institutions to have a plan for responding to sexual harassment and violence and that staff (including its frontline campus safety staff) be trained in complying with Title IX, the nature of sexual violence, and institutional policies in addressing it. While some issues need further resolution (such as off-campus behavior reporting requirements), the “Dear Colleague” letter creates an obligation to respond.
Kiersten Feeney White asked for questions from the audience. Some of the topics discussed included whether SARTs act out scenarios to understand sexual assault; the availability of online student training programs or resources and whether they have been evaluated for effectiveness; SART outreach programs for males; prevention programs that empower bystander intervention; same sex sexual violence; the underreporting of stalking; the Campus SaVE Act’s requirement that a victim make the decision about whether to report an act of sexual violence; the lack of a systematic review of sexual violence prevention strategies; whether Title IX requires an investigation even if opposed by a victim; trends in sexual violence; the role of alcohol in sexual violence; primary prevention of sexual violence; suggestions for starting a SART; legal liability of institutions regardless of whether or not they have SARTs; the role of self-defense; and the need to move beyond research solely focused on prevalence toward better understanding of prevention. Take-home messages from this panel included the contrast between the continuing high rates of sexual violence but the progress in raising awareness; explaining the problem better to higher level administrators; the need to reframe sexual violence as an institutional problem; and the accomplishments of campus law enforcement in addressing this issue.
Chapter One

Joint Welcome

Edward K. Shupp
Chief of Police, Lehigh University

Alison Kiss
Executive Director, Security On Campus, Inc.

Shupp: Welcome. My name is Ed Shupp. I am Chief of Police here at Lehigh. On behalf of Lehigh University and our president Alice Gast, I’d like to extend a warm welcome to all. We are excited about our partnership today with Security On Campus and today’s program. I am pleased to look around the room and see so many individuals who have been leaders of campus safety for years. I applaud your hard work and dedication. We are also pleased to be able to work directly with Mrs. Clery and the organization herself and her late husband, Howard, have founded on behalf and in honor of their daughter Jeanne, in presenting this event. We hope for a very productive day discussing the issues that we all share and map out concrete strategies in moving forward in this area. We were able to gather experts from across the country on these very important topics we are discussing today and I’m sure you will gain a lot from the presentations. It is now my pleasure to introduce Alison Kiss, Executive Director of Security On Campus.

Kiss: Thank you and thank you Chief Shupp. On the behalf of the staff and board of directors at Security On Campus, we are grateful to Lehigh, notably Dr. Gast, Chief Shupp, Dr. Smeaton, and the Communications staff for hosting this landmark event and really helping to bring this to fruition. Furthermore, I’m very grateful for the sponsors for this event: Securus GPS and AlliedBarton Security, who were wonderful with providing a welcome reception last night and also with covering a lot of the costs for the travel of our panelists.

It has been such a pleasure to talk to these panelists as we bring everyone together during what most of us know in higher education is a terribly busy time. They have very much been committed to making sure we have a wonderful program for you today. SOC has been through many developmental stages and over the past few years has truly transformed into a conduit to bring together students, parents, student affairs, and public safety professionals to discuss issues surrounding public safety.

We are always faced with new challenges. We need your help. This day was organized because we want to hear from you. We purposely kept this small and we hope that you will interact with our panelists and ask questions. Thank you very much.
Chapter Two

Welcome

Dr. Alice Gast

President, Lehigh University

Gast: Thank you all for being here; I’m pleased to welcome you here today. I join Ed and Alison in thanking you for taking time out of your busy schedules to be here for this very important day in this very valuable summit. I also want to thank all of you who work each and every day on your own campuses and in your own places to make a difference. It’s really this work and our work together that will make the difference.

When we talk about the broad issue of campus safety, we are really talking about a number of related issues. Some of these issues we aim to address in this summit; threat assessment, emergency response, alcohol and drug abuse, and sexual violence. As you well know, these are not easy things to talk about. These are not things that have simple solutions and they are highly linked to one another. Despite their complexity, we cannot ignore these issues. They deserve nothing less than our best thinking and our strongest commitment, and that is what brings us here together today.

I’d like to welcome and recognize Mrs. Connie Clery. Mrs. Clery and her late husband Howard devoted themselves to the promotion of security on college campuses following Jeanne’s death. The Clerys suffered an unbearable loss, yet out of their personal tragedy and their unwavering dedication came something truly transformative and life affirming. This is an extraordinary legacy and we take this moment to thank them. (Applause).

I also welcome and thank Dr. Robert Carothers for being here; his inspirational work is motivation to all of us. And I would also like to thank Alison Kiss and all of the staff of Security On Campus for all that they do to make a great loss into a force for change. I had the great pleasure of meeting Connie last night and her good friend, and I greatly appreciate their dedication to this important work.

It is impossible to quantify all of the good work that Security On Campus has done and to fully appreciate the tremendous difference it has made since its inception in 1987. The efforts of this valued organization have created more secure college campuses for generations of students who come after Jeanne. They achieved all of this through unique and innovative programming, and through the development and enforcement of policy and legislation. Starting with the Jeanne Clery Act, Security On Campus has spearheaded important legislation on the federal and state level. They are also at the forefront of victim advocacy. They are committed to empowering students, student victims, and parents to learn about the rights afforded to students on college campuses.

Much has been done. We must not, however, deceive ourselves; there is still much that we must all continue to do to create campus environments where students feel safe so they can learn and grow and embrace this time of their life as a wonderful experience.
Lehigh is steadfast in our commitment to creating a campus environment where students can thrive. For example, the Lehigh University police department formed a community-policing program with the Bethlehem police department, which places officers from the state-accredited Lehigh University police in the neighborhood surrounding the campus. The Lehigh police and the City of Bethlehem police collaborated to develop a joint surveillance system that helps protect students living in off-campus housing and to monitor activity on campus and in the neighborhoods. This advanced technology and fully integrated program allows our forces to truly work together for the safety of our community. Lehigh has also developed a new “hawk watch” program of student volunteers in the neighborhood watch arrangement; they are created to make our off campus neighborhoods safer. And yesterday, together with the City of Bethlehem, we dedicated a portion of the South Bethlehem Greenway, a beautiful linear park of pedestrian and bicycle paths connecting South Bethlehem.

At the dedication ceremony, I announced Lehigh University’s collaboration with the city of Bethlehem to add play areas, gathering spaces, and art, and to improve the street crossing and add a security camera on the Greenway to serve as a deterrent to crime. Improving safety in our neighborhood is an essential component of improving safety on our campus, and I am happy to have many of the Lehigh staff here today to share their best ideas and to learn from you all at this summit.

I am so grateful for the efforts of the Clery family and the dedication of all of you here today to proceed in partnership to identify those programs and practices that will improve campus security. I understand that the report produced from our discussions today will be distributed broadly throughout the country. Our work today is extremely important and carries the potential to set the standard for the next generation of college security practices, so thank you very much for being here and for being part of this important summit.
Chapter Three

Welcome

Constance B. Clery
Founder & Chairwoman Emerita, Security On Campus, Inc.

Shupp: I’d like to personally welcome SOC co-founder, Mrs. Connie Clery. On a personal note, I’d like to give a little background and history. I’ve known Mrs. Clery for over 25 years. I was a sergeant in investigations here at Lehigh the day I met Connie and Howard Clery due to the tragic loss of her daughter. Virtually the entire next year was devoted to this case. Through my interaction with the Clery family, I have come to know and respect Mr. and Mrs. Clery for their courage and dignity. I’ve also been impressed and deeply moved by their commitment to improve campus safety and to spare other families the heartache they endured over their loss. The work that has been done by the Clery family on security on campus for the past quarter of a century has been instrumental in promoting campus safety. Their initiatives and programs and their continued push to modernize campus safety has rightfully been recognized across the country. Security On Campus has been at the forefront for these efforts. Their commitment has changed the way we all look at campus safety and we’re very appreciative of the incredible progress that has been made. Now, it’s my honor and my privilege to introduce Connie Clery.

Clery: I’m overwhelmed. This is a day of celebration for me and it’s hard for me to believe that we’re all together. I love seeing Security On Campus with Lehigh. Jeanne must be smiling. I know she’s proud. She loved Lehigh. It’s like the phoenix rises from the ashes and you make me happy. I hope I can hold myself together.

Thank you so much, President Gast, it was much fun meeting you last night, lovely. And Chief Shupp, and Alison, my wonderful executive director. She has done a fabulous job, as well as the SOC staff. Securus GPS Incorporated, thank you so much and AlliedBarton, thank you so much. And US Attorney Memeger, it was so nice meeting you last night. Dr. Carothers, my hero, thank you for the many years for your courage in speaking out and trying to help save lives. And thanks to all the members of the distinguished panels and all the partners in the quest to save campuses.

I think life is a mystery. Twenty-seven years ago, my husband Howard and I found ourselves in a frantic search with our daughter, Jeanne, to find a college in the Northeast. Jeanne had committed to attending Tulane University, where her two brothers attended, and we had heard of a violent rape/murder and decided that we couldn’t let her go away that far. So we wanted her to come closer to home, Pennsylvania. We desperately searched and found a lovely campus at Lehigh, where she had a wonderful interview. Jeanne loved Lehigh and she loved her Lehigh friends. I was pleased to see her growing into a mature young woman. Jeanne would tell me of her fun times at Lehigh, like being thrown upside down in a trash barrel, and of course I would say kiddingly ‘Oh I hope you were wearing slacks.’ ‘Of course I was, Mom.’ And she’d tell me her fun times at Phi
Sig, her favorite fraternity. Jeanne was so sweet and beautiful, but more beautiful inside. She was also strong and fun-loving. She was joy, total joy.

Right after I learned of Jeanne’s death, a brutal rape and murder by a student she did not know, I knew that I had to do something. I didn’t know what. I didn’t know where or how, but I had to do something because I felt that right from the beginning, because I did not want Jeanne’s life to be in vain. So I started passing out petitions. It led to legislation and then the legislation led to six federal laws to protect students and their parents. Twenty-five years later, I see colleges and universities doing a fantastic job.

It has been a privilege to do this work and to see that Jeanne’s life and my efforts are saving lives and helping others. Many of you here have done wonderful things for safety and for our college students. We have some outstanding leaders that are working on the issues of binge drinking and sexual assault. Vice President Biden has taken a strong stance on the issues of violence against women for over 17 years. I recently visited his residence to celebrate this work. By the way, he was very proud to tell me that his grandfather went to Lehigh and he said he had a picture of his grandfather with his chest out and “Lehigh” right across it. So, I was quite surprised and I thought Lehigh would like to know that.

Then, we have President Kim of Dartmouth College, who has partnered with 32 colleges and universities, including Lehigh, to develop the learning collaborative in examining the high-risk drinking through a new lens. This unprecedented group initiative represents a serious effort to tackle a student health problem. President Kim was recently quoted in the Washington Post as saying, “Loss of life is reason enough to act, but excessive drinking, as repeated studies have shown, can also lead to academic problems, unsafe sex, and sexual abuse. As a leader, a parent, and a physician, I believe that this particular given of college life has led to far more deaths and harm than we should tolerate.” And he also said, “Cultural change is a crucial ingredient in breaking the code of silence.”

Our keynote speaker, Dr. Carothers, one of my big heroes, took a stand while he was president of the University of Rhode Island. The University of Rhode Island was named Princeton Review’s National Number 1 Party School in 1993, and again the following year. Dr. Carothers made a number of tough decisions with the intention of changing the culture at University of Rhode Island. In 2007, University of Rhode Island, under his leadership, was name one of America’s ‘Colleges with a Conscience.’ Congratulations.

In collaboration, we can do many things and make a tremendous difference. We can and must continue to change the culture of high risk drinking and sexual assault. These institutions, their leaders, and you all can’t do it all. We must engage the students. We have to reach them. Respect and responsibility need to come back into style. And stay in style. Young people today live in a different world. There is a lot of fear and terror. Students can feel empowered by helping one another to take ownership of their campus’ safety.
This summit gives me hope that we will have people working on solutions all over the country. I expect you to infect everybody else. I am quite confident that the event today will help spread Jeanne’s gift of safety of college campuses. I do not know how I would have survived without the three F’s: faith, family, and friends. I could not have done what I’ve done without my faith in God. For so long, I have given it my all, and now I am leaving it all up to you. This summit is a gift to my family and me. It shows me that Jeanne’s life wasn’t in vain.

In the Bible, Jesus says, ‘Truly truly, I say to you, unless a grain of wheat falls into the earth and dies, it remains by itself, alone. But if it dies, it bears much grain.’ Jeanne’s seed was horribly trashed and thrown to the wind, but look what happened. We are working together to help save student lives. The best education in the world is useless if a student doesn’t survive with a sound mind and body. These students are our nation’s future leaders. Let us help them to survive with healthy minds and bodies. Thank you all for coming, for caring, and for your compassionate work and commitment for making our nation’s campuses safe for students. God bless you all in this difficult lifesaving endeavor.
Chapter Four

Welcome

Zane David Memeger
United States Attorney, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

Melissa Lucchesi: United States Attorney Zane David Memeger represents the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. He is a graduate of James Madison University and University of Virginia School of Law, where he was awarded the Robert F. Kennedy Award for public service. His dedication to public service and fairness in application of the law to all citizens was also recently recognized by the Philadelphia Barrister’s Association when he was awarded the Honorable William F. Hall award in January of 2011. Mr. Memeger served as an assistant US attorney from 1995 to 2006 and then returned to private practice. He now leads the office of more than 120 attorneys where he once served as an Assistant United States Attorney. Please welcome Zane Memeger.

Memeger: Good morning. Thank you, Melissa, for the kind introduction. It’s a pleasure to be here with you Chief Shupp, Alison, Dr. Gast, and Dr. Carothers. Connie, thank you for all your hard work in the interest of campus safety. It’s a pleasure to be here with you today and members of the organization Security On Campus as you continue to pursue a very important mission in memory of your daughter, Jeanne Clery.

As the academic year continues to move forward here at Lehigh and at other colleges and universities across the country, your efforts make sure and make clear that we must continue to work diligently with institutions of higher education to make sure that students can pursue their studies in safe campus environments. In that regard, I want to take a moment to thank all of you in the audience here today for taking time to participate in this summit. As leaders of your various institutions, your presence here today speaks volumes about your commitment to safety on college and university campuses throughout the country. While this summit is being held during National Campus Safety Awareness Month, I am confident that you recognize that safety requires year long and dedicated commitment. Hopefully you will walk away from this summit with action items that you can use to improve how issues pertaining to sexual violence, physical threats, alcohol, and drugs are addressed at schools that you are associated with.

Over the past few days as I was thinking about and preparing my remarks, I kept thinking back to my college experience at James Madison University, from which I graduated back in 1986. At that time, I can honestly tell you that crime and violence was not something that students and their parents generally thought about or talked about. Rather, the campus environment was viewed as a safe haven where students can learn and become responsible adults while having a bit, okay maybe a lot, of fun along the way. It was not uncommon around campus to be able to get into dorms or friends’ rooms at any time as doors were often propped open or left unlocked. Although there was some
discussion about alcohol and drug abuse awareness, engaging in drinking activity was often encouraged and recreational drug use was not always frowned upon, depending on your circle of friends. Finally, social networking was done in person, not on a computer. If you wanted to get a message to someone, you went and dropped it off personally; you didn’t hit the send button. Unfortunately, we are here today because everyone in this room understands that the activities I just described significantly increase the risk that a student who went off to college to learn and grow never comes home or becomes seriously injured as a result of becoming a victim of a violent crime.

Now fast forward twenty-five years in the age of the internet, Facebook, and Twitter, and you’re sitting down with your daughter who is just celebrating her tenth birthday earlier this week. While she’s super excited that she received a Cliff Lee jersey as the Phillies prepare for their World Series run, you are thinking about how much college tuition is going to be in eight years unless that full ride scholarship to UConn comes through as she promised during the Final Four. More importantly, as a protective father, I’m thinking about what can I do to make sure that she is safe when the time comes to give her the necessary freedom away from home, so that she can grow into a young woman.

Fortunately, I am in a position where I can engage with and interact with the educational leaders so that they can better understand their role as our young people arrive, stay, and live near their campuses in order to prepare for their futures. Since the Clery Act was signed into law in 1990, all colleges and universities that participate in federal student financial programs are required to publish and distribute an annual report which discloses campus security policies and three years’ worth of selected crime statistics. They are required to provide students and employees with timely warning of crimes that represent a threat to their safety and they are required to keep a public crime log where the institution has a police or security department. Failure to comply with the Clery Act can result in large fines being imposed or suspension from participation in federal loan and financial programs.

Since 1990, numerous amendments have been put into the Act and made the Act stronger by providing better access to information regarding sex crimes and offenders. While the Clery Act provides a mechanism through which students and their parents can better be informed about the crime risk that exists on campuses, the mechanisms are useless if those who are responsible for dealing with crime issues on campuses fail to recognize that real world issues exist within the confines of the college property. Accordingly, it is incumbent on all of us to make sure that we do everything in our power to make sure that we are identifying and taking appropriate steps to minimize crime issues on campus.

Last spring, Senator Casey introduced a Senate bill entitled the “Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act”, the “Campus SaVE Act”, in order to improve education and prevention efforts related to campus sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. A similar bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Congresswoman Caroline Maloney. In support of their respective bills, the following sobering findings were cited. Between 20 and 25% of female students experience some form of sexual assault while attending an institution of higher learning, with 3% of all
such women becoming victims of an attempted or completed rape. Multiple studies show that lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender students are more likely to experience violence and threats, including sexual violence, than their non-LGBT peers. 85% of reported sexual assaults against female students at institutions of higher learning are perpetrated by someone known to the victim and nearly 50% of such sexual assaults occur on a date. Less than 5% of rapes or attempted rapes of female students are reported to campus authorities or law enforcement. Although students are more likely to report a sexual assault when they know how to report it, less than half of the institutions of higher learning have written policies for filing criminal charges and campus reports related to sexual assault. Only 1/3 of institutions of higher education report their crime statistics correctly, resulting in an underreporting of sex crimes and less than 20% of institutions of higher education educate students about acquaintance rape. Those are sobering statistics that underlie the bills that were introduced in Congress.

In the face of these statistics, however, there is a belief among campus administrators, as noted in the proposed bill, that the reporting of sexual assaults would be facilitated if institutions of higher education provide services for victims, provide written law enforcement response procedures, provide new student orientation as to sexual awareness and violence, and provide campus-wide publicity about past crimes. While Congress has yet to take action on these bills, there’s nothing to stop institutions of higher learning, as good citizens, from independently taking these proactive steps to address the issue of sexual assault on campus. To the extent you have already done so on your campuses, you are to be applauded. If you believe your safe campus mechanisms in this area need work or are lacking, I would encourage, strongly encourage, you to seriously consider taking the proposed measures in the bill, outlined in the SaVE Act, to reduce sexual assaults on your campuses.

Personally, I think it makes good business sense, and especially when you are considering the fact that prospective students and their parents are trying to identify that special school which will allow a dream to be fulfilled. I truly appreciate you being here today. I think this summit is going to be a very valuable experience and is going to be a very important part of the dialogue that needs to continue to make sure that all students are able to attend colleges in a safe environment.

Enjoy your summit. Thank you very much.
Kiss: It is my honor to introduce our keynote speaker for the day, Dr. Robert Carothers, President Emeritus of the University of Rhode Island. Dr. Carothers has worked for many years with the issue of abuse of alcohol by students and the consequential part that accrues to the campus community. He began his work right here in Pennsylvania at Edinboro University of Pennsylvania, where he served as the Vice President for Administration and Student Affairs; later at Southwest Minnesota State University, where he was President; and in the Minnesota State University System, where he was Chancellor.

It was only after when he became the president of the University of Rhode Island in 1991, however, that the full impact of these issues really hit home when URI was named the Princeton Review’s number one national party school in 1993 and subsequently in 1994. Last night at the reception, I spoke to Dr. Carothers. Since I am from New England and Connecticut, I mentioned that in 1994 when friends were going off to URI, they nicknamed it “You Are High,” as a result of those rankings.

What followed were a number of tough decisions intended to change the culture of the university. These changes were of course initially resisted, but over time students, parents, and alumni gained pride in the university’s new reputation, and as Mrs. Clery had mentioned, in 2007 it was named one of the “Colleges with a Conscience.”

President Carothers served on the President’s Council of the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), which resulted in the landmark report that many of us have seen, entitled “A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of College Drinking at University Colleges.” President Carothers received the James Audimar Award for helping to change the alcohol culture in Rhode Island, the President’s Leadership Award from the NIAAA, and the Jeanne Clery Campus Safety Award. Currently he is serving as the Co-Chair of the NIAAA President’s Working Group on College Drinking. He is also a member of the Rhode Island Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education and teaches courses on leadership at the University of Rhode Island. Please join me in welcoming Dr. Robert Carothers.

Carothers: Thank you very much, Alison. It’s a great pleasure to be here and be a part of Security On Campus and the important work that derives from Connie Clery and Howard Clery’s commitment to change the world on college campuses, with regard to safety. I want to thank President Gast for hosting us; as I listen to the things that are happening here at Lehigh, I was very impressed and I knew that Lehigh can be and is becoming a model for campus safety around the country. [I am thankful] to be in the
presence of Connie Clery and to recognize the work that she has done for so many years sometimes singlehandedly, making the campuses of this country much safer.

Now I want to tell you a little bit about my story at the University of Rhode Island and I’d like to tell you a little bit what we learned from that experience and finally what the research today tells us about strategies to deal with alcohol abuse on college campuses. With that being said, “My name is the University of Rhode Island, and we’re an alcoholic.” We’ve been sober for fifteen years, more or less. I think that Alison’s recollection of her years in Connecticut put her finger on where we were in the early 1990’s. We were clearly known around the region and around the country as “You Are High.” I came there in 1991 from Minnesota and at my first commencement, where I had not yet taken office, I saw that large amounts of alcohol were being passed around during the commencement ceremony. There were bottles of champagne, bottles of beer, bottles of alcohol, just circulating through the student body, while the faculty and the president went through a rather solemn commencement ignoring all that was going on around them.

I knew that that had to change. So in 1992, we set up dumpsters for the march line and, I’m telling you, we filled one and a half dumpsters full of alcohol that was being carried in to the commencement service. In 1993, Princeton Review dealt us the first of wake up calls when we were named the number one party school in the nation and in the next year in 2004, we got it again. We also had a very high profile rape at that time and subsequently the suicide of the young man who was accused in the rape in a fraternity house, where we had posted a police officer at the door where the young women circled around the back of the house and climbed the fire escape, got inside, was sexually assaulted, and sued. We lost. We got a judgment against us for over $800,000 in 1992 money. That was another wakeup call to the campus community.

Homecoming had become such a disaster and such a drunken brawl spread over acres and acres of land that young alumni could not bring families back to the university for homecoming. The public perception of the university as out of control grew after Henry Wechsler’s first study on binge drinking identified the university as a place with one of the highest rates of binge drinking among colleges and universities that he studied. The fraternities were a moving force in this and the fraternity houses were a disaster. I had the bad fortune of living in the President’s house across from four of those houses and I used to say my great fantasy was to get up in the morning, take my stereo system to their house and play classical music at 7 a.m. at the top of the thing. I spent many nights out there breaking up fights, waiting for police to come to help with the problem.

So we began to define the problem broadly. Deaths were the most obvious, drunken driving deaths, sexual assaults, unprotected sex, injuries while under the influence, I had a young man crash through a window like this and fall through three stories and die while he was drunk in a dormitory, vandalism, which was all over the campus from this, assaults, fights, hazing, too many suicides, and what was very important to me at the time was a large level of academic failure. Our dropout rate, our failure rate, our disciplinary rate were way too high for what I wanted to do. Like every new president, I came in with
a vision of creating a new culture of learning and I worked hard to begin to bring the faculty around to that vision. What I discovered was that that work was being undermined by both the reality of alcohol abuse around the campus and that external perception of “You Are High.” We began on the campus to think of this as an academic issue. Faculty who were in the sort of “boys will be boys” frame of mind about this began to understand how their work was being undermined by this culture of drinking.

So we began this process of making a change in the culture. What we learned was there were deep and broad roots of alcohol throughout the campus community. There was first of all denial. Princeton Review says we are the number one party school in the nation and the chorus goes up “No, we’re not.” So one of the important things in the beginning to say, “Yes, we are.” Shedding that sense of denial and acknowledging the problem was one of the first things we had to do. That was greatly resisted by many people who were fearful in what acknowledging the problem would mean to the university in the whole. But we persisted and we began to establish new policies that were tied to this institutional vision and mission of what we were going to be.

So the first dramatic act that we took was to ban alcohol from any event that was held on campus. That included the President’s house and all of the fraternities as well, and that was a shock, a deep shock, to the entire system. We began to do more extensive staff training in this area to get the buy-in from student personnel people who had been looking the other way for a long time, and to get student involvement, peer group involvement in working on that. We began to look at specific target populations: fraternities, athletes. The University of Rhode Island is six miles from the ocean and a lot of our students, many of our upper-class students, live in people’s summer homes for the academic year down on the shore. We call that “moving down the line.” “Moving down the line” was another major source of alcohol abuse for the university and the community.

We began to build alcohol and drug education throughout the curriculum and that was a matter of finding the faculty to do more of work on this issue in their classes. We established a freshmen seminar, a significant part of which dealt with alcohol abuse, drug abuse, sexual assault, and things of that nature. We began to establish a support mechanism for people with problems, screenings, interventions, support groups, and referrals to professionals off the campus who could deal with particularly troubled people. We began to do enforcement, establish what’s now very common in some places, a “three strikes you’re out” policy in which the first violation involved a fine and mandatory alcohol education, a second that was a much larger fine and a probationary period, third was simply you’re out.

And as the reality of that policy spread through the campus, things did begin to change. But they didn’t change fast enough in our fraternity and sorority houses. And there was a great deal of resistance there, and their young alumni were one of the major sources we had to overcome. I shut down eight fraternity houses in a three-year period of time, four of the cases sent the bulldozers in just to raise them to the ground, and began to rebuild that main entrance into the university. Today, all four of those houses across the street
from the President’s house are gone. The alumni association’s building is there, the foundation’s building is there, and an international engineering program is in two of those buildings across the street. The new president has a much quieter evening than I used to have.

In 1999, we decided to do parental notification, which at that time it was very unclear that we were permitted to do that then, so I eventually said “let them sue us”, we are going to do that and that began to have a greater impact in the families of the students. At each freshmen orientation, I used to get up there in front of the families and parents and I would say to them “I hope you have some values coming into this university because we have some values and one of those is that we don’t allow the abuse of alcohol and drugs on this campus, so if you’re coming here to have a good time and to abuse alcohol, please do us all a favor and go somewhere else. We don’t want you, we don’t need you, you won’t be happy here.” The parents would give a standing ovation over that statement; the students we were not so sure.

We also established, under a grant from the NIAAA, a community coalition, which was called the Narragansett Coalition that brought police from the towns around South Kingstown and Narragansett, and from the university police department, community activists, complaining neighbors, a whole lot of people that came into that group. We worked to air these issues out and work on policy.

Finally, we established a research group for assessment and evaluation; we called it the A Team, the alcohol team, and Riley back here was on that team when we first put it together. That resulted in probably one of the best longitudinal databases in the country on college drinking practices. We can tell you, for example, what day of the year the alcohol abuse is likely to be the highest, what night of the week, what the hour will be when that happens, because it is important to target your resources on the times when alcohol abuse is most prevalent.

Now we got a lot of resistance and I want to talk just a little bit about where that came from. It came from students, especially fraternity members, and, as I said before, the young alums of those fraternities. It came from people who were committed to that celebration of homecoming. One of the toughest things we did was to ban alcohol from homecoming. That resulted in a much smaller event, as you can imagine, and a great deal of resistance and bitterness around that because so many people have had such great memories that grow hazier and hazier through time; it was a glorious time for them. In reality, we were sending fifty, sixty kids to the emergency room in the hospitals from alcohol poisoning every one of those homecoming years until we stopped it. Now it’s come back. It’s more of a family event. I think that we are not back where were in terms of participation, but it’s still an event where people are not being injured and hauled off to hospitals.

We had some surprises in the resistance. One of the surprises for me was from the police department. It took me a long time to understand why the police were resisting these changes in alcohol policy. What we discovered was that they were all making a lot of
money in overtime details guarding these parties and fraternity houses and elsewhere. They did not want to give up that money.

We also had a lot of problems from our admission staff because they believed that if we changed this policy, students wouldn’t come. We had that niche. They weren’t all that unhappy about the number one party school because it was a way to market the university as a fun place to go to. We had a lot of resistance from our development offices, who wanted to believe that you had to have alcohol at alumni events in order for people to have fun, feel good, make pledges, whatever. Then we had some resistance from our neighbors, who said that we simply were pushing the problem off the campus into the neighborhoods. What we learned in the Narragansett Coalition was that things had not much changed in those neighborhoods. There was a lot of abuse out there, but it didn’t get any greater and it didn’t get any less. The challenges out there are sort of a separate subject that I can talk about a little later.

Then in 1995 we had an event which galvanized everybody’s view of this. One of the fraternity houses, before we had shut all the alcohol off at the houses, we were at that time giving them a license on a one night basis. A group of football players came to the fraternity party and were tossed out by the fraternity brothers. They came back again and were tossed out. The next day at one o’clock in the afternoon, the entire football team assembled in a parking lot, came up to that fraternity house, surrounded it, and sent a squad into the house and just beat the hell out of those brothers who happened to be at the house at that time of the day. We had serious injuries, broken noses, broken cheeks, teeth knocked out. All of those things happened by our football team.

So we had to figure out what we were going to do about it and how to use that as a moment to make a stand about what our values were. So we suspended the football team. We brought criminal charges against five of those football team members including our star running back. Then we had a football game on Saturday against the University of Connecticut. We decided to forfeit that game. I’m told that was the first time in NCAA history that anybody forfeited a game for disciplinary purposes. That story caught on. The Los Angeles Times did a big front-page story on that because it was a time in which privileged athletes were a big issue in the country. We began, to my surprise, to get checks from people in California, who wanted to support what we had done in this situation. They weren’t so happy about this over in UConn because they lost a lot of revenue from the game; we ended paying UConn $150,000 in compensation for the revenue they lost from that game.

But what was most important was the engagement of our students in reaction to that event. There was a huge rally on the quad of students against violence and against the abuse of alcohol. That movement caught on and it began to spread through various parts of the campus. We ended up in the creation of the Center of Nonviolence and Peace Studies, which has been remarkably successful in training people in nonviolent techniques to solve problems that they face.
Out of that crisis, which was a teachable moment, we got ourselves firmly established in the policies and the practices we were going to have in going forward. I remind us all that every year we start up again. As you know, 37% of high school students coming into college self-report having alcohol issues in their lives. Last week at URI, we saw it again. We had a little melee that happened down at the fraternity houses. We have had all hands on deck to get that under control again.

You never solve this problem. You have to solve this problem every year. If you think you have it solved, you have a problem.

We’ve mentioned the NIAAA Task Force on College Drinking that culminated in 2002’s report. That group was made up of college presidents, alcohol researchers, and students. It was shared by Rev. Edward Malloy, who was then President of Notre Dame University and Mark Goldman, who was a researcher in alcohol at the University of South Florida. Its goal was to create new and comprehensive data on the extent of the problem and then make scientific recommendations to the college, to the nation’s college presidents and their staff.

