

December 2013

Holistic Responses to Campus Violence in the United States: Understanding the Needs of Campus and Community - Based Service Providers--RESEARCH

Jennifer R. Wies
Eastern Kentucky University

Caroline Reid
Eastern Kentucky University

David C. May
Mississippi State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://encompass.eku.edu/kjectl>

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wies, Jennifer R.; Reid, Caroline; and May, David C. (2013) "Holistic Responses to Campus Violence in the United States: Understanding the Needs of Campus and Community - Based Service Providers--RESEARCH," *Kentucky Journal of Excellence in College Teaching and Learning*: Vol. 11 , Article 9.

Available at: <https://encompass.eku.edu/kjectl/vol11/iss2/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Education at Encompass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Kentucky Journal of Excellence in College Teaching and Learning by an authorized editor of Encompass. For more information, please contact Linda.Sizemore@eku.edu.

Holistic Responses to Campus Violence in the United States: Understanding the Needs of Campus and Community-Based Service Providers *RESEARCH*

Jennifer R. Wies, Eastern Kentucky University
 Caroline Reid, Eastern Kentucky University
 David C. May, Mississippi State University

Abstract

Campus violence is a significant social and public health problem in the United States and poses a unique situation for service provision. Victims often have access to both campus-based and community-based services, as they are simultaneously students and citizens of a larger community. Therefore, understanding the needs of campus violence service providers is essential for enhancing responses to campus violence. This research identifies knowledge and service delivery needs among service providers to support a comprehensive approach to ending campus violence. Situated in the social-ecological model, this article discusses the results of a survey to identify knowledge and service delivery needs among campus- and community-based service providers. The results indicate that both campus- and community-based service providers were knowledgeable about campus violence and expressed confidence in providing services. However, clear areas for improving service providers' knowledge base emerge, such as providing community-based service providers with a better understanding of campus judicial policies and campus-based responses to violence. Therefore, two recommendations for campus-based anti-violence efforts emerge. First, it is important for campus-based programs to provide broad training for the multiple service-provider constituents. Secondly, knowledge and service needs assessments can illuminate areas for additional training specific to constituencies.

Keywords: campus violence, judicial affairs policy, social-ecological model

Introduction

Campus violence is a significant social and public health problem in the United States and poses a unique situation for service provision. Victims often have access to both campus-based and community-based services, as they are simultaneously students and citizens of a larger community. Therefore, understanding the needs of campus violence service providers is essential for enhancing responses to campus violence. In this article, we identify knowledge and service delivery needs among these service providers to support a comprehensive approach to ending campus violence. "Service provider" is used to include all personnel affiliated with campus and community agencies that respond to, advocate for, and care for victims of campus violence. We assert that a thorough assessment of the training needs and resources of service providers is necessary, as they may be the first point of contact with

survivors of campus violence and are connected to individual victims in a social-ecological framework. Our results indicate that both campus and community-based service providers were knowledgeable about campus violence and expressed confidence in providing services to those affected by campus violence. However, we also reveal areas for improvements in training and possibilities for campus policy revisions. We end this work with a call for holistic approaches to serving students affected by campus violence, grounded in the social-ecological model.

Campus Violence

Campus students experience a broad array of violence against women that includes domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Domestic violence and dating violence, sometimes referred to as intimate partner violence, includes "... physical, sexual or psychological harm by a current or former

partner or spouse. This type of violence can occur among heterosexual or same-sex couples and does not require sexual intimacy... It occurs on a continuum, ranging from one hit that may impact the victim to chronic, severe battering” (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010, para. 1-2). Approximately 32% of women experience physical assault in a relationship between the ages of 14 and 24 (White & Koss, 1991). Psychological or emotional violence is even more common than physical or sexual abuse, as 77% to 87% of campus women report psychological abuse (Mahoney, Williams, & West, 2001). Sexual assault is “any sexual act that a woman submits to against her will due to force, threat of force, or coercion” (Mahoney et al., 2001, p. 150). One out of four college women are victims of sexual assault (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Stalking includes, according to the United States Violence Against Women Act and many state statutes, behaviours “directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to fear for his or her safety or the safety of others or suffer substantial emotional distress.” Thirteen percent of campus women experience stalking, including electronic forms (Fisher et al., 2000).

