

Coordinated Community Response Team (CCRT)

2023 Recommendations



CCRT Co-Leads

Tami Strickman

Special Advisor to the President and
Executive Director, Equity, Civil Rights & Title IX Office

Rebecca Leitman Veidlinger

Title IX Attorney and Consultant (external advisor)

Sandra R. Levitsky

Arthur F. Thurnau Professor and
Associate Professor of Sociology





EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Coordinated Community Response Team (CCRT) was created in August 2022 as the result of the settlement of a class action lawsuit involving University students who alleged that the University had created an environment where they faced an increased risk of experiencing sexual misconduct. With membership representing students, staff, faculty, and other key stakeholders from all three U-M campuses, the CCRT is charged with recommending to the President how the University might better prevent and respond to campus sexual misconduct.

In the Fall of 2022, the CCRT Co-Leads conducted listening sessions with students, staff, faculty, and alumni survivors to identify what needs University of Michigan community members felt were unaddressed by existing policies and programs relating to campus sexual misconduct. These conversations revealed disappointment in the University's past responses to sexual misconduct, as well as skepticism regarding how the University might respond to future instances of misconduct.

Since January 2023, four CCRT working groups (Appendix A) (focused on obstacles to reporting, prevention, organizational structure, and repairing harm) evaluated the University's existing policies and programs and considered research on best practices in each area (Appendix B). Our working groups were particularly attuned to thinking about sexual misconduct as an issue of well-being, consistent with the Okanagan Charter, and as an issue of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

Two core themes emerged from our work:

- **The need for innovation:** Persistently high rates of sexual misconduct at the University of Michigan require us to look beyond compliance with legal and regulatory mandates, to fundamentally re-imagine the University's approach to sexual misconduct.
- **The need for investments in prevention:** While lawsuits, federal regulations, and media coverage have disproportionately drawn attention to sexual misconduct reporting, investigations, and adjudication, the University must now center its investments on supporting and enhancing U-M units that provide programming on sexual misconduct prevention.

The University of Michigan has an opportunity to model real changes in how universities think about campus sexual misconduct and to serve as a national leader in the areas of campus restorative justice, survivor-centered care, and prevention and education. The CCRT encourages President Ono to consider the following recommendations:

INNOVATION #1 CENTER FOR RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

One of the most pioneering approaches to repairing harm caused by sexual misconduct and resolving conflict on college campuses today is the adoption of restorative justice principles and practices. Restorative justice is a non-adversarial, collaborative approach to addressing conflict, wrongdoing, and offensive behavior that prioritizes repairing harm and rebuilding trust. The University of Michigan has been at the forefront of this movement, as one of the earliest adopters of restorative practices on college campuses and with some of the nation's leading experts on campus restorative justice. The CCRT recommends that we build on this expertise by creating a new Center for Restorative Justice designed specifically to address key campus needs, including:

- The need to re-build institutional trust and repair harm as part of our commitment to community well-being.
- The need for restorative practices for addressing harm independent of adversarial systems of investigation and adjudication. This is particularly urgent for members of the U-M community who identify as racial and ethnic minorities and/or LGBTQ, as they are more likely to be the target of sexual misconduct but are less likely to utilize formal systems of investigation and adjudication.
- The need to address behaviors that cause documented harm to students and employees but do not rise to the level of formal policy violations.
- The need to attend to the “ripple effects” or communal harm caused by sexual misconduct.

While many of our peer institutions have begun to implement restorative justice practices for sexual misconduct alongside more traditional investigation and adjudication processes, the CCRT's proposed Center for Restorative Justice would be the first in the nation to support restorative justice applications for the entire campus community (students, staff, and faculty).

INNOVATION #2 UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN CENTER FOR SURVIVOR SUPPORT

U-M currently offers a wide range of resources for sexual misconduct survivors, but they are highly decentralized and underfunded relative to the needs of the community. Survivors typically must navigate opaque processes and interact with multiple community and campus providers. The CCRT recommends that U-M reorganize existing resources to provide survivors with wrap-around services accessible through a single service entry point. In a survivor-centered care model, survivors would be able to access advocacy services, medical care, counseling services, and other forms of academic, housing, and financial support in one place. Those services would be available not only to students, but also to faculty and staff who experience sexual and/or gender-based violence.

INNOVATION #3

UNDERGRADUATE COURSE/PILOT STUDY ON SEXUAL CITIZENSHIP

Research has demonstrated the striking effects of a comprehensive sex education on students' experiences of sexual violence. One study found, for example, that women who had received comprehensive sex education before college (including training on refusal skills) were half as likely to experience sexual violence in college (Hirsch & Khan 2020). Yet most students have not received that education before arriving on campus. The CCRT recommends that we integrate sexual assault prevention work into the academic core of the university, incorporating research and theory on "Sexual Citizenship" (Hirsch & Khan 2020) into the first-year educational curriculum as a four-week mini-course offered jointly through the School of Social Work and LSA Department of Sociology. Because the evidence base for sexual assault prevention remains relatively limited, we propose introducing the course as part of a pilot study to assess whether U-M undergraduate students who learn about Sexual Citizenship as part of their academic education have different experiences with sexuality during their time at U-M compared to students who attend the current SAPAC programming.

INVESTMENTS IN PREVENTION

The CCRT sees an urgent need for substantial investments to elevate, create, and coordinate prevention and education resources across all three U-M campuses.

The CCRT recommends:

- Expanding PEAR Specialists to directly support the U-M Dearborn and U-M Flint campuses; Athletic and Club Sports; and online sexual and gender-based misconduct training and prevention education;
- Investing in the expansion of SAPAC's well-regarded, evidence-based prevention program, the First-Year Relationship and Sexual Talk (FYRST) to the Flint & Dearborn campuses and addressing SAPAC's need for additional physical space.
- Expanding interventions for those who have caused harm to include the Science-based Treatment, Accountability, and Risk Reduction of Sexual Assault (STARRSA) Cognitive Behavioral Treatment Program, to decrease the likelihood of future misconduct.

¹ Sexual Citizenship is a concept generated by Columbia University's Sexual Health Initiative to Foster Transformation (SHIFT) study, one of the most comprehensive studies of campus sex and sexual assault ever conducted. The term refers to the idea that people are "sexual citizens" when they know they have the right to say "yes" and the right to say "no" to sex—and when they recognize that everyone else has the same rights.

INNOVATIONS



INNOVATION #1 CENTER FOR RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

BACKGROUND

In the Fall of 2022, CCRT Co-Leads conducted listening sessions with faculty, staff, students, and survivors to identify what needs University of Michigan community members felt were unaddressed by existing policies and programs relating to campus sexual misconduct. These conversations were sobering. They revealed a deep sense of disappointment in the University's past responses to complaints of misconduct, cynicism regarding the University's interests in the well-being of the community, and a lack of trust in how the University might respond to future reports of misconduct. Since January 2023, the CCRT Working Group on Repairing Harm has explored how the University might re-imagine its commitment to repairing harm to people and relationships as a key dimension of Michigan well-being—and how we might begin the process of restoring institutional trust. One of the most innovative approaches to repairing harm and resolving conflict on college campuses today is the adoption of restorative justice principles and practices (Williamsen and Wessel, 2023).

Restorative justice practices involve an important paradigm shift in thinking about sexual misconduct: rather than pitting two parties against each other to determine right and wrong, winner and loser, the focus is on accountability and healing: “Who was harmed? What do they need? Whose obligation is it to meet those needs?”

Restorative justice is a non-adversarial, collaborative approach to addressing conflict, wrongdoing, and offensive behavior that prioritizes repairing harm and rebuilding trust (Karp et al. 2016, p.11). Restorative justice practices involve an important paradigm shift in thinking about sexual misconduct: rather than pitting two parties against each other to determine right and wrong, winner and loser, the focus is on accountability and healing: “Who was harmed? What do they need? Whose obligation is it to meet those needs? [Harm] is a violation of people and interpersonal relationships. And those violations create obligations, and the central obligation is to do right by the folks you’ve harmed” (Robins 2018).

Rooted in indigenous peacemaking practices, contemporary restorative justice includes a spectrum of practices—from facilitated dialogue to restorative circles or conferences to shuttle facilitation—but all approaches are designed to empower harmed parties and strengthen offenders’ social ties and accountability to the community (Karp et al. 2016, p.11). In addition to repairing harm, restorative practices can also be used proactively to build relationships, strengthen community, and improve campus climate for both work and study. The University of Michigan has been at the forefront of this movement: it was one of the earliest adopters of restorative practices in cases involving campus conflict and sexual misconduct, and retains some of the nation’s leading experts on campus restorative justice. **The CCRT is recommending that we build on this expertise by amplifying restorative justice as a key component of the University of Michigan’s commitment to well-being and diversity, equity, and inclusion through the creation of a new Center for Restorative Justice.**

CAMPUS NEEDS

CCRT listening sessions with faculty, staff, students, and alumni survivors—together with conversations with campus practitioners and stakeholders—identified six sets of campus needs that could potentially be addressed by a Center for Restorative Justice.



The University does not emphasize harm repair as an essential element of physical, emotional, and social well-being.

One of the most consequential unaddressed needs identified by the CCRT listening sessions was a deep sense of distrust in the University's commitment to community well-being, particularly with respect to sexual misconduct. In the absence of trust, community members who experience sexual misconduct are less likely to notify University officials when harm has occurred and are less likely to seek out campus resources that might help them. Left unaddressed, the harms caused by sexual misconduct can adversely affect the educational and employment experiences of our community members.

In September 2021, the University of Michigan joined seven other U.S. universities in adopting the Okanagan Charter, pledging a commitment to take a holistic and sustainable approach to becoming a health-promoting university. In doing so, the University committed to developing the physical, emotional, and social well-being of community members (including a sense of connection and belonging, and of having a well-developed support system). Sexual misconduct threatens all three dimensions of well-being: it not only has well-documented effects on the physical (Smith et al. 2017) and psychological (Carey et al. 2018) health of victims, but it also tends to isolate victims from their community and the supportive relationships they require to heal (Herman 2023). Restorative practices seek not only to repair the harm to victims and the relationships in which they are embedded, but also to rebuild and strengthen community. A comprehensive, campus-wide approach to restorative justice would collectively elevate the importance of repairing harm to people and relationships as a key dimension of Michigan well-being—and begin to restore trust in the university's commitments to community well-being.



