Rackham Student Government
Board Meeting: March 12, 2013

Agenda

I. Call To Order
II. Approval of Agenda
III. Community Input: Serge Farnas, TBA
IV. Approval of Previous Minutes
   a. February 19, 2012* (p. 2)
V. Officer Reports
   a. Graduate Student Body President, Michael
   b. Graduate Student Body Vice President, Kaitlin
   c. Graduate Student Body Treasurer, Phil
VI. Director Reports
   a. Election Director, Dan Trubman
   b. Events Director, Ryan Roberts
VII. Committee Updates
   a. Academic Affairs* (p. 5)
   b. Budgetary
   c. COSAC* (p. 8)
   d. Elections
   e. Legislative Affairs* (p. 11)
   f. Student Life
   g. Grad. Gala * (p. 9)
   h. J-COM
VIII. Academic Calendar for 2015 – 2016 Academic Year
IX. SAGE Issues Update
X. SAGE Delegation
XI. Student Safety Working Group Report and Recommendations
XII. Open Discussion
XIII. Adjournment

* - Item included in packet
** - Item will be provided on Day of Meeting or at Meeting
*** - Item was included in a previous packet
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT
BOARD MEETING
2/19/13
RACKHAM GRADUATE BUILDING
2ND FLOOR WEST CONFERENCE ROOM, NORTH ALCOVE
7:34 P.M.

a. CALL TO ORDER: 7:34pm

b. Present: Kaitlin Flynn, Michael Benson, Dan Trubman, Michael Lang, Ryan Roberts, Ryne Peterson, Pete McGrath, David Barton, Anna Belak, Chris Tom, Eugene Daneshvar, Alex Gutierrez, Vanessa Cruz, Evan Arthur

c. Absent: Lauren Knapp

d. Excused: Phil Saccone, Janakiraman Balachandran, Yiting Zhang, John Forrest, Matt Filter

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

a. Moved by Pete and seconded by Ryne. Approved unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES, 2/12/13

a. Moved by Pete and seconded by Michael. Approved with two abstentions.

IV. OFFICER REPORTS

a. President Michael Benson. Last week the second half of the CSG case was adjudicated by CSJ. They filed a number of requests regarding our operations and the bylaws. The outcome was that RSG can no longer appoint graduate students to University committees and appointments must go through CSG. A couple of guest speakers will be coming in the next few weeks, offices from SAPAC, Beyond the Diag, Security, etc. Steven Apotheker has resigned from the board and Michael has accepted his resignation.

b. Vice President Kaitlin Flynn. Newsletter went out last week and another going out soon. Kaitlin was approached by a member of CSG re: entrepreneurial experiences for graduate students.

c. Treasurer Phil Saccone. $16,900 projected total for the account, SOAS has still not deposited our student fees into our account. Current amount is around $13,000.

V. Event’s Director Report

a. Valentine’s day event was really well attended.

VI. Appointment of Winter 2013 Elections Director
a. Motion by Pete and seconded by David to confirm Michael’s appointment of Dan and Michael Lang as Election Director and assistant ED, respectively. Approved with 2 abstentions.

VII. Committee Updates
a. Academics: committee meeting tomorrow at 6:30pm.
b. Budgetary: Minutes included in the packet, motion to receive and approve by Dan and seconded by Pete. Approved and received with one abstention.
c. COSAC: Michael has participated in WolverineExpress, an outreach effort to get children oriented to science. FOCUS:Hope event had 22 people, boarded up 10 houses and cleaned up an entire block. Want to set some goals: try to get 1,000 volunteer hours as an organization. Over 100 so far this year.
d. Elections: Dan and Michael are the new Elections Directors, elections in late March.
e. Legislative Affairs: The committee meets tomorrow. Committee is working on a variety of issues, both local, state and federal and items will be included in the packet as they become available.
f. Student Life: Stoplight event went really well. Discussion around the student life minutes ensues. Motion by Pete and seconded by Ryne. Approved.
g. GPC: The poll went out with the newsletter last week. Those suggestions will be taken into account as well.
h. JCOM: Working on selecting a meeting time, hopefully next week.

VIII. Campus Safety Discussion—
a. Building Accessibility: BSRB accessibility for inner doors (currently lock at 7pm).
b. After Hours Transportation: Kaitlin talked to some constituents who work around the medical campus and none of them were aware of or use Blue Cab or worry too much about after hours transportation. Michael brings up that there is no place for these students to call for Blue Cab on medical campuses. Dan brings up Night Ride by AATA. Vanessa asks what companies might be involved in the taxi sexual assaults. Michael responds with an explanation about limo vs taxi services and how they can be regulated by the City taxi board. SafeRide is a 1mi radius anywhere from campus. Kaitlin says that there should be a graduate student safety email.
c. Personal Safety: Vanessa asks about adding more lights on Thompson, and heading towards Trotter on south U. Michael writes them down.
d. Graduate Student Programs: Send out a newsletter.

IX. Major Events Discussion
a. Bowling 3/16: will need a few volunteers for that, let Ryan R know if you’re interested.
b. SAGE 4/13: trip to lobby on the Hill, April 13-17.
c. Gala: Could be planned for late Spring or Fall.
d. Town Halls: Late March or early April.
e. **IP seminar**: Hosting a Rackham wide event, Eugene will work with AAC and Ryan.

X. **Graduate student Governance:**
   a. Michael included the President’s notes from the SAGE roundtable. Lots of discussion on educational initiatives, the structure of graduate student governance at each school, etc.
   b. Michael also includes the undergraduate and graduate student government structure at Berkeley. Michael has approached CSG President Manish and Manish was generally supportive for the representation piece but not supportive for the monetary split.

XI. **Open Discussion**
   a. **Eugene**: GEO is negotiating a new contract with the University. He asks if we as graduate students in general are under a contract. He also asks if this would be an opportunity to move any RSG initiatives forward, for instance IP rights. Michael responds that we might be able to make changes on IP issues through the GSBOR. Eugene finds some issue with the fact that contract status is ambiguous. Kaitlin mentions that it varies by program. Eugene makes a point about how GEO is one of the organizations that bargains on the behalf of student employees. Michael clarifies the role of GEO and mentions that a lot of the legwork happens in RSG committee meetings.
   b. **Pete**: asks if there are organizations we might want to get involved with at a COSAC level. Ryne suggests finding resources regarding composting. Kaitlin suggests education, outreach, natural resource cleaning trips, etc. Chris mentions academic issues.
   c. **Ryne**: some of his constituents have complained about the status of the gyms. Michael mentions that a group of students as well as Building a Better Michigan have been pushing the Reagents to approve an increase in student fees for this measure. Michael mentions that we could create a resolution to support the initiative alongside LSA-SG. Anyone is open to create the resolution given the template Michael emailed out.

XII. **Adjournment** - Motion by Chris and seconded by David. Approved unanimously. 8:35pm
I. CALL TO ORDER: 6:45 pm

II. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Chair Chris Tom, Michael Benson, Phil Saccone, Janakiraman Balachandran, Steven Apotheker, Alex Gutierrez, Kaitlin Flynn, Anna Belak, Eugene Daneshvar

Present: Michael Benson, Phil Saccone, Alex Gutierrez, Kaitlin Flynn, Anna Belak

Excused: Eugene Daneshvar

III. CURRENT INITIATIVES & TASKS

a. Resolutions

i. Eliminating Fall break
Janet asked RSG to take a stance on this issue. Undergraduates and Masters students would probably be opposed to it. Does not really affect PhD students unless they are a GSI or if it cuts into holiday plans. University wants to hear from graduate students before putting it to the rest of the student body. RSG could consider putting out a poll to gauge graduate student support/opposition before endorsing. A resolution draft will be written by Michael and sent to the committee.

ii. Resolution for Class Bank System
Make it so that PhD candidates can take upper-level classes that are offered sporadically.

iii. Resolution to Amend the Emergency Fund Requirements

- Allow other individuals besides program/department head to write the required letter for emergency fund. Avoid privacy problems.
- Possibly postpone to later after Town Halls where we can attempt to have a discussion with the students on the topic. Kaitlin to include question in Gazette to ask students their opinion, especially regarding privacy.

iv. Resolution to Disband the Continuous Enrollment Dispute Resolution Board
CEDR isn’t used, so we can formally disband it. This is dropped from our
agenda because we cannot action it.

v. Resolution to Require Evaluations Before Receiving Grades
   - Help GSIs and professors get meaningful feedback from
     grads/undergrads, which will either serve to enhance teaching
     abilities or go towards tenure/salary evaluations
   - Next board meeting, ask representatives to talk to constituents
     about potentially changing the time of the evaluations or other
     possible changes to help make them more useful for the teachers.
     We need to gather more information from students, teachers, and
     CRLT and bring it back to a future meeting.

vi. Resolution to Amend the Non-Discrimination Policy of the University
    (part 2)
    - “Relationship status” was passed as part of this resolution last
      Spring. Chris will be re-introducing it to include “sexual practice”
      (or something along those lines) in the NDP.

b. SACUA Joint AAC Committee
   i. Eugene, Chris, Anna interested

c. Eugene’s inquiry for academic discrimination (see appendix)
   i. Consider forwarding it to Janet after consulting with Eugene.

d. Career Services/Consulting workshop
   Next meeting.
   i. February date?
   ii. Best practices between programs

IV. OPEN DISCUSSION
   a. Anna brought up policy regarding Spring break and conflicting
      interpretations on whether the break is also for graduate students. Add to agenda
      for next AAC meeting.

V. ACTION ITEMS
   a. [Eugene] Email information about IP issues
   b. [Phil] Email Paula and CC events director
   c. [Michael] Set up meeting with Janet for GSBOR
   d. [Chris] Set up dropbox
   e. [Everyone] Send Chris 5 survey questions for next meeting
   f. [Kaitlin] Send other committee chairs notice to gather 5 survey questions
   g. [Kaitlin] Add to Gazette a question about emergency fund policy
   h. [Michael] Invite CRLT professor to a meeting
i. [Eugene] Write draft of pamphlet regarding basics of IP for graduate students to present to committee

VI. ADJOURNMENT: 7:27 pm

VII. APPENDIX

Excerpt from Eugene

Chris,

My constituent asked me if we have the ability to request information from the Registrar's office to aid in determining if he was discriminated against in taking a course. Specifically, he wants to find out if an override was issued for any other student in a class that he was denied because of missing preqs.

Background:

- A PhD student in Engineering and Master's in Economics wanted to take a Finance course that had introductory accounting as a prereq.
- The student attended the first few classes and felt that he understood the material well and asked for an override. The instructor agreed that he would allow him to take the course.
- During class, the student pointed out a mistake in the mathematical theory of the instructor. He asked it as a question during the class, and followed up after class to point it out without embarrassing the instructor.
- The instructor seemed flustered by the realization that he may be incorrect.
- The student emailed multiple times without response to be added to the class. Later, the instructor claimed that he replied, however, the student has confirmation from ITS that no emails were sent.
- At the next class, the instructor claimed that he had misspoke and would not be able to issue the override due to the prereq needed. The instructor said that he would add the student to the CTools site, but still has not done so.
- The student believes that the instructor is treating him differently than other students and is lying to cover it up.

I've instructed the student to contact Darlene Ray Johnson.

I too have a experience that is troubling. Last term I was dis-enrolled from a class by the University's General Counsel the night before the first day of class because I was told that I had "past strained interactions " with the professor teaching the course. I did not know this was a justification for dis-enrollment. I think these two issues raise the broader question of what are our rights to take a class and under what conditions are they taken away.

I would like to propose to explore this issue by adding it to the AAC's agenda.

Thanks,

-Eugene
RACKHAM STUDENT GOVERNMENT  
COSAC MEETING MINUTES  
DATE: 2-12-2013  
RACKHAM WEST HALL—SOUTH ALCOVE

I. CALL TO ORDER: 6:37
   a. Present: Michael Lang, Pete McGrath, Jamie Simcheck
   b. Absent:
   c. Excused:

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA, Members agreed to have an informal meeting, due to the low attendance.

   Reports:

   Pete: Focus: HOPE is full steam ahead. UPSA is working with us (Urban Planning Student Association). We will be boarding up houses in partnership this Saturday. We have twenty people signed up thus far. We are caravanning there to save money, and while we don’t have a final headcount yet, we expect around 20 people.

   Michael: This past Saturday I went to the Forsythe Middle School Science Fair. It was a great success. Well run and there was a lot of great food—breakfast and lunch. Talking to the science fair director she wants it to be completely grad-student judged for next year. Given the time investment (seven hours) and the fact that it’s a great learning experience I say go for it. We also briefly mentioned partnering for a mentor/mentee partnership.

   This upcoming Thursday I’m going to downtown Detroit to speak at a high school through Wolverine Access about the importance of a college education within the scope of my field. I'll be speaking to at least one if not two classes. Wolverine Access will have two additional trips: one in March and one in April.

III. NAME CHANGE: Pete moved to table the conversation over the name. Michael seconds it. Passed 3-0-0. Keep thinking about name changes.

IV. ADJOURN: Motion to adjourn by Pete. Seconded by Michael. Meeting adjourned at 6:57PM.
I. CALL TO ORDER: 5:13pm
   a. Present: Representatives Lauren Knapp, Ryan Roberts and Cristine Zuchora
   b. Absent: Chris Tom, Pete McGrath
   c. Excused:

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

Event Date
- Our first pick is Saturday, April 13th. Second pick is Friday, April 12th. We chose these dates to not conflict with relay for life the following weekend and avoid close proximity to finals.

Dance Location (9-11pm)
- 1st pick: League Ballroom ($240 up to 5 hours if we charge admission)
- 2nd pick: Union Ballroom
- Rationale: classy locations that are easy to walk to.

Pre-Dance Location (6-9pm)
- 1st pick: Bar Louie
- 2nd pick: Blue Lep

Expected attendance
- Target attendance: 300 people

Budget: big ticket items
- Renting the venue: $240 for League ballroom
- Pre-event party at Bar Louie/Blue Lep: Lauren will call them today
- DJ: ~$300 or less for event. Lauren will ask her friend (Ross) that DJs this weekend how much he will charge and if he has equipment, too.
- Catering: at the ballroom portion we’d like to provide punch, fruit, and small desserts. The small desserts through University catering are ~$1 a piece, so if we provide 300, that’s ~$300 for small desserts.
- Advertising: diag boards, RSG listserv

**Theme:** ~Black and White Masquerade~

**Tasked Assignments:**
- Ryan will talk to League and Union about renting ballroom for dance portion
- Lauren will ask about Bar Louie for pre-event and DJ (ask Ross this weekend)
- Crissie will talk to Blue Lep as a backup to Bar Louie if it’s too expensive or booked

**Miscellaneous**
- UMEC has $600 slated to co-sponsor this event so we figure we could match that for a total estimated budget of $1,200.
- We’ll charge $5 to pick up a ballroom ticket. We could sell tickets at all of our RSG office hours and email the list of people that RSVP the list of RSG representative office hours and tell them to pick one up at any of these times.
- Depending on how many people RSVP, we could offer a party favor bag with a b&w mask in it when people arrive at the ballroom portion of event

**IV. OPEN DISCUSSION**

**V. ADJOURNMENT** at 5:52pm.
I. **CALL TO ORDER: 7:33pm**

   a. **Present:** Representatives Michael Lang, David Barton, Anna Belak, Vanessa Cruz, John Forrest, Alex Gutierrez, Treasurer Phil Saccone, and President Michael Benson (Chair).

   b. **Absent:** Representatives Ryne Peterson

   c. **Excused:** Representatives Chris Tom, Dan Trubman, Lauren Knapp, Vice President Kaitlin Flynn

II. **CHAIR’S REPORT**

III. **Local issues**

   a. **Lease signing form**

      i. Benson speaks: college of engineering student government (UMEC) wants to cosponsor. Other folks probably also want to help out. We need to select a date—evenings work best. We have a small budget we can use for snacks.

   b. **Format**

      i. We have an official come in and give history—5 to 10 minutes. Then we'll have the landlords come in and speak. Then we'll have students and the community ask questions and express grievances. The purpose of this is to see if anyone even cares about the landlords desire to get rid of the moratorium. Landlords raise safety concerns that arise because of it. John feels most students there will not understand the purpose of it to begin with. We need to stress the history of it so everyone present has a clear idea of the issue.

      ii. The issue arises that we should have a couple of people ask stock questions to get the questions rolling overall. Phil raises the question of advertising—see assigning tasks.

   c. **Assigning tasks**

      i. Phil volunteers to help. John also helps to volunteer. Benson: Contact landlord tenant association. Plan to get it up and running within the next two weeks.

IV. **Personal Safety**

   a. **Ann Arbor taxis**
i. There have now been three conflicts—one reported rape, one sexual touching (Blue Cab Driver), and another. Two of them involved students. The division of student affairs is strongly encouraging students to (if you take a cab) to have at least two people in the cab. Question: has Ann Arbor’s public safety budget increased? Benson answers: there are four or five new officers. AA did receive a grant recently. They are hoping to decrease the number of firefighters. They have also changed the patrolling area. There is also an up ticket in panhandling. This may be a reason for the change in patrolling. A next step would be to have an officer(s) join us at our next meeting so that they can explain their practice. Show of hands, who wants us to bring officers at our next meeting (The week after spring break) (more yes than no for this).

b. near campus street lighting

i. If we want the city to add lights it is complicated—depending on who owns the lights. There are three main shareholders who own any one set of street lights.

ii. The other thing we can do is that, given we have money; we can help subsidize it for a number of years (or just the first year). We have not done this before and there is nothing wrong with using student fees to do this.

iii. Clarification: we are talking about the blue lights not street lights. We need to focus effort on blue lights.

iv. Vanessa: we should invest more money in a shuttle or blue lights. Lang: a safe-walk program is also an option.

V. State Issues

a. central student government’s Fall Break Issue

i. Benson: There fall break was originally implemented by CSG. Due to state law, public schools cannot start their school academic year until after Labor Day. The university right now is trying to create the 2015-2016 calendars. The way the calendar looks right now, the last day of finals will be December 23rd. GSAs, if they have finals, will be grading past then. The last time this happened was in 2007. Benson notes: this sucked. One option they are looking at is shortening fall break or eliminating it. Janet Weiss has asked RSG to weigh in on this. There will be a resolution coming up to the board. The ideal situation is that our committee will lobby at the statehouse to get rid of this law that restricts the school only starts after Labor Day law, which is where we chime in.

ii. Vanessa: we need to be sensitive toward other religious practices that may feel Michigan is leaning too much toward the Christian Calendar. Benson notes this and remarks that it’s not so much about Christmas as is it is about allowing people to travel if they need/want to. This also affects international students thus allowing them to actually travel. Most winter breaks are only 8 days, which is really not a lot of time to travel for international students.

iii. Benson proposes that, if we take one day off fall break, we tack one on winter break. It’s an issue academic affairs is looking into. What is
important for us is when we can start the fall semester—focus on the before mentioned law about the start of the school in Michigan.

iv. John: this is a nonissue.

v. Overall: the consensus is that it seems to be a nonissue.

vi. Benson: who wants to see more information on this in the next meeting? Five for more information, three against. We’ll get more information.

b. update on tracking issues

i. Benson: please let me know if you need help focusing your search.

ii. Benson: Higher Education Funding: the committees are starting to hold meetings. Benson is working with Fletcher at Michigan State to set up times to testify in late march for the committees. This way it’s joint and is a stronger committee. It’s more powerful to have two of the three large state schools together. Should have info after spring break. If you would like to go let Benson know.

iii. Lang: Auto no-fault: This is a problem both for the here-and-now: it raises insurance premiums for a lot of grad students when they move here as well as in the case of an accident and who pays for what. The committee discusses the history of the problem. Lang notes that he is in talks with a law student about coming in to talk to the committee about this issue. Vanessa: We can also get legal services to come speak, which would be a more legitimate person. The group decides to break up the police force speakers with this set of speakers.

iv. David: Weapons on campus: we can find two bills on guns on campus (weapons not guns). Both bills have public schools outlawing weapons. The bills numbers are too high. A bill was vetoed during the lame duck. After Newtown the governor vetoed said bill. It dealt with the impact of a gun versus a loaded gun.

v. Ryan isn’t here but he wanted to look at firearm regulation. Phil: the ones I looked at dealt with designated school personnel. it was something about how designated persons would be able to have a concealed carry.

c. discuss trip to Lansing

Benson: It’s coming up in late march/early April. It will be a big thing for us following spring break.

Benson: Also as a heads up CIC (the big ten schools plus U Chicago) will be hosting the annual conference May 22nd to the 25th. We will try to host a CIC graduate student presidents meeting. Benson attended the last one in East Lansing. One of the sessions we want to have there is on state and federal lobbying and state and local lobbying. This is to teach/learn best practices. No expense for the committee/board.

VI. Federal Issues

a. SAGE update

i. The sage dates on the hill will be April 13th to the 16th.

ii. Alex updates: we will keep the previous schedule. Sat and sun just the sage schools together somewhere in DC. We will all get together and go over lobbying and the white papers and any internal business. Monday morning we will be meeting with the congressional liaison from Texas and
Michigan. Monday afternoon will be state day for each school: we speak with legislators/staffers from each state. Tuesday: sage day: we split up and go talk to anyone we can get a hold of that we want to connect with. Benson: we will not double up state day and sage day i.e. we won’t speak to the same legislator both days—we can split it up between staff and statesperson. We will meet with personal staff one day and then them the next day. Benson has received a few applications for people that want to go. Middle of next week he’ll make decisions. As long as you’re on this committee and active you’ll probably go.

iii. Q: How many people went last time? 5 of us went last time. Benson wants to bring the count up to 8-9 from RSG. We may be bringing an undergrad with us. Alex: it would be great to have someone from a professional school to join us.

b. Immigration White Paper update process and Timeline
i. We will be the immigration experts at the SAGE conference. We will state the case and explain what we support, why, and encourage other members to follow our lead.

ii. assign committee members to specific tasks
iii. We are responsible for the sage immigration white paper. We want to form a subcommittee of this committee to look at each of the items for this white paper and add new things if deemed necessary.
iv. Benson wants to appoint Alex to head up our delegation. No objections. Alex is heading the delegation.
v. Alex raises the point about personal stories to help us lobby: Benson has directed the academic affairs committee to create a survey for this purpose. Alex wants us to do this separately. Benson agrees that this is alright. Alex agrees to draft a survey. Benson aims to get the survey completed to go out before spring break. This survey will be about all of the sage issues not just immigration.
vi. Benson: once we have this list of questions, we can send it out to all sage schools to show how common the issues are thus strengthening the case.

c. review federal issues
i. Benson: we need to start putting together research funding and indebtedness issues.

ii. Phil: immigration act: the issue that he is looking at (See spreadsheet) is related to higher ED (PhDs) and making sure that they can stay here and grow our economy. It’s in committee judiciary. Benson: if not much has changed call the committee staff and see if anything has changed.

iii. Lang: NIH/NSF funding: it’s important. Benson wants to make a subcommittee to look at funding levels for the previous year’s whitepaper. We need to try and increase funding. Once the president’s budget proposal comes out we can then base our recommendation off of this. A question we could put on our survey: are you a GSRA/GSI/ how are you funded? Benson has a report from OVPR detailing budgeting.

1. A second subcommittee to get the current funding levels and to find one or two things NIH or DOD funds at Michigan to show as
examples same as the jovettes fellowship (sp?) has ben purposed by Benson. Who would be interested in being involved with this committee. Various committee members volunteer. Lang is heading the subcommittee and will send out a doodle about this to find a time to meet/assign tasks.

iv. Allen: Advanced manufacturing: I’m helping to draft a white paper on advanced manufacturing. This will be completed the Friday of spring break. There is a lot that goes into it. Benson: this can be tied into a lot of issues that the committee is dealing with.

v. Allen: Infrastructure funding and energy policy: there is a floating infrastructure bank. Q: Is it an issue we want to take up? Q: What is the bank? There is an idea to create a federal infrastructure bank to raise 6-7 trillion dollars to invest in infrastructure—roads, smart grid systems, fiber optics, et cetera. Essentially it creates a government mechanism to raise funding without going through taxes. It goes to PPEs—public private partnerships. It would increase our infrastructure and therefore global competitive-ness.

1. Benson: write up a piece how it is important to graduate students overall.

VII. OPEN DISCUSSION
Benson: thanks everyone.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT at 8:45pm.
EXAMPLE EMAIL FROM UW ON SEQUESTER

UW Federal Research Funds at Risk
This Friday, March 1st, the federal budget “sequester” is scheduled to take effect. This action, the result of the failure of Congress and the President to reach an agreement on taxes and spending, will lead to across-the-board budget cuts for many federal agencies and is likely to mean a 5% cut to grants from the National Institutes of Health and National Science Foundation. Some financial aid programs, like Federal Work Study, will also face cuts.

Take action:
Please take 2 minutes to call Senator Patty Murray (D-WA) and Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R-5th) and ask them to stop the sequester and preserve research funding and financial aid:

- Senator Patty Murray: (202) 224-2621 (or send an email message here)
- Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers: (202) 225-2006 (or send an email message here if you’re a constituent from the 5th district of eastern Washington)

Message: “I’m a student at the University of Washington and I’m calling to urge ______ to end the budget sequester because it directly impacts federal research funding and financial aid.”

After you make your calls, please send an email to gpssvp@uw.edu to let us know. Senator Murray is chair of the Senate Budget Committee and Rep. McMorris Rodgers is Vice-Chair of the House Republican Caucus; as Congressional leaders they are both influential. For more information about sequestration see the recent article1 in the Chronicle of Higher Education, or the AAAS sequestration page2 and petition3. Questions? Contact Melanie Mayock: gpssvp@uw.edu.

1Link to: http://chronicle.com/article/Threat-of-Sequester-Has/137533/?key=T2h7IQY7aHJDIYnthZDkTMj5PyY%2BNxkkNXtE9nPv3blxcFw%3D%3D.
3 Link to http://membercentral.aaas.org/speakup
Democratic and Republican leaders in the Senate are teeing up rival bills aimed at shielding their members from blame when an $85 billion cut to federal spending takes effect on Friday.

The Senate will vote this week on two proposals to stop the cuts, known in Washington as the sequester, but neither version is expected to pass, according to Senate aides.

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) and Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) recognize their bills are dead on arrival, but are forging ahead in an effort to secure public support in the messaging war over sequestration.

The dueling votes could take place as soon as Wednesday, but a senior Democratic aide said Thursday is the more likely date. Each proposal must garner 60 votes to pass, and there is no Plan B.

The Republican plan would maintain the level of spending reductions but give President Obama more flexibility to minimize their impact on military preparedness and other vital government services, such as air traffic control and airport security screening.

The Democratic package, meanwhile, would freeze the sequester through the end of the calendar year and offset the $110 billion cost with an even mix of spending cuts and tax increases.

Both bills will be used as ammunition in the political firefight over the sequester, which has intensified in the run-up to Friday’s deadline.

Democrats are planning a full-scale campaign to blame Republicans for cutting vital
government services in order to preserve niche corporate tax breaks.