One of the things we learned early on, there was a huge disconnect between the alcohol research and the presidents and student affairs vice presidents around the country. The researchers wanted to do double blind studies of this and that or the other. The college presidents wanted to know what to do Saturday night.

So we worked a long time to bring those cultures together and we did end up with an analysis of practices people were trying to curb alcohol abuse on the campuses. There are four tiers of those. One was a tier that showed evidence of effectiveness working among college students. The second was evidence that worked with a general population that could be applied to college environments. Third was evidence of logical and theoretical promise, but requiring more comprehensive evaluation. Finally, tier four doesn’t work: evidence of ineffectiveness. These are the things, for example, when someone has a wrecked car and pulls it up on the quad. What we know looking at those things, is it has no effect whatsoever. College presidents want to be able to say that they did something. Without any regard to what those things offer. Without any regard to that those things work.

We hoped what would come out of that study was that we would be able to put in the hands of college presidents what worked and what was possible to do on their campuses. I think the 2002 report called action, provided that framework that came out in many, many forms. Our tactic targeted parents, targeted college administrators, targeted student groups, targeted sororities. It was a ray of publications and websites that went to those issues.

Now the question today is: did any of that make a difference? What we know, according to research that was completed last year, that there is widespread knowledge and

---

1 NIAAA (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism). (2002). *A call to action.*
understanding of those findings and the recommendations of that report. Upwards of 80% of college student personnel workers on campuses, presidents, vice presidents, deans, and so forth, 80% were familiar with that study. And 77% of their colleges had implemented at least one strategy that was recommended in that report.

Nonetheless, rates of binge drinking of alcohol among college students continued to rise, mostly among the group between 21 and 24. We did have a slight decline in the 18 to 21 groups. But that 21-24 has the highest rate of drinking under the influence and the highest rate of alcohol injuries and deaths. I think it is fair to say today that we do know a great deal about the problem and about intervention strategies that work. What we don’t yet seem to know is how to implement those strategies. Dr. Ralph Hingson has done more work than anyone I know about this question and his analysis of that was contained in a commentary published in the journal of *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research* in 2010.² His first conclusion is that most schools focused on individual interventions for students who are problem drinkers or high risk for such behavior, using things like norms training, cognitive behavioral skills training, and brief motivational interview, which I personally think is one of the best strategies for all of us. It is also true that that only works if a small number of the students are less than the number of people that need that kind of treatment. One answer to that problem on how to scale up what we know that works may be web-based feedback programs that can reach much larger populations. There is some evidence that those programs are effective. In many ways this is what social norming could use to establish an understanding of just how many people do drink. College students have a tendency to say that everybody does it. In reality everyone doesn’t. So getting them to understand that there are large sections of their friends around them, who don’t engage in this kind of behavior, is important to do.

But the evidence also shows that the single most effective way of dealing with this problem is efforts that focus on the overall student environment. These are the most effective and the least used by colleges and universities. The environmental approach is toughest for college administrators because it requires extensive interaction with people and organizations outside the college community.

One of the things I [heard Dr. Gast say] is how much you were involved in interacting with that larger community and making your efforts to work together. For example, the few administrators have been involved in or even discussed compliance checks outside the university. Usually they are done by local police departments and we typically want to stay far away from that as we can. They are not engaged in discussions to limit alcohol outlets or to eliminate certain practices such as happy hours, two for one, ladies’ nights, all of those things that drive the price of alcohol down. Alcohol pricing has been closely

related to alcohol abuse for a long time but practically no administrators are willing to engage those issues.

We need to work with city officials, community groups like MADD and Security On Campus, on these and other questions. In Rhode Island, we have been able to pass laws to regulate kegs, keg registration laws, so if somebody takes a keg out, we know who has it, and we can hold them accountable for that. We now have the loss of driver’s license for any alcohol in the bloodstream for people under 21 years of age. We have developed what we call an orange sticker policy that occurs off campus where houses abuse alcohol and create noise, urinate on people’s lawns, all that kind of behavior. If they do that twice, a large orange sticker, not the red badge of courage, but something that came out of Hawthorne, more like, in which we attempt to control behavior by targeting places where the abuse goes on.

Now the NIAAA has recently convened a second leadership group, The College Presidents’ Working Group, which I co-chair with President Jim Kim of Dartmouth, who is a world leader in public health policy and is bringing lots of new and exciting strategies to the country. At our first meeting of that group, we decided to focus this time on these questions, to look to implementation strategies in communicating to others in leadership positions and to build correlations. This organization, Security On Campus, has been an important force for these issues around the country for many years and I hope they will be an important ally with the efforts being lead out of Dartmouth College in working on new strategies President Gast is now working on that group as well and as [Mrs. Clery] said, there are more than two schools that have signed up to work on this project together.

So there are some good things happening, but the problem is huge. It is very difficult to overcome billions of dollars every year focused on teaching young people to use alcohol. A few years back a number of college presidents and I, there was about fifty of us, went and petitioned the NCAA to ban alcohol advertising from the Final Four basketball tournament. We got our head handed to us because the money is so big. So we have to be smart in order to develop strategies that can offset some of that advertising. As President Kim has made the point directly, we did this in this country with cigarettes. We stopped cigarette smoking from being cool. We did it by throttling down the advertising on cigarettes to young people, and he believes we can do that again. I look forward to working with all of you on these issues going forward. I’d like to stop now and take some questions. Thank you.

**Audience:** Have you addressed off campus drinking not in university-owned buildings? We have a lot of binge drinking that goes on in houses.

**Carothers:** It’s very interesting question because the question is where your jurisdiction lies. About three or four years ago, we extended our disciplinary authority to those off-campus houses. For years, the communities out there have wanted us to have our police departments patrolling those neighborhoods that were populated by students. I resisted doing that because it was a jurisdictional question. It was uncertain whether we had the legal authority to operate in those areas, but we have been able to establish a variety of
practices in those communities that make people and the neighbors aware of what their rights are and what their responsibilities are and as I say this orange sticker policy came out of that process, the Scarlet Letter strategy I think of it. It has in those areas where the police patrols have been stepped up and those orange stickers have been established. You don’t have to sticker every house that is a problem; people know that it’s going to happen to you. That results in fines to the landlord as well as to the residents of the houses. We have a lot of absentee landlords in that community and it’s important to make them responsible for what goes on in their facilities.

**Audience:** Where do you stand on the Amethyst Initiative?

**Carothers:** I had an interesting opportunity to be on the Fox News Show with the president of Middlebury and talk about that issue. I don’t think that there is any question that the 21-year age drove down, in various substantial amounts, the drunk driving in the country. On that issue alone, I would oppose the Amethyst Group. There are some things they are saying about teaching responsibility that I don’t think I quarrel much about with. But I also think the danger having more young people on the highways and being allowed to do that is too great.
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Kiss: I want to take a second to welcome some of our invited guests that we’re so pleased to have with us. Jody McQuade has joined us from the VTV Family Outreach Foundation, which was a family foundation that was developed following the shooting at Virginia Tech. It’s comprised of family members and survivors of the students who lost their lives or were injured. We had the pleasure of working with them recently at a press conference down in D.C. So, it’s, it’s a wonderful group, and I encourage you to visit their website as well. And they have left brochures over there. And I also extend a welcome to Dennis Greenhouse from the U.S. Department of Justice Office for Victims of Crime. So we’re really pleased. We know how busy you all are so we’re so pleased that you can join us.

It is an honor to really welcome the panel discussion on alcohol and other drugs. I have newly met some of the members of this panel as well as known some for quite a while, so it’s wonderful to introduce them. Dr. Stacy Andes is the Director of Health Promotion at Villanova University. I’ve worked with Stacy probably since 2005 on and off for a while. So she has done some tremendous work in the field. Dr. George Dowdall, who is a Professor of Sociology at Saint Joseph’s University. He is also on the board of directors at Security On Campus, Inc. So, we are very pleased to have him, and he assured me that it was not a secret last night that he’s retiring this year, so I’m hoping that we will have him a little longer. Dr. John Smeaton is the Vice Provost for Student Affairs at Lehigh University and one of our hosts. John has been wonderful in helping us to arrange this program, so we are so thrilled that he was also willing to serve on the panel. Dr. Peter
Lake, Professor of Law and the Charles A. Dana chair and director of the Center for Excellence in Higher Education Law and Policy at Stetson University Law School. And I believe there are also some materials on the table over there - some of his publications as well as information on the conference that they put on annually. And then Dan Riley, who is the Director of the Safety, Environment, and Education Center at University of Tennessee at Knoxville and who formerly worked with Dr. Carothers at URI. Our panel moderator for today is an attorney with Bode and Grenier law firm out of Washington, DC and I was very pleased when we reached out to him to have him moderate that he accepted that invitation. Their biographies are also included in the brochure and I would love to go through each of their biographies but that may, they have so many accomplishments, I fear that would take most of our time. So, please join me in welcoming the panel. (applause)

Sheffer: Well, I get to stand up first since I have the least amount of accomplishments. I was very thankful to be asked to moderate this panel and to meet all of these very accomplished folk that will be speaking. And what we’re going to do first is we’ll go through and each of our panel members will give a short introduction of themselves. And then we will talk about the different areas that they would like to focus on today. And we’ll move on from there. So, we’ll just start with Dr. Smeaton.

Smeaton: Very good, thank you, John. My name is John Smeaton. I’m the Vice Provost of Student Affairs. I’ve been at Lehigh for twenty-eight years, and when Dr. Carothers was talking about uh, his experience I swore he was stealing our experience, too. It was amazing similarities in terms of the issues we faced and the challenges we’ve tried to address. But I’m delighted to add my welcome to you as we gather to address these important issues.

From my perspective as a senior university administrator, and perhaps even more importantly as a parent, I believe there’s no higher priority than the health and well-being of our students. Like most of you, I’m a practitioner. Over the course of my nearly four decades in the field, I’ve had the opportunity to work at three fine institutions. It has been truly a privilege to play a role in the education and personal growth of many wonderful, bright, young students. Like you, however, I’ve witnessed a wide range of negative repercussions--personal, social, and academic--associated with high risk drinking.

It is my firm belief that alcohol abuse presents the single greatest threat to the health and safety of college students. It is equally clear to me, however, that there’s no silver bullet answer. If we are to make a difference, and working with professionals such as you and we surely will, we need to develop comprehensive, evidence-based approaches that will make it less likely that students put themself at risk of harm, or others at risk of harm, due to the use and the abuse of alcohol. Now during my opening comments, I’d like to share three examples of steps we’ve taken at Lehigh to reduce high risk drinking and improve the quality of life on our campus.

In 1996, Lehigh was one of six universities selected to participate in the Robert Wood Johnson sponsored A Matter of Degree program. We joined with the American Medical
Association, the Harvard School of Public Health, and colleagues from five other universities to develop and implement strategies to reduce the incidents of alcohol abuse and its intended consequences. Our initiative, entitled “Project Impact,” involving multiple partners to achieve a cultural transformation, employed a broad based approach that included individual, campus, and community interventions. As Dr. Carothers says, it really is about changing a culture. And I’d be happy to describe some of the specifics our efforts during the discussion period if there’s interest in that. Suffice it to say, however, that, by no means eliminating all of the problems, we were able to significantly reduce personal and secondhand effects of high risk drinking by as much a third in categories such as doing something you later regretted, experiencing an unwanted sexual advance, falling behind in school work, or having your sleep or study interrupted.

Partnerships have been instrumental in our efforts. Ed Shupp (you’ve met already), our university police chief, maintains a close working relationship with Bethlehem’s police commissioner. Each year a letter signed by both of them is sent to off-campus students explaining the law, providing tips on hosting safe social events, and establishing expectations about being a good neighbor and being good citizens. And since about a third of our students live in off-campus neighborhoods adjoining the university, we established a community policing program in which officers are dedicated to patrolling those neighborhoods on foot, on bicycle, on motorcycle from 7 PM to three AM nightly throughout the academic year. Those community police officers provide a highly visible presence, and by getting to know the students and local residents, they are seen as a point of contact and a resource for various quality of life issues, most prominently safety, but also day to day issues such as trash, parking, and noise. Now the connection to combating alcohol abuse in this effort is very clear. As we have been able to improve social life on campus, parties tend to migrate off campus. Ed and I can speak more to this program if there are questions, but I’m pleased to say that the program has been very well received both by our students and by local residents.

The third example I’d like to mention is being undertaken at a national level. You’ve heard already about the learning collaborative. We’ve embarked on this very exciting and promising effort to reduce alcohol abuse and the consequences. This past July, Dartmouth president Kim welcomed thirty representatives from thirty-two universities to participate in an 18 month learning collaborative on high risk drinking. Now, the framework, borrowed from the medical world, relies on the spread and adaptation of existing or emerging knowledge to accomplish a common aim. Our intention in this action-oriented project is to identify and implement measurable strategies that will prove effective in reducing the incidents of harm among college students. Collaborative members have committed to test such strategies and share the results with one another. And ultimately we will share our findings with colleges and universities throughout the country.

Partnerships are critical, but so too is leadership. President Carothers is a shining example that leadership from the top of the institution is fundamental to progress. Our own president, Dr. Gast, is a vocal advocate for student success in and outside the classroom. She’s doing her part to address the challenge posed by alcohol abuse through
And finally as we move into our open discussion, I hope that among the many important topics we can address is that of the use of hard alcohol. The harmful effects of hard alcohol have been well documented. Each year a number of our students require alcohol-related emergency treatment at our local hospital. And almost without exception, these incidents are directly connected to the consumption of hard alcohol. And it will come as no surprise to many of you that most of the folks affected by this are freshmen, first year students, that most vulnerable population. We need to find ways to reduce this health and safety risk. And I’m very interested in the successes you may have had in addressing this serious challenge. Again I’m pleased to be here and look forward to our conversation. Thank you.

Sheffer: Thanks John. Just before we turn it over to Peter, I just wanted to remind you all, we’ve got such a distinguished panel, and they’re all going to come at this broad topic we’ve been given from slightly different angles. We’re going to let them give all of their opening remarks first, but I would advise you and ask you, if you have any questions, please write them down while you’re listening to the speaker, so that you haven’t forgotten them by the time you’ve heard the next extremely interesting person has to say. Or me, whatever (laughter in background). Interesting people or me! But go ahead, Peter.

Lake: Thank you. Hi everyone. I’m Peter Lake from Stetson Law School in Florida. My day job is a law professor, so if you hate lawyers, then I’m the guy that you should hate the most on this panel. But by night, I’m prevention Batman. (laughter in background). I’ve been moonlighting, I suppose, in prevention now for fifteen plus years, and I’ve gotten to meet a lot of the folks on the panel doing this kind of work. And your, your work has deeply influenced my work in the law. So my remarks today will really be timed out about law reform and trying to do sort of the fastest five minutes on what the state of the law is and what I think we need to change that would be the biggest impact. This is going to go pretty fast and we may need to step back and ask a few questions about it after I’m done, but I want to lay out a micro blueprint for where we are and what I think we need to do to move alcohol prevention forward legally.

When I entered this field about fifteen years ago, the primary modality of creating safety on campus was court-made law. Very little intervention from the federal government in terms of creating a safe campus. I entered the field even before really the department was deeply influenced by the Institute of Medicine, the NIAAA reports, and Security On Campus, and the Clery Act were still in a relatively new stage when I came in and was involved. And so from a legal point of view, the leadership in terms of creating safe campuses was coming from the court system. And I spent a lot of my time writing about trends and legal decisions, and state law in particular, that leads the field.

What’s happened in terms of the leadership from state law and the court system: in a sense it sort of stalled out. I don’t think we’re going to get provocative and meaningful
change coming out of the court system in the United States. We may get a case here or there that shows leadership towards prevention goals, but for every one we get that steps forward, there’s one that steps backwards, and it’s not a fast moving or even easily coherent system of regulation.

I’ll take you to the federal courts first because this is where people are paying a lot of attention. Interestingly the trend in the federal courts when they see cases involving student alcohol use has been to kick those cases out of court. The federal courts are a very unfavorable place to bring student injury claims. And it really has more to do with the fact that the federal courts are overwhelmed with criminal law jurisdiction and just simply don’t have time. They don’t want to open their doors to these kinds of claims, so they’ve made it fairly clear in the last ten years that they don’t want to play a leadership role in helping to create safe campuses. We have a case, for example, out of the eighth circuit that is relatively recent where a student involved in using alcohol was involved in a rape situation with an invited guest in a dormitory, and the federal court just about bent over backwards to say, “We don’t want to hear these cases. Don’t bring them to federal court.”

And then shortly after that we get the April 4th letter from the Department of Ed. saying that we have to ramp up our sexual assault enforcement procedures. The court was exactly the opposite, really, where the regulators were on this. The federal court said “We don’t really want to participate unless we really have to, unless there’s a clear mandate. We don’t want to lead the charge.” The states, each state has its own alcohol regulation system, so they’re all very different. You know, for example, it’s still lawful to drive with a drink in Mississippi. But when you drive in Maine or Massachusetts and you hand your keys off to another driver you could potentially be charged for DUI.

So we get tremendous variation in state enforcement and attitudes, but just to give you a quick picture of this, what’s holding back a lot of forward initiatives are these residual, social host immunities. Coming from the Don Draper era, if you watch Mad Men. Back in the 60s, we had this idea that social hosting was a unique event that shouldn’t be and viewed with a lot of responsibility. And although a few states have gone against that, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and a couple others, most states have very broad social hosting immunities, which apply to colleges. Typically courts looking at cases will look at those immunities and say that’s, that’s sort of what we’ve got here. It’s not like serving people beer at work. It’s like serving people beer at dinner. It’s more of a personal choice, a home-like choice. That image has a lot to do with keeping the courts from moving forward. Much of it’s statutory.

Moreover, if an individual, a student, has been drinking, we have legal rules that count against them. In Florida, for example, where I’m from, if you’re .08 and you’re injured, that’s going to bar your client. That’s a complete bar to recovery if you’ve been drinking. So we do have a little victim blaming with alcohol. We look at the victims and we say, you’ve made a voluntary choice to become intoxicated, and therefore when you sue other people, the mistake is yours either in whole or in part. It’s a very common system of law throughout the United States.
One other quick point. We tend to tether responsibility for safety to buildings, which is one of the reasons we talk in terms of jurisdiction and buildings’ security, etc. The state law of safety is very structure oriented. It has an orientation towards that. But we know that our students live in a riskscape that’s much broader than the buildings and grounds that we operate. And they’re very crafty because what are they doing? I head this question from Dr. Carothers. What about these houses off-campus that people move out of our jurisdiction? They understand what a lot of dangerous people understand: move away from areas of responsibility to do things that are bad. And the law, I think, does have this geophysical overtime.

Well, if we’re not going to get a major reform the court system any time soon, where could we look for it? Presumably we’d hope that the U.S. government might take a leadership role with this. And we do have the Safe and Drug Free School Act, but my perception, and I’ll share that with you today and certainly you might have other perceptions, is Safe and Drug Free School Act enforcement under EDGAR part 86 has been very heavily oriented towards demonstrating that you have a policy, that you enforce it, that you report on what you’re enforcing, and that you do a so called biannual review (not at any particular schedule by the way), to show that you’re coming into compliance. And it’s very interesting to me that Safe and Drug Free School does not connect as clearly as it could to the leading science in the field. So we have NIAAA, Institute of Medicine, we’ve got some other burgeoning initiatives and the regulations are from the eighties and nineties in their mentality. They’re very much about enforcement, individual responsibility, reporting on that, and yet the field of prevention has mutated to move in another direction. That we’re thinking in terms of environmental management.

So, I want to throw that out. If I had an agenda, if I could fix one thing today, I would talk with Congress about possibly amending Safe and Drug Free School or with the Department of Education more likely to rethink regulations under part 86, to make them more consistent with where the field of prevention has evolved. And I will say that, though with a word of caution. Because I do think as well one thing we don’t want to be doing, if we’re going to advance this, is to punish schools with regulations and not give them the protection that they deserve. Very much what I hear from my colleagues in the field is, if we start taking on responsibilities that we can’t fulfill, that’s exactly what’s going to get us sued in court (so called assuming duties), and I’ve written a lot about that. We can have that discussion.

It’s intriguing to me that every other actor in American society that steps up to do proactive missions of safety gets protection, but we don’t. So, if you have a car crash, the emergency medical technicians that come to help you out have an immunity. They’re given some protection under the law. The emergency rooms have immunities. I could go on; even good Samaritans that stop to help people injured on the highway get some kind of protection under law, but colleges don’t. We’re the only business that engages in proactive rescuing risk management that doesn’t get that kind of good faith immunity. So, I would suggest, and I’m just going to plant this idea, that we should encourage and incentivize colleges to consider using state of the art, scientific prevention methods to
evaluate those. But if they’re coming in to compliance, we should also consider protecting them from litigation, with potential good faith immunities or something similar to that. So that we say to colleges, if you do this, we want you to be looking for the cutting edge of safety. But we’re also going to give you some protection from endless litigation in the courts, when you’re out of compliance, or arguably out of compliance in the eyes of a plaintiff’s lawyer. This is an idea really that has not been hatched in federal regulation, so I throw it out today just to consider that. But I think that this is the future.

I’ll end on one quick point, and then we’ll turn over because I know that there’s much more stuff that you all want to hear about today. Alcohol really from a lawyer’s perspective is the root of just about every evil on campus. It connects directly with sexual assault. It connects with attainment rates. It connects with giving after graduation. Just about everything that you can think of on campus that has a downside, alcohol is a core risk factor. So when people come to me and they say what are the magic bullets, what are the solutions to create a safer campus, I come back to alcohol every time. I’m not on the sexual assault panel but as you consider that I would certainly throw out this idea as well. If we really want to get our hands around the sexual assault issues, we have to be thinking about alcohol too.

These things tether, and when I see legal cases, I see alcohol and sexual assault. I see alcohol and violence. I see alcohol and educational malpractice claims. The booze is always right behind the negative outcome in the litigation, and so I want you to be thinking about that. We don’t want to be siloing this issue from the other issues that face higher education. In a sense, we need to do environmental management, at least from a legal perspective, as we try to regulate the field. I think I’ve probably already taken more time than I should have. Thank you for suffering with a lawyer this early in the morning, and we’ll turn it over to folks much nicer than myself.

Sheffer: Thanks, Peter.

Lake: Thank you.

Riley: If we want to go nicer we probably need to skip to Stacy. I need to check where I am. I’m surrounded by doctors and lawyers right now. I’m not sure if this is a conference or a country club, but (laughter in background) either way, it’s intimidating. My name is Dan Riley. I’m not a doctor, but we’ll just use my initials D.R. and keep me within that group.

So why am I here? Why was I asked to be on this panel? I’m a practitioner of the art and science of college alcohol prevention and have been incredibly fortunate to work at three different campuses where we’ve had significant reductions in high risk drinking. And just to kind of give you a framework. From 1995 to 1999, I had the opportunity to work at the University of Arizona and we had a very structured and celebrated social norms approach, which would be one approach to looking at reducing college drinking. We were able to reduce our high risk drinking rates from 48 percent in 1994 to 38 percent in
I was part of a great team there and got some really fabulous mentorship and training.

I was provided the opportunity to join Dr. Carother’s team at the University of Rhode Island. And sought out that opportunity specifically because I knew there were more tools to prevention and wanted to become more proficient and really sought out the model that they really established regarding environmental management. I was fortunate to join that team in the middle of their success. I had an opportunity to observe how they decreased their high risk drinking rates from around 60-70 percent in 1993 to 52-50 percent in around 2004, 2005, and they continued to have incremental reductions.

With that experience, I was provided the opportunity to transfer to the University of Tennessee, who, like the University of Rhode Island, did have the distinction of the number one party school in the nation in 2001. It was in a different region in the country. The numbers did correspond with atypical high risk drinking patterns for that part of the country with that campus. In 2004, we had a binge drinking rate of about 50 percent and through some combination of both social norms, environmental management, population level interventions, and a lot of the things that the NIAAA reports and other experts in their field were recommending, we were able to reduce our high risk drinking rate from 50 percent in 2004 to about 27 percent in 2009.

I don’t have the credentials of the other people at this table, but what I do have is the opportunity to work with some really fabulous teams and actually see and experience success in this area that all of us working in this area know historically how difficult it’s been despite good intentions.

So I wanted to throw the gauntlet down a little bit for us as a group, that change is not only possible in this area but predictable if you use the right tools. And the reason I say that there is a handful of campuses that have had significant reductions in their high risk drinking behaviors and are all doing pretty much the same manual things, are all incorporating bits and pieces of tier 1, tier 2, and tier 3 strategies. It’s important to look at how you do your resource allocations on your campus to achieve this success, and maybe, incredibly, required to stop doing the things on your campus that are not predictive of success. And we have a lot of people on our campus today that have really bought into different practices, and I’d just like to throw that out there. One of the things that I saw happen on all three campuses was a concerted effort to sunset projects that we had a lot of folks invested in, and Dr. Carothers will agree with this. There’s a lot of those crash car scare tactics awareness programs that, despite good intentions, we needed to stop doing, because we were allocating resources to things that weren’t working, and we didn’t have enough resources left over to allocate the things that were more promising.

So, I really want to throw the gauntlet down to us as a group and I keep myself accountable to look at what we’re doing doesn’t match national standards and best practices. Just as an interesting experiment, I’d love to see a campus that with best intentions doing a lot of tier four stuff, and their only intervention is to stop doing those things and see if their numbers change. Corresponding with the first law of public health
to “do no harm,” despite our best intentions, some of the things that we think that we’re doing that we think are improving the problem may actually be harming it. So, it’s just kinda, as a group, think about that. If you want to have some discussion that would be interesting.

One of the new tools that have, that has come out as far as being more effective is looking at strategic planning, specifically strategic planning for alcohol prevention on college campuses. There’s some great technical assistance available. If you have some questions, I can give you more information about that. And what that really allows for is campus specific approaches. The best practices that we’ve identified through NIAAA and some other experts may not fit your campus, and may not fit your campus in the way that other campuses have implemented. So, it’s important to look for best practices but at the same time, make sure that those approaches that you’re using match your campus’s specifics, and the tool, the strategic planning framework really provides you a format on how to do that.

Finally, both Dr. Smeaton and Peter have alluded to it: Look at ways of, and Dr. Carothers really established this at Rhode Island, operationally defining and accepting your problem. What are your high risk numbers? How are you collecting that so you can see if your interventions are making any change? And the seed for the question that I want to toss out there and ask you to consider is, are good intentions good enough at this time? Do we have good information to move beyond good intentions? Are we doing a lot of good things on our campuses, but not having any success moving our numbers down towards safety? And I know that we’re all really concerned about fixing this problem, but Dr. Carothers alluded to it: we may need to take a step back and look at incrementally reducing the problem. Because a lot of times there’s a lot of failure in looking at totally reducing, and then being frustrated when we don’t get there. To look at a little from a healthier perspective of having incremental reductions in this year, in this problem year after year. Thank you.

Sheffer: Thank you, Dan. Stacy?

Andes: Thank you. Hopefully everyone can hear me. I have to echo Dan’s comments in that I am honored to be sitting at the table with everyone here. I’ve been in the field of college health promotion for twelve years now, two of those years at the University of Scranton and the remaining ten I’ve spent at Villanova. And in the last five I’ve been serving as a Director of Health Promotion there. Part of my job responsibility is addressing the alcohol and other drug issue on campus. So I have certainly had some time and opportunity to look at those things on my own campus.

Probably most important to what I’m going to be talking about today is my recent doctoral research on nonmedical proscription drug use. So, I’m really going to be taking a little bit of a step away somewhat from alcohol in our panel and talking a little bit about that and hopefully opening up some discussion around prescription drugs on campus. So, I have to say I’ll probably going to be raising more questions today than I am going to be providing any sort of answers because unfortunately, or fortunately if you love research
and are really excited about that, we’re still learning a lot about this issue as it relates to our campuses and so much of what I would like to discuss today are sort of issues or questions I’ve been identifying over the last four or five years that I’ve been really looking at this issue on college campuses. I’d like to share with you a little bit of what I’ve learned but also a little bit of what I would like you to be thinking about to discuss today and bring back to your campuses as we look at prescription drugs. So, I’m literally going to go by several issues that I’ve identified.

So, my first issue is using the same language. If you’ve noticed I specifically said nonmedical prescription drug use as opposed to prescription drug abuse. It’s a term that is becoming more broadly used, particularly in health promotion and prevention, and so I try to be very true to that language. And the reason for that is that when I talk about nonmedical prescription drug use, I’m not isolating it just to the person who is not prescribed the medication. I’m talking about a person who is prescribed a medication and is not using it in the way it was intended. Someone who is prescribed a medication but is using it in a dosage it wasn’t intended. And then what most of us think about when we talk about this issue, the student who is not prescribed the medication and is using that. So, as I use NMPDU, which is what I’ll probably use moving forward, a little bit of a mouthful. That’s what I’m referring to. I’m referring to sort of all of those levels of misuse and abuse on our campuses.

Second issue: We definitely do not know as much about this issue with our population as we do with alcohol and even other drug use. And I would argue we still have a long way to go particularly in the other drug area as well. Much of the media, however, has been calling NMPDU an epidemic. And I would argue, and Dan led very nicely into this, this is really campus dependent. It is so important that we’re looking at what this looks like on our campuses. Some of the earliest studies around NMPDU rates ranged from zero percent to 25 percent. That disparity was very telling for those of us who were just starting to look at this issue and understand that the national studies were very informative but they would not necessarily define or shape how we approach the issue on our campuses because that is such a significant difference from campus to campus.

Consistently, the data that we’ve collected across the country show, however, that our nonmedical prescription drug use rates are still significantly lower than our alcohol and marijuana use rates, so I always like to put that into context. However, it is higher than our other illicit drug use rates, so for example cocaine, heroin, any of the other illicit drugs except marijuana. So, I sort of call them the big three, if you will, alcohol, marijuana, and then we’re looking at prescription drugs. But again keep in perspective the numbers are significantly lower than our big two.

The next issue I’d like to talk about since we are also talking about alcohol today is linking NMPDU with alcohol use. We’re also starting to understand who might be the at risk students for nonmedical prescription drug use. McCabe and his colleagues have done quite a bit of research around this. If you’ve studied the issue at all, you’ll see his name come up quite a bit. He is finding that the risk profile looks very much like the risk profile for our high risk drinkers on campus, which can be very telling. Additionally,
institutions of higher education with higher admissions standards located in the Northeast also demonstrate higher rates of NMPDU. I’m not sure where all of you are coming from to the summit today, but I’m guessing many of you are in the Northeastern part of our country. And so, again, it looks very much like that risk profile for high risk alcohol use. And as research continues to demonstrate, those students who report NMPDU also are reporting higher risk drinking behaviors as well.

So, I ask you what does this mean for our prevention and intervention efforts? Should we be integrating conversation about our students’ prescription drug use, abuse, nonmedical use into some of our alcohol intervention strategies? For example, in our BASICS programs, are we asking about prescription drug use? Are we having conversations about that in our intervention strategies with our students?

