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The North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCCADV) contracted with ETR Services, LLC (ETR) in August 2017 to conduct an evaluation of a newly launched tool, the ModelCampus: Title IX Action Guide (ModelCampus hereafter), an online tool to aid intimate partner violence (IPV) response and prevention across North Carolina college campuses. Central goals of the evaluation included assessing the uptake, impact, and challenges associated with use of ModelCampus to ensure that additional revisions to the tool improve its uptake and usability. Through conversations with NCCADV staff, ETR identified four primary objectives for this evaluation:

Objectives

1. Assess the use, utility, and shortcomings of ModelCampus: Title IX Action Guide;
2. Understand individual and institutional motivations for using the tool;
3. Document how campuses are using and/or plan to use the tool. NCCADV is specifically interested in the variation of use/planned use across campuses of differing sizes, demographics, organizational structures, and capacities for response, prevention, and advocacy for students affected by IPV, sexual assault, and stalking; and
4. Gather feedback (from DELTA FOCUS and non-DELTA FOCUS-affiliated campuses) to be used for improving ModelCampus.

Methodology

In completing these objectives, ETR anticipates addressing five evaluation questions (outlined below):

1. To what extent are college employees*1 aware of ModelCampus?
2. To what extent are NC campus employees using ModelCampus?
3. In what types of situations have college employees found ModelCampus helpful?
4. In what types of situations have college employees found ModelCampus unhelpful or inadequate?
5. What additional resources are necessary for effectively preventing and/or responding to intimate partner violence on college campuses?

The full list of evaluation questions and sub-questions can be found in Appendix B.

---

1 Campus employees may include Deans, campus-based prevention staff, faculty who are required to report, and other faculty members who choose to report.
Utilizing a mixed methodology, ETR gathered interview and survey data to answer the evaluation questions (see Appendices C and D for instruments). Interviews were conducted with college counselors, victim advocates, and Title IX office representatives during Fall/Winter 2017 (n=6) to better understand the ways in which ModelCampus has been used by college campus staff across the state and to ascertain rich feedback from front-line IPV responders. An online survey was launched in January 2018 to campus staff across the state to learn more about the effectiveness of tool dissemination (n=86; 14% response rate).\(^2\)\(^3\)

Qualitative data were aggregated and examined for emergent themes, which are reported in the following section. Both qualitative and quantitative data from the survey are also reported below, along with descriptive statistics, and following the path of tool awareness through use. Survey demographics can be found in Appendix A. The short duration of this evaluation did not allow for a second wave of data collection, however, the data included in this report can serve as a baseline measurement for ModelCampus uptake if NCCADV were to collect additional survey data in the future.

\(^2\) External surveys administered online typically have a response rate of 10-15%, which suggests that the low response rate reported in this report is average given the mode of administration and audience.

\(^3\) Response rate was calculated as follows: (86/631) *100.
Description

ModelCampus was created to help campuses think through the process of responding to IPV on college campuses in a way that is trauma-informed, survivor-centered, and compliant with current laws. Covered topics include: prevention and education; support services; reporting and privacy concerns; investigation and adjudication; policy development; and guiding principles related to each topic. Additionally, ModelCampus provides several examples of real life scenarios that "strive to operationalize, in spirit and letter, the requirements and recommendations set forth in this tool."[4]

Changes to Title IX Guidance. Since the time ModelCampus was created, the federal government has since reinterpreted Title IX legislation. Not only did these changes have implications for how sexual misconduct and IPV cases are handled across U.S. college campuses, the changes are in opposition to and without regard for best practices in IPV response and prevention. Rescinding prior guidance contained in a 2011 Dear Colleague letter and a 2014 Q&A on Title IX Sexual Violence, new guidelines from the Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights provides schools with greater discretion in choosing between a standard of proof that requires a “preponderance of evidence” to determine guilt or the more stringent “clear and convincing” standard. In previous Title IX guidance:

Grievance procedures that use this higher [“clear and convincing”] standard are inconsistent with the standard of proof established for violations of the civil rights laws, and are thus not equitable under Title IX. Therefore, preponderance of the evidence is the appropriate standard for investigating allegations of sexual harassment or violence.