“We’re just going to use every tool at our disposal to pressure Republicans to come to the table,” said a senior Democratic aide. “In the past it’s been the deadlines that forced them to come to the table. Now it’s just a question of convincing them it’s worth their while to come to the table and negotiate.”

Republicans will counter by accusing the president of choosing the campaign stump over the negotiating table. McConnell and other Republicans have criticized Obama for not putting forward a comprehensive plan to reduce spending, and say his insistence on more tax hikes is the only thing standing in the way of a deal.

Leaders in both parties are under pressure to unify their members ahead of the votes.

Democratic senators will vote in unison against the GOP proposal because they want to ramp up pressure on Republican leaders, Democratic aides said.

But Republicans predict some Democratic lawmakers up for reelection in conservative-leaning states might balk at supporting the $55 billion tax increase in Reid’s bill.

Both sides think public support will swing their direction once the cuts from sequestration begin.

Democrats acknowledge there has been less public attention to the spending cuts than in previous fiscal fights, but they believe Republicans will crumble once the public realizes how broadly the sequester will disrupt their lives.

“It seems like they’re putting on a brave face,” a senior Democratic aide said of Republicans. “There haven’t been as severe warnings as there were before the fiscal cliff or the debt ceiling. They’re erring in betting the consequences won’t be too tough.”

Republicans insist they are not going to raise any more revenues through taxes, as Democrats are demanding, and note that overall federal spending will still increase after the sequester takes effect.

GOP Sens. James Inhofe (Okla.), Tom Coburn (Okla.) and Pat Toomey (Pa.) have worked on a package of proposals that is likely to become the GOP’s sequestration alternative.

Coburn believes Obama already has the power to structure federal budgets so that most of the cuts from sequestration hit low-priority and duplicative programs. He and his colleagues are preparing legislation to explicitly give the president more flexibility to shift funding to high-priority programs.

Coburn sent a letter Friday to Janet Napolitano, secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, urging her to use her authority to protect critical programs.

“Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance provided to agencies on January
14, 2013 urged each agency to ‘use any available flexibility to reduce operational risks and minimize impacts on the agency’s core mission...’ This language provides a unique opportunity for each federal department to reduce spending in each program on those expenditures that are less essential,” Coburn wrote.

Napolitano warned Monday that the country would be more vulnerable to terrorist attacks if the sequester were to take effect.

Toomey says the sequester must be reworked to soften its impact on the military.

“I think we must go through with this reduction in increased spending but we need to give the president and agency heads the discretion to proceed with the cuts in a better way,” Toomey said Monday morning at the Greater Susquehanna Valley Chamber of Commerce. “I want to give the president this flexibility. The other side so far has pushed back.”

Democrats say if the proposal to give Obama more flexibility to manage the cuts were to pass, Republicans would have less incentive to negotiate a package to reduce the total size of the spending cuts by ending corporate tax breaks.

“Democrats would temporarily replace this harsh austerity with a combination of smart spending reductions and measures that would close corporate loopholes and end wasteful subsidies and ask the wealthiest Americans to pay a little more,” Reid said on the floor Monday.

Senate aides said there was no negotiation between Obama and Republican leaders over the Presidents Day recess except for brief phone calls the president made to McConnell and Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio).

Republicans believe Obama purposely kept his distance so that he could blame them in a public campaign for not doing anything to reverse the cuts.

Source:
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1) Executive Summary

The Student Safety Work Group identified three broad recommendations to expand, enhance, or better coordinate U-M’s already significant student safety education efforts: building stronger relationships between students and law enforcement for specific populations; utilizing technology solutions to make safety education and resource information more accessible to students; and implementing bystander intervention skills training on campus.

The Beyond the Diag/Off Campus Student Safety and Personal Safety Education subcommittees, through a thorough and robust assessment process, identified additional recommendations that are congruent with the recommendations of the larger committee and that respond to identified gaps in U-M’s student safety education efforts.

If implemented, these recommendations, in concert with the recommendations from the Beyond the Diag/Off Campus Student Safety and Personal Safety Education subcommittees, will help address the gaps in current efforts identified by the work group and also position U-M as a leader in student safety education nationally.
2) Background & Context

During the Winter, Spring and Summer terms of 2011, the University of Michigan responded to a variety of emergent concerns when students living in the Oxbridge off-campus neighborhood were the victims of a number of crimes. Students voiced the need for improved general safety resources, a strong interest in self-defense education, and concerns about lighting and security communications. Safety concerns escalated during the summer of 2011, stemming from a series of well publicized stranger sexual assaults occurring in Ann Arbor near campus. These events underscored the importance of student safety and increased campus-wide interest in general safety, violence prevention and personal safety education.

This prominence of student safety efforts is not new or unique. The University of Michigan has always been deeply committed to maintaining and enhancing a safe, secure and healthy community for all its students, faculty and staff. Numerous programs and collaborations already in place highlight safety resources and provide student safety education. In fact, as Interim Department of Public Safety Chief Joe Piersante shared at a recent campus security briefing, while concern about crime on campus was up in 2011, actual crime rates on campus were down. At this time, the campus community’s investment in comprehensive student safety education remains high.

The Student Safety Work Group (SSWG) was charged in February, 2012 by three co-sponsors - the Dean of Students/AVP for Student Affairs Laura Blake Jones, the Interim Chief of the U-M Department of Public Safety, Joe Piersante, and then Interim Chief of the Ann Arbor Police Department, John Seto. The SSWG’s charge was to explore the scope of current student safety programming, identify theoretical foundations of existing initiatives, research national best practices, evaluate current and recommend new programming, and propose a possible funding model for both existing and new initiatives. Subcommittees were identified to provide recommendations to the Dean of Students office regarding the content and future of Personal Safety Education (PSE) and the Off-Campus Student Safety program, Beyond the Diag (BTD). The SSWG was charged to supply the group’s co-sponsors with an advisory report for their consideration.

Student safety is inclusive of many content areas, including, but not limited to:

- General orientation to the safety resources of the campus
- Housing security such as renters’ insurance, fire safety, and protection of property
- Bystander intervention education
- Emergency alert systems
- Sexual violence prevention
- Property and personal crime prevention
- Late night transportation
- Alcohol and other drug abuse prevention and education
- Neighborhood and residence hall community development
● Personal safety education
● Campus climate initiatives to reduce hate and bias incidents and promote reporting
● Academic unit-specific research, programs, and advocacy on behalf of student safety

While acknowledging the many excellent student safety programs, initiatives, collaborations, and policies already in place at the institution, the 2012 Student Safety Work Group’s responsibilities were to:

1. Complete a comprehensive review of existing University of Michigan student safety efforts, utilizing a public health approach to prevention, and with an emphasis on the community level of intervention;
2. Categorize how existing safety efforts fit into the public health prevention model, noting and prioritizing any identified gaps;
3. Make recommendations to the Dean of Students office regarding the content and future expansion of the Beyond the Diag Off-Campus Student Safety program;
4. Make recommendations to the Dean of Students office regarding the content and future expansion of Personal Safety Education at the institution;
5. If possible, identify financial and other resources necessary to fill gaps and provide for new and ongoing comprehensive student safety education at the University of Michigan.
3) Methodology

Guiding Principles

Three underlying principles guided the work of the Student Safety Work Group and formed the basis of its activities, priorities and, finally, its recommendations. These were: 1) Student Development Theory, 2) Public Health Violence Prevention Theory, and 3) the Primacy of Collaborative Work, with students at the center. Each of these principles is briefly explicated below.

Guiding Principle #1: Student Development Theory

As discussed in the widely-cited public health publication “What Works: Principles of Effective Prevention Programs” (Nation, el al., 2003), the timing and developmental appropriateness of prevention programs are essential to their effectiveness; program activities should happen at a time developmentally that can have maximal impact on the participant’s life. Developmental fit is closely related to the prevention concept of “dosing” which states that participants need to be exposed to enough of the activity for it to have an effect (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002). Such “dosage” and “timing” issues identified in the public health field of violence prevention are essential to and have a number of implications for the work of student safety education.

The SSWG identified the need to target programs to all student life cycles, as each individual exhibits different needs at different stages in the personal and educational journey. Efforts must be geared to and relevant for the life cycle of the student calendar (pre-campus, arrival, orientation, year one, etc.) as well as to stages of personal development (following external authorities, standing at the crossroads, becoming self-authored, etc.) Additionally, student safety education must be thoughtful about how interventions are provided, as the medium is important to its successful delivery.

The following two charts depict some student developmental milestones and turning points, giving particular attention to safety education messages, questions, and needs for each developmental stage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>What authorities say about what I should know</th>
<th>How Do I know?</th>
<th>I know because...</th>
<th>I know because...but I also accept ambiguity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td>What authorities say about what one should be</td>
<td>Who am I?</td>
<td>I am...</td>
<td>I am...even when environmental forces pressure me to change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal</td>
<td>What authorities say about kinds of relationships one should have</td>
<td>What type of relationships do I want to have?</td>
<td>I want relationships &amp; community that...</td>
<td>I want relationships &amp; community that...but negotiate to meet both my needs and others' needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety Awareness, Behavior &amp; Curriculum</th>
<th>Following External Formulas</th>
<th>Standing at the Crossroads</th>
<th>Becoming Self-Authorized</th>
<th>Building an Internal Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authorities for students may include parents, staff, faculty, peers &amp; cultural messages</td>
<td>Students questioning everything, their own values and those of others</td>
<td>Students affirming and asserting their own values</td>
<td>Students developing resiliency, inter-cultural maturity, inter-cultural communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whom: Pre-campus, first year (later for others)</td>
<td>When: Second year students; (earlier/later for others)</td>
<td>When: Third year students; (earlier/later for others)</td>
<td>When: Fourth year &amp; grad students (earlier/later for others)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences as motivators: laptop stolen from library, MIP ticket, etc.</td>
<td>How do our safety messages facilitate students asking their own questions and seeking their own answers?</td>
<td>How do we support students to express and live into their values and choices?</td>
<td>How do we facilitate students teaching, leading, sharing safety within and beyond their own communities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestones &amp; Events: Bridge program students arrive, parent &amp; student orientation, international student arrival in country</td>
<td>Milestones &amp; Events: Sophomore “slump”, move to off campus housing for some.</td>
<td>Milestones &amp; Events: Move off campus for some</td>
<td>Milestones &amp; Events: Grad student arrival in country/Ann Arbor, Masters and Doctoral programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety messages which emphasize rules, guidelines, consequences, expectations and responsibility for one’s own safety</td>
<td>Safety messages which emphasize exploration; personal decision making and personal responsibility</td>
<td>Safety messages which emphasize choice and personal accountability to self, others and community</td>
<td>Safety messages which emphasize multiple needs, values, choices and promote empathy, flexibility &amp; resiliency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guiding Principle #2: Public Health Violence Prevention Theory

The Centers for Disease Control call for the utilization of a Public Health approach to community-based violence prevention efforts (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002). The public health model provides a theoretical grounding clearly adaptable to college and university campus environments and grounds much of the work of Student Affairs. Practitioners target interventions at multiple levels (individual, relationship, community, societal) and multiple intervention points (primary, secondary, tertiary.) Campus-based prevention models pay close attention to working comprehensively on all levels, with particular focus on efforts at the community level.

Guiding Principle #3: Collaborative Work, with Students at the Center

The safety work of the campus is best accomplished in partnerships; efforts should be collaborative and implementation should be inclusive of students, staff and faculty. To honor this guiding principle, the SSWG itself included broad representation. (See Appendix B for a complete membership roster.) Its twenty-three members represented undergraduate and graduate students, the Division of Student Affairs, the Department of Public Safety, Academic Affairs, and the Ann Arbor Police Department. Further, the Division of Student Affairs highly values placing students at the center of its work. Thus the SSWG included student representation from Rackham, the College of Engineering, the Dean of Students’ Student Advisory Board, Services for Students with Disabilities, Beyond the Diag, and Rackham Student Government. The work group prioritized student-identified needs for discussion and analysis as identified by Beyond the Diag, Oxbridge student residents, and the Central Student Government.

The identification of partners for SSWG sponsorship and membership was based on the core work and missions of the Division of Student Affairs (DSA), the Department of Public Safety (DPS) and the Ann Arbor Police Department (AAPD). DSA’s core work includes multiple elements with student safety implications, including Health and Well-Being Education, Personal Development, Student Intervention, Support and Advocacy, Transformative Learning Experiences, Community Development, and Intercultural Development and Social Justice Education. The Dean of Students office (DOS) within DSA has historically embraced a shared responsibility with DPS and AAPD for fostering a safe and inclusive campus community. The mission of the Dean of Students office is to “create the conditions that allow all students to thrive, including a safe, vibrant and diverse campus community.”

The mission of the Department of Public Safety is to contribute to and promote a safe and secure community, while respecting the rights and dignity of all persons utilizing facilities and programs of the University of Michigan. Toward that end, DPS officers make presentations designed to inform students and employees about DPS, security procedures and practices that aid in the prevention of crime, with a focus on individual and community responsibility for personal and property security and the security of others. Similar presentations are made each year by DPS during student and parent orientations.
DPS has a very cooperative relationship and works very closely with the Ann Arbor Police Department to provide a seamless policing experience for students across jurisdictions. The AAPD’s mission is to provide protection and service to all, including student residents of Ann Arbor. The city of Ann Arbor and the University of Michigan mutually benefit from many “town & gown” relationships and collaborations. The AAPD provides speakers at U-M and campus events, updates the U-M community on investigations and prevention efforts, and works in close collaboration with DPS, DOS, other university units to prevent and respond to crime and safety issues. Working collaboratively, the Student Safety Work Group of the DOS office, DPS, and AAPD maximized reach and efficiency to best serve U-M students.

Work Group Process

The SSWG met as a group six times between February and July of 2012, supported two subcommittees, (Personal Safety Education and Off-Campus Student Safety, which met concurrently), hosted break-out groups on specific student populations, and held a number of focus groups and individual interviews with key stakeholders. After identifying existing student safety education efforts, new opportunities and key areas of as yet unmet need were identified for the global student population.

Additionally, the SSWG gave special attention to the safety needs of specific student populations and living groups. Based on consultations with SSWG members, campus experts, subcommittee members and additional stakeholders, needs were identified and recommendations explored for each group. Recommendations were prioritized according to theme, impact, and potential success of implementation. To view the complete collected recommendations for every student population and living group please see Appendices E, F, and G.

The following work flow document explains the SSWG’s process, and also identifies those specific student populations and living groups which were assessed for gaps, needs, and recommendations.
Student Populations includes first year students, graduate students, international students, students with disabilities, LGBT students, students of color, athletes, and Greek life students.

Living Groups includes residence halls, co-ops, Greek houses and live outs, academic/professional school fraternities, athlete/team houses, North Campus residents, and off campus students.
4) Needs Assessment

In order to identify appropriate recommendations for enhancing student safety education at U-M, the committee first sought to identify all of the currently existing safety education efforts on campus and assess these efforts based on the methodology described above. The Student Safety Work Group explored existing U-M safety education programs and identified which levels and intervention points they targeted. The committee strived to develop a comprehensive list of all the activities across the Division of Student Affairs, as well as within other units and at the program and college level. They identified 204 discreet programs across the institution within Student Affairs, the Department of Public Safety, the Ann Arbor Police Department, Housing Security and some academic units. Of these, one-hundred and thirty-four were classified as primary prevention efforts, aimed at preventing violence by increasing protective factors and healthy behaviors while mediating risk factors. Sixty-one existing efforts were classified as secondary prevention, efforts aimed at meeting the student’s need immediately before or after a safety risk occurs. Thirty-three efforts were identified as tertiary prevention, efforts that occur long after a safety violation has occurred to promote healing and prevent recurrence. The committee classified fifteen of the efforts as functioning at two different levels and eighteen efforts that addressed all three prevention levels.

The numbers, however, only illustrate a portion of the full picture of student safety education. The nature of the current efforts assessed varied widely, from distribution of safety-related publications or displays (such as materials distributed to parents and incoming students during Orientation programs or bulletin boards displays in the residence halls) to campus-wide social norming campaigns (such as Stay in the Blue or Expect Respect) to population-specific programming (such as safety education classes for student employees in the University Unions and in-person orientation through the International Center) to efforts that form the core of a unit’s or program’s operation (such as SAPAC and Beyond the Diag). The primary prevention efforts, targeted at the community, relationship, and individual level, reflect the institution’s significant commitment to preventing safety concerns in the community long before they develop. In contrast, while the number of tertiary prevention efforts are fewer, those efforts are more likely to be ongoing throughout the school year, include significant staff FTE, and be largely focused on the individual level to support individual healing and prevent re-victimization. The secondary prevention efforts focus on community and individual levels, but are fewer in number and narrower in scope than the primary prevention efforts, and are not as likely to be supported by significant employee FTEs or be the focus of any one program or unit. From this assessment, the committee identified three key findings.

First, the extensive student safety education efforts already in place reflect the institution’s recognition that a student’s comprehensive educational experience, and their preparation to become engaged, global citizens, includes gaining the knowledge and skills needed to enhance the safety of oneself and one’s community. The committee further identified that student safety education needs to

---

1 While we have made significant effort to be comprehensive in our assessment, we acknowledge that some colleges, schools, or units may be engaging in student safety education efforts that are not reflected in this report.
be appropriate to the student’s developmental stage and delivered at key moments in the life cycle of a student’s time on campus when the information will be most immediately applicable. The committee has sought to incorporate this finding holistically into all of its recommendations.

Secondly, the committee identified that, while the current efforts represent significant institutional investment in the safety and well-being of the entire community, the great majority of the efforts are focused on primary prevention with substantive ongoing, unit efforts also focused on tertiary prevention. This focus is appropriate for a college campus and is congruent with research on best practices for violence and crime prevention in the college population. However, the committee recognized that enhancing existing primary prevention efforts with strategically targeted secondary prevention efforts would better balance U-M’s spectrum approach to student safety education. The committee has proposed a recommendation to address this issue.

Lastly, the committee’s review also recognized that U-M’s student safety education efforts, consistent with U-M’s institutional culture and organizational structure, are highly decentralized. This decentralization provides opportunities and poses challenges. Without a central locus for student safety efforts, units, schools and colleges are able to create and implement efforts that maximize their population or subject area expertise; the sheer number and types of educational efforts already underway speaks to this strength in U-M’s decentralized structure. This strength also may present challenges for creating a comprehensive student safety curriculum on campus in several ways. First, U-M’s decentralization means that schools, colleges and units are challenged in staying abreast of other efforts already underway on and off campus and coordinating efforts to avoid duplication or overlap. Like professional staff, students face a challenge in knowing about all of the efforts on campus and, perhaps even more importantly, accessing the information or services easily and effectively. The committee has proposed a recommendation that specifically addresses the latter challenge.

See Appendix D for a listing of all existing U-M student safety education efforts and their classifications.
SSWG Recommendations

SSWG Recommendation #1: Bystander Intervention Education

In order to strengthen the secondary prevention education efforts currently offered, the SSWG recommends the adoption of a bystander intervention education program at U-M. Decades of research consistently demonstrate that bystander influences significantly impact whether and when people take action when witnessing actions that may jeopardize the safety or well-being of an individual or a community. These influences include:

(1) Diffusion of responsibility – when faced with a crisis situation, individuals are less likely to respond when more people are present because each assumes that someone else will handle it (Chekroun & Brauer, 2002; Darley & Latané, 1968);
(2) Evaluation apprehension - when faced with a high risk situation, individuals are reluctant to respond because they are afraid they will look foolish (Darley & Latané, 1968);
(3) Pluralistic ignorance – when faced with an ambiguous, but potentially high-risk situation, individuals will defer to the cues of those around them when deciding whether to respond (Clark & Word, 1974; Darley & Latané, 1968);
(4) Confidence in skills – individuals are more likely to intervene in a high-risk situation when they feel confident in their ability to do so effectively;
(5) Modeling – individuals are more likely to intervene in a high risk situation when they have seen someone else model it first (Bryan & Test, 1967; Rushton & Campbell, 1977).

These well-documented principles not only suggest what inhibits bystanders from intervening, but also, strategies for effectively overcoming these inhibitions and increasing the pro-active response of bystanders. Bystander intervention skills seek to help all members of a community understand that they have a responsibility to act when another is at risk of being harmed and to equip them with the knowledge and experience to act in ways that are appropriate, safe, and effective.

Recent studies indicate that bystander intervention education programs on college campuses may be an effective way to address incidences of harm associated with sexual violence, harmful alcohol use, hazing in athletic and greek communities, and suicidality (Kalafat & Elias, 1995; Waldron & Kowalski, 2009; Berkowitz, 2003; Banyard, 2011). Currently, six of the eleven Big 10 schools offer some type of bystander intervention training for their campuses.2 Hundreds of other campuses across the country have already adopted bystander intervention programming at some level, including peer institutions like Harvard, Yale, Cornell, Stanford, University of Pennsylvania, University of Virginia, and the University of North Carolina. The committee identified U-M’s lack of bystander intervention

---

2 Big Ten schools that currently offer bystander intervention training programs include University of Iowa, Indiana University, Michigan State University, Northwestern University, Purdue University, and Ohio State University.
education programming as the most significant gap in the student safety education programming currently offered for the global student population.

In developing this recommendation, the SSWG benefited from the earlier work of the 2010-2011 Division of Student Affairs’ Bystander Intervention Committee. This work group reaffirms the findings of the earlier Bystander Intervention Committee and supports the adoption of the Step Up! bystander intervention program at U-M. For a review of the criteria used to assess Step Up! on suitability for adoption and its comparison to other nationally-recognized bystander intervention programs, please see Appendix H.

SSWG Recommendation #2: Using Technology to Publicize and/or Consolidate Existing Efforts

Recent scholarly research as well as consumer and market-based research concur that most children born in the U.S. after 1990 are “digital natives.” That is, they mediate much of their interaction with their environment through technology, including communicating with others, forming peer networks and relationships, purchasing and consuming products, seeking information, and learning (Bennett, Maton, & Kervin, 2008; Jones and Shao, 2011; Common Sense Media, 2012). The majority of digital natives use technology or social media every single day. A recent study by Common Sense Media, a non-profit media policy research organization, identified that for 13-17 year olds in the United States:

- 90% have used social media at least once in their lives
- 68% text daily
- 51% visit a social networking site daily
- 67% own a mobile technology device capable of connecting to the internet

In contrast, only 30% of this population uses e-mail daily and 23% have never used e-mail at all.

In order to communicate with students in the ways students communicate with each other, and in order to present information in ways that students are able and likely to access, the working group unanimously agreed that safety information needs to be organized and shared through technology, and be made available on mobile internet-capable devices. A variety of technology tools already exist that can help increase awareness of safety on and off campus and share safety related information in consistent and meaningful ways. Some of the possible ways to use technology to organize and disseminate student safety education and information include:
Michigan App

A student safety module could be integrated into the existing Michigan App. This technology tool would be an excellent interface to provide users with safety tips, sign up for and obtain safety alerts, find and sign up for safety trainings or workshops, and register laptops or — with the support of DPS — other valuable personal items. Additionally, the working group noted that this app should utilize an approach in its information delivery that is consistent with bystander intervention principles. One model app that integrates bystander intervention principles into its design is Circle of 6. This app recently won a national Apps Against Abuse contest, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Studentsafety.umich.edu – The Dean of Students’ Safety Initiative website

Provided greater content development and publicity, this site could become the hub for on and off campus safety information. A more robust site would include safety information from units across campus and within the community, providing timely safety information and extensive connections to University and community resources.

Wolverine Access

Placing a link to studentsafety.umich.edu on the Student tab in Wolverine Access would highlight and remind students of the availability of safety information and resources for students. As an example, U-M’s international travel registry is now located on Wolverine Access and encourages students to register their travel inside and outside the U.S., even when student travel is not affiliated with U-M. This kind of voluntary portal to information on student safety resources may serve as a model for other kinds of student safety information.

Digital Signage

ITS launched its Digital Signage Service in late 2011. A growing number of units across campus are adopting ITS’s service. Since its launch, the number of signs on campus has increased exponentially. This service is now the standard for digital signs on campus. These signs have the ability to display timely information, advertise programs and events, and provide immediate emergency alert information. In the case of an emergency, DPS can take over all signs on campus to display emergency information. Moreover, student safety information and resources could be displayed across campus or targeted to specific locations with content designed by DSA.

3 For more information on this app and a video demonstration, see www.circleof6app.com
SSWG Recommendation #3: Building Student/Law Enforcement Relationships

One of the practices of effective community policing, common practice for at least twenty-five years, is to nurture and develop relationships with community members in non-enforcement settings in order to increase community cooperation and enhance enforcement effectiveness. This work group identified a number of ways in which the Department of Public Safety and the Ann Arbor Police Department already engage in these activities with the student population. Some of those efforts include: participating in public information forums with students around specific crime incidents, providing educational programming, on request, to student groups related to specific issues, and participating in over 33 different orientation programs with both students and parents. The committee also noted that many individual AAPD and DPS officer interactions with students in crisis situations, or as victims of crimes, positively impacted the overall perception of law enforcement among students. The work group identified the response from both law enforcement agencies during the summer 2011 incidents of sexual assault near campus as an example of this positive impact on an individual and community level.

The work group recommended increasing opportunities overall for AAPD and DPS officers to engage with students in an educational context, to the extent possible given budgetary constraints and the ever-increasing demands on all law enforcement agencies to respond effectively to a wide range of public safety threats. Some of those opportunities may include developing and delivering more educational programming to student populations on safety education, and participating in more campus-wide student events in an educational and informational role, as well as in a public safety enforcement role, and regularly offering open forums to the campus community in order to increase dialogue, improve student knowledge of existing programs or services, share accurate information, and build trust. Appendix G lists a spectrum of opportunities for consideration.

Additionally, the work group identified a number of specific student populations that would benefit from targeted programming to respond to their particular needs and experiences.

**International Students:** This population may positively benefit from additional educational programming that includes AAPD and DPS participation and focuses on sharing information on local and state laws and the role of law enforcement in maintaining community safety and security in the U.S. The work group recommends this information be included as a part of orientation for incoming international students.

**Students of Color:** This population may positively benefit from ongoing dialogue with DPS on a) understanding the institution’s obligations for disseminating crime information under the Clery Act, and b) collaborating to identify ways to reduce students’ negative perception of being targeted in Clery-mandated crime alert language.
North Campus Residents: This population may positively benefit from opportunities to build relationships with law enforcement and contribute to community safety and security efforts. This population may also benefit from additional pedestrian safety programming.
6) Subcommittee Recommendations

Personal Safety Education

The goal of Personal Safety Education is to empower students to recognize, interrupt, and respond to safety matters of many types, particularly those most common in their communities. Evidence in this emerging field indicates that PSE is a promising intervention for increasing protective factors, limiting and correcting for risk factors, and preventing victimization in multiple populations. The subcommittee completed a comprehensive needs assessment and review of existing PSE programs at U-M. Members documented best practices derived from the evidence-base in the literature and from national PSE programs in higher education communities. Concurrently, evaluation data was collected locally from a series of pilot PSE workshops offered to U-M students during Winter Term, 2012.