Campus violence is a pervasive problem and patterns emerge among college women who are victimized. For the purposes of this article, campus violence is a blanket term used to refer to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking that is experienced by university and college student populations. Victimized female students are more likely than their peers to: engage in dietary and eating irregularities, feel stressed, feel sad or depressed, use alcohol to reduce stress, spend less time per week on academic pursuits, and use drugs (Newton-Taylor, Dewit, & Gliksman, 1998). Yet, only 4 in 10

colleges and universities offer any sexual assault training (U.S. Department of Justice, 2005).

The Social Ecological Model: Responding To Campus Violence

In response to high rates of gender-based violence found on college and university campuses in the United States, campus institutions have established intervention and prevention responses. Many of these responses have been warehoused in Campus Women’s Centers (see Wies, 2011), though increasingly the issue of gender-based violence intervention and prevention is addressed through a number of units within Student Affairs and Student Development divisions.

Many campuses have adopted a social-ecological model as a framework for campus violence prevention. The social-ecological approach is a system of strategies that seeks to identify and change the physical, social, legal, and economic factors that promote and support negative behaviors in an environment (DeJong, 1998). Instead of focusing exclusively on the behaviors of individuals, the social-ecological model takes into account the interplay between four environmental levels: the individual, the relationship, the community, and the society (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2009).

A social-ecological model can be utilized to reduce campus violence by focusing on changing the multiple social systems that support or tolerate gender-based violence (DeJong, 1998). Prevention strategies in these programs take into account the experiences of individuals with peers, partners, and families; their place in schools, workplaces, and neighborhoods; and the influences of health, economic, education, and social policies.

It is through a comprehensive, social-ecological approach that this research

is situated. Specifically, we sought to ascertain knowledge and service delivery needs that operate in the community and societal levels. A comprehensive approach to ending campus violence must include a thorough assessment of the training needs and resources of service providers, as they may be the first point of contact with survivors of campus violence and are connected to individual victims in a social-ecological framework.

EKU-SAFE, funded by the Department of Justice, Office of Violence Against Women, is a unique program designed to meet the needs of students who are attending Eastern Kentucky University. The purpose of ECU-SAFE is to provide tools and information to students that help them participate in creating a safer learning environment and campus experience for all students. Grounded in a social-ecological framework, ECU-SAFE provides evidence-based information concerning domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. In addition, the ECU-SAFE program offers a variety of services to provide support and volunteer opportunities to students, including Bystander Intervention Training, Community Service, Resources and Information, Peer Education, Service Referrals, Support, Violence Prevention Programs, and Workshops on Healthy Relationships. ECU-SAFE is particularly dedicated to helping students consider their legal options for ensuring their safety.

EKU-SAFE works closely with campus and community partners to ensure that students feel there is a strong, supportive network in place to assist them. In order to develop an understanding of the knowledge levels and training needs for our campus and community partners, a comprehensive assessment was conducted as an initial step to ascertain the needs and resources of campus violence service

providers. The survey was designed to gain an understanding of knowledge levels and training needs related to 1) campus violence issues and 2) service delivery issues among campus-based service providers (EKU Police Department and EKU Student Judicial Affairs) and community-based service providers (Richmond Police Department, Bluegrass Rape Crisis Center, and Bluegrass Domestic Violence Program) who work as campus violence service providers for Eastern Kentucky University students.

Setting

Eastern Kentucky University (EKU) is one of eight public universities in Kentucky and serves a student population of over 15,000. It is located in Madison County (population 70,872 and 440.68 square miles). However, the service region of Eastern Kentucky University is comprised of 22 rural Appalachian counties in southeastern Kentucky, an area which constitutes one of the most impoverished and undereducated regions in the nation. In Fall 2011, EKU reported a total student population of 16,062, and women comprised 57.8% of total enrollment. Few racial minorities reside in the area, with whites making up approximately 97% of the service region. Ethnicity for the Fall 2011 student body was as follows: 88.5% White, Non-Hispanic; 5.9% Black, Non-Hispanic; 1.2% Asian, Non-Hispanic; 0.4% American Indian or Alaskan Native, Non-Hispanic; 1.8% Hispanic or Latino; 0.2% Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander; 2.0% Two or More Races. 99% of EKU's student body is from Kentucky. Over half (51.3%) of first-time freshmen enrolled full-time in Fall 2011 were first-generation college students (Horton & May, 2012). Service providers surveyed for this study serve the aforementioned students, working collaboratively to address domestic violence

prevention, education and intervention concerns on campus.