Additional changes articulated in the September 2017 guidance include: the equitable extension of interim measures and accommodations as appropriate “to either or both the reporting and responding parties involved in an alleged incident of sexual misconduct, prior to an investigation or while an investigation is pending;”[5] any rights or opportunities made available to one party during an investigation “should be made available to the other party on equal terms;” colleges and universities need only demonstrate a “good faith effort to conduct a fair, impartial investigation in a timely manner designed to provide all parties with resolution;” and colleges and universities may now exercise discretion in choosing who can appeal decisions regarding responsibility and/or disciplinary sanctions.

---

4 Taken verbatim from ModelCampus website; can be accessed at: https://modelcampus.org/scenarios
5 https://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/qa-title-ix-201709.pdf
As of March 2018, the only amended Title IX guidance provided by the Department of Education is in the form of a Q&A document that addresses twelve questions and a statement of intent to solicit input from stakeholders and the public during a forthcoming rulemaking process. Professionals working within the field have lodged a number of criticisms of the September 2017 changes, arguing that they unfairly advantage the responding party. Whether advantages for the accused come at the expense of survivors is an empirical question worthy of careful study. However, if additional Title IX guidance adheres to the same principles as the guidance set forth in September 2017, then it likely they will undermine the ability of colleges and universities to respond to sexual misconduct and intimate partner violence in trauma-informed, survivor-centered ways.

Findings

When asked to describe the tool, interviewees were able to easily describe the ModelCampus tool and ways in which it can be used by individuals and groups with responsibilities for IPV response and prevention:

*ModelCampus is a guide for campuses in order to utilize to help with different things related to Title IX. So prevention effort, support to students, different pillars around Title IX to not only be compliant with Federal guidelines, but also go beyond compliance to better support our students and also be compliant with Title IX.*

*It’s designed to be a resource for schools to be able to review the guidelines surrounding what they should be doing on their campus around prevention and advocacy. It has recommendations and also has scenarios discussed to use as reference points.*

All interview participants reported an awareness of the ModelCampus tool and favorable attitudes toward its content and usability across NC college campuses, yet interviewees’ reported use of the tool varied widely. Most participants (4 of 6 participants) indicated that although the tool is of interest to them, they have not yet had the opportunity to use it in their work. The following quote is illustrative:

*I have not used ModelCampus yet. It was of interest to me because since I’ve been here at [NC College] – initially we had a number of cases that involved sexual misconduct, sexual assault, inappropriate touching, or rape. Now it seems our sexual assaults are on the decline and we have a lot more intimate partner violence, domestic violence, relationship violence, same sex violence. I was thinking Model Campus may be a good resource in terms of prevention and education – trying to figure out what the root cause of that is and how to address it on campus.*
One third (2 of 6 participants) noted having previously used the ModelCampus tool, though each one noted different applications of the tool in their own work. For example, one participant noted using the tool to educate themselves on Title IX and how to accurately report in accordance to the law,

*So this is my first real job out of school, so coming into a campus setting was a little bit difficult for me to transition and just learning the ins and outs with Title IX and how those procedures worked, I think that Model Campus was helpful specifically with reporting.*

Another participant discussed multiple uses of the tool:

*So we are part of the culture of respect through NASPA currently, so we have been working with different consultants through that we have a very large task force that has been working on different pillars related to a Culture of Respect and we’ve actually been utilizing ModelCampus as to help inform those pillars and actions that we are going to take on campus. So that is one big one that we have recently been using…*

*…I think that we have mostly been using it to inform Culture of Respect, but also Title IX sends out a Student Rights Handbook sheet of paper whenever they do outreach to students, so utilizing ModelCampus to make sure that it aligns with what the students’ rights are.*

Survey results follow a similar pattern, with a larger percentage of respondents reporting unfamiliarity with the tool. Survey findings yield that 60% of respondents had not previously heard of ModelCampus. Of the 40% who reported knowledge of ModelCampus, 50% reported that they had looked over, read, or used ModelCampus:
Most respondents who reported that seeing the tool had either reviewed it quickly or read it in depth (56% and 38%, respectively), while less than 10% of respondents reported having used the tool in their work on campus.