In response to the institutional needs assessment and program review, emerging local and national evidence, student demand, and comparable programs at peer institutions, the subcommittee recommends that the university develop and provide comprehensive, multi-level Personal Safety Education for U-M students. To maximize choice and developmental fit, a tiered program with three distinct levels of student engagement is recommended, including: short workshops, credited coursework, and an integrative co-curricular option.

Given the lack of existing PSE models fully aligned with best practices in the fields of public health, violence prevention, student affairs, and higher education, the subcommittee identified a need to develop new programming unique to the University of Michigan.

The UM Personal Safety Education Program should be positive, strength-based, and skill-building, and embrace six core programmatic elements which are aligned with best practices and with the Student Safety Work Group’s guiding principles.

UM Personal Safety Education should:

i. Demonstrate simple, practical techniques, tactics, and strategies.
ii. Include comprehensive awareness, body language, social, verbal, & physical skills.
iii. Utilize integrative, experiential, interactive, and embodied learning.
iv. Deliver adaptable, relevant skills for multiple social identity groups and multiple contexts.
v. Honor each individual’s past and future choices by offering options, not “shoulds.”
vi. Provide a good fit for UM’s unique culture.

Please see the complete PSE Subcommittee final report for additional information on the needs assessment, research, methodology, and for complete recommendations on program content, design, and structure, as well as implementation suggestions and suggested next steps.
Off-Campus Student Safety / Beyond the Diag

This sub-committee established three objectives to prepare recommendations for the sponsors of the Student Safety Work Group. The objectives were to 1) Review the Beyond the Diag Program report, 2) Engage off-campus stakeholders in conversations about the safety issues that they feel pose the biggest risk for University of Michigan students living off-campus, and 3) Benchmark the off-campus safety work of other colleges/universities to determine best practices for our community. Seven recommendations follow:

1. **Preserve and expand Beyond the Diag (BTD) to provide continued support for students off campus.** Beyond the Diag connects off-campus students to wellness and safety resources they wouldn’t typically receive, helping them transition to living on their own. Additionally, as the University and City of Ann Arbor are closely intertwined, it is essential that we continually and actively engage both student and permanent residents to improve the experience of living in an off-campus community.

2. **Fund a full-time staff position that oversees the Beyond the Diag program and additional off-campus student services.** This position would act as a liaison between the University and off-campus constituents, integrate BTD into the existing Student Affairs model, manage social media outlets, and supervise student staff. The position would also craft a long-term, adaptable vision for the program to ensure it addresses current needs and scales to serve the entire off-campus student population.

3. **Develop educational programming in collaboration with Residence Education, to increase awareness and education related to rental housing issues during the first semester of the academic year.** Many students sign a lease for the first time within their first few months on campus and are often unsure of what to look for in rental housing options. Through educational initiatives in residence halls, students will receive information regarding: protocol for safe off-campus housing tours, inspection records through Rental Housing Services in Ann Arbor, costs of energy and utilities, and additional safety concerns. It is our hope to cultivate a campus of educated renters who feel confident securing safe housing in Ann Arbor.

4. **Consolidate web-based and print materials related to safety and off-campus living through Beyond the Diag.** While this information is currently available on various University and Ann Arbor websites, it is often difficult to find and is not actively promoted among off-campus students. By aggregating these resources, health and safety information can be easily accessed by all U-M students and delivered to student neighborhoods within a broader off-campus framework. Promotional efforts would include an integrated social media campaign, PULSE representatives in student neighborhoods, and off-campus newsletters with timely updates and tips.

5. **Coordinate neighborhood designations across the city/campus/off-campus websites and rental listing services.** Currently, all have separate (and different) neighborhood boundaries, which creates confusion for students, staff and city employees. Through a consistent organizational structure, the rental housing search will be made easier and safer for students looking to live in particular off-campus...
areas. Finally, by establishing uniform neighborhoods for student and permanent residents, off-campus communities will have a better chance to flourish.

6. Create a task force that consists of representatives from the city of Ann Arbor, UM students, and UM staff to review and plan for collective street lighting needs. Students perceive lighting to be a major factor in their safety, especially because most walk between campus and their off-campus residences at night. Due to the complicated relationship between the University and City of Ann Arbor in regard to street lighting, collaboration will be necessary to address the interests and concerns of all stakeholders. It is our hope that this task force will develop realistic solutions to improve lighting in off-campus areas.

7. Participate in the national study of off-campus house parties to better understand guest/host expectations. With knowledge from this study⁴, Beyond the Diag – along with the UM Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Office – can utilize data to design interventions to promote the health and safety of students who attend and host off-campus parties.

Please see Appendix I for additional information on the Off-Campus Student Safety Subcommittee.

⁴ Off-Campus Parties: National Survey of Student Experiences. Principal Investigator: Rick Jakeman, rjakeman@gwu.edu, 703-726-3771; Department: Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Higher Education Administration
7) Conclusion

Overall, the Student Safety Work Group identified three broad recommendations to expand, enhance, or better coordinate U-M’s already significant student safety education efforts: building stronger relationships between students and law enforcement; utilizing technology solutions to make student safety information more accessible; and implementing bystander intervention skills training on campus. If implemented, these recommendations, in concert with the recommendations from the Beyond the Diag/Off Campus Student Safety and Personal Safety Education subcommittees, will help address the gaps in current efforts identified by the work group and also position U-M as a leader in student safety education nationally.

The Student Safety Work Group encourages program sponsors to review these recommendations and use them in guiding future student safety education development efforts, in allocating current funding, and in seeking new funding to support student safety education efforts. The work group recognizes that the current challenging economic environment will play a role in determining whether, how, and to what extent these recommendations will be adopted. Some of the recommendations may be implemented using resources already available; others will require identifying new resources.
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Appendix A. Student Safety Work Group Charge

Charge to the Student Safety Work Group

Laura Blake Jones, Dean of Students/Associate Vice President, Student Affairs  
Joe Piersante, Interim Chief, Department of Public Safety  
John Seto, Deputy Chief, Ann Arbor Police Department

Statement of Purpose

The University of Michigan is deeply committed to maintaining and enhancing a safe, secure and healthy community for all students, faculty and staff. The Department of Public Safety’s role in leading campus-wide safety efforts is paramount. The Dean of Students office in the Division of Student Affairs has historically embraced a shared responsibility for fostering a safe and inclusive campus community. The Ann Arbor Police Department enacts their mission to provide protection and service to all via close teamwork and partnerships with the university community. The purpose of the Student Safety Work Group (SSWG) is to advise the Dean of Students, the Interim Chief of DPS, and AAPD’s Deputy Chief regarding the current status of student safety efforts at UM, and to recommend future directions.

Objectives

The SSWG’s objectives are to report on the scope of current student safety efforts, identifying theoretical foundations of existing initiatives; to research national best practices in student safety education; to evaluate the effectiveness of current initiatives; to recommend new initiatives, if applicable; and to propose funding models for both existing and new initiatives. The work group is charged to supply the group’s sponsors with an advisory report for their consideration.

Principles & Guidelines

Numerous programs already in place at UM emphasize student safety and overall wellness. Student safety is inclusive of many content areas, including: general orientation to the safety resources of the campus, sexual violence prevention, property and personal crime prevention, late night transportation, alcohol and other drug abuse prevention and education, neighborhood and residence hall community development, self-defense and martial arts, campus climate initiatives to reduce hate and bias incidents, as well as academic unit-specific research, programming, and advocacy on behalf of students.

The safety work of the University of Michigan campus is best accomplished in partnerships. Therefore, the SSWG includes broad representation; efforts should be collaborative and inclusive of students, staff and faculty throughout university communities.
The violence prevention field has historically informed the efforts of such work at UM, and it will serve as the SSWG’s foundation. In particular, the public health model for violence prevention provides a theoretical grounding clearly adaptable to college and university campus environments.

Committee Leadership & Timeline

Chair: Holly Rider-Milkovich, Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center
Staff: Katy Mattingly, Dean of Students office
Timeline: Winter, Spring, Summer, 2012

Specific Responsibilities

The Student Safety Work Group will:

1. Complete a comprehensive review of existing University of Michigan student safety efforts, utilizing a public health approach to prevention, and with an emphasis on the community level of intervention (needs for student populations and student living groups);
2. Categorize how existing safety efforts fit into the public health prevention model, noting and prioritizing any identified gaps;
3. Make recommendations to the Dean of Students office regarding the content and future expansion of the Beyond the Diag student safety program;
4. Make recommendations to the Dean of Students office regarding the content and future expansion of self-defense education at the institution;
5. Identify financial and other resources necessary to fill gaps and provide for new and ongoing comprehensive student safety education at the University of Michigan.
Appendix B. Student Safety Work Group Membership

University of Michigan Student Safety Work Group (SSWG) 2012
Sponsors: Laura Blake Jones, Dean of Students; Joe Piersante, Interim DPS Chief; John Seto, AAPD Deputy Chief

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Representing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holly Rider-Milkovich</td>
<td>Chair; Director of the Sexual Assault Prevention &amp; Awareness Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katy Mattingly</td>
<td>Staff; Dean of Students Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Benson</td>
<td>Rackham Council, Graduate Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Buoy</td>
<td>Beyond the Diag, Central Student Government, Undergraduate Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Burkman</td>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renee Bush</td>
<td>Ann Arbor Police Department, Lieutenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deb Cauffiel</td>
<td>Ann Arbor Police Department, Neighborhood Watch Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jo Desprez</td>
<td>University Health Service, Alcohol &amp; Other Drugs Policy and Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Hamel</td>
<td>Beyond the Diag, Central Student Government, Undergraduate Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Hicks</td>
<td>UM Department of Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Kubec</td>
<td>Sexual Assault Prevention &amp; Awareness Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Livingstone</td>
<td>Housing, Residence Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaimee Marsh</td>
<td>Multi-Ethnic Student Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan Marshall</td>
<td>Services for Students with Disabilities, Undergraduate Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck McDermott</td>
<td>Housing Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlene Ray-Johnson</td>
<td>Rackham Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brittnay Sandefur</td>
<td>University Health Service, PULSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kari Schueller</td>
<td>Office of New Student Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Sherry</td>
<td>Spectrum Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Skoczylas</td>
<td>College of Engineering, Graduate Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Weincouff</td>
<td>Gary Hicks UM Department of Public Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Wiseman</td>
<td>International Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Zollweg</td>
<td>Go North, North Campus Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C. Context & Background for the Student Safety Work Group

During the Winter, Spring and Summer terms of 2011, the Dean of Students Office responded to a number of emergent concerns when students living in the Oxbridge neighborhood were the victims of a series of crimes. The Dean of Student’s response was significantly informed by existing knowledge of best practices and articulated student needs. Work was accomplished with broad student input from advisory boards, Central Student Government (CSG/MSA), and LSA student government. Students voiced the need for improved general safety resources, a strong interest in self-defense education, and concerns about lighting in targeted areas off campus.

Donor funding was secured by the Division of Student Affairs to support and launch the Beyond the Diag program. Within the past ten years, many higher education institutions have begun targeting prevention efforts in the neighborhoods bordering their campuses which house large student populations. The Beyond the Diag program thus far includes a number of initiatives: neighborhood, community and coalition development with students in off-campus housing; systematized distribution of safety resources to off-campus students; and the utilization of social media to share resources and information. The program also focused on enhancing awareness, accessibility and capacity of existing late night transportation options for students and has reviewed the issues surrounding increasing lighting off-campus.

Safety concerns escalated during the summer of 2011, stemming from a number of stranger sexual assaults occurring in Ann Arbor near campus. These events underscored the importance of student safety and increased campus-wide interest in general safety, violence prevention and self-defense education. The Ann Arbor Police Department, UM’s Department of Public Safety, and the Dean of Students Office collaborated closely on responses to the violence and utilized the developing Beyond the Diag program to systematically address evolving concerns. In Winter term, 2012, these three offices co-convened the Student Safety Work Group (SSWG). The SSWG will explore the scope of current student safety programming, identify theoretical foundations of existing initiatives, research national best practices, evaluate current and recommend new programming, and propose funding models for both existing and new initiatives.

Specific Responsibilities The Student Safety Work Group will:

1. Complete a comprehensive review of existing University of Michigan student safety efforts, utilizing a public health approach to prevention, and with an emphasis on the community level of intervention (needs for student populations and student living groups);
2. Categorize how existing safety efforts fit into the public health prevention model, noting and prioritizing any identified gaps;
3. Make recommendations to the Dean of Students’ Office regarding the content and future expansion of the Beyond the Diag student safety program;
4. Make recommendations to the Dean of Students’ Office regarding the content and future expansion of self-defense education at the institution;
5. Identify financial and other resources necessary to fill gaps and provide for new and ongoing comprehensive student safety education at the University of Michigan.
Theoretical Underpinnings of Violence Prevention

The Centers for Disease Control call for the utilization of a Public Health Approach (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002) to community based violence prevention efforts. The existing fields of sexual violence prevention and alcohol and other drug abuse prevention have been built upon such a framework. Figure 1 illustrates the importance of targeting violence prevention efforts to multiple levels. Campus based prevention models must pay close attention to working comprehensively on all levels, while focusing acutely on the community level.

Prevention theory also indicates that comprehensive violence prevention efforts are to be enacted at multiple time points (see Figure 2). Primary prevention entails work done before an act of violence is committed. It incorporates an emphasis on the promotion of healthy behaviors, and it includes both risk reduction interventions and efforts at augmenting protective factors which mitigate the occurrence of violence in communities. Secondary prevention efforts focus on stopping imminent violence or responding to the needs of victims of violent behavior immediately after the harm occurs; and, tertiary prevention occurs later with a focus on the promotion of healing and prevention of recurrence.
The Public Health Approach further calls for a four step approach to the proactive prevention of violence (see Figure 3.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The CDC Public Health Approach to Violence Prevention (Dahlberg &amp; Krug, 2002)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Describe and monitor the problem:</strong> Identify the “who”, “what”, “where” and “how” associated with the perpetration of violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Identify risks and protective factors:</strong> Understand what factors protect people or put them at risk for experiencing or perpetrating violence to help identify where prevention efforts need to be focused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Develop and test prevention strategies:</strong> Use research data and findings from needs assessments, community surveys, stakeholder interviews, and focus groups to craft an evidence-based approach to program planning. Once programs are implemented, they are evaluated rigorously to determine their effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Promote widespread adoption of effective strategies:</strong> Implement and adopt programs with proven effectiveness more broadly. Dissemination techniques to promote widespread adoption include training, networking, technical assistance, and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3*

The violence prevention field has historically informed the efforts of prevention work at the University of Michigan, and it will serve as the SSWG’s foundation. In particular, the public health model for violence prevention provides a theoretical grounding clearly adaptable to college and university campus environments.
## Appendix D. Existing U-M Student Safety Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effort</th>
<th>Sponsor(s)</th>
<th>Primary, Secondary, Tertiary</th>
<th>Individual, Relationship, Community, Societal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department of Public Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual distribution of <em>Campus Crime Report</em></td>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>P/S/T</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicity on DPS website about the service of property engraving to prevent property loss</td>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus security community meetings</td>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>P/S/T</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentations to student groups, colleges, student employee groups; and to sorority houses and leadership re: general &amp; specific crime investigations (see below)</td>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation #1: “See Something? Say Something!”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is part of a Homeland Security initiated program designed to promote awareness and reporting; focuses on identifying suspicious behavior, gathering relevant info and passing it on to law enforcement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation #2: This presentation focuses on what to do if you are in a situation where someone is actively shooting at people and what to expect from responding law enforcement. Many people received training in school from an early age to turn off the light, close/lock the door and sit quietly in the corner. This presentation gives other options to consider and encourages developing an action plan in advance.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving crime awareness cards on unattended laptops at the libraries</td>
<td>DPS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of New Student Programs - Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Public Safety speaks with both new students and their parent/family members in separate presentations at orientation. The presentation includes information on: Mission/Purpose of Department of Public Safety; Overview of Departmental Services; Housing Security; Parking Enforcement; Loss Prevention Specialist Unit; Tips and Crime statistics; Overview of campus safety issues: Larceny/Theft, Identify Theft; special attention was given to sexual assaults happening near campus summer of 2011; Question and Answer: during the student session, this time is frequently devoted to the issue of MIPs.</td>
<td>DPS/ONSP</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Materials Distributed in Orientation:
UM Annual Security Report and Annual Fire Safety Report; Late Night Transportation/Emergency Phone Numbers/What do in a life threatening, alcohol related emergency Card; Choose to be Safe and Legal pamphlet; CSG Flyer on UM Emergency Alerts, Emergency Contacts, Laptop Registration Program, Safety Tips; Mplanner – Safety section includes information on Night Time Transportation Options, Ride Home, Night Ride, and SAFE Walk, DPS, SAPAC, Protecting Your Property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONSP</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Upon completing the student orientation evaluation at the end of orientation, students are directed to **Wolverine Access** to sign up for Campus Alerts, Emergency Contacts, and to authorize their parents to receive communications from the university. Students are also encouraged to fill out Emergency Contact information during the completion of the Housing Application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONSP</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Materials Distributed to Parents and Family Members:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONSP</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**New in 2012** – currently remaking our **transportation video** and it will feature late night transportation information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONSP</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Campus safety presentations to transfer students and their parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONSP/DPS</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Spring-half and Summer-half pre-terms safety info from ONSP staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONSP</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

International orientation for students and parent places strong emphasis on safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ONSP/DPS/International Center</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Community Matters

Sexual Assault Edu **online tutorial required** for all first-year students prior to arrival at UM’s campus that addresses sexual assault and alcohol-related issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAPAC/UHS</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### DIVISION OF STUDENT AFFAIRS UNITS

#### The Career Center

Public Service Intern Program **travel participants** cover basic Washington, D.C. safety (situational awareness, cab and metro system, neighborhoods in DC, GW policies); Require all participants to complete Emergency Contact Form & Travel Registry & review emergency preparedness plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Center</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Dean of Students Office
### Crisis intervention, advocacy, and case management for students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Crisis intervention, advocacy, and case management for students</strong></th>
<th><strong>DOS</strong></th>
<th><strong>S/T</strong></th>
<th><strong>I/R</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expect Respect</strong> value articulated in Student Government president introduction</td>
<td>DOS/CSG</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.5 hour personal safety and self-defense workshops</strong> made available Winter 2012</td>
<td>DOS/UMOVE</td>
<td><strong>P/S/T</strong></td>
<td><strong>I/R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beyond the Diag (BTD) SAFERide Community Organizing:</strong> late night transportation was reorganized so that all programs exist under the name SafeRide, and all may be accessed by calling a single phone number; 2 additional vehicles added for free door-to-door service, thereby tripling the capacity of that program</td>
<td>BTD/DPS/Parking &amp; Transportation Services/AATA</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Safety Assistants:</strong> two part-time students working out of the Dean of Students office to coordinate the Beyond the Diag (BTD) program</td>
<td>BTD/DOS</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future planned <strong>BTD Community Building Events</strong> include free skate night, safer St. Patrick's Day activities and an off-campus spring carnival; and education within the residence halls about Beyond the Diag for hall staff and RA's; collaboration is also planned with the Ann Arbor Campus Community Coalition to promote healthy drinking habits and general safety awareness</td>
<td>BTD/DOS</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BTD Neighborhood Ambassadors</strong> are working closely with the Student Safety Assistants to develop community in individual off-campus student neighborhoods</td>
<td>BTD/DOS</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BTD Off-Campus Student Newsletters</strong> share timely safety related information</td>
<td>BTD/DOS</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Canvassing and Welcome Back packets:</strong> distribution of safety information including SafeRide business cards and magnets, &quot;lock your door&quot; hangers, Party Safe magnets, the Off-Campus Life and Safety Guide during a Welcome Back canvassing event in September, 2011</td>
<td>BTD/DOS/OVPSA</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BTD Halloween Canvassing:</strong> a &quot;reverse trick or treat&quot; for off-campus housing students delivering candy, condoms, and safety reminders</td>
<td>BTD/DOS/AODPP/UHS</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BTD Social Media:</strong> to connect off-campus students with resources and events using Facebook and Twitter</td>
<td>BTD/DOS</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BTD Website:</strong> aggregating safety information at <a href="http://www.studentsafety.umich.edu">www.studentsafety.umich.edu</a> includes fire, party, and fan behavior safety, as well as information on DPS laptop registration, UM emergency alerts, housing security, AAPD, AAFD, and AA Housing Bureau as well as Beyond the Diag information and late night transportation options</td>
<td>BTD/DOS</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Housing</strong></th>
<th><strong>DOS</strong></th>
<th><strong>P</strong></th>
<th><strong>C</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual community meetings during Welcome Week</strong> occur at both hall and floor / community level; many safety issues addressed by Resident Advisors and Hall Directors in these meetings</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**First year <strong>Relationship Remix workshops:</strong> New first-year workshop in all residence halls every fall reaching approximately 6,000 students that focuses on healthy relationship promotion.</td>
<td>Housing/SAPAC/UHS</td>
<td><strong>P</strong></td>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing passive safety programming efforts (bulletin boards, etc.)</td>
<td>Housing/Housing Security</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General safety info at mandatory hall meetings &amp; floor meetings</strong> - Review of basic safety reminders of living in the residence halls and apartment communities.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Model - The tenets include getting to know students well and assessing needs. This allows our staff to be able to help students individually because of strong relationships and develop programs on a huge range of topics based on known research of needs of students as they develop as well as unique needs of the current resident population.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Buddy Walk Programs - A volunteer program managed by many hall councils where students can call/text each other to walk each other across campus or back to their rooms at nighttime.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Residential Contact Initiatives - Res Ed partners with Housing Security to do walk-throughs of each community. Conversations include introductions of the Security Officer assigned to that specific area as well as general safety reminders about living in the halls/apartment communities.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Checks - new as of 2011, this initiative involves Housing staff checking each resident room to ensure that furniture is in proper furniture configurations to avoid accidental injuries. Follow up meetings and assistance in moving furniture is provided to residents who have improper configurations.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solicitation Policy - Few outside entities are allowed access to the halls/apartments. Lounges can only be reserved by residents only to ensure that non-residents do not have access to Housing communities.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing passive safety programming efforts - this includes bulletin boards, Community Websites, newsletters, and emails to students on a variety of safety/security topics depending on current assessed needs and campus climate.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaster Outreach</strong> - If there are natural or large disasters, lists of potential students who themselves or their families are affected are dispersed to Hall Directors for outreach and support.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>S/T</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Spring Break Program - Since buses do not run to Oxford Hall over Spring Break, students may use Blue Cab for free to travel to certain locations on campus and from campus to Oxford over Spring Break.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing International Program - A facet of this program is assisting our international student population with programs campus culture and safety.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Safety Checks - Should a concern arise about the safety of a student, Res Ed professional staff and Housing Security may key into a student room to confirm the safety of a student.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester Break Checks - When Housing closes for the semester break, Res Ed staff key in and check every room to ensure that basic safety measures have been taken by students (windows closed and locked, items unplugged, doors securely locked, etc)</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal Break Communications- These emails/bulletin boards/Community Website content go out before each break (Fall, Thanksgiving, Winter, and Spring) about general safety if on campus and safety measures to take for their rooms if leaving.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOAS and Student Account Charges- For Hall and Multicultural councils and Res Ed student staff, the use of SOAS cash drops and charging student accounts policies for collecting money assists in avoiding students holding onto large sums of cash.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Cards- Every resident completes this card at move in that has emergency contact information as well as a contact person for Housing to contact in case the resident is thought to be missing.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afterhours POCC- should an immediate facilities concern arise, Housing Facilities and POCC have staff on call to assist students or to clean up human bio waste in community areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onity Electronic locks- Every residence hall room door and most apartments have Onity locks which can only be opened by a resident’s specific door key or a staff member’s duty key. All Onity locks can be tracked to view who has had access to the room if needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move-In Materials- At move in, students are given a packet of information including safety reminders, CLAM information and approved furniture configurations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASICS and ASAP Referrals- If students exhibit signs of concerning alcohol or other drug usage or addiction, Res Ed staff will collaborate with UHS staff to refer a student to the Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students (BASICS) program or to the Assessment of Substance Abuse Patterns (ASAP) program.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharps Program- Each Housing community has a Sharps Collection site for students needing to dispose of hypodermic needles and blood test lancets.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lead Based Paint Notification</strong>- Northwood residents are given notification materials upon move in that the paint in their apartments may contain lead as well as basic lead paint information and contact information if a resident has a concern or question.</td>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwood Apartment Transition Information- For students new to apartment living, documents and programs are facilitated to review how to maintain an apartment such as how to clean or work with a gas stove safely.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Living At Michigan Document- This document, also part of the Housing Contract, contains a spectrum of safety information such as prohibited items in the halls, Housing policies and procedures, Community Living Standards and the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias Incident Protocol- This protocol involves specific notifications, documentation, and response/support for targeted students and affected communities involved in a Bias Incident. The threshold for an action to be considered a bias incident in Housing is lower than the Federal Hate Crime definition.</td>
<td></td>
<td>S/T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Suppression Systems- Residence Halls are systematically being installed with Fire Suppression systems which significantly reduce fire damage, and injury.</td>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Res Ed Duty System (RAs, HDs, Central Staff)- Every night, Housing community has a student Resident Advisor that is on duty and performs community walk-throughs multiple times throughout the night. A professional Hall Director is on call every day to assist RAs and address higher level emergencies and follow up. A Res Ed Central Staff member (Associate Director or Assistant Director/Area Coordinator) is on call every day to consult or assist HDs.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Online Menu and Nutritionist- Residential Dining Services has every Dining hall menu online each day and online features include food allergy information so students are aware. Dining also has a nutritionist who can meet with students or chat online who have allergy questions or concerns.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate Care Reports- The Advocate Judicial Database allows for Care Reports to be submitted for students of concern. Res Ed, Housing Security, OSCR, and DOS all can submit and view reports to ensure for efficient response, support and inter-departmental communication regarding the work done with the resident.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>S/T</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC 471 Course for Res Ed Student Staff- Every Res Ed student staff member attends a 10 week pre-employment course on social identity awareness, development and ally training in order to be equipped with the tools and knowledge to build inclusive communities for all residents.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Peer Educator/ Diversity Peer Educator Assistant Program- Every Housing community has a DPE or DPEA whose main work is to work with other Res Ed staff in supporting students of targeted identities, promoted social justice initiatives, and assessing and responding to community and campus climate issues. They also take lead in Bias Incident response with HDs.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Review of CLAM and CLS with OSCR, HIO, Security- Each year the Community Living at Michigan and Community Living Standards are reviewed by multiple offices, campus stakeholders, and student leaders to ensure the most up to date information, policies, and content.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly SCCT Meetings- These Crisis Coordination meetings occur each week with various offices in attendance (Res Ed, DOS, SAPAC, UHS, etc) to review students who are in dire crisis, review the work being done by each office and coordinate efforts for response, support, and resolution.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Res Ed Central Staff Student Crisis Review- Each week Res Ed Central staff review all duty responses, and Advocate reports about residents. Response and follow up efforts are discussed.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay in the Blue Campaign Collaboration- Res Ed collaborates with UHS throughout the year, and especially around move in, large football games, and popular drinking holidays to promote the Stay in the Blue Campaign for students to be safe if they choose to consume alcohol.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock Outs Policy- Students who lock themselves out of their rooms multiple times meet with the Community Center Manager to discuss safety and security.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Digital Doorman- To ensure property safety around packages, all incoming packages are logged with the MDD system by barcode and students must bring UMID to retrieve. The package is logged in and logged out in an online database for tracking purposes.</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCard Access- All residence halls have exterior MCard access which restricts outside access by non-residents. Floor access and elevator access is also restricted by interior MCard locks to ensure that non-residents visiting the Dining Hall or Public areas cannot access residential floors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Bathroom locks- Every Community bathroom is locked and can only be accessed by a resident’s Onity room card to ensure that only residents access the bathrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Guest Policy- All non residents must be escorted at all times by a resident of the community and residents are responsible for the actions of their guests. Non-residents who are not escorted are asked to leave.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Phones- phones at each residence hall entrance can be used for campus phone numbers only for emergencies or to contact the Community Center for assistance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Usage for Food Ordering- All food for Hall/Multicultural Council, or Res Ed programming is ordered through Residential Dining Services to ensure that food is prepared and served according to OSEH Food License Regulations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Removal Assessments- In certain cases, residents involved in policy violations will be immediately be assessed for Emergency Removal from Housing should they be found to be a danger to themselves or the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Emergency Spaces- In cases where a resident feels unsafe in their current room, they may work with a Res Ed Central Staff member on possibly obtaining a temporary emergency space until the situation is resolved or the resident is permanently moved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Website: Health and Safety- this section covers Emergency Preparedness, Crime Prevention and Personal Safety, Personal Property Protection, Residence Hall Electronic Lock system information, Elevator Safety, Fire Safety, Environmental Health information and Health and Wellness resources such as the Dining MHealthy Nutritionist, SAPAC, UHS, and CAPs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Fire Marshall-This staff person consults in many areas to ensure that Housing staff and residents is following proper fire regulations and safety measures when reviewing/creating protocols or in programming.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing OSEH Representative- This OSEH rep can consult with Housing Staff or work with students concerned with Asbestos, Carbon Monoxide, Radon, Mercury, Mold, or other environmental hazard concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Extinguisher Training- Res Ed Professional and Student staff members are trained on how to properly use a fire extinguisher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing Security

| **Resident Contact Initiatives (RCIs)** | 2-3 times a year Housing Security Officers (HSO) go door to door in residence halls to provide information regarding crime prevention, emergency contact numbers and safety services offered; pamphlets + officers talk with the residents to go over the material in greater depth and to answer questions the resident may have. | Housing | P | I/C |
| **Community meetings and presentations** | HSOs are available to meet with student groups to discuss general safety and specific incidents, HSO also meet nightly with the on duty Residence Staff to exchange information related to any ongoing issues that may be occurring in or near the building. | Housing | P/S | C |
| **Bulletin Board Material** | Building bulletin boards / announcement cases used to display crime prevention and safety services information, emergency contact numbers and crime alerts. These boards are also regularly used to display alcohol and sexual assault education information. | Housing | P/S | C |
| While HSOs will often have to go back and forth between the service and enforcement roles during the course of their shift, they are encouraged to interact with the community in a non-enforcement role as much as possible so they will not be seen as enforcement only. The majority of work related interaction HSOs will have with students is in the service role and the HSOs are encouraged to be seen in that manner so that residents will feel more comfortable approaching them with questions and or concerns. HSOs also regularly provided escorts for residents between buildings on campus. | Housing | P/S/T | R/C |