The results from a 2011 campus climate survey at Eastern Kentucky University revealed that students experience fear of violence, including: 32.1% fear being attacked by someone with a weapon; 22.6% fear being beaten up; 18.2% fear being shot; and 7.4% fear attending campus activities or events because of the risk of crime victimization. Additionally, students expressed the following attitudes and beliefs about sexual assault: 32.1% believe most sexual assaults are committed by people the victim does not know; 14.9% believe men should be in charge of sexual interactions; and 9.7% believe that a woman cannot change her mind after consenting to sex (Horton & May, 2012). Further, a 2010 campus climate report found that 50.9% of students who reported crime victimization indicated they did not report the crime to anyone because, "they did not think police could do anything to help;" 15.1% did not report the crime because they were afraid the offender would want revenge; and 15.1% reported embarrassment as the reason preventing them from reporting the crime (May & Reid, 2011).

Campus-based services are provided primarily by two ECU-SAFE partners: the ECU police department and ECU Student Judicial Affairs. ECU Police have 25 sworn police officers, who have full law enforcement authority on all University property, and concurrent jurisdiction on all roads and streets adjacent to the campus. They provide 24-hour patrol of the ECU campus buildings, parking lots, residence hall exteriors, and campus grounds. They also have the authority to investigate crimes committed on University property anywhere in the state. The ECU Police also offer educational classes, including Rape Aggression Defense (RAD) training classes to female students, faculty, and staff. ECU

Student Judicial Affairs is responsible for ensuring that students adhere to the Student Rights and Responsibilities set forth by the University. The staff provides educational outreach programs and a student judicial system, which is charged with adjudicating all reports of alleged violations of the General Regulations for Student Behavior and the Policy for Academic Integrity. This includes sexual misconduct, defined as including sexual assault or sexual abuse, sexual harassment, and other forms of nonconsensual sexual conduct.

Participants

To understand service providers' knowledge of campus violence and their needs related to providing services to victims of campus violence, we identified key campus and community partners associated with the ECU-SAFE violence prevention program. In the spring of 2010, a survey was administered to members of the following five service provision organizations: the ECU police department, the Richmond Police Department (RPD), members of the ECU Student Judicial Affairs, service providers at the Bluegrass Rape Crisis Center (BRCC), and service providers at the Bluegrass Domestic Violence Program (BDVP).

Community-based services are provided by the Bluegrass Rape Crisis Center, the Bluegrass Domestic Violence Program, and the Richmond Police Department. Current services provided include 24-hour crisis lines, medical accompaniment and advocacy, legal advocacy, crisis counseling, emergency shelter, case management services, safety planning, support groups, community education groups, resource linkage consultation, and prevention and intervention education. Prevention, education and training related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and

stalking on campus is currently provided by all three community-based service providers.

EKU-SAFE leadership developed a survey and distributed it to a purposive sample of service providers from these campus- and community-based service provision organizations. The survey instrument included basic background information about the participants and questions ascertaining their perceptions, knowledge and needs related to training in the areas of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. The survey was emailed to participants with instructions to complete and return the survey either electronically or via a stamped-addressed envelope within 30 days. Seventy-nine surveys were returned and are included in the final analysis. The exact quantity of surveys distributed is unknown, as they were sent via e-mail and forwarded to an unknown number of service providers.

The participants' demographic information is presented in Table 1. Most of the participants were between the ages of 25 and 45 years old (73.42%) and White (75.00%). Just over half of the participants had six years or less in their primary job (54.43%), but the rest of the participants had over 10 years of experience in their primary job. Almost half of the participants had a college degree (46.15%) while one in four participants had a high school diploma. The remaining participants had some form of graduate education; one in six had a Master's degree (15.38%).