Another issue I’d like to raise is perceived harmfulness and access. Much like alcohol, NMPDU is perceived as relatively harmless by our high school, middle school, and our college students. And at best they assign about moderate risk to nonmedical prescription stimulant use and analgesic use, at a strikingly low percentage of about 40 percent. So, a striking majority of our high school, middle school, and college students are indicating that nonmedical prescription drug use is at best moderately risky. So add to that their perceived efficacy or superhero syndrome that many of our students demonstrate particularly around prescription stimulant use, which I think is what a lot of the research has focused on particularly earlier on. We’re starting to see a little bit more around prescription analgesics and pain killer use now.

We’ve seen much more around stimulants, so I wanted to share with you something my colleague at UCLA has recently studied in a qualitative study, he’s focused specifically on nonprescription stimulant use. And in his first hand interviews with students who admittedly are nonmedically using stimulant medication, here are some of their quotes: “When I first took it, it was amazing! It was incredible how much better I studied. I turned a C+ paper without it to an A paper with it.” “I didn’t study at all until the last two days, and I got an A, so it’s kind of like I didn’t have to study for those four or five weeks leading up to the exam. And then in two days, I was fine.”

We’re tackling an issue for which there is very little stigma, increased access, and very low perceived harmfulness by virtue of its affiliation with many of us who are in this room if we are health care providers, its affiliation with our profession and the fact that it is a prescribed medication. There is this perceived level of safety and security in abusing a medication or medications like this that our students have.

Another issue I’d like to raise is leveraging the prescribed user. So, approaching very two different audiences: We’re looking at students who are legitimately prescribed medications, come to campus with medications from their physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists at home. The data show that this, the prescribed user under medical supervision demonstrates the same risk as any other college student for illicit drug use, but a student who misuses their prescribed medication, or the student who uses someone else’s medication, is showing increasing and increasing risk for other illicit drug use. So
again, we’re seeing this link between NMPDU higher risk drinking and other illicit drug use, so we’re again seeing this merger of issues and, and understanding again these are not isolated behaviors that are happening on our campuses.

And two last questions. My question for you, is what are you doing? I propose that we have to start at the beginning. What do you know about your individual campuses? What’s happening on your watch? If you don’t know, I challenge you to think about ways you can collect “data,” and I used air quotes because I don’t necessary mean hard core research that you’re publishing but how are you collecting any kind of data? How can you look at this issue with the resources that you have? If you already have data, what are you doing with it? I absolutely would love if any of you are doing some things to look at the issue on your campus to certainly hear from you today with some of your comments and questions.

And then my last question is well what are we doing? And by we again I mean collectively, we as a community. Many of you may be wondering about this and rightfully so. We often take the lead from many of our colleagues who are addressing these issues; however, I want to reiterate how important it is to really understand your campus culture as it relates to this issue. There are some great examples of data collection. There are some great university campuses, for example, the Ohio State University’s Generation Prescription Initiative is an excellent example of an environmental approach to this issue. So I would always recommend that as a great starting point. Also there are some national efforts that are happening now from the National Council on Patient Information and Education that’s created a tool kit for various populations on this issue as well the college population being one of them. And then, certainly not a plug but just so you’re aware if you would like more information, one of the publications available over on the table is a culmination of my research and resources from other campuses that are really looking at this issue now and are trying to tackle the issue. So that’s available over on the table as well if you want to give that a look. So, I’m hoping just to continue some dialogue about this. Perhaps answer some questions. Perhaps raise some more. Thank you for having me.

Sheffer: Thank you, Stacy. George?

Dowdall: My name is George Dowdall, and I’m a Professor of Sociology at Saint Joseph’s University. Can the Saint Joseph’s University people raise their hands? (laughter in background) Hi guys. They are the other Hawks here in Pennsylvania. I am also a board member of Security On Campus. May the board members raise their hands? The staff members of Security On Campus? And I think we owe all of these people a big round of applause (applause).

And I have a very simple message this morning that actually was embodied in a slide I was going to show you, but I decided to kill the slide lecture. The slide basically shows a mountain scene at night with a moon high up in the sky and a crowd of wolves baying at the moon. And one wolf turns to the other and says, “My question is, are we having an impact?” (laughter)
You didn’t laugh at that, but one of the wolves is sitting over there and is a pleasure to acknowledge a leader (Dr. Carothers) in higher education in dealing with this issue. I’d like to just echo one point that was just made: that what we absolutely need is a better system for recognizing if we’re having an impact and we’re succeeding at what we’re doing. The national data actually show some glimmer of hope. There are fewer drinkers coming to American colleges and universities, but more abstainers coming every year. Binge drinking itself is pretty flat, and drug use and nonmedical prescription drug use is beginning to go up. But we know a lot more about the problem.

I was told to introduce myself. Given my advanced age, that might take a little bit too long, but let me simply tell you about the part that deals with alcohol and drug use on college campuses. I’ve been a college professor for almost thirty years now, and may I ask, how many of you are full time college or university professors? I think part of our challenge in this field is that so few people from the biggest silo of them all - academics - are engaged in the issue.

I want to thank the Clerys for their extraordinary leadership in dealing with this issue. What they’ve brought to this was to focus on a problem that many of us in higher education wanted to ignore. Lehigh is a great national university and deserves great credit for dealing with a very difficult problem.

There’s a new generation of people coming aboard to deal with this issue. We’ve learned a lot in the last few years, and I think it it’s not surprising that one of the leading prevention figures actually said that there might be an end to college binge drinking right ahead of us. We are in a position to begin to tackle this issue. Personally, I don’t think we’ll ever deal with that issue at such a dramatic level, but we can make a big dent and improve the safety of our students.

The key word is for me, is reframing. I’m an author of a book called College Drinking: Reframing a Social Problem. I’m terrible at marketing, so I’ll have to go over later and put the handout about the book over on that table. The book’s cover has a picture on the top, a view of Royce Hall at UCLA where I was a postdoc in Public Health. And on the bottom of the cover, it has students drinking. That’s the image of the American university or college today. By day, the dream of reason; by night, a quite different scene.

Let me just note that reframing takes a lot of effort, and I was very proud to be part of the original Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study team that produced the first national studies of binge drinking and drug use. And then we came to universities like Lehigh and Saint Joseph’s and other institutions across the country with evidence colleges perhaps didn’t want to see. What we’ve learned very recently (and Dr. Carothers mentioned this very briefly in his speech) is that a lot of the knowledge we have about interventions isn’t being used effectively by colleges and universities.

My final issue about reframing, to be very brief about it, is to simply note that a new chapter is really starting in this area. We are in an unusual institution: American higher
education is extremely decentralized. Colleges are as much rivals as they are cooperators. And what we need are partners. A new National Drug Control Strategy has been released by the U.S. government. I don’t mean to exaggerate how different it is from its predecessors, but it does strike a new note about a partnership of different kinds of social, governmental, and nongovernmental institutions beginning to act together to deal with this issue.

Just a few days ago on September 23rd, the Secretary of Education Arne Duncan and the Director of Office National Drug Control Policy Gil Kerlikowske who represent education and criminal justice in their backgrounds, released a three page memo. What it says is that we need new partnerships to deal with both drinking and drug use on college campuses, both licit drug use and illicit drug use. I think it strikes a very important note that we should take into account in our discussions. Add to that a new National Prevention Strategy that was released at the beginning of the summer from the U.S. Government’s health organizations that lists drinking and alcohol use and drug use as a major area to improve, if we’re going to prevent poor health for our population. That’s noteworthy because I don’t think there’s ever been such a document in the history of this country.

Well I could go on, but I just wanted to raise the cause for refocusing and reframing the issue. We won’t be able to treat or arrest or flunk or discipline our students out of this problem. We’ve got to look at them as partners in dealing with the problem, and we’ve got to look at it from a variety of different kinds of frameworks. So, I’ll just conclude by saying that what we really need today is a new focus, a new way of reframing this kind of problem. Thank you.

Sheffer: Thanks, George. And so now we’re at the part that I know the panel is really looking forward to, where we get to talk about the questions that have been raised by the points they’ve made here. And we have, Alison said, a microphone that’s going around. If when you get the microphone in your hand you could just tell us your name and where you’re from, and then ask your question. If you’re directing it at a specific panelist, that’s fine. Otherwise, we’ll let them wrestle for it.

Audience: You talk a lot about moving the needle, and I think that makes a lot of sense. I mean it’s kind of hard to wipe it out. So, you talk about moving the needle, and I actually have two questions. Number one, what do you consider binge drinking? You kind of gave us the statistic of 58 percent? So, how do you measure that exactly?

Riley: Operationally defining the percentages that I was referring to was the gender nonspecific five or more per drinking occasion. So, it’s very similar to the binge drinking number. And those measures worked well at those particular campuses. Nationwide it’s a good predictor of negative consequences. Anything to add regarding the value of those measures?

Dowdall: The field went through a very difficult point of arguing about this language. Some people prefer not to use that term, preferring the term “high risk drinking,” which
includes binge drinking and heavy drinking. But binge drinking’s been defined since this 1994 Journal of the American Medical Association paper (Henry Wechsler was the principal author and I was a coauthor), as five drinks in a row, in an occasion in the past two weeks for men, four drinks in a row for women, and any number above that. Many people think that’s too low a definition of contemporary drinking. But it’s now being used all the way around world, including in the World Health Organization’s in research and publications on alcohol use.

**Riley:** I think the important thing is, while those are very good standardized national measures, use measures that work for your campus, have meaning for your campus. And maybe the measures are quantitative, or maybe they’re qualitative, as Dr. Andes recommended. But the whole concept is to start gathering useful data on your campus, and design your programs around your existing data, and then continue the process of evaluating those numbers again to see if your programs are being effective. We don’t have time to talk about it today, but if you are really interested in how to use that process, just Google search “strategic planning framework,” and there’s some very good examples. Peter, you had something to say?

**Lake:** I was just going to chime in and say from a lawyer’s point of view, the term binge is almost invisible in the literature. I actually did a search on this in the legal databases, and it just shows up occasionally. So, we don’t, we don’t use that term to work with our categories of thinking. And similarly in the risk management field, broadly conceived, where you get some parallels to what Dr. Carothers spoke of, where there are good techniques for risk management but a lot of schools aren’t using them. The term binge isn’t particularly prominent either. And I think, you know, trying to summarize and speak on behalf of two fields, which is just ridiculous, I think we look at it and think, there’s probably a range of proxy concepts that would nail the issue on the head. So, it could be binge, it could be high risk, it could be several things. You could pick one of these proxy concepts, and if you did and focused on it, you’d still be doing better than doing nothing at all. And that’s just sort of speaking from risk management on the law side.

**Riley:** And just to bring up a specific example, there might be some campuses where their binge drinking rate is very high, and you may not be able to move that too much right now. But there’s other definitions such as frequent binge drinking, which is the same behavior not once in the past two weeks, it’s three or more times, which is highly correlated with negative consequences. So, on a particular campus you might identify that as your marker that you want to work on, and you may not see high risk drinking move at all. But if you significantly reduce frequent high risk drinking, you really reduce the negative consequences. So, I kind of took your question in a particular direction. Did it answer your question.

**Audience:** Yes.

**Smeaton:** I just wanted to add to it from my point of view. I think it’s really important to measure consumption, but the phrase binge drinking is such a emotionally laden term
that we found working with our students that kind of sidetracked the conversation. So we really focused on a harm reduction model, which measures the consequences both for the drinker and for those around that person. And that’s the gauge by which we try to determine success.

**Audience:** And I think one of the, one the great points you made is that - how many college safety, or police officers do we have here today? I think that’s the rest of the room. And do you have more resources or less resources lately? So, I think the answer is less resources. So, I think you made a great point of, you have little resources due, my second part of the question and you can answer the beginning part was is that if you have less resources, is it more advantageous to go after the event, the homecoming, where you have a lot of, you can move the needle a lot more because you just attack that one event, or is it you’re just trying to go across the whole year? You talked about that it starts every year, so was it, did you move it by dealing with a few events or did you move it by trying to change the whole behaviors?

**Riley:** Stacy, I know, wanted to follow up to your first question, but I’m very excited to give my opinion on your last question. Part of the process of strategic planning is not only to identify the high risk behaviors on your campus and how they’re specific to your campus, but also do what Dr. Carothers alluded to. How malleable is that issue right now? So at one of the campuses I was working at, they have a very large football culture, maybe like an SEC football culture. Their tailgating really drives a lot of the negative consequences on campus. Maybe it drives the culture the most. However, we do not have the resources or the political readiness to address that issue right now. So, we could probably allocate millions of dollars, not have success at moving the needle, and burn bridges. So, to answer your question, what do you go after? You use a process of looking at your campus culture, collecting as much data as you can, and identifying, and this is my opinion, identifying a few things that you think you can have success with right now. So what is contributing to the problem and is it malleable, do we have the resources? So, there might be a national model that is really advertised as being great. It would work on your campus, but you don’t have the resources right now. You have fifty percent of the resources to do it, and you won’t hit that tipping point, so you won’t move the needle. You may have to choose different things. So, what works for your campus right now I think is really important. Part of that is, as I alluded to earlier, is it may require taking resources away from good programs, and just focusing on your great programs.

I really appreciate the work that the NIAAA report provided us with, best practices and good targets as to where to go to be successful. Where I challenge what they gave the field to work with ten years ago was they encouraged us to be comprehensive. I and a lot of my peers that do this work thought “comprehensive” meant doing as many programs as we could do and doing each area. My experience has been campuses that have actually moved the dial have been not comprehensive, but strategic. So one of the approaches that we used at University of Rhode Island was we picked and chose how many programs we could realistically implement, and we did the same thing at the University of Tennessee. We put off things that [were] promising and we’ll look at next year, but this year we are
going to work on these two or three things really strongly, and not take resources away from it. So my opinion to your question would be to be strategic in what would be realistic at this time. What we found at both campuses, and Dr. Carothers can support this, is we picked and chose and established credibility and capacity in such we were able to do that next thing the following year, two years later. Whereas if we would have identified that goal right up front, at the front end we would have burned resources, and may not have had success.

**Andes:** I think I was just going to add to the previous question about moving the dial. Something that we have done over the last decade at Villanova is to implement what’s called a severity index. So any incidents that we have had through our public safety or student dean’s office, we actually rate on a scale of one to six, one being least severe, six being most severe. What that’s enabled us to do is really look year to year and even semester to semester at the severity of the number of incidents that come through our public safety and dean of students and we have moved the dial in that arena, we’ve seen less severity in the last several years so that’s been a real victory for us, because the kinds of issues that are coming through our public safety and dean of students have been changing and have carried less risk than some of our previous trends. So that’s one way, again, of looking at your culture of drinking and for us, something that we really wanted to work on reducing was severity of those incidents that we saw come through our campus, so just one other example of looking at that issue.

**Dowdall:** Just one last comment. I think what colleges and universities individually need to do is to have some kind of dashboard of indicators that tell them how there doing. I work at a pretty small university where, with our almost 6,000 undergraduates, we need to use other techniques, other than just anecdote or reports to figure out what’s going on with our students. We need to monitor both licit and illicit drug use and alcohol use, using a bunch of concepts. Binge drinking makes a great contribution to public health and the medical model for understanding this issue. It’s not very helpful in understanding, for example, underage drinking, which is pretty different concept, of one that is of great concern to many of you here.

**Smeaton:** One other thought about resources. I think it’s impossible to think that a small group of dedicated people can change the world in, alone. So I think you have to leverage those resources, and what we’ve found is that if we could link our efforts to the goals of other folks around the campus and our communities. For example, we provide to our local vendors, taverns, and other establishments that sell alcohol, what we call our birthday list, and what that’s done is help to combat the false ID rampant use. So based on the students’ information they provided at the time of entry, we’ll provide that list to tavern owners and they could use that not as a primary source of information but a secondary source to check. If the kid comes in and the ID says 22 and they look 16, there’s an opportunity to check that out, so they appreciate that. Working with our athletic coaches, working, focusing on not trying to stop drinking on your team, but focus on peak performance. How are you going to win games, how are you going to make it work, so linking what we’re trying to do to goals that other folks have I think is a way to leverage our resources.
Audience: Dr. Lake brought up the issue of individual responsibility and I’m curious about the panel’s ideas on how that should be addressed within your programs, not necessarily legally, but how it is addressed with your program set up, specifically about drinking, without getting into this blame the victim kind of issue.

Dowdall: One of my colleagues was telling me the other day that one of the toughest issues we have to deal with in the area of sexual assault and rape is figuring out a way to talk about how alcohol plays a role in this problem. I’m guessing that many of the public security and safety would agree that it is often present in those episodes. But we have to figure out a way to talk about it without blaming the victim. My colleagues and I did a study that looked at three years of huge data sets across the United States and discovered that 1 out of every 20 college students will have nonconsensual sex sometime during the school year. Seventy percent or more of those people have nonconsensual sex because they were too intoxicated to give consent. We’ve got to figure out a language, better than the one we have, to raise the issue of putting yourself into a difficult situation, without changing the fact that only the rapist is responsible for this crime. We have to develop a language that talks about how, on college campuses, there are a lot of events that will never get classified as crimes, they’ll never be prosecuted as crime, but they are, in fact, nonconsensual sex events that are deeply tied to alcohol.

Audience: …not necessarily getting into the sexual violence angle of things, but let’s say a student gets drunk and is injured because of alcohol impairment. How would you address that individual’s responsibility for getting drunk in the first place?

Riley: I’ll start. I know that Dr. Andes and Peter [have] some points. I may be sounding like I’m talking on two sides of my mouth, but when you can be comprehensive, be comprehensive so looking at it as a multifaceted approach. So first of all, have the enforcement necessary so that you can hold the individuals accountable and provide that as learning opportunities for the individuals. So, for example, one of the things that we found … at the University of Rhode Island: We do find some really interesting programs to address, was our resident assistants were not being consistent with policy enforcement and we did some training to increase that consistency so that would be an example of one of the policy approaches that we use to hold individuals more accountable. The second thing that Dr. Carothers alluded to also is not denying the students’ negative consequences or natural consequence. [The] three strike policy that Dr. Carothers referred to was a very useful tool at holding students accountable. One of the things he didn’t mention, one of the nuances of that program, which I got to see first hand was the third strike was a two semester suspension. They weren’t expelled; it was a two semester suspension, and the majority of students returned, but they needed to meet with the substance abuse prevention office on their return. It was amazing the quality of information we got from these students, and “yeah, I was partying too much and I went home, had to pay rent, had to work nine to five,” and they came back very successful because we provided an opportunity for them to experience the natural consequences of their behavior. And 80% of those students returned to campus and were successful, so it’s a great program, not only from a consequence standpoint but from also an educational standpoint. So that’s the individual responsibility.
As far as being comprehensive, I think it’s important for that campus also to do the environmental management approaches. And what does that mean? Setting up the environments such that the desirable behavior is the easiest route for students to take, and that’s where campus specifics really come in. Do you set up your environment such that the desirable behavior is easy for the students and the undesirable behavior is difficult and that’s going to be very campus specific.

**Andes:** I actually did not have anything to add to that but I would echo everything that Dan has had to say. We have many of the same policies, three strikes you’re out we have, absolutely similar suspension policies, and the majority of our students return. I think the critical part are for students who are coming back in recovery. I think that in my experience so far most of our campuses are not doing a great job in supporting those students. And so I think we as a campus are getting there, that is something we still struggle with, to really provide the supports to students who are coming back and are still in recovery, so that’s something I would just add to Dan’s comments but certainly accountability is absolutely part and parcel of our dean of students and public safety process, and certainly we have all of those educational elements built in as well. I wouldn’t say anything different than Dan has said.

**Lake:** I mean I’ve got to chime in on this. I think it’d be a huge mistake to think that what we’re doing is trying to shoulder safety responsibility for individuals—you know we’ve got it and the environment is great and you’re safe. Safety begins with number one. I teach that to students and their parents all the time, that the number one safety agent is the student. Their safety will be most determinative of outcomes, and in terms of environmental management I think of individuals as an environment of one and their part of the concentric process. We have the individual student, the community, etc and I think we have to handle that head on, but I think we have a generational challenge here that’s also an educational challenge. A lot of our students are so-called Millennials and this is a broad overgeneralization because it is not all of our populations nor does it describe all of the students of our populations. One of the features of their rearing process was that they encountered a world that was designed to be super safe, where adults were constantly monitoring all decisions, even making them for them. I see incredibly poor self-management skills among the very broad number of students. I see it all the way into law school. We see it in the cases, where you see cases of just unimaginably bone-headed behavior where you’re just thinking, “What were you thinking?!” There was a case out of Louisiana where a student became profoundly intoxicated, I think he was trying to dodge the cops and he climbed on the roof of the natatorium, which is a dome over a pool, it’s a dome and tried to sleep off the drunk on a dome, and I don’t know if he’s watching too much Adult Swim or Cartoon Hour but only cartoon characters can sleep on domes. I fall out of a flat bed and he fell off and was seriously injured and he sued the school and the court looked at that and thought, “Huh?” What do you expect people to do? Level the campus to two inches tall? Rubberize everything? Put the police on repelling ropes to see who’s sleeping on spires? It’s unbelievable what we’d be asking people to do. It’s a microcosm of I think a challenge educationally to transition young people into more accountability and responsibility for their own decisions, and to realize that the illusion of safety and security is starting to wash away. Look at “The Real World” for example,
which is anything but. If you watch that show, this is what the students are watching, they’re watching MTV and they see students getting drunk and they’re safe, they’re living at the Hard Rock hotel. Well what they don’t see is off camera there’s security forces and you know it’s one of the best paid, most expensive forces waiting to intervene. We don’t all have a SWAT team sitting behind us when we make bad decisions, and so individual responsibility is a big part of prevention and really educational management but it’s not an either/or thing – I think that’s the point everybody has been making, that the responsibility to make good choices occurs in an environment that we co-create and we have to take our share of responsibility right along with the students. But I will say a point of choice, a point of injury a lot of times individual choices are exactly the thing that makes the difference between a bad night and a good one. And that’s something that parents and students need to realize, that we can provide the very best world-class environmental management techniques, but if people persist in making individual choices that go against the environment it will be dearly costly.

**Audience:** I just don’t know if this will take it in a direction in which we don’t need to go but just a question about the interface between the alcohol or the prescription, non-medical drug use and mental health dangers in regards to risks. So the student who, while intoxicated, cuts or threatens suicide or what have you, but does that while under the influence and similar to I think your question was, is there a changing landscape out there around the thought of do you intervene in a conduct manner as well as a helping manner? You know it’s a dicey situation but we’ve been doing that on our end with the conduct process as well as the mental health repair process and I just wondered if there were different thoughts about that right now.

**Riley:** I just read a fabulous book, “Beyond Discipline” by one of our colleagues here and I’d like him to talk about that.

**Lake:** I’ll stop blushing in a minute. Thank you, Dan. One thing I’ve noticed studying college safety law over a very long period of time is that there’s been a steady progression away from reaction and intervention after behavioral problem to prevention, and this is why I keep coming back to the prevention field. You all deeply influenced my work and I actually see that progression happening, not as fast as I’d like, but what you’re seeing really on campus today is a really broad based mental health challenge that is very deeply integrated with prescription drugs and alcohol and social soirees and family relationships. It’s a very complex mass and we still sometimes come at this with reactive intervention modalities like care and threat assessment teams. When I work with those teams I often tell them that it’s good to have such a team but it’s not something we really need. What we really need to do is be hitting issues before they mature into behavioral challenges, and the thing that’s really staggering to me about mental health in particular is that we know a lot about our students when they come to college but we don’t access that information. It’s like the Indiana Jones warehouse where the ark goes to die and to be lost in a sea of information that’s never used. You know a lot of this information is in the K-12 record. It’s sitting right there. Our high functioning students have had psychological profiles. There are IEP’s. The parents have been involved in a day-to-day basis. There are guidance counselors and yet they land on our campuses, and there’s this information
break and now comes the behavioral missteps. Look at Loughner for example. You
know, it’s there, its sitting in the K-12 record, but we don’t access that. We don’t use it,
we don’t integrate it. The national tragedy right now is disconnecting parents from the
transition process, and something I think the federal government has to facilitate at some
point is a better flow of information from K through 12 to higher education, because that
loss of information leads to, “I don’t know who you are and I don’t know if you’re
taking, you should be taking 3 red pills and 1 blue but you’re taking 4 blue and 1 red and
now you’re going to be acting out in class, or not showing up for class, or whatever”, and
I would know that information if we had a better vehicle to share it in planning. You
know the solution to a lot of our problems is better planning and better mentoring and
better formation of why people are in our schools in the first place, and I don’t know that
we really do that great a job of that transition. I think we could do a lot better, and
breaking that link with the parents and K-12 is a national tragedy. If you work in
residence life and you’re a cop the first four weeks of school looks like Saving Private
Ryan. It’s because there’s just all sorts of problems exploding and it’s as if its very
predictable what’s happening so the more we do to get on top of that, the better job we’ll
do.

Dowdall: I think it’s a question also of reframing. Our country has very broadly speaking
plenty of mental health, behavioral health, alcohol and drug use problems. They are much
broader than just what we meet up with at colleges and universities, but all of us in this
room uniquely deal with that segment of the population that goes to college. The binge
drinking rates of non college-going Americans are not that much lower than college
going Americans. Binge drinking rates of young adults 21-25 are actually higher than
college students and what I think we need, and I’m very hopeful that we’re beginning to
turn to that, is a boarder national strategy for dealing with behavioral health and the
problem of undiagnosed and untreated serious mental illness and alcohol use disorders,
drug use disorders. There’s a special segment of the college population that literally
needs screening, brief intervention, referral to treatment and a kind of medical model.
Most college students probably fall outside of that. College presidents are the mayors of a
community that includes all kinds of people at different stages of these kinds of issues,
and we have to work inside our silos to some extent, but we also have to break out of
them.

Andes: And I would absolutely echo George’s last statement. I myself am in health
promotion, I don’t work directly in a student health center or counseling center, we’re a
separate department so I find that with certain issues level of communication is quite low,
with other issues it’s quite high. I would say, just to touch specifically on the prescription
drug issue, the communication is relatively low. You know, do we have a sense of how
many students are coming to our campuses with medications? Is that access increasing
with each year? Is that diminishing? Is it about the same? What kinds of conversations
are we having with those students in either those medical interactions or those counseling
interactions? Is that important to use to have those conversations? Who should be having
those conversations, our health educations, or would it be those folks who are having
those direct medical and counseling interactions?
On another side note, I think there are a number of things we can also be looking at and utilizing and leveraging some of our student leadership as well. In a post Virginia Tech world, there’s been lots of conversation about being mindful of behavior of concern and certainly at Villanova we’ve sort of tried to look at what we do currently. Something that was instituted a number of years ago was a letter of concern option from our RA staff. It wasn’t a write up or citation of any kind but it was a “You know I’m observing some behavior that I’m not quite sure what it means, I’m not quite sure if its concerning but I feel an obligation to let someone know that I’m concerned” and so it’s sort of taken out the getting someone in trouble for behavior that I don’t know if I should be concerned, and it puts it in the hands of, we have a group of folks that merges public safety, dean of students, counseling, residence life and sort of key folks that might interface with the student. It opens that preventative communication so that there’s sort of more eyes and ears. At some points it has spurred action, because a number of concerns have come in from multiple sources. Faculty can also report concerns through this vehicle. I myself have used it as well, and you know if it gets to a level of concern then our dean of students is able to mandate some sort of action, whether it be “you must speak to a counselor, you must do X, Y, Z” so its given us some leverage to work on, not just those behaviors that violate our policy but those behaviors that just concern members of our community. So that’s just one way. Some of the prescription drug issue has come up through that vehicle but that’s the only vehicle that I have really been privy to conversation about.

Smeaton: Let me just echo that to. Stacy, we’ve had that same students of concern listing in place. It really helped us to identify folks in the early stages of decompensation or behavioral problems that we can intervene before we’re looking at a disciplinary situation. So we think it’s a great model and we’re finding it very useful.

Riley: Yeah and I’d just like to follow up again. I’m really upset with Peter’s answer, because in an attempt to not be self-promoting, he underestimated the impact that this new paradigm can take on, and just the way you asked the question indicates that your campus has the readiness to really do some cutting edge stuff. Beyond Discipline, 2009.

Smeaton: $29.99 at the table [Laughter]

Riley: That’s a fabulous book.

Lake: Yes sir, you’d like me to say more? Okay, I’m trying to get the blood out of my face.

Riley: As a friend I appreciate that you weren’t self promoting but as a professional of field that wants to see the field move forward, I’m very upset.

Lake: Well I mean, okay, I’ll speak very quickly but you know, some of you know me some of you don’t, but I’ve been deeply impacted by prevention theory to the point my legal writings now are actually prevention speak, and if you read my book you’d see it is trying to get lawyers and judges to understand prevention and try to implement it in terms
of legal doctrine. The thing that that disturbs me the most, doing this as long as I have, is that we still live in a martyr reaction culture of students. We made this enormous leap forward in the 1960’s with basic civil rights, and we have the most inclusive and diverse higher education institutions that have ever existed on this planet. It’s remarkable what we’ve done in just half a generation to create these open institutions, and the whole world is watching what we’re doing, but we’ve lagged behind in safety pretty badly, and it’s something that we’ve come to only when we’ve had to.

When Jeanne Clery was murdered, the dominant mentality on American campuses at that time was that most colleges were offering substandard housing. They fought the idea of basic safety rights for tenants on campus--this is in the ‘90’s--and then along came Virginia Tech. We responded to that and deaths of various students from alcohol. I think it’s time for us to mature as an industry and move past a reaction culture and move toward a prevention culture and I’ve spent a lot of time around the folks in the room that do this for a living. We don’t want to get the point where we have to do a behavioral intervention, we want to get to a point where students can see the pattern of choices their making and cut it off at the pass before it even becomes a problem in the first place and we have a lot of these tools in place. I mean, for example, it’s just sort of stunning to me that parents themselves don’t buy BASICS or CHOICES for their own students. If we don’t do it for them it’s just remarkable that we have this tool for self assessment that is incredibly valuable for individual responsibility and decision making that costs next to nothing when you compare it against the cost of education, and most people don’t avail themselves of it. We use it primarily as a discipline tool and occasionally, if we get funding, we use it a little bit more.

I can go on and on with this, but I think that the ultimate solutions to higher education’s nagging problems lie in doing better planning and information connectivity. I have some other ideas in the book as well that I can connect this with. But so much of what happens is just people have very poorly formed ideas of why they are coming to higher ed, what they are doing here, and what the consequences of their choices are. They land in our environments and start predictably making mistakes, and it becomes high risk drinking rates, binge drinking rates, sexual assault statistics, etc. A lot of its very, very preventable with a little bit of planning and forethought, and that’s where I know this field will mature. It’s going to get there because we’ve been toeing up to it.