## International Center

| **Initial 2-hr check in** | which all attend; covers very basic safety issues: personal safety (blue boxes on campus, 9-1-1, don’t walk alone at night etc.), and healthcare (accessing emergency services or UHS). | International Center | P | C |
| **Website on “Important Laws, policies, and procedures”** | covers violence, sexual harassment and assault, traffic tips, crime prevention and reporting, underage drinking law, and has a list of phone numbers for UM and Ann Arbor. There is also a page on transportation issues and a page on healthcare. | International Center | P | C |
| **Four optional summer orientation sessions:** Getting Around Ann Arbor and Personal Safety (presented by IC and DPS): Focus on transportation but for safety talks about biking, walking, emergencies, driving, hate crimes, sexual assault, alcohol and drugs, loss prevention, and emergency procedures (fire/tornado) | International Center/DPS | P | I |
| **Four optional summer orientation sessions:** Driving in the US — overview of many driving rules and safety issues | International Center | P | I |
Four optional summer orientation sessions: **It's not just a good idea, it's the Law** (presented by Student Legal Services): discusses things like civil liability, misdemeanors, alcohol, domestic violence, stalking/sexual harassment, felonies, sexual assault, child safety/laws, driving mistakes, car seats law, buses, driving laws, immigration issues, general safety tips, and identity theft

| International Center/SLS | P | I |

Four optional summer orientation sessions: **UHS info**: discusses how students can take care of themselves, manage stress, how to access UHS and specific services offered, CAPS, also brief mention of potential health issues in Michigan like poison ivy, winter weather, seasonal affective disorder, alcohol and smoking and texting laws.

| International Center/UHS | P | I |

**Multi-Ethnic Student Affairs / Trotter Multicultural House**

Community building, peer mentoring, community summits, cultural and educational events

| MESA/Trotter/Many collaborators | P | R/C |

Free weekly HIV screenings

| MESA/Trotter/UHS/Wash Co. Dept of Public Health | S/T | I/R |

Annual presentations from SAPAC and DPS to staff and student staff

| MESA/Trotter/SAPAC/DPS | P | C |

**Office of Student Conflict Resolution**

Educational sanctions for individual students found responsible for violations of the Statement of Student Rights and Responsibilities

| OSCR | T | I |

**Recreational Sports**

CPR/first aid certification courses

| Rec Sports | S | I |

AED/Lifeguard training

| Rec Sports | S | I |

All of the supervisors from programs and facilities go through an annual training surrounding topics such as; conflict resolution & team building, we have invited SAPAC to present before as well as UHS on alcohol education and awareness. Each year topics change.

| Rec Sports/SAPAC/UHS | P | C |

Specific programs and buildings have their own individualized trainings as well on risk management and emergency procedures.

| Rec Sports | S | C |

**Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC)**

**Relationship Remix**: New first-year workshop in all residence halls every fall reaching approximately 6,000 students that focuses on healthy relationship promotion.

<p>| SAPAC / Housing/UHS | P | R/C |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Workshops</strong> on sexual assault, intimate partner violence, stalking, and sexual harassment offered for any student group throughout the year including fraternities and sororities, student groups, classrooms, and co-ops.</th>
<th>SAPAC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshops offered by the <strong>Men's Activism program</strong> on redefining masculinity, cultural norms that perpetuate sexual and intimate partner violence, and bystander intervention; Men's Activism Program discussion series on men's role in the movement, masculinity, and culture change.</td>
<td>SAPAC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freshman orientation theater skit</strong> for all first-year students about sexual and intimate partner violence that addresses societal myths, bystander intervention, and men's role in the movement.</td>
<td>SAPAC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive, campus-wide <strong>bystander intervention skills</strong> training program in development</td>
<td>SAPAC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R/S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ally training program</strong> offered twice a year where students, faculty, and staff are invited to participate in a 6-hour training program to become allies and supporters of the movement.</td>
<td>SAPAC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parent orientation</strong> every summer (Sundays through Wednesdays) in which SAPAC conducts a presentation on SAPAC services, sexual assault and intimate partner violence, healthy relationship promotion, how to support survivors, and suggestions for parents on speaking with their student about these topics.</td>
<td>SAPAC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>36-hour volunteer training program</strong> every winter that covers the following topics: sexual assault, intimate partner violence, stalking, sexual harassment, systems of oppression, activism, confidentiality, how to support survivors, primary prevention principles, and much more.</td>
<td>SAPAC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer Education Program discussion series</strong> on various aspects of sexual violence and culture change; Peer education workshops on sexual assault, intimate partner violence, stalking, and sexual harassment throughout the campus community.</td>
<td>SAPAC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>R/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Student Conflict Resolution appeals board training</strong></td>
<td>SAPAC/OSCR</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing <strong>Greek Life retreats and workshops</strong> around bystander intervention; Greek Life Sober Monitor training on sexual assault prevention during social events; Developing student athlete retreats and workshops around bystander intervention.</td>
<td>SAPAC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAPAC’s <strong>Networking, Publicity, and Activism Program (NPA)</strong> brings in speakers every year to address issues related to SA, IPV, stalking, men’s role in the movement, culture change, sexism, and other topics; NPA program organizes a campus-wide art show each year called Revolution: Making Art for Change; NPA program organizes Survivor Speak Out, Clothesline Project, and Sexism in Advertising Campaign each year.</td>
<td>SAPAC</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis intervention, advocacy, short-term counseling, safety planning for survivors of sexual assault, sexual harassment, intimate partner violence and stalking</td>
<td>SAPAC</td>
<td>S/T</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spectrum Center**
Spectrum provides a number of **support services for students** which may include elements of student safety support; including: the Coming Out Group (10 week closed-group program); Guidance, Perspective and Support (one-on-one peer mentoring program); student drop-in Monday through Friday between 9am-6pm; and Gender Explorers (Gender Identity and expression group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LGBTQ Student Ally training</th>
<th>Spectrum</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Technology Services**

DSA's Tech Services maintains a number of **safety related websites** for students; including: http://studentpolicies.umich.edu/; http://umich.edu/~nohazing; http://www.housing.umich.edu/fire-safety; http://studentaffairs.umich.edu/tags/safety; http://studentaffairs.umich.edu/parents/tags/safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tech Services</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**University Health Service (UHS)**

- UHS Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Program distributes a card which includes saferide information
- Alcohol and other drug abuse prevention efforts; BASICS program; Biannual review of AOD prevention efforts
- UHS Health Promotion and Community Relations (HPCR) additional programs: eating disorder prevention; safe sex supply distribution; HIV test counseling
- UHS also conducts: STI testing; flu and other vaccinations; alcohol and depression screening
- PULSE program outreach on variety of wellness and related safety issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UHS</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UHS</th>
<th>P/S/T</th>
<th>I/R/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**University Unions**

- **Safety Education Classes for Student Employees:** Knife safety; First Aid/AED/CPR; See Something, Say something for theft/robbery safety; TAM classes/alcohol safety; ServeSafe/Food service safety; Sexual Harassment
- **DPS class for Student Building Managers** covering basic emergency procedures, i.e. severe weather, fire, electrical outage, how to use fire extinguisher, building specific alarm panel, how campus 911 system works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Unions</th>
<th>P/S</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| University Unions/DPS | P/S | I |

**ADDITIONAL AREAS**
### Communications

VP of Communications highlighted safety information in the Summer of 2011 and aggregates safety related content at [http://vpcomm.umich.edu/issues/safety.html](http://vpcomm.umich.edu/issues/safety.html)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVPC</th>
<th>S/T</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### College of Engineering

CoE Emergency Action Plan posters are located throughout all CoE facilities that include short descriptions of action steps for major emergencies and hazards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoE</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Building maps posted throughout facilities indicating evacuation points and assembly zones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoE</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Miscellaneous

Emails to Student Body From VPSA, DOS, DPS Chief, Athletic Director

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSA/DPS</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Tabling at Welcome Week, Festifall, Winterfest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSA/Others</th>
<th>P/S/T</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Various self-defense programs offered in past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rackham/Office Greek Life/Housing</th>
<th>P/S/T</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Rackham Graduate School

‘Navigate the Maize’ flyer – produced by Rackham and distributed to incoming graduate students during Fall Welcome and Rackham academic programs and departments for distribution at departmental orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rackham</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Your Safety Matters’ flyer** – produced by Rackham and distributed to Rackham academic programs and departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rackham</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Workshops:** What Works, What Doesn't and Why (SAPAC); Campus Safety Presentation with DPS (DPS); Introduction to Personal Safety (Katy Mattingly); Previously offered self-defense workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rackham</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The Guide to Campus and Community: Safety (http://www.rackham.umich.edu/student_life/living_in_ann_arbor/safety/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rackham</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Academic Units:** Post flyers and other information from other resources as received

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rackham</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Academic Units:** Discuss/distribute campus safety information at departmental orientations – provide brief overview of safety resources on campus (contacts and phone numbers, property and personal crime prevention, and late night transportation options)

| Rackham | P   | C |
### Academic Units: Safety information in online Graduate Student Handbook
- EMERGENCY: 911 (or 123)
- SECURITY: 3-1131
- 24 Hour Crisis Line 996-4747
- Disabilities, Services for Students with 763-3000
- Health Service 764-8320
- International Center-Michigan Union 764-9310
- NiteRide 763-3888
- Psychological Clinic 764-3471
- Stress Counseling and Support (CAPS) 764-8312

### Academic Units: Safety information on departmental websites

### Academic Units: Organize safety education workshops and develop targeted emails to address emergent safety issues

### Academic Units: Graduate students required to attend LSA Sexual Harassment Seminar

### Ann Arbor Police Department
- Provide AAPD speakers at UM and campus events
- Updates to community on investigations and prevention efforts

### Other Identified Safety Efforts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor(s)</th>
<th>Primary, Secondary, Tertiary</th>
<th>Individual, Relationship, Community, Societal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Department of Public Safety
- Bike registration, property engraving

### Transit Services
- Transit Services coach operators have direct radio access to the Department of Public Safety
- Transit services are in operation for about 20 hours of the day, and during hours which buses are not operating, the department covers those gaps with services such as SafeWalk and Ride Home
- Transit coach operators are able to assist passengers with basic safety-related issues, and are able to provide safe refuge (on the vehicle) for those in duress, as well as contact with the appropriate authorities
- When a passenger is alighting in a university parking lot, transit coach operators will wait to ensure that passenger safely enters the passenger’s personal vehicle, upon request of the passenger
- Operators are able to provide a wealth of information to those who seek it regarding safe methods of travel around campus and Ann Arbor in general.
### Dean of Students Office

**Hate Crimes and Bias Incident Reporting Protocol:** A number of DSA staff led by Monita Thompson (IGR/DOS) are in the process of developing a collaborative reporting protocol for hate crimes and bias incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-Ethnic Student Affairs / Trotter Multicultural House</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Rush Week, Trotter Multicultural Center was a &quot;safety site&quot; for sororities' games &amp; activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC)

- **Working with the Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR) and other campus partners to evaluate and revise sanctioning guidelines;** Collaborating with multiple campus departments to review **Title IX guidelines** and develop policies that are in compliance; Working with OSCR to revise evidentiary standards; Partnering with University Health Services to create a sexual assault protocol within their department.

- **Sexual Assault Response Team policy and protocol work** that involves collaboration with SafeHouse Center, Department of Public Safety, Ann Arbor Police Department, Pittsfield Police Department, Washtenaw County Prosecutor's Office, Washtenaw Child Advocacy Center, Dean of Students Office, and others.

- **Training** for law enforcement on effective response; Training & technical assistance for community partners such as Ozone House on crisis response; for hall directors, resident advisors, community center managers, on sexual assault protocol & effective response.

- **Collaboration on the Abuse Hurts Initiative,** a cross-campus collaboration promoting prevention of and effective response to domestic or intimate partner and sexual violence affecting members of the University community.

- **Partnering with campus and local law enforcement** for continuing education on investigating and prosecuting sexual assault and intimate partner violence.

- Regular expert **technical assistance** to colleges and universities nationwide on crisis intervention, advocacy, policy and protocols, education and training, and other areas.

### Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD)

- **Emergency Evacuation Procedures**
## Spectrum Center

The Spectrum Center identifies a number of University of Michigan Policies as having some student safety related elements, including gender neutral housing, gender neutral bathrooms, student and staff health insurance for other qualifying adults; and gender identity and expression resources (mental health, physical health, social transitioning, physical transitioning)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spectrum</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spectrum</td>
<td>S/T</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal liaison relationship with CAPS</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## College of Engineering

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CoE</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CoE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoE</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>I/R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoE</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoE</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoE</td>
<td>S/T</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AED

Each building’s designated severe weather zone is equipped with 1st aid kit; Each building’s facility coordinator is equipped with a 1st aid kit; Handwash is available in each classroom to prevent the spread of cold, flu, and other communicable diseases.

### Emergency response team

Committees hold “table-top” exercises to prepare personnel for managing possible emergency situations.

### Safety phones

Safety phones are located in each classroom. DPS can be contacted directly in the event of an emergency. DPS can also listen in on classroom activity in case of active or suspected emergency.

### CoE campus has excellent exterior lighting.

CoESafe: In coordination with the Safety and Security Committee, CoESafe manages laboratory and shop safety. CoESafe's membership includes all CoE academic departments, CoE facilities, CAEN, and OSEH. CoESafe meets monthly to review past and current laboratory and shop safety incidents for facility, procedural, or other safety improvements. (See http://www.engin.umich.edu/safety/coesafety).

CoE Safety and Security Committee: meets monthly; The mission of the Safety and Security Committee is to provide planning, direction and oversight of CoE safety and security initiatives for crisis management, business process continuity, and the protection of the CoE community. Safety, security and response planning, whether managed directly by this committee or in parallel with work done in other CoE committees addresses: Safety standards in CoE facilities; Safe practices in CoE research and instructional labs and shops; Crisis management procedures; Business continuity procedures; Information technology security; Incident communication policies and procedures; Coordination with related University offices and efforts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ann Arbor Police Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide AAPD speakers at UM and campus events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Updates to community on investigations and prevention efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with DPS, SAPAC, other units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra patrols during special events and key dates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. Collected Recommendations for Specific Populations

Student Safety Work Group
Population Specific Recommendations

Key for SSWG Focus Groups:
- Graduate & International Students
- Student Athletes & Greek Life
- Students of Color
- LGBT Students & Students with Disabilities

THEME A: Bystander Intervention Education

- Develop a Disability Ally Training Program
- Provide online LGBTQ ally training
- Self-defense training for international students (could be part of bystander intervention training)
- Help International students understand how police system works as part of bystander training with a refrigerator magnet for easy reference
- Education about how to respond to stalking (work into Bystander intervention training)
- Enforce standard crime prevention/encouraging students to call AAPD when there is a problem
- Continuing efforts for hazing prevention
- Step-Up module for new athletes about hazing awareness
- Personal Safety Education (holistic self-defense) incorporated into Bystander/Step-Up module (intervening safely, using your intuition, how to assess safety)
- Train student orgs on Expect Respect (combine with bystander training)

THEME B: Disseminating Existing Program / Resource Information

- Add information to university acceptance letters about SSD resources
- Identify and label single-occupancy bathrooms as gender neutral
- Mention SSD at orientation, parent orientation, and transfer orientation
- Provide a mid-tenure update on safety and security issues, new initiatives
- Encourage more students to attend Rackham Orientation (currently <50%)
- Distribute comprehensive reference book / pamphlet / webpage with safety info
- Connect off campus students to various information
- Identify theft/phishing/risky practices
- How to report sexual harassment / violence for International Students (cultural barriers)
- Awareness of resources for students with families
- Outreach by Beyond the Diag for athlete heavy neighborhoods
- Publicize the nighttime Oxford bus service
- Publicize SAFERide for Greek students to get home at night
- Publicize Bias Incident site (Expect Respect)
- Expand visibility of Expect Respect, main UM & Housing sites, every DSA site

### THEME C: Building Relationships between Students and Law Enforcement

- Help International students understand how police system works as part of bystander training with a refrigerator magnet for easy reference
- More info on alcohol and domestic violence laws for International Students
- Contact AAPD and DPS about community police presentations at chapter houses with increased focus on sober monitor training for fraternities
- Enforce standard crime prevention/encouraging students to call AAPD when there is a problem
- Call cops, change culture, make it clear that party is right next to UM building
- Evaluation, processing, review of crime alerts and training for crime alert writers w/ feedback from students
- Host regular forums with DPS, AAPD to discuss crime alerts/safety issues (partner with Eracism)
- Host intentional discussions with students of color about feeling targeted by crime alerts
- Enforce standard crime prevention/encouraging students to call AAPD when there is a problem

### THEME D: Other

- Develop social messages encouraging respectful language w/ specific examples
- Social messaging regarding intra-community behavior (i.e. norms of respect, unwanted physical contact)
- Social messages normalizing gender variation
- Graduate student safety education programs at the academic unit level
- Work with OGL to reach out to houses around Trotter, diversity awareness education
- Education about travel safety for away games and tournaments
- Report broken streetlights to the city (near Trotter, Oxbridge)
- Reach out to newer students going through recruitment while they’re in the residence halls
- Check with SAAC to hear what their concerns are
- Create text walking group for buddy-style Trotter walk requests, combine with existing Oxford group
- Require party hosts to have safety plan for commuters in neighborhood when registering party
- When registering party have contact for sober monitors/risk managers for party, inform them that someone will be in neighborhood, need it to be safe
- Community between Trotter, Greek Life, Oxford discuss safety in area
Appendix F. Collected Recommendations for Living Groups

Ideas were brainstormed in small groups in a working session of the SSWG and then ranked by impact and feasibility. The full SSWG membership then used multi-voting to identify highest priority recommendations. Number of votes received is noted for each recommendation; ideas in each category with the highest number of votes are underlined.

Students in Residence Halls

- [6] Hold Safety Panels in which upper class students return to the residence halls to share their various safety experiences around campus; “what I wish I knew then”; have Greek Life students come back to the Residence Halls to talk about party safety
- [1] Direct students to one location for safety info over time; community websites, LCD screens

Additional ideas for this living group:
Follow-up around alcohol safety and sexual assault online module throughout the year
- Have RA’s partner up to give presentation to residents (so that all bases are covered)
- Advertise after hours transportation options / tips for safe travel at night
- Bystander Intervention training program in Residence Halls
- Promote the “buddy system” – letting someone know you will be walking home and when to expect you
- Safety tips / messaging before school breaks
- Education about finding off-campus housing during Fall semester
- Expand resources about roommate disagreements / communication resources
- Adjusting messages in each building based on populations living there
- Improving the relationship between residents and Housing Security / authority figures (especially at beginning of the year)
- Thinking about a spectrum of messaging, not just talk to typical student population or just saying “don’t do it”

Students on North Campus

- [3] Community building theme overall; Establish/DO Community Projects together, great buy in!
- [1] Education, using 911, non-emergency, tip lines, area of city/campus, expected response from PD, explain priority of service, what services are priority?
- [1] Could use the email/texting features to “tell” about changes, refresher...while you were away this is what changed (send the emails), offer advice with crime stories blotter, ask a cop session, allow to ask and answer, community oriented police offer, direct line to answer questions, educate, focus 1st and 2nd week of the Fall Term

Additional ideas for this living group:
- Establish neighborhood associations/watch in specific areas with community
- Clean-up day city wide, assign a street with 5 people for ex.
- Forums / meetings; Q&A, provide advice
- Education for pedestrians / drivers about the pedestrian crossings; what the law is, enforcement? Expectations?
- Links to: driver’s license, traffic closures, construction, etc., direct link from UM website to City of Ann Arbor, SOS, MDOT, etc.
- Executive Summary of summer events; campus wide; use marketing campaign, Michigan Daily, the Record
- PD’s visibility / presence in community; drive through, communities
- Personal Safety Education workshops for North Campus students
- SAPAC educational programs like “What Works, What Doesn’t” for North Campus

**Students in Off Campus Apartments**

- [9] Create a tiered ranking systems of landlords with safety ratings to increase landlord buy-in and student safety; Enforce/promote/incentivize landlord disclosure of relevant housing safety information; promote Tenant Rights and Responsibilities (70 day rule); student feedback to landlords / Off Campus Housing (on listing server)
- [3] Integrate Off-Campus Housing and Beyond the Diag in significant ways
- [1] App creation, rental listing server
- [1] DPS / AAPD liaisons to neighborhoods off-campus; DPS AAPD neighborhood canvassing; getting to know law enforcement to increase student reporting of safety issues

**Additional ideas for this living group:**
- Updated, more thorough off-campus housing listing service for students
- Education around lighting and landscaping safety
- Off-campus video updates on party safety
- Neighborhood-based Personal Safety Education workshops
- More publicized and attended Off-Campus Housing Fair with strong Beyond the Diag presence
- Promoting Saferide to off-campus students; consider expansion of pick-up locations and overall capacity of Saferide; work with departments to change Saferide info to reflect their new name and programs
- More publicized and engaging social media (increase readership)
- Neighborhood Association meetings between students, Beyond the Diag Neighborhood Ambassadors, City of Ann Arbor, Greek Life, etc.

**Students in Greek, Athlete, Academic Live Out, ICC Houses**

- [3] Step Up Bystander Intervention Education Program: Health & Wellness Workshop for Athletic Teams
- [2] House Mom Program of UM resources & referrals
- [1] Annual risk management training to address comprehensive safety issues for all Greek affiliates
- [1] ICC Social Norming Campaign about helping behaviors; specific to the ICC community; complement Bystander Intervention training

**Additional ideas for this living group:**
- Academic Live Out Houses Orientation Programming
- Collaborate with the ICC to create a specific safety education program for all affiliated house
## Appendix G. Collected Recommendations for Building Law Enforcement & Student Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestions</th>
<th>Populations</th>
<th>Origin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improving the relationship between residents and Housing Security / authority figures (especially at beginning of the year)</td>
<td>Students in Residence Halls</td>
<td>Living Groups SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, using 911, non-emergency, tip lines, area of city/campus, expected response from PD, explain priority of service, what services are priority?</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>Living Groups SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could use the email/texting features to “tell” about changes, refresher...while you were away this is what changed (send the emails), offer advice with crime stories blotter, ask a cop session, allow to ask and answer, community oriented police offer, direct line to answer questions, educate, focus 1st and 2nd week of the Fall Term</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>Living Groups SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish neighborhood associations/watch in specific areas with community</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>Living Groups SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forums / meetings; Q&amp;A, provide advice</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>Living Groups SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education for pedestrians / drivers about the pedestrian crossings; what the law is, enforcement? Expectations?</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>Living Groups SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Links to: driver’s license, traffic closures, construction, etc., direct link from UM website to City of Ann Arbor, SOS, MDOT, etc.</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>Living Groups SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD’s visibility / presence in community; drive through, communities</td>
<td>North Campus</td>
<td>Living Groups SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPS / AAPD liaisons to neighborhoods off-campus; DPS AAPD neighborhood canvassing; getting to know law enforcement to increase student reporting of safety issues</td>
<td>Off Campus Apartments</td>
<td>Living Groups SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Association meetings between students, Beyond the Diag Neighborhood Ambassadors, City of Ann Arbor, Greek Life, etc.</td>
<td>Off Campus Apartments</td>
<td>Living Groups SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help International students understand how police system works as part of bystander training with a refrigerator magnet for easy reference</td>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>Population Specific SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More info on alcohol and domestic violence laws for International Students</td>
<td>International Students</td>
<td>Population Specific SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions</td>
<td>Populations</td>
<td>Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact AAPD and DPS about community police presentations at chapter houses with increased focus on sober monitor training for fraternities</td>
<td>Greek Life Students</td>
<td>Population Specific SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforce standard crime prevention/encouraging students to call AAPD when there is a problem</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Population Specific SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call cops, change culture, make it clear that party is right next to UM building</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Population Specific SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation, processing, review of crime alerts and training for crime alert writers w/ feedback from students</td>
<td>Students of Color</td>
<td>Population Specific SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host regular forums with DPS, AAPD to discuss crime alerts/safety issues (partner with <em>Eracism</em>)</td>
<td>Students of Color</td>
<td>Population Specific SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host intentional discussions with students of color about feeling targeted by crime alerts</td>
<td>Students of Color</td>
<td>Population Specific SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforce standard crime prevention/encouraging students to call AAPD when there is a problem</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>Population Specific SSWG Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix H: Comparison of Three Bystander Programs Using Guiding Principles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Green Dot</th>
<th>Response Ability</th>
<th>StepUp!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Created, implemented, and sustained collaboratively by students, faculty, and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes that peers are most influential in their own social circles</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes a continuum of behavior that includes intervening in cases of harm to self, others, and community</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporates both knowledge-building and skill-building</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses a positive, strength-based, empowerment model</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is socio-culturally relevant</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotes ownership of the issue and responsibility</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involves a variety of delivery modalities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers a continuum of options for intervention and assessment</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is broad-based and applicable to a wide variety of issues and situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Beyond the Diag / Off Campus Student Safety Subcommittee

Members
Mary Jo Desprez-Chair
Brittany Sandefeur
Josh Bouy
Stephanie Hamel
Eric Lipson
Sabrino Palombo
Emily Ho
Wenxin Ning

The sub-committee established three objectives to prepare us to make recommendations to the sponsors of the Student Safety Work Group. The objectives were to 1) Review the Beyond the Diag Program report, 2) to engage off-campus stakeholders in conversations about the safety issues that they feel pose the biggest risk for University of Michigan students living off-campus and 3) to benchmark other colleges/universities off-campus safety work to determine best practices for our community.

