

## Appendix A: Support Resources and Advocacy

The University offers various resources for individuals who have had an experience with sexual misconduct and/or are going through the Title IX investigation/adjudication process. Below we provide a detailed overview of those resources.

### *SHARE staff members/advocates*

Princeton provides advocacy to survivors through the SHARE office. In this capacity, SHARE staff members assist survivors in navigating on- and off-campus systems, including the Title IX investigative process. (While students who serve as SHARE peers do not play an advocacy role, they are trained to be empathetic listeners, validate survivors, and quickly refer survivors to the SHARE staff members and other critical resources.) In the SHARE office, advocacy services are trauma-informed, empowerment-based, and survivor-centered. All SHARE staff members are trained extensively to provide trauma-informed services, through their training as licensed clinicians,<sup>1</sup> volunteer work as advocates, and/or doctorate in social work.

SHARE staff members are confidential resources, allowing for secure communications so individuals who have experienced sexual misconduct can take time to consider which resources, if any, best meet their needs, without automatically triggering an investigative process. During sessions with survivors, SHARE staff members review a *Resource Overview and Selection* form that includes information on planning for safety, accommodations (e.g., academic and housing adjustments), preserving and collecting evidence, medical resources, psychological and emotional health resources, University disciplinary process, law enforcement, visa and immigration resources, etc. A comprehensive listing of resources, written through the lens of a survivor, is available in the form of a Prezi and SHARE [flowchart](#) on the [SHARE website](#).

SHARE staff members work with community partners in order to ensure that all survivors are treated in accordance with the legal rights afforded to them,<sup>2</sup> including, but not limited to, being free from pressure to report or refrain from reporting crimes and being notified about resources, regardless of whether a report is made/complaint filed with the University and/or with law enforcement. SHARE is also able to inform survivors about the right to file a lawsuit or complaint against the University and

---

<sup>1</sup> Beyond the education required for their Masters degrees and many hours of direct clinical experience for licensure, each clinician is required to obtain social and cultural competency continuing education units to remain in good standing with their respective licensing bodies.

<sup>2</sup> New Jersey's Campus Sexual Assault Victim's Bill of Rights: <http://web.princeton.edu/sites/publicsafety/BoR.htm>.

provide specific resources to assist in these processes. As confidential resources, SHARE staff members do not serve as formal advisers during Title IX investigations,<sup>3</sup> nor do they draft documents or otherwise “represent” the complainant. However, they may review documents and help the complainants process their experiences.

SHARE staff members work to create the conditions that permit survivors to reclaim their sense of power and agency. For some, that means pointing them in the right direction of additional resources, while others prefer a higher degree of support (scheduling appointments, communicating on a client’s behalf,<sup>4</sup> and/or accompaniment to meetings). Once the initial decisions are made, SHARE staff members continue to provide support to clients to the extent desired by the client. SHARE staff members rotate on-call duty to ensure coverage 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

#### *Other confidential resources*

In addition to the SHARE Office, campus community members have access to other [confidential resources](#), who are not obligated to report information that is provided to them. This allows individuals to explore their options in a non-pressured environment while they make informed decisions. There may be exceptions in cases involving child abuse, imminent risk of serious harm, emergent hospitalization, or a court order. While other confidential resources including CPS, medical practitioners at University Health Services (UHS), the Ombuds Office, Carebridge, and the Office of Religious Life chaplains, are available to assist students, only the SHARE Office provides advocacy in the form of assistance with accommodations or other procedural supports. Womanspace is an additional off-campus confidential resource available to people of all genders.

#### *Guidance provided by the Office of Gender Equity and Title IX Administration*

Individuals who seek assistance from the Office of Gender Equity and Title IX Administration (Title IX Office) are provided with information regarding options and resources that are available to them – regardless of whether they choose to participate in a formal investigation. This includes information regarding confidential resources, academic and housing accommodations, No Communication and No Contact Orders, reporting to law enforcement, and reporting to the University.

---

<sup>3</sup> As confidential resources, the SHARE Office, Counseling and Psychological Services (CPS), and the chaplains in the Office of Religious Life are designed to provide specific types of services to students (i.e., advocacy, psychological, and pastoral, respectively). The University seeks to preserve these unique relationships, and intends for complainants and respondents to have multiple types of support as they navigate the Title IX process. Therefore, confidential resources do not serve as Title IX Advisers; however, they can and do continue to provide additional support to students throughout these processes.