Because interviewees were selected based upon their attendance at a recent training offered at a Fall 2017 Campus Consortium meeting, it is unsurprising that interview participants reported first learning about ModelCampus at that training. Survey participants were also asked to report how they heard about ModelCampus, with most respondents reporting they heard about it from an email from NCCADV or some other type of institutional communication (see Chart 1 for additional information). Interestingly, no respondents reported learning about ModelCampus through any social media platform.

Figure 2. Reported Awareness, Knowledge, and Uptake of NCCADV’s ModelCampus Tool
Chart 1. Just over one third of survey respondents heard about ModelCampus through an email from NCCADV.

Among those who indicated having previously heard of ModelCampus, 50% reported learning about it during the Fall 2017 semester. However, less than one third of respondents who reported knowledge of ModelCampus were unsure when they first learned about the tool. On average, survey respondents reported receiving communication about ModelCampus three or fewer times and 21% of respondents reported receiving training on the tool.

Figure 3. Resources Used for Addressing IPV on NC College Campuses
Addressing IPV on NC campuses. To better understand respondents’ existing toolbox and the IPV resource landscape that currently exists, survey respondents were also asked to identify the tools they often use in IPV response and prevention on their campuses. Findings suggest that the resource landscape is flush with resources, but the preferred resources vary considerably across campuses. The following list represents a few of the responses provided about tools currently used by respondents to address IPV on their campus:

- “An IPV Resource Guide, our Title IX Case Manager and various presentations to students, staff and faculty.”
- “Brochure, video, and discussion of Title IX during orientation, student workshops on Bystander Training, Stalker Awareness, Healthy Relationships, Clery Act data, and participation in the Red Flag Campaign. We also have a staff member from the local Shelter Home for women on campus once/month.”
- “annual training, periodic emails from president or colleague, course syllabus statement”
- “Campus-wide surveys; program evaluations; national best practices”
- “CDC Prevention Toolkit, NCCADV, national coalition resources”
- “colleagues, information and resources available online, NCCADV and NCCASA resources, EverFi, trainings and conferences”
- “Campus-specific programming”
- “consolers, church, Wake County DVA”
- “Counseling resources through DHHS, NCCADV, & NCCASA”
- “Email/orientation presentation/student handbook”
- “Everfi training, Edurisk training, In-house designed in-person training during freshman orientation and employee orientation, One Love (Escalation, Yards for Yeardley, etc), guest speaker programs, etc.”
- “Intimacy choreography for productions and performer union and non-union standards for sexual harassment”
- “Local police department and activist group”
- “NCCADV website, CFWDV resources”
- “Title IX office, Safe Office, University Police”
- “US DOE; HR related professional associations; HR related newsletters; legal counsel”
- “We conduct several training on campus to address the issues of IVP. Trainings are done in all resident halls, Greek Life org, athletic department, annual IVP resource fair, annual sexual assault event’ (Clothesline Project) Denim Day (sexual assault awareness) and staff training. Office of IVP located on campus provides literature/ support for students. IVP literature available in key student locations.”
- “We design our own in-house”
- “We have a partnership with a local domestic violence facility. We have a counseling team on campus we send students to.”

As the list shows, NC campuses rely on different tools when addressing IPV across NC. This list also suggests that the resource landscape is relatively flush with IPV resources.
Data suggest the need for periodic reminders about the tool’s availability and/or updates:

*I think it’s going to be a very useful site. I don’t know if ModelCampus, if they have a listserv where we can get updates when the site is updated. We have so many different agencies out there now vying for our attention and give us information, so sometimes we’re overwhelmed with emails, but I think that it might be easy to forget that this is a resource out there for us. Obviously now that I know about it I’ll use it a lot more. [sic]*

This may indicate a need for greater standardization among NC college campuses and the importance of branding and repeated communications regarding the availability of the ModelCampus tool. Standardization in tool kits used across NC campuses would increase fidelity in investigations and disciplinary actions across campuses.