Formal systems of investigation and adjudication rarely meet the needs of victims of sexual misconduct.

Rates of sexual harassment in the academic workplace are second only to the U.S. military (National Academies of Sciences 2018). In one of the most comprehensive meta-analyses on sexual harassment prevalence ever conducted, Ilies and colleagues (2003) found that 58 percent of female academic faculty and staff experience sexual harassment. The Association of American University Women (AAUW) (2005) found that 62 percent of undergraduates had experienced sexual harassment, and nearly one in four undergraduate women experience some form of nonconsensual student contact (Cantor et al. 2020).

Despite pervasive levels of campus sexual misconduct, most victims of sexual misconduct do not report their experiences to the university. Cortina and Berdah (2008) found that only 25% of targets of sexual harassment will file a formal report with their employer. A report by the AAUW (2005) found that only 7% of undergraduates report sexual harassment. In a study of graduate students, 6.4% of reported sexual harassment (Rosenthal, Smidt and Freyd 2016).

Reasons for not reporting include concern about social backlash, fear of not being believed, concerns that reporting will adversely affect one's career and reputation, and worries that the university will not be responsive (Ameral, Palm Reed and Hines 2020; Cortina and Berdahl 2008; Holland and Cortina 2017; Khan et al. 2018). ***Put succinctly, few victims believe that formal processes of investigation and adjudication will serve them well.***

Even when formal adjudication processes work well—when they are fair, equitable, trauma-informed, and transparent—they are not intended to meet the needs of the victim (Herman 2005; Karp et al. 2016). Adversarial adjudication procedures, designed to comply with legal requirements, are structured to ascertain whether a policy violation has occurred and determine an appropriate punishment. Such procedures are a necessary component of the University's response to sexual misconduct and the CCRT is not proposing to replace them, but they are limited in what they can offer the community, as they are not designed to repair harm to individuals or relationships.

Studies have found that what sexual misconduct victims need to heal is a sense of physical and emotional safety, community support to counteract isolation and self blame, space for grief, answers to questions, the ability to tell their story—including the need for public acknowledgement that a wrong has been done—and accountability, including offender remorse for harming them (Herman 2023; Karp et al. 2016; Koss, Wilgus and Williamsen 2014). Many victims do not want to “ruin a person's life” by pursuing punishments, but instead want the respondent to understand and take responsibility for the harms they caused (Coker 2016).

Survivor advocates observe that restorative practices allow survivors choice and control over the full recovery process – a particularly important consideration for survivors, who have often experienced significant violations of their own sense of agency.

Restorative justice practices focus on who was harmed and what they need to heal. Survivor advocates observe that restorative practices allow survivors choice and control over the full recovery process—a particularly important consideration for survivors, who have often experienced significant violations of their own sense of agency (Karp et al. 2016; Koss 2014). At the same time, a foundational principle of restorative approaches to sexual misconduct is fostering active accountability toward repair of harm (Karp, 2019, p.8). **The emphasis is on addressing needs, rebuilding trust, and creating space for the responsible party to accept responsibility for repairing harm (McMahon et al. 2023).**



Faculty, staff, and students who identify as racial and ethnic minorities and/or as LGBTQ are more likely than other community members to experience sexual misconduct but are less likely to utilize formal investigation and adjudication procedures.

Rates of sexual misconduct are higher among nonwhite, noncisgender, and nonstraight populations than other populations (National Academies of Sciences 2018). These groups also experience sexual misconduct differently: women of color often experience sexual misconduct as racialized, for example, meaning they are targeted based on racist and sexist stereotypes about Black women’s sexuality, body autonomy, and physical features (Porter 2022). Similarly, members of the LGBTQ community often experience harassment as a combination of sexism and heterosexism (National Academies of Sciences 2018).

Despite being frequent targets of sexual misconduct, individuals who identify as racial or ethnic minorities and/or LGBTQ are often distrustful of systems of authority that have a long history of discriminatory treatment of people with marginalized identities, including campus offices for investigating and resolving reports of sexual misconduct (Karp et al. 2016; Porter 2022). The fear of reporting or disclosing sexual misconduct to university offices means that members of these communities often lack access to resources for safety, healing, and accountability (see also Coker 2016; Méndez 2020).

We see the need for a robust set of choices for resolving reports of sexual misconduct for racial and ethnic minorities and LGBTQ individuals (from restorative justice to formal investigation and adjudication procedures) as a priority for a university committed to principles of diversity, equity, and inclusion.



There are few resources available to faculty, staff, and students for addressing uncivil behaviors that do not rise to the level of policy violations.

Microaggressions, incivility, and disrespect can cause real harm to individuals and units even when they do not rise to the level of policy violations; left unaddressed, such behaviors can eventually lead to policy violations (National Academies of Sciences 2018). The 2018 National Academies of Sciences report on sexual harassment observed that while the most familiar forms of sexual harassment are *sexual coercion* (making conditions of employment or education contingent upon sexual cooperation) and *unwanted sexual attention* (expressions of romantic or sexual interest that are unwelcome, unreciprocated and offensive to the target), the most common form of harassment is *gender harassment*, behavior that conveys insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes about members of one gender. Information gathered during CCRT listening sessions and from CCRT working groups echoed this data: members of the U-M community described experiencing more subtle but still impactful incidents of gender-based hostility and insults that they did not expect would fall under the University’s official policies.

Microaggressions, incivility, and disrespect can cause real harm to individuals and units even when they do not rise to the level of policy violations; left unaddressed, such behaviors can eventually lead to policy violations.

While often characterized as a “lessor” or more inconsequential form of sexual harassment, persistent or severe gender harassment can result in the same level of negative professional and psychological outcomes as isolated instances of sexual coercion (National Academics of Sciences 2018). And workplaces that experience a high level of gender harassment are also more likely to see incidents of unwanted sexual attention and sexual coercion (National Academies of Sciences 2018).

Importantly, organizational climate plays an essential role in facilitating and enabling all forms of sexual misconduct (National Academies of Sciences 2018). The National Academies of Sciences report on sexual harassment found that “[o]rganizational climate is the single most important factor in determining whether sexual harassment is likely to occur in a work setting” (p.121). Organizational climate refers to an organization’s shared perceptions of policies, practices, and procedures, including their purpose, how they are experienced, how they are implemented, and what behaviors in the university are rewarded and expected (Schneider, Ehrhart, and Macey 2013).

One way of preventing campus sexual misconduct is to address concerns about gender harassment and other forms of incivility before they rise to the level of policy violations, and with particular attention to their effects on organizational climate. Restorative practices can be used proactively to educate units about civility and respect, and to improve campus climate by building trust, developing compassion, and facilitating conversation, sharing, and listening. Over time, we envision the Center as providing an array of resources from which community members can proactively turn to receive consultation, training, and other forms of reparative intervention.



There are few resources available for addressing the “ripple effects” or communal harm caused by sexual misconduct.

ECRT investigation and adjudication procedures are necessarily focused on the parties to a case (i.e., complainant and respondent), rather than the effects of misconduct on the broader community. Yet most cases of sexual misconduct have “ripple effects” that affect relationships among friends, classmates, colleagues, and co-workers (Koss, Wilgus and Williamsen 2014). Left unaddressed, community members can experience a loss of safety and an erosion of trust in colleagues and administrators (particularly in cases where the leader of a unit is under investigation or is not taking steps to address the impact of the case within the unit) (Cerdera & Lopez 2023). Here too, information gathered during CCRT listening sessions and from CCRT working groups mirrored this research: community members talked about the challenges of being part of a unit with co-workers involved in a sexual misconduct case and the negative workplace dynamics that situation created for everyone.

ECRT currently has a Restorative Justice Lead, who has recently begun doing this work. While very well received by units and unit leadership, she reports not having nearly enough time or resources to meet the needs of the U-M community.

Restorative justice practices seek to bring together those who have been harmed, those who have accepted responsibility for causing harm, and affected community members in a process designed to repair harm, reestablish trust, and balance the needs of group participants (Karp et al. 2016). Many forms of restorative justice practices conclude with a mutually agreed-to written redress plan that outlines the concrete ways that an individual (or group) will remedy the impacts on the victim as well as the community.



While the University of Michigan has been an innovator in developing restorative justice practices, there is a need for us to lead in researching the effects or benefits of restorative justice, particularly in the case of campus sexual misconduct.

Restorative approaches have a long history, but they remain new to higher education, particularly with respect to sexual misconduct (Wessel and Williamsen 2023). A number of key studies have provided the initial empirical support for implementing campus restorative justice programs (e.g., Koss 2014; Karp & Sacks 2014), and there is a growing body of anecdotal and experiential evidence from campuses that have implemented restorative practices (Wessel and Williamsen 2023) but the field still lacks the kind of robust empirical scholarship that could lead to best practices on college campuses and beyond. Administrators and practitioners would benefit from more evidence on the implementation and effects of campus restorative justice practices on survivors, offenders, affected units or groups, campus climate, and institutional trust. We believe the University of Michigan is exceptionally well positioned to play this role: it is simultaneously a leader in the implementation of campus restorative practices and a top-tier research institution, with the reputation and resources to serve as a model for the rest of the country.

RECOMMENDATION: CENTER FOR RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

Campus stakeholders (Appendix B) have collaborated on a blueprint for a new Center for Restorative Justice, with broad consensus on the organizational structure (particularly with respect to existing campus programs), scope, and programming. To implement the CCRT's recommendations, we recommend the creation of a formal task force to more concretely resolve issues involving staffing, organizational structure, location, and programming.

Organizational Structure

There are currently a wide range of units on campus that utilize restorative practices. Campus stakeholders believe that fully centralizing these practices could problematically “silo” restorative justice on campus and impede the goal of diffusing restorative practices throughout the campus community. Under this proposal, the Center would instead adopt a “hub-and-spoke” model, ensuring the continuity and independence of spoke partner programs (referred to here as “Affiliates”), but also offering training and support from the Center.