Stakeholders Conversations
Arb/Botanical Gardens
Realty Agencies (Zaragon, Campus Management, JMS)
International Students
Transfer Student Association
Cab Companies
UM Housing
Inter Co-operative Council
Ann Arbor Neighborhood Associations
LGBTQ Community Members
UM Greek leadership
Huron Valley Ambulance
Ann Arbor Parks & Rec

Off-Campus Neighborhood Program Benchmarks

Members of the sub-committee visited The Ohio State University and met with Sean M. McLaughlin, Ph.D. Director, Off-Campus & Commuter Student Engagement. The program is approximately 10 years old and was created as a response to student riots that erupted after a sporting event. This program is considered one of the best practice benchmark programs in the country. Please see following page for detailed information on the comparison between U-M and two peer institutions with benchmark programs.
## Program/Service Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Ohio State University</th>
<th>University of Oregon</th>
<th>University of Michigan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Safety Information</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Housing Information</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Housing Fair</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Living Guide</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Neighborhoods</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Neighborhoods</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Ambassadors</td>
<td>1-2 per</td>
<td>2 per</td>
<td>3 total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Building Events*</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome-Back Event</td>
<td>Campus-wide</td>
<td>Campus-wide</td>
<td>Active Neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with City Neighborhood Associations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>In progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Campus Newsletters</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook (# of likes)</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter (# of followers)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door-to-Door Canvassing</td>
<td>Campus-wide</td>
<td>Campus-wide</td>
<td>Active Neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Staff Member / Director</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Night Transportation Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Types of Community Building Events offered:
OSU: cookouts, pumpkin carvings, light contest, safety distribution, salt delivery, “corn-hole”
Oregon: end-of-year recycling fair, light contest, safety distribution
U of M: light contest, safety distribution, ice skating
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“Learning how to yell ‘no’ in my deepest voice and how to physically defend myself in a mock attack taught me that I am much stronger than I realized. I also grew to understand the importance of setting boundaries in my daily life which has given me the confidence to stand up for myself in my personal and professional relationships. For me, personal safety education has been about much more than knowing what to do in a worst case scenario. It has been about finding my voice and realizing that every one of us has value and is worth fighting for in all aspects of life.”

University of Michigan Graduate Student
2012
1. Executive Summary

The Personal Safety Education (PSE) subcommittee of the University of Michigan Student Safety Work Group (SSWG) was charged with the task of making recommendations to the Dean of Students / AVP of Student Affairs regarding the content and future expansion of PSE at the institution.

The goal of Personal Safety Education is to empower students to recognize, interrupt, and respond to safety matters of many types, particularly those most common in their communities. Evidence in this emerging field indicates that PSE is a promising intervention for increasing protective factors, limiting and correcting for risk factors, and preventing victimization in multiple populations. The subcommittee completed a comprehensive needs assessment and review of existing PSE programs at UM. Members documented best practices derived from the evidence-based literature and from national PSE programs in higher education communities. Concurrently, evaluation data was collected locally from a series of pilot PSE workshops offered to UM students during Winter Term, 2012.

In response to the institutional needs assessment and program review, emerging local and national evidence, student demand, and comparable programs at peer institutions, the subcommittee unanimously recommends that the university provide comprehensive, multi-level Personal Safety Education for UM students. To maximize choice and developmental fit, a tiered program with three distinct levels of student engagement is recommended, including: short workshops, credited coursework, and an integrative co-curricular option.

Given the lack of existing PSE models fully aligned with best practices in the fields of public health, violence prevention, student affairs and higher education, the subcommittee identified a need to develop new programming unique to the University of Michigan. The UM Personal Safety Education Program should be positive, strengths-based, and skill-building, and embrace the following six core programmatic elements which are aligned with best practices and with the Student Safety Work Group’s guiding principles.

UM Personal Safety Education should:

i. Demonstrate simple, practical techniques, tactics, and strategies.

ii. Include comprehensive awareness, body language, social, verbal, & physical skills.

iii. Utilize integrative, experiential, interactive, and embodied learning.

iv. Deliver adaptable, relevant skills for multiple social identity groups and multiple contexts.

v. Honor each individual’s past and future choices by offering options, not “shoulds.”

vi. Provide a good fit for UM’s unique culture.

The following report defines PSE, reviews the evidence for its effectiveness, and lays out the need for a program at UM. Guiding principles are identified, and recommendations made to both continue existing and to launch new PSE programming for the student population. The implementation and conclusion sections outline the beginnings of a strategic plan for implementation of these recommendations.
2. Background & Context

The University of Michigan has always been active in assuring student safety on campus and beyond, and the institution is well known for a variety of ground-breaking safety programs such as the Division of Student Affairs’ (DSA) programs in sexual assault prevention, alcohol and other drug abuse prevention, and student conflict resolution. The UM Department of Public Safety (DPS) engages in proactive and preventative student safety and community policing, and works closely with the Ann Arbor Police Department (AAPD) in crime prevention and response.

During early 2011, the University of Michigan responded to a number of emergent concerns when students living in the Oxbridge neighborhood reported multiple crimes. Students voiced a variety of safety needs including a strong interest in self-defense education. Concerns escalated during the summer of 2011, stemming from a series of well publicized, stranger sexual assaults occurring in Ann Arbor near campus. These events underscored the importance of student safety and increased campus-wide interest in personal safety education.

A new collaboration began in January, 2012 between the Dean of Students office in DSA, DPS and the AAPD. These three areas charged the Student Safety Work Group (SSWG) with exploring the scope of current student safety programming, identifying theoretical foundations of existing initiatives, researching national best practices, evaluating current and recommending new programs, and making recommendations to the Dean of Students / AVP Student Affairs regarding the content and future expansion of Personal Safety Education and off-campus student safety. The work group was charged to supply sponsors with an advisory report for their consideration.

As part of this effort, the Personal Safety Education Subcommittee began to meet concurrently with the SSWG. In addition to exploring the evidence, the subcommittee completed a comprehensive needs assessment and review of existing PSE programs at UM. Members documented best practices derived from the literature and from national PSE programs. Focus groups were held, stakeholders from many social identity groups were consulted, and diverse staff and students assessed existing PSE program models. Subcommittee members also participated in the evaluation of a pilot PSE workshop, provided to 227 students during Winter Term, 2012. This subcommittee is the first at the institution to look systematically at the evidence base for personal safety education, explore program models, and forward recommendations to leadership.

The findings of the SSWG and its PSE subcommittee recommend that a new and unique program be made available to all students. The UM Personal Safety Education Program should be in alignment with best practices in violence prevention, and provide students with skills-based education which is practical, comprehensive, adaptable, integrative, and which provides safety options for students on campus and beyond.
“...empowerment is achieved when women feel able to defend themselves and to use physical force in response to potential or actual physical assaults. Women who are able to respond forcefully and physically to provocations and attempts at physical coercion can effectively prevent assaults from occurring. The self-esteem inherent in the ability to defend oneself to whatever extent possible is one of the most effective antidotes to a variety of attitudes and behaviors that may increase women’s risk of sexual assault.”

Alan Berkowitz

Critical elements of sexual assault-prevention and risk-reduction programs for men and women.
3. What Is Personal Safety Education?

Personal safety education (PSE) includes comprehensive skills, strategies and tactics which individuals can learn and practice for the prevention of interpersonal violence. PSE includes awareness, body language, social, verbal, and physical skills which provide participants with choices for avoiding, de-escalating, and responding to potential harm from known and unknown others.

The following chart delineates some specific examples of the breadth and depth of Personal Safety Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSE Content Area</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Awareness</strong></td>
<td>Learning which crimes one is most likely to experience on campus and beyond; Unlearning stereotypes and myths about perpetrators and victims; Debunking the “just world” view (that bad things never happen to good people); Learning to identify and trust one’s intuition in interactions with known and unknown others; Increasing awareness of one’s surroundings and the behavior of others; Education about one’s legal rights and responsibilities regarding safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body Language</strong></td>
<td>Projecting confidence; Setting boundaries; Letting someone know you don’t want to be touched; Expressing congruence between one’s words and actions; Responding confidently to incursions into one’s personal space; developing inter-cultural awareness and competence about differences in body language and personal space across communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>Practicing skills for saying no early in a new relationship and accurately assessing the partner’s response; Exploring one’s right to say “no” from a social norms perspective; Assessing the perceived socio-emotional costs of self-protective dating/hooking up behaviors; Bystander interventions on behalf of others at risk; Learning about resources for getting help when setting boundaries with employers, peers, and colleagues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbal</strong></td>
<td>Communicating assertively (rather than passively or aggressively); Expressing a strong, confident willingness to consent or not consent to sexual activity; Shouting to attract attention or startle a perpetrator; Telling one’s own story; Getting support to break free of abusive relationships; 3-part statements (reflecting a problem behavior, describing its effect, and asking for a different behavior.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td>Escaping from a potentially unsafe situation; Breaking a physical hold; Emergency techniques such as strikes or kicks; Learning to make choices based on one’s own personal values about how and when to employ physical skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal Safety Education is integrative learning which is embodied and skills-based. It provides students with “opportunities to learn, observe, and practice physical, social, and cognitive skills through the use of role-plays, discussion, and simulation exercises” (Brecklin & Ullman, 2005). PSE aims to increase accurate assessment of dangerous situations and respond, even when adrenalized or frightened. Comprehensive PSE requires thoughtful exploration of the social and emotional costs of assertive and self-protective behaviors and provides the opportunity to practice surmounting social barriers like embarrassment, fear of losing face or friends, and shock or denial (common barriers to safety with known assailants).

Sometimes referenced in the literature as self-protective behaviors, resistance strategies, risk reduction, assertiveness training, self-defense, violence prevention, or rape avoidance, PSE formats range from short workshops taught by student peers, to multi-year study of martial arts, to state-dependent or adrenaline based “padded attacker” courses such as R.A.D. or IMPACT. These vary widely in philosophies, tactics and learning outcomes. For example, feminist, social justice oriented programs emphasize power and privilege differentials and known assailants, whereas R.A.D. teaches defenses against abduction by strangers.

Most PSE learning outcomes extend beyond those situations stereotypically identified as “dangerous” (such as parking lots and wooded areas). In one longitudinal study based on a credited, upper-class PSE course at the University of Oregon, students reported numerous positive outcomes including “more comfortable interactions with strangers, acquaintances, and intimates; more positive feelings about their bodies; increased self-confidence; and transformed beliefs about women, men, and gender” (Hollander, 2004, p. 205). The PSE workshops provided by DSA in Winter Term, 2012 had the following learning objectives:

- Learn and practice verbal and social skills for assertive communication
- Learn and practice physical skills for setting boundaries with acquaintances, friends and family
- Identify those personal safety threats of highest risk to you personally, as well as those most common on college campuses
- Identify campus and community safety resources

PSE is appropriate for students of all social identities, physical abilities, ages and developmental levels. Programs include skills, strategies, and tactics for responding to stranger violence, mugging and property crimes, hate crimes and bias incidents, setting boundaries and limits with acquaintances, friends, and intimates, sexual and intimate partner violence, and sexual and street harassment.

The PSE Subcommittee of the SSWG analyzed multiple program models, including several in direct conflict with each other’s stated goals, purposes, and target populations. As with any other type of programming, it will be essential that the UM Personal Safety Education Program be a good fit with UM’s unique culture, while providing comprehensive, integrative, practical and relevant options for all interested students.

1 http://www.rad-systems.com/
2 http://www.impactpersonalsafety.com/
“I could know all the physical skills known to woman, but if I did not feel confident or assertive, my knowledge would be useless.”

University of Oregon PSE Student

Hollander, 2004
4. Needs Assessment

The subcommittee completed a PSE needs assessment via a combination of approaches. The group surveyed students and other stakeholders about the perceived need for and availability of PSE programming at UM. They also surveyed current and previous providers of PSE at UM to find out more about learning outcomes, program models and participation rates. Via the literature and interviews with practitioners locally and nationally, committee members explored secondary data within and beyond Higher Education. Program models at comparable institutions were then further explored via focus group discussions. Finally, data from the Winter Term, 2012 pilot PSE workshops was analyzed by the subcommittee as a whole.

The group identified four gaps indicating needs which the institution can meet for students:

1. A gap between students’ expressed needs and available PSE programs,
2. A gap between UM programming and that of comparable institutions,
3. A gap between available PSE programs and student awareness of those resources, and
4. A gap between students’ safety concerns and belief in their ability to effectively respond to potentially harmful situations.

The PSE Subcommittee recommends that the university make Personal Safety Education available to the global student population at various levels of engagement to most effectively meet all of the above needs.

1. Expressed Need – Students & Other Stakeholders

Many students are interested in participating in Personal Safety Education. Historically, student demand for PSE has been expressed to and met by independent contractors, student organizations, and occasional offerings by individual academic programs. Students with financial resources have hired PSE instructors, or used free time to participate in martial arts organizations on and off campus, have attended SAPAC trainings and DPS safety updates and workshops, and have participated in workshops provided by schools and colleges.

Early in 2011, the Michigan Student Assembly’s Student Safety Commission approached a local PSE instructor and DSA employee to request a credited class in PSE. The course was opened for the Fall of 2011 and filled to capacity (plus a waitlist) within a few days of being made available. DSA also developed the pilot PSE workshops of 2012, which filled to capacity with very little marketing beyond Student Affairs. To date, students continue to submit requests for these workshops for Summer and Fall, 2012.

Surveys of students, staff and faculty also surfaced requests for Personal Safety Education. (See Appendix F for complete survey content.) The majority of respondents believed the institution should make such education available as an option for students. Some representative responses follow:
“I feel that the University of Michigan should not only offer, but encourage these types of classes. A well-taught class does not create people with a prejudice for violence, but rather gives them the presence of mind to understand the situation they are in, and use the minimum force necessary to handle it. Passivity does not lend itself to the avoidance of conflict, but rather having the capability to handle the conflict can assist in avoiding unnecessary physical struggles.” (UM ROTC Officer)

“There should be more awareness of [PSE] on campus and with the students. Every student should have a chance to be able to learn more about it.” (Student Resident Advisor, RA Survey)

“It would be great if self-defense was more of an expectation and integrated part of campus. I would like to see the University respond with well-advertised courses and programs in light of events that occurred earlier this year.” (Student Resident Advisor, RA Survey)

“It should emphasize getting away safely instead of winning a fight.” (Resident Advisor, RA Survey)

“I think it would be great if there were ongoing workshops that would begin early during each term, offered for a nominal fee ($10?) - while it would be great to offer them for free, you would probably have a lot of people not showing up in that case.” (Student Resident Advisor, RA Survey)

[I believe UM should be] “Educating people about the types of situations in which self defense can be useful and teaching them methods of self defense.” (Student Resident Advisor, RA Survey)

Student expressed need was also identified via pre-surveys of the pilot PSE workshops. Before the training, students generally reported much more confidence in their ability to speak up and stand up for themselves with known others and a higher need for skills to use in their interactions with strangers. Yet during the trainings, students expressed that, in fact, it’s much harder to utilize effective assertive communication with one’s friends and intimates than it is with strangers. Students come to understand via the intervention that the consequences of setting a boundary with a friend often feel much more challenging than when setting that same boundary with a stranger. Therefore, student expressed need for skills to use with known others was both met by, and in some cases increased by, PSE workshop participation.

Finally, as higher education administrators know, critical incidents such as active shooters or serial stranger rapists on college campuses are exceedingly rare. Because they are, however, highly publicized, students are likely to express interest in and need for skills applicable to these atypical scenarios. The vast majority of students are far more likely to experience sexual assault, intimate partner violence, sexual harassment, property crime, and aggressively drunk peers. Safety and prevention programs that leverage the expressed need for skills applicable to rare safety scenarios can also provide techniques and strategies relevant to the types of violence students are most likely to experience.
2. Comparative Need – Big 10 Institutions

The University of Michigan stands alone among the Big 10 schools in not systematically providing either personal safety education or self-defense programs for students. Programs vary widely at comparable institutions: some are student-led, some taught by university faculty, some by campus police or security officers, others by community partners. Content includes numerous styles of martial arts, short workshops, credited coursework and padded attacker models. More than fifty percent of Big 10 schools have a R.A.D. (Rape Aggression Defense) program, including: the University of Illinois, Indiana University, Northwestern, Ohio State University, Penn State, Purdue, and the University of Iowa. Credited coursework in Personal Safety is available to students at the University of Minnesota, the University of Wisconsin, Michigan State and Ohio State University. Student Services, Student Affairs, and/or Student Recreation offer PSE programming at Michigan State, the University of Wisconsin, and Nebraska. (See Appendix D for details on Big 10 PSE content and sponsorship.)

3. Need for Increased Awareness of Resources

A key finding of the Student Safety Work Group was a need for wider publicity efforts to raise student awareness about existing safety resources and programs. Similarly, the PSE subcommittee noted that many students reported a lack of awareness about the availability of the PSE workshops, or confusion about how to participate. Student respondents to a March, 2012 UMOVE survey were asked if they were aware of any PSE programs for students. Approximately 50% knew of the free workshops at UMOVE. Other respondents were either unaware of any such programs or unsure. Fifty percent is a respectful figure for a two-month old program at UM, but publicity efforts will obviously need to continue and expand. The SSWG’s recommendation to utilize new and existing technological tools to better publicize safety programs also applies to PSE. Awareness campaigns and publicity must be nimble and responsive given the decentralized nature of the institution. Assuring student safety and preventing violence will always be a joint effort across many schools, colleges, divisions and departments, thus the need for publicity and awareness campaigns will be ongoing.

4. Need for Skills in Response to Safety Concerns

Data from DSA’s pilot workshops offered to students in Winter Term, 2012 provides a helpful overview of student interest in and need for Personal Safety Education. For example, while most participants reported feeling moderately or very safe both on and off campus, a significant minority reported feeling not very safe on campus (7% of University Housing residents and 5% of off campus residents) and not very safe or not at all safe off campus in Ann Arbor (20% of University Housing residents and 17% of off campus residents). Further, many student attendees reported only moderate or low confidence in their own abilities to communicate assertively, set boundaries, or to stand up for themselves in interactions with known and unknown others. (See Appendix E for detailed summary findings.) Student participants reported an average of 3.5 different personal safety concerns each, which varied markedly by gender. (Details follow on page 11.)
In conclusion, the PSE Subcommittee believes that all of the four identified needs can and should be met by the provision of personal safety education by the University of Michigan. A robust, skills-based program with three levels of engagement (short workshops, credited classes, and an integrative, embodied co-curricular program) will:

1. Meet student requests for PSE
2. Align with offerings at comparable institutions
3. Increase awareness of existing safety education and resources at UM, and
4. Help students to develop the skills needed to respond to potential harm and violence.
## Need Data from UM Workshop Participants

### PRE-WORKSHOP

#### Perception of Safety On & Off UM Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>On Campus Residents</th>
<th>Off Campus Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely safe</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately safe</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very safe</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all safe</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Personal Safety Concerns at UM – By Gender Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property crime <em>(such as having something stolen)</em></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical assault or being attacked <em>(such as mugged or beaten up)</em></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being targeted because of my social identity, whether real or perceived <em>(such as ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender or gender identity, disability, etc.)</em></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate partner violence <em>(such as emotional, verbal, physical, sexual abuse from a partner)</em></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street harassment <em>(such as catcalls, name calling, aggressive panhandling)</em></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“For those who have never learned the basics of physical self-defense, this instruction can become a method of both psychological mastery and physiological reconditioning... survivors put themselves in a position to reconstruct the normal physiological responses to danger, to rebuild the “action system” that was shattered and fragmented by the trauma. As a result, they face their world more confidently.”

Judith Herman

Trauma and Recovery: The aftermath of violence – from domestic abuse to political terror
5. Supporting Research on Personal Safety Education

An additional gap identified in the needs assessment was between violence prevention’s best practices as noted in the literature and the services which UM currently provides. There is a small but growing and consistent evidence-base indicating that Personal Safety Education is a promising intervention for increasing individual protective factors, limiting and correcting for risk factors, and preventing victimization in multiple populations. Local data from DSA’s workshops similarly indicate promising improvements in self-efficacy, assertiveness, boundary setting skills, and awareness of risks and safety resources.

A. Prevention Experts & Federal Recommendations

Personal Safety Education is a key recommendation of numerous national experts in violence prevention, public health, sexual violence, criminology, and trauma studies. Alan Berkowitz recommends that programs for women, in particular, include the following elements of PSE: discussion of effective responses to coercive behavior, overcoming of social norms that reduce self-efficacy, understanding protective and risk behaviors, and learning physical self-defense techniques and skills (Berkowitz, 2001, pp. 85-86). Judith Herman recommends self-defense in the newest edition of her seminal work Trauma and Recovery, in which she notes that self-defense training can empower survivors to “face their world more confidently” (1997, p. 198). National prevention expert Gavin De Becker recommends IMPACT Personal Safety Education and further readings on self-defense in his best-seller The Gift of Fear (1997). Teaching PSE skills has been identified as a promising practice in the same category as Bystander Intervention Education; both are “supported by a preponderance of the evidence” for changing knowledge, attitudes, beliefs, or behavioral intentions and for reducing... victimization,” (Schewe, 2007, p. 227.) Further, self-defense training has been labelled “one of the most promising interventions to prevent violence against women, particularly sexual assault committed by strangers or acquaintances” (Hollander, 2009, p. 575).

Various federal U.S. institutes, grant-makers and departments recommend that intended victims practice PSE. In a recent report commissioned by the National Institute of Justice, researchers examined various types of assault against women. They found that certain actions reduce the risk of rape more than 80 percent compared to nonresistance and did not significantly increase the risk of serious injury to the defender (Kleck & Tark, 2005). The most effective actions, according to survivors, are attacking or struggling against their attacker, running away, and verbally warning the attacker (all actions which are taught and practiced in Personal Safety Education). Further, while the Department of Justice once identified self-defense-styles of PSE as an example of victim-blaming programming which would not be funded, in recent years they have moved from such a stance. Their 2012 solicitation for Campus Grants no longer disallows such programming, but cautions only that any funded self-defense programs must not be mandatory nor the sole Prevention program available for students on campus.3

B. Academic Literature

A number of studies have found evidence that self-defense training, specifically, may decrease a woman’s chances of experiencing future sexual victimization as compared to women without training; and that forceful verbal and physical resistance and fleeing (all taught and practiced in PSE) have a proven association with rape avoidance in both reported and unreported crimes (Bart & O’Brien, 1993; Brecklin & Ullman, 2005; Ullman & Knight, 1993; Orchowski, Gidycz & Raffle, 2008; Peri, 1991; Zoucha-Jensen & Coyne, 1993).

Low utilization of self-protective dating behaviors (including those taught and practiced in PSE) is associated with more frequent sexual victimization (Orchowski, Untied, & Gidycz, 2011). Additionally, self-defense has been empirically proven to decrease a number of psychological attributes that are associated with victimization (Brecklin, 2008; Ozer & Bandura 1990; Sochting, Fairbrother & Koch, 2004; Ullman, 2007). PSE programs may increase assertiveness, perceived control, self-efficacy, risk avoidance behaviors, confidence, and self-esteem, and may also lower anxiety and fear (Brecklin, 2008; Hollander, 2004). Importantly, low self-esteem and low assertiveness have been found to be predictive of victimization (Brecklin & Ullman, 2005).

Unfortunately, crime prevention effectiveness is a difficult topic to quantify, as successful risk reduction or escape from violent situations is rarely reported as such. Experts believe women successfully resist at least 75% of all attempted sexual assaults (Bart & O’Brien, 1993; Gordon & Riger, 1989; Ullman 1997). Such was the case during the well-publicized Ann Arbor attacks of 2011; 5 out of 6 of the assailant’s intended victims successfully employed Personal Safety strategies to end the assault. Survivors of intimate partner violence similarly employ many different active and creative self-protective strategies both to resist and to escape violence (Campbell, Rose, Kub, & Nedd, 1998; Cook, Woolard, & McCollum, 2004; Gondolf, 1988; Jones, 1994; Hollander, 2005).

Case Study - University of Oregon

One well-known and widely respected academic PSE class reveals additional important supporting research. This upper level, 4-credit Women’s Studies class was taught by the author of *Self-Defense from the Inside Out*. Nadia Telsey is a national expert on non-violence and personal safety, and a founder of the National Women’s Martial Arts Federation who taught at the University of Oregon for 17 years. Her course included 45 hours of instruction in PSE over a 10 week academic quarter. This women-only class included 3 hours per week of physical and verbal PSE training plus a required weekly 1.5 hour discussion section.

Deep and broad learning outcomes for students were revealed in a qualitative, longitudinal study. Researchers identified five areas in which changes were most striking: “interactions with strangers, interactions with known others (acquaintances, friends, employers, teachers, and intimates), feelings about one’s body, perceived self-confidence, and beliefs about women, men, and gender” (Hollander, 2004, p. 212).