Most campuses perceived having adequate institutional capacity to address IPV, though one participant noted that colleges with lower capacity for IPV response and prevention may find the ModelCampus tool especially helpful:

*I think we have a pretty good system and don’t think we are having to rely on guidance of this type for this sort of thing. I think for schools that don’t have the resources we do, it would be very helpful. I think the real life scenarios are always important because so many things can come up that you just don’t think of. Between married students – that doesn’t always come up but when it does, it presents different problems than other cases do.*

**Chart 2.** Perceived Capacity of NC Colleges’ Capacity to Address IPV
Challenges to addressing IPV on NC campuses. Interviewees noted a number of challenges to IPV response and prevention efforts on NC college campuses, including the ongoing battle against IPV stigma that often results in reactive rather than proactive approaches to addressing IPV on campuses. Other IPV work conducted on college campuses has yielded insight into this matter, illustrating that college administrators often fear proactive approaches to addressing IPV and sexual assault on campus for fear of causing panic among students, parents, and faculty. The following quote is illustrative:

*My perception – been at [University name] for 15yrs. – [IPV] is considered taboo when I first came and people were more reactive than responsive. We live in a social media-friendly world, and slowly universities are recognizing this is a serious concern and they are trying to implement as needed. Implementation could be done a bit differently – there doesn’t have to be stigma. In high traffic areas – post phone numbers for Counseling Center, Domestic Violence agencies – housing could be more proactive, add signs throughout residence halls with information. Lot of students try to live on campus.*

Another interview participant notes the importance of cultural relevance and humility in IPV prevention and education, however that same person’s response also indicates there are lots of gaps in knowledge regarding best practices for culturally relevant IPV prevention and education:

*One, making sure that the prevention and education is culturally relevant to the needs of the campus. Then developing a plan – like how are we going to…first you have to acknowledge and address that there is an issue, then after acknowledging and addressing that there is an issue, how do we approach the different segments of our population? Or do we approach them all at once?*

A final area of importance is having multiple stakeholder groups engaged in IPV prevention and education work, including students. When asked to suggest areas where improvements in IPV response, prevention, and advocacy could be made, one interviewee remarked,

*A student voice – I think that the students in terms of programming we do, they see me a lot, they see our counselors a lot, we have campus police and they do programming – but I think we could really use a student voice that is more involved in bystander intervention training.*
Recommendations

Based on the evaluation findings presented in this report, ETR makes the following recommendations:

⇒ Send periodic reminders to institutional partners that ModelCampus tool is available and/or has recently been updated.

⇒ Given the recent change in federal guidance, ModelCampus should consider expanding its guidance on how schools can best help victims and survivors understand these changes. Requiring institutional agents to treat the reporting and responding party equally may undermine equity and trust, thus communicating a subtle, damaging message about institutional values; consequently, a student in crisis may have trouble understanding why identical supports and accommodations are being extended to the responding party in their case. NCCADV may also consider adding an additional scenario that directly addresses how to respond in a situation where a reporting party becomes upset that a responding party is receiving institutional support and accommodations.

⇒ Provide additional guidance around cultural relevance and humility in IPV prevention and education programming and materials. Although campus staff are aware of the need for culturally relevant programming and materials, there appears to be an opportunity for identifying and sharing best practices in this area.

⇒ Feature innovative and/or successful IPV response, prevention, advocacy, and education programming and practices on the ModelCampus website. In using the tool this way, ModelCampus becomes not only a resource for addressing IPV across NC campuses, but also provides an additional networking platform that encourages the use of best practices and peer learning.
Appendix A.
Survey respondent demographics (n=84)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-year with one campus</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-year with multiple campuses</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small 4-year university</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>large 4-year university</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Funding                                          |            |
| public                                           | 58%        |
| private                                          | 42%        |

| Institutional ideology                           |            |
| historically black college or university (HBCU)  | 29%        |
| predominately white institution (PWI)            | 50%        |
| religiously affiliated college                    | 21%        |

| Student life                                     |            |
| live on campus or campus-provided housing        | 33%        |
| commute to campus                                | 41%        |
| both                                             | 26%        |

| Student population                               |            |
| mean                                             | 4,090      |
| range                                            | 1700 – 30,000|

| Community                                        |            |
| Urban                                            | 30%        |
| Suburban                                         | 29%        |
| Rural                                            | 41%        |

Note: not all respondents provided demographic information.

