Recommendation for Primary Prevention of Gendered Violence Programming
For Oregon Campuses and Universities

The Campus Prevention Work Group was formed in June, 2014, as a collaboration between the Campus and Prevention & Education Subcommittees. It grew out of work that had been done on an update of the "Campus Guidelines" paper in 2013, which work was redirected by the initiatives of the White House Task Force and new legislation, including the SaVE Amendments to Clery, in 2014, which articulated specific expectations for prevention programming to be implemented by colleges and universities receiving federal funds.

At the June 19, 2014 retreat, Campus Subcommittee members met with Nancy Greenman, who summarized the recent initiatives and identified key components of effective primary prevention that are relevant to campus communities. Nancy specifically described a comprehensive approach in terms of the *Spectrum of Prevention*[1], and including complementary action at various levels of campus life. They specifically requested that the Work Group identify possible prevention programs that are evidence based and/or informed.

The Work Group has developed such a list, based on recommendations of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the White House and other national experts, and incorporating experiences of Oregon colleges and universities. AGSATF understands that program-specific information is a living document and will change, based on experience in implementing specific programs and as new programs become available. Additionally, as the preface to the program information stresses, individual programs will be effective to reduce gendered violence when part of a comprehensive approach to preventing violence. While each campus community is unique, some general guidelines and considerations for a comprehensive approach include:

1. **Administration/Leadership endorsement of violence prevention** as an important institutional goal that benefits the whole campus community. Key elements of this endorsement would include:
   - **Reconsideration/reprioritization of resources** to reflect the importance of both prevention and response. Which campus programs are well-supported and which are not? How does current resource allocation align with risk and protective factors for violence, including the respective valuation of different campus groups and individuals?
   - **Review, update and full implementation of campus policies** related to violence prevention and response, importantly including a confidential disclosure option for people who have been victimized. Creating safe spaces for victims and survivors to talk about their experiences is a key piece of prevention programming. Clear and accessible processes to address the potential impact of violence on a victim's academic record is one part of a victim-centered policy. Accessibility includes consistent use of terms that readily link community members to on-line resources.

[1] http://preventioninstitute.org/component/jlibrary/article/id-105/127.html

2. **Engagement of a broad diversity of campus voices and perspectives** in planning and development of prevention programming. We all have a role in supporting healthy interactions, relationships and sexuality; and bringing everyone to the table leverages resources and creates responsive strategies. Broad outreach will also increase the likelihood of connecting to groups and communities on or near the campus that are already engaged in this work.

3. **Development of programming based on local risk and protective factors**. It seems fairly certain that campus climate surveys will not be required in the near future. However, using the most current and relevant data is a key piece of selecting evidence based programs, as the evidence supporting a program includes the risks it is intended to address and the strengths on which it is intended to build. We urge a timeline that includes needed data collection and analysis, as well as the stakeholder input described above. Cost may not be a barrier as relevant data may already exist, while formal and informal existing group can serve as focus groups on issues of gendered violence.

4. **Programming time for skills development.** Bystander engagement and consent, two of the key components of required prevention programming, are skills that are developed through discussion, and interactive practice. We recommend that prevention programming for all students include opportunities to develop language for talking about healthy relationships and sexuality, including positive consent; and to develop confidence in bystander intervention skills. As noted above, recommendations as to specific programs available is included in a companion document.