---

4 [http://police.umich.edu/?alerts=all](http://police.umich.edu/?alerts=all)
Direct quotes from University of Oregon students reveal the breadth of outcomes from this integrative and embodied course:

“My best friend’s boyfriend pushed me onto a bed and started ‘playfully’ tickling me. He was DRUNK and I was too but I was frightened when he got on top of me. I was disgusted, yelled ‘Get OFF ME!’ and slapped him. He called me some name and stumbled out of the room.”

“I have way more confidence in my ability to stop a potential assault, and I’m not scared as much anymore. I was followed one night, and I used some strategies that made the man stop following me. I feel much safer in my skin.”

“When my friend’s boyfriend got belligerently drunk, tried to hit on me and called me a bitch I used three-part statements and assertive voice and saying “NO!” I said “John you are making me feel very uncomfortable. You are being very rude and invading my space – it is NOT okay and I want you to leave.”

“I walk confidently and with purpose with my arms swinging along with me – I TAKE UP SPACE. I speak louder, laugh louder, I make eye contact, I resist smiling at everyone if I don’t want to.”

“I feel more entitled to be assertive and maintain my boundaries, whereas I used to feel I was being rude.”

“I’m more aware of myself – my environment and my powers – so I feel safer. I’m also at the same time more knowledgeable about violence and the realities of it. So my fear is angled now in a more accurate direction where before it was so scattered by the stereotypes of rapes, abusers, etc.”

C. Limitations

The field of violence prevention remains a relative newcomer to the randomized, controlled, double-blinded study. Therefore, more interventions remain “promising” and “emerging” to date than can truly be labeled as evidence-based practice. As with Bystander Education programming, the current body of knowledge on PSE focuses not on actual long-term prevention of victimization, but on self-reported outcomes related to self-efficacy and intention to change future behavior. To further complicate prevention research, “the use of self-reports after intervention is problematic because an individual’s definition or perception of what constitutes sexual assault is likely to change after sexual assault education” (Schewe, 2007, p. 227). This is one presumed reason why reports of attempted sexual assault sometimes increase after participation in PSE.

Randomized, controlled, and blinded trials pose a number of ethical and practical challenges in this field. Also, some practitioners would assert that violence has more in common with social issues such as poverty than with public health ones such as smoking or seatbelt usage, further complicating efforts to research and prevent its occurrence.
D. Local Data

Local data on the effects of Personal Safety Education on students was collected in pre-, post-, and two month follow-up surveys of participants at the University of Michigan (n=227). Workshops were taught by Katy Mattingly, a local PSE instructor and author of *Self-Defense: Steps to Survival*, and sponsored by the Dean of Students office in the Division of Student Affairs.

The learning objectives were:

- Learn and practice verbal and social skills for assertive communication
- Learn and practice physical skills for setting boundaries with acquaintances, friends and family
- Identify those personal safety threats of highest risk to you personally, as well as those most common on college campuses
- Identify campus and community safety resources

Pre- and post- surveys showed marked improvement in all learning objectives, and particularly high rates of change for awareness of personal safety threats, awareness of campus safety resources, and self-efficacy regarding ability to communicate assertively, set boundaries, and stand up for oneself physically with unknown others. Self-efficacy regarding situations with known others also improved (though to a lesser extent, as students rated themselves higher to begin with on skills for use with known others.)

Significantly, in the two-month follow-up surveys, multiple participants report using assertiveness, boundary setting and physical skills with known and unknown others since their training. Qualitative responses include: “I’ve become more assertive in general” and “I used the eye-strike with a stranger and it worked!”

Before the workshop, 46% of participants felt they did not know how to “use assertive communication with people I don’t know.” After the workshop, only 5% still felt they lacked this skill. Similarly, before the workshop, 23% of participants felt they did not know how to “use assertive communication with people I know,” while after the workshop, only 9% still felt they lacked this skill.

Ability to set boundaries also improved markedly. Before the session, 28% of participants did not know how to set boundaries with strangers, after the session only 4% said they still lacked this skill. Participants reported smaller, though still significant, gains in their ability to set boundaries with people they know, those in disagreement declined from 19% to 9%.

Improvements in awareness of safety risks and resources was noteworthy. Moderate or strong agreement with the statement “I am aware of which crimes I am at highest risk of experiencing” increased from 45% to 93% from pre- to post-. Pre-workshop, 33% of students strongly or moderately disagreed with the same statement; after the workshop 0% strongly or moderately disagreed. Levels of awareness of campus safety
resources experienced a similarly notable shift, from pre-workshop agreement of 55% to post-workshop agreement of 96%, and from pre-workshop disagreement of 27% to post-workshop disagreement of 1%.

The largest self-efficacy changes were noted in the area of physical skills. Before the workshop, fully 67% of students did not know how to physically stand up for themselves with someone they know; after the workshop this figure declined to just 7%. See the page 19 for additional selected self-efficacy scores.

Appendix E provides a detailed summary report of the evaluation data from the local PSE workshops.
“My big take-aways from taking one of the DSA Personal Safety Workshops? Realizing that it’s very normal to “freeze” at first, and the power and self-confidence from saying NO. I now feel much more able to get out of a bad situation if it ever arises. I encourage everyone to learn some basic easy-to-do tactics that could save you from injury or worse. I’m glad to be able to partner with DSA through U-Move Fitness by offering some sessions at CCRB.”

Sheila Calhoun
Assistant Director, U-Move
School of Kinesiology
PSE Pilot Workshop Participant Self-Efficacy Scores

PRE-WORKSHOP

I know how to use assertive communication skills with people I don't know.

POST-WORKSHOP

I know how to use assertive communication skills with people I don't know.

I know how to use physical skills to stop someone I know from physically assaulting me.

I know how to use physical skills to stop someone I know from physically assaulting me.
Follow-Up Surveys

Researchers asked participants to indicate to what extent they used skills learned in the PSE workshop over the two months since participation:

- I have used assertive communication with people I know – 41% responded a great deal, considerably or moderately
- I have used assertive communication with people I don’t know – 30% responded a great deal, considerably or moderately
- I have set boundaries with people I know – 33% responded considerably or moderately
- I have set boundaries with people I don’t know – 42% responded a great deal, considerably or moderately
- I have used physical skills to stop someone from assaulting me – 5 individuals responded a great deal, considerably, or moderately (see below for details)

Qualitative Responses on Follow-Up Surveys

The most common theme of the qualitative comments in the follow-up surveys was an interest in opportunities for ongoing practice or additional sessions to help remember, practice and integrate the techniques. This data is particularly supportive of the recommendations for a three-tiered UM Personal Safety Education program, which would add length, content, and practice opportunities to the single session workshops via a credited course and a longer, integrative, co-curricular program.

- “I've become more assertive in general.”
- “I have not been assaulted while walking alone, so when I say I have used physical skills to stop someone I don’t know from assaulting me, I mean when walking alone at night I maintain a posture, awareness, and mental preparedness that not only may prevent an assault, but also makes me ready to handle a situation should one arise.”
- “I used the eye-strike with a stranger and it worked!”
- “I have already forgotten much of what was covered in the class and would love more opportunities to practice the basic skills and learn more advanced skills.”
- “I haven't had any events that have allowed me to use what I learned, but I have shared some of the information with others. I definitely found the workshop helpful.”
- “I haven't really needed to use boundary setting, as no one has approached me in a way that I don't approve of. There is someone on my bus who crosses verbal boundaries with me (inappropriate conversations and odd dinner invitations). I've mainly tried to avoid this person, but I hope that I will
use the assertiveness tools from the workshop when I do encounter him. I have tried to be aware of other people’s boundaries and to refrain from touching people. I have mixed feelings about that.”

- “I just haven’t run into any situations where I would need to use any of these behaviors. I have however, shared the “repeat what just happened” strategy with friends and family.”

- “It would probably be good to attend multiple such workshops. I found that I couldn’t really remember all of the recommendations even just a couple of weeks later. It helps to get the self-defense movements into the muscle memory multiple times, I’m sure.”

Overall, the data from local workshop evaluations was very strongly positive and supported the hypothesis that Personal Safety Education is capable of increasing awareness, self-efficacy, and self-protective behaviors, while decreasing known risk factors for experiencing victimization. At least one student believed the PSE workshop contributed to her prevention of an attempted attack in the two month follow-up period. Students attained learning outcomes congruent with the national literature: self-efficacy, assertiveness, boundary setting and confidence in physical skills.

The subcommittee recommends continuing the single session workshops, while also providing two additional tiers of programming with more opportunities for practice and reinforcement of skills (credited coursework and an integrative, embodied program). This strategy will improve accessibility, reach more students, and supply additional evaluation data, which will allow UM to become a notable contributor on the national stage in this emerging field of inquiry.

In conclusion, the data on Personal Safety Education is substantial, promising and deserving of deeper exploration. PSE’s evidence is a decisive combination of:

a) An emerging evidence-base,

b) Self-reports of powerful results from program evaluations like the University of Oregon class, and
c) Local data from UM evidencing need, interest, and successfully meeting learning objectives.

PSE should be broadly implemented and robustly evaluated at the University of Michigan.

7 NOTE: This student comment is an excellent depiction of the “contemplation” stage of behavior change as defined by the Public Health field.
“Taking self-defense was an eye-opener. I realized I was able to do things with my body that I never thought I could do, that no one ever told me I could do--or should do--and, perhaps most importantly, that I was worth protecting.”

Alia Toran-Burrell
School of Social Work 2012 Grad

Took IMPACT self-defense in 2010
Overview

The Personal Safety Education subcommittee was charged with making recommendations to the Dean of Students / AVP of Student Affairs regarding the content and future expansion of PSE at the institution. The group’s membership included graduate and undergraduate students, staff from UMOVE, Rackham, DPS, and SAPAC, long-time practitioners and instructors of PSE, and people with no background in PSE. (For a complete listing of members and their bios see Appendix A.) The group also consulted with additional stakeholders including staff from the International Center, Multi-Ethnic Student Affairs, the Spectrum Center, ROTC, martial arts student organizations, Kinesiology, SAPAC volunteers, and many others.

Members and consultants engaged in a thorough and thoughtful process, which invited input from people invested in, concerned about, and experienced in a wide range of personal safety education programs. They explored existing programs at UM and interviewed providers of popular national models in higher education. In completing its review of best practices, the subcommittee did not ask “What PSE Programs have been proven to effectively prevent all types of crimes in all situations?” (Indeed, according to NCASA guidelines, good self-defense programs recognize that there are no guarantees when it comes to self-protection.) Instead, evidence was explored for various benefits of participation identified in the literature, including self-confidence, risk reduction, avoidance of victimization, greater sense of awareness of risk, improved self-image, and increased willingness and ability to set boundaries and communicate assertively.

The committee considered credited courses, SAPAC’s “What Works, What Doesn’t, and Why” sessions, martial arts practice, and IMPACT and R.A.D. padded attacker models. Members asked both “What is the best program that exists?” and “What is the best program that could be designed?” Concurrently, members observed, reviewed and revised DSA’s pilot workshops for students. The subcommittee identified a number of key elements of best practice, and ultimately decided that the UM community would be best served by designing a new and unique PSE program, incorporating various elements of existing successful efforts.

A. Guiding Principles & Best Practices

Three underlying principles guided the work of the Student Safety Work Group and formed the basis of its activities, priorities and, finally, its recommendations. These same principles also guided the PSE subcommittee:

- **Student Development Theory** (Which necessitates that PSE be provided at multiple levels of engagement, length, and content in order to meet the needs of a diverse student body.)

- **Community Violence Prevention Theory from the field of Public Health** (Which prioritizes evidence-based interventions based in prevention theory.)
• **Collaborative Work, with Students at the Center** (Which assures that programs are culturally competent, relevant and meaningful to students, and that implementation is feasible in the highly decentralized environment of the University of Michigan.)

Additionally, these PSE recommendations draw substantially from the **National Coalition Against Sexual Assault's (NCASA) Guidelines for Choosing a Self-Defense Course.** The NCASA guidelines are widely believed to be the best national guidelines for PSE practice, and provide a good fit with UM’s and DSA’s social justice orientation. (See Appendix B for complete guidelines.) NCASA affirms that a good self-defense program should reflect these philosophical points in its outlook:

1. **No one asks for, causes, invites, or deserves to be assaulted.** Women and men sometimes exercise poor judgment about safety behavior, but that does not make them responsible for the attack. Attackers are responsible for their attacks, and use of violence to overpower, control, and abuse another human being.

2. Whatever a person’s decision in a given self-defense situation, whatever action s/he does or does not take, that person is not at fault. **Someone’s decision to survive the best way s/he can must be respected.** Self-defense classes should not be used as a judgment against a survivor/victim.

3. Good self-defense programs **do not “tell” an individual what s/he “should” or “should not” do.** A program should offer options, techniques, and a way of analyzing situations. A program may point out what USUALLY works best in MOST situations, but each situation is unique and the final decision rests with the person actually confronted by the situation.

4. **Empowerment is the goal** of a good self-defense program. The individual’s right to make decisions about participation must be respected. Pressure should not be brought to bear in any way to get someone to participate in an activity if s/he’s hesitant or unwilling.” (*emphasis mine*)

**B. Existing Programs at the University of Michigan**

While inquiries revealed a number of existing programs at UM with Personal Safety Education elements, each served or serves a relatively small number of students. To date, PSE has not been systematically or consistently made accessible to the student body. At the University of Michigan, a single institutional home for student safety does not exist, nor should it, as the wide array of safety needs requires programming at many different levels and from many different sources. Such decentralization has led to a number of challenges, including an absence of consistent messaging and frameworks, inconsistent attunement to best practices, and limited evaluation or data sharing from existing programs. Additionally, raising awareness about PSE opportunities for students has been challenging in such an environment.

The following brief review based on the subcommittee’s survey of stakeholders reveals the wide range and small reach of each existing program. (See Appendix F for an overview of survey questions asked of existing PSE providers at UM.)
• **U-MOVE** in the School of Kinesiology has offered various self-defense programs over the years. They currently offer a martial arts-based class which meets weekly for a semester. Tohkon Ryu Martial Arts is an accumulation of 16 years and 7 different martial arts styles focusing on self-defense techniques for men and women, incorporating joint manipulations, throws, arm and knee bars, chokes, weapons, knife defense, knife fighting, and striking techniques used for protection and to build confidence and physical ability.

• **Rackham Student Affairs** has offered a number of PSE programs for graduate students including *Basic Self-Defense: You Can Do Something* (Perry); *What Works, What Doesn’t, & Why* (SAPAC); *Campus Safety Presentations* (DPS); and *Personal Safety Education and Self-Defense for Everyday Life* (Mattingly).

• Various **Student Organizations** teach elements of self-defense, including: Tae Kwan Do, Godai Nimpo Karate, the “UM Fight Club,” and the women’s boxing club. Techniques, strategies and expertise vary considerably. For example, the Tae Kwan Do club has offered self-defense workshops specifically for non-martial artists, while UM Fight Club describes their mission as “not so much to teach, but to engage.”

• **The Navy & Marine ROTC** on campus provide recruits with a Marine Corps Martial Arts Program including mixed martial arts techniques, ethics, character, and physical development. Learning outcomes include practical fighting skills, intense physical conditioning, and building moral character by compelling decision-making under stressful and punishing circumstances while choosing situation-appropriate force.

• **The Division of Student Affairs** began offering free PSE workshops to any group of 10 or more students during Winter Term, 2012. These workshops were 1.5 hours in length, introduced comprehensive personal safety techniques and strategies, and emphasized verbal and social responses to known others. Workshop availability was heavily publicized to DSA units and total participation for the term included 227 students in 15 separate workshops.

• **The UM Department of Public Safety** currently provides two safety education programs to the student body: *See Something – Say Something*, part of the Homeland Security initiative, and a session designed to educate the community about safety strategies in the event of an active shooter. Beyond those programs and primary responsibility for preventing and responding to all crime on campus, DPS has no expressed interest in offering PSE for students (J. Piersante, Interim Chief of DPS, personal communication to Dean/AVP Laura Blake Jones, 2012.)

• **Academic Departments** have indicated interest in PSE Education, including Kinesiology, Psychology, and Women’s Studies. (See Appendix I for a syllabus of a PSE course created for UM Psychology for Fall, 2011.) While the majority of PSE offerings have not been credit bearing, the Department of Kinesiology has offered Tae Kwan Do for a single-credit (a class which may be phased out in the near future.)

• **Independent Contractors and Community Providers** have been hired by groups and individuals with financial means to teach PSE workshops to student organizations, residence halls, Greek Life houses...
and other groups, generally via single session workshops which combine verbal, social and physical techniques and strategies.

C. Nationally Prominent Program Models

Five PSE programs are commonly available in higher education communities: R.A.D. and IMPACT padded attacker classes, martial arts, credited classes, and single session workshops. All of the “Big 10” schools provide one or several of these PSE programs to their students. (See Appendix D for complete listing of PSE in the Big 10.) Program models vary greatly from each other in learning outcomes, instructional methods, and theoretical frameworks. Benefits and challenges to each model were identified, and each was assessed for adherence to SSWG and NCASA guiding principles and for potential UM culture fit. (See Appendix H for a complete chart of focus groups findings which compares and contrasts techniques, types of perpetrators, reinforcement of skills, adaptability of curricula, length, and implementation considerations.) A basic overview follows of the five most common program models.

“Padded Attacker”

The most common padded attacker programs in existence are R.A.D. (Rape Aggression Defense) and IMPACT Personal Safety. Offered by at least half of the Big 10 schools, padded attacker classes are also referred to as simulated antagonist models or embodied, realistic personal safety education. These programs utilize teams of instructors; one wears customized padding to allow students to practice techniques full force for physical feedback and psychological realism. Such state-dependent or adrenaline-state learning is transferable in ways that solely cognitive learning may not be. Practitioners feel that one of the greatest benefits of this model is long-term retention of skills after relatively short training periods. The R.A.D. program promises only “self-defense against abduction by unarmed strangers” while the IMPACT model emphasizes techniques and strategies applicable for known assailants and sexual assault.

Martial Arts

Martial arts are frequently taught in higher education, often by student organizations or in collaboration with community instructors. The martial arts emphasize physical techniques and personal discipline. Most practitioners agree that self-defense and the martial arts are different though overlapping skill sets. Self-defense specific curricula include simple techniques and an emphasis on short fights and escape strategies (rather than tournament level competition or “mixed martial arts” stamina). Many martial arts have been developed to teach physically effective techniques regardless of the sizes of the attacker and defender. Long-term practice of martial arts can develop “internal skills” (confidence, self-esteem, resolve, and adrenaline management) which can be helpful long-term. Some participants in the subcommittee’s Martial Arts Focus Group associate the field with male attackers, male defenders, standing fights, and stranger assailants, rather than with a more diverse set of safety concerns.
For-Credit Classes

Credited coursework in Personal Safety Education is regularly provided in higher education communities and is available at three of the other Big 10 schools. Classes generally focus on awareness, community organizing & primary prevention. Some credited courses also include actual practice of skills & strategies alongside academic content. Multi-session classes, readings and group discussion have proven conducive to unlearning myths about perpetrators and victims, and may help to develop the complex strategies necessary for responses to known attackers. Ongoing sessions over the course of a term or half-term may increase retention compared to a single session program model. Depending on the department(s) offering credit, this program model could maximize accessibility for the widest range of students. (For an example of a syllabus for a credited PSE class, see Appendix I.)

Single Session Workshops

At least three (and probably more) of the other Big 10 schools regularly provide short workshops in Personal Safety Education and/or self-defense for students, utilizing a variety of different formats with different learning outcomes. Short workshops offer a number of benefits: they are frequently requested by students and can be adapted for various populations. They can raise awareness about the most common crimes on campuses, and provide a ready response when high profile incidents raise fears and concerns. Such workshops often teach one or two verbal, social and physical techniques and answer student questions about common fears. Skill-building and integrative learning are strictly limited due to the short format, and little evidence exists for retention of skills long-term.

Conclusion

Given the group’s guiding principles, the review of existing and previous PSE offerings at UM and those most commonly available nationally, as well as the need to adhere to best practices in the fields of PSE and prevention, the subcommittee recommends the development of a new program. UM Personal Safety Education should draw from each of the existing program models, maximizing benefits while also compensating for some of the key challenges of and deficits to each approach. Such a program should be positive, strength-based, and skill-building, and provide simple, comprehensive, integrative, and adaptable techniques, tactics and strategies at multiple levels of engagement.
“In my junior year of college, I took a self-defense course at my university [before UM]. I was mainly going to learn physical techniques, but I got so much more out of the course. I became aware not only of the importance of awareness about how predators work, but also of prejudices that I held which are commonly supported in the media and in society at large. The class went beyond teaching me to protect myself by incorporating issues of social justice.”

UM Graduate Student

2012
7. Recommendations

A. Summary of Recommendations

In response to the institutional needs assessment and program review, emerging local and national evidence, student demand, and comparable programs at peer institutions, the subcommittee unanimously and emphatically recommends that the university provide comprehensive, multi-level Personal Safety Education for UM students. Given the lack of existing PSE models fully aligned with best practices, the subcommittee recommends the development of a new program. *UM Personal Safety Education* should embrace six core programmatic elements which were identified as fully aligned with national best practices, the evidence base, and with the Student Safety Work Group’s guiding principles.

B. Core Recommended PSE Program Elements

i. Demonstrate simple, practical techniques, tactics, and strategies

ii. Include comprehensive awareness, body language, social, verbal, & physical skills

iii. Utilize integrative, experiential, interactive, and embodied learning

iv. Deliver adaptable, relevant skills for multiple social identity groups and multiple contexts

v. Honor each individual’s past and future choices by offering options, not “shoulds”

vi. Provide a good fit for UM’s unique culture

i. Simple, practical PSE techniques, tactics, and strategies

Skills taught and practiced in the *UM Personal Safety Education Program* should be simple, practical and easy to learn. Students should have opportunities to practice in realistic environments and skills should be transferable to real-life settings. For example, martial artists consulted by the subcommittee affirmed the many differences between formal practice of martial arts (often long-term study of intricate and scripted scenarios with skilled sparring partners) and personal safety education (often short-term study of simple and spontaneous techniques for escape and survival). Simple and practical skills for PSE must not require life-long training to master; they should be transferable over shorter sessions and require fewer “dosages” for efficacy (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002).

ii. Comprehensive PSE: including awareness, body language, social, verbal, & physical skills

While physical skills and strategies are one important part of PSE, the committee unanimously agreed that it is essential to incorporate comprehensive skills, strategies and tactics in the *UM Personal Safety Education Program*. National best practices guidelines emphasize the importance of such comprehensive programming: “Self-defense is a set of awareness, assertiveness, and verbal confrontation skills with safety strategies and physical techniques that enable someone to successfully escape, resist and
survive violent attacks. A good self-defense course provides psychological awareness and verbal skills, not just physical training...” (NCASA, see Appendix B). Examples of such skills include, but are not limited to:

- **Awareness PSE**: Evaluating passive, assertive, and aggressive behaviors from known and unknown others; accurately assessing risk; identifying boundary violations and other common ploys of perpetrators; development of intuition, and the ability to make choices about how and when to utilize one personal safety strategy over another; identifying personal risk categories; deciding what one is willing to stand up for and what one is willing to accept

- **Body Language PSE**: Modulating one’s own body language; recognizing and responding to information from the body language of others; choosing and communicating personal boundaries; expressing confident and assertive body language, rather than passive or aggressive

- **Verbal PSE**: Clear and assertive communication; adding emphasis to speech; yelling; responding to and interrupting verbal abuse and harassment; expressing what one wants and doesn’t want in interpersonal relationships; asking for help and community building

- **Social PSE**: Exploring options for setting boundaries within existing relationships with friends, families, colleagues and peers; learning how to balance the sometimes competing needs of self-care and relationship management; identifying and normalizing one’s own chosen boundaries; assisting others; obtaining assistance; being willing to back down from a fight

- **Physical PSE**: Self-regulation when adenalized; escape strategies; breaking holds; avoiding blows; strikes and kicks

To give just one example of the richness and depth of comprehensive PSE, national expert and social psychologist Jocelyn Hollander evaluates twelve different elements of Assertiveness which are taught within a credited PSE class at the University of Oregon (2004). Students practice: Body language/taking up space, Eye contact, Assertive voice, Using intuition, Saying “no”, Active listening, Avoidance, Three part statements, Verbal principles or strategies, Recognizing ploys, clues, and testing, De-escalation, and the “broken record” technique. Fluency in such techniques is particularly relevant to responding effectively to boundary violations from known others, the most common perpetrators on college campuses.

### iii. Integrative, experiential, interactive, and embodied PSE

Integrative and embodied PSE includes active learning opportunities which prompt self-reflection, decision making, and future action. It includes mechanisms for students to identify their own personal safety needs, to connect their curricular and co-curricular safety experiences, and to integrate this knowledge life-wide. One example of the many ways in which Personal Safety Education invites students to make meaning is the “Say No” exercise. Students are invited to “say no” to something they would normally just go along with between sessions. As one example, some students choose to say no in a newly intimate relationship, in order to assess the partner’s response. They then have the opportunity to write reflection papers on the experience, discuss their successes and challenges in small groups, and to explore when,
where and with whom they feel safe as well as what additional resources they may need in order to be able to say no freely in their lives.

Integrative and embodied PSE also includes opportunities for active practice of techniques and strategies such as revoking consent for sexual activity, asking an acquaintance not to touch them, or escaping or defensively striking a perpetrator of violence. While many UM websites such as DPS’s share safety tips such as yelling loudly, firmly discouraging unwanted physical contact, or not accepting open beverages – there is a world of difference between reading such advice online and personally practicing it. In an integrative and embodied PSE program, students are empowered to hit a strike pad or practice a difficult conversation in an emotionally safe, low-risk environment. Such learning opportunities generate options for students, allowing them to choose which skills to implement in which situations.

Embodied practice reinforces learning. One common problem with non-integrative PSE is the high drop-off in recall weeks or months after the training is received. In contrast, anecdotal evidence indicates that integrative and embodied PSE enables participants to integrate skills holistically - mentally, emotionally and physically - over comparatively short sessions. Students don’t just study strategies - they develop the capacity to enact them. Integrative, embodied PSE:

- Increases reinforcement and recall via state-dependent learning;
- Acknowledges and benefits from the relationships between self-image, self-efficacy, and the ability; to act protectively in one’s own self-interest (Ozer & Bandura, 1990); and
- Addresses the physiological “fight, flight or freeze” response common to experiences of danger.

iv. Adaptable and relevant PSE for multiple social identity groups and multiple contexts

Students’ safety concerns and actual risk factors vary markedly based on real or perceived social identity (such as race/ethnicity, gender and gender identity, socio-economic status, etc.) Additionally, their rights and responsibilities regarding the implementation of some personal safety skills vary dependent on context. Further, awareness of personal risk and protective factors varies markedly from student to student and from one developmental stage to another. Here are a few specific examples which point toward the importance of adapting PSE to assure relevancy across populations and contexts:

- Strategies for responding to robberies vs. hate crimes are quite different
- Perpetrators tend to target men, women, and transgender people using dissimilar strategies
- African-American men are often pre-judged by white people to be dangerous or aggressive despite their actual behavior; their choices about body language and responding to threats are therefore often more complicated than similar choices for white students
- Despite actual risks, many female students are more concerned about stranger sexual assault than personal safety during dating or hook ups with acquaintances
• International students frequently have more concerns about guns and other weapons than American-born students, and may have very different expectations of law enforcement.