Potential Center Affiliates Include:

- Prevention Education, Assistance, and Resources (PEAR)
- Rackham Resolution Services
- Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR)
- Housing
- School of Social Work (DEI Office & MSW Program)

Each of these programs has been designed to address the needs of particular populations (e.g., undergraduates, graduate students), and relies on specific forms of expertise. A Center for Restorative Justice would supplement, not replace, these programs, by working toward more alignment and coordination, offering training, communications, and staffing support where needed.

Programmatic Responsibilities for Center

The Center would serve as the primary “hub” for restorative practices at the University of Michigan (including the Flint and Dearborn campuses), offering not only training and support to existing Affiliate programs, but also facilitation and consultation services to community members who are not served by existing programs. While restorative services for most student-related matters are housed in OSCR and Housing, similar services for faculty and staff do not have an organizational home.

Stakeholders expressed strong consensus for including all forms of conflict resolution and harm repair within the scope of the Center’s purview, rather than limiting its scope to sexual misconduct. They view the objective of restorative justice as repairing all harms to relationships in the University community, not only those caused by sexual misconduct—and they see many forms of harm as intersectional, involving not only identities rooted in sex/gender, but also race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, citizenship status, and other identities.

Center programming would include:

- **Affiliate Training and Support:** Training would include regular professional development workshops for staff in Affiliate programs, as well as training in restorative practices for new hires in Affiliate programs. Support to Affiliates would include intake referrals, communications support, and evaluation and assessment of existing programs.
- **Facilitation and consultation services for resolving conflict and repairing harm among faculty and staff.** This would include conflict resolution and harm repair within units and groups to address the “ripple effects” or communal harm caused by misconduct. Center staff could also assist other units serving students as needed.
- **Coordination with Affiliates to build conflict resolution competencies and capacities for all members of the UM community, including “conflict coaching” or “restorative coaching” for unit leaders.**
- **Coordination with community partners (such as OSCR, Ombuds, Spectrum, MESA, ODEI, HR) to amplify and ensure access to restorative practices for all members of the Michigan community, including underrepresented minorities and members of the LGBTQ communities.**
- **Research:** As a top-ranked research university who is also a national leader in campus restorative justice practices, we believe the Center should be at the forefront of research on campus restorative justice practices. This would ensure not only that Michigan is implementing best practices, but that we help to establish a national standard for campus restorative justice.
- **Summer Training Institute (similar to IGR’s National Group Dialogue Institute) for higher education faculty and staff outside the University of Michigan to teach the philosophy and practice of campus restorative justice.**

COST - Staffing Proposals

Director. Responsible for establishing and advancing a vision for building a restorative collective impact network across stakeholder partners, coordinating campus programs involving restorative practices, and supervising training, facilitation and consultation services at the Center. (Possible salary range: \$140-160,000)

Intake Specialist (1-2 FTEs). Responsible for listening to concerns and providing information about resources and resolution options. Intake specialists would have specific training to be able to answer questions, guide decision making, and make appropriate referrals. (Possible salary range: \$50-65,000)

Case Manager (1 FTE). Responsible for supporting and assisting case management, particularly from an administrative perspective. Monitors restorative agreements and assists in following up with restorative process participants as helpful and appropriate. (Possible salary range: \$55-70,000)

Facilitator/Consultants (5 FTEs). Consults with members of campus to explore restorative ways of addressing harm and conflict within the university community. Facilitates restorative processes that explore and repair harm and conflict in the community, and works to identify and address unmet community needs. Operates from a culturally-competent and trauma-informed lens. Has expertise in compassionately and carefully addressing sensitive issues and allegations that may include harassment, discrimination, bias, sexual and gender-based misconduct, and other campus climate concerns. At least one facilitator/consultant would be dedicated to serving the Flint and Dearborn campuses. (Possible salary range: \$65-80,000)

Program Evaluation/Assessment (1 FTE). Responsible for developing and implementing comprehensive evaluation of the Center's activities. Ensures that evaluation activities are complementary to the Center's operations and values utilizing restorative principles and practices. Coordinates, plans, develops, conducts, monitors, analyzes, and reports out on the Center's research activities for internal and external audiences. (Possible salary range: \$70-80,000)

Training Lead (1 FTE). The Center would provide ongoing training opportunities for new and existing practitioners to ensure consistency in our campus restorative justice practices. All new campus unit leaders would also receive training in restorative justice principles and practices. "Conflict coaching" would also be available to units and unit leaders upon request. The Training Director would also be responsible for helping to organize the Summer Training Institute, and may be available for paid training at other institutions. (Possible salary range: \$50-65,000)

Communications Lead (1 FTE). While the University of Michigan has been an early leader in implementing restorative justice practices, very few members of the community know what restorative justice is, what form of restorative practices we offer at Michigan, or what kinds of harms (beyond policy violations) or conflicts such practices might address. A communications director would be responsible for educating the campus community about restorative justice principles and practices, showcasing the research and innovations of the Center and its partners, and amplifying the importance of repairing harm as a key pillar of well-being at the University of Michigan. (Possible salary range: \$50-70,000)

Administrative Support (1 FTE). Responsible for calendar management for RJ Center staff, including organizing materials, scheduling rooms and other venues, and preparing meeting agendas. Provides additional logistical support for the Center's offerings. (Possible salary range: \$50-60,000)

Research Investigator (not tenure track) (1-2 FTEs). Full-time researcher with a focus on the implementation and effects of campus restorative justice practices on individuals, units, campus climate, and/or institutional trust. (\$50-70,000)

INNOVATION #2 U-M CENTER FOR SURVIVOR SUPPORT

BACKGROUND

Even before students arrive on the University of Michigan campus, many have experienced sexual assault. A national climate survey found that 26% of female students, 9% of male students, and 47% of gender nonconforming students experienced sexual assault before college enrollment (Cantor et al 2019). Many more students experience some form of sexual misconduct after arriving at the University of Michigan: A 2019 Campus Climate Survey found that of the 43,939 students enrolled at the University of Michigan, 13.1% of students reported experiencing a sexual assault (attempted or completed penetration); 8.9% had experienced intimate partner violence; 14.6% had experienced stalking. More than 42% of students reported experiencing some form of sexual harassment. Furthermore, sexual violence reproduces inequalities of gender, race/ethnicity, class, age, sexuality, ability status, citizenship status, and nationality (Armstrong et al. 2018; Guckenheimer, 2021; Weist et al., 2014). These community members need and deserve a network of support to help them thrive at the University of Michigan.

While the University of Michigan offers a wide range of services for individuals who experience sexual and gender-based violence, the CCRT's Working Group on Organizational Structure determined that the structure of institutional resources does not adequately meet the recognized best-practice standards for client-centered care (Batts, 2020; Cattaneo, 2012; Goldscheid, 2009; Iwasaki, 2023; Robinson et al. 2008). Clients seeking to access services at U-M are required to navigate opaque processes and a decentralized service model that can require them to interact with multiple campus and community providers to address their needs. For example, medical services are currently embedded in the University Health Service (UHS); advocacy is housed in the Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC); counseling must be sought through Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS). Additionally, support housed within Student Life may not be perceived as accessible to faculty and staff.

The CCRT has also found that many of the offices that are tasked with supporting individuals who have experienced sexual and gender-based violence are under-resourced, allowing them to serve only a fraction of the community that would benefit from services. **The result is an inadequate, slow, and fundamentally limited response to serving survivors within the U-M community.**

Responding to student requests for a more survivor-centric approach to care, a group composed of members of University Health Services (UHS), Dean of Students (DOS), Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC), Prevention, Education, Assistance & Resources (PEAR), Counseling and Psychological Service (CAPS) and Equity, Civil Rights, and Title IX Office (ECRT) began to explore new models of care. In the Fall of 2022, a subset of this group convened to learn more about Michigan State's new approach to survivor support, the Center for Survivors. Our proposal for the Center for Survivor Support builds upon the preliminary work of those community members and adopts many of the best practices utilized at MSU's Center for Survivors.

RECOMMENDATION: CENTER FOR SURVIVOR SUPPORT

The CCRT recommends that we facilitate survivor access to comprehensive care by co-locating current resources to provide trauma-informed wraparound services to all individuals in the U-M community who are impacted by sexual misconduct (Koss et al., 2017; Laing, 2017; Maguire et al., 2021). Center services would be provided based on a survivor-centered care model (Figure 1), where expert services and advocacy are centralized through a single service entry point to maximize accessibility for the survivor and meet all of their holistic needs.

Figure 1 - Survivor-Centered Care Model



Such services would include:

- Advocacy (currently in SAPAC)
- Medical Care Services (Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner exams currently offered in UHS)
- Therapeutic Services (new). We recommend the addition of at least five dedicated therapist positions to work in this Center to provide immediate and ongoing confidential support to those who have been harmed by sexual violence (Cole, 2011).

Co-locating these resources in one Center provides for multi-disciplinary, holistic, and comprehensive care for those who have been harmed by sexual violence (Greeson et al. 2016; Herbert & Bromfield, 2019). We also recommend that place-based organizational structures that honor the specific needs of the U-M Dearborn and U-M Flint campuses be included as functional arms of the Center.



COST

To implement the CCRT's recommendation for a new Michigan Center for Survivor Resources, we recommend the creation of a task force (Appendix C). Because of the complexity of this work, we recommend that members of this group be paid an appropriate honorarium for their work.

INNOVATION #3

RETHINKING PREVENTION FOR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS AS SEXUAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION—A PILOT STUDY

BACKGROUND

In 2015, Columbia University launched the Sexual Health Initiative to Foster Transformation (SHIFT), one of the most comprehensive studies of campus sex and sexual assault ever conducted. The study included a survey of over 1,600 undergraduates regarding their experiences with sex and sexual assault, 150 in-depth interviews, ethnographic observation, and daily diaries of 500 students (Hirsch & Khan 2020). The objective of the study was to understand the social roots of sexual assault: *why does our focus on consent and individual bad actors consistently fail to stem the high rates of campus sexual misconduct?*

SHIFT researchers sought to understand sexual assault as a public health problem, focusing not just on individuals, but the broader context of their relationships, their pre-college histories and education, the organizations they are a part of, and the communities that influence them.