<sup>4</sup> SHARE staff members are able to communicate on behalf of a client when authorized to do so through a written release.

While the Title IX Office typically does not facilitate accommodations directly, parties are referred to the appropriate resources (e.g., housing requests are handled by the Directors of Student Life or Graduate School administrators, academic accommodations are handled by the residential college deans and Graduate School deans, etc.). Complainants and respondents<sup>5</sup> who participate in formal investigations are encouraged, verbally and in writing throughout the process, to seek assistance from confidential resources and Title IX advisers.

Complainants who choose to participate in formal investigations meet in person with the Director of Gender Equity and Title IX Administration (“Director”), at which time they are provided with a detailed description of the investigatory and adjudicatory process. Many complainants choose to be accompanied by SHARE staff at these introductory meetings (SHARE staff do not participate further in the investigatory/adjudicatory process). Respondents are also invited to meet with the Director regarding the process.

Information regarding the investigatory and adjudicatory process is provided to complainants and respondents via email (including links to the [Sex Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct policy](#) and information regarding [choosing an adviser](#)), as well as orally at the outset of their interviews with the investigatory panel. The parties are again provided with detailed written instructions regarding next steps and online policy information when they receive the case file and Notice of Allegations (midway through the investigation), and they receive additional written instructions at the conclusion of the fact finding portion of the investigation.

#### *University Title IX Advisers*

University Title IX Advisers provide general support to the complainant or respondent during a Title IX investigation (witnesses are not entitled to Advisers). The Title IX Adviser may be copied on correspondence between the Title IX Office and the complainant or respondent; however, the Title IX Adviser may not act as a proxy for/on behalf of the complainant or respondent. The Title IX Adviser may attend any interview or meeting connected with the disciplinary process; however, the Adviser may not actively participate in interviews – e.g., the Adviser may not answer questions posed to a party.

At the outset of every Title IX investigation, parties are provided with a link to information regarding the role of Title IX Advisers and a list of University administrators who have been trained to

---

<sup>5</sup> A complainant is an individual who alleges a violation of the sexual misconduct policy. A respondent is an individual alleged to have violated the policy.

serve in this capacity. The current list of Advisers includes residential college staff (deans, directors of studies, and directors of student life), Center directors (Women’s Center, LGBT Center, Carl A. Fields Center), Graduate School administrators, and other campus administrators who have volunteered to serve and who have experience working with students on non-academic matters. Through their roles in the residential colleges, Centers, and Graduate School, Title IX Advisers receive regular training in other areas pertaining to supporting students. University Title IX Advisers have a diverse range of personal identities and backgrounds. University employees who serve as Title IX Advisers do not serve as advocates for a particular complainant’s or respondent’s position or as adversaries to the other party, advise parties on how to “argue” their cases, or draft documents on the behalf of parties. Rather, their role is to provide general support to the student throughout the process, which may include assisting the party in obtaining resources and [accommodations](#), providing emotional support, meeting with the party to discuss case materials, and/or reviewing statements drafted by the party whom they are assisting. University administrators who serve in this capacity provide the same level of support regardless of the student’s role – complainant or respondent - in the investigation.

New University Title IX Advisers complete a 90-minute in-person training with the Director, which includes detailed information regarding the Title IX process. Thereafter, Title IX Advisers receive annual training. Prior training topics have included best practices for serving as a Title IX Adviser, supporting complainants (provided by the SHARE office), supporting respondents (provided by CPS), causes and consequences of interpersonal violence, legal issues related to Title IX, the Community Integrity Program<sup>6</sup> (provided by a CIP practitioner), prevalence of sexual misconduct on campus, and prior disciplinary outcomes for Title IX cases.

#### *Other Representatives or non-University Title IX Advisers*

Many University Title IX Advisers serve as residential college staff or deans in the Graduate School. As a result, they are able to manage complainant and respondent accommodation needs during the Title IX process, including providing academic extensions, issuing No Communication or No Contact Orders, and facilitating housing changes. Although most complainants and respondents choose University Title IX Advisers who have undergone campus training, occasionally a party will choose another individual, such as a friend, family member, or attorney, to serve as their Title IX Advisor.

---

<sup>6</sup> CIP is an individualized psychoeducational curriculum administered by a clinical psychologist that serves to assist individuals in exploring harmful attitudes and behaviors, with an aim to empower individuals to actively contribute to a healthier and safer campus community.