But at some point we’ll stop asking our students to be martyrs to change, and that’s what they are today, they are exactly like the students in the 60’s that went South and got shot at and hosed and attacked by dogs. They’re stepping up and sacrificing to our institutions, and saying pay attention to me, that what I’ve gave has meaning. When you talk to parents who’ve lost sons or daughters, they don’t want money, they want meaning. They want to see that our institutions can grow so that it never happens again. This is the energy of Security On Campus and the Clery Foundation and it’s the energy of many institutions out there, like the Jed Foundation that does suicide prevention. They keep crying out to us to say, “how can we think ahead, put the pieces together and plan so that we don’t ever have to have these kinds of outcomes, so that we can reduce them before they come.”
This is, to me, the energy of prevention that I picked up. It’s the message and I think it’s our opportunity to think, how do we write this into our prevention work and into the law so it can become a coherent framework for the next generation of people. Believe me, the world is watching because right now, as we argue what happens in the United States, the entire world is starting to globalize education and what we’re doing, people are paying attention to so this doesn’t just impact a couple of hundred million people, we’re talking billions of people over the next couple of decades, so this is important work and I always keep pushing back to that. Dan bated me to do this speech so I’ll throw my hands up, I’ll shut up. [Laughter]

**Audience:** Sir, I’m hoping your question got answered. Alright, but my head’s spinning. Peter, thank you. That was, no that was very insightful to me but I’ve got a question regarding non-medical prescription drug use and to both of you, Stacy and Peter, in obviously the lack of visibility into that on campus provides a lot of questions. Are there any groups, formally, informally, that have gone to manufacturers and found ways to begin the discussions about prevention for that specific issue as you’ve seen it grow, and perception and potentially reality?

**Andes:** I definitely can’t speak to Big Pharma but I can speak to campuses I know that have engaged pharmaceutical companies and also, I think more importantly, are colleges of pharmacy. I had mentioned earlier the Ohio State University’s Generation Prescription Initiative. They are very engaged with, I can’t speak to which pharmaceutical companies specifically, but with pharmaceutical companies, their college of pharmacy, members of their community, public safety, community health officials. They actually sponsor drug disposal days for the community where they all assemble at Ohio State and sort of dispose of their medications there. They provide trainings to their residence life folks as well as their first year seminar course and then they just provide education and work with the pharmacy students, specifically around training, and having conversations with their future clients about how to appropriately use their medication. Something that I think could be more at the forefront of the conversation with prescribed users is talking about refusal skills…Something that I’m hearing from students that are legitimately prescribed medications is that they feel pressure to either share or sell their medication with their peers. Their peers perceive them to have an advantage, even though we all know in this room there’s a reason someone is prescribed a medication and it is not to give them an advantage over another student. It is because they are in need of that medication, for whatever reason it might be, and so I feel that there’s a great opportunity for some education with our pharmacy folks and really learning how to have those conversations about appropriate use of medication, how to handle those situations where they’re approached or solicited, and some strategies particularly when they are in the college environment about sort of keeping their medications private so that they don’t sort of involuntarily share with others that they’re on certain medications. So there are a great number of challenges that I’ve had in talking with just students on my own campus who are prescribed medications but I would say the Ohio State University is an excellent place to look in terms of connecting with pharmaceuticals, colleges of pharmacies, and various elements of their campus. I see another hand but I’m going to see if Peter did, or did someone else want to weigh in on that as well?
Riley: I don’t have any answers but if the devil’s in the details and you want to, really want to talk to, our students might understand this area a lot better than we do. With the pharmaceuticals, the drugs available to students are changing every year, but a lot of times as those of us who are in our cohort, we lump the pharmaceuticals into one group and we two real groups of drugs out there. The stimulants - Ritalin, Adderall, that group: which it appears from the data that that might be a cheating issue and a health issue, but students aren’t going to emergency rooms for it. The benzodiazepines, the painkillers: students are dying, dying accidentally. I think there’s a percentage of students that know the difference and in scary terms there’s the students that what they call farming, they take what’s ever available, the students that don’t know the difference between what their taking is really scary. We’ve had students, and this is all anecdotal, across the nation that do not meet the DSM-IV classification for addiction or even severe use that are just playing around with drugs, that mix alcohol and the painkillers, and they’re dying. And the other scary thing that we find from the national data is that all of these drugs are incredibly available. Most households have leftover benzodiazepines for the amount of outpatient surgery that we have available, that are being sent home to the houses and most adults don’t finish the prescriptions, and it stays in the cabinet and the neighbor kid that knows what they’re looking for will help the son or daughter in that house identify which things in the house will actually be fun, from their perspective, be fun to play with. Would you agree?

Andes: Oh absolutely, and I think you know we get into the issue of stockpiling with the college environment. Students come with often three months supplies of a medication and if a student for the first time is managing their own medications without any adult supervision, they may be picking and choosing when they want to use their medication. They may stockpile for certain times of the semester, depending on, again this is probably more specific to the stimulant issue, but even students who have injuries and are prescribed pain killers typically don’t end up using the entire prescription and are left with these extra medications. What we find out is students find out very quickly who’s been prescribed these medications and it’s just sort of part of their social network of the campus. It’s very bizarre to me, it was not part of my experience but students know who’s taking medications because they see who’s injured and they inquire about whether there’s leftover meds, and can I borrow or purchase?

So I would concur with everything that Dan has said and I would say that a lot of the research, as I have said earlier, is really focused on perception around stimulant use but there is emerging literature, particularly around these painkillers’ use and other combinations with alcohol and certainly they carry some more immediate fatal consequences. What I will say what the challenge is for us in really talking with students about this is recognizing the long term consequences that come with sporadic stimulant use, because they really don’t perceive there to be any. We’re really trying to understand the science and try to put that into a language that makes sense to the students because we know our students are not thinking about long term consequences. They’re thinking, “Well, can I get through the week? Okay, I’ll crash for a day or two, and I survive it and I do fine.” They’re not thinking about maybe what’s happening over the long term as they
are sporadically using. So that’s a big challenge for us as educators and prevention specialists trying to address that specifically around stimulants.

**Dowdall:** Just to highlight what issue the kind of risk factor of alcohol in this whole thing is that it is used as a precursor to some of these other drug uses. It’s bought in the same locations that it’s sold. Drug selling patterns in Philadelphia often takes place in college bars, in Manayunk and on Route 30. And finally the biphasic effect of alcohol, even though its technically a depressant, it makes you initially think it’s stimulant and it could push people on to different kinds of substance use. Washing down different kinds of prescription painkillers with alcohol probably happens more than not, but it’s not a “drug” of course.

**Audience:** This is for Mr. Riley; you had talked about the success of cutting down some of the binge drinking of college campuses you worked at. Can you give three specific, practical things that were done at those campuses that you feel had a real effect on the decrease of binge drinking? Three specific, practical things.

**Riley:** Well I’ll broaden it. Oh by the way, Mr. Riley is not here. My dad isn’t here. [laughter] Broaden it to not just the three campuses that I had the pleasure to work with but also my colleagues that have had success, and I don’t think I’ll give you three; I’ll give you one. They gather data on their campus and identified what they could work on at that campus right now. Now, and that was very campus specific, at the University of Rhode Island we had Dr. Carothers, we had a team of researchers that focused on campus drinking. We also had the Pro Change Institute which was the Prochaska-DeClementi team that worked on the Stages of Change model, so while Dr. Carothers came into a situation that was extreme, the team he created had incredible resources, so we were able to do lots of things and have a lot of success.

You may be on a campus where you don’t have the presidential support, and I’ll be the first one to tell you that you can still have success. My opinion on this was originally was in our field of alcohol prevention on college campuses, we had about forty years of “nothing worked” when we looked at the data and within the last ten years we’ve identified a handful of things when you look at the tier one approaches, there was about three or four things, correct? And so then the message to the field was you have to do only these three or four things. My opinion right now is there’s probably hundreds of things that work, based on your campus specifics, but the challenge is that there’s thousands of things that don’t work, and a lot of our allies and stakeholders will encourage us or provide resources to do the things that don’t work.

So the first thing I would encourage is gather data and look at it as far as campus specifics, so do strategic planning. And then the second thing is looking at a paradigm shift as far as being intentional about your programming. There are a lot of well-intentioned charlatans out there that want to come and speak to your students or bring the simulated car or things along those lines, and basically suck up a lot of your resources for approaches that are not supported by the evidence.
One of the things that we did at the University of Rhode Island and at the University of Tennessee, we were empowered to use those dollars to bring in experts in training our staff, our RA’s and our change agents, rather than do the auditorium presentation to the students. We still did that went it was appropriate but we were empowered to make some paradigm shifts on our campus. So I guess the second thing I’d really encourage is, the research by Mary Larimer really showed that it was a big part of the NIAAA report, was eighty percent of our campuses are doing tier four, which is information, education in and of itself, scare tactics, things along those lines. Despite the best intentions that we had that those things would work, the evidence does not support it. So as a campus have the courage to stop doing the things that may give you great public relations and start allocating your resources in directions that are more promising.

**Sheffer:** George, do you have something to say?

**Dowdall:** I’m not going to plug my book, but I’m going to simply mention my book tries to summarize all of that research and especially pays a lot of attention to the tier 1-4 issue and how its changed over the almost ten years since the report was released. My book is available, by the way, through interlibrary loan for nothing. Could I just add one other thing? One of the things my book tries to do is list a bunch of resources, one of them being the Higher Education Center, which is funded by the US Department of Education. From what I’ve read in the documents I’ve been reading the past couple of days, it’s going to have an enhanced role to play in all of us trying to find solutions. The Higher Education Center is in Newton, Massachusetts. It is funded by the government. You pay nothing; you call their 800 number and they’ll try to provide you with help. They have had some of the best researchers in the country affiliated as fellows, which is what I am, very honored to be that, or as directors or researchers.

The research changes by the month. There are literally fifteen or twenty publications each month in the peer reviewed literature that the Higher Education Center reviews. To take just two, one is a very successful study done in California that shows that campuses as big and as diverse as the University of California and Cal State campuses can go out into the community and intervene successfully in disruptive parties and can have an impact on alcohol and drug use on their campuses. The second is a study that shows that the commercial product Alcohol.Edu has a small but measurable and real effect on first year students when it’s used universally on a college campus. I’m not endorsing that product but simply noting that things are moving along in a positive direction. The National Institute on Alcohol Use and Alcoholism has a website called collegedrinkingprevention.gov that updates as best it can the recent research on this thing and I’m sure we’ll see the results from the college presidents group soon on that site.

**Smeaton:** I’d like to underscore the importance of data on the ground. For us, it helped to, we were a participant in the Harvard School of Public Health research, we asked George and come and present the analysis to our students, and what the helped us to do is move beyond a phenomena I call “Dueling Anecdotes” where I would listen to students or listen to alums and they would tell me their perspective, we talk, but we’re talking past each other, and with the data available we can then start talking about the facts and
reality. So very powerful. Data in and of itself doesn’t change but it’s a foundation for change.

Sheffer: Alright I see that we have a couple of questions left and we are running a little low on time so let’s try to keep our answers succinct so we can talk about all of the topics that we’ve got up here.

Audience: Yeah thank you, just one interest. A lot of good data, a lot of good research is pervasive throughout the country. We’re getting the students as they come in with those values already in their mind. My thought is, in the old days we used to have very great DARE programs. The reason they failed is there’s never any follow up by the federal government. When you reach kids in the third or fourth grade, there’s never a follow up when they reached high school to see if those values that were taught to them are carrying through. To the research and data that you’re picking up and that’s being shared here, is there any mechanism of trying to get to the high school environment to educate the professionals in the high school level what tendencies to look for, and what type of interventions they could take at an early age, so that when they get to the colleges there may have been some preventive measures taken already. It seems like, from my perspective, it’s not really being done on a high school level and that’s where the kids learn to party. There’s no true educational efforts and a lot of the information you gentlemen and ladies have up there really could help us all if that gets down to a lower level early on and we win that support there to help us at least bring the information out and let them know what the ramifications are if they act like this in a university setting.

Riley: I would really like the others panelist to challenge me on my opinion on your question, but as George mentioned, one of the tools is Alcohol Edu. Most of the campuses that utilize that tool gather data from the students pre-matriculation, usually in July, before they arrive on campus, and the program provides a survey to the students and then provides specific feedback based on that individual, so different students will get a different online program based on what information they put into it. When I looked at our data with Alcohol.Edu and other campuses’ data, what I was shocked by was how healthy our incoming students are. There’s real good data, and George has a lot more information on this, as far as high school seniors that are not college bound have some of the highest risk behavior imaginable. College bound students are much lower, the overwhelming majority of them. However, a year later the non college bound students have a big drop in their drinking behavior and the college bound students accelerate. Hopefully somebody will challenge me on this, but the biggest change you see, while our juniors and seniors have a tendency to drink the most, the biggest changed behavior is from August 1 to October 15th. That’s one of the things I liked about that particular tool, is it enters data on our students before they enter our institutions. So if you want to take a step back, and I could get in trouble for this, but nationwide our campuses promote drinking. It changes student behavior and what we could do to dampen that slope during the first 45 days is imperative. I’m challenging you, giving you a different look at the data but I’d be interested in what the other panelists think.
Andes: I also, again, we sound like we’re shamelessly promoting AlcoholEdu, but my campus also uses the program, so we’ve been able to use the data in that way as well but another way that we’ve been able to really look at our data is we can understand who we’re attracting to our campus. Unfortunately for myself, and other Catholic institutions around the country, we historically attract higher risk drinkers to begin with, so typically our number of higher risk drinkers coming in is a little bit higher than the national average. But I will say, again on a positive note, we have seen in the last several years, and to use their language, as George has used earlier, more and more students are reporting to be abstainers.

So we’re sort of seeing this shift to the two extremes, we’re seeing more students coming in higher risk, more students coming in as abstainers, so people are moving away from the middle. And so talking about moving the dial, that’s sort of an interesting conversation to have in terms of what kind of movement you’d like to see on your campus, which is why I think you first need to understand what it looks like to begin with.

And so we’ve been able to use data in that way to get a sense of who we have coming in, but also sort of to let our admission folks know here’s who we’re attracting, and for us, a big part of that puzzle is our alumni connection. We have fabulous alumni network and many of our alumni hosts welcome to Villanova kind of events before they even get to our campus. We don’t necessarily always know what kind of messages are being shared, what kind of traditions are being promoted, what behavior is even happening at those events, and so even challenging our admissions folks and our alumni rep folks to have some of those conversations. We were fortunate enough to be able to share some of that data last year with many of our volunteers around the country who come to Villanova for a training to be some of these alumni reps and when I shared with them some of the same information I’m sharing with you, they looked around at each other, almost with looks of guilt, you know like, “oh are we contributing to the problem or are we helping with the problem – I’m not quite sure.” And so I didn’t have those answers but you could tell it sort of raised some questions. So I would say having that information and if there are opportunities for you to reach out to what your historical feeder schools might be and to court date some of those efforts could be a potential strategy but just knowing the data, again, understanding what’s happening is a critical piece.

Sheffer: Alright, I think we have time for one last question.

Audience: Yes, my question is to Dr. Lake, you’ve talked about the importance of prevention strategies and universities accessing the histories, mental health histories of students, and having full access to information and I was wondering about the issue of competing rights. In your position as a lawyer, and certainly I’m from Toronto, and there’s always concern about privacy issues and about competing rights in terms of human rights and disability issues. Can you speak to that please?

Lake: Yes, absolutely and this is an excellent point. I think as we open up an information treasure trove we have to be very, very sensitive to how that information is used and
potentially misused. So if we’re going to make the bridge between K-12 and higher education and make it a good one, we’ve got to be sensitive to privacy rights and discrimination and all of the other issues that will come up along the way. Having said that though, maybe I’m a little skewed on all of this, but I actually think some of the greatest barriers to inclusion and diversity and promotion of civil rights on American campuses occur because information is not being shared. I think there’s that residual fear, and it’s a legitimate one, that the information will be used to profile, weed out, create access barriers, but what I actually see is, particularly with students with disabilities, the greatest single barrier is the lack of information transfer, and that seems to be so determinative of success or failure in that first critical few months even just coming to campus and its mental health, physical health, I mean it’s the full range of disability issues.

So I think this is a civil rights issue and I think we tend to think that we’re worried that Dean Wormer will return. You know, that he will take this information and create barriers, but in some sectors I think it’s exactly the opposite, it’s what I’ve been observing which is why I push for it. There’s a conference at Lynn University, I think its in January called “Transitions” which is one of the fastest growing conferences in higher ed. They’re turning people away now, it’s like a thousand plus parents are coming and this is exactly why their coming. It’s because Lynn historically has this mission of serving people with disabilities coming into higher education and are known for this. This is what all of the parents want to talk about, is how do I from K through 12 to the college? They were doing so well with accommodations in K through 12 and now they’re failing out of college, and how do I fix that? I think that absolutely we need to pay attention to this and how this information is used.

I also think that we need to be thinking about procedural rights and what kind of processes are fair and appropriate, and I think it connects. What is really happening in America today is the admissions committees, because they don’t want to get caught with these issues, tend to put the blinders on deliberately, and they rather not get sued. “So I don’t want to know; don’t tell me, I didn’t hear that.” It’s this false culture of literally making yourself not know the information so you won’t get sued. That’s what really has got to stop. I totally agree with you on your point. We have to protect privacy and make sure we don’t have a reverse discrimination culture coming out of sharing information across all the broad variety of continuum we’ve seen historically. We’ve got to be sensitive to that.

Sheffer: I think we are out of time for our panel. I know that there’s at least one question that unfortunately went unanswered. I’m sure that our panel members would be more than happy to discuss anything with any of you who have questions that weren’t able to come into the general discussion. So thank you.
Chapter 7

Presentation of the Jeanne Clery Award for Campus Safety

Recipient: Kristin Lombardi, Center for Public Integrity

Kiss: I wanted to take this opportunity to announce the presentation for the Jeanne Clery Award for campus safety. This year our recipient, who unfortunately was not able to attend, I believe she is at Harvard currently - okay, she is doing a special program there. But, we chose our recipient and the board has chosen Kristin Lombardi. Kristin Lombardi is from the Center of Public Integrity and she recently released a report – sexual assault on campus, a frustrating search for justice. If you have not seen it, I very much encourage you to look for it through their center. It has also been feature in stories on NPR and she really did a wonderful job interviewing survivors and administrators on campuses and throughout.
Chapter 8
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Kiss: I also want to take this time to ask a couple of our sponsors to get up and just say a word in support of the event. First, I would like to introduce Chris Rice who’s a Vice President for College Solutions with Securus GPS. I had the opportunity to meet with Chris Newman who’s their CEO and subsequently, Chris, shortly thereafter and they have done a lot in terms of creating a product, working with focus groups down in North Carolina of students and administrators, and have really been active in finding solutions for campuses to integrate. So I would like to just take a moment to invite Chris up to the stage to just speak a little bit in support of the event. Thank you.

Chris Rice: Thank you, Alison. Securus GPS, our company, is the nation’s leader in providing GPS products to families throughout the country, small products folks can use for a variety of uses. Our mission is very simple. It’s to provide GPS tools that help find people that are in need of help, to help find them and locate them efficiently and quickly. Our company is young, we’ve been around for about four years and during that time, to complete the mission, we have chosen a path to find partners who are leaders in the field and with that we are very happy that we were able to meet Alison and the team of Security On Campus very recently. GPS Solutions are the most efficient and precise way to find someone who needs help and do it very quickly.

Standing here, I know that this group is the room of experts for public safety, student administrators, or excuse me, student affairs, and you interact with the students and parents of whom we like to interact with as well. Our mission is to develop the products and in that mission we are trying to learn. We want to learn from you, ask you questions, probably ask too many questions, to learn how you interact with the folks on your campus, with your parents, with your students, and with your teams. In our learning, we’ve covered a number of topics, mostly with schools near us, the University of North Carolina, North Carolina State University, and a variety of small private schools to learn their different experiences in safety. And through our experiences, we also very clearly found that through a horrific event to a tremendous family several years ago, they were able to change and improve the operating practices at 2,200 campuses across the country. No small feat and a tremendous legacy.

As we learn what happens and how campuses have changed, believe it or not, we’ve been able to say that there is a connection between GPS and Clery Act compliance and we’ve been able to integrate those two things into our products. Again, it is my privilege to be
here, it’s our privilege for our company to be here and meet with you, to speak with you, and to learn from you. I have, as so many of you in the room, known people; I’ve been involved in an assault on my campus. In my area, I am familiar with a number of different groups in the Raleigh, Durham, Chapel Hill region that interact with those folks. This is a field that I tried to learn for awhile but I and my team are very young at it. We respect that and we thank you for all of the insight that you’re able to give us and certainly the work of Security On Campus.

**Kiss:** Thank you Chris for those words and again we are very grateful. Without the support of Securus GPS we probably would not have been able to get our panels here and as you saw with the preview after the first panel, I think we have a wonderful group speaking today. I also now want to invite Glenn Rosenberg up. Glenn is with AlliedBarton Security Services. He is a vice president for the higher education security group of AlliedBarton Security Services. He also, after talking with Glenn and his team, and really getting them involved, we were thrilled for a number of reasons. One being their support is helping us to put together a publication after this event and distribute that to you all. So, as some of you in the room who are also in non-profits know, its just so wonderful to have the support of other corporations so thank you and I would just like to invite Glenn up.

**Rosenberg:** Thank you Alison, and we’ve been long-term partners with Security On Campus and have helped sponsor programs for a number of years with the organization, sending many of our officers and our managers to the Security On Campus Clery workshops. I first met with Daniel and the team back in the days right around Virginia Tech, so we understand how important the work is of Security On Campus.

About AlliedBarton - we provide about 4,000 plus security officers on college campuses around the country, many of you are our clients, its great to see you all, and we make a small difference each day keeping campuses safer and in order to be able to do that we have to be able to understand the best practices that are in the industry and we make a conscious effort understand that through our participation in these programs. We’re hoping that the promulgation of the proceedings of this are going to make a difference as well for years to come and we’re very proudly sponsoring this activity.

Just a quick note and it was a sad note. We’ve talked here about how dangerous the first few weeks are on a college campus and unfortunately the AlliedBarton family was touched very, very closely this last couple of weeks. Many of you may have seen the report of a stabbing and fatality at Bowie State University and it was a very unfortunate incident for us as both the student who was stabbed was a security officer who was working for us, not at Bowie but was one of our employees, and the mother was also one of our long time employees, so there, a lot of work that we’re doing right now in workplace violence and roommate violence is going to become a major initiative for us and we hope to contribute for a long time to the field. But Alison, thank you very much for the opportunity to participate here and we look forward to continuing discussions this afternoon.
**Kiss:** Again, thank you so much. I think that a lot of this would not have been possible so the support has been wonderful.
Chapter 9

Panel Discussion: Emergency Response and Assessment

C. Ryan Akers
Mississippi State University

Darren Baxley
University of Florida

Jason Friedburg
Bucknell University

Jen Day Shaw
University of Florida

Kiss: I’d like to introduce my colleague, Daniel Carter, who is the Director of Public Policy at Security On Campus. He also has the longest tenure at Security On Campus, over 20 years now. So I am going to invite Daniel up to introduce the next panel, which is Emergency Response and Threat Assessment.

Carter: Thank you, Alison. And as Alison said, I’ve been with Security On Campus for a long time, and it is an incredible honor to have you all here with us today. And it is very, very much appreciated. I’d just like to add my words to that. And I’m also glad to not be the person between you and lunch. Often times I’m somehow, I get scheduled to be the person before lunch. So, I’m glad I’m after lunch today, and I’m not keeping you from your meal.

I have the pleasure today of introducing the moderator of our emergency response panel, a relatively new member of what I consider a Security on Campus family, Jason Friedberg, who is the Chief of Public Safety at Bucknell University. Jason? Jason? There he is! (laughter in the background). He’s coming up now. He is one of our new Clery Act training instructors. He did a fantastic job on his first outing last month. And he is also the incoming university and college police section vice chair for the North-Atlantic region of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Without further ado, Jason.

Friedberg: Thank you very much.

Carter: You’re welcome. (Applause)

Friedberg: Good afternoon. We have a very distinguished panel, I’m going to see if they want to come in now, come on in guys. (Laughter) So, the presentation we’re going to be doing here after lunch, and we hope that we can keep you awake through, it is
actually very good. I think we strategically planned it like that. It’s going to be on threat assessment and risk management. We have three very distinguished panel members today. We have Dr. Jen Day Shaw, Dr. C. Ryan Akers, and Deputy Chief Darren Baxley. Each of them brings their own specialty and perspective to what we’re going to talk about today. I think the best part about our discussion and what we are going to go over today is this great cross section. We have some very distinguished campus administrators and some very distinguished people in their own fields.

The role and presentations that we’re going to lay out today also fit very well with the overall programming because it cuts across what we need to do to sustain and to make partnerships across all these campus departments. To make it work; to make our campuses safer. And overall safer places to live, work and play. We have student affairs representative, public safety, and we also have emergency management. What we are going to do is the same format as we did a little but earlier. So, each one of the panelists is going to get up and do their presentation, and if we could hold the questions to the end that would be perfect. We do have a set time frame for each of them I have been told that I have to corral maybe one or two. But, they do these presentations all over the place. And they are a wealth of knowledge and I appreciate your time for and your attention that you’re going to give to them today. So, without further ado, I’m going to introduce Dr. Jen Shaw, who is the Assistant Vice President and Dean of Students for the University of Florida. Jen Shaw. (Applause)

Shaw: How is everybody doing? I prefer to think that they saved us for after lunch because we are going to keep you awake. (Laughter) And get you home. So, what we’re going to go through today is a little bit about national data that’s out there about threat assessment, some basics, the process, some tools and then some resources for you. And Peter actually did a really good job for me in introducing that there’s a whole lot more to this process than the actual threat assessment process, and it really starts with prevention. That means creating a culture of care on your campus where faculty, staff, students, and families know that they need to be a part of this process of recognizing students that are in distress or faculty and staff that are in distress and making sure information about that person gets to a helping resource or that person gets a helping resource. In that way, hopefully we never get to the point where we actually have to do a threat assessment because we’re stopping it before it gets to a crisis level.

Clearly, we have to train our faculty and staff and students and family members about how to recognize what the signs are that might cause us concern and help them to help us mitigate that danger with those students by using a variety of techniques, which I’m sure we will be able to talk about today. Some of us are lucky enough to have a great police force on campus. It makes a tremendous difference in terms of when we get into the actual threat assessment process. I’ve talked to a lot of community colleges and small private institutions that aren’t as fortunate as we are at the University of Florida. They are making great connections with their community police and that’s making a big difference too. I’ve talked to many schools who are inviting members of their local police to join their team, whether it’s a care team or a threat assessment team, risk assessment, it’s
called a variety of things, to help make sure that this process is a good one coming from a variety of perspectives.

So, in terms of data, students clearly are the most at risk for causing acts of violence on our campuses, but faculty and staff are not too far behind. And the teams out there, we’re seeing a wide variety. Some campuses have two teams, one for faculty staff specifically, one for students. At the University of Florida, our model is a combined team. It’s working for us because of the large number of individuals that we deal with. But there’s… different models work for different campuses.

In terms of data, there was a recent study last year of 900 plus institutions. And they asked people, both chiefs of police and chief student affairs officers, about what’s going on campuses. And this just gives you a little walkthrough of the kinds of things we’re seeing. What we found in this survey is that virtually every single school had a team so, you know, pre-Virginia Tech, the earliers after Virginia Tech, it was sort of a rarity, and you saw a lot of conversations at conferences about how do we do this and starting teams. I think now most campuses have teams, and it’s perfecting the process.

So, how do we, how do we do it most effectively? In terms of responsibilities, pretty similar. Of course we’re seeing a lot of relationship violence that tends to be something that’s causing a lot of concerns on our campuses, disruptive behavior. The mental health issues are huge almost in the vast majority of our cases at the University of Florida. We see about 400 a year. We have 50,000 students and about 13,000 employees. So if you kind of do the math there, we see about 400 cases coming through our team a year. And mental health is the predominant issue that seems to cause so many of the problems that we’ve been dealing with. Threats of violence to others is, was the biggest in this survey of issues that teams dealt with, but also emotional distress, suicide ideation or attempts, a wide variety.

So, in terms of the basics, I think all of us know threat assessment is a process. And violence, premeditated violence is predictable. And so the person of concern gives us clues to look for and I think that’s where I go back to that culture. Care is so important that we’re making sure our campus recognizes what we need to be concerned about and even more important, who we need to communicate that information to. The process, and I take this from Margolis and Healy, and I know that Dr. Healy is here with us today, is identify persons in situations of concern, gather information about that person of concern from a wide variety of sources that we’ll talk about, assess that information and here’s where the team is so handy because you are coming from different perspectives.

As you can imagine, Deputy Chief Baxley and I come from very different perspectives when we are looking at a student of concern. I, the student affairs lines, oh we’ve got to keep this sweet student here and we love them so much, and Deputy Chief Baxley is much more concerned about community safety. And so it’s important when you have multiple lenses on that team that you come to a strong consensus. I think that makes for a better decision.
And then of course case management, which is taking so many resources on our campus. We’re fortunate enough that we’ve hired two social workers to do our case management for us. So, every student that comes through our threat assessment process is actually assigned one of our case managers. And they are meeting with that student weekly. We’re involving the family. We’re involving faculty members. We’re really lucky that we have that resource, but a lot of campuses aren’t as fortunate as us, and different staff members are having to take on this responsibility in addition to their regular work. And I think that’s what I’m hearing the most from campuses is that follow through on the process is not what’s happening. And if I were going to tell you anything today from my experience, it would be: put your energy into the case management piece.

So, here’s a definition of threat assessment, and it’s a formal evaluation of the degree and nature of a threat in relationship to a specific target with the intent of stopping it before it happens. So campuses, teams, vary greatly. There’s typically campus law enforcement, student affairs personnel, if you’re lucky enough to have psychologists on your campus, a counselor is typically involved, student conduct housing, on our team we also have an attorney, human resources, we’re lucky enough to have a psychiatrist, which is hugely helpful when it comes to understanding medication, and other members.

We hear about potential threat in a whole variety of ways. So, it might be a police action. It might be a family member calling, sometimes the student themselves, based on their behavior. We are using social media enormously. We are getting more information from Facebook, blogs, writings that students are doing, and anytime in the past. So if you are not connected in that way, I would suggest you talk to your students about what are they using and start paying attention.

The fundamental question when you’re dealing with threat assessment is, is danger imminent? And of course if the answer is yes, then it immediately moves to a police realm. If the answer is no, but we’re worried about it, that’s when you go into threat assessment mode. So, for us, we’re getting information from a variety of sources. And it comes to the attention of our threat assessment team. For us we funnel the information through all the different members and then bring it to the team. We meet weekly for a couple of hours or as needed. So, if a situation comes up, we’re constantly on our Blackberries. We’re always talking to each other. We’ll do a conference call and we’ll bring the team together, but we meet weekly just on our basic situations that are going on. The team is going to gather information from their variety of sources.

I was talking to Peter last night, I was telling him one of the things that we’re doing routinely now is calling the guidance counselor of the high school where the student came to us. We deal with mostly traditional age students. And so, they have most recently been in high school, and the guidance counselor is telling us, you know, despite FERPA, is really willing to let us know what kinds of behavioral issues did they see in high school, what methods worked, who might be a person or relationship that that student has that might be able to help us start figuring out what our case management plan is going to be.
The student affairs counselor housing kind of side, we do more of an inquiry. So we are looking at conduct records and how are they behaving in class and what does the roommate say and everything that we can think of sort of on the outside. The police are doing the background check, checking their sources. They might be, if a weapon is involved, might be going to pawn shops finding out something about purchase. So we’re, at the same time, we’re both doing as much gathering of information as possible. And of course, this continues throughout the process. The more information you can get, I think the better decision you can make about what’s going to happen next.

Some of the questions that we use came from the Secret Service model. If you’ve not looked at the book that the Secret Service and the Department of Education put out, I would recommend it. There are some really good resources out there now. I’ve got some listed on the slides that I think you’ll have access to. That’s sort of has always been our foundation, is the Secret Service model. And these questions that we use are from them.