High-quality sex education can help shape beliefs and attitudes about gender and sexuality associated with sexual assault.

SHIFT researchers Jennifer Hirsch and Shamus Khan offer the metaphor of “clean water” as a way of thinking about this shift in focus: “If we know that people are drinking water that is polluted, one solution is to try and educate every person about how to use that water in safe ways. Another is to go upstream and remove the toxins from the water, reducing the need to change individual behavior one person at a time” (Hirsch & Khan 2020, p. xi). The SHIFT project asked: *“What would the ‘clean water’ approach to sexual assault look like?”*

One of the study’s most striking findings was how little sex education students had received before arriving on campus. As sex education in the United States has become increasingly politicized, fewer and fewer school districts offer comprehensive sex education. High-quality sex education can help shape beliefs and attitudes about gender and sexuality associated with sexual assault (Hirsch & Khan 2020, p. 266). **SHIFT researchers found, for example, that women who had received comprehensive sex education before college (including training on refusal skills), were half as likely to be raped in college (Hirsch & Khan 2020, p.266).**

The SHIFT study suggests the powerful impact that would result from offering the comprehensive sex education that students *should* have had before arriving at university. We routinely offer this kind of “compensatory” education in other aspects of Michigan’s undergraduate curriculum: for our students who are underserved by middle and high school writing programs, for example, we require courses on writing as part of our curriculum and we offer students the help and resources of the Sweetland Writing Center. The CCRT sees a similar educational need in preventing sexual assault.

One particularly generative concept identified by the SHIFT study is that of Sexual Citizenship, or the idea that people are “sexual citizens” when they know they have the right to say “yes” and the right to say “no” to sex—and when they recognize that everyone else has the same rights. Importantly, Sexual Citizenship is not something we are born with. It is developed through education and supported by communities. The CCRT sees this concept as an important foundation for teaching undergraduates about sex and sexuality.

RECOMMENDATION: PILOT COURSE ON SEXUAL CITIZENSHIP

The CCRT recommends that we integrate sexual assault prevention work into the academic core of the university. Specifically, we recommend incorporating the research and theory of Sexual Citizenship into our first-year educational curriculum as a mini-course—a four-week, 3-credit class with a structured syllabus, peer facilitators, and an experienced instructor. Because the evidence base for sexual assault prevention remains relatively limited, we propose introducing the mini course as part of a pilot study to assess the long-term impact of teaching about Sexual Citizenship on undergraduate experiences with sex and sexual assault.

The study would randomly recruit first-year undergraduate students to enroll in a mini-course on Sexual Citizenship offered jointly by the School of Social Work and Department of Sociology (the experimental group), and an equal number of first-year undergraduate students who would only attend the mandatory SAPAC prevention trainings in their first year (the control group). At the end of the course, and every semester thereafter, a researcher would administer a short survey to participants in both groups on their sexual experiences since the prior semester. **The objective is to identify whether students who learn about Sexual Citizenship as part of their academic education have different experiences with sexuality while an undergraduate at the University of Michigan compared to students who only attend the current SAPAC programming.**

Dr. Sandra R. Levitsky, Arthur F. Thurnau Professor and Associate Professor of Sociology (Principal Investigator) and Prof. Abigail Eiler, Clinical Associate Professor of Social Work, (Co-Principal Investigator) would collaborate with a research team to assess student outcomes over the four-year period and issue recommendations. The evidence-based framework established by SHIFT researchers Hirsch and Khan, and outlined in their book, *Sexual Citizens: Sex, Power, and Assault on Campus*, combined with other evidence-informed research, will shape the course's objectives and assignments.

Sample Course Structure

Course Title: Promoting Social Change through Sexual Citizenship

Credit: 3

Grading: Pass/Fail

Eligibility: Full-time, first-year undergraduate students

Pilot Departments/Schools Faculty Involved: Department of Sociology and Community Action & Social Change Minor Program

Course Description:

This undergraduate course provides students with a comprehensive understanding of healthy sexual behaviors, community engagement, and social change with a focus on diversity, equity, and inclusion. Students will explore strategies to reduce sexual misconduct on college campuses while promoting healthy relationships with peers and the wider community.

Throughout the course, students will examine the multifaceted aspects of Sexual Citizenship and healthy relationships. They will critically analyze factors influencing campus sexual misconduct, such as gender, sexuality, culture, and power dynamics. Students will learn about evidence-based practices for promoting sexual health and wellness on college campuses with an emphasis on comprehensive sex education that defines sexual geographies, sexual projects, and Sexual Citizenship (Hirsch & Khan, 2020).

The course places a strong emphasis on community action and social change. Students will engage in collaborative projects to create safer and more inclusive environments for all individuals.

They will explore strategies for addressing the root causes of sexual violence and develop practical skills for supporting survivors and promoting bystander intervention. In addition, the course will foster an understanding of the intersectionality of sexual health issues, considering the experiences of marginalized communities and advocating for equity and inclusion. Students will examine how race, class, ability, and other social identities intersect with sexual misconduct.



COST

A detailed proposal budget can be found in Appendix D.

INVESTMENTS IN SEXUAL MISCONDUCT PREVENTION



BACKGROUND

The Coordinated Community Response Team (CCRT) has identified the prevention of sexual misconduct as pivotal to establishing a secure and respectful environment at the University of Michigan. To achieve this kind of respectful environment, the CCRT has focused on prevention—rather than response—as a theme in our 2023 recommendations. After an extensive review of the University’s current sexual misconduct prevention and education efforts, it is clear that despite the dedication and expertise of our skilled staff, faculty, and student volunteers, there is a need to re-envision the ways the University delivers prevention programming, as well as a need for substantial investments to elevate and coordinate essential prevention resources throughout the entire U-M system.

At U-M currently, sexual misconduct prevention work is done in varying ways across the three campuses, by a range of units and professionals. On the Ann Arbor campus, the Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC) provides most of the prevention programming for students. In 2022, the University created the Prevention Education, Assistance & Resources (PEAR) unit within the Equity, Civil Rights, and Title IX Office and devoted meaningful resources to its launch; PEAR provides much of the prevention programming for employees on the Ann Arbor campus. Other units at U-M Ann Arbor also provide prevention programming, including Organizational Change, the CRLT Players, and Athletics.

The CCRT’s recommendations on prevention seek to build upon the momentum of the new PEAR unit and amplify the successes and strong prevention work provided by SAPAC.

SAPAC has a long and proud history at U-M. It was created in 1985 after students launched a sit-in the office of Vice-President for Student Services to address safety concerns of women on campus and the need to open a rape crisis center. Today, SAPAC offers a diverse range of prevention and intervention services largely targeted at students, utilizing a network consisting both of professional staff and trained student volunteers. On the Ann Arbor campus, SAPAC has

provided exemplary prevention, support, and advocacy, and the University relies on SAPAC to assist in fulfilling its legal mandates regarding prevention programming to incoming first-year students. However, funding and space constraints have significantly limited SAPAC’s potential to grow into the leader it could be in this field.

Sexual misconduct prevention work at U-M Flint and U-M Dearborn is far more limited. At U-M Flint, prevention and education programming for more than 6,000 enrolled students is overseen by just one of three staff members at the Center for Gender and Sexuality (CGS). Staffing and financial constraints limit CGS’s capacity to offer support and prevention services to the 1,000+ faculty and staff on that campus. U-M Dearborn shares a comparable situation: a single provider, the Program Coordinator for Violence Prevention and Confidential Support, manages prevention and education programming within the Center for Social Justice and Inclusion—an office dedicated to more than 8,000 students.

The CCRT’s recommendations on prevention seek to build upon the momentum of the new PEAR unit and amplify the successes and strong prevention work provided by SAPAC. The recommendations below are focused on:

- Expanding PEAR’s human and financial resources to enable PEAR to develop focused prevention programming for some of the highest impact areas at the University;
- More robustly funding SAPAC to enable it to grow its successful, evidence-based peer-led prevention programs; and
- Expanding respondent-focused education programs to reduce recidivism and increase community safety.

RECOMMENDATIONS

PREVENTION #1

CREATE A PEAR LIAISON SPECIALIST POSITION TO WORK WITH U-M DEARBORN AND U-M FLINT

The CCRT recommends that the University add a PEAR liaison specialist who will work with all three campuses (and be physically present on all three campuses regularly) to promote information-sharing, efficient use of resources, and improved prevention programming. Prevention programming on the three U-M campuses has developed and grown independently of each other. While this independence has enabled the three campuses to develop programs suited to the particular identities, dynamics, and culture of each campus, it has also resulted in inequities in human and financial resources. Prevention specialists at Dearborn and Flint told the CCRT that they appreciate the independence and authority they have on their campuses to implement programming, but they would benefit from being more connected to the expertise and resources of PEAR.

This recommended expansion aligns with the University's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) by addressing underserved areas, particularly at U-M Flint and U-M Dearborn with significant populations of people of color. This liaison specialist will bolster DEI goals by amplifying existing prevention programs designed to cater to the diverse communities and identities on these campuses. At a minimum, the CCRT recommends that the University implement some mechanism to ensure that Flint and Dearborn are being allocated equitable resources and access to prevention services.

PREVENTION #2

CREATE A PEAR SPECIALIST POSITION TO DIRECTLY SUPPORT THE UNIVERSITY'S ONLINE SEXUAL MISCONDUCT TRAINING AND PREVENTION EDUCATION

The development of dedicated staff for online sexual misconduct training and prevention education is essential to meet state and federal law requirements and best practices to support staff and faculty across U-M Ann Arbor, U-M Flint, U-M Dearborn, and Michigan Medicine. This position would work closely with a similar role in Wolverine Wellness, which manages the online training for students.

Throughout the CCRT's listening sessions, a theme emerged regarding the mandatory online training: it is insufficient in content and impact. For employees, the University offers one mandatory 15-minute online training, called "Cultivating a Culture of Respect: Sexual Harassment and Misconduct Awareness." That online program was previously administered through Organizational Development, but ownership of the program was transferred to PEAR in the 2023-2024 academic year. Mandatory sexual misconduct training is informed by federal and state legal requirements, and it is often viewed as a legally-compliant but practically ineffective way to communicate about sexual misconduct

prevention. With the recent shift of online training to PEAR ownership, the CCRT believes the time is opportune to create a position within PEAR to examine anew whether the University's online training meets the U-M community's needs, is consistent with current best practices in prevention education, aligns with the Universities DEI priorities, and results in measurable positive outcomes.