Although residential college staff and deans in the Graduate School are still available to assist with accommodations in these situations, students who choose not to work with University advocacy and/or support services must take the initiative to seek accommodations. In an average year, about 20% of parties choose to hire an attorney to serve as their Adviser; this is more common for respondents. The University does not participate in this selection process. During an investigation, attorneys are held to the same standards as University Title IX Advisers (for example, the Adviser may not actively participate in interviews, etc.). In the experience of the University's Title IX investigators and disciplinary authorities, a party's use of an attorney as their Adviser does not impact finding of responsibility or penalty determination.

## Appendix B: The Title IX Process

Below we describe the current process for consultations, investigations, adjudications, and appeals.

### Consultation with the Title IX Office

Individuals who feel that they have experienced sexual misconduct regularly meet with the Director to discuss options that may be available to them. Oftentimes, they are accompanied by a SHARE staff member or other support person (such as a friend) for these initial conversations. Depending on the nature of the alleged policy violation, the complainant may prefer that certain types of conduct be addressed without a formal investigation. If the Title IX Coordinator determines that such a request can be handled appropriately (taking into account the safety of the campus community and/or complainant, etc.), the Title IX Office or another office may raise issues of concern with the other party or provide targeted and/or broad-based training and educational programming for relevant individuals, groups, or departments.

### Initiation of Investigation

If the complainant chooses to pursue disciplinary action and the allegations are appropriate to continue with a Title IX investigation,<sup>7</sup> the Director provides a detailed description of the Title IX investigation and adjudication process<sup>8</sup> to the complainant. The Director also seeks to answer or address any questions or concerns the complainant may have. Topics discussed during this initial meeting include:

- Choosing an adviser
- Gathering evidence
- Discussing the investigation
- Interviews
- Nature of the questioning
- Notice of Allegations and case file
- Review of case file

---

<sup>7</sup> In a few circumstances, an individual makes an allegation and wishes to pursue disciplinary action, but following an Initial Assessment, the Title IX Coordinator determines that the allegations do not support proceeding with a Title IX investigation. Under such circumstances, the individual may still receive accommodations and other support services. See [Rights, Rules, Responsibilities 1.3.10.2](#) for more information.

<sup>8</sup> The process described below differs slightly in cases involving faculty or staff respondents, and may differ in cases involving third-party complainants or respondents.

- Outcome
- Penalty
- Notification of outcome
- Length of investigation
- Appeals process, and
- Retaliation

While it is impossible to predict the outcome of a particular matter prior to engaging in a thorough investigation, depending on the nature of the allegations, the Director may be able to share at the outset a general range of penalties. The range of behaviors associated with categories of violation is broad, as is the variety of circumstances involved. For example, an allegation of non-consensual sexual contact can include touching a variety of body parts, over or under the clothes, be brief or extended, take place in public or private settings, or involve repeated actions, or incapacitation. All of these factors can influence the outcome in a manner that makes it unwise and potentially misleading to provide a rubric of expected outcomes at the outset of an investigation.

Following the initial meeting, the Director sends the complainant a formal email regarding the investigation, which includes a summary of the process, the name of the investigators assigned to the investigatory panel,<sup>9</sup> links to the Sex Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct policy, information regarding [choosing an adviser](#), and information regarding next steps.<sup>10</sup> This correspondence (or prior correspondence with the complainant) also contains information about confidential resources, accommodations, and reporting to law enforcement. The Director sends a similar email to the respondent, which includes information regarding the nature of the allegation against them (for example, the date and location of the incident and the type of behavior alleged) and support resources. The Director also offers to meet with the respondent in order to explain the process.

### *Factual Investigation*

---

<sup>9</sup> The investigative panelists, who have a diversity of personal identities, are comprehensively and regularly trained regarding topics such as trauma, intersectionality, and regulatory compliance. Conflict of interest protocols are in place so that administrators involved in the process are recused as necessary.

<sup>10</sup> The panel can investigate other allegations of misconduct, including ones related to other forms of discrimination and/or harassment based on identity, during a combined investigation. See [Rights, Rules, Responsibilities 1.3.10.7](#) for more information about this option.