Campus Violence Knowledge and Related Training Needs

The participants were asked a series of questions regarding their knowledge of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Responses for questions were offered as a Likert scale as follows: 1=almost none; 2=a little; 3=some;

and 4=a lot. In general, participants were knowledgeable (responding at the rate of 3 or 4) about most of the topics under consideration. Participants from both campus and community entities felt most confident in their knowledge of (1) confidentiality issues, (2) confidentiality and sexual assault, (3) basic domestic violence power dynamics, (4) relevant federal and state laws, and (5) working with law enforcement officials from other jurisdictions.

While the data indicate that both campus and community service providers are knowledgeable about domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, clear gaps in knowledge also surfaced. Overall, the areas where participants were least knowledgeable include: (1) understanding and implementation of campus judicial policies and codes, (2) issues surrounding cyber-stalking, (3) intervention training, (4) the student code of conduct and campus disciplinary process, and (5) relevant rape shield laws.

Participants were also asked how much knowledge they felt they needed about each of those topics included in Table 2 to be effective in their job. Responses to those questions are presented in Table 3. Participants felt that the areas where they needed the most knowledge to help them effectively perform their jobs were (1) relevant federal and state laws, (2) working with law enforcement officials from other jurisdictions, (3) risk assessment for victims, (4) interviewing techniques for working with victims and avoiding victim blaming, (5) how to document stalking violations by keeping notes, tracking phone calls, and collecting evidence to support the victim's account of the incidences, and (6) availability of local services for victims and local training resources.

Insert Table 3 here

Participants felt that the areas where they needed the least knowledge to help them effectively perform their jobs were in the areas of (1) the student code of conduct and campus judicial/disciplinary processes, (2) understanding and implementation of campus judicial policies and codes, (3) avoiding mutual arrests, (4) issues surrounding cyber-stalking and the misuse of campus computers/property, and (5) officer safety when responding to domestic violence calls.

Service Deliver Knowledge and Related Needs

Participants were then asked to rate their current personal knowledge about dealing with certain types of crime and law enforcement, people of various racial and ethnic origins, and local policies and procedures for dealing with domestic violence and sexual assault. Responses to those questions are presented in Table 4. Participants felt most knowledgeable about (1) working with people of Caucasian origin, (2) how to report an act of violence, (3) working with law enforcement officials from the local jurisdiction, (4) working with African American people, and (5) local police's policies and procedures for dealing with domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Participants felt least knowledgeable about (1) EKU's policies and procedures for dealing with domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, (2) stalking in a "closed" campus environment, (3) human trafficking, (4) working with people of bi-racial origin, and (5) working with people of Asian origin.

Participants were then asked to rate how much knowledge they needed about dealing with certain types of crime and law enforcement, people of various racial and ethnic origins, and local policies and procedures for dealing with domestic violence and sexual assault to effectively do

their jobs. Responses to those questions are presented in Table 5. The responses presented in Table 5 suggest that participants felt they needed the most knowledge about (1) resources for victims, (2) working with people of Latino origin, (3) working with gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, and transgender people, (4) working with law enforcement officials from the local jurisdiction, and (5) local police's policies and procedures for dealing with domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking to effectively do their jobs. Participants felt they needed the least knowledge about (1) EKU's policies and procedures for dealing with domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking, (2) stalking in a "closed" campus environment, (3) how to report an act of violence, (4) working with people of Caucasian origin, and (5) filing internal administrative complaints and local criminal charges to effectively do their jobs.

Holistic Responses to Campus Violence: Recommendations and Implications

Understanding the campus violence knowledge and related training needs among campus- and community-based service providers forms a basis for strengthening the quality of intervention services for victims of campus violence. In general, both campus- and community-based service providers were knowledgeable about campus violence and expressed confidence in providing services to those affected by campus violence.

However, clear areas for improving service providers' knowledge base emerge. For example, community-based service providers express the need for a better understanding of campus judicial policies and campus-based responses to violence. Campus-based service providers such as EKU Judicial Affairs personnel express the need for additional knowledge related to legal policies, including laws of search and

seizure and avoiding mutual arrests. Based on the findings here, both campus- and community-based service providers identify areas of need to provide services to victims of campus violence, and those needs are sometimes disparate.