PREVENTION #3

CREATE A PEAR SPECIALIST POSITION TO COLLABORATE WITH SAPAC IN DIRECTLY SUPPORTING ATHLETICS AND CLUB SPORTS

Research in the field of sexual misconduct has consistently identified athletics as a high impact area, one with its own particular structures and culture that warrants tailored attention and programming when it comes to addressing sexual misconduct. Within Athletics and Club Sports at U-M Ann Arbor, a dedicated PEAR position will ensure consistent, tailored, and effective education for employees and will collaborate with SAPAC to offer ongoing trainings and resources for 950 varsity athletes, 400 staff, and countless club sports members, coaches and staff on the Ann Arbor campus. The goal of a dedicated athletics-focused PEAR position will be to transform sexual misconduct prevention and education programming from sporadic presentations made by people outside athletics to systemic, thoughtful programming delivered throughout the year, through a variety of modes, by a PEAR professional who is also part of the Athletics world.

PREVENTION #4

EXPAND FUNDING FOR SAPAC'S WELL-REGARDED, EVIDENCE-BASED STUDENT PREVENTION PROGRAM, THE FIRST-YEAR RELATIONSHIP AND SEXUALITY TALK (FYRST) TO THE FLINT AND DEARBORN CAMPUSES

The CCRT recommends providing funding to specifically tailor and administer FYRST for the Flint and Dearborn student populations. FYRST is an in-person, peer-facilitated workshop where trained student facilitators provide an accessible, supportive space for student-driven conversations where all identities and experiences are welcomed and in which students can build the skills to identify and communicate goals and values around sexuality and relationships.

Michigan law requires institutions of higher education to offer in-person sexual assault prevention education to students; FYRST is U-M's answer to that statutory mandate. Research has consistently shown that peer-led programs are a best practice in teaching about sexual misconduct prevention.

Research has consistently shown that peer-led programs are a best practice in teaching about sexual misconduct prevention.

The 2023-2024 academic year is the first time FYRST has resumed in person since the pandemic, and the CCRT believes the time is opportune to expand FYRST to students at the Dearborn and Flint campuses, in partnership with the prevention professionals already working on those campuses to ensure cultural competency of the tailored programs.


PREVENTION #5**PROVIDE SAPAC WITH ADDITIONAL PHYSICAL SPACE AND FUNDING TO DELIVER LEGALLY-REQUIRED SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION PROGRAMS AND OFFER ADVOCACY AND SUPPORT SERVICES IN A BEST-PRACTICES ENVIRONMENT**

Despite the essential prevention, education, and support services SAPAC provides, SAPAC has been constrained in its operation by insufficient funding and inadequate physical space. The CCRT recommends several funding and infrastructure enhancements to SAPAC as part of its focus on prevention work.



Provide Funding to Offset Room Rentals for FYRST

SAPAC is currently responsible for providing FYRST to all first-year and transfer students on the Ann Arbor campus—a total of approximately 9,000 students—but its budget falls short of being able to cover the robust follow-up and other FYRST-related programming expenses necessary for true systemic prevention work. To provide some background on FYRST, the program is offered in engaging, interactive peer-facilitated workshops of approximately 50-60 students; this means that SAPAC is administering around 200 workshops every fall. Workshops are held throughout campus, in residence halls, multi-cultural lounges, unions, and even in partnership with some academic units. The reason SAPAC's budget falls short of being able to cover the robust follow-up and other FYRST-related programming is because SAPAC must spend a substantial portion of its FYRST budget on campus room rentals; with no dedicated training space of its own, SAPAC must pay the University to rent space for the FYRST workshops. Looking at the 2024-2025 academic year, SAPAC expects to expend \$30,000 on room rentals alone; this cost is fully separate from what SAPAC spends on its permanent staff, student staff, and other FYRST-related costs such as marketing, workshop supplies, resource provision within the workshop, evaluation-related costs, and follow-up programming. Given that the FYRST program is part of the University's mandatory sexual misconduct educational program for students, the CCRT recommends the University provide funding to offset this significant portion of FYRST costs, which would free up some FYRST funds for essential follow-up programming, which is critical for a systemic prevention approach.



Provide SAPAC with Additional Physical Space for Its Services and Programming Needs

SAPAC's physical space presents significant challenges, and space constraints have unfortunately limited SAPAC's ability to best serve the U-M community. SAPAC's current office space has become inadequate for its team, which includes professional staff, student staff, and volunteers (150+ individuals) to gather, build community, plan, and implement prevention education. In 2020, the University created a new physical space in the Student Union for SAPAC. The office was created for SAPAC at that time—and for the team and programming SAPAC offered then—but it didn't leave any room for growth or expansion. Since that time, the responsibility for administering the legally-required required sexual assault prevention workshops for all incoming first-year and transfer students was transferred from other offices to SAPAC. This meant that SAPAC needed to hire one program manager, two graduate student staff members, and 18 peer facilitators. In addition, recognizing the value that SAPAC adds to the U-M community, the Provost recently approved funding to scale up SAPAC's prevention education workshops for the graduate student population, potentially requiring such workshops in LSA in the fall 2024.

As a result, SAPAC hired 10 new graduate student staff members to help support the program. In sum, SAPAC has quickly outgrown its physical space and does not have adequate physical space to house newly hired staff.

Ideally, SAPAC's office would offer the physical space to accommodate its growing team of professional staff, student staff, and volunteers so they can convene, build community, hold meetings, and even facilitate workshops and trainings. Much of SAPAC's prevention work is focused on workshop and training facilitation, so a space that included an accessible state-of-the-art training space would be ideal.

For those 150+ workshops that SAPAC provides as a requirement for all first-year students, the CCRT is also recommending that SAPAC have its own training space so that SAPAC could create a truly meaningful learning experience for its students.

SAPAC also faces physical space challenges when it comes to conducting its survivor support and advocacy work, as that work needs a particular type of space and environment (quiet, confidential, more clinical-oriented), while the prevention work needs a different type of space (open, engaging, vibrant, open to students dropping in to build community, etc.). Because the survivor support and advocacy work often needs to be prioritized because SAPAC deals with high-risk situations, SAPAC often has challenges in creating the different kinds of spaces needed for prevention and for support work.

The CCRT recognizes the complexity of finding physical space on campus and is recommending as a first step that the University convene a task force to assess, plan, and accommodate SAPAC's growing needs.

PREVENTION #6

EXPAND PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR THOSE WHO HAVE CAUSED HARM BY INCREASING INVESTMENT IN EMPIRICALLY-BASED PROGRAMS

The CCRT encourages the University to have a broad conception of prevention, one that includes interventions that decrease recidivism as a form of prevention. Research consistently emphasizes the need for distinct support structures for complainants and respondents, recognizing the divergent experiences and impacts they face. Data informs us that those accused of sexual misconduct often remain in or return to their professional/academic communities pending the grievance process or at the end of a grievance process depending on the finding and sanction. To promote safety and security, the University of Michigan should substantially enhance its support services for respondents, which may include advising, educational, and therapeutic interventions.

The CCRT encourages the University to have a broad conception of prevention, one that includes interventions that decrease recidivism as a form of prevention.

One intervention that U-M Ann Arbor currently employs for respondents is the Science-based Treatment, Accountability, and Risk Reduction of Sexual Assault (STARRSA) Program, which is administered by professionals in the Office of Student Conflict Resolution. STARRSA is the first empirically-informed, comprehensive program to address sexual misconduct in a

college student population. Informed by research and practical experience, STARRSA not only decreases the likelihood of future misconduct but also fosters a sense of safety for survivors and the community. Expanding empirically-based programs like STARRSA is crucial. Currently, the University utilizes STARRSA's Active Psychoeducation (AP) Program,

which through assessment and psychoeducation, allows the opportunity to close knowledge gaps that can lead to unwanted and harmful sexual behaviors.

The University's prevention work would greatly benefit from implementing STARRSA's Cognitive Behavioral Treatment (CBT) Program, which integrates assessment, therapy, and education, providing a confidential space for students to address behaviors, attitudes, socialization, and sexual and gender-based misconduct. The program aims to facilitate positive and prosocial changes in students, ensuring their safe reintegration into the U-M community. The CBT program is appropriate for more severe cases that require intensive intervention. By adopting these measures, the University of Michigan will not only address misconduct effectively but also provide a supportive environment for all community members. To this end, the CCRT recommends that the University create a position to oversee and implement the STARRSA CBT Program.