So, sources of information, some of the kind of unique ones that we’ve been using lately. A lot of our students live off campus, and the apartment managers tend to know a whole lot about them. They know about roommate complaints. They know about…are they late on their payments? Do they know, you know, do they interact with other people? We had a student recently that was writing on the wall of his apartment some pretty scary things. And the apartment manager had to go in and paint. So, that was some very helpful information in terms of what we were going to do next. So, I would tell you think creatively about who might be good sources of information. Don’t stick with just kind of the traditional things that you might think about, but really think about who’s really seeing this person and can give you a good picture.

So I think most of you know sort of the common questions you’re looking at: are there patterns of behavior that are leading to think this person is planning an attack, who’s the target, why, are there any trigger events coming? All of the kinds of things that help us make good decisions. We do often talk to the student of concern or the faculty/staff member of concern. And I know some campuses that I’ve talked to don’t. We do that pretty earlier on.

One of the things that Darren and I were both lucky enough to go to the de Becker training in California, fabulous training if you have the opportunity. It’s the advanced threat assessment academy. And one of the things they teach you is, the important thing is, establishing a relationship with the person of concern because if your end goal is really case management and trying to keep this person, you know, at an even keel, but also for you to know enough to know are they reaching a point where they might be prone to hurting someone else, then someone’s got to have a relationship with that person. So, we early on, sort of figure out based on who this person is who needs to have this relationship. It might me if it’s a student, it might be our HR rep, it could be a counselor, someone that’s really going to get to know that person as an individual so you can start seeing are there behavior changes that would tip us off that something more might happen. And of course the decision point for the team is does this person pose a threat and if they do, how are we going to manage it? If they don’t pose a threat, are there
things that we can do to continue that relationship and case manage so that person can be successful on our campus.

So, the Dean of Students Office role is about gathering information. So, we use conduct database. We have a student sense of stress database. So that if a faculty member calls and says this person isn’t going to class or a family member called and said I’m worried, they’re not acting themselves, we check every source of information that we can come up with. We also tend to be the ones that deal with sort of the collateral issues: so, roommates, family, classmates, faculty, anybody who’s been affected by the behavior because typically there’s some behavior going on that’s brought this person to our attention. The team, again, continues to gather information.

For us, cases never stop and that can be overwhelming I think with the size, population we have, but we really try to make sure, we’ve just heard too many examples of a student might be fine for a year and then something flares back up. So for us a case always continues. We always get somebody staying in touch with that person, even if it’s sort of on a semester basis, how did they do in school that semester? Have they had any financial aid issues? Is there some other triggering issue that’s of concern?

We, we never close a case, as I shared with you. The connection of course is very important. Our philosophy at UF is that we’re not going to separate the person from campus unless we absolutely have to. Again it goes back to, the only way we can sort of have some control over the situation and really have knowledge of what’s going on is if we know that person. As soon as you take somebody off your campus, you really kind of lose control of how are they changing. Are they still on their meds? Are they doing everything that they need to do to not get to that point where they might pose a danger to somebody?

And then we monitor ongoing as much as we can. So, we’ve turned some tools. We use behavior contracts in a huge way. And these are both for students of concern in terms of distress but also students that go through our threat assessment process. They sit down with a member of my team and we go through with them, you know, here if you want to continue at the University of Florida, here’s what you need to do. And so it might be mandated counseling, it’ll certainly be releases with any caregiver so we can know that they’re continuing to attend. It might be registering with disability resource center, behavior expectations. Everyone, everything that we can think of that’s been a concern we put in that contract. And then that’s a good way for us to keep sort of a handle on how are they doing.

So, if they’re keeping with the contract, it lowers our concern a little bit. But as soon as they start breaking pieces of that contract, then our radar goes up a little bit because it makes us a little more concerned about what might be happening. We do have an involuntary medical withdrawal policy. I hope most of your campuses do. I would tell you this is also a best practice. We use it as a last resort. This is a student typically delusional; they can’t make choices for themselves. Sometimes it will be an eating disorder that’s out of control.
But it is a case where we have tried every resource we can think of to keep this student successful on our campus, and they can’t make good decisions and so we need to separate. And we’re working with the family the whole time. Sometimes that’s a helpful thing. Sometimes that’s more of a detriment. But we try very much to keep them in the loop. For us, it’s written notice from me. I have the authority to separate someone, and they have an appeal. So, your due process is met, but it gets them immediately off campus. And hopefully with some kind of care, and they must have a signature from a psychologist who’s done a full battery assessment on them in order to be able to come back to campus with recommendations. And then we turn those recommendations into their behavior contract if we let them back.

We use no contact orders pretty extensively. These typically, a dean of students office, conduct office can put in place. It doesn’t remove a property right from a student. So you’re not really having to do a due process kind of thing. It really is just saying to them, you may not be in contact with this person, whether it’s faculty, staff, or another student. We’ve found that pretty helpful with intimate violence, stalking kind of situations. And again, if they violate, that tells us, higher concern for us.

What else are we going to need to try? Interim suspend: last resort for us. That is the person has done something egregious enough that we need to remove them from campus. And of course Arizona learned that, that doesn’t always do you a lot of good. So, we really try to keep them on campus and using our resources if they can, but if we get to it, we need to separate, we have the authority to do so. And of course student code of conduct charges is something we use pretty regularly with behavior issues.

So in terms of resources, we put on a threat assessment conference. This last year it was so successful, we plan to do it again. There’s a lot of great regional resources. So, I would certainly look around and see what campuses around you have good teams. We just actually agreed with Penn State this weekend that we’re going to do exchange training with them. So, they’re going to come down and tabletop with us. We’re going to go up and tabletop with them. So, I would recommend really look around and see who in your area might be a good resource for you.

Our team has found what has helped us most is to sit down and do a tabletop together and have some observers kind of watch how we do it and give us some suggestions. De Becker I told you about, great, great thing. The campus safety knowledge community is part of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. Anybody can access this website, and it’s got a lot of stuff that Ryan’s going to talk about and Darren’s going to talk about on it. So when you get this PowerPoint, I would recommend you just go take a look. It’s just got a ton of different information. And we’re going to take questions at the very end.

Friedberg: Yep. Thank you very much Dr. Shaw. Alright, next up we’re going to have Deputy Chief Darren Baxley. He is the deputy chief for and associate director for
University of Florida Police Department. And I’m going to let him do a little bit of a expanded introduction of himself. Come on up.

**Baxley:** How’s everybody doing today? See if I can find my slides here. If I look a little nervous and a little shell-shocked, it’s because in about, I don’t know, 48 hours or so we’ve got 200,000 of our, of most rabid fans in the SEC that are going to descend upon my campus. And my Blackberry’s been hovering about four foot off my table all day because of all the concerns and stuff that goes along with our football planning stuff. And just to tie in with what Jen said we have a lot of crossover with emergency response and threat assessment and I could have picked the topic today to talk about you know responses the act of shooters or emergency notifications or things like that.

But I decided to take a little bit of a different tact or track with this presentation today because who in this room has ever heard the phrase “Don’t taze me, bro?” (Laughter) And if you haven’t, I’m shocked because it was a viral event that Senator John Kerry and a young college student by the name of Andrew Meyer spawned that phrase at our university several years ago. And it centered around an event that none of us thought was going to be an emergency type event or response at all. It was, you know, your average afternoon affair where a guest speaker comes on campus and, you know, lectures about some topics and it quickly spun out of control when this student decided to basically take over the function and ultimately the police intervened and it was all captured on video and it went viral. And it went all over the, the world basically on the internet.

So, because of that and other student type activities that we’ve been experiencing at the University of Florida, and I’ve seen it nationally as well with students being more engaged and more politically active. I decided to go down a little bit of a different road today and talk a little bit about some best practices that we’ve developed at the University of Florida to deal with celebration type events or spontaneous events and you can see from some of the slides here. We’ve had three national championships in the last few years at the University of Florida. Two in football, one in basketball or two in basketball, one in football where we had to literally preplan, preposition assets and it kind of ties into a lot of the topics today about how we can do, what strategies we can implement to mitigate the effects of the binge drinking of this, the crimes that it creates…possible damage to property or loss of life issues.

And also strategies as they relate to student-led protests and, you know, events of that nature that basically turn an average day at the University of Florida sometimes into emergency response mode very quickly. When you get a text from somebody at your president’s office saying that there’s three thousand students marching on the president’s office, it tends to get everybody’s blood pressure up around the university. So, as the, the president here that spoke of URI earlier today, I’m sure he had all the fraternity houses raised, and that may have led to some student activism, some protests and stuff. I’m sure it would at our place.

So, wanted to talk just a little bit about some of the strategies we’ve developed to, to try to account for some of these wild and crazy events that’s happened. And they create or
they become kind of an emergency situation for us. So, one of the things that we look to do is really, really focusing our efforts on training our staff at the police department. And also working in partnership with the folks from the Dean of Students office and other resources on campus. And not only on campus, we reached out to our community support groups as well with the other law enforcement agencies. Town and gown type things with the city commission, county commission and so forth.

And really one of the things that we try to focus on to all of these people that would respond to these kind of incidents is what we call basic training that everybody, kind of 101 kind of training that these folks need to know so that you are familiar enough with the policies and procedures and the case law in dealing with these situations so that you did not do something unintentionally to cause them to get even worse than they could have been anyway.

So, we focus on freedom of speech issues obviously as a result of the Andrew Meyer incident with “don’t taze me.” UF took a hard look at their regulations and policies and try to model them and change them and tweak them in such a way that we can encourage freedom of expression, freedom of assembly but we put some reasonable restrictions on that. We’ll talk about that a little bit in the future. And we’ll talk about some types of events and what, what kind of response that we have for those. And the roles of all the individuals in that system and how we look at these things.

So, obviously and this ties in really well, when I made this slide I had it included in this, I didn’t realize how well it would tie into all of the over, overwhelming theme, theme of the presentations that I’ve heard today about collaboration with many, many groups and, and people around the table. It’s very, very important.

One of the lessons I learned a long time ago in law enforcement is that when a tragedy strikes, an emergency happens, or whatever you don’t want to pick up the phone and for the first time be talking to this person that’s going to help you. You want to build that relationship ahead of time. And to kind of tie in with Jen said about her behavioral threat assessment functions, we have found it very beneficial to, before we have some type of a tragedy or before it’s you know nine o’clock on Friday night and we’re all trying to figure out what to do, to already know who all of these people are that we’re going to reach out to.

So it’s, it’s very important you have those collaboration pieces in place. And our strategy is always to try to prevent or mitigate as much as we can of any kind, anything that would become an emergency situation. We want to preplan for it, so that it’s not an emergency. We will make good, sound assessments of whatever this event is either prior to as we can we gather information about what’s going to happen. Or when it develops, we want to make to make good, sound assessments about what we actually have. We want to try some intervention strategies. We want to build dialogue with the leaders of the group or the movement or whatever it may be. And then if they commit crimes or if they’re violating policies that the university has set, we want to try to suppress those in a proactive way, but also be very reasonable and mindful about it.
And we develop a strategy to do that called the tiered system that I’ll go over with in a little while that really in my career anyway over about twenty years in campus law enforcement. It’s kind of changed our thinking about how we do this. We, we used to be viewed primarily as the enforcers only on campus and no matter what the rule policy violation was the police were always the ones making the first point of contact. Those in law enforcement can probably raise their hand though and tell me how successful you are in campus law enforcement in trying to enforce a rule and not a law. It’s very difficult. And often times the police officer on the street runs out of tools when this person won’t comply and then we get into resisting an officer kind of situation and an arrest situation very quickly.

So one of the things we did to try to prevent that is what we call the tiered system and I’ll go over that in just a minute. But basically and I, there’s plenty of lawyers in this room, I found out today. I was kind of scared when I came in here and found out that there was so many attorneys here. Not that I don’t like attorneys but you know sometimes they’re not always on my side, so I have to be careful. But one of the things that we found and, and working with these types of issues and getting with our general counsel’s office and other outside experts and I would encourage you to do that on your campus is to really make sure that everybody in the room that’s in a staff or police role, advisory role fully understands what it means about the First Amendment and what you can and can’t allow to go on with that and so, so we drilled this down and I’m not going to read all of these slides for you. They’re available, as Jen said, for you later to look at. But we really try to drill down what the First Amendment really meant and what type of reasonable restrictions and accommodations we can put on that such as time, manner, and place. And you know we really tried to do that in such a way that we felt like legally we could defend it too from anybody that says that we were trying to violate their first amendment rights whenever we tried to deal with those persons.

So I encourage you, and we encourage you, the University of Florida, that that would be a good first step to do when you’re trying to train up your response teams to these types of events. And again, I’m not going to, for the sake of time, I’m not going to go through and read all of these slides to you. They’re available to you. But basically in a nutshell, most of this stuff to me anyway is very common sense oriented. I mean there’s reasonable restrictions and locations that you can put on these types of gatherings and, and, and create reasonable expectations of behavior and speech for these types of events. And as long as you do that, I think you’re going to be in good shape. It’s when you try to shut them down unilaterally and not give them some type of a venue or outlet to either carry on that type of speech or celebration or whatever it is in a safe way is when you’re going to run into trouble and you’re going to get the most resistance. And probably the most criticism as well from, from the community and perhaps the media.

So, the University of Florida, as I said, we took a real hard look even before the Andrew Meyer incident but again, you know, trying to look back and look at best practices we’re always looking to learn and grow from every experience. We took a look at our own institutional policies and procedures as a result of that incident and many others and we
really went through kind of a top down review of all of our policies and tried to tweak them in such a way to allow for the reasonable expression of speech that may be controversial whatever. But still prevents somebody just taking over and dominating a situation or running in somewhere and yelling “bomb” or “fire” in a crowded room or stuff like that. To still give us some tools to prevent that stuff from happening.

And we also have designated several locations throughout the campus that are basically free speech zones that don’t necessarily impact the educational mission that’s going on necessarily. They’re farther enough away from, you know, the traditional classroom environment that a protest could happen pretty much go unabated so to speak and do pretty much whatever they want without distracting from the educational mission of the university and impacting people in labs or classroom settings. Because believe it or not that’s the, the at the police department ironically the biggest criticism that we get is from the professors who are trying to teach about students being too rowdy, too loud, or whatever they’re [doing] when they’re dealing with their issue. So, we’ve tried to craft this in such a way to give both sides a good opportunity to do what they need to do. And again, I’m not going to read all of these to you, but, you know, there’s plenty of times that you can send reasonableness to you know when amplified sound can be used, whether or not you can carry a banner or signage into a closed facility.

Another event that we had a couple of years ago was Dr. Jack Kevorkian, when he was alive, came to speak at the University of Florida--very controversial then. It was kind of on the hills of the Andrew Meyer situation. We had a lot of pro and con protesters coming to that event to either support him or denounce him and some of the restrictions that we put in place for that was the type of signage that you could bring into the venue, whether or not you could stand up and block other people’s view, how we handled questions from the audience. We did it in such a way to try to minimize any kind of confrontations and stuff like that. But still tried our best to preserve an open dialogue with those individuals and the speaker. Again these are all available as hyperlinks to you off, off these slides if you choose to go and look at them.

But one of the other things we did beyond the free speech and looking at the regulations is we tried to develop kind of looking at the incident command system (ICS) national model for how to deal with incidents. We put that in place for our emergency response and crisis teams. And so we do this as kind of a unified command. So oftentimes it will literally be myself and Jen and a couple of other people are our designees out in the field kind of taking command in a unified way of these types of incidents to try to decide what’s the best course of action for us you know what impact to the community is this event going to have and how are we going to handle it.

And again, as I said collaboration on the front end is huge for that. Pre-planning it. Doing this annual training that we do with our staffs is, is key so that we have like today for instance myself and Jen are both out of town, so our proxies are back running the shop. And should something happen today, we want to feel confident that they’re going to make the same types of decisions based on this training and realization of what’s going on that we would in our absence. So we, we put this training together you know and
really try to stress this stuff. So, all types of events that we try to pre-plan, we have speaking events, both outdoor and indoor events, and depending on the layout of the facility, the expectation of the crowd, the controversialness of the speaker, and or the opposition to whatever they’re message is all goes into our pre-planning. We have protests and demonstrations.

One of the things that we’ve been very good at and I hate to say this sounds Big Brotherish, but it’s out there so we look at it, as, as Jen alluded to, we look at social media a lot. And if we find out that, you know, there’s going to be a big gathering to oppose the new tuition increase or whatever, we’re not going to just bury our heads in the sand and ignore that, we’re going to be aware of it, make sure we have enough staff that day to handle something if it gets out of hand.

And Jen and her staff and some of my officers actually do a really good job of kind of going out and making contact with these groups and trying to find out exactly what do you want. Do you want to do a march? Great. Do we need to close the road for you in order to get you there in a safe manner? Do you want to have a meeting with the president? We’ll work on that. You know do you have some, some cautified demands that you want to do? I mean he doesn’t want to stop his day every day and meet with every single group that comes in, but if you have some kind of a legitimate beef with the university and you can kind of articulate that in a, in a well thought-out way, then we can arrange that for you and we can help you be successful.

So, it’s kind of a partnership even with the protestors what we try to do. We always try to have pre-event meetings whenever we know of something going on. Jen or I will pull together a quick pre-meeting with all of our staff that’s going to be working that event. And we’ll talk about contingencies. You know what, what could possibly happen with this? What has this group done in the past that we may need to be prepared for today? Have we seen anything in social media or we heard anything from students that we know that they may be planning to do something different toda?.

And it’s not just students. You know we have a lot of the budget short falls in higher education have really impacted the University of Florida as well. And so we have faculty who also will protest occasionally. Usually not as aggressively as the students but you know in times of this budget crisis that we’re facing in the country, it’s definitely trickled down to our environment as well. We try to always on a speaking event, we always try to identify a moderator for that event, somebody that’s quote “in charge” of the event and has the ability to stop it on a dime if things get out of hand.

What we don’t want to see is the police coming in and shutting down a free speech type event. We don’t want to do that. We want to employ our tiered system and have the moderator of the event take charge of that and make some pretty clear guidelines in the very beginning of the event about what is and isn’t acceptable and then be the first point of contact to basically call out people if they’re not following those guidelines. And then we’ll follow that back up with student affairs staff and then ultimately if somebody doesn’t comply we can at the very last resort follow that up with a police contact. It is
very similar for marches as I just alluded to. We, we have the same thing. But in a nutshell kind of the basis of the protocol that we kind of enshrined as the University of Florida host some of these big events. As I said, Andrew Meyer was just one of them. We had Roberto Gonzalez who was the Attorney General for George Bush back when the Iraq War was going on. We had protestors basically take over the stage all dressed in Guantanamo Bay jump suit uniforms. So we had that happen. We had the Kevorkian event. And then we had also, on a more lighter note in some ways but also very serious, we had these national championship events that the students would and community members would spontaneously just have like a flash celebration for with several hundred thousand people in an area.

And so what we did, we developed what I refer to as the tiered system to respond to these. Again, not to really take a back seat role, but we did want the police department and the police officers to be that first point of contact in most of these situations. I mean if there was an act of violence or something like that or a clear felony kind of violation of course the police are going to immediately step in. But if it’s a conduct issue or a minor rule violation or a compliance with the procedures of that event, we really want to develop this layered system that basically in a nutshell kind of gives people a warning and an educational opportunity to comply with kind of going back to some of the discussions today social norming them to what is acceptable for these kind of events.

So, this is just kind of a flow chart that we developed and we use in our, our staff training that we want the first point of contact to be the ushers, supervisors, staff members that are working that event to be the first voice or the first person they see. Again absent some overt act of violence or anything. If that doesn’t gain compliance, then we, we bump it up. At that level it may very well be Dean of Students Shaw or somebody from her staff saying “Look, the event staff has already spoken with you about this. We, we communicated to you what the expectation was at the beginning of this event. Now you’re still not complying. Here’s some things that could happen to you because of that.” And they have a pretty nice, educational conversation with them. Again, about ninety-five percent of the people at that point they comply, they get with the program, and they’re fine. And, and we’re very successful in eliminating most of the quote arrests for resisting or having to trespass someone or something of that nature by utilizing the first two layers of the system.

But unfortunately, there’s always going to be a few and I think someone used the word “bonehead” today somewhere in this room, that don’t want to comply with all this. They don’t want to conform to whatever the social norms of this event are, and they eventually end up with a police contact. And again, even once we get to them absent again some kind of overt act of violence we try to go back and start at the beginning and explain to them in an educational way what they’re doing, why they’re doing it is wrong and problematic and try to give them several options. I like to call it the buffet as to what we can do to resolve this. And unfortunately a very small percentage of them eventually do get arrested or removed from the event. But we really, really strive hard to try, to try to minimize that.
And I think I’m out of time. But again, I’d be happy to answer questions about this, and we do view that all of this stuff ties into in some way or another, our overall behavioral threat assessment, components, and our, our response to these types of events and other emergencies.

**Friedburg:** Thank you very much. (Applause) Alright, the last panelist we’re going to have for this session today is going to be Dr. Ryan, C. Ryan Akers who is the Assistant Extension Professor of Crisis Preparedness Management at Mississippi State University.

**Akers:** How’s everyone doing? Good? Everyone doing okay? I know Darren’s, I know Darren’s doing well. I noticed during his presentation he mentioned national championships twice. (Laughter) Definitely, definitely not music to the ears of the University of Georgia grad. (Laughter)

Today I am here to, well actually let me tell you a little bit about my position before we get started. As Jason mentioned, I am an assistant professor with an issue extension in crisis preparation and disaster management. It’s a relatively new position and it was created out of basically the response to all this great weather threats that we’ve had this past year, which I’m going to talk a little about. They were quite frequent. I know that when we actually starting talking about this program, we had to cancel several conference calls because I was scurrying about trying to avoid tornados and, and the like. But in my position it’s a rather long title.

Basically what I’m doing, what I’m charged with is making sure that I’m there for all eighty-two counties in Mississippi in terms of programmatic initiatives, research, and service dealing with the four principal functions of emergency management. So, the preparation, the prevention, the preparation, and the response and recovery piece as well as the assessment.

Perhaps I guess maybe a little bit more notable was before my position in my previous life as a student affairs administrator about fifteen years of experience working with college, college students, and my research being areas that dealt with the individual response to the different types of emergencies and crisis that you would see, the different categorical crisis. And I guess, did, did you talk about the, the campus safety knowledge community? I think she mentioned that. That was sort of my parting gift, I guess you would say, to college student affairs before I moved off into this new adventure in emergency management was being able to establish actually take, get through the proposal process and establish the campus safety knowledge community within NASPA, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. And in terms of developing a nice website and an electronic catalog of resources we thought that that was very beneficial. We had some great positive feedback from that. I would, I would invite you to check that out if you haven’t already.

And perhaps probably the most notable accomplishment that I have was to find somebody that was qualified enough and had the passion and the vision to take my place after I stepped out of that national chair role, and thank you Jen. Again, I know I’ve said
that several times, but she’s doing a very good job there. To sort of expand a little bit, I think that probably ninety-five percent of the room is, does not know this. I’m sort of today acting, I’m actually a picture of emergency response. As my dear wife, I love her dearly, six months ago we sat back and said can I make this trip to be a part of this program...knowing that at any day around that program, you’re going to give birth to our second child. And so, actually, going to bring it up in front of you. If you get a text, Jen, let me know, okay? We were actually assured yesterday about five o’clock that she would not be having the baby before I get home tomorrow morning. So, if I get a text or if I get a phone call and all of a sudden I bolt out of the room, stay calm. (Laughter) Everything will be okay.

Okay, so I guess in all seriousness I should actually get to what I’m here to speak about today, which is that emergency management piece. And what I would like to do and I’ve got some, some very good visuals up here. I don’t know that the lighting in the room is actually going to allow that to happen. So, in the case that it doesn’t, I will try to describe some of the scenes, some of the scenery that we saw this past April in Tuscaloosa, Alabama. And in some small communities in Mississippi that dealt with both F4 and F5 tornados. So what I am focusing on in my role and not only am I working in the counties, but I’m also working with the college, the university, Mississippi State University and as a consultant with other colleges and universities around the country in dealing with these types of natural disasters. So we’re, we’re shifting gears just a little bit to talk about different types of disasters.

What I’m supposed to talk to you about today are those that develop from these abnormal weather patterns or these extreme atmospheric conditions. I think I also put up on the slide the breaking or shifting of subterranean rock, which I know that we all know, especially folks in, in the Northeast even experienced the recent earthquake tremors with the epicenter in Virginia. But basically what we’re seeing in college student affairs now is it’s more of, it’s more than an “other duties as assigned” role. Our emergency or our front line, even our front line practitioners and paraprofessionals in college student affairs, are being forced into this emergency management role and so they’re having to talk about prevention and mitigation and preparation and take part in the response and recovery processes. And you know that’s all well and good, but they’re not trained in those. They don’t have the experience in working in those capacities. So we have to do a much better job of educating them.

Now, these roles also include the planning, the communication, the coordination, and the psychological first, first aid as well. So how big is the problem? It looks like this is actually going to turn out okay on the slide. If you look at the darker colored images on this map, each one of the, we’ll say around twenty-five to forty of these last two images. Those images on the map are states that have been affected since 1980 with billion dollar weather and climate disasters. So, we’ll take my home state as an example, Mississippi. We have experienced between thirty-three and forty billion dollar weather disasters since 1980. Okay? And we’re going to talk about some disturbing trends in terms of what’s going on out there with the atmosphere. But this does actually represent twenty-two hurricanes, five fires, ten floods, and seven heat waves as well as blizzards and things of
that nature. No pun intended. So, hurricanes and flooding these tend to be at least of most recent record.

The most destructive, that’s what we hear about so much. That’s what we read about. Obviously, we’ve in Mississippi and in the Southeast we’ve talked about Hurricane Katrina until we don’t want to talk about it anymore. But it is a part of what we do. It’s a part of our existence in Mississippi so we must do that. And it’s really not necessarily the winds, the highs winds and things like that that’s causing the problems. As we witnessed with New Orleans, it’s more the flooding and the storm surge that caused all the devastation in, in New Orleans when the levies broke. And also, in Mississippi, although Mississippi sustained if you’re familiar with the recovery process in Mississippi due to Hurricane Katrina, we had many, many of our small communities that will just simply not recover. They’ll go away. Slabs, homes, empty slabs are still there. They will not recover.

Now if you, most of you who have been to Mississippi have probably been to the resort areas. Yes, we have resort areas in Mississippi. Casinos and what not down on the coast, gulf port, Biloxi. Those came back fairly quickly, but it’s the small communities about twenty miles in, twenty-five miles in that just simply were wiped off of the face of the map. So, broken homes, broken dreams both metaphorically and literally. One of the great things about the rise of TV and Internet media is that we can now, we know that these things are coming. Okay. We know all the hurricanes and we know about the flooding and all that. We know that’s coming. So we have time to prepare.

We’re going to talk about hurricanes, tornados in just a bit and that’s a much different story. Flooding does tend to be the most common natural disaster that we see. It’s not hurricanes. It’s not tornados. It’s actually, it’s actual flooding, and there are some misconceptions about flooding. And many of you are probably aware of what some of those may be.

First of all hurricanes and flooding are specific to certain regions of the United States. Not the case. Okay. We know that now. Flooding only occurs when hurricanes make landfall. Okay. That’s simply not the case either. That’s a common myth. And then lastly, we hear this quite often on campus working with students, if we see flooding happening we’ll have plenty of time to react. Okay, number one that’s not true. And number two, it really depends on who “we” are. Okay. Are you talking about our disabled students? Are they going to have plenty of time to react in the event of flooding? Your international students? No, that’s not necessarily the case.

Hurricanes don’t really bother me that much by definition. It were the number, the sheer number of hurricanes that we see. It’s the size of these storms that’s scare me more than anything now. You know, the two, the two images up top, that’s both Hurricane Katrina as it came at us. And then Rita down here in the left hand corner. Folks from Florida probably recognize Hurricane Andrew back in 1992 that did so much damage. And then I believe that’s Hurricane Fran coming up the Atlantic seaboard as well.
But those images are astonishing but it’s actually what we see closer to the ground that’s the most astonishing with the destruction of buildings, the flooding. This one always stands out in my mind. I remember being a teenager when Andrew came across and seeing these pictures had to, had to put that in there. Just the sheer destruction that we see from floods and what not. And then we’ll take a look at some. You probably, I don’t know if you can see that very well or not. But again, you will have these slides. What we saw in institutions in the New Orleans areas with Tulane, University of New Orleans. The destruction that they saw absolutely remarkable, unfortunate, and unforgettable. And University of Louisville dealing with their floodings that they have. And also the University of Iowa and several other institutions. Just the damage that these floods are causing these days is just absolutely tremendous.

Let’s talk about, real quick, about tornados and straight line winds, and there are some distinguishable differences between the two. Number one, obviously being the rotation aspect of it. But tornados can be and as we experienced back in April, can be the most violent types of natural disasters that we’ll see. These scare me more than anything. Just because the can tend to appear out of nowhere with little warning. And oftentimes little prep time or little advance warning. The perception is that we see these most often in the Midwest, the Southeast, and the Southwest areas in Tornado Alley and what is now becoming known as Dixie Alley a little bit further east. To survive these, especially the F4 and F5 tornados that we saw, advanced prep is critical. Putting together go kits of emergency supplies and things like that. Hydration kits, protein bars, first aid supplies and things like that. Absolutely essential. Evacuation and shelter plans need to be talked about beforehand and then a very strong crisis communication plan both at the institutional level and with the family level in terms of families dealing with their students. Or dealing with their children. We stress that quite often at Mississippi State.

Straight line winds are just gusts without the rotation. They can reach up to eighty miles an hour. They can do a lot of damage. Straight line winds can do a lot of damage. They don’t have the rotation aspect that the tornados do. These are some, I hope you can see these, these images that we put together again to show some trends. Up in the left hand corner, those are severe weather reports from January 01 of 2011 to May 17th. Severe weather reports. Look at the sheer number of severe weather reports that were reported across the country, especially in the Southeast cause that’s where is dominated in. In the right hand corner, that’s April 27th. Those are the tornado tracks across South, across the Southeastern portion of the United States. Going from Louisiana all the way up into Virginia. I’ll talk a little bit more about that in just one second.

I’ll have you go over to see this one as good, but that’s actually the satellite imagery right after the tornado came through Tuscaloosa. And you can see the tornado’s path and just how lucky the University of Alabama was to, in terms of taking a direct hit. They obviously had a lot of indirect issues. Had a lot of students that were injured. We had some students that died at the University of Alabama in that particular incident as well.

And then again, that’s another representation of all the storms that we saw on April 27th. There’s a lot debate out there, and I’m not a meteorologist first of all. I’m, but what I
would say is that I tend to believe that the spring and the summer of 2011 particularly for the Southeastern portion of the United States is more the new norm. Okay. It’s more than the norm. We’re going to see a lot more of that. I don’t know what’s causing it, exactly what’s causing it. Again, I’m not a geoscientist. I’m not a meteorologist. But I do know that there are some specific changes that have occurred over the last couple of years, and I’m thinking that we’re going to see more F4, F5 type tornados that are not traditionally going to be found in tornado prime areas. And they’re not going to be found in tornado season. So, I’m believing that’s more of the new norm. Not necessarily debatable here today but something to consider.