Therefore, two recommendations for campus-based anti-violence efforts emerge. First, it is important for campus-based programs to provide broad training for the multiple service-provider constituents. Secondly, knowledge and service needs assessments can illuminate areas for additional training specific to the constituency. Attending to the variety of needs of multiple service providers supports the social-ecological framework by including the community and societal spheres in intervention efforts, as well as recognizing that students operate in multiple domains.

Committing to a social-ecological model requires attention to the multiple social systems in the total environment of a person. In this case, we have focused on service providers holistically, with the understanding that victims of campus violence interact with both campus and community personnel. The results speak to the related social system of policy, at both the campus and societal levels. Addressing policies and procedures is a way to change the infrastructure to create cultural-level change in the university environment (DeJong, 1998). Policy and procedure reviews can work to increase the likelihood of victim reporting, streamline the adjudication process, and increase the possibility of sanctions against perpetrators of violence. Furthermore, in the social-ecological framework, policy creation and revision would ideally include the participation and endorsement of highly visible leaders, who would establish the

expectations for social behavior. The analysis and reformation of policy should also strive for authentic stakeholder representation to establish support for campus anti-violence policies.

Based on the data presented here, campus anti-violence policy should attend to the multiple domains of service providers who interact with victims. Effective social-ecological models will weave campus- and community-based service providers together to enhance intervention services. These policies might address the communication expectations among provider constituents, create areas of overlap to ensure seamless services, and commit to consistency with regards to campus violence investigations and interventions. In addition, policies can set expectations for minimum training requirements for partner service providers.

Reducing, and ultimately eliminating, campus violence requires us to provide quality intervention options for victims. Quality intervention can potentially decrease the incidence of future acts of campus violence and establishes a culture of care and response for victims of campus violence. Thus, this study both identifies areas of campus violence knowledge and related training needs as well as areas of divergence in responses based on campus or community affiliation. Bringing these two communities of service providers together supports the social-ecological model for campus violence intervention and prevention. As increasing attention is paid to the holistic lives of students, as both academic agents and community citizens, our approaches to serving their needs should mirror their lives. The social-ecological model provides a basis for supporting this holistic perspective of, and care for, students.

References

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009). The Social-Ecological Model: A Framework for Prevention. Retrieved August 13, 2012, from <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/overview/social-ecologicalmodel.html>
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2010). Intimate Partner Violence: Definitions. Retrieved July 28, 2012, from <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/definitions.html>
- DeJong, W., Vince-Whitman, C., Colthurst, T., Cretella, M., Gilbreath, M., Rosati, M., & Zweig, K. (1998). *Environmental Management: A Comprehensive Strategy for Reducing Alcohol and Other Drug Use on College Campuses*. Washington, D.C.: The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention.
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The Sexual Victimization of College Women*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Horton, N., & May, D. (2012). Perceptions and experiences with crime at Eastern Kentucky University in 2011-12: Responses from a Random Sample of Students. Unpublished manuscript.
- Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The Scope of Rape: Incidence and Prevalence of Sexual Aggression and Victimization in a National Sample of Higher Education Students. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 162-170.
- Mahoney, P., Williams, L. M., & West, C. M. (2001). Violence Against Women by Intimate Relationship Partners. In C. M. Renzetti, J. L. Edleson & R. K. Bergen (Eds.), *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women* (pp. 143-178). Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.
- May, D., & Reid, C. (2011). Perceptions and Experiences with Campus Safety among Eastern Kentucky Students 2010--2011. Unpublished manuscript.
- Newton-Taylor, B., Dewit, D., & Gliksman, L. (1998). Prevalence and Factors Associated with Physical and Sexual Assault of Female University Students in Ontario. *Health Care for Women International*, 19(2), 155-164.
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2005). *Sexual Assault on Campus: What Colleges and Universities are Doing About It*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- White, J. W., & Koss, M. P. (1991). Courtship Violence: Incidence in a National Sample of Higher Education Students. *Violence and Victims*, 6, 247-256.
- Wies, J. R. (2011). The Campus Women's Center as Classroom: A Model for Thinking and Action. In P. Pasque & S. Errington (Eds.), *Empowering Women in Higher Education and Student Affairs: Theory, Research, Narratives, and Practice from Feminist Perspectives* (pp. 255-269). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.