---

Chart A-1. Respondents by institutional role

---

6 Historically White Colleges and Universities (HWCU) is a technically more accurate term to distinguish from HBCUs, but we chose to use PWI because it is more commonly used by institutions to describe themselves, and thus would be more familiar to survey respondents.
### Appendix B. Evaluation Matrix

#### Q1. To what extent are college employees aware of ModelCampus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicators and Measures</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1. How did campus staff learn about the tool?</td>
<td>- # of staff aware of tool</td>
<td>Campus staff*</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2. Which outreach methods have been most successful in bringing awareness of the tool to campus staff across the state?</td>
<td>- outreach methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3. When did campus staff learn about the tool?</td>
<td>- frequency and mode of communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4. What do campus staff know about the tool?</td>
<td>- “date” of awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5. Is awareness of the tool consistent across campus staff?</td>
<td>- knowledge of tool, including awareness and depth of utility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6. Is awareness of the tool consistent across campuses in NC?</td>
<td>- reported awareness across campus staff with various titles and functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Q2. To what extent are NC campus employees using ModelCampus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicators and Measures</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Have campus staff used the tool?</td>
<td>- reported usage</td>
<td>Campus staff*</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Is usage consistent across campus staff?</td>
<td>- reported usage across campus staff with various titles and functions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. For what issues have campus staff utilized the tool (i.e., response, prevention, advocacy)?</td>
<td>- reason for usage (i.e., prevention, response, advocacy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4. What motivated campus staff to use the tool?</td>
<td>- motivations for usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5. Why haven't campus staff utilized the tool?</td>
<td>- barriers to usage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6. In what types of situations do you choose to consult external resources like ModelCampus instead of relying on in-house expertise? What tools have you utilized in these situations?</td>
<td>- alternate tools reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7. What tool-related training have campus staff received?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q3. In what types of situations have college employees found ModelCampus helpful?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicators and Measures</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1. In what types of incidents have campus staff used the tool?</td>
<td>- examples where used</td>
<td>Campus staff*</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2. When has the tool been helpful for responding to students affected by IPV on their campus?</td>
<td>- examples when tool helpful in responding</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3. When has the tool been helpful for conducting IPV prevention work on campus?</td>
<td>- examples when tool helpful for IPV prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4. When has the tool been helpful in advocating for students affected by IPV?</td>
<td>- examples when tool aided IPV advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q4. In what types of situations have college employees found ModelCampus unhelpful or inadequate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicators and Measures</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1. In what types of situations has the tool been unhelpful or inadequate?</td>
<td>- examples when tool unhelpful/inadequate</td>
<td>Campus staff*</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2. What factors are considered when determining the helpfulness and adequacy of IPV response and prevention tools?</td>
<td>- factors for determining adequacy/helpfulness</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q5. What additional resources are necessary for effectively preventing and/or responding to intimate partner violence on college campuses?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicators and Measures</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1. In what ways should the tool be revised to improve its usability among campus staff charged with responding to IPV on campus?</td>
<td>- suggested revisions for using tool in IPV response</td>
<td>Campus staff*</td>
<td>Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2. In what ways should the tool be revised to improve its usability among those charged with IPV prevention efforts on campus?</td>
<td>- suggested revisions for using tool in IPV prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td>Surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Campus staff is a broad term that encompasses many different titles and offices within the university context, including (but not limited to): decision-makers, advocates, and faculty unsure of reporting requirements and/or how to help students who disclose IPV; Deans, Chancellors, Campus Police, Counseling Centers, Campus Recreation and Wellness, Student Health, Residence Life, Dean of Students, Public Health Departments; other faculty and staff who find themselves engaged in IPV response, prevention, and/or advocacy work.*
Appendix C. Interview Protocol

North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCCADV)
Evaluation of ModelCampus: Title IX Action Guide

Interview Guide
Fall 2017

Staff (Non-Delta Campus)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee:</th>
<th>Title/Role:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviewer(s):</td>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction: Hello, I am ____________________ with North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCCADV). I will be conducting this session with you. My colleague is ____________________. She will take notes during the interview. We expect the interview will take up to 45 minutes.