I put the EF scale, the Fujita scale, up on the board just so that you can take a look at the miles per hour of these winds. Let me ask a question to the crowd real quick. Do I have any tennis players in the crowd? Raise your hand if you’re a tennis player. Okay. One tennis player. Peter, you’re a tennis player. Okay. We need to talk. Okay well Peter, since you’re the only one that raised your hand, I will ask you. If you have a fifteen to twenty-five mile an hour wind that you know is going to be going on while you’re trying to go play tennis outside, what are you going to do? You stay home. You play the next day. Fifteen to twenty mile an hour winds. Peter, I do the same thing. Okay. I’m going to go back home and find something else to do. Category five, F5 tornados have wind speeds greater than two hundred miles an hour. Okay. Two hundred miles an hour. Think about that, and I’m going to show you another graph in just one second that, it really just blows my mind.

Some of the recent events we’ve seen with tornados and hurricanes and flooding and the secondary effects. Shaw University most recently had a direct touchdown on their campus right outside, right in Raleigh, North Carolina. They had a center campus touchdown. They were closed. It was during the late spring, so they didn’t miss the whole semester but they were closed. And actually if you go to YouTube and search “Shaw University tornado,” it’s a great lesson of what not to do in terms of tornado response. So, students running up and down the stairwells with their iPhones and iPads and cameras. Hurrying to get outside, so moving around in front of windows, glass, and going outside actually while the tornado is there on campus. Actually I should warn you, I would label that NSFW. I think that’s “not suitable for work.” So, if you look at it, lower your volume because there’s some considerable language that goes on in that actual video that I can’t say that I blame them.

University of Maryland had an F3 that came through in 2001. Had created about fifteen million dollars worth of damage in College Park. Georgia Tech in Atlanta had to deal with a tornado a few years back. University of Alabama obviously we’ve talked about that. Vanderbilt’s in the greater Nashville area has dealt with flooding. Vanderbilt didn’t actually get it that bad, but they had some students in the area that got it pretty tough. Two million in New Orleans. Obviously we all know about that with Katrina. And then again the University of Miami closed campus for about two weeks. And then about 13.7 million dollars worth of damage. One image that I wanted to show you, we’re now dealing with F4 and F5 imagery from tornados on the ground. And these are sporadic.
Some of this is Joplin, Missouri. Some of this is Smithville, Mississippi. Hackleburg, Alabama. Some of this is Tuscaloosa.

But the one that I would really like for you to concentrate on is the one in the very middle. When an F4 tornado or an F5 tornado comes in and demolishes a building, say for example a house made out of wood, what do you think happens to that house? They are now projectiles. So, you see this, I hope you can see this, this long piece of wood has actually gone through a concrete parking block. So when you start dealing with F4s and F5s that’s when you start hearing and you may have heard this story about the University of Alabama football player the longsnapper who was actually doing everything that he had been taught to do. This is an F4, remember this. This is an F4 tornado that came through. It’s the one that is down in the lower right hand corner. This F4 tornado, this football player was inside a closet in an interior room down on the ground doing everything that he was taught to do. It sucked him out of his apartment. Threw him about seventy-five yards in the air. And you start hearing things about people being sucked through dry walls. And you start hearing things about paperclips and pins being embedded in skin. And that’s where a lot of the injuries and deaths occur is from the projectiles from tornados actually.

F5 tornados in the United States since 1950. You see the numbering system right here on the left on this graph. Most recently, May 24th in Oklahoma, the May 22nd tornado at Joplin that pretty much destroyed that city. April 27th in Mississippi and Alabama we had four. Four that occurred, and I can tell you a little bit about that day, and I told you that I would try to give you a little bit of a description of what that was like. We actually knew that something was going to occur across Mississippi that day. When Jim Cantore comes to your campus and sets up shop (laughter) you know something’s going to happen. This was actually a month-long event for us in Mississippi and Alabama and parts of Georgia. We were sent, as I mentioned before, we were sent scurrying quite often over the course of the entire month. Now towards the end of the month, it’s a little bit of the, the boy who cried wolf syndrome. Do we really need to leave now?

But on that particular day, I thought that the media and especially the, the geoscientists on our campus, the meteorology program did a very, very good job with Mississippi State community in alerting them. Hey, this is going to be like nothing that you’ve ever seen. We may not get hit directly on this campus, but this state is going to be impacted. And, and was it ever. At about three o’clock in the afternoon, I look out my, I’m sort of my office is in the center of campus, I look out and my trees outside my office are basically doing handstands. And we have a very large video board for our football stadium that is designed to withstand an F4 tornado, and I’m seeing panels flying up and down. Keep in mind, I have a two and half year old son on campus and my pregnant wife is also on campus, so when we got word through our instant messaging system that we have very large storm cell that was just, just south of us in the neighboring county that was coming right for us.

What do you think I did? I went after my wife, and I went after my son and I was going to bring them to what I thought was going to be the most safe place on our campus,
which just happened to be my building. Now, when I got, as soon as I got up, the power went out. And you know those gated parking lots that we tread in? Those gated parking lots that we love so much. Guess what happens when the power goes out. They don’t go up. So, we had this long line of cars and trucks trying to get out of the parking lots and the actual physical plant had to come by and open every single, unlock, unscrew the arm on every single gated parking lot that we had on campus. But we have luckily I don’t know if it’s a South thing or what not, but there are a lot of trucks and what not that were jumping curbs.

Getting the heck out of dodge cause that’s, sometimes that’s what you do in an F4 or F5 tornado. That’s just a personal decision. But anyway, fortunately we did, whew, is that my time? Sorry. Oh wow. Okay. I should speed things up. Again, this, these PowerPoints will, these slides will be available to you. This actual event was, we were fortunate it missed us. One cell went north went to Smithville, became an F5 tornado, demolished it. The other cell went east to Tuscaloosa as an F4, demolished it. I don’t know if you’ve ever seen the damage from an F4 tornado, so I’ll try to describe it to you. Imagine mowing your yard for the first time in about say six to eight weeks. So, you’ve got grass standing up pretty tall. Your first pass with your lawnmower, that is exactly what an F4 tornado looked like in Tuscaloosa. It took out city blocks and it looked like one giant lawnmower had come through mowing buildings down, mowing buildings down.

An F5, I went to Smithville after that we were able to get in. It took us about two weeks to get into Smithville, and there are no words to describe the damage from an F5 tornado that would do it justice in this room with you today. There are no words, you can’t see it. If you saw it on TV, that’s one thing, but to actually be standing on a concrete slab to look up at a city’s water tower and see dents and find out that’s where semitrucks were picked up and thrown into the water tower. It’s unbelievable the devastation and the damage.

I guess my lesson here is, we’ve been very fortunate on our college campuses and universities in terms of taking direct hits. But just like one of these days the Chicago Cubs are going to win the World Series, we are eventually going to sustain some serious damage. Let me just real quick run through here. There’s my increasing trends. We’re averaging about 1200 tornados a year. 1200 a year. Did you know that from F0 to F5 about 1200 a year and it’s going up, it’s rising.

Earthquakes, not going to spend a whole lot of time talking earthquakes. It is mainly perceived to be a west coast thing, but there are forty-five states and U.S. territories that are at moderate to high risk for earthquakes. Particularly us. We stand on one of the, one of the potentially the worst fault line in the United States. The New Madrid fault line. The most notorious earthquake that we’ve seen that hit a college campus or affected, affect a college campus was the, the, what we call the Cal State Northridge earthquake that within the span of ten to twenty seconds left thirty-three dead, almost ten thousand injured, 6.7 magnitude, and a twenty, twenty billion dollars worth of damages in Northridge and in California.
What I would like to wrap things up with today is I have, I’ll tell you a little bit, gosh I really went, I really went over up here. I have some common problems and concerns dealing with coordination, internal and external coordination. And also dealing with internal and external communication. Those tend to be what breaks down the most within your crisis response plans in times of natural disaster. Also complacency.

But I think probably the bigger issue that we have is a lack of strategic planning including emergency management in the higher echelon of the, of the institution’s strategic plans. We have a lack of an adequate budget. I just saw a survey of a hundred and forty institutions where eighty reported that they only gave it between zero and a thousand or one hundred thousand dollars per year. That’s just not enough folks. We’ve got to do more. We’ve got to hire more. We have to have better positioning within the institutional structure.

And then lastly, what I’ve seen, there’s just a lack of general knowledge within university administration and the academic community with regard to emergency procedures and what not. So, we have to do a better job with educating folks to what emergency management actually does. There’s a lack of understanding about the importance of recovery in the emergency management process. And then finally, there’s a general misrepresentation of what emergency management’s responsible for. Go back to your campus and think about where it’s housed. Where is yours actually housed? Is it in public safety? Is it in environmental health and safety? Is it risk management? Or perhaps it’s a stand alone, which is what we’re seeing a lot more. I’m a big advocate for stand alone, working in direct correlation with or partnership with campus police and local agencies.

Okay, so here’s what I’ll do cause I know Jason’s going to jerk me off this podium in just one second (Laughter). I have a litany of best practices that I’d like for you to review. So please, I put this PowerPoint together. Please at least take a look at some of the dos and don’ts. Why these actual plans fail and then take a look at both the best practices for communication and coordination. And you can kind of go down the list and look and based on the research that you know about your particular institution find out whether or not you are doing these particular things on your campus. And it’s like four or five slides. So, definitely take a look at that, and I’m sorry. I shouldn’t have talked so much about Tuscaloosa and Joplin and all those things. But thank you very much. Sorry Jason. (Applause). I appreciate it.

Friedberg: No problem at all. That was wonderful. I appreciate all of your insight and time. So, I’m going to open up our question and answer period here with a quote that I’m reminded of by Ron White. I don’t know if you guys have ever seen Ron White, but he, he often says, “It’s not that the wind is blowing. It’s what the wind is blowing.” That’s often the issue, and we’ve got to get that around because it’s good for tornados. It’s good for hurricanes, and actually we just had some floods locally here in Pennsylvania. And I think we all saw it’s also what’s carried by the water that can also affect our lives, our buildings, our property, our students, and our families.
So, why don’t we jump in with, start off with the behavioral threat assessment piece that Dr. Shaw provided to us today. And I guess I’ll start it off by asking you the question about what, what do you think the smaller schools can do to start a behavioral threat assessment program? Something that maybe they don’t have in place now that would at least get them rolling. Get them the training and education that they need and get it up and running.

**Shaw:** I think this is what I talked about earlier. Take advantage of schools in your area that have teams already. We have a community college in our community and we trade, trade back and forth with them even though our populations are significantly different and clearly size wise we’re very different. We’ve learned a lot from them I think as much as they’ve learned from us. So, I would take advantage of area teams, and then as I said there’s a lot of good resources out there. Do, do some reading. Email us. I know Darren and I talk to schools all the time about what our model looks like for us, but I would say talk to institutions that are similar to you as well. Take advantage of your colleagues.

**Friedberg:** Alright. We’ll open it up to the floor, and we can start with them.

**Audience:** Dr. Shaw, you talked a little bit about when you were in the fact-finding stage through the assessment piece that you don’t separate students from the campus. Can you talk about strategies that you used when you’re in that fact-finding phase. There are potential threats and you’re working with the student. I come from a small private college and a commuter college, and so most of our students are off-campus, all of our students are off-campus, but in working with adult students I find that I have used suspending them from campus during that fact finding stage, so that I can get to the meat, get answers and then make a good decision.

**Shaw:** I think it goes back to campus culture, and you know what works for you works great for you but might not work for us or other, you know for us, we’re a flagship for the state of Florida. And so people, we have an average GPA of 4.3. I mean people worked really hard to get to the University of Florida. So, for us, it’s more of a motivator to get to stay on campus than to separate them. And so, as long as there’s not an imminent threat kind of situation where it might be a hospitalization or an arrest or some, some other action that we have to take, we’re going to try to do everything we can to keep them on campus because we just find the better we can form a relationship with them and work with them, the better off we are. But we’re constantly balancing how are they affecting the community. So, if they’re acting out in a way that’s negatively affecting classmates, faculty, roommates, whoever than we might limit access to campus. We might do online classes. We’re fortunate that we have a lot of options, so that we can keep them in essence in school, but potentially like not in housing or physically in classes.

**Baxley:** One thing I would add to that is that it is, it does sometimes present an instance where we have to take immediate action. And we are not advocating not to do an interim suspension in those cases, but what we are saying is that you need to be careful you know using that ultimate power because it can be over used we think.
Friedberg: Next question. Alright, while you’re thinking of that, I’ll do the follow up and that’s again coming back to Dr. Shaw’s comment about sort of the long term monitoring. And I’m just wondering, in your perspective, or in your mind, what is long term? Is it through graduation or, or is there a finite period time where you say listen we’ve, they’ve been on our radar for about two years and, and they’re working through it, and, and they haven’t had any issues. Nothing’s risen up. Do they slide off of that or do they stay on there really through graduation?

Shaw: They stay, for us, they stay on. So, for a person who might take a break from the institution as I said they want to come back to UF so badly that we’ll put a flag on their record, so that we’ll know if they’re applying to get back into the institution. Our team will actually be consulted before they’re allowed back in the institution. We, we really try to keep an eye on everybody that’s on our list until they graduate from the institution and leave us and go on to one of your institutions.


Audience: Jen, you all joked about sort of the Big Brother aspect, but that’s the concern that’s being raised about threat assessment is that at times it’s happening in secret. You don’t even know the source of the information. How do you respond to those in your community who push back and use that as a criticism of what you’re trying to do? Or those in the media?

Shaw: We really focus on the care aspect. One of the resources that I left over on the table is a program we’ve initiated called “You Matter, We Care.” And what it says is that every single member of our community matters, and that every single member of our community has an obligation to care about each other. So, the threat assessment, we present in the same ways. We present as our philosophy is we really want you to stay here on campus. We want you to be successful but because of the behavior that you’ve exhibited we’ve got some concerns and here’s how we’re going to address those. We actually haven’t had any push back on our campus. I’ve heard that nationally some, but we’ve not had any push back either from families, even the students themselves because we work so hard to have at least one of us form a relationship with that person. We’re not getting pushed back in that way.

Friedberg: Another question back there.

Audience: A little bit of a follow up on this gentleman’s question. What measures do you take to prevent the information you’ve gathered about that particular student or any student from being misused, which would be another way to present to the community and students saying, this is what we’re doing, safeguarding information. And this is what we’ll do should the information be mishandled.

Shaw: I think one of the advantages of having a team is that there’s no one person that’s making decisions about students based on the information that we’ve gathered. It’s all of
us, and we, the way our team operates is we have to come to consensus about what our action plan is going to be. So, I think in that way, we’re protecting the students that we’re gathering information about. Typically though for us, with the size population we have, our threshold is pretty high for them to actually make it to the team. So there’s behavior we can point to, if anyone was ever to question us, there’s behavior that we can point to that, that creates a significant enough concern amongst all of us on the team that I think, anybody that works in our field would say okay it makes sense why you’re trying to figure out what’s going on with this person.

Baxley: I’d add one, one thing to that in terms of the information flow. Really on our team and on most of these teams, most of this information that’s out there either in a private sector, be it a FERPA record, possibly. Not in HIPPA cause we’re not allowed to really view or know that but we, we incidentally gather that through a police report or something like that, is siloed in many different organizations within the campus environment. And each one of those silos has varying levels of privacy built into it anyway. For instance, the records that I gather at the police department, if it’s in a police report and the investigation is done, it’s a public record. But prior to that, it’s shielded at least in Florida as an ongoing investigation and/or intelligence information. So we, we can protect that data somewhat in that regard if it’s a criminal matter. And then the information that Jen may have on a student or housing they have about a conduct issue is all stranded into FERPA. And so, there are some safeguards built in and at, at least at our university, the only place where this information ever kind of cross pollinates is in this group. It’s, it really can’t get out in another way at least in the holistically.

Friedberg: Okay. How about a question for Deputy Chief Baxley just to come back to that? What do you think is the number one downfall for campuses when it comes to this event management piece?

Baxley: You know, I think the biggest downfall that I’ve seen and one of the lessons that we’ve tried to learn is and it really touches with what you said in your presentation, is the lack of pre-planning and strategic thinking about these events. A lot of people I think get into this complacency you know, you know I hope we stay out of the news. I pick up the Chronicle or some other news thing, and I read about a shooting that happened here or a weather event that happened there, or some incident and I used to be somewhat like that myself going, “Man, I’m glad that didn’t happen here.” But then all of a sudden, we had several events at our campus that really kind of forced us to take a hard look internally and then externally for best practices. And we’ve tried to position ourselves to become a leader in these areas that were before perhaps a challenge to us, so I think, I think that’s how we address that issue.

Friedberg: Question in the back?

Audience: Yes, I have a question for Dr. Shaw. You mentioned that your, your group gets information from guidance counselors in high schools to formulate a case management plan. So as the psychologist, who has my foot in the counseling center and
the Dean of Students with case management, I’m wondering how you navigate that confidentiality law as far as getting that information from the counseling professional.

Shaw: So, navigate in terms of my conscience? (Laughter)

Audience: Confidentiality.

Shaw: Well, you know, again to me threat assessment is about building relationships, and so we’re pretty selective in who is calling the guidance counselor and then explaining why. So, you know, we’re sharing with the guidance counselor, here’s the behavior we’re seeing on our campus. Here’s what our concern is. Can you help us understand? Is there a history here? Was there something that you guys did that really worked? So, is there a particular counselor that person is close to in their high school environment? Or do we, a lot of times we’ll learn something about the family relationship that’ll help us sort of understand the dynamics and help us figure out are the family members going to be allies for us or are they going to be more of a detriment. So, for us, you know, we’re not violating anything. Potentially, you could say the guidance counselor was violating FERPA. I think in most cases people are going to interpret, again because we’re so big, our threshold’s so high for a person to become a case for us. It’s, it’s a pretty dangerous situation typically, so I think if an attorney was looking at FERPA, they would say sort of an educational need to know. It’s going to fall under one of the waivers. It has never been tested and, and you know our fundamental purpose is how can we best help this person succeed whether it’s at UF or in life. So, I think when people look back over our cases and look at how we handle things, they’ll see that we’re always coming from that framework of how can we keep our community safe but also help this person be successful?

Friedberg: So how about Dr. Akers? One of the things that you, you also specialize in is this low resource community. The college and university are historically not low resourced. We’re always looking for opportunities to get out there and bring a concentration of funds into the university. Is there any grant funding opportunities or pipelines that are out there for colleges and universities maybe specifically or in joint partnerships that could help us do the pre-planning, mitigation, or training?

Akers: Yeah there’s, there are a lot of opportunities out there at the National Weather Service... Also, I’m not familiar with more of the Northeastern states’ homeland security departments, but ours in Mississippi, we definitely have opportunities to receive funding there. We work in partnership with them, and one of the greatest things that probably more so than that funding is just utilizing because our institutions’ higher ed, are low resource communities in Mississippi. Just with the way the budgets and, and the financial scope of things that are right now in Mississippi. But partnering with other institutions and sharing those resources has probably been the best thing that we’ve been able to do in terms of, say for example, Mississippi University for Women is twenty miles down the road. You know, we can help out with them, and in Mississippi we have a very strong or very large community college population. And those institutions don’t have the resources that even we have, so we help out with them too so…
**Friedberg:** Good question. The one more question that we have is, how do you respond to, or how do college and universities and this is actually for the whole panel I think because it’s really cross-sectional, how do you respond to non-local or non-campus emergencies? And I’ll give you the for instance, you know, the Northridge earthquake or the attack on September eleventh. When you have a large swath of your population that you recruit from at California or New York that’s impacted by an event nationally that has nothing to do with your campus. Do you stand something up? How do work through that? What do you provide?

**Baxley:** Why don’t you touch off on the student perspective, and I’ll talk.

**Shaw:** Okay, so at UF anything that happens globally actually, we, we’re ten percent international students, so anything that happens in the world, there’s probably some aspect of our population that’s affected by it. So, we’ll immediately bring our crisis team together and sort of figure out how are we going to outreach to the students that are impacted? How are we going to talk to faculty and staff? Do we need to do any kind of commemoration events? So, so we react pretty much to anything that happens around the world.

**Baxley:** And I would just add from the law enforcement piece in the state of Florida we’re used to dodging hurricanes and getting hit with some pretty significant weather events and then our, our Southern neighbors, in Alabama and Mississippi and Louisiana, traditionally the state and university police have kind of banded together and whenever a campus community is impacted we send a delegation from all of the other universities to help those other universities. For instance, after New Orleans, we sent a contingency after Katrina to New Orleans to help out under mutual aid agreements with the states to do that. So, we’re very much involved and engaged on a regional, state, and national level.

**Friedberg:** And I actually, the mutual aid piece is obviously something that with Clery, you know, one of the things that we try to attach in that Clery compliance in the Clery report is, is the understanding of the mutual aid. And it’s part of the new Higher Education Opportunity Reauthorization Act. You know, to put that in there, and I think it’s an important piece for colleges and universities to understand for that reason. Because we’re, you know, we’re not islands and we’re not mutually exclusive. It’s really a tight knit community. So, one more question or are we out of time? Or are we good? Okay, I think we’re good. Thank you all for your time and attendance. (Applause) Thank you to our panelists. (Applause)
Kiss: I’d like to take this time to introduce my colleague Melissa Lucchesi who is the Outreach Education Coordinator at Security On Campus to introduce the next panel.

Lucchesi: I am pleased and honored to introduce our panel on sexual violence, an issue very near and dear to my own heart, and for which I am terribly passionate. The individuals on this panel are experts that come from a variety of backgrounds and work on a range of issues related to all types of sexual violence. Our first panelist, in no particular order, is Paul Cell, Chief of Police at Montclair State University; Michelle Garcia, Director of the Stalking Resource Center at the National Center for Victims of Crime; Michelle Issadore, the Executive Director of School and College Organization of Prevention Educators, or SCOPE, and who also used to work at Lehigh in their women’s center; Dr. John Lowery, Associate Professor at Indiana University of Pennsylvania; and our lovely panel moderator, Kirsten Feeney White, who is the Assistant to the Vice President for Student Life and Director of Community Standards at St. Joseph’s University.

White: Great, thank you so much. I am very honored to serve as moderator for today’s sexual violence panel and introduce this extremely distinguished group of panelists from diverse areas in the field. The format is going to mirror those previous sessions, so we’re going to have about 7-10 minutes we’ve agreed upon of presentations and then hold the questions until the end and then hopefully open it up and generate some discussion and engage in a collaborative conversation around sexual violence prevention, education, response, and research. And so the panelists have already been introduced briefly, the
order will be, first we are going to have Michelle Issadore come up, and then Michelle Garcia, and then we will have Chief Paul Cell, and then Dr. John Wesley Lowery. Thank you.

Issadore: Good afternoon everybody. So my role on the panel today, representing SCOPE, which is a membership association for prevention educators, is to really bring the focus of our conversation on sexual violence to the prevention arena. So this morning, you heard some conversation about needing strategic plans for alcohol prevention, and that’s really what I’d like to talk about.

I have an article that I co-authored with SCOPE advisory board member, Brett Sokolow, that is forthcoming in End Violence Against Women International’s *Sexual Assault Report*, and it is about strategic prevention initiative, which can encompass a whole host of things from sexual violence to alcohol and other drug abuse, mental health awareness and prevention, but I will tailor my comments today around sexual violence. So, for those of you who are working on campuses or are familiar with this issue, you understand that the approach is often very piecemeal. You have folks in difference offices, working on different things, not communicating, not necessarily having a comprehensive plan in place.

One of the things that Brett and I mention in this article is what we call the 7 C’s, so we want to manifest those 7 C’s that encompass effective strategic initiatives, and those would be: cogent, community wide, collaborative, concerted, consistent, comprehensive, and centrally planned, and this will all be made available to folks after today as well. The, the notion being that in this time of liability and big risks, you need to meet that with big ideas, and so there really needs to be a strategic prevention plan in place. Again, in, in talking about our alcohol panel this morning, we talked about the effects that social norming has had in terms of alcohol abuse prevention campaigns, and in the sexual violence realm, a lot of us have seen work in recent years on bystander intervention being very effective, but those campaigns and those strategies can be applied to all realms of prevention.

Often times, those of us who are doing prevention work on college campuses may not have the power and the pull that we need to lead institutional change, and so one of the things that I suggest is not necessarily directing all of your prevention programming towards students, but rather working with the faculty and staff on your campus to get them to buy into the idea that prevention is a very proactive model of risk management and that it would be important to staff and fund and make time on a master calendar for and those types of things.

We also have talked today, especially in the last panel, about legal duties, and for those of us working on campuses in Pennsylvania, you know that we have legislation that mandates prevention education, New York has some more legislation, and now with the Campus SaVE Act that Security On Campus is proposing and which SCOPE is a co-sponsor of, we’re hoping to see that prevention work being mandated federally.
Another problem that we often see in prevention work on campuses is that there’s not a consistent message, so some folks are coming from a harm reduction model, some folks are working on environmental management. You need to get on message and stay on message, and another topic that came up this morning was talking about the, the relationship between alcohol and sexual violence, not that alcohol causes sexual assault, they’re not that inextricably linked, but it is really important to have that conversation, to talk about women’s sexual rights and their sexuality and how responsible alcohol use can play into preventing sexual violence on the campus.

In terms of centralized planning, which was mentioned in the introduction that until four months ago, I was working here at Lehigh’s Women’s Center; we had a peer educator group. We had staff that served as advocates. Residence life was doing programming, orientation, fraternities and sororities, athletics, the health and wellness center, as well as faculty who were conducting research, and there was a very concerted effort to get those folks around the same table, communicating, and sharing some goals and some visions. In terms of what we want to offer our students, it really needs to be a comprehensive curriculum every semester. So, not “we’re going to bring in this speaker,” “we’re going have this march,” there needs to be a plan, the same way we would at the onset of a course. That can be coordinated in terms of timing, message, dosage, audience, the developmental progression of the concepts, mutually reinforcing those concepts, and cross pollinating effective prevention paradigms to create that tipping point of transformation that we are all looking for like the URI example of culture change this morning.

We also need to get on board with mandates. We mandate all kinds of things on college campuses, and prevention needs to be one of them. Lehigh was lucky enough to have a mandatory sexual assault prevention piece in their orientation. The reason that had teeth was because we could either put a registration hold on students or make them write a ten-page paper. So your mandates need to have teeth. The flip side of that is that you could also have positive incentive mechanisms, so students can earn points, they can get co-curricular transcripts, those types of things. You can’t just reach out to those who will come to your program, that’s preaching to the choir. You’re not going to reach the most at risk and over represented populations that need to hear your message.

You want to vary the, the mode of your messaging, so whether it is a speaker, a passive display or exhibit, a social norming campaign via posters. You want to have a lot of variety. You don’t want the message to get stultifying and repetitive. Infuse some academic curricular element in there. Work with your faculty who are doing research on gender and crime. At Lehigh we were able to offer a sexual violence course in the women’s studies program, which was really helpful to reach students that I wouldn’t have seen otherwise had I only been working in the women’s center.

We need to be getting better at assessment. It’s the story that you’ll hear anytime you come to anything related to student affairs or higher education, but that’s the only way that we can demonstrate that what we’re doing is effective, and so its really important to not only do a needs survey of your campus, and what we talked earlier about what’s
targeted for a specific audience. What are the norms and mores on your campus? You need to find out what makes sense for you, and then are you meeting the goals that you’ve set forth for yourself?

A master calendar is a really important thing to have, not all of us in this room are programmers, but if you can set aside funding for prevention, if you can preapprove by committee or position what’s happening on campus to make sure that it is consistent, that’s very helpful. It also makes sure that you’re not repeating the message to the same constituents, that you have enough trainers, that you have the space needs, that your group size is appropriate for the message that you want to deliver, and what to build on next so that it makes sense, curricularly and developmentally. Additionally, times of year might make sense. On Lehigh’s campus, we, we’re focusing on our big football rivalry between Lehigh and Lafayette. We also focused on spring break and would make sure that we had certain campaigns targeted to that time of year, and other offices were aware of that and were supportive of those efforts.

Some of the issues that you may come up with when you do a needs survey, some that another university found when they did their assessment, was that there was a lack of victim empathy or victim blaming on their campus, that notion of invulnerability or not in my backyard that we talked about earlier, a misperception of norms around drunk sex, misinterpretations of consent, predation issues, drug facilitated rape issues, male defensiveness, fear of false accusations, self defense issues, how to help a victim, so those are the kinds of things that you might find if you do a needs assessment on your campus where you want to target your prevention mark.

Lastly, you need to be flexible, right? We recognize that there’s going to be new generations of students coming in. Their social cues are going to change, and if something isn’t working, it’s okay to learn from that and move on to something new. So, I think those are all my comments, and I look forward to hearing the rest of the panel’s comments and your questions and having a great discussion. Thank you.

Garcia: Good afternoon everyone. While my PowerPoint comes up, I just want to express what a thrill it is for me to be here. I actually started out as a sexual violence peer educator when I was an undergrad over 20 years ago, and so the issue of sexual violence on college campuses has been very near and dear to my heart. I went on to spend most of my career working in the sexual violence and domestic violence fields, including running a rape crisis center, a community based rape crisis center in a very large Midwestern university that also at the time had the largest Greek system in the country. We had extremely high rates of sexual assault and alcohol involved in those.

What I’ve been asked to talk about today is the connection that we see between stalking and sexual assault, and coming out of the sexual violence field, when I started focusing on stalking about six years ago, this was something of particular interest to me, especially how it played out on college campuses. And where I actually want to start with, just to make sure we’re all on the same page as we move forward, is just with the definition of stalking that guides us in our work. Because if we look across the United States, the
statutes around stalking all differ to some degree, and your campuses have definitions that probably vary to some degree as well.

And so, the definition that we use to guide us in our work is that stalking is “a pattern and behavior directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to feel fear.” And we’re going to come back to this, so try to keep this in the back of your mind. When we look at the scope of the problem of stalking in our society, what we know from the research is that 3.4 million people are stalked every year in the U.S. Now this is not reported. This is research based from the National Crime Victimization Survey: 3.4 million people, and we find that 18-24 year olds, the primary age of students on our campuses, have the highest rates of stalking. What that breaks down to is about for every 1,000 people, fourteen cases of stalking. So, you can do the math to figure out the rates on your campus, but this number is going to be an underestimate, again because you have that weighted population of 18-24 year olds, and also because when we look at the research, what we find is that the rates of stalking on campuses are higher than in the general population, very similar to sexual violence.

And very similar to sexual violence, what we find is that when we look at the relationship between victims and offenders, most often they know each other, very rarely is it going to be a stranger. And so nowadays with technology, I think many of us have this image of stalking as something where you have an offender whose searching Facebook, searching Myspace, finds someone and then targets them. Well we actually find is that most often they’re going to know each other, and most often, they’ll have dated. They’ll be current or former intimate partners. And the types of behaviors that we see these offenders engaging in is widespread, whether it’s contacting people, emailing them, showing up at their classes, sending them gifts, showing up at their residents halls, following them.

There’s a wide range of behaviors that we see these offenders engaging in, and today especially we have to be very mindful about the technological aspect, that in our experience, it is extremely rare these days for a stalking case not to involve some form of technology, that the most common form of technology we see used are cell phones. To make calls, to send text messages, to send video, and other types of multimedia messages. So, some form of technology will be used in most stalking cases, particularly when we’re talking about a campus population which tends to be a very tech-savvy population.