Because the parties themselves usually have the best information about their experiences, the parties are encouraged to identify evidence that they believe could be relevant, and the investigative panel will seek to obtain such evidence. In addition, during the course of interviews, investigators will ask the parties and witnesses to provide specific evidence if the investigators determine that such evidence may be relevant to the investigation. The investigators will themselves seek relevant information from publicly available sources and/or from the University (for example, where camera footage or card entry records may be relevant). The most common types of evidence submitted by parties and witnesses in these cases include: messages (texts, Facebook, Snapchat, etc.), emails, letters, diary/journal entries, medical records, photographs, and videos. Investigators will also ask the parties to provide the names of individuals whom the parties believe have relevant information (including non-members of the Princeton community); for example, individuals who witnessed the incident, individuals with whom the parties spoke regarding the incident, etc.

The investigative panel conducts separate interviews of the complainant, respondent, and any witnesses, and will collect all relevant available information. At the start of both the complainant's and the respondent's interviews with the investigatory panel, the investigatory/adjudicatory process is again described. The panel's notes are read back to interviewees at the end of each interview, during which time the interviewee and their Adviser can make adjustments to the interview notes if appropriate.

It is important that the investigators obtain all possible relevant information. Therefore, the investigators must ask detailed questions which may relate to very personal matters. The investigators are trained to do so in a sensitive and respectful manner, but it is recognized that such questioning is difficult to experience. In addition, investigators may need to ask questions of parties and witnesses related to alcohol and drug use in order to ascertain levels of intoxication, which may impact the reliability of memories. The panel recognizes that for a variety of reasons (e.g., the length of time since the incident, the use of alcohol or other drugs, or trauma), individuals may not clearly recall every aspect of an incident.

After the above-described information has been gathered, the panel prepares a case file of all relevant documents, including all interview summaries and other documents/materials. In cases involving student respondents, the case file will be shared, in redacted form, with both parties and their

advisers.<sup>11</sup> Together with the case file, both parties also receive the Notice of Allegations, which describes all of the allegations to be adjudicated.

The parties are asked to review the full case file. (If a party chooses not to do so, this limits their ability to respond to the material in the file.) After reviewing the file, both parties typically have five business days to (1) submit a written response to the panel; (2) inform the panel that they would like to meet again with the panel, (3) request that the panel consider the collection of other information, and/or (4) identify individuals who may possess relevant information and request that such individuals be interviewed. This includes the ability to engage in cross-examination by submitting proposed questions for the panel to ask parties and/or witnesses. If any additional information is gathered by the panel, it is shared with both parties.

At the conclusion of the investigation, the panel determines whether the respondent has violated the Sex Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct policy.<sup>12</sup> The respondent is held responsible if a majority of the panelists find that a preponderance of the evidence supports the allegation(s). The respondent is found not responsible if a majority of the panelists find that there is insufficient information to substantiate the particular allegation(s). If the panel does not substantiate a factual allegation, the panel is not making a determination that the alleged conduct did not occur – rather, the panel is concluding that it cannot make that determination based on the available evidence. If there are multiple allegations (for example, related to different acts), the panel will consider and address each allegation separately. The panel will explain its decision in a final panel memorandum, which will include an assessment of the credibility of the parties and the witnesses. The multipage (typically from five to twenty pages in length) panel memorandum contains procedural information, factual history, credibility assessments, relevant policies, findings of fact, and findings of responsibility.

### Outcome/Penalty

If a majority of the panel finds that the Sex Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct policy has been violated, the panel's memorandum and the case file is forwarded to the dean of undergraduate students and deputy dean of the Graduate School. The deans jointly determine the appropriate penalty.

---

<sup>11</sup> In rare cases, an individual who alleges a violation of policy chooses (for various personal reasons) not to serve as a formal complainant but rather as a witness. In such cases, they have been specifically advised at the outset of the investigation that if they choose not to serve as a formal complainant, they will not receive the case outcome and will not have the right to appeal.

<sup>12</sup> As stated above, the panel can also make findings related to other policy violations (such as other forms of identity-based discrimination and/or harassment). See [Rights, Rules, Responsibilities 1.3.10.7](#).

