

# 2018-2019 Assessment Final Report

## Department: Sexual Assault Prevention and Education Center

---

### Jayhawks Give A Flock (Bystander Intervention) Program Assessment

#### Introduction

#### Assessment Project Description

The development of a pro-social bystander intervention culture is imperative in primary prevention work on college campuses. Participants will come to understand that everyone has an important role to play in the intervention and prevention of sexual violence. The participants will be given scenarios and asked to practice intervention strategies and share their observations with others. This program focuses on skills such as understanding appropriate levels of intervention, being mindful of personal safety, and different personal options bystanders have depending on the nature of the situation.

#### Service/Program Student Learning Outcome(s)

Students participating in Jayhawks Give A Flock will be able to...

- Identify risky situations where bystander intervention could be needed
- Develop strategies to facilitate safe bystander intervention as an individual
- Apply strategies to facilitate safe bystander intervention as a group
- Recognize prevalence of sexual violence as a serious campus issue
- Demonstrate an increased confidence in ability to support survivors and hold offenders accountable
- 

#### Population/Sample:

All participating student will have the opportunity to complete the assessment. Selected populations include but are not limited to Adidas Scholars, UNIV 101 students, Options students, Housing Student Staff, Greek Life, Athletics, and student groups training request. Student IDs are tracked to avoid participant and assessment duplication.

Out of 4,036 participants in AY18, 3,560 completed the assessment.

#### Assessment Method(s):

Electronic and/or paper Survey for immediate pre and post assessment at each training session. Electronic Survey for 8-10 week post assessment.

# 2018-2019 Assessment Final Report

## Department: Sexual Assault Prevention and Education Center

---

### **Summary of Key Findings/Results**

Students. The total number of students to complete JGAF was 4,036. Of those, 3,560 filled out a preassessment survey. The mean age was 18.28 (SD=1.535). As expected, the majority (80%; n=2,841) of the students were 18 years old, 11% (n=396) were 19 years old and 4% (n=142) were 17 years old. The minimum age was 16 and the maximum was 52 years of age. 55% (n=1982) were women, 45% (n=1561) were men and less than one percent identified as non-binary. 16 fraternity chapters attended JGAF.

A follow up survey was sent via email to all students who participated in JGAF on August 18th. 393 students completed the follow up survey aimed to learn more about their experience (e.g., satisfaction, relevance of the material, perceived value). Quantitative items included measures of the utility of the content, and facilitator competency. Qualitative items included questions to assess aspects of the workshop that the students thought were beneficial and aspects of the workshop that could be improved. Some example items that assessed value of the content included “Information in the JGAF workshop applied to me,” “I feel I will use this information during my time as a KU student” and “I learned valuable information” Response items were on a 7 point Likert scale and ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The majority of students reported that they learned valuable information. Specifically, 78% (n=232) indicated that they “Strongly Agreed” or “Moderately Agreed” with the item “I learned valuable content.” One student reported “I did learn valuable information. It was a little long, but it still was necessary. I learned the words that would come out of someone’s mouth that might be sexually assaulting that will help me be aware.” For more specific item results see Table 3.

A little over the majority (56%) of students stated that they “Strongly Agreed” with the item “I would recommend JGAF to future incoming students, while 17% moderately agreed, 9% slightly agreed, 10% were neutral, 3% slightly disagreed and 5% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed.”

# 2018-2019 Assessment Final Report

## Department: Sexual Assault Prevention and Education Center

---

When asked “How would you rate the workshop overall,” 46% of students rated it as “good”, 39% as excellent, 13% as “average”, 1.6% as “poor” and less than one percent as “terrible.”

### Conclusions

It is crucial that future JGAF implementations keep improving. For this reason, we must ask what are the current strengths of JGAF and what can we change? Specifically, how can we take what we have learned from the student and facilitators and apply it to future prevention education implementation? Logistical improvements include better communication across student departments (e.g., athletics and marching band) to ensure student attendance. This includes working with those organizations to reduce the likelihood of holding activities/practices that conflict with the time of JGAF. Another logistical improvement includes reducing advertising costs by learning what advertising methods were most effective for students/parents this year.

Based on the student feedback, it is clear that JGAF had many strengths including the real world examples provided to students, the interactive scenarios in which students applied active bystander skills, and the workshop environment that was created for students to feel free discuss their perspectives. Given these strengths, and the desire expressed by some students for it to be even more interactive, future JGAF implementations could enhance discussion based activities throughout the workshop (instead of predominantly at the end) and possibly limit some of the lecture portion. Based on the facilitator feedback, future JGAF implementation should provide facilitators with more information ahead of time, such as who their co-facilitator will be and if they will be leading an all-male identified session. This will allow facilitators time to prepare and/or to change sessions if it they feel it will be difficult for them to manage, as was indicated by some of the facilitators who led sessions of all male identified students. Given the fact that many facilitators indicated difficulty with facilitating/fostering discussion with all-male identified sessions, it is important to consider how we can strive to overcome this difficulty.

One facilitator found it helpful when an older member of a fraternity came and sat in on the session. It could be beneficial to have an older member of the fraternity attend the JGAF with the incoming freshman in their fraternity. Another possibility is to

# 2018-2019 Assessment Final Report

## Department: Sexual Assault Prevention and Education Center

---

assign male identified facilitators to all-male identified sessions, which could enhance relatability, however, due to the number of male facilitators, this is not always feasible. In terms of material and content, the facilitators had positive feedback overall but would have liked to see more detail on the topic of sexual consent. Although SAPEC has a separate workshop dedicated to sexual consent education, it may be important to expand on the topic of sexual consent (e.g., what constitutes consent) in JGAF in order to increase knowledge and awareness. However, this may be difficult due to time constraints.

One major way to improve future JGAF implementation is to allow more time for each session, time in between sessions and time for students to arrive/check in. This may mean creating a whole day for JGAF instead of from 8am to 2pm. The facilitator feedback suggested that students coming in late due to a slow check in process detracted from the workshop. In addition, those tardy students did not get the full workshop experience. Finally, more time in between sessions would allow facilitators to relax and reboot for the next session. This is especially important given that many facilitators taught the maximum number of sessions.

Additional results of the impact and effectiveness of JGAF will be communicated to administrators, policy makers, and researchers via webinars and research conferences. Journal articles and conference presentations will be used to disseminate findings of the impact of JGAF to fellow researchers as well as other campuses looking to deliver a similar intervention.