Jennifer R. Wies is Associate Professor, Eastern Kentucky University.
 Caroline Reid is Associate Professor, Eastern Kentucky University.
 David C. May is Associate Professor, Mississippi State University.

Table 1
Participant Demographic Information

Variable	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
Less than 25 years old	4	5.06
25 – 35 years old	34	43.04
36 – 45 years old	24	30.38
46 – 55 years old	10	12.66
56 – 65 years old	7	8.86
Race		
African American	8	10.00
Asian	1	1.25
Caucasian	60	75.00
Bi-Racial	2	2.50
Other	9	11.25
Years in Primary Job		
2	23	29.11
6	20	25.32
10	11	13.92
14	8	10.13
18	6	7.59
22	4	5.06
26	3	3.80
30	4	5.06
Level of Education		
High School or GED	20	25.64
Bachelors	36	46.15
Masters	12	15.38
PhD	1	1.28
Other	9	11.54

Table 2*Level of Current Service Provider Knowledge about Campus Violence*

Subject Area	1	2	3	4	Overall Mean
Relevant Federal & State Laws	0.00	8.86	35.44	55.70	3.47
Working with Law Enforcement Officials from Jurisdiction	2.56	8.97	39.74	48.72	3.35
Confidential Issues	0.00	5.06	31.65	63.29	3.58
Risk Assessment for Victims	5.19	11.69	42.86	40.26	3.18
Crime Scene Prevention & Evidence Collection	8.97	11.54	28.21	51.28	3.22
Interviewing Techniques for Working with Victims & Avoiding “Victim Blaming”	7.59	5.06	40.51	46.84	3.27
Probable Cause as Related to Violence Against Women Cases	10.13	5.06	40.51	44.30	3.19
Student Code of Conduct & Campus Judicial/Disciplinary Process	35.53	15.79	32.89	15.79	2.29
Information on Enforcement of Orders of Protection (including full faith & credit issues)	15.58	11.69	38.96	33.77	2.91
Arrest Protocols	10.39	7.79	23.38	58.44	3.30
Working with Advocates & Advocacy Groups (including clarification of roles & responsibilities)	9.09	23.38	42.86	24.68	2.83
Availability of Local Services for Victims & Local Training Resources	6.49	11.69	51.95	29.87	3.05
Officer Safety when Responding to Domestic Violence Calls	10.39	12.99	15.58	61.04	3.27
Review of Basic Domestic Violence Dynamics (including issues of power & control)	1.30	7.79	33.77	57.14	3.47
Laws of Search & Seizure	14.29	9.09	25.97	50.65	3.13
Avoiding Mutual Arrests	14.47	17.11	34.21	34.21	2.88
Relevant Federal & State Statutory Firearms Prohibitions & Seizure Policies (including protection order provisions)	14.29	18.18	40.26	27.27	2.81
Definitions of Dating Violence & Its Effects	1.32	23.68	39.47	35.53	3.09
Making Predominant Aggressor Determinations	12.99	9.09	38.96	38.96	3.04
Specific Procedures for Sexual Assault Exams & Evidence Collection at the Crime Scene	9.21	17.11	46.05	27.63	2.92
“Known” Perpetrator Investigations	23.38	11.69	38.96	25.97	2.68
Communicating With Victims About the	7.79	15.58	46.75	29.87	2.99

Course of the Investigation					
Appropriate Interviewing Techniques When Questioning Sexual Assault Victims	10.39	16.88	49.35	23.38	2.86
Appropriate Discussion with Victim Regarding Persecution Decisions	5.26	15.79	47.37	31.58	3.05
Specifics of Rape Trauma Syndrome & Its Effects on Victims	14.29	32.47	31.17	22.08	2.61
Relevant Rape Shield Laws	28.95	19.74	40.79	10.53	2.33
Departmental Decisions on How Appropriately to Handle Victims Who Face Issues of Other Violations in Connection with Their Assault	14.47	28.95	35.53	21.05	2.63
Understanding Stalking Properly as a Crime	1.28	16.67	47.44	34.62	3.16
Methods to Help Officers/Detectives to Identify Stalking Cases More Effectively	14.29	19.48	42.86	23.38	2.75
Orders of Protection and Their Effectiveness or Lack of Effectiveness in a Campus Environment	21.62	20.27	31.08	27.03	2.64
Issues Surrounding Cyber-stalking as the Misuse of Campus Computers/Property	32.89	21.05	34.21	11.84	2.25
Insight on Intervention Training	28.57	24.68	36.36	10.39	2.29
How to Document Stalking Violations by Keeping Notes, Tracking Phone Calls, & Collecting Evidence to Support Victim's Account of the Incidences	10.39	22.08	42.86	24.68	2.82
Understanding & Implementation of Campus Judicial Policies & Codes	46.05	17.11	23.68	13.16	2.04
Confidentiality & Sexual Assault	0.00	8.97	32.05	58.97	3.50