Purpose: The purpose of this interview is to learn more about your understanding of ModelCampus: Title IX Action Guide.

- This interview is completely voluntary. If there are any questions you don’t want to answer or feel that you don’t know the answer to, let me know, and we’ll move on. You are also welcome to stop answering questions at any point during the interview.
- I will ask the questions and _________ will record electronically.
- We would like to audio record the session – this just helps us ensure that our transcripts are accurate. Do you agree to being recorded? Do you have any objections?
- Your responses are confidential. There will be no reference to your name or any identifying information in the report of these findings. Instead, data are aggregated and themes are identified for reporting purposes.
- Report of findings will be submitted to NCCADV leadership and may be included in reports to funders.

Consent Form: Prior to conducting the interview, please obtain oral consent to participate. In discussing consent, remember to note:
- As an interview participant, you have rights.
- Your participation is voluntary.
- There are no direct benefits to your participation.
- There are no risks to your participation.
- You are free to discontinue the interview at any time without penalty or consequence.
- Your responses are confidential.
- Audio recordings will be destroyed after transcription.

Do you have any questions before we start?
I. **Introduction** – let’s start with just a little bit of background about you.

1. What is your current title?
2. What are the roles and responsibilities associated with your position?
3. What roles and responsibilities, if any, do you have with addressing intimate partner violence (IPV) on campus?

II. **ModelCampus: Dissemination and Knowledge of Tool** – now we’ll talk a little bit about the tool itself, focusing first on how and what you may have learned about it.

4. How did you first learn about ModelCampus?
   a. Have you received any additional communications about the ModelCampus, its uses, or its availability?

5. What type of training, if any, have you received around using ModelCampus?

6. Based on your understanding of ModelCampus, can you please describe what it is and how it is intended to be used?

7. Prior to learning about ModelCampus, what tools did your campus use for addressing IPV on campus?
   a. Do you continue to use those tools?

III. **ModelCampus: Usage** – now we’re going to talk a little bit more in depth about your perceptions of the site itself.

8. In what types of situations has staff at your campus used ModelCampus?
   a. To your knowledge, why was it selected for use in addressing IPV on campus?
   b. *If tool hasn’t been used:* what is your sense of why campus staff have not yet made use of ModelCampus?
   c. *If tool hasn’t been used:* let’s take a few moments to walk through the ModelCampus website together. I’d like to get a better idea of when you think you would use the tool. (skip to Q13)

9. In what types of situations has ModelCampus been helpful for responding to students or faculty who experience IPV?
a. Can you provide an example of when the tool was useful in improving response to IPV on campus?

10. To your knowledge, in what ways has ModelCampus been used for IPV prevention and advocacy on campus?

11. In what types of situations has the site been unhelpful or inadequate?
   a. In what ways could this shortcoming be addressed?
   b. Similarly, in what ways could the tool be revised to improve its usability across NC college campuses?

12. To your knowledge, has the site been useful for other purposes on campus? If so, can you talk a little bit about how others have found use in it?

IV. Final Comments – just a few more questions about your feedback on improving how NC campuses response to IPV.

13. In what ways do NC colleges struggle in addressing IPV on their campuses?

14. What additional tools are needed or necessarily for addressing IPV in trauma-informed, survivor-centered, legally-compliant ways?

15. Do you have any additional comments you would like to share at this time?

Thank you for taking the time to share your feedback with us today!
Appendix D. Online Survey

Decision Aid Online Survey for Campus Staff

Thank you for taking the time to share your feedback about the ModelCampus: Title IX Action Guide. The North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence (NCCADV) is working with an external evaluator, ETR Services, to collect feedback on the ModelCampus: Title IX Action Guide and how it is disseminated to college campuses across North Carolina. You should be able to complete this survey in about ten minutes and your responses are confidential, meaning that only staff directly involved with the evaluation will have access to your responses. All survey data will be aggregated for analysis and the findings will be used to further improve the ModelCampus: Title IX Action Guide.