COST

<u>Expand PEAR Specialists</u>	
U-M Dearborn and U-M Flint liaison <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 FTE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FTE salary for both positions (sugg. \$75-100K) <p><i>The tri-campus liaison position is envisioned to work with the Ann Arbor PEAR office but reside on the Dearborn and Flint campuses. We propose that the professional spend one to two days a week at PEAR in Ann Arbor and the remainder of their time at their respective campuses. This means that the position will require office space on all three campuses. We recommend that the office space be located in U-M Ann Arbor's PEAR, in U-M Dearborn's Center for Social Justice and Inclusion, and in U-M Flint's Center for Gender and Sexuality or Division of Student Affairs. Costs of office assignments and possible costs of gas/parking due to the traveling nature of the position</i></p>
Online Sexual & Gender-Based Misconduct Training & Prevention Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 FTE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FTE salary (sugg. \$75-100K)
Athletics and Club Sports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 FTE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FTE salary (sugg. \$75-100K)

Expand SAPAC's FYRST program to Flint & Dearborn Campuses

- 2 FTEs (1 per campus)
- 20 Student Staff (10 per campus)
- Additional Programming Dollars

- FTE salary (sugg. \$75-100K)
- Student Staff salary (sugg. \$15K)
- Programming (5K per campus)

Create a task force to address physical space limitations and potential new space for SAPAC

- No FTE's; the CCRT envisions a volunteer task force

- No cost is envisioned in connection with the task force's work

Increase Investment in Programs Designed to Reduce Recidivism

Expand prevention and intervention programs for those who have caused harm (expanded STARRSA services)

- 1 FTE
- External Training provided by Klancy Street Consultation

- FTE salary (sugg. \$75-100K)
- Training & Hosting (est. \$25K)

REFERENCES

- Ameral, V., K. M. Palm Reed, & D. A. Hines. 2020. "An Analysis of Help-Seeking Patterns Among College Student Victims of Sexual Assault, Dating Violence, and Stalking." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 35(23-24):5311-35.
- American Association of University Women. 2005. "Drawing the Line: Sexual Harassment on Campus." Washington, D.C. American Association of University Women Educational Foundation.
- Armstrong, E. A., Gleckman-Krut, M., & Johnson, L. 2018. "Silence, Power, and Inequality: An Intersectional Approach to Sexual Violence." *Annual Review of Sociology* 44: 99-122.
- Batts, R. A. 2020. "Using Trauma-Informed and Victim-Centered Approaches to Provide Assistance to Survivors of Human Trafficking." Doctoral dissertation, Valdosta State University.
- Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Harps, S., Townsend, R., Thomas, G., Lee, H., Kranz, V., Herbison, R., Madden, K. 2019. *Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Misconduct - The University of Michigan. Association of American Universities (AAU) Survey on Sexual Assault and Misconduct Report on the AAU Campus.*
- Cantor, D., et al. 2019. "Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Misconduct." https://safe.unc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1110/2020/06/University-of-North-Carolina-at-Chapel-Hill_Report-and-Appendices-.pdf.
- Carey, K. B., Norris, A. L., Durney, S. E., Shepardson, R. L., & Carey, M. P. 2018. "Mental Health Consequences of Sexual Assault Among First-year College Women." *Journal of American College Health* 66(6), 480-486.
- Cattaneo, L. B., Stylianou, A. M., Hargrove, S., Goodman, L. A., Gebhard, K. T., & Curby, T. W. 2021. "Survivor-Centered Practice and Survivor Empowerment: Evidence from a Research-Practitioner Partnership." *Violence Against Women* 27(9): 1252-1272.
- Cerdera, P., & E. Lopez. 2023. "What About Due Process? Addressing Common Concerns and Questions About Using Restorative Justice in Cases of Campus Sexual and Gender-Based Misconduct." Pp. 50-65 in *Applying Restorative Justice to Campus Sexual Assault: A Guide to Emerging Practices*, edited by Kaaren M. Williamsen and Erik S. Wessel. New York: Routledge.
- Coker, D. 2016. "Crime Logic, Campus Sexual Assault, and Restorative Justice." *Texas Tech Law Review* 49:147-210.
- Cole, J. 2011. "Victim Confidentiality on Sexual Assault Response Teams." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 26(2): 360-376.

- Cortina, L., & J.L. Berdahl. 2008. "Sexual Harassment in Organizations: A Decade of Research in Review." Pp. 469-97 in *The SAGE Handbook of Organizational Behavior: Volume 1 Micro Approaches*, edited by J. Barling and C.L. Cooper. London: Sage Publications.
- Cortina, L. M. & Areguin, M. A. 2021. "Putting People Down and Pushing Them Out: Sexual Harassment in the Workplace." *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior* 8: 285-309.
- Fitzgerald, L. F. & Cortina, L.M. 2018. "Sexual Harassment in Work Organizations: A View from the 21st Century. *APA Handbook of the Psychology of Women: Perspectives on Women's Private And Public Lives*, Vol. 2. Washington, DC, US, American Psychological Association: 215-234.
- Goodman, Lisa A., & Deborah Epstein. 2008. *Listening to Battered Women: A Survivor-Centered Approach to Advocacy, Mental Health, and Justice*. Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.
- Greeson, M. R., Campbell, R., Bybee, D., & Kennedy, A. C. 2016. "Improving the Community Response to Sexual Assault: An Empirical Examination of the Effectiveness of Sexual Assault Response Teams." *Psychology of Violence* 6(2): 280.
- Guckenheimer, D. 2021. "What Are We Going to Do with a Penis in the Room?: Rape Crisis Centers and Treatment of Transgender Survivors." Pp. 299-319 in *Sexual and Gender Minority Health* (Perry & LeBlanc eds.) Leeds: Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Herbert, J. L., & Bromfield, L. 2019. "Better Together? A Review of Evidence for Multi-Disciplinary Teams Responding to Physical and Sexual Child Abuse." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 20(2): 214-228.
- Herman, J. 2005. "Justice from a Victim's Perspective." *Violence Against Women* 11(5):571-602.
- Herman, J. 2023. *Truth and Repair: How Trauma Survivors Envision Justice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Hirsch, J. S. and Khan, S. 2020. *Sexual Citizens: A Landmark Study of Sex, Power, and Assault on Campus*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Holland, K. J., & Cortina, L.M.. 2017. "'It happens to girls all the time': Examining sexual assault survivors' reasons for not using campus supports." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 59(1-2):50-64.
- Ilies, R., Hauserman, N. Schwochau, S. and Stibal, J. 2003. "Reported Incidence Rates of Work-Related Sexual Harassment in The United States: Using Meta-Analysis To Explain Reported Rate Disparities." *Personnel Psychology* 56(3):607-31.

- Iwasaki, M., Picchiello, M. C., Morgan, C. H., & Henninger, A. L. 2023. "Voices of Female Sexual Assault Survivors: Striving for Survivor-Centered Reporting Processes in the US Criminal Justice System." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 47(1): 65-79.
- Karp, D. R., Shackford-Bradley, J. Wilson, R. and Williamsen, K.M. 2016. "Campus PRISM: A Report on Promoting Restorative Initiatives for Sexual Misconduct on College Campuses." Saratoga Springs, NY: Skidmore College Project on Restorative Justice.
- Karp, D. R., & Sacks, C. 2014. "Student Conduct, Restorative Justice, and Student Development: Findings from the STARR Project." *Contemporary Justice Review* 17(2): 154-172.
- Khan, S., Hirsch, J. Wamboldt, A. and Mellins, C. 2018. "'I Didn't Want To Be 'That Girl'": The Social Risks of Labeling, Telling, and Reporting Sexual Assault." *Sociological Science* 5:432-60.
- Koss, M. P. 2014. "The RESTORE Program of Restorative Justice for Sex Crimes: Vision, Process, and Outcomes." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 29(9):1623-60.
- Koss, M. P., Wilgus, J.K. & Williamsen, K.M. 2014. "Campus Sexual Misconduct: Restorative Justice Approaches to Enhance Compliance With Title IX Guidance." *Trauma, Violence & Abuse* 15(3):242-57.
- Koss, M. P., White, J. W., & Lopez, E. C. 2017. "Victim Voice in Reenvisioning Responses to Sexual and Physical Violence Nationally and Internationally." *American Psychologist* 72(9): 1019.
- Laing, L. 2017. "Secondary Victimization: Domestic Violence Survivors Navigating the Family Law System." *Violence Against Women* 23(11): 1314-1335.
- McGuire, M. J., Sabo, D. B., & Klingenstein, J. 2022. "Envisioning a Better Victim Response: Survivor-Centered Advocacy, Destigmatization, Collaboration, and Accountability." Pp. 396-416 in *Sexual Assault Kits and Reforming the Response to Rape*. London: Routledge (edited by Lovell & Langhinrichsen-Rohling).
- McMahon, S. M., Williamsen, K. M., Mitchell, H.B. & Kleven, A. 2023. "Initial Reports From Early Adopters of Restorative Justice for Reported Cases of Campus Sexual Misconduct: A Qualitative Study." *Violence Against Women* 29(6-7):1183-205.
- Méndez, X. 2020. "Beyond Nassar: A Transformative Justice and Decolonial Feminist Approach to Campus Sexual Assault." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 41:82.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2018. *Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.

- Nichols, A. J. 2013. "Survivor-Defined Practices to Mitigate Revictimization of Battered Women in the Protective Order Process." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 28(7): 1403-1423.
- Porter, K. 2022. "Speaking into Silence: Intersections of Identity, Legality, and Black Women's Decision to Report Sexual Assault on Campus." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan.
- Robins, S. 2018. "The Spirit of Restorative Justice: An Interview with Sujatha Baliga." *Syndicated from [stillharbor.org](https://www.dailygood.org/story/1900/the-spirit-of-restorative-justice-an-interview-with-sujatha-baliga-sebastian-robins/), <https://www.dailygood.org/story/1900/the-spirit-of-restorative-justice-an-interview-with-sujatha-baliga-sebastian-robins/>.*
- Robinson, A., Hudson, K., & Brookman, F. 2008. "Multi-Agency Work on Sexual Violence: Challenges and Prospects Identified From the Implementation of a Sexual Assault Referral Centre (SARC)." *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 47(4): 411-428.
- Rosenthal, M. N., Smidt, A.M. & Freyd, J. 2016. "Still Second Class: Sexual Harassment of Graduate Students." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 40(3):364-77.
- Schneider, B. Ehrhart, M.G., & Macey, W.H. 2013. "Organizational Climate and Culture." *Annual Review of Psychology* 64: 361-388.
- Smidt, A. M., Adams-Clark, A. A., & Freyd, J. J. 2023. "Institutional Courage Buffers Against Institutional Betrayal, Protects Employee Health, and Fosters Organizational Commitment Following Workplace Sexual Harassment." *Plos one* 18(1): e0278830.
- Smith, S. G., Chen, J., Basile, K. C., Gilbert, L. K., Merrick, M. T., Patel, N., Walling, M., & Jain, A. 2017. *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS):2010–2012*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Smith, C. P., & Freyd, J. J. 2013. "Dangerous Safe Havens: Institutional Betrayal Exacerbates Sexual Trauma." *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 26(1): 119-124.
- Weist, M. D., Kinney, L., Taylor, L. K., Pollitt-Hill, J., Bryant, Y., Anthony, L., & Wilkerson, J. 2014. "African American and White Women's Experience of Sexual Assault and Services for Sexual Assault." *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma* 23(9): 901-916.
- Williamsen, K., & Wessel, E. S. 2023. "Introduction." Pp. 1-11 in *Applying Restorative Justice to Campus Sexual Misconduct: A Guide to Emerging Practices*, edited by Kaaren M. Williamsen and Erik S. Wessel. New York: Routledge.