So what about this connection between stalking and sexual assault? And I’m actually going to pose this as a question and see where you end up. So, I’m going to provide you with some information. I think you pretty much know what my opinion is, or at least you will by the time I’m done speaking, but I want to see where you go with me on this. So, where I want to start is when we look at the research, we find there is a connection between stalking and sexual assault. When we look at the research on sexual violence on campus, we find that there are a significant number of stalking victims who report that they were also sexually assaulted or that the offender attempted some sort of sexual assault or sexual contact. Both when we look at large scale national studies, like the Sexual Victimization of College Women, and smaller studies, like a study that was done at the University of Kentucky in 2007, that found 26% of stalking victims also
experienced rape or sexual assault, and 11% also experienced rape, sexual assault, and physical assault.

So, we need to also be thinking about the fact that we’re seeing these types of cases not happening in a vacuum. Stalking often coincides with sexual violence as well as with dating violence and other type of physical abuse. But all of the research that has found this connection has approached the question from the perspective of asking stalking victims, “were you also sexually assaulted?” or “was there an attempted sexual assault?” There really hasn’t been any research that has asked sexual assault victims, “Were you also stalked,” with one exception. How many of you are familiar with the work of Dr. David Lisak, who’s done [research on] the undetected rapist? Okay. So, only a handful of you in the room. For those of you who are working on the issue of sexual violence on your campuses, I strongly recommend familiarizing yourself with his Dr. Lisak’s research. He focuses on what he calls “the undetected rapist.” So individuals, men, who have committed sexual assaults, who have never been held accountable for their sexual assaults, and the majority of these cases almost entirely are non-stranger sexual assaults on campuses, and the way he identified these men was by conducting surveys. In his most well known piece of work, he surveyed over 1,800 men on two campuses and not asking them questions about “have you ever raped someone,” but questions about behavior that would meet a legal definition of sexual assault, questions like “have you ever had sexual intercourse with an adult when they didn’t want to because you used physical force if they didn’t cooperate?”

What he found, the good news is, was that the vast majority of men were not offenders. That in fact it was only a very small number; it was less than 7%. 120 of the men admitted to committing acts that met a legal definition of sexual assault. What was particularly alarming, though, about this is that more than half of them reported committing multiple sexual assaults. So, the 120 committed a total of 483 rapes. The 76 repeat offenders committed 439 of those sexual assaults for nearly 6 sexual assaults each. And again, none of these offenders were ever held accountable or reported for any of their behavior. Now, in following up with the surveys, Dr. Lisak interviewed the men who admitted to committing this type of behavior.

What he found were some very interesting things, but most particularly related to what we’re talking about here, this connection with sexual assault, is that he found that there was premeditation and planning prior to the assaults, that a very common scenario in these cases would be where an individual or a group of individuals would spend some time in advance of a party, where they would identify what they call targets. They would seek specific types of women on campus, often freshmen, which they perceived as naive and inexperienced. They would groom them, in essence. They would get to know them. They would show up at their classes. They would engage them multiple times over the courses of the week before the party to ensure that they would show up at that party. Once they were at the party, they would use a punch that was spiked with alcohol, it was very sweet so it was very difficult to detect how much alcohol was in it. They would move them away from the party. They would take them to designated rooms, isolate them from their friends, and then they would sexually assault these women. And in that
pattern, what David found, what Dr. Lisak found, was there was this targeting, this prey behavior, this staking out behavior that proceeded the sexual assaults.

What we’re also finding nowadays is that much of this behavior is also happening online. So the gathering of information that the offenders are using to again build that relationship, do that grooming with their intended victims and also to have that continued contact. Again to ensure that these women show up at these parties or these events. So, these sexual assaults were proceeded with multiple contacts; surveillance, information gathering, communication, showing up at the women’s classes, their residence halls, etc. We also know that often our sexual violence offenders contact their victims after a sexual assault. I will tell you that in my career of working with sexual assault victims, the vast majority of victims that I worked with were contacted by the offender after the sexual assault.

And when we look at these types of non stranger sexual assault cases on campus, the type of contact tends to break down into three areas: one you have an offender who may contact the victim to try and silence the victim, threaten her either implicitly or explicitly not to report or something worse will happen. We also see offenders who contact the victim in an attempt to frame the incident, particularly if there was alcohol or if it was drug facilitated sexual assault to shape how the victim is thinking about it if they’re unclear, if their recollection is fuzzy in order to try and mitigate their own responsibility. And then lastly, many of these offenders that Dr. Lisak interviewed didn’t see anything wrong with their behavior and contacted the victims in attempt to maintain social contact because they had a great time, and they want to hook up again. So when we see these contacts happening, we also need to think again about technology, that these contacts are happening not just when the offender runs into the victim on the quad again, but via Facebook, text messaging, email, and other uses of technology.

So, I’m going to go back to my original definition of stalking, that stalking is “a pattern of behavior or course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to feel fear.” And so, when we look at these types of sexual assaults that are happening on campuses, that Dr. Lisak has researched in his work on the undetected rapist, this is the course of conduct that we typically see, where we have that initial approach--engagement, that grooming behavior, escalating to the actual sexual assault and then any possible post assault contacts. So, I will put it to you, I’m assuming you’re a group of reasonable people, is this a course of conduct that would cause a reasonable person to feel fear? And I see most heads nodding, and some of you may still be struggling with this, and so the one thing that I want to point out about stalking, what’s unique in it, as a crime, is that it is a course of conduct crime. And so, fear does not have to attach to every single incident because some of you I know are looking at this first part right here, this approach in the engagement, and do you think that that victim at this point is afraid of that person? No, they probably feel flattered, because here’s an upperclassman paying attention to them. But when we look at stalking as a crime, we have to look at it as that full course of conduct, and it doesn’t have to, fear does not have to attach to every incident.
So when we look at it in total, and I told you you’d probably guess where I ended up at this. That I see this as a full course of conduct that will cause a reasonable person to feel fear, and I think when we start looking for those connections between stalking and sexual assault, it provides us with many benefits, both in terms of validating a victim’s experience, opportunities for intervention and prevention, and also opportunities to hold these offenders accountable. Because we all know that sexual violence cases can be some of the most challenging to adjudicate and to prosecute, but stalking can enhance our ability to hold those offenders accountable. Thank you. (Applause)

**Cell:** Good afternoon everyone. I’m going to ask you to join me in a little exercise here. And I want to, it’s an exercise of honesty. First, how many people here in their lifetime back in the college days had went to a party while they were in school? Please stand. Honestly everybody went to a party. Those are sitting, you’re not listening. Went to a party while you were in school. Alright while you were at that party, how many people consumed alcohol? Raise one hand. How many people consumed alcohol more than once? At many different parties? Two hands. How many people went to a party with the intent, whatever your definition is, to hook up? If you did kind of wave your hand an little bit. (Laughter)

You can sit down now. Why SART [sexual assault response team]? Because it’s no different now than it was then. They’re out there doing the exact same thing that we all did when we went to school, and it’s our obligation now to put in place a program a mechanism for our students who are becoming victims to become survivors. When we start to believe we are the change, then change happens. So, join me and I’m going to say, let’s say “We are the change!”

**Audience:** We are the change.

**Cell:** Even better. “I am the change!”

**Audience:** I am the change.

**Cell:** Say it with spirit. You’ve got to get some energy here. That’s the problem. We’ve been sitting here for eight hours. We have an amazing group of panelists that have been here, right? I want to thank you for what you did. You scared some people off though when the rain was coming so, (laughter) I appreciate that, but it was great what you did. But you really got to be psyched, and no matter what end we’re looking at. Whether we’re looking at stalking, sexual assault response teams, crimes with sexual violence, we need to put the energy into them. Because I see too often at universities, we’re putting energy into parking problems way more than we are to crimes of violence. Do you agree with me? To some degree? I have a lot more meetings about parking issues than I ever have had about dealing with what can we put in place, and some of the heavy hitters in the universities are more willing to sit on those type of, those types of meetings than they are when we sit there and say we need to talk about sexual violence on campus and what we’re doing.
But why SART? Why do we start ours? Well, it goes back to about ten years ago. I have over thirty years of experience in law enforcement, a detective for many of those years investigating crimes of sexual violence against women. During that stage, I looked about ten years ago, and we had a case with a student where we failed her. And I’ll be honest with you, when I say “we” collectively as part of the university I believe the whole system failed her. We know today for our attorney. He’s here. Where’s our attorney. Is our attorney still here? We know today that the court systems continue to fail our victims of sexual violence. We had a victim who came. She went through the process. She wasn’t helped in any way. We really had no set steps in place for her. She went through the criminal process. Nothing happened there. She ended up leaving our school and consequently had many, many issues with her life.

I sat down with our nurse practitioner who’s the director of our health center and we decided we had to do something about it. We started looking at what programs we could put in place, and we decided the best program that there is out there was to create an active sexual assault response team. You can give it any initials you want depending what part of the country you’re in. They’re starting to change the acronym, and now it’s a CCRT. We use the word “victim” and we need to change it with “survivor.” None of that’s relevant. What’s relevant is what are we doing to get people who are victims of crime help?

So, we looked at the SART team and we said to, to have an active and really, really productive SART, you need to do two things if you’re going to be part of it. Number one: you need to become an expert in what you do. Too often we sit on these panels, we sit in these groups, and we want to be part of it because we care, but we never take the time to become experts in our field in what we need to do in the area that we are representing when we sit in these groups.

Second and most importantly, and you can take this one home because I put this sign outside of my meeting doors, and this is what everyone should have. “Check your ego at the door.” Agreed? So many times we have people coming in from different levels at a university, from the outside community, coming in and everybody wants to be in charge. Everybody wants to be the one who’s running the whole show. Check your ego at the door. What we need to do is adopt a philosophy that it’s all about the victim. Because that, that’s exactly what it’s about. It’s about the victim. It’s not about me getting credit for doing something. Or you getting credit. It’s about putting together a plan that works, so that the victim can get the help that they need.

One of the things we looked at was our team itself. Our team consists of three groups. One: law enforcement. Myself. I represent that for the law enforcement group. Two: is our medical/forensic. And three is our advocacy group. All three groups make up the sexual assault response team. Not to be confused with the sexual violence task force. I’ve travelled around the country. I just did several of the University of California schools, and what I found out there, we asked for their SART team to come to a meeting. And when that meeting showed, when the people showed up for that meeting, I had over thirteen people sitting around a table. And I said, “you’re the response team?” They
said, “Yeah. We’re all part of the response team.” And I think that’s one of the problems. I think everybody wants to be involved. We need to define what the sexual assault response team does and who should be on it and what the sexual assault task force does and who should be on it. Because they should be two separate groups: one response, the other sits there and helps formulate the plan and works cohesively with the other groups on campus to make sure all the pieces are in place for our potential victims.

So, that’s one area that you need to look at. The other is I started looking at judicial boards. How many times, one of the areas that I specialized in is victim behavior, victim response and offender behavior. How many people here have served on a judicial board? How many people have been trained ahead of time on how a victim acts when she is a victim or he is a victim of a sexual, violent crime? If you have, you’re above the curve. You’re ahead of the curve. Cause I’ll be honest with you when I traveled across the country, the majority of judicial hearing officers really had no clue how a victim should act.

Then we talk about offender behavior, and I know David Lisak quite well and his work that he does, and we kind of specialize in the same area, looking at offender behavior. And then I ask the question, how do, how many people here know how offenders act? How many people know before, with Gail, right Michelle, I did that earlier today didn’t I? With Michelle spoke about how many people knew that. How many people know that they set up this ahead of time? I do normally an exercise with students when I’m doing my presentations where I’ll take two females, and I’ll say “Please stand up together and you be the wing person for her. And you do me a favor, you stand with her. I’m going to hit on you because we know there’s that eye contact and that waving. And what I’m actually doing, what he talks about is what I’m actually looking for a target.” It’s so often people sit there and think ‘Well, it’s going to be the hottest looking person with the most risky clothing on.’ That’s absolutely not true. What they’re looking for is who is going to be the easiest target. We understand that. Then, they will work on a female and start to lower the resistance.

And so often we are so busy teaching them what the red flags are. Red flag number one: when he tries to separate you from your wing person. Right? We always tell our females, travel in groups. Be with somebody. Have somebody watching your back. I can tell if you know what the person is doing, how they do it, I can talk a person into wanting their wing person to leave. And what happens is during this process this offender, this serial offender or what I call the opportunist offender, he starts to play this head game. So, that our victim starts to look at her wing person and say “You know what, you know, why don’t you just give me a few minutes with him.” And the person who’s the real offender who knows what he’s doing starts to look at the wing person saying, “No, no let her come with us.” And what happens is they actually start to form a jealousy. And now the person who’s interested in the, in the person who’s about to commit the crime, says, “Hey wait a minute. What’s he so interested in my friend for?” He starts pushing away, he starts pushing away, or she starts pushing away the wing person. And it gets to a point and it goes on and on to finally each step of the way, this person, this perpetrator, this serial offender is convincing in his own way this female to get rid of her, her defense
systems. And then when nothing is left, and he takes that final step and she says, “Stop it. What are you doing?” And he commits the act.

What do you think happens the next morning? The next morning, she starts questioning herself. If we don’t have that already in any situation, you sure as heck have it when you’re dealing with these serial and these opportunist rapists that are out there, and offenders that are out there. That’s exactly what happens. She starts questioning, and so does her friends because her friends will sit there and say, “Hey, what are you talking about? I was with you. He wanted us to stay together. Are you crazy? You’re the one telling me to get lost. He’s telling me to come with her.” And you know, she starts questioning herself. But as a judicial hearing officer, do you know this? Do you know that this behavior happens?

So when we start looking at putting together a SART team, it is much more than just the actual team that responds to the victim and provides the services. You all should be aware of what a SART team does, but make sure if you do have a SART team on your campus, how many have it on your campus? There you go. Every, every university should have one, and you don’t need a lot of money to do it. All you need is a lot of cooperation, and we need to sell it. We need to sell it to the administration, and for the administration anything that we look at as we look at exposure, and we look at liability, and that’s the area you have to know. But before you can sell it to the administration, you have to become an expert in what you’re selling because you have to be able to answer the hard questions like “Why will our numbers rise? If we put a sexual assault response team in and more people start reporting the crimes, why will the numbers rise?” Because that’s what we want the numbers to do. Because we know it is one of the most underrated crimes there.

What I say, I call it the “voiceless crime” because the victims don’t have a voice. And we need to be that voice, but we need to know what we’re doing so that we can sell it both above us, out to our peers, by taking and incorporating programs that are there and not shutting people out as well as to all of our students. Everybody needs to be on board with that, but to do that, you need to check your ego. You need to be able to become an expert in what you do. You have to train other people, which is part of it. Not just your group to be the best group to respond because you can lose it so easily just in a judicial hearing alone if the board that sits there has no clue what they’re looking for. We know in law enforcement that if a woman changes, a person, excuse me, changes their story, where’s my law enforcement people? Raise your hand. Policing 101, somebody changes their story, what are they probably doing? Yell it out. They’re lying. Okay. What about a victim of a sexual assault? Is it common for her to change her story? Very common. Why? Embarrassment, shame, wants it to sound like a real sexual assault, right? Wants it to be it. You know when we think about the stereotypical rapist, offender what does it look like? We just talked about this the other night over dinner. What does it look like? It’s the person with the hoodie and the dark glasses out there. It’s not the athlete sitting next to you that you go to class with. It’s not your fellow classmate that you talk with all day long. We have to break that but to do that again we need to become the change. So
Please end it by telling me nice and loud and this time with some energy, “I am the change!”

**Audience:** “I am the change!”

**Cell:** I believe in it. I believe in it with all my heart. We can make that change, and I want to thank everybody for the job they’re already doing. And Security On Campus, it doesn’t get better than you, and the group that’s here today, I have to tell you being in law enforcement, in campus law enforcement a long time, in the beginning days, we looked at you as the enemy and if that’s not politically correct, I’m going to perfectly honest with you. And this organization today has changed that, and to you are partners with us, and I want to thank you for all you do. Thank you. (Applause)

**Lowery:** Another, I think, what we have to admit, a very difficult element, but profoundly important element of preventing and responding to sexual violence on campus is how we address reports of sexual violence when they are received. Now, Chief Cell talked about the campus police perspective and also the SART team perspective, which is really to a great degree about the immediate response. And he hinted a bit at the intermediate response from institutions, and that’s really what I want to spend some time talking about with you now. Now, these institutional responses to reports of sexual violence, and the associated policies are necessary but as Michelle was talking about, they are certainly not sufficient in and of themselves for how we as institutions address sexual assault. They are one, but one part of our institutional response, and prevention is another important part of that that we can’t lose sight of.

And through the work of Security On Campus and others, both those of us in higher education and our society at large, are significantly more aware of the issues surrounding campus aid and sexual assault since the passage of the Clery Act in 1990, institutions have worked to develop and enhance their campus safety policies. And attention was focused much more specifically on sexual assault in 1992, but the first of a number of amendments to the Clery Act, which required changes including the development of policy, prevention education, and changes to student conduct rules.

But more recently, and this has been hinted at today and it’s really what I want to explore, the Office for Civil Rights in the U.S. Department of Education in April issued a Dear Colleague letter specifically on sexual violence. The Department of Education had been saying a variety of things related to sexual violence and how institutions responded. For a number of years in individual letters to institutions, but it was difficult if not impossible to get the Department of Education to say anything definitive outside of the scope of an active investigation. That changed with the Dear Colleague letter, which is specifically about sexual violence, and for the most part focused on sexual assault.

They are a number of key elements that had been addressed there. First and foremost, the Department of Education has said clearly it is their expectation that institutions of higher education employ more likely than not or preponderance of the evidence standard when resolving these difficult cases. This is the aspect of the Dear Colleague letter probably
that has received the greatest public attention with groups like FIRE, the Foundation for
Individual Rights and Education as well as the AAUP, American Association of
University Professors, actively opposing that more likely than not standard, although for
different reasons. Although interestingly this is not the most significant aspect of the
Dear Colleague letter for most institutions of higher education. Our research tells us that
at least seventy percent of institutions of higher education already employ a more likely
than not standard. FIRE pays the most attention to Harvards and the Stanfords and those
institutions, which were, admittedly, many of them using a higher standard. Stanford’s
president took an usual step after the Dear Colleague letter came out and circumvented as
the, as Stanford’s rules allowed the president to do, their entire judicial process and
judicial review process and announced by fiat that for sexual assault cases, they would
change their standard to “more likely than not.” The rest of their cases are actually used
“a beyond a reasonable doubt” standard.

Another part when it comes to talking about the Dear Colleague letter, I think it’s even if
I don’t fully agree with the perspective, it needs to be acknowledged. That some have
questioned whether or not the Department of Education’s use of a Dear Colleagues letter
in this particular arena was a subversion of the regulatory process because it denied the
public, including the higher education community, any opportunity to comment before
what our effectively new regulations were issued. So, there is debate there.

But the underline perspective of the Dear Colleague letter, which they don’t necessarily
explicitly say but I think is valuable, when we look at these cases particularly when they
involve two or more of our students that we’ve got to a cite to afford the same rights and
opportunities to both of those student who are involved in the process. We lose sight of
that sometimes. We get so wrapped up in the process and the focus on the accused that
we lose sight of the fact that the complainant is one of our students as well. And it is our
obligation long before the Dear Colleague letter to treat all of our students with the same
dignity, care, and respect. At times [we] lose sight of that in this process. Some of the
ways the Department of Education has said we should make that happen include an
expectation that if we provide opportunities within our code of student conduct for the
accused student to have a meeting with an administrator in advance to the hearing to
explain to them what to expect that we do the same thing for the complainant. If our
policies or practices allow for the accused student to review documents in advance to the
hearing, we provide the same to the complainant. To clearly identify the timelines by
which we typically expect that we’ll resolve these cases and that we would update the
parties involved if for whatever reason we have to deviate from that timeline.

These are often complex cases; they don’t always go according to plan, but what the
Department of Education has said is you really ought to tell people what the plan is. And
if the plan changes, you should tell them that’s happened, so that they know what’s going
on. It isn’t a black box. There is an expectation, and this is back to something else that
Paul was talking about, a clear expectation that decision makers and staff on campus have
training on Title IX, the nature of sexual violence, and the nature of institutional policies
for addressing them. And knowing that many of you are from campus police, it’s
important to acknowledge that the Department of Education went out of its way to talk
about the need for frontline campus safety staff to have training both on issues related to sexual violence and on the institutions’ policies for responding as part of their training.

And most of those pieces that I just talked about beyond the standard of proof are probably things on most campuses that don’t even require changes in policy. Those are more changes in practice. They’re not something we have to wait until some standard review process and have to get everyone’s permission before we do can move forward more quickly on those. The element of that Dear Colleague letter that is most likely to require on the average college campus a formal change in policy is the requirement that both the accused and the accuser have to have the same opportunity to appeal a finding. U.S. Department of Education and in fact the Constitution don’t demand a right to an appeal for anyone in a student conduct procedure. But, what the Department of Education has said is if you have an appeal for the accused, you must offer the same opportunity for the complainant, and they must be on the same grounds. You can’t say, “Well if you’re the accused, if you think the sanctions are too harsh, you can appeal those” but not have some opportunity to repeal the sanctions for the other party. So again going back to that fundamental perspective of we ought to be treating both parties the same way.

There are issues honestly that still aren’t well resolved. This doesn’t answer every question. Right now our responsibility under Title IX for conduct which occurs off campuses is relatively murky at best. The Department of Education acknowledges that in some cases, a sexual assault that occurs off campus there will be a continuation of behavior, which comes on to our campus, which creates some obligation under Title IX. As well as the fact that we have an obligation whenever we get a report. Even if it is not something that ultimately can create a, will create a Title IX problem for us on our campuses to respond and to follow our own policies. The other areas where they need to clarify over time, Michelle was talking about stalking, the Department of Education only hints in their dear colleagues letter that stalking may well fall under Title IX as well, depending on the pattern of behavior. So understanding better those things beyond sexual assault and how they fit into Title IX will be important.

We’ve heard mention of the Campus SaVE Act today and that mirrors many of the same requirements as the Dear Colleague letter. And I’ve been encouraging people on my own campus at Indiana University of Pennsylvania and around the country to adopt right now at least one element of that piece of legislation. One of the things that the Campus SaVE Act requires is that institutions have written documentation available that can be provided to anyone who reports to a school official that they’ve been a victim of sexual assault. We give them information that says here are our policies. Here are the things that we’ll do. The more I thought about that particular piece, often people are coming to us in emotional crisis. We tell them lots of information. And at the end of the meeting we pat ourselves on the back and say, “That was great. I covered everything I was supposed to cover.” You ask that person ten minutes later what was said in the hearing, they have no memory because they’re in a moment of emotional crisis, and we have that written information, we’re giving them something that they can then follow up on. And so I’ve been encouraging and working on my own campus for us to do that. And I think it’s a
great idea even if I’m not in general a fan of federal regulation of higher education. I can recognize a good idea when I see it, and it’s one of those things that I don’t think we should be waiting for Congress to act on the Campus SaVE Act in order to implement that particular change.

The other thing I’ll say just as in general as it relates to sexual violence and how I sometimes feel folks in student conduct feel, is this is sort of their Scylla and Charybdis moment. They’re caught between two forces. On the one side they have victims’ rights groups arguing the institutions historically and in specific cases have done poor jobs of handling these cases and have not done justice to survivors. But on the other end of the spectrum, you’ve got Libertarian groups like the Foundation for Individual Rights on Education pushing and challenging institutions to create systems that look more like the criminal justice system than the educational systems that we’re seeking to create. So we’re getting battered from both sides being told that we need to go in two completely different directions at once. So, I think that’s part of the challenge that we continue to face, but rather than talk longer now, I’ll stop and we’ll have time for questions and hear more from the rest of the panel.

White: So, I think the beauty of a panel like this is that there is such diversity in the perspectives that were brought forth, and so I want to allow as much time as possible. I don’t know if Ali’s going to walk around with the mic again. Yes, so questions?

Audience: About the, the example of, of how predators behave and, and, and pull in their victim do…

Cell: Do you want to get up and act it out?

Audience: No, I don’t want to act it out.

Cell: I’m just kidding you.

Audience: But do, do you in your sexual assault prevention education things that you do, do you act out those kinds of scenarios?

Cell: Yes we do. We do act those scenarios out. Not only when we do it to student groups but also to anybody who’s going to be involved in our task force as well as the hearing officers. We want them just to have an idea of what does go on, so that when they are reviewing cases, they really know that there is a different side than what they see that they inside, you know, what’s, what’s just in writing. They get to really understand a little bit on how the predator acts, and how the victim should respond. So a lot of times when we’re looking at hearing officers that may see reports that differ. You know, they, they came in one day and said one thing. Later the report changed a little bit. A little bit later, it changed again. They’re not, they understand it’s a natural response for a victim of that kind of crime.
**Audience:** This can be for any member of the panel. We have a lot of online students at our college, and so prevention and awareness is challenging at times. Do you know of any virtual training programs or resources that colleges could possibly use?

**Issadore:** Alright, everybody’s looking at me. There, there are several, and I, I would say that in your particular institution’s case if it’s the only viable option, Outside the Classroom as part of their Alcohol.Edu component has a sexualassault.edu piece. There’s also inform.net, however research has found some challenges with them and certainly we’re all in education. We recognize that face-to-face interaction, the ability to ask questions is really important with all online learning modules. People can click through. They can leave the room. You’re not sure exactly how much they’re grasping. So, I think there, there is some, some work out there that could be helpful. What I would recommend is potentially some mandated reading. Some of the books that were on my syllabus in my sexual violence course were things like *The Macho Paradox* by Jackson Katz. *Yes Means Yes*, which was edited by Jaclyn Friedman and Jessica Valenti. And things that really hit home for today’s college student that are very accessible just, you know, sort of popular nonfiction, not too theoretical, but really give them a broad overview and provoke a lot of thought.

**Lowery:** And to be honest say what you want about the marketplace, but the reality is I think more common we’ve begun to see since the Dear Colleague letter clearly has within it an expectation that institutions are doing education and outreach, and it’s in the SaVE Act as well. Much more expansively for your average, traditional, four year residential campus. That kind of education is relatively, is easier relatively speaking, to do than on a commuter campus or much less online, at an online institution. So, I think we’ll see more things develop. What will be interesting over time is whether or not we see the research to back up the effectiveness of those approaches. We’ve been dealing with online alcohol education now for a number of years, so we’ve begun to see research that actually can speak to its efficacy. At least some efficacy. We won’t have that for some time to come when it comes to these other, newer forms of online education.

**Audience:** Paul Cell, you talked about really unpacking the ways in which men plan and orchestrate how they’re going to approach their victim or how they’re going to carry out their sexual assault. And, and how in your education you work with victims to warn them about how this process happens. Do you also do work with perpetrators, with young men about how to take responsibility for their actions?

**Cell:** Yes, yes. We do have several programs that are in place at our university. I’m sure most university have men outreach programs, and if you don’t that’s one of the areas that’s essential that you need to do. We also have several different things that we have done to promote this type of behavior for men. For instance, we have the Real Men calendar of Montclair State, and that’s where we pick twelve people, the students, faculty, and staff pick twelve people a year who have really shown their, their support of and have acted in a way that they are conscious about victim, about violence against women and have acted to work against it. And they are featured each year in a calendar with a little bio of them and on that calendar is also set dates for training programs and
that goes out to all the students, faculty, and staff. So, that’s just one of the programs that we do. We also have guest speakers come in and speak to many of our male populations that we know tend to be more likely to commit an act of that nature. So, we have several programs out there, but I think most universities do have men outreach programs, and if they don’t, it’s something that needs to definitely be put in place.

**Issadore:** Yeah. If I can add a bit to that, I would say in the research that Michelle was referring to, it’s a very small number of college men who are committing the acts of assault. And so, the, one other approach to take that’s very preventative and effective is to focus on empowering their peers, male peers, to stand up as bystanders. So, you may not change the values of the person who comes in and finds that type of behavior acceptable, but to have their peers challenging them as opposed to the administration or their parents or anything like that tends to be really effective. I would also say when John was talking about the research that we have on alcohol online modules, we also have that research that’s over a decade old at this point on the effectiveness of prevention programming in the realm of sexual violence. And so most of that will dictate that there be single sex, you know, prevention programming that you do some within group programmings, whether it’s a sports team or a residence hall floor that’s single sex, or a fraternity that that within group mentality really would motivate them to intervene. It would be much more likely than in, you know, a random two hundred, first year students that are in the program together.

**Audience:** Do you find that this line of thinking or tactic works also with the gay community with regard to bullying, gays and lesbians, transgenders? Because I’m thinking, you know, when you go forward and you say to the administration that “We need to promote this. We need to move forward. And I got to warn you that you know that you’re going to see an increase because of this education process, an increase of incidents.” But with the, the way society is now as opposed to in my youth, you see a lot of gays coming out. You see transgenders coming out. So that means you see the bullying or you might as you see sexual assaults. So, does this same process work and apply but also is there literature or research that can help them as well. Because I can see it coming. I mean I see it on my campus, and I see it other places as well, so I know that if we go forward and promote this, with information and knowledge that we will see an increase of reporting.

**Issadore:** Yeah I don’t mean to keep jumping in, so feel free to interrupt. I would say there’s certainly not enough literature or research on same sex sexual violence. It’s, it’s an emerging field, and I think based on the events of the last year and the focus on hate crimes against LGBT individuals and the suicides that we’ve seen in the youth community, it’s, it’s going to expand rapidly, which is a great thing. What I would say is the training piece as we were talking about making sure you’re student conduct board is trained, making sure your advocates are trained, making sure your resident assistants are trained, particularly on a campus where it doesn’t necessarily feel safe to be out. Survivors of same sex sexual violence may not be aware of the resources available to them, may not realize that that’s categorized as a crime or a violation of the student code of conduct. So just basic humanity and compassion and making sure that whether it’s a
stranger or non-stranger, perpetrator of the same sex, perpetrator of the opposite sex, you have the same rights and you’re entitled to the same recourse on your campus.

**Cell:** And I can say during our training we do include and talk about, I normally say it when I’m doing a full presentation that we do have same sex sexual assaults, but for the sake of the presentation, we were saying male, female only because of the numbers and the majority is that. But yes, in our training we do take that into consideration and offer and make sure that all the groups are included in our training session as much as we can get in there.

And on a personal level, we had several years back a same sex sexual assault and that really opened our eyes to some of the educational end of it that we were missing a piece out there that should have been included the entire time. So it really, it was an eye opener for us as we went out there a lot of the LGBT group was left out. We now make sure they’re actually part of the process, and we have a representative that actually sits on our sexual violence task force.

**Lowery:** A couple things I’d add. One I think a few years ago students on campus did a good job of acknowledging an institution’s numbers going up at least when it comes to sexual assault can well mean the institution is doing a more effective job of reaching out and creating an environment where people are willing to come forward in the same way that one of the things that will happen when an institution for example changes how it addresses alcohol issues. That its disciplinary violations may well spike because the institution’s approach has changed. What may work with administrators is to look to a completely different area that they’re familiar with and talk about the fact that it is similar to the way in which an institution sees an increase in the number of reported cases of academic dishonesty when they do more to reach out to faculty. Because it’s not that the amount of academic dishonesty has changed, it’s that the people who are on the front lines are now more aware of it, and are more knowledgeable about the process for coming forward. That may parallel if you’re talking with academic administrators and others to say now here’s something to think about that is in your neck of the woods, that is a similar phenomenon to what we’re telling you we’re seeing here.