Table 3*Level of Needed Service Provider Knowledge about Campus Violence*

Subject Area	1	2	3	4	Overall Mean
Relevant Federal & State Laws	11.29	14.52	20.97	53.23	3.47
Working with Law Enforcement Officials from Jurisdiction	11.29	14.52	20.97	53.23	3.11
Confidential Issues	21.67	11.67	23.33	43.33	2.88
Risk Assessment for Victims	6.67	18.33	35.00	40.00	3.08
Crime Scene Prevention & Evidence Collection	20.34	15.25	16.95	47.46	2.92
Interviewing Techniques for working with Victims & Avoiding “Victim Blaming”	15.52	15.52	17.24	51.72	3.05
Probable Cause as related to Violence Against Women Cases	13.11	32.79	16.39	37.70	2.79
Student Code of Conduct & Campus Judicial/Disciplinary Process	23.73	30.51	25.42	20.34	2.42
Information on Enforcement of Orders of Protection (including full faith & credit issues)	13.33	20.00	28.33	38.33	2.92
Arrest Protocols	16.67	23.33	15.00	45.00	2.88
Working with Advocates & Advocacy Groups (including clarification of roles & responsibilities)	14.52	27.42	24.19	33.87	2.78
Availability of Local Services for Victims & Local Training Resources	11.29	20.97	19.35	48.39	3.05
Officer Safety when Responding to Domestic Violence Calls	26.23	16.39	14.75	42.62	2.74
Review of Basic Domestic Violence Dynamics (including issues of power & control)	18.33	13.33	23.33	45.00	2.95
Laws of Search & Seizure	23.33	16.67	11.67	48.33	2.85
Avoiding Mutual Arrests	20.69	18.97	34.48	25.86	2.66
Relevant Federal & State Statutory Firearms Prohibitions & Seizure Policies (including protection order provisions)	11.48	16.39	36.07	36.07	2.97
Definitions of Dating Violence & Its Effects	16.67	21.67	25.00	36.67	2.82
Methods to Help Officers/Detectives to Identify Predominant Aggressor more Effectively	26.33	13.11	18.03	42.62	2.77
Methods to Help Officers/Detectives to Identify Sexual Assault Cases More Effectively	16.67	18.33	31.67	33.33	2.82
Methods to Help Officers/Detectives to	20.00	20.00	20.00	40.00	2.80

Identify “Known” Perpetrators More Effectively					
Methods to Help Officers/Detectives to Communicate with Victims More Effectively	15.00	13.33	31.67	40.00	2.97
Methods to Help Officers/Detectives to Question Sexual Assault Victims More Effectively	16.67	16.67	26.67	40.00	2.88
Methods to Help Officers/Detectives to Discuss Persecution Decision with Victim More Effectively	11.67	23.33	26.67	38.33	2.92
Methods to Help Officers/Detectives to Understand Rape Trauma More Effectively	11.67	21.67	20.00	46.67	3.02
Methods to Help Officers/Detectives to Apply Relevant Rape Shield Laws More Effectively	8.62	17.24	22.41	51.72	3.17
Methods to Help Officers/Detectives to Handle Victims Who are Facing Issues of Other Violations More Effectively	11.86	20.34	28.81	38.98	2.95
Understanding Stalking Properly as a Crime	15.00	11.67	33.33	40.00	2.97
Methods to Help Officers/Detectives to Identify Stalking Cases More Effectively	13.33	21.67	23.33	41.67	2.93
Orders of Protection and Their Effectiveness or Lack of Effectiveness in a Campus Environment	26.32	10.53	24.56	38.60	2.75
Issues Surrounding Cyber-stalking as the Misuse of Campus Computers/Property	18.64	25.42	22.03	33.90	2.71
Insight on Intervention Training	10.00	28.33	25.00	36.67	2.88
How to Document Stalking Violations by Keeping Notes, Tracking Phone Calls, & Collecting Evidence to Support Victim’s Account of the Incidences	13.33	10.00	35.00	41.67	3.05
Understanding & Implementation of Campus Judicial Policies & Codes	32.20	20.34	15.25	32.20	2.48
Confidentiality & Sexual Assault	25.81	9.68	20.97	43.55	2.82