Appendix A

CCRT Co-Leads and Working Group Membership

CO-LEADS

Tamiko Strickman, Special Advisor to the President and Executive Director, Equity, Civil Rights & Title IX Office

Tami Strickman currently serves as Special Advisor to the President and Executive Director of the Equity, Civil Rights and Title IX office (ECRT.) Tami is responsible for supporting the university's efforts to comply with federal and state civil rights, including Title IX.

Rebecca Leitman Veidlinger, Title IX Attorney and Consultant (external advisor)

Rebecca Leitman Veidlinger is an attorney in private practice specializing in Title IX and the institutional prevention of, and response to, gender-based discrimination, sexual harassment, and sexual violence.

Sandra R. Levitsky, Arthur F. Thurnau Professor and Associate Professor of Sociology

Sandra Levitsky is an Arthur F. Thurnau Professor and Associate Professor of Sociology. Her research focuses on gender-based discrimination, American social policy, political mobilization, and the relationship between law and social change.

2023 CCRT WORKING GROUP MEMBERS

REPAIRING HARM WORKING GROUP

Charge

The Repairing Harm Working Group was established to examine how to restore institutional trust, repair harm to survivors, repair harm to units, how to reintegrate respondents into the University community, and understand intersectional harm.

Co-Chairs

- Karla Goldman, Professor of Social Work, Ann Arbor Campus
- Ramonda Kindle, Alumni

Membership

- Allison Alexy, Associate Professor of Asian Languages and Cultures & Women's and Gender Studies, Ann Arbor Campus
- Pamela Aronson, Professor of Sociology, Department of Behavior Sciences, Dearborn Campus
- Devin Berghorst, Assistant Dean of Students, The Dean of Student Office, Ann Arbor Campus
- Tom Braun, Professor of Biostatistics; Chair of SACUA, Ann Arbor Campus
- Lydia Kado, Undergraduate student, Ann Arbor Campus
- Sandra Levitsky, Arthur F Thurnau Professor & Associate Professor of Sociology, Ann Arbor Campus
- Patrick McEville, Associate Director for Survivor Support and Advocacy, Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, Ann Arbor Campus
- Richard Tolman, Sheldon D. Rose Collegiate Professor, School of Social Work, Ann Arbor Campus
- Ceirra Venzor, Case Manager & Advocate, Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, Ann Arbor Campus

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES WORKING GROUP

Charge

Organizational structures provide the foundation of standard operating processes and routines for the University. These structures profoundly affect organizational decision-making and action. Organizational structures also help shape the perspective through which individuals see their organization and its environment. The OS team was tasked with providing recommendations on how U-M can reorganize current University structures to better meet the diverse needs of the U-M community with respect to addressing sexual misconduct and gender-based violence. For the purposes of the CCRT objectives, the OS team defined the purview of organizational structures as containing University elements of role development, resource allocation, task coordination, culture management, leadership/supervision requirements, and structural modes needed to achieve CCRT aims.

Co-Chairs

- Nadia Bazy, Director of the Office of Multi-Ethnic Student Affairs (MESA), Ann Arbor Campus
- Julie Evans, Program Manager for Research, Well-being, and Diversity, Equity & Inclusion, Michigan Medicine, Ann Arbor Campus

Membership

- Elizabeth A. Armstrong, Sherry B. Ortner Collegiate Professor of Sociology, Ann Arbor Campus
- Jesse Beal, Director of the U-M Spectrum Center, Ann Arbor Campus
- Keisha Alise-Gipson Blevins, Chief of Staff & Chief Diversity and Inclusion Officer, Dearborn Campus
- Jacquindre Brown, Undergraduate student & Director for UM-Flint Student Government, Flint Campus
- Colleen Conway, Professor of Music Education, Ann Arbor Campus
- Susan Dwyer Ernst, Chief of Gynecology and Sexual Health, University Health Service, Medical Advisor for Gender-Based Violence, ECRT and Associate Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ann Arbor Campus
- Pamela Heatlie, Title IX Coordinator & Director of the Equity, Civil Rights & Title IX Office, Dearborn Campus
- Tom Kent, Associate General Counsel, Ann Arbor Campus
- Kimberly Thomas, Clinical Professor of Law, Ann Arbor Campus
- Tami Strickman, Special Advisor to the President & Executive Director, Equity, Civil Rights and Title IX Office, Ann Arbor Campus
- Kaaren Williamsen, Director of Prevention, Education, Assistance, Resources Department, Ann Arbor Campus
- Anthony Webster Jr, Associate Director in the Division of Student Affairs, Flint Campus

OBSTACLES TO REPORTING WORKING GROUP

Charge

The Obstacles to Reporting group was charged with identifying the barriers and assessing wide-ranging strategies, tactics, and structures to harness the benefits of reporting while also minimizing the potential for institutional harm to reporters. The group was tasked with providing recommendations that align with the following four charges:

1. Identifying and responding to general obstacles to reporting
2. Identifying specific obstacles to reporting for marginalized communities
3. Examining how to eliminate retaliation.
4. Transforming the culture of reporting from adjudication to support

Co-Chairs

- Karin Muraszko, Professor of Neurosurgery, Michigan Medicine, Ann Arbor Campus
- Paula Williams, Police Lieutenant, Department of Public Safety and Security, Ann Arbor Campus

Membership

- Nicole Banks, Associate Dean of Students, Department of Student Affairs, Ann Arbor Campus
- Sascha Matish, Associate Vice Provost for Academic and Faculty Affairs and Senior Director, Academic Human Resources, Ann Arbor Campus
- Andrea Berry McDaniel, Deputy Director and Deputy Title IX Coordinator, Equity, Civil Rights & Title IX Office, Dearborn Campus
- Amy Merkle, Sexual Assault Services Coordinator, SafeHouse Center, Ann Arbor
- Amy Reiser, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, Washtenaw County
- Shelagh Saènz, Senior Project Manager, Michigan Medicine Wellness Office, Ann Arbor Campus
- Elizabeth Seney, Director, Sexual & Gender-Based Misconduct & Title IX Coordinator, Equity, Civil Rights & Title IX office, Ann Arbor Campus
- Tangela Smith, Case Manager and Advocate, Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, Ann Arbor Campus
- Kirstie Stroble, Director, Equity, Civil Rights & Title IX Office, Flint Campus
- Eric Ward, Assistant Managing Project Representative, UM Office of Research and Sponsored Projects, Ann Arbor Campus

PREVENTION & EDUCATION WORKING GROUP

Charge

Collaborating with the Coordinated Community Response Team (CCRT), community members have pinpointed the following areas for attention within the realm of prevention and education:

1. Amplify attention to identities in sexual and gender-based misconduct (SGBM) prevention and education programs
2. Improve SGBM training for faculty and staff
3. Improve SGBM prevention and education for students

Throughout its work, this group has been attentive to the University's existing structures, personnel, and resources dedicated to sexual misconduct prevention and education. By conducting comprehensive data collection and research, the group has sought to identify the University's current strengths in this domain and build upon them. Additionally, they have identified potential gaps in the current prevention and education system and areas where enhancements or changes could be beneficial. The ultimate goal is to formulate innovative recommendations that will assist the University in transforming its efforts to enhance prevention and educate the U-M community on issues of SGBM.

Co-Chairs

- Abigail Eiler, Clinical Associate Professor of Social Work, Ann Arbor Campus
- Felicia McCrary, Assistant Director for SGBM Programs, Office of Student Conflict Resolution, Ann Arbor Campus

Membership

- Rose Beck, Alumni
- Gabriella Boufford, Counselor at the Center for the Education of Women+, Ann Arbor Campus
- Carrie Brezine, Assistant Director of Institutional Research, Rackham Graduate School, Ann Arbor Campus
- Shareia Carter, Director, Center for Social Justice and Inclusion, Dearborn Campus

- Simone Dixon, Project Manager, Violence Prevention and Confidential Support Center for Social Justice and Inclusion, Dearborn Campus
- Samara Hough, Director, Center for Gender and Sexuality, Division of Student Affairs and Adjunct Lecturer in Social Work, Flint Campus
- Anne Huhman, Director of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, Ann Arbor Campus
- Ambria Hutton, Undergraduate student, Dearborn Campus
- Nathan Sadowsky, Graduate Coordinator, Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Ann Arbor Campus
- Matt Snyder, Communications Specialist, Human Resources, Ann Arbor Campus
- Rebecca Leitman Veidlinger, CCRT External Co-Chair, Title IX Attorney

Appendix B

Working Group Data Review and Considerations

REPAIRING HARM WORKING GROUP

Members of the Repairing Harm working group conducted an exhaustive review of empirical research on the prevalence and reporting of campus sexual misconduct, as well as the uses and effectiveness of restorative justice practices.

We reviewed models of restorative justice administered by other colleges and universities.