If you have any questions related to this survey, you may contact the external evaluator by email at jen.gathings@etrservices.org

Part I. Uptake and Usability of Decision Aid tool

1. Have you heard about the ModelCampus: Title IX Action Guide, a decision aid tool used for addressing intimate partner violence (IPV) on your campus?
   [ ] yes
   [ ] no

If yes: continue to Q2
If no: skip to Q14

2. How did you hear about ModelCampus: Title IX Action Guide (hereafter referred to as ModelCampus)? (check all that apply)
   [ ] email from Title IX investigator for your campus
   [ ] email from another campus employee other than the Title IX investigator
   [ ] email from North Carolina Coalition Against Domestic Violence
   [ ] communication from a prevention or advocacy-focused organization or group
   [ ] social media
   [ ] another form of university-based communication (i.e., mentioned during training, meeting, etc.)
   [ ] in person at a training
   [ ] other: ____________________________

3. When do you remember first hearing about ModelCampus?
   [ ] Spring 2017
   [ ] Fall 2017
   [ ] Winter 2017
   [ ] I’m not sure when but I have definitely heard about it before

4. How many times have you received communication about ModelCampus?
5. Have you received any training to use ModelCampus on your campus?
   - yes
   - no (if no, skip to Q9)

6. What type of training to use ModelCampus have you received?
   - I watched a pre-recorded training video
   - I attended an in-person training provided by someone on my campus
   - I attended an in-person training provided by someone outside my campus
   - I learned about ModelCampus during a training that had a different focus

7. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means very poor and 10 means excellent, how would you rate the training you received on using ModelCampus?
   Poor – 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 – Excellent

8. Have you either looked at, read over, or used ModelCampus since learning about it?
   - yes
   - no
   if yes: go to Q10
   if no: go to Q13

9. After learning about ModelCampus, which of the following did you do?
   - I read over or looked at it quickly
   - I read over the material in depth but have not yet used it
   - I have used the tool in my work on campus (if yes: go to Q11)

10. For what reasons have you used ModelCampus?
     - campus IPV victim response services
     - IPV prevention efforts on campus
     - advocacy for students affected by IPV
     - formulating policies related to IPV on campus
     - campus prevention or response to other forms of violence besides IPV, such as sexual assault or stalking

11. What motivated you to use ModelCampus? (open-ended response) (skip to Q14)
12. What resources do you use for informing IPV response, prevention, and advocacy on campus? (open-ended response)

13. On a scale of 1 to 10 where 1 means very little capacity and 10 means strong capacity, how would you rate your institution’s capacity to address IPV on campus?

Very little capacity – 1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10 – Strong capacity

Part II. Benefits and Areas for Improvement

14. What do you perceive to be the major strengths of ModelCampus? (check all that apply)
   - [ ] it helps our campus better address IPV using a trauma-informed approach
   - [ ] it helps our campus better address IPV using a survivor-centered approach
   - [ ] it helps our campus better comply with federal policy regulations
   - [ ] it is easy to understand
   - [ ] it uses realistic examples to help our campus better address IPV
   - [ ] it helps our campus respond to IPV more quickly and efficiently
   - [ ] it helps reduce the time needed/required for forming and improving campus policies related to IPV
   - [ ] it provides information our campus can trust

15. What feedback would you like to offer about improving outreach or ModelCampus itself? (open-ended response)

Part III. Demographics

The last few questions are just about you and your institution.

16. How would you categorize your campus?
   - [ ] a two-year school with one campus
   - [ ] a two-year school with multiple campuses
   - [ ] a small four-year university
   - [ ] a large four-year university

17. Does your college receive primarily public or private funding?
   - [ ] public
   - [ ] private
18. Do any of the following descriptions apply to your university?
   [] historically black college or university (HBCU)
   [] predominately white institution (PWI)
   [] religiously affiliated college

19. What do the majority of your students do?
   [] live on campus or in campus-provided housing
   [] commute to campus
   [] hard to say – large segments of our student body live on campus AND commute

20. How would you classify the community surrounding your campus?
   [] rural
   [] suburban
   [] urban

21. How large is your student population? (Your best estimate is fine; open-ended response with validation for numbers only)

22. How would you classify your job title?
   [] college administrator
   [] college faculty
   [] Title IX investigator
   [] counselor
   [] college violence prevention or response staff
   [] student
   [] other: ________________________________

Thank you for your time and input.