Table 4

Level of Current Service Provider Knowledge about Issues Related to Campus Violence Prevention

Subject Area	1	2	3	4	Overall Mean
Drug Facilitated Sexual Assault	2.60	15.58	51.95	29.87	3.09
Working with Law Enforcement Officials from the Local Jurisdiction	3.90	6.49	37.66	51.95	3.38
Stalking in a “Closed” Campus Environment	42.25	15.49	29.58	12.68	2.13
Filing Internal Administrative Complaints & Local Criminal Charges	20.78	7.79	28.57	42.86	2.94
Resources for Victims	2.56	14.10	43.59	39.74	3.21
Knowledge of Human Trafficking	18.18	28.57	44.16	9.09	2.44
Working with African American people	1.32	9.21	43.42	46.05	3.34
Working with Asian people	11.69	25.97	44.16	16.88	2.67
Working with people from Appalachia	3.90	15.58	42.86	37.66	3.14
Working with Caucasian people	0.00	2.56	28.21	69.23	3.67
Working with Latino people	9.09	16.88	48.05	25.97	2.91
Working with Bi-Racial people	3.90	9.09	51.95	35.06	2.64
Gay, Lesbian, Bi-sexual, Transgender people	8.97	15.38	47.44	28.21	2.95
How to report an act of violence	0.00	3.90	28.57	67.53	3.64
Response protocol	11.39	12.66	30.38	45.57	3.10
EKU’s policies and procedures for dealing with DV, Sexual Assault, Stalking, etc.	50.00	14.86	12.16	22.97	2.08
Local police’s policies and procedures for dealing with DV, Sexual Assault, Stalking, etc.	6.49	5.19	37.66	50.65	3.32

Table 5*Level of Needed Service Provider Knowledge about Issues Related to Campus Violence*

Subject Area	1	2	3	4	Overall Mean
Drug-Facilitated Sexual Assault	11.48	18.03	29.51	40.98	3.00
Working with Law Enforcement Officials from the Local Jurisdiction	12.07	15.52	22.41	50.00	3.10
Stalking in a “Closed” Campus Environment	15.79	29.82	17.54	36.84	2.75
Filing Internal Administrative Complaints & Local Criminal Charges	16.39	19.67	22.95	40.98	2.89
Resources for Victims	8.20	19.67	22.95	49.18	3.13
Knowledge of Human Trafficking	8.20	29.51	24.59	36.07	2.91
Working with African American people	13.33	15.00	23.33	48.33	3.07
Working with Asian people	4.92	24.59	29.51	40.98	3.07
Working with people from Appalachia	11.67	20.00	33.33	35.00	2.92
Working with Caucasian people	25.00	11.67	18.33	45.00	2.86
Working with Latino people	6.56	19.67	31.15	42.62	3.13
Working with Bi-Racial people	11.67	16.67	30.00	41.67	3.05
Gay, Lesbian, Bi-sexual, Transgender people	10.00	15.00	31.67	43.33	3.12
How to report an act of violence	20.00	25.00	10.00	45.00	2.84
Response protocol	19.67	8.20	29.51	42.62	3.02
EKU’s policies and procedures for dealing with DV, Sexual Assault, Stalking, etc.	25.86	24.14	15.52	34.48	2.61
Local police’s policies and procedures for dealing with DV, Sexual Assault, Stalking, etc.	13.79	15.52	20.69	50.00	3.07