In August of 2023, the CCRT hosted a half-day summit meeting of CCRT working group members and campus stakeholders interested in restorative justice at the University of Michigan. Stakeholders included:

- Kaaren Williamsen, Director of Prevention, Education, Assistance, Resources Department in ECRT
- Carrie Landrum, Adaptable Resolution and Restorative Practices Lead, ECRT
- Rachel Sawatzky, PEAR Specialist, ECRT
- Anne Huhman, Director SAPAC
- Jim McEvily, Associate Director of Survivor Support & Advocacy, SAPAC
- Sarah Daniels, Associate Dean of Students
- Devin Berghorst, Assistant Dean of Students
- Erik Wessel, Director, Office of Student Conflict Resolution
- Michael Ryan, Associate Director for the Office of Student Conflict Resolution
- Felicia McCrary, Assistant Director Sexual and Gender-Based Misconduct Programs, Office of Student Conflict Resolution
- Ellen Grachek, Director of Academic Labor Relations
- Grace Sekulidis, Program Manager, Adaptable Conflict Resolution, Office of Student Conflict Resolution
- Joe Zichi, Well-Being Collective Lead
- Patty Griffin, Director, Conduct, Conflict Resolution, and Covid Response, Michigan Housing
- Diamond Woodland, Associate Director, Housing Student Conduct & Conflict Resolution, Michigan Housing
- Nicola Saliendra, Associate Director, Diversity and Inclusion, Michigan Housing
- Mallory Martin-Ferguson, Director of Graduate Student and Programs Consultation Services, Rackham
- Richard Tolman, Sheldon D. Rose Collegiate Professor of Social Work
- Tom Braun, Professor of Biostatistics, School of Public Health; Chair of SACUA
- Allison Alexy, Associate Professor of Women's & Gender Studies
- Ramonda Kindle, UM Alumni, Co-Chair of CCRT Repairing Harm Working Group

Meeting participants considered the objectives, scope, and organizational structure of a proposed Center for Restorative Justice at the University of Michigan. The core areas of consensus among stakeholders are represented in the recommendations.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURES WORKING GROUP

The working group members conducted knowledge gathering from team members and other key representatives at U-M Flint, U-M Dearborn, U-M Ann Arbor, and Michigan Medicine:

U-M Internal Knowledge Partners

- Pedro Coracides, LLMSW - PEAR Specialist
- Chris Harris, JD - Deputy Title IX Coordinator Michigan Medicine
- Jim McEvilly, LMSW - Assistant Director for Survivor Support and Advocacy (SAPAC)
- Anne Katherine Huhman - Director of SAPAC
- Karin Muraszko, MD - Professor of Neurological Surgery Michigan Medicine, CCRT Co-chair Obstacles to Reporting
- Shelagh Saenz, LPC, NCC - Senior Project Manager Michigan Medicine Wellness Office, CCRT Obstacles to Reporting
- Krista Stelmaszek, Performance Consultant U-M Organizational Learning
- Melissa Cunningham, Michigan Medicine Office of Patient Experience
- Julie Piazza, Michigan Medicine Office of Patient Experience
- Felicia McCrary, Assistant Director for Sexual and Gender-Based Misconduct (SGBM) Programs within the Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR), CCRT Co-Chair Prevention and Education Working Group
- Abigail Eiler, Clinical Associate Professor of Social Work, and Director of Undergraduate Minor Programs, School of Social Work, CCRT Co-Chair Prevention and Education Working Group

The working group members conducted knowledge gathering from external resources:

- Tana Fedewa, Director of the Michigan State University Center for Survivors

The group also examined external models and practices:

- Harvard University Center for Gender Equity
- MIT Institute Discrimination and Harassment Response Office
- Mayo Clinic College of Medicine and Science (MCCMS) Education Programs
- Michigan State University Center for Survivors
- Mount Sinai Sexual Assault and Violence Intervention Program
- Rutgers University Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance Office & Center for Research on Ending Violence
- University of California – Berkeley Path to Care Center
- University of Minnesota Aurora Center for Advocacy and Education

OBSTACLES TO REPORTING WORKING GROUP

The Obstacles to Reporting group held approximately fourteen meetings, including a half-day retreat to identify our recommendations. During these meetings, we identified the need to learn 1) the definition of reporting, 2) existing policies surrounding reporting, 3) pathways community members have to report, and 4) potential barriers.

To answer these questions, we hosted guest speakers from Equity, Civil Rights and Title IX (ECRT), UM Police Department (UMPD), the Washtenaw County Prosecutors Office (WCSO), the Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC) and the Spectrum Center.

Using a human-centered design thinking approach in a half-day focused working group, we examined the problems exposed through our research and interviews, scoped the problems to identify common themes and pain points, brainstormed on major themes through a series of activities, and selected ideas that exhibited most impact and feasibility.

In the design-thinking process, four prominent reporting obstacle themes emerged, and the group formed sub-groups to perform deeper dives into these themes:

1. Reduce retaliation and address fears of retaliation for victims, witnesses, reporters, and anyone involved in the process;
2. Improve communication, education, and transparency around the reporting process, resources, and retaliation policy;
3. Provide comprehensive and diversified support before, during, and after the reporting process;
4. Elevate awareness and importance of reporting for the health of the greater community by assigning responsibility to leaders for creating an open environment.

These subgroups held additional meetings to conduct focused work to develop recommendations specific to their theme. Recommendations are outlined below and address the interwoven multi-layers that impact barriers at the individual, operational, and institutional levels. Because of their interconnectedness, changes in any of these areas are anticipated to improve and impact outcomes at all three levels through ease of use, transparency and understanding, re-establishing trust, and improved wrap-around care.

PREVENTION & EDUCATION WORKING GROUP

The Prevention and Education Working Group met as a full group 16 times from January 2023 - November 2023. Several subcommittee meetings were scheduled outside of workgroup meetings to utilize the expertise and dive deeper into the working group's three charges. In addition to workgroup meetings, a full-day retreat was held in June 2023 with several internal campus programs to explore the strengths and areas for improvement for sexual misconduct and gender-based violence programs, policies, and initiatives. Co-chairs met biweekly to discuss progress, as well as to serve as open office hours for committee members to review their recommendations.

Our data review consisted of learning from individuals currently doing prevention and education work and collecting information about the specific prevention programs currently offered on all three campuses. Our efforts highlight our U-M practitioners' ongoing work of conducting listening sessions with students, benchmarking with peer institutions, and reviewing evaluations and reports representing student experience. Additionally, our working group conducted a brainstorming SWOT analysis regarding each of the charges to identify areas of focus for this working group.

We sent outreach to units on all three campuses to collect prevention and education materials (e.g., training, workshops, handouts) utilized with students, staff, and faculty. We collected articles commonly referenced by prevention and education staff in their day-to-day work. Both can be reviewed in references. Additionally, colleagues from U-M Flint and U-M Dearborn shared the most recent Climate Studies (2017, 2018), Clery Reports, and specific programming data.

We met with the following individuals:

- Anne Huhman, Director, Sexual Assault Prevention & Awareness Program (member of working group)
- Beth Manning, Director of U-M Flint Human Resources

- Christy Simonian-Bean, Associate Director, CLRT Theatre Program, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching
- Elizabeth Armstrong, Sherry B. Ortner Collegiate Professor of Sociology
- Jacquelyn Hippe, Program Manager for Prevention Education: Community and Graduate Student Engagement, Sexual Assault Prevention & Awareness Program
- Joe Zichi, Well-being Collective Lead, UHS
- Jordan Stevens, Program Manager for Prevention Education and First-Year Programs, Sexual Assault Prevention & Awareness Program
- Kaaren Williamson, Director, Prevention Education Assistance and Resources, Equity Civil Rights and Title IX
- Kaylie Straka, Title IX Coordinator of U-M Flint ECRT
- Kelsey Cavanagh-Strong, Program Manager for Student Engagement, Sexual Assault Prevention & Awareness Program
- Lilia Cortina, University Diversity and Social Transformation Professor of Psychology and Women's & Gender Studies; Expert in the science of sexual harassment
- Samara Hough, Director, Center for Gender and Sexuality (CGS), Division of Student Affairs and Adjunct Lecturer in Social Work, U-M Flint (member of working group)
- Sarah Devitt, Sexual Assault Advocate for U-M Flint CGS
- Sebastian Capp, Program Manager for Prevention Education and Men's Engagement, Sexual Assault Prevention & Awareness Program
- Shareia Carter, Director, Center for Social Justice and Inclusion, U-M Dearborn (member of working group)
- Simone Dixon, Project Manager, Violence Prevention and Confidential Support, Center for Social Justice and Inclusion, U-M Dearborn (member of working group)
- Sophie Walters, Assistant Director, Prevention Education Assistance and Resources, Equity Civil Rights and Title IX

Appendix C

Suggested Stakeholder Appointments to Task Force on Michigan Center for Survivor Resources

To implement the CCRT's recommendation for a new Michigan Center for Survivor Resources, the CCRT recommends the creation of a task force. We recommend that the task force include representatives from the following units:

- Prevention, Education, Assistance and Resources (PEAR)
- Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS)
- University Health Service (UHS)
- Sexual Assault Prevention & Awareness Center (SAPAC)
- Dean of Students
- Equity, Civil Rights, and Title IX Office (ECRT)
- Student Leaders from the Ann Arbor, Dearborn, and Flint Campuses
- Spectrum Center
- Office of Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion
- Dearborn Campus Staff/Faculty
- Flint Campus Staff/Faculty
- Academic and Faculty Affairs
- Voices of the Staff
- Communications
- Development
- Office of General Counsel

Appendix D

Proposal Budget for Undergraduate Course/Pilot Study

University of Michigan Proposal Budget					
PI Detail Budget Summary					
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Cumulative
	09/01/24 08/31/25	09/01/25 08/31/26	09/01/26 08/31/27	09/01/27 08/31/28	
Personnel	17,447	4,493	4,627	4,766	31,333
Sandra Levitsky	16,456	4,237	4,365	4,495	29,553
Lecturer, TBD	103,000	-	-	-	103,000
Peer Facilitator, TBD Peer	7,416	-	-	-	7,416
Facilitator, TBD Peer Facilitator,	7,416	-	-	-	7,416
TBD Peer Facilitator, TBD	7,416	-	-	-	7,416
Evaluation Team, TBD	7,416	-6,216	-6,403	-6,595	7,416
Grader, TBD	6,035	-	-	-	25,249
Salaries	9,888	14,946	15,395	15,856	9,888
	182,490				228,687
Fringe Benefits	44,557	3,095	3,188	3,284	54,124
Participant Support	187,000	66,000	66,000	66,000	385,000
Other Direct Costs					
Materials/Supplies Development	11,000	-	-	-	11,000
and Planning	2,000	-	-	-	2,000
Total Direct Costs	\$427,047	\$84,041	\$84,583	\$85,140	\$680,811
Total Costs Requested	\$427,047	\$84,041	\$84,583	\$85,140	\$680,811
Person-Months Per Year					
Personnel:	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	
Sandra Levitsky	1.00	0.25	0.25	0.25	SM
Abigail Eiler	1.00	0.25	0.25	0.25	SM
Lecturer, TBD	9.00	-	-	-	AY