• The use of alcohol or other drugs can reduce students’ ability to utilize some personal safety strategies and necessitate others.

v. PSE which offers options, not “shoulds”

The UM Personal Safety Education Program must be designed and provided in adherence with the accepted best practices guidelines which emphasize that “No one asks for, causes, invites or deserves to be assaulted…. Attackers are responsible for their attacks” (NCASA, See Appendix B). Some campus stakeholders shared the concern that offering PSE could inadvertently imply that survivors of violence “should have” or “could have” done something differently to prevent past victimization, or that students who are victimized after taking PSE might feel increased self-blame than if they’d never studied personal safety options at all. Good practitioners all share this concern; we must not contribute to blaming the victims of violence. Indeed, the subcommittee noted that many survivors, particularly women and survivors of sexual violence, have been trained by the dominant culture to self-blame no matter what the context of their victimization and whether or how they were able to resist or not.

Personal Safety Education is intended to increase options, not assign blame for how any individual handled past assaults (Hollander, 2009). PSE holds perpetrators responsible by helping students to develop the skills to recognize, respond to, and report attempted violence, as well as to make personal decisions about which safety skills to employ in which situations. Refusing PSE options to the many students who desire them would place staff in the position of deciding on students’ behalf which tools they should be allowed to explore. Such an approach fails to allow students the personal agency to decide for themselves what they need to be safe, while ignoring substantial evidence that survivors of violence and others experience PSE as empowering. Indeed, a study referenced by the National Institute of Justice on their Assault on College Campuses site8, has found that even when a rape was completed, women who used some form of resistance had better mental health outcomes than those who did not resist (Ullman, 2002).

The UM Personal Safety Education Program will acknowledge and challenge the ubiquity of societal victim-blaming via multiple strategies:

• Emphasize that PSE offers choices; there are no “guarantees” that a particular strategy will be effective for every student, in every context, or against every perpetrator.

• Ensure an environment of emotional safety for all learners via carefully selected and trained instructors. (One national PSE program only accepts instructor candidates who have significant work or volunteer experience as survivor advocates to assure sufficient understanding of the foundations of power-based violence.)

• Include awareness-raising about victim blaming and perpetrator responsibility within every session and at every level as an essential element of the PSE program framework.

In the UM Personal Safety Education Program, all students, including survivors, will be empowered to make their own decisions about skills, tactics, and strategies in a welcoming and supportive community.

vi. PSE which is a good fit for UM’s unique culture

A “one size fits all” PSE program based on pre-existing models would not meet the needs of the University of Michigan community. The UM Personal Safety Education Program must be unique to our community, developed by and for University of Michigan students, faculty and staff. To best serve students and match the expectations of the UM and Division of Student Affairs cultures, the program should build upon a social justice foundation and be attuned to the importance of power, privilege and social identity. Such an orientation is referred to in the PSE field as the Empowerment Model of feminist self-defense or social justice personal safety education.9

The social justice framework realizes that, unfortunately, many PSE programs fail to acknowledge the legacy of power and privilege inherent in any American conversation about crime, violence and safety, or to adequately challenge stereotypes about perpetrators based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and other categories. Many existent PSE programs also underestimate the ability of smaller, female, and differently-abled students to forcefully and effectively protect themselves. Without an emphasis on social justice, power and privilege, PSE can reinforce stereotypes such as “no female or person with a disability could ever stop someone from harming them,” (when in fact, people of all social identities actively and effectively utilize personal safety skills every day.) Such frameworks disadvantage all students by obscuring necessary and relevant information about their own abilities.

The Division of Student Affairs’ commitment to student learning and the development of the whole student in a diverse campus community, necessitates that personal safety education be uniquely designed for the UM community and specifically attuned to issues of social justice.

C. Existing PSE Program Models

The following chart explores five PSE program models which are common to higher education communities. Each was assessed by the subcommittee for alignment with the six core recommended program elements identified as essential for inclusion in the UM Personal Safety Education Program.

9 [http://www.nwmaf.org/empowerment-model](http://www.nwmaf.org/empowerment-model)
C. Alignment of Existing Program Models with Core Recommended PSE Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSE PROGRAM MODEL</th>
<th>i. Simple, Practical</th>
<th>ii. Comprehensive</th>
<th>iii. Integrative &amp; Embodied</th>
<th>iv. Relevant &amp; Adaptable (social identity &amp; context)</th>
<th>v. Options, Not “Shoulds”</th>
<th>vi. UM Culture Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UM DSA Pilot Workshops</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single session, 1.5 hours, mix of physical, verbal, social skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.A.D.: Rape Aggression Defense</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low (varies)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police-led, padded attacker model for preventing stranger abduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial Arts</td>
<td>Mid (varies)</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mid (varies)</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Organizations, Community Dojos, many varieties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT Personal Safety</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International, feminist/social justice padded attacker model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credited Courses</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mid (varies)</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Studies, Psychology, Physical Education, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UM Personal Safety Education Three Tiered Program</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note that in order to achieve an across the board “high” ranking in all six core recommended PSE elements, the institution must provide programming at all three tiers of student engagement: short workshops, credited course work, and an integrative and embodied co-curricular program. Additional detail on the tiers and recommended design follows in section 8.

In conclusion, given the lack of pre-existing programs fully aligned with best practices and local needs, the subcommittee recommends the creation of a new PSE program which draws elements from existing models yet is designed specifically for the University of Michigan community. The *UM Personal Safety Education Program* must be non-victim blaming and adhere to NCASA Guidelines; teach simple, practical, and comprehensive skills; promote integrative and embodied learning to maximize retention and efficacy; be adaptable and relevant across social identities and contexts; and match UM’s unique culture by acknowledging the significance of social justice, power, and privilege as they relate to student safety.
“The self-defense workshops conducted at Martha Cook provided me with more... ability to set boundaries and protect myself. I had previously participated in martial-arts based self-defense workshops where I often felt uncomfortable, since I did not believe I would remember the techniques once the course was over, much less be able to apply them in a real-life scenario. The simplicity and natural flow of the defenses we learned at Martha Cook were much more encouraging and have definitely encouraged me to continue looking for self-defense courses in the future.”

UM Undergraduate Student and Resident Advisor Pilot Workshop Participant

2012
8. Recommended Program Design

A student’s willingness, ability, and interest for engaging in PSE will vary based on age, developmental stage, gender and gender identity, available time, need for additional credits, perceived appropriateness of the program for their social identity group, previous experiences of trauma and stage in the recovery process, awareness of safety issues, personal safety concerns, and individual risk and protective factors. The PSE subcommittee gave considerable thought to ways in which intentional program design could assist in balancing these legitimate - yet sometimes competing - needs of a diverse student body.

To maximize choice and accessibility, three distinct delivery modalities along a continuum from lower to higher levels of engagement are recommended; these offer students choices in intensity, formality, flexibility, ease of access and time commitment. Providing PSE options with consistent messaging at all three tiers of engagement enables the institution to “meet students where they are” developmentally, academically, and personally. Further, as “use of self-protective behavior in college may decline over time it may be useful to promote maintenance of a self-protective stance [via] opportunities to engage in [PSE] programs during each year of college” (Orchowski, Untied, & Gidycz, 2011, p. 15). Three tiered Personal Safety Education can provide such an opportunity.

Additional Design Considerations

- **Collaborative with Students at the Center:** All three tiers of the UM Personal Safety Education Program should incorporate student-led and student-developed peer-to-peer education to keep students at the center of the work, minimize costs, ensure flexibility and adaptability, and assure the institution’s ability to provide relevant PSE on an ongoing basis to the maximum number of interested students.

- **Aligned with Public Health Best Practices:** Design recommendations reflect the nine principles of effective prevention programs in the seminal public health primary prevention article “What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs” (Nation, et. al, 2003). Note that all three tiers of PSE programs must be available in order to adequately reflect the seven principles.

1. Comprehensive: multiple components, settings, risk, and protective factors
2. Varied teaching methods, including active and skills-based components
3. Sufficient dosage to have an effect on participants
4. Theory driven
5. Fostering positive relationships
6. Appropriately timed developmentally for maximal impact
7. Socio-culturally relevant
8. Systematic outcome evaluation
9. Well-trained staff: sensitive and competent with sufficient training, support, and supervision

The chart on the following page explains the content and structure of each of the recommended three tiers of the UM Personal Safety Education Program.

---

10 In an environment of restricted resources, such a tiered approach could have the additional benefit of building student demand, scale-ability and institutional capacity over the course of a multi-year implementation strategy.
Tiered Levels of Engagement

**UM Personal Safety Education Program**

**Low**
- **CONTINUE SINGLE SESSION WORKSHOPS**
  - 1-2 hour time commitment, high accessibility
  - Lower intensity, least content
  - Lowest reinforcement of skills
  - Least adaptable for specific student populations
  - High visibility promotes other PSE programs

**Mid**
- **ADD A CREDITED PERSONAL SAFETY CLASS**
  - Full or half term, 1-4 credits
  - Combines integrative learning with academic content
  - Maximum accessibility for many (finances/time)
  - Freq housed in Women Stud, Psych, Soc, Phys Ed, Kines
  - Syllabus Appendix I, Big 10 Classes Appendix D

**High**
- **ADD AN INTEGRATIVE, EMBODIED PSE PROGRAM**
  - Stand-alone, 25-40 hour co-curricular program
  - Male and female instructor teams
  - Realistic and intensive practice in PSE skills
  - Highest reinforcement of skills
  - Requires significant student emotional investment
As with all new programs at the University of Michigan, the subcommittee recognizes that there will be inherent implementation challenges for creating such a comprehensive and holistic offering at this institution. The following implementation suggestions may serve as a foundation for future directions and discussion:

1. **HOUSED IN STUDENT AFFAIRS:** The Division of Student Affairs is a natural home for the **UM Personal Safety Education Program**. The Dean of Students office within DSA has historically embraced a shared responsibility with DPS and AAPD for fostering a safe and inclusive campus community. The mission of the Dean of Students office is to “create the conditions that allow all students to thrive, including a safe, vibrant and diverse campus community.” DOS’ focus on climate includes a responsibility to address any pervasive, severe health and safety issues on campus. Further, as with much of DSA’s work, PSE is co-curricular, integrative learning which crosses institutional boundaries to address student transformation, health, and wellness.

2. **INTEGRATE PSE WITH BYSTANDER INTERVENTION EDUCATION:** Personal Safety Education shares many of Bystander Education’s ultimate goals. PSE should serve as a skills-based complement to all Bystander Education sessions. When students feel confident in their emergency-only self-protection skills, they are more able to accurately assess risk and to be willing to “Step Up” on behalf of others in potentially harmful situations.

3. **STAFF:** Continue part-time placement in the Dean of Students office of a staff person for research and development of a full implementation plan for PSE. Such planning should include a business case, proposed funding models and a formal proposal to be forwarded to DSA and to the Office of the Provost during academic year 2012-2013. Implementation plans should address scale-ability, instructor training, and securing institutional partners for sustainability.

4. **COMMITTEE:** Many members of the PSE Subcommittee are interested in remaining involved in PSE support and expansion. We recommend that the subcommittee be expanded and re-charged by the Dean of Students / AVP of Student Affairs as an implementation team. Such a group could assist in the identification and accomplishment of divisional and institutional goals for program development, administration, sustainability, and long-term evaluation.

5. **PUBLICITY:** Finally, the subcommittee recommends that **UM Personal Safety Education** be incorporated into the broader campus culture via multiple introductory or “low touch” publicity efforts, including:

   - As a tab on the new Student Safety App recommended by the SSWG
   - Referenced as a student resource on the mandatory Community Matters online course
   - Via a regularly featured column in the Beyond the Diag off-campus newsletter
   - On electronic bulletin boards within Residence Halls and university facilities
   - Widely publicized via Student Affairs as well as individual schools and colleges
“[Since taking PSE], I have felt unbelievably freed on so many levels - in both potentially dangerous situations and in other areas of life where being able to look someone dead in the eye and speak up for myself is both critical and my right. Imagine, it's my RIGHT to speak up for myself. I love that."

L.H.
Integrative & Embodied PSE Participant
10. Conclusion: Measurements of Success

In conclusion, the advisory PSE subcommittee recommends that DSA lead an effort to develop and provide a unique *UM Personal Safety Education Program* for all interested students. The program should be positive, strength-based, and skill-building, and fully aligned with best practices and SSWG’s guiding principles. *UM Personal Safety Education* should maximize accessibility and participation via three distinct levels of programming: short workshops, credited classes, and an integrative co-curricular option.

All three tiers of PSE should:

i. Demonstrate simple, practical techniques, tactics, and strategies.

ii. Include comprehensive awareness, body language, social, verbal, & physical skills.

iii. Utilize integrative, experiential, interactive, and embodied learning.

iv. Deliver adaptable, relevant skills for multiple social identity groups and multiple contexts.

v. Honor each individual’s past and future choices by teaching options, not “shoulds.”

vi. Provide a good fit for UM’s distinctive culture.

Measurements of Success

Many students of transformative and holistic Personal Safety Education report feeling like new people; many had no idea the depth to which they’d been living in fear. Once they internalize their right and ability to protect themselves, a new and profound sense of empowerment transfers life-wide. Students frequently state that PSE enabled them to ask for a raise, apply to graduate school, learn to scuba-dive, stand up to an abusive family member, or start jogging again. Once students feel safe and strong, they are freer than ever to reach their potential and go after their dreams.

Additional measures of success for individual students may include:

- An enhanced sense of safety at home, at work, and in their neighborhoods
- Increased awareness of common campus crimes and risk reduction strategies
- Increased awareness of campus safety resources and where to get help
- Social norming of self-protective behaviors in their peer groups and communities
- Availability of an additional tool in the toolbox for crime prevention
- Crimes and boundary violations experienced as less traumatic
- Improved sense of personal agency and self-efficacy
- Realistic skills in avoidance, risk reduction, de-escalation, verbal, social, and physical self-protection
• Enhanced ability to take personal responsibility for one’s relationships and community

Measures of success for the institution may include:

• Ability to meet student requests for PSE with consistent, evidence-based interventions
• Provision of training by consistent, sensitive, competent, supported and supervised trainers
• Effective promotion of the program’s availability to all students and parents
• The ability to scale provision of PSE for all interested students
• Robust program evaluation of immediate, short-term, and long-term learning/prevention outcomes
• Maximization of student choice and developmental effectiveness via multiple program tiers
• Ability to provide adaptable programs relevant to all social identities
• Publication/presentation on the national stage of innovative, evidence-based Student Affairs programming in this emerging field
• Divisionally and institutionally sustainable provision of Personal Safety Education to students

Such a Personal Safety Education Program will meet the needs of a diverse student body, adhere to the emerging evidence-base for prevention and national best practices, and create an innovative program unique to the University of Michigan, while ensuring robust, ongoing evaluation of outcomes in the essential area of student safety.
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NCASA Guidelines for Choosing
A Self Defense Course

Prepared for the National Coalition Against Sexual Assault by the
NCASA Self-Defense AD-HOC Committee

PLEASE NOTE:
Although the guidelines as originally written addressed women looking into self-defense options, they are appropriate guidelines for men also. To reflect this, any gender-specific wording has been changed.

Ideally, a good self-defense program should reflect these philosophical points in its outlook

1. People do not ask for, cause, invite or deserve to be assaulted. Women and men sometimes exercise poor judgment about safety behavior, but that does not make them responsible for the attack. Attackers are responsible for their attacks and their use of violence to overpower, control and abuse another human being.

2. Whatever a person’s decision in a given self-defense situation, whatever action she or he does or does not take, he or she is not at fault. A person’s decision to survive the best way they can must be respected. Self-defense classes should not be used as judgment against a victim/survivor.

3. Good self-defense programs do not "tell" an individual what s/he "should" or "should not" do. A program should offer options, techniques, and a way of analyzing situations. A program may point out what USUALLY works best in MOST situations, but each situation is unique and the final decision rests with the person actually confronted with the situation.

4. Empowerment is the goal of a good self-defense program. The individual's right to make decisions about his or her participation must be respected. Pressure should not be brought to bear in any way to get a person to participate in an activity if that person is hesitant or unwilling.

Frequently Asked Questions

What Is Self-Defense?
Self-defense is a set of awareness, assertiveness, and verbal confrontation skills with safety strategies and physical techniques that enable someone to successfully escape, resist, and survive violent attacks. A good self-defense course provides psychological awareness and verbal skills, not just physical training.

Does Self-Defense Work?
Yes, self-defense training can increase your options and help you prepare responses to slow, de-escalate, or interrupt an attack. Like any tool, the more you know, the more informed you are to choose when to use it.
Is Self-Defense a Guarantee?
No. There are no guarantees when it comes to self-protection. However, self-defense training can increase your choices/options and your preparedness.

Is There a Standard Self-Defense Course?
No. There are many formats for training. They may be as short as two hours or as long as 8 weeks or a semester. Whatever the length of the program, it should be based on maximizing options, simple techniques, and respect for people's experiences.

Is There a Course I Should Stay Away From?
Only you can answer this question. Find out about the philosophy of the program and the background of the instructor. Observe a class session if you can and talk to an instructor or a student. Is the instructor knowledgeable and respectful of your concerns? Is it a length of time that you can commit to and at a cost you can afford? You deserve to have all your questions answered before taking a class.

Who's Better--A Male or Female Instructor?
There is an advantage for women to having a female instructor as a role model--who has similar experiences surviving as a woman. All-women classes tend to provide an easier atmosphere in which to discuss sensitive issues. On the other hand, some women feel having male partners to practice with can add to their experience. The quality of a class depends on the knowledge, attitude and philosophy of the instructor, male or female, not necessarily on gender. The most important aspect is that the instructor, male or female, conducts the training for the students geared to their individual strengths and abilities. Feeling safe and building trust comes before learning.

Must I Train for Years to Learn to Defend Myself?
No. A basic course can offer enough concepts and skills to help you develop self-protection strategies that you can continue to build upon. Self-defense is not karate or martial arts training. It does not require years of study to perfect. There are women and men who have successfully improvised and prevented an assault without having taken a class. People often practice successful self-defense strategies without knowing it!

If I Use Physical Self-Defense, Could I Get Hurt Worse?
The question to answer first is what does "hurt worse" mean? Rape survivors speak eloquently about emotional hurts lasting long after physical hurts heal. Studies show a physical self-defense response does not increase the level of physical injury, and sometimes decreases the likelihood. Also, women and men going along with the attacker have sometimes been brutally injured anyway. The point of using self-defense is to de-escalate a situation and get away as soon as possible. Knowing some physical techniques increases the range of possible self-defense options, but the decision to choose a physical option must remain with the person in the situation.

What Does "Realistic" Mean?
Words like "most realistic", "best", "guaranteed success", etc., are all advertising gimmicks. Choosing a self-defense class is a serious decision and is preferably based on some research. No program or instructor can replicate a "real" assault since there are so many different scenarios, and because a real attack would require a no-holds barred fight which would be irresponsible and extremely dangerous to enact. Responsible self-defense training requires control. It is important that each student in a class is able to control his or her own participation in the class and never feel forced to participate.

What Is the Role of Mace or Other Aggressive "Devices" as Self-Defense Aids in Harming an Attacker?
Any device is useless to you unless you understand how to use it and have it in your hand ready to use at the time of the attempted assault. There is nothing "guaranteed" about any of these devices. None are foolproof. None of them can be counted on to work against all possible attackers (no matter what the labeling may say). Realize that anything you can use against an attacker can also be taken away and used against you. While some of these devices have sometimes helped people escape to safety, it is important to be aware of these devices' limitations and liabilities.

How Much Should I Pay?
Paying a lot of money for a course does not mean you automatically get better instruction. On the other hand,
don't assume all programs are the same and just go for the cheapest. It is always beneficial to be an educated consumer. Shop around the same as for anything else you buy that is important to you.

Where Can I Find a Self-Defense Class?
Check with your local rape crisis center. Some centers provide self-protection classes or can refer you to one. YWCA's and Community Colleges sometimes offer classes. Some martial arts schools provide seminars and workshops. Check the phone book. If there isn't one in your community, get involved and try to organize one.

Am I Too Old? Out of Shape? What If I Have Some Disabilities?
You don't have to be an athlete to learn how to defend yourself. A good program is designed to adapt to every age and ability and provide each student with the opportunity to learn. Each individual is unique and students should be able to discuss their own needs. Some programs have specialized classes for specific groups.

How Can I Tell a "Good" Course From a "Bad" One?
A good course covers critical thinking about self-defense strategies, assertiveness, powerful communication skills, and easy-to-remember physical techniques. The instructor respects and responds to your fears and concerns. Instruction is based on the belief that people can act competently, decisively, and take action for their own protection. Essentially, a good course is based on intelligence and not muscle. It offers tools for enabling a person to connect with her or his own strength and power. These courses are out there. Good luck in your research. Taking a self-defense class is one of the most positive acts people can do for themselves!

The National Coalition Against Sexual Assault was a non-profit, membership organization of rape crisis centers, associated agencies and individuals, established in 1978. The goal of NCASA was the elimination of sexual assault in all of its forms through education, monitoring public policy development and coalition building. When it remained in existence, NCASA encouraged dissemination of this material with attribution.

NCASA Self-Defense Ad Hoc Committee:

Chair - Patricia Giggans, Los Angeles, CA
Co-Chair - Mary Brandl, Minneapolis, MN
Linda Adams, Cape May Point, NJ
Py Bateman, Seattle, WA
Mary Boland, Glen Ellyn, IL
Kathy Hopwood, Durham, NC
Appendix C: Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary Prevention

Prevention education at the University of Michigan and within the UM Division of Student Affairs is broad and comprehensive, enacted by many departments, units, schools and colleges, and includes primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention strategies in multiple content areas.

Personal Safety Education at the University of Michigan is one element of the institution’s response to diverse safety concerns. It occupies a position along the spectrum of prevention interventions in both the General Safety and Sexual Violence content areas. Personal safety education may be implemented at the primary, secondary, or tertiary prevention levels. Examples include:

**Primary Prevention:** A student takes a Personal Safety Education class which allows her to accurately identify the warning signs of a controlling partner and creates a safe space to practice the skills needed to end a relationship with “red flags” before physical intimate partner violence begins.

**Secondary Prevention:** Another student joins a self-defense student organization the morning after experiencing a mugging, and finds that his new martial arts skills and sparring practice help to relieve the anxiety, shame, and self-blame he experienced after the attack.

**Tertiary Prevention:** Many students at UM, survivors of violence, and most women in American culture experience a basic level of ongoing, culturally-moderated fear of attack. Personal safety education can empower these individuals to feel safer, stronger, and more positive about their bodies and their choices over the long-term. At the societal level, PSE developed skills such as self-efficacy, assertiveness and awareness then act to prevent ongoing victimization.
Appendix D – Personal Safety Education in the Big 10

Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

The Self-Defense for Women Program
Sponsored by IM Sports & Recreative Services
https://www.msu.edu/~sdclub/2hr.htm

The Self-Defense for Women Program is a free 2 hour workshop offered to groups and organizations affiliated with MSU. It began in 1976 in response to a string of well publicized sexual assaults on campus. Student facilitators with extensive training in self-defense and/or martial arts lead the classes. Facilitators come to the group's location of choice (even off campus). Women and men can attend. There must be at least 10 participants for a workshop to take place. In the Level 1 Program there is discussion about personal safety and opportunities to learn and practice a variety of physical maneuvers. In the Level 2 Program there is a short role play segment to review assertiveness and situation assessment.

Michigan State Self-Defense Club
https://www.msu.edu/~sdclub/

Established in the fall of 2004, the Michigan State Self-Defense Club is an extension of the IM Self-Defense 2 hour program. The club allows additional time to practice skills, learn new maneuvers, and ask questions. The club offers opportunities to learn techniques and improve skills, get a cardiovascular workout, gain punching bag and shield training, and attend workshops with specialized instructors (ground defense, weapons, and various martial arts).

MSU - Kines 106V
Sponsored by Kinesiology

This one credit course is offered every Fall, Spring, and Summer term. This course is intended to increase students' awareness and understanding of sexual assault. Focus is placed on defense against sexual violence that is most often directed towards women, and increasingly men, in our culture. Techniques for diffusing or avoiding potentially dangerous situations are examined. Such techniques include verbal, nonverbal, physical and psychological responses. Physical self-defense skills include evasions, blocks, counterattacks and other defenses against common attacks. The concept of unlearning "victim-like" thinking and behaviors is also examined. The course will include lecture, discussion, and participation.

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

PE 1044 Self-Defense
Sponsored by College of Continuing Education
http://cce.umn.edu/courses/PE-1044.html

PE 1044 Self-Defense is a 1 credit course that can be taken in fall, spring, or summer. The course focuses on learning basic physical and psychological skills to help the student recognize and act in crisis and pre-crisis situations: to avoid or stop physical assault, harassment, irritating and/or dangerous situations and encounters. Physical skills include basic striking, kicking, shifting (learning to move out of the way), blocking, and specialized techniques for specific situations. The final exam includes physical demonstration of basic skills plus student’s choice of one from each of the following four categories (partner exercises): 1) basic blocking, 2) response to a grab from the front 3) response to a grab from behind 4) one special situation.
**PE ACTIV 111: Self-defense and Assault Prevention**
Sponsored by the School of Education

PE ACTIV 111: Self-defense and Assault Prevention is a 1 credit course. It's taught by School of Education lecturer Robert Yu and the class focuses on the physical aspects of protecting yourself. The class covers three methods of defense: punching, strikes and kicks; wrestling, grappling; and escaping from holds and grabs. Students are taught techniques and then instructed and observed in their performance. For part of the class, students put on padding and test the self-defense methods one-on-one.

**Chimera Self Defense Program**
Sponsored by Madison's Rape Crisis Center
http://danecountyrcc.org/chimera/index.php

Chimera is a nationwide self-defense program designed especially for women. Campus classes are taught each semester, including the summer session. The price of the class is $30 for the public and $20 for students. Need-based scholarships are available. Classes teach physical and psychological self-defense skills useful to all women, no matter what age, size, strength or physical ability. Women learn awareness, precautions, assertiveness and physical techniques.