**Audience:** [inaudible.]

**Garcia:** Well. I can start by saying that stalking is vastly underreported that when we look at stalking on campus, over eighty-three percent of students do not report. The good news is, over ninety-three percent of them tell somebody, which really highlights the need as we’ve talked about for training across disciplines, across providers, responders on campus because it’s not always going to be law enforcement who sees it. Often when students are reporting, they’re not even using that language of stalking. They’re talking about being creeped out. They’re talking about their ex won’t leave them alone. They’re talking about freaky phone calls. They’re talking about a fellow classmate who’s creeping on them. And so again it really shows that we have to have the language and be able to identify that behavior for what it is. Now as to whether it’s getting lied, I’ll let Paul address that from his perspective, but what I can tell you stalking is currently not
part of the Clery Act, and it’s currently not part of the Uniform Crime Report and so unless a campus chooses to do it, there’s nothing incentivizing them to do it.

**Cell:** For us, like many of the universities here, we have a police agency. So, if somebody was to report, it definitely would become part of our report system as well as on our daily log. But we see a lot of it coming in as under the harassment. They’ll be reporting as a harassment. And again, you’re correct, the numbers are so, so low because they are underreported, but we see more each year. And I think the educational process to the community members help us to get more numbers coming in.

**White:** Yes.

**Audience:** [inaudible.]

**Cell:** It, it really depends on your university. We are an autonomous police agency. We’re actually larger than two of the towns that our university sits in. So, no. We have the resources there. We have the entire resources all the way to we have the medical end. We do our kits right there on campus, so we don’t do it, but yes. If your agency didn’t have what was necessary, it kind of goes back to checking the ego at the door. There’s no reason, and I’m sure most of my peers here work with their local towns anyway. Then if they needed it, yeah. If you didn’t have the resources you needed, absolutely you should work with the local PD.

**Lowery:** And, and an interesting piece of the Campus SaVE Act is to be very, is to make it very explicit in institutional policy that ultimately the decision for a whether or not to report to local law enforcement should rest with the victim. That is not a decision that should be taken away from the victim, but ultimately that should be their choice. So that there is what I, and often where that comes up is not with things not being reported to a law enforcement agency but a perception that things are forced to go down that road when that’s not what the victim desires. And that actually serves as a disincentive to future student to report.

**Audience:** [inaudible]

**Cell:** Yeah the local department should be at least aware of it, and not just the police agencies. You know I’ll ask any university out here. When you’re looking at offering services to your victims, are you talking to your local hospitals? Are you providing them with, with the paperwork that if one of the victims who’s a student come in there and say, “Yeah. I’m a student at whatever university you’re at,” and listen by the way these are all of the services your school offers. And we see that when I speak to other schools around the country that a lot of schools don’t do that. They never, even though they have a fantastic program at their school, they’re not really reaching out to the local hospitals and other groups not just police agencies. But all, all the agencies should be working together. I mean and, and if there’s not it’s, I’m sure something that could be remedied with not much of a problem.
Issadore: And if I could just add to the first part of your question in terms of how stalking reports are coming in. I think what Michelle said is really important. The fact that stalking isn’t categorized in a lot of the legislation and a lot of the codes. Similarly neither is intimate partner violence, and so a lot of the stalking incidents that I saw during my tenure here at Lehigh came in as you know harassment, an ex creeping on someone. We even added language to the code of conduct on sexual exploitation because there were photographs being put online. Videos being made public that didn’t necessarily fall under the broad sexual misconduct category. So, I would say in terms of getting some stalking language in there and some intimate partner violence language in there, I think that’s absolutely the next step that we need to think of sexual violence more broadly because it’s often hand in hand with sexual assault but also because the, the experience that survivors are going through is so similar, and so the folks that are working with them should be trained on a whole range of issues. And also in terms of working with the local agencies, don’t forget that many of your faculty, staff, students, graduate students are living in the local communities and that we don’t necessarily just want to make our campuses safer. We want to make our communities safer and have this be lifelong learning that, you know, members of our campuses and members of our communities are all taking with them long after four or five, six years with us so…

Audience: First, thank you for the work you do especially considering the lack of resources we allocate to this important issue, so thank you. My question is, with alcohol prevention we have the luxury of things like the NIAAA report giving us information as regarding effective practices and prevention in specifically with incident reduction. Do we have an equivalent for our sexual violence issues? And if not, what are some things that we can do collectively to move the science forward?

Issadore: The CDC (Centers For Disease Control) probably has the most recent, has the most recent literature out, but yes it’s certainly not funded to the same extent. And so no, I wouldn’t say that there’s a government body of research and literature the way NIAAA has for alcohol prevention.

Lowery: The Department of Justice has financially supported research in that area, but there’s another piece of legislation pending in Congress, which would create a National Campus Safety Center in the Department of Justice which would have responsibility for research in this area. That could ultimately, were it not only created but actually funded. Congress has a bad habit of creating things but then not giving the department in question any additional monies to do that thing, whatever it happens to be. So, departments are either forced to stop doing something or do the bare minimum they can.

Audience: So, I just have a comment and then a question. I guess my interpretation of the Title IX letter is somewhat different. It completely changes the interpretation of Title IX prior with regards to who the compliance officer could be. The requirement for investigations it puts an undue burden on colleges and universities who don’t want to do that. Now having said that, do we see any change in the stance of OCR on this requirement to investigate after they put this out because of the chilling affect that it’s going to have on colleges and universities? For instance, we’re now required by law to
investigate even if the survivor does not want an investigation to assure that it’s timely and accurate has written in the law there. I’m wondering if we can see any change there.

Issadore: Take it away Dan.

Carter: I apologize for interrupting the panel but we actually have, I think we may have some information you don’t. (Laughter) So, we’ve actually been in conversations with along with some other advocacy groups for the last couple of months with the Office for Civil Rights about that very provision. And John, have you been in touch with any of those groups too?

Lowery: Not recently.

Carter: Okay and essentially what they have told us, is if you read the Dear Colleague letter it refers back to the 2001 guidance that they published, and they’re saying that is still the guidance that is in effect, and it talks about investigations in terms of things like sharing the name of the accused with the Title IX coordinator, so that they can identify a pattern. It does not necessarily mean interviewing the accused directly if that’s not what the victim wishes. Now, there is some lack of clarity about some of the details. But Jason in terms of what you’re talking about, do they automatically expect a law enforcement investigation? They’ve been absolutely clear about that. They don’t.

Lowery: It is clear. I think it, it did shift the marker a little bit in an expectation that we do something and acknowledged in a way that the Department of Education had not before, that there may well be circumstances that even against the strong opposition of a victim, that an institution would move forward with an investigation and well move forward with a hearing and be required to do that under Title IX in at least some narrow circumstances. Those narrow circumstances they talk about are some sort of ongoing safety threat.

Carter: In our tentative conversations with them, they’ve indicated essentially they’re talking about if there’s an ongoing hostile environment that affect, potentially affects other individuals now with the research of David Lisak.

Garcia: Lisak.

Carter: Lisak. We know that there is that potential, and that really is one of the gray areas. Now they, we actually plan to write a letter requesting a formal clarification. We’ve had a conversation with them and hope to be moving forward with that in the next few weeks. And hopefully, we’ll have some additional guidance that will clear things up. So, we’re hopeful.

Lowery: My response would be, don’t hold your breath. In the sense that not that they won’t someday do it, but they spent years writing that Dear Colleague letter with input, I would add, from advocacy groups. Because CALCASA was significantly involved in
writing the letter itself, not necessarily that language. It’s a process that has lots of hands
in it, so it would be surprising if you got clarity in the short term.

**Man commenting:** (inaudible)

**Issadore:** The word that I’ve heard is that there is more coming from OCR. That they
will clarify the, the Dear Colleague letter because if some of these questions, because of
feedback from advocacy groups, but also because there was so much unsaid and
unknown. And so, it remains to be seen.

White:** Any other questions? Yes.

**Audience:** …Can you tell me if there’s, if you have a sense there is a trend of sexual
assaults on campus going up, going down, leveling off? Is there, you know, do you have
any sense of what the picture looks like nationally?

**Issadore:** The only distinction that has come recently from the research is many of us
were working off a 1980s statistic of one in four women will be a victim of attempted or
completed sexual assault by the time they graduate. That has recently been adjusted to
one in five, however the number’s one in three worldwide, so in my mind it still sort of
averages out to one in four. And, and it’s just the wrong question to be asking in my
mind. It’s too many. It’s too many are happening. It’s consistent. It doesn’t matter
about your campus. No one is immune. There are very few places where it’s happening
at higher rates, so in my mind I would prefer to see less research and funding and going
towards number of incidents and more going towards prevention, educational programs,
know you. I just think we’re focused in the wrong area when, when it’s all trafficked in
statistics.

**Audience:** [inaudible.]

**White:** Could you just repeat the question so that everyone can hear? So, that he doesn’t
have the mic. Whoever chooses to answer that first.

**Cell:** He wanted to know what the role of alcohol plays in a sexual assault. And I’ll just
start off with, if you look again statistically, and I know numbers can, can be played with
either way. But the number is so high of the amount of non-stranger sexual encounters
involve alcohol; a majority do involve alcohol, so there’s a direct correlation there
between them.

**Audience:** [inaudible.]

**Cell:** Yes, yes. Other substances also.

**Issadore:** But often in conjunction with alcohol so…

**Cell:** With alcohol, yes.
Lowery: And the, the research we’re talking earlier, the people among that predatory group, that’s a not uncommon tactic, the use of alcohol. But that’s, that is not something that one would limit to sexual assault, I mean. I ask you for a moment to guess when this was said, a faculty member by the name of George B. Rogers said of campus life, “Ninety-nine one hundredths of our problems spring from drink.” He could have said that last year. He could have said that ten years ago. Or he could have said it when he said, one hundred and fifty years ago. This is not a new problem, and much of what we struggle with outside of the classroom is related, not caused by certainly we wouldn’t that sexual assault is caused by alcohol because that suggests that if we get rid of alcohol, this problem goes away and it certainly doesn’t. But this is one of the great ongoing issues in higher education that we’ve struggled with for a long time, and we continue to work on.

White: A question in the back there?

Audience: I just wanted to thank all of you for being here today. So, you did an amazing job of talking a lot about the response to gender violence on college campuses and some of the secondary prevention programming around bystander and helping women be aware of some of the predatory behaviors. Could you talk about, about some of the primary prevention programs that your campuses are doing?

Issadore: You’ve got to love that that’s the person who’s filled my position, who’s trying to hand me a primary prevention question on a platter. Thanks Brooke.

I think it’s absolutely true that a lot of the work we’ve done has focused on awareness, and I’ve had conversations with Daniel and Alison at Security On Campus that a lot of Security On Campus’s work in the past and much of the Campus SaVE Act early on was focused on awareness and response and not necessarily focused on issues of primary prevention. And so, we’re taking a look as cosponsors and trying to fit in some of those best practices, which as we talked about earlier today don’t necessarily fit every single campus. It’s not a one size fits all approach, but I think bystander intervention, social norming, men’s involvement, survivor supportive communities. There are all types of things that we can be doing that need to be done in a very strategic way. Again that piecemeal approach that I, I mentioned in my comments it’s just ineffective. It’s spinning your wheels. It’s burning people out of the field. And so, little plug for SCOPE is that it’s the first prevention educator membership association, and so we’re trying to work with folks who are working on primary prevention in suicide, in you know threat assessment, in eating disorders, in sexual violence and, and trying to build that sense of a field and a community to put out a lot of literature on primary prevention. So, any other suggestions, things that are working on people’s campuses or in their communities, I’m sure everyone would love to hear about. Thanks Brooke.

Audience: Great panel presentation. In the previous panel on drug and alcohol prevention and intervention, it talked about how different campuses have different needs because there are different patterns of drinking and, and drug use. You know there may be a lot of substance abuse before it was a non-medical use of prescription drugs, whereas
another campus is there may be not. Does that effect how you respond to sexual assaults? I mean because you’re saying that there’s a huge relationship between drug and alcohol abuse and sexual assault. So, the fact that the, the use of drugs and alcohol is different per campus, does that affect how you address the sexual assaults?

**Cell:** I’ll start. I imagine that it would affect the primary program initiative. You’d have to know what is occurring on your campus to be able to combat it. I mean you have to look at what the trends are in your campus, so when you’re setting up your primary programs, they need to focus on what the issues at your campus are. As far as after the sexual assault, I don’t think it affects it at all as far as your response. And I’m not sure exactly where you’re coming from, if you meant prior to.

**Audience:** I meant prior to. So, is there more of a cookie cutter kind of approach to sexual assault as opposed to alcohol and drug abuse prevention.

**Cell:** I don’t believe there’s, could be a cookie cutter approach. I think there’s some basic elements that are the same at all universities, but I think each individual university as well as program has to be geared towards that university.

**Lowery:** When you think about who you might reach out to, what you’re institutional policies would look like if you have a large residential population versus a commuter institution. Are you an institution where you know that the primary place that your students are drinking is at house parties off campus? That might suggest the different prevention response in relate to sexual assault, and if it’s happening at fraternity houses versus it’s happening at bars downtown who you would, which might suggest different partnering strategy for this reduction.

**White:** Other questions? Okay, you can keep thinking. I’ll ask Paul a question. I noticed how many in the crowd did not have sexual assault response teams employed at your institutions, so what suggestions would you give for starting one.

**Cell:** My first suggestion, well would be this amazing book called *Creating Campus Sexual Assault Response Teams*, but there’s probably a brochure over there that you can get that would help set up the basic team; actually, John is one of the contributing authors in the book. But that’s what I would do. Get online. Meet with other university officials or other universities that have SART teams in place and just have them come by and really look at what they have. You can go online and research many of them across the nation and have very, very good SARTs in place. You can kind of steal it because that’s what we all do. We steal it and adapt it to fit our, our own. And then I would call and actually, you know, that’s one of the things it’s always. You know, it’s easy to look online and see what’s there in writing but, but that personal touch is really what, is what is needed at a university. Pick up the phone and call. I know, I’ll offer our services. Anybody here, you know, my card, my contact number is in the brochure. You could call us, I’ll tell you what we did, how we did. We actually applied for grants. How we were able to secure two grants to help financially put it together. How we sold it to our
administration. So, I’m more than willing to share with anybody here, so and I think that’s what it’s all about. That’s what this whole summit’s about; it’s about sharing,

White: I’ll look to the crowd before I ask another question. No? Okay. So we’ve talked about it a little bit. I'll pose this to each of you if you feel like you can respond. What challenges if you could name maybe one or two, do campuses face in effectively responding to reports of sexual violence and how can those be effectively addressed? So, I think we’ve touched on this in different ways, but if you could summarize or give your highlights on that, on that question.

Issadore: I think just that notion of, of reactivity of waiting until a campus crisis emerges to figure out how to respond and having a plan in place, having hired the right people, having created the right positions, having created working relationships with one another where you get that you all are working towards a similar goal even if you play different parts. You know, often campus police can’t necessarily refer to a survivor as a survivor. They need to use the legal terminology of “victim” and “accused” and that type of thing, and I got that with the police that I was working with. And they understood why peer educators and advocates were using the terminology “survivors” and so, I think having that groundwork in place makes responding to a report much easier not just for the staff and faculty on campus but certainly most importantly for the survivor as well.

Garcia: Ditto. And I still think, having started out doing this work over twenty years ago that it is still not a priority for most campuses. That for many of you it is, that’s why you’re here. But compared to what were you saying, parking was more of a priority on many campuses? That that is one of the biggest impediments. That it’s not taken seriously. It’s not given the resources that should be allocated in terms of training for campus officials, campus responders, for resources for victims that it’s often relegated to a single unit that’s responsible for dealing with all of the married of complexities of these issues on campuses. And so until that changes, I think our responses are still going to be inadequate.

Cell: I think piggybacking off of what they both said if you were to get both of them in place those pieces, you would still need to make sure you had the right people doing it. Not people being placed into positions because they were told to be there, and then we need to make sure that the message gets out too often. We’re so used to just getting things out, and I think our opening speaker touched base on that. That we’re so busy getting something out, we don’t really take the time to see if it works. And lastly I would say, get out of what I call the “brochure box.” I mean I think we’ve proven brochures do not work. If I ever made a brochure for a sexual assault response team, there would be four pictures on it. You know a person walking, a person going like this, you know an assailant on top of them stick figures, and the last one would be them calling the police or all of the other number they can call because pretty much so many people are so used to putting so much into a brochure, they’re just not working. We know statistically brochures just do not work. There is a need for them, but, but we’ve got to think outside of that brochure box.
Lowery: I think the last challenge is that there, and I say this as someone whose spent the more than a decade training administrators, there are too many people on campus, particularly at higher levels, who, when they hear about these cases, what immediately comes to mind is the idea of the institution’s going to get sued. I don’t think it, it is I mean the traditional mythology was that institutions were worried about somehow this was going to harm there admissions portfolio. I think that’s less the issue. It’s this concern about legal liability, and over time we’re moving to a point where that’s less of an issue. At times you have to remind people, look there’s legal liability no matter, there’s legal liability even if we do nothing to this accused student. That exposes us to liability as well. I mean to some degree we can begin to use these cases to say, “Look, we need to set liability aside because there’s liability attached no matter what we do.” Now the question needs to be what’s the right thing for the institution to do in this situation? And make that our mindset, and get out of the way when we hire good people and let them do their jobs.

White: Yes.

Kiss: I have a question. Just and this goes back to Michelle maybe as another plan for you both, when we’re talking about primary prevention I know that a lot of times at least in our training, we’re training primarily law enforcement and a lot of times when we go through and talk about programs that exist we’ll hear R.A.D., self-defense (interrupted)

Issadore: Blue lights. (Laughter)

Kiss: Right. A program like that. I was interested especially given the audience we have, and of course Paul might be able to answer this as well because I think you gave the impression that we need to move away from risk reduction. What kind of advice do you have, because I think that if you have someone who and we know there’s no one size fits all? So, if you have someone whose prevention officer or whose educator is a prevention officer who may not have public education training or may not, what advice would you have for them if they think “I want to move away from risk reduction. I’m going to take away from this that we’re not going to do self-defense?” I just wonder you know of course besides joining SCOPE, which I know would help, but other advice do you have.

Issadore: Brochure’s over there! (Laughter) That brochure is one sheet. No, I think it’s a great point and it’s not to say that there isn’t a place for self-defense or blue lights or other measures. I think that, you know, they are addressing a problem that isn’t necessarily the main problem. Right? So we’re focusing on stranger assaults happening outside, on campus, you know, when in reality we know that there happening in people’s rooms, apartments, houses, they know one another, alcohol is involved, if not another substance in addition to that. And so, okay you have the blue lights. That’s great.

I think what you need to focus your attention on is what we talked about in URI’s case and refer to alcohol this morning is just that cultural shift, and that takes work. And it’s going to take more than one prevention officer, you know, that person is going to have to
work very, very closely with their women’s center if they have one, with athletics, with health promotion, with counseling. And, and I think those relationships are really, I know for me in that role, they were incredibly valuable. So, it, it’s easy to write about those things in an annual report, and it looks really good. And it feels really good, and sounds really good. But anyone who has the first drop of knowledge about prevention recognizes that they are at best not wholly effective, at worst completely ineffective.

So, I would say, that sending your investigators and even your patrol officers to trainings. We had a lot of issues with officer sensitivity responding to cases, which you know is secondary prevention, not necessarily primary but certainly makes for a very different reporting experience and may reduce that chilling effect on reporting if students are feeling comfortable with the way they’re treated, if it’s respectfully and kindly by the police and security staff on their campus. So, I think that there are a lot of things you can do to be ready for that type of response and like John was saying, trust the people that you hire. There’s no point hiring someone at a coordinator level and, and having them be an expert and then not necessarily listening when an assault happens or when you’re looking at strategic planning for five or ten years.

**Garcia:** I think one thing I would also add to that is that it can be overwhelming if you’re thinking you’re having to create a prevention program from scratch. And you don’t have to that there’s a number of different models out there with a, varying levels of evaluation and research as to their efficacy, and you can find a program that works, that will fit for your campus. And so, you don’t have to start it by yourself. You don’t have to create it. There’s a number of programs out there that have been already created that do work.

**Cell:** And I would also say, don’t be afraid to have someone from the outside look in. I think that’s one of the biggest problems we have seen when we’ve gone to other universities. It’s just, they’re afraid to have other people come in to take a look at what they have, and maybe show some things that they may be missing or things they could change. Again, it’s the whole ego thing. Once you put a program together, we’ve done it. We’ve had other institutions come in and take a look at our program and have pointed out some really good things for us too, so it’s just what should be done.

**Issadore:** Just a disclaimer since I saw Chief Shupp’s face when I said issues with officer sensitivity. I actually meant that Lehigh was doing a good job in terms of investigating, officers coming up with, they were not in uniform. (laughter) They were not carrying a gun. They would not touch a survivor without permission. They would often try and have a female officer or advocate in place. So my point was, officer sensitivity is a positive thing, not a dis of Lehigh. Alright.

**White:** Other questions? We’ve about five, ten minutes I believe. Okay. I’ll take it back to some of what we talked about a little bit already with, in regards to some of the research that’s out there and some of the research that may be lacking. One point Vice President Biden spoke of the epidemic of social violence on campus. And so knowing what we know about those rates, what suggestions would you have for those who are
critical of the research that is out there on sexual assault, sexual violence, stalking, intimate partner violence, and so on?

**Cell:** Sadly, if you take a look at the research out there it looks like when we’re looking at sexual violence, not much has changed. The numbers, whether we’re looking at one in four, one in five, one in three, it, it’s so close to each other that the message we need to look at for those looking at the research whoever said it here, one of my Ms, so I have it right this time. Not Gail. Michelle’s. Whichever one said it is completely correct. We should stop spending so much time on the research end of it and get more into the prevention end of it because we’ve seen that the research end of it is really just coming up with, with numbers and it’s really not helping us at all. That’s what I feel. I feel we need to really get the money and kind of switch gears with it and get it into the programming and the response.

**Lowery:** I think another dimension of what happens is that, often that’s very new onto research that we want to boil down to a statistic. And we have people say things like one in four college women will be sexually assaulted. And that’s a softball pitch to the person who wants to hit it out of the park. Because that’s not even what Mary Koss said ever. And the, the people, the same people who had who challenged, she was the one who, who did the original research, the original one in four. Her actual statistic was, “one in four women between the ages of fourteen at the time they were surveyed had been the victim of an actual or attempted sexual assault” but what happened was when that got simplified down to one in four, those critics are going to attack you no matter what you did, that was the softball pitch for them to come in and go “Look, you’re not even treating the research right.” So, I think we have to be careful when we present it, particularly to groups like faculty audiences where we may get pushback that, that we’re as accurate as possible when we describe it, so that we don’t give them an excuse to shoot us down.

**White:** I’ll follow up to the audience one last time with any questions. George, yes. Okay hold on one moment.

**Dowdall:** Just, just a comment if I can.

**White:** Sorry. Yes.

**Dr. George Dowdall:** I’m going to just take the other side of the research question. I think when you look at the change that we know in the knowledge that we have about college drinking that the research has actually paid off to some extent. Partly by demolishing the notion that you can hand out little pamphlets and that that’s going to take care of the problem. Partly by showing a model for testing pretty rigorously whether anything actually happens, and partly by pointing to the fact that broader forces in the society including public policy actually can shape what’s often constructed as a very individual, tragic, and disastrous event that affects just a handful of people. There’s some very solid evidence that the enforcement of the minimum drinking age law, for example, as poorly enforced as it is, actually affects rates of college drinking and presumably also
other kinds of events. So, I think we, we need the knowledge whether it’s the only thing we should do, I, I absolutely agree with you. We need to, to work on prevention as well.

**White:** Thank you. Sir, did you have a question?

**Audience:** [inaudible]

**Lowery:** The original statistic that people talked about was from Mary Koss. And there, there’s updated, there’s updated research as well. But her original statistic when she was surveying students, she was asking them about their experiences from I believe the age of fourteen. And it was both experiences with sexual assault and with attempted sexual assault. So it was in, it got simplified down to the one in four college women will be raped soundbite, which didn’t accurately represent what she found and that created a target for people to shoot at and shoot down everything or trying to shoot down everything institutions were trying to do in that area.

**Issadore:** Yes. And I would say the other critics that I’ve heard of the existing research are from the attacks that John was referencing by FIRE and AAUP talking about you know this is a man-hating, you know, victim centered only movement that we don’t care about individual rights. And I would say that anyone again who knows the first thing about the work that’s out there is that individual rights are the very cornerstone of this work. Any comprehensive approach fully integrates men’s involvement, and so I think it’s a very reactive approach because someone’s uncomfortable with something and, and I don’t see it as based in any form of reality,

**White:** Okay, I’m going to, to the panelists for a one minute take away if you have not done so already. To wrap it up because I think we have about five minutes. Sorry for putting you on the spot. That wasn’t on the list. (Laughter)

**Garcia:** I’ll start, I guess. I will say, my one minute take away, in having been working in this field for over twenty years now and as starting as a college student myself, I will say, I am continuously dismayed about how high the rates of sexual assault on campuses continue to be, that we still have underwhelming resources for victims. That we still tend not to hold our offenders accountable. On the flip side, I think we have made tremendous progress in raising awareness about sexual violence but though in many cases we’re still at that awareness raging, awareness raising stage about the reality of these crimes on our campuses. That there need to be resources in place for victims and that we need to hold offenders accountable. I do this work every day because I have seen the progress we’ve made in the past twenty years, and I knew the progress that was made in the twenty years before that. But, I used to think when I started this that we could see an end to sexual violence in my lifetime. I don’t believe that anymore, but I do think we can make it better and that we all can be the change. I can be the change to make sure that as victims come forward, we can properly respond and that we can try and create environments where we can at least see a decrease in the sexual violence on our campuses.
**Issadore:** I guess my one minute take away is to present prevention strategies in a way that is inviting to the upper level administrators on your campus. And so whether that’s, you know, it’s the best use of resources. We’re going to have the best outcomes. It’s sustainable. It’s proactive risk management. We’re going to have less liability. I think that that’s the language that has helped us in terms of alcohol and other drug abuse prevention and hazing prevention and that this is another one of those, you know, dangerous behaviors that takes place on our campuses and that we need to sit up and take and pay attention. The federally mandated compliance is recent. It’s very attention getting. It’s not new, as Daniel stated. There was 2001 guidance, you know, surrounding Title IX as well.

And so I think that we’ve already seen I don’t know how many investigations since April of the 2007 reports by college campuses where schools are being fined, you know, tens of thousands of dollars and so OCR isn’t messing around necessarily. Stanford may be able to afford not to pay the fine, but not every school has that kind of endowment. And so, you know, I would say present this as a academic would, a faculty member would, any existing successful initiative on your campus has been presented as, you know, a well thought out, intentional, outcomes based, and I think that will help people secure the funding and the staffing support for professional development that they need to see real change on their campuses.

**Lowery:** I think, I’ll save the, I’ll go, and then I’ll save the last word for, for Paul. I think part of what we need to do is reframe how we think about sexual violence. We have a tendency to think about it as a campus police and a student conduct issue. I think we need to reframe it in much the same way that we have reframed over the past few decades how we think about alcohol. This is an institutional problem. This is not a problem that can be isolated to a small number of offices. And I think there was a time, you know, twenty years ago when I started doing this work where it was not uncommon that institutions would say, “Well, we, we’ve got an alcohol and drug educator. That person can take care of that.” We’re still in that phase when it comes to sexual assault. You know, we’ve got to, we’ve got a health prevention person. They can take care of that. We need that institutional response that we, that has helped us make strides in the area of alcohol. We need to do the same thing when it comes to sexual violence.

**Cell:** And I’d just like to close it. First personally, I want to say, I’m really proud of the men and women on campus law enforcement and how far we have all come. I think we wouldn’t even be having these same conversations twenty years ago. I’ve been in law enforcement a long time, so for all my brothers and sisters that are out there, I just want to say that I’m proud of the profession. I think we’ve really have risen to the call, and, and I’m proud to see the steps and the strides that we’ve been able to take.

That being said I, I really have two questions. One is if you do not have a sexual assault response team on your campus, you need to ask the question why? And then second, you need to ask yourself what are you doing to help our potential victims or our victims become survivors? I think it’s much more than just a university environmental question. It’s a human question. That we have to take a look at ourselves. And, and lastly I would
say when we do have a victim who’s in the process of becoming a survivor and going through it, if they are to leave your campus, do you follow up with them? Or do we send the message to them that they’re only important when they go to our school? I’ll end it with that. Thank you.

**White:** Thank you very much. I tend to take a lot of notes and even as the moderator I couldn’t resist the urge to take notes sitting up front just because of how helpful this information was, so thank you to the panelists and thank you for your attention later in the afternoon. (Applause)
Chapter 11

Closing and Next Steps

Lehigh speaker: I want to thank everybody on behalf of Lehigh for being part of this important discussion. We have some momentum now and now is the time to keep it moving. I encourage you to utilize Lehigh, Security On Campus, and your further discussions on your campuses. We’re available to talk to you at any time and meet with you.

Kiss: And again, I think it was mentioned several times today that the higher education community is really a lot about sharing – there’re really no such thing as sealing. So, a lot of our presenters provided wonderful information and are very willing to share it with you. The PowerPoints that were presented today, the one during sexual violence and the three during emergency response threat assessment, will be emailed to you. I just didn’t have formal permission before, but I will make sure to get those to you. And, there was a lot of wonderful information in there.

I want to thank in advance Dr. George Dowdall, who has kindly and graciously offered to help with the report that is going to come out of this. We have the sessions taped and we really look forward to putting that together. There were a lot of questions raised and challenges from our panelists, so we’re very grateful to them for that.

Some housekeeping, a lot of people have showed interest in some of the information over there, some is already gone. We are happy to get stuff for you. Also, Peter Lake has graciously offered to stay since there was a lot of interest in his publication and people have already ordered. There are some copies and he has offered to stay and sign some, if you wanted to get the book today.

You will receive evaluations via email and it will be a pretty comprehensive evaluation. We’re going to be asking you for some…we’ll ask you some questions, some of your thoughts, so I really hope, I know you took the time today. I really hope you will take the time to fill that out, so we can get close to 100% response. We’re offering…we will raffle off a package of those publications, so the Smart Response Team, Reframing the Problems, Dr. Lake’s books, so you will be able to…that will be an incentive for you to complete your evaluation.

I want to ask folks from Lehigh to stand, who are still around, I know everyone’s busy. I just want to give them a round of applause for being such wonderful hosts. And I’d also like the staff of Security On Campus to stand to give them a hand, because for the behind the scenes work. And there is a shuttle coming from the hotel. It will be downstairs at 4 o’clock for those of you who need to get back to the hotel or to the airport, but otherwise we are so happy that you could come.
If I could just have another round of applause for all the panelists, who put in so much time during this. It was a great group; it was really wonderful that you took the time, and that you asked some hard questions, and also answered some difficult questions. So again, we appreciate that and have a wonderful evening. Thanks for joining us.