Chimera A
- sexual assault myths and facts
- the effectiveness of resistance
- awareness skills
- assertiveness skills
- physical skills
- defenses for harassment and assault by acquaintances and strangers

Chimera B
- for Chimera A graduates
- basics review
- defenses for multiple attackers
- advanced ground techniques
- strategies for dealing with weapons
- protection in and around cars

**Women’s Self-Defense: Six Points**
Sponsored by Campus Recreation
http://crec.unl.edu/recclasses/descriptions.shtml

The Women's Self-Defense class is a part of the Rec and Leisure Classes (non-credit) group at the school’s recreation center. The class lasts approximately 4 hours and costs $25 per participant. It covers basic awareness, posture, how to stay vocal, basic striking, choke defenses, ground assault defenses and how to use some weapon defenses, followed by an attack simulation. It also includes how to deal with a carjacking and how to use every day purse items as weapons.
EDU PAES 172.01: Self-Defense
Sponsored by the School of Physical Activity and Educational Resources

The purpose of this one-credit class is to provide the student with the appropriate level of knowledge and skills in self-defense. As a result of the class, the student will improve his/her general physical fitness and skill performance. Principles, techniques and safe practices of self-defense will be taught throughout the class. Content includes: yell and stance, verbal skills, body language, strikes and kicks, and development of a personal safety plan.

R.A.D. (Rape Aggression Defense) Programs

The following schools have R.A.D. Programs, run by local police and campus safety departments. R.A.D. [http://www.rad-systems.com/](http://www.rad-systems.com/) is a program of primarily physical self-defense tactics and techniques for women. Instructors use a padded attacker model. R.A.D.’s expressed goal is to give women the skills they need to successfully escape an attempted abduction by a stranger without a weapon.

- University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL
- Indiana University, Bloomington, IN
- Northwestern, Evanston, IL
- Penn State, University Park, PA
- Purdue, West Lafayette, IN
- University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA
- Ohio State University, Columbus, OH
Appendix E – UM Evaluation Data PSE Workshops

Summary: While most UM student participants report feeling moderately or very safe both on and off campus; a significant minority reported feeling not very safe on campus (7% of University Housing residents and 5% of off campus residents) and not very safe or not at all safe off campus in Ann Arbor (20% of University Housing residents and 17% of off campus residents)

Students report an average of 3.5 different personal safety concerns each. Concerns vary markedly by gender. Interactions with unknown others receive the lowest self-efficacy scores pre-workshop; participants experience the biggest changes post-workshop in self-efficacy in their ability to use assertive communication, set boundaries, and physically deter unwanted behavior with unknown others. Students report high rates of positive change from pre- to post- in both awareness of campus safety resources and awareness of which crimes they are most likely to experience. Significantly, in the two-month follow-up surveys, multiple participants report using assertiveness, boundary setting and physical skills with known and unknown others since their workshop, commenting: “I’ve become more assertive in general” & “I used the eye-strike with a stranger and it worked!”

Demographics Percentages are rounded (227 total participants; 141 complete Pre- surveys; 152 Post- surveys; 33 two-month follow-up surveys)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rating of the Workshop</th>
<th>Student Year</th>
<th>Residential Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>71% Excellent</td>
<td>15% First</td>
<td>31% University Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27% Good</td>
<td>20% Second</td>
<td>59% Off Campus (within 5 miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% Average</td>
<td>18% Third</td>
<td>9% Off Campus (further than 5 miles)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1% Below Average</td>
<td>11% Fourth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% Poor</td>
<td>36% Grad Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Role</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>88% Student</td>
<td>4% Black or African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2% Faculty</td>
<td>3% Latino/a American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% Staff</td>
<td>12% Asian American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66% White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3% Multiracial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10% Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity</th>
<th>Greek Life Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85% Female</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Athletes</th>
<th>International Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Concern</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(such as having something stolen)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical assault or being attacked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(such as being mugged or beaten up)</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being targeted because of my social identity,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whether real or perceived (such as ethnicity,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual orientation, gender or gender identity,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disability, etc.)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual assault</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate partner violence (such as emotional,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbal, physical, sexual abuse from a partner)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street harassment (such as catcalls, name calling,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive panhandling)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages reported are percent responses.
141 respondents, 489 responses.
## Perception of Safety On & Off Campus
By Residential Status, Pre-Workshop and at 2-Month Follow-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE University Housing</th>
<th>PRE Off campus Housing</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How safe do you feel on campus?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely safe</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very safe</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately safe</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very safe</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all safe</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      |                        |                        |                 |
| **How safe do you feel off campus in Ann Arbor?** |                        |                        |                 |
| Extremely safe       | 0%                     | 0%                     | 3%              |
| Very safe            | 18%                    | 28%                    | 33%             |
| Moderately safe      | 61%                    | 55%                    | 52%             |
| Not very safe        | 20%                    | 15%                    | 12%             |
| Not at all safe      | 0%                     | 2%                     | 0%              |

*Note: Percentages reported are percent responses.*
## Awareness of Common Crimes and UM Safety Resources

### I am aware of which crimes I'm at highest risk of experiencing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE- WORKSHOP</th>
<th>POST- WORKSHOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I am aware of resources at UM that can help me with my safety questions and concerns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE- WORKSHOP</th>
<th>POST- WORKSHOP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Agree</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Disagree</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Follow-Up Surveys

Participation in the 2-month follow-up was unsurprisingly low for a summer survey (n=33); data may not be statistically predictive.

We asked participants to indicate to what extent they've used skills learned in the workshop over the past two months (a great deal, considerably, moderately, not very much, not at all, not applicable, prefer not to answer):

- I have used assertive communication with people I know – 41% a great deal, considerably or moderately
- I have set boundaries with people I don't know – 42% answered a great deal, considerably or moderately
- I have used assertive communication with people I don’t know – 30% answered a great deal, considerably or moderately
- I have set boundaries with people I know – 33% answered considerably or moderately
- I have used physical skills to stop someone from assaulting me – 5 individuals answered a great deal, considerably, or moderately (see below for details)

Follow-Up Comments

The most common theme of the qualitative comments in the follow-up surveys was an interest in opportunities for ongoing practice or additional sessions to help remember, practice and integrate the techniques. This data is particularly supportive of the recommendations for a three-tiered UM Personal Safety Education program.

- “I used the eye-strike with a stranger and it worked!”
- “I have not been assaulted while walking alone, so when I say I have used physical skills to stop someone I don't know from assaulting me, I mean when walking alone at night I maintain a posture, awareness, and mental preparedness that not only may prevent an assault, but also makes me ready to handle a situation should one arise.”
- “I've become more assertive in general.”
- “I have already forgotten much of what was covered in the class and would love more opportunities to practice the basic skills and learn more advanced skills.”
• “I haven't had any events that have allowed me to use what I learned, but I have shared some of the information with others. I definitely found the workshop helpful.”

• “I haven't really needed to use boundary setting, as no one has approached me in a way that I don't approve of. There is someone on my bus who crosses verbal boundaries with me (inappropriate conversations and odd dinner invitations). I've mainly tried to avoid this person, but I hope that I will use the assertiveness tools from the workshop when I do encounter him.¹ I have tried to be aware of other people's boundaries and try to refrain from touching people- I have mixed feelings about that.”

• “I just haven't run into any situations where I would need to use any of these behaviors. I have however, shared the ‘repeat what just happened’ strategy with friends and family.”

• “It would probably be good to attend multiple such workshops. I found that I couldn't really remember all of the recommendations even just a couple of weeks later. It helps to get the self-defense movements into the muscle memory multiple times, I'm sure.”

¹ NOTE: This student comment is an excellent depiction of the “contemplation” stage of behavior change as defined by the Public Health field.
Appendix F – Questions Posed to UM PSE Providers & Stakeholders

Do you now or have you ever provided self-defense or personal safety education for UM students?

If not, do you feel like personal safety education or self-defense should be offered at UM and what should that look like?

If so....

**WHAT**
- What did they teach?
- What were the learning outcomes?
- Was the program evaluated? What did they learn from evaluation?
- What changes (if any) were made based on the outcomes/evaluations?

**WHO**
- Who taught those classes/programs and can we contact them?
- How many people participated? Who were they? (demographics, student groups)
- Who was involved in the sponsorship, collaboration?

**HOW**
- How did they promote/publicize the classes/workshops?
- How was this funded? What were the costs—to run program?
- Costs to participants?
- Long-term plans—plan to continue?

**WHY**
- Was there a reason they decided to do it?
- Was there a prompt? Was it in response to something?

**And Finally**
- Do they feel like self-defense/personal safety education should be offered at UM and what should that look like?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Judged Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.5.2.1</td>
<td>Bystander Interventions</td>
<td>Promising Practice/Preponderance of Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5.2.2</td>
<td>Unlearning Rape Myths</td>
<td>Promising Practice/Preponderance of Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5.2.3</td>
<td>Teaching Self-Defense Skills</td>
<td>Promising Practice/Preponderance of Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5.2.4</td>
<td>Communication Training, Assertiveness, Limit Setting</td>
<td>Promising Practice/Preponderance of Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6.1</td>
<td>Victim Empathy</td>
<td>Possible Practice/Mixed Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6.2</td>
<td>Avoidance of High-Risk Situations</td>
<td>Possible Practice/Mixed Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6.3</td>
<td>Negative Consequences for Perpetrators</td>
<td>Possible Practice/Mixed Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6.4</td>
<td>Changing Social Norms</td>
<td>Possible Practice/Mixed Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6.3</td>
<td>Changing Social Norms</td>
<td>Possible Practice/Mixed Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7.1</td>
<td>Rape Awareness/Legal Definitions</td>
<td>Unsupported Practice/No Effect, Negative Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.7.2</td>
<td>Education About Self-Defense</td>
<td>Unsupported Practice/No Effect, Negative Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8.1.1</td>
<td>More than one session</td>
<td>Promising Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8.1.2</td>
<td>Shorter sessions</td>
<td>Promising Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8.1.3</td>
<td>Specifically Targeting Race/Ethnicity of Audience</td>
<td>Promising Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8.1.4</td>
<td>Single-Gender Audience</td>
<td>Promising Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8.1.5</td>
<td>Intervening w/younger students</td>
<td>Promising Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8.2.1</td>
<td>Male &amp; Female Co-presenters</td>
<td>Possible Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8.2.2</td>
<td>Multiple, Interactive Presentation Methods</td>
<td>Possible Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8.2.3</td>
<td>Exploiting Cognitive Dissonance</td>
<td>Possible Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.8.3</td>
<td>Confrontational</td>
<td>Unsupported Practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H – Benefits & Challenges of Existing PSE Program Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Techniques</th>
<th>Padded Attacker Model</th>
<th>For-Credit Academic Classes</th>
<th>Martial Arts Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Easy to learn techniques, developed for real life violence, including sexual violence; standing, ground, verbal, &amp; emotional management.</td>
<td>Generally focuses on non-physical techniques of awareness, intuition, getting help, community organizing &amp; primary prevention.</td>
<td>Many martial arts have been developed to include physically effective techniques regardless of the relative size of the attacker and defender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple</td>
<td>State-dependent learning or “muscle memory” enhances mastery and retention of skills.</td>
<td>It’s possible that credited courses could include physical skills &amp; strategies alongside robust academic content.</td>
<td>Self-defense specific martial arts curricula include simple techniques; for example, an emphasis on short fights and escape strategies (rather than tournament level competition or MMA stamina).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complicated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing</td>
<td>Heavy emphasis on ground skills, specific to sexual violence and addresses the most common type of violence on campus for women.</td>
<td>Perceived institutional resistance to courses with physical skill components.</td>
<td>Techniques vary widely between martial arts and self-defense, and between different schools of martial arts; many do not include ground fighting but others do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrators</td>
<td>Padded Attacker Model</td>
<td>For-Credit Academic Classes</td>
<td>Martial Arts Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strangers</strong></td>
<td>Students experience the realism of state-dependent learning in these programs as an important element in unlearning unwanted role socialization, and in increasing confidence in diverse settings, including with friends and family.</td>
<td>Multi-session classes, readings and group discussion are conducive to unlearning myths about stranger attackers and developing the complex strategies necessary for responses to known attackers.</td>
<td>Long-term practice of martial arts can develop &quot;internal skills&quot; (confidence, self-esteem, resolve, and adrenaline management) which can be helpful to people in abusive relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dating Violence</strong></td>
<td>IMPACT students practice skills against verbally abusive behavior, verbal intrusion and testing - all important strategies of known attackers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A number of ground techniques focus on controlling an opponent (holds, joint manipulation) rather than surviving and escaping an abusive partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IPV</strong></td>
<td>The RAD curriculum is defined as “defense against single, unarmed abduction by a stranger”; although some techniques are described as useful in dating situations, students are cautioned the program does not “apply” to known assailants.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Even some members of the martial arts focus group associated the martial arts with male attackers, male defenders, standing fights, and unknown/stranger assailants; this could be a challenging presumption to overcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Known Stalkers</strong></td>
<td>IMPACT students learn verbal strategies for responding to known attackers and receive personalized instruction in assertive communication, boundary setting, and setting limits with intimates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
<td>Padded Attacker Model</td>
<td>For-Credit Academic Classes</td>
<td>Martial Arts Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Padded attackers allow for physical and psychological realism. State dependent or embodied learning is transferable in ways that cognitive or academic learning may not be; learning is enhanced and reinforced by the adrenaline state; allows for long-term retention after relatively short trainings (20+ hours).</td>
<td>If credited programs include physical skills, then weekly sessions over the course of a term or half term increase retention compared to single session workshops.</td>
<td>Learning techniques requires repetition and reinforcement; some martial artists feel that a 13 week course is too short to include ground fighting elements; one attendee felt that a single short session of martial arts could destroy confidence and actually be detrimental to some learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length</td>
<td>Students can return for refreshers or to reinforce skills.</td>
<td>We posit improved learning outcomes and attendance compared to programming that doesn't offer credit.</td>
<td>Students can return for refreshers or to reinforce skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embodied or Integrative Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Martial artist self-defense courses often utilize multiple instructors (even more instructors than students) to maximize learning, accessibility and one on one attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refresher Opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability of Curriculum</td>
<td>Padded Attacker Model</td>
<td>For-Credit Academic Classes</td>
<td>Martial Arts Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>IMPACT programs recommend gender segregation (male, female, and trans classes) due to different safety needs and to enhance emotional safety for all; evidence suggests women in particular learn better in single gender programs; co-ed programs can be unsafe for transgender students.</td>
<td>Depending on how broadly the course is listed, offering credit creates accessibility for the widest range of students; those who work nights, need credits, or lack time can take a class who might not be able to participate otherwise.</td>
<td>&quot;Martial arts&quot; as a concept may be more appealing to men than &quot;self-defense&quot; (yet the term and field may be a barrier for other genders).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Identity</td>
<td>IMPACT programs allow for revision of content for students of varying social identities; students have the opportunity to personalize practice scenarios to revisit and heal previous experiences of violation.</td>
<td>Hard to target content for specific populations; can't have a class &quot;for women&quot; or &quot;for students of color.&quot;</td>
<td>There are many interested martial arts instructors in the community; their diverse curricula and frameworks could be a challenge to standardize or adapt for specific communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>The RAD program is strictly limited to nationally approved content; instructors must teach all the recommended techniques and may not introduce any others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAD Programs are for female students only.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong></td>
<td>Padded Attacker Model</td>
<td>For-Credit Academic Classes</td>
<td>Martial Arts Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>Quite variable: 2 hours to full semester; the “full Basics” IMPACT program is generally 20 hours in total.</td>
<td>Longest overall, varies: 1-4 credits, weekly, biweekly, half-term, full-term.</td>
<td>Quite variable: from short introductory programs to full semester and beyond; including life-long learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Sessions</strong></td>
<td>A range of program lengths maximizes accessibility for students with different time allowances.</td>
<td></td>
<td>A range of program lengths maximizes accessibility for students with different time allowances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RAD programs are usually 12-15 hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Implementation Considerations** | Expense, length of training time for instructors. | Institutionally, we perceive a number of barriers to successfully launching a credited course which includes applied learning, physical skills, self-defense, etc.; not impossible, but not simple or easy. | There are many interested martial arts instructors in the community; could increase availability of instruction to maximum number of UM students to address scaleability. |
| **Cost** | | Such a class could incorporate additional benefits: a service/learning component, opportunities to return as assistants and develop peer leadership skills, thus adding value academically and professional development. | |
Course Description

This 15 week, two-credit mini-course is intended to familiarize students with the variety of issues in contemporary personal violence prevention, with a special focus on sexual assault prevention and self-defense issues on college campuses. The political and historical context of violence prevention strategies, theory and research will be introduced, and multiple frameworks explored via the fundamental scholarly literature. The work of violence prevention will be investigated through a number of lenses - including contributions to the field from psychology, gender studies, public health, student affairs, empowerment theory, law enforcement and the martial arts. Students will define and learn to identify sexual assault, interpersonal or “dating” violence, child sexual abuse, stalking, and sexual harassment. Coursework will explore social, cultural, political and psychological factors which contribute to violence in families and communities. Students will engage in reflective and active learning via classroom discussion and written and experiential assignments. Violence prevention is broadly defined and coursework includes personal self-defense (awareness, verbal, psychological and physical skills), bystander interventions in situations with the potential to become violent, and community-wide mobilization of anti-violence resources with a focus on social justice for all. Resources specific to the University of Michigan community will be emphasized. This course is open to students of all social identities, genders, and physical abilities. Physical coursework will be tailored to meet the needs of participants. Survivors of violence are welcomed and invited to participate in the ways which work best for them in an environment of safety honoring each individual’s choices.

Course Objectives

Upon successful completion of this course, students will have met the following objectives and completed the following assignments:

- Understand the intellectual framework of violence prevention employed by a number of competing and overlapping ideological perspectives; exposure to core literature in this multi-disciplinary field; identify the political/ideological frameworks of different for-profit and not-for-profit self-defense programs; identify most resonate approach for oneself when considering future training or education programs
• Engaged and active learning through development of personalized safety assessments, identifying perpetrators and scenarios of highest concern, resources available, and identifying any potential risk-taking behavior patterns

• A self-designed challenge program based on the safety assessment to enhance overall safety, wellness and ability to defend oneself which implements risk reduction strategies at home, school, and/or in the workplace

• Study the most effective techniques for the practice of harm reduction and violence prevention when making personal choices about alcohol use and healthy relationships; learn to recognize the warning signs of abusive partners, and of alcohol and other drug-facilitated violence

• Understand common reactions to violence and coping strategies used by many survivors; learn about community resources for survivors, how to be of help to survivors individually and as an engaged community member

• Extensive practice of progressive, realistic, and effective self-defense and violence prevention skills, including physical and verbal techniques for defense against sexual and other assaults

**Required Texts & Readings**

Mattingly, K. (2007). *Self-Defense: Steps to Survival*. Human Kinetics. This required text is available locally or via Amazon or other online merchants. All other required readings will be made available via cTools.


Lisak, D. Rape Fact Sheet. UMass, Boston, MA.

NCASA Guidelines for Choosing a Self-Defense Program.


**Recommended Texts**


Class Schedule

WEEKS 1-3 Preventing Sexual Assault in Our Communities

Week 1
Course Introduction, Overview, and Expectations
Defining Sexual Assault - Institutional, State, National Definitions
Vicims and Perpetrators, Myths and Facts

For Week 2: Submit a one page reaction paper on today's course material.

Week 2
Defining Consent
Complete and Discuss Safety Assessment
Choose three personal goals as challenge areas

Deterrence Level One
Physical & Verbal Boundaries
No is a complete sentence.

For Week 3: Say no to something you would normally just go along with, come to class prepared to share your experiences with this assignment.

Week 3
Defining Self-Defense
Survivors: Phases of Recovery
Guest Speaker: Surviving Sexual Assault

Techniques Using Hands and Arms
Standing Defense Strategies

For Week 4: Come to class prepared to discuss in pairs of two your chosen personal challenge areas and goals for the semester.

WEEKS 4-6 Alcohol & Other Drugs, Links to Violence

Week 4
Alcohol & Other Drugs
Alcohol/Drug Facilitated Assault
Abstinence – Moderation - Bingeing

Deterrence Level Two
Standing Techniques: Feet & Legs

For Week 5: Teach week 2, 3, and 4 techniques to one or more friends, come to class prepared with questions for any technique you didn’t understand or couldn’t remember.
Week 5
Barriers to Effective Self-Defense
Bystanders and Allies
Party Safety
Breaking Standing Holds
Making a Scene

For Week 6: Draft a party safety plan for yourself or a friend, include potential risk areas, barriers to implementation of the plan, and whether or not you want to actually try it out.

Week 6
Guest Speaker: Surviving Alcohol and Other Drugs
Community Resources for Students and Allies
Introduction to Ground Techniques
Ground Defense Strategies

Note: A written progress report on your personal goals & challenge areas is due Week 8.

WEEKS 7-9 Advanced Personal Safety – Threats from Within

Week 7
Defining Child Abuse
Survivors: Symptoms and Coping Mechanisms
What if you suspect a child is being hurt?
Advanced Ground Techniques
The Adrenaline Response

For Week 8: Submit written progress report on your personal goals/challenge areas.

Week 8
Addictive Escapes
Self-Esteem vs. Self-Hatred – What’s Normal?
Self-Injurious and Risk-Taking Behavior
Avoiding Blows

For Week 9: Teach week 5, 6, 7, & 8 techniques to one or more friends, come to class prepared with questions for any technique you didn’t understand or couldn’t remember.

Week 9
Guest: Surviving CSA and Self-Harm
How To Help a Friend
Escaping Holds on the Ground

For Week 10: Submit a reaction paper on today’s course material.
WEEKS 10-12 “I Can’t Believe It Happened to Me” – Violence from Friends/Family

**Week 10**
- Dating Violence – Warning Signs & Cycles
- Stalking/ School/Workplace Harassment
- Introduction to Knock-Out Blows

*For Week 11: Work on student presentations.*

**Week 11**
- When Someone You Love is Being Hurt
- Families and Communities Respond to Violence
- Advanced Knock-Out Blows

*For Week 12: Work on student presentations, bring personal safety assessment to class.*

**Week 12**
- Guest Speaker: Surviving Dating Violence
- Strategies for Ending the Assault

*For Week 13: Review Personal Safety Assessment from Week 2; schedule appointment with instructor to discuss ongoing safety planning, work on student presentations.*


**Week 13** (one on one meetings with the instructor this week)
- Should You Carry a Weapon?
  - Keychains, pepper spray, guns
  - Shooter On Campus, Taking Cover
- Weapons Defense
- Defense against multiple assailants

*For Weeks 14 & 15: Complete student presentations; conduct appointment with instructor to discuss ongoing safety planning*
**Week 14**
(one on one meetings with the instructor this week)
Student Presentations

*For Weeks 14 & 15: Complete student presentations; conduct appointment with instructor to discuss ongoing safety plan*

**Week 15**
Student Presentations
Options for Future Training
Exercise and Discussion: What Are You Willing to Fight For?
January 15, 2013

Dear Colleagues,

On behalf of all of the sponsors of the Student Safety Work Group (SSWG), including myself, Interim Chief of the University of Michigan Police Department (UMPD, formerly DPS) Joe Piersante, and Chief of the Ann Arbor Police Department (AAPD) John Seto, I'm writing today to formally respond to the SSWG's work of 2012, including the final recommendations report of August 1, 2012. We would like to assert our interest in implementing the group's recommendations, to share progress on a number of student safety education fronts, and to thank you heartily for your service in this most important arena for the campus community.

As you know, the Student Safety Work Group was charged in February of 2012 to report on the scope of current student safety efforts at the University of Michigan, to identify theoretical foundations of existing safety initiatives; to research national best practices in student safety education, to evaluate the effectiveness of current UM initiatives, and to recommend new initiatives, if applicable. The work group was charged to supply the sponsors with an advisory report for consideration.

The SSWG identified five broad recommendations to expand, enhance, or better coordinate UM's already significant student safety education efforts: 1) Implement bystander intervention skills training on campus; 2) Build stronger relationships between students and law enforcement for specific populations; and 3) Utilize technology solutions to make safety education and resource information more accessible to students. Additionally, the Personal Safety Education (PSE) Subcommittee recommended; 4) the implementation of a multi-tiered PSE program for UM students, and the Off-Campus Student Safety Subcommittee recommended; 5) the continuance and expansion of the Beyond the Diag program.

The sponsors concur with these recommendations for continuing and expanding the excellent student safety education and programming already in place at the University of Michigan; and we thank you for your efforts in identifying and exploring each area of recommendation. Further, I am pleased to be able to report progress. We have already begun implementation of a number of the SSWG's final recommendations. Additionally, we are seeking funding for a number of others. By way of example:

- The Beyond the Diag Off-Campus Student Program has utilized existing DSA resources to hire a full-time Program Manager. Further, private donors have been secured for an additional year of programming dollars, and multiple new student Neighborhood Ambassadors have been identified and trained.

- By leveraging a graduate student intern and existing DSA resources, pilot Personal Safety Education workshops have continued throughout all of 2012 and will continue in Winter Term 2013. Work has begun to identify academic partners for credited PSE coursework and a pilot cohort to participate in an embodied, integrative co-curricular program.

- The University of Michigan Police Department and the Ann Arbor Police Department will continue to lead out efforts for community-based policing and relationship development as recommended by the Student Safety Work Group. The Neighborhood Watch Program of the AAPD will work to incorporate student Neighborhood Ambassadors from the Beyond the Diag program into community meetings and neighborhood events.
The Division of Student Affairs (DSA) is preparing a significant funding request which includes support of: bystander intervention education, personal safety education, off-campus student safety programming, and the development of technology tools in support of student safety awareness and education. We recognize resources are limited yet hope to secure the necessary funding to continue to advance this important work.

Please know how grateful Joe, John and I have been for your work. Your efforts in identifying, vetting, benchmarking, researching, and exploring student safety education options have been invaluable in the ongoing process of assuring the safety of University of Michigan students. Sometimes the impact of one’s membership in a work group of this type can be unclear as recommendations are offered and response or changes take time to develop. We are all committed to this truly collaborative work, and to the additional involvement of the many stakeholders to be consulted in funding and implementation decisions. In the current economic climate, locating sustainable funding for even the best designed and most thoughtful recommendations will continue to call for creativity, persistence, and resilience.

Your participation with the Student Safety Work Group, the Personal Safety Education Subcommittee, and the Off-Campus Student Safety Subcommittee has highlighted the existing excellent work of our colleagues, identified important future directions for student safety education, and made forward movement possible. If you are interested in remaining involved with the implementation of any particular set of recommendations, I have noted below those individuals who will share ongoing responsibility for each area. Please do contact them if you, or someone you know, is interested in staying involved.

DSA Bystander Intervention Education:  Mary Jo Desprez  maryjod@med.umich.edu  
AAPD Law Enforcement & Community Relations:  Lt. Renee Bush  rbush@a2gov.org  
AAPD Neighborhood Watch Coordinator:  Deb Cauffiel  dcauffiel@a2gov.org  
UMPD Law Enforcement & Community Relations:  Gary Hicks  dhixter@umich.edu  
DSA Off-Campus Student Safety:  Ben Rosebrock  benjamro@umich.edu  
DSA Personal Safety Education:  Katy Mattingly  ktlm@umich.edu  
DSA Technology Solutions for Student Safety Education:  Holly Rider-Milkovich  hburmeis@umich.edu

With continuing gratitude for your service,

Laura Blake Jones, Associate Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students  
Joe Piersante, Interim Chief, UM Police Department  
John Seto, Chief, Ann Arbor Police Department