In determining penalty, the most important consideration is the relative seriousness of the infraction. Consideration is given to the specific standards of conduct that were violated and the impact of the respondent's actions on the individuals personally affected, the University community, and the University's values. Precedent cases inform the decision and are normally determinative, as the fair and equitable application of sanctions for similar conduct is essential to preserving the actual and perceived fairness of the disciplinary system.<sup>13</sup> (However, the University does make carefully considered adjustments in its use of precedent over time with appropriate notice to the campus community.) A respondent's previous disciplinary record (a violation of any sort) is taken into account when considering a sanction for the current violation. If a respondent is found responsible for multiple violations, this will be reflected in the penalty.

Both parties and their Advisers are notified separately via email of the outcome of the investigation. In cases involving student respondents, both parties receive the panel's memorandum and an outcome letter, which includes penalty information if applicable.<sup>14</sup>

### Appeal

When the parties are notified of the outcome of the case, they receive information regarding the appeal process, in which both the complainant and the respondent are entitled to participate equally. Appeals are heard by the Student Appeal Committee (which consists of three senior administrators and/or faculty members). Grounds for appeal are as follows: (1) there is substantial relevant information that was not presented and reasonably could not have been presented during the investigation, and such information might have materially impacted the panel's finding on responsibility; (2) there was procedural unfairness during the disciplinary process and such unfairness materially impacted the panel's finding on responsibility; or (3) the imposed penalty does not fall within the range of penalties imposed for similar misconduct.

### Feedback regarding the process

---

<sup>13</sup> Although each case is unique, [Information regarding Penalties in Sexual Misconduct Cases](#) and the University's annual [Sexual Discrimination and Sexual Misconduct disciplinary reports](#) provide information regarding outcomes for prior cases.

<sup>14</sup> Without exception, in cases involving student complainants and student respondents, every complainant and respondent receive detailed outcome information in writing. As noted above, individuals who have made an informed choice not to serve as a formal complainant do not receive the case outcome and do not have the right to appeal.

The University welcomes general student input and feedback about the sexual misconduct policy and investigatory/adjudicatory process. In addition to this report and its recommendations, there have been numerous prior instances in which feedback has informed enhancements to the process. For example, input from the Women in STEM graduate student group resulted in development of new online and in-person training materials. Feedback gathered through written submissions and town halls held in 2018 resulted in several important changes to University policy. The Faculty-Student Committee on Sexual Misconduct collects ideas annually to inform its [yearly recommendations](#). Individuals who wish to provide general comments or suggestions regarding the sexual misconduct process may contact Title IX Coordinator Michele Minter ([mminter@princeton.edu](mailto:mminter@princeton.edu)) or use the Faculty-Student Committee's email address ([facultystudentcommittee@princeton.edu](mailto:facultystudentcommittee@princeton.edu)). In addition, individuals can share comments or suggestions regarding the process with SHARE staff members, who can assist individuals in advocating for systemic change.

Occasionally, after the conclusion of a case and appeal, a party will attempt to revisit the case through other venues, including efforts to make further arguments. The Title IX Office can receive such statements in writing and maintains them as part of the case file but cannot meet with the parties after the conclusion of a case. Feedback related to a case or the Title IX process can also be sent to the University Provost, Deborah Prentice ([predebb@princeton.edu](mailto:predebb@princeton.edu)) in writing.

## Appendix C

### Restorative Practices Working Group: Charge

The Faculty-Student Committee on Sexual Misconduct and the University Student Life Committee, meeting jointly, recommend the establishment of a Working Group on Restorative Practices. The Working Group, which would include administrators, undergraduate and graduate students, will operate during academic year '20 and make an initial report by the end of the fall semester. The joint Committees will serve as executive sponsor for the Working Group and receive periodic reports regarding the Working Group's activities and recommendations.

The Working Group will focus primarily on restorative practices (trust building, conflict resolution and community dialogue) rather than restorative justice (alternatives to disciplinary systems). Research indicates that it is critical that universities establish a strong foundation of restorative practices prior to integrating them into any adjudicative processes. In its review of restorative practices, the working group should consider their applicability for many forms of community conflict, including but not limited to bias and sexual misconduct concerns.

The Working Group will consider the following strategic questions:

- Do we need restorative practices at Princeton, and if so, why? What challenges can they help us to address?
- How might restorative practices be developed on the Princeton campus as a strategy for conflict resolution and/or community support?
- What are the challenges of implementing restorative practices in Princeton's current climate, and how could those challenges be addressed?
- Several campus administrators received restorative practices training in 2018. Building on this experience, what additional training would be useful for administrators, and who might receive that training?
- What is the role of faculty in restorative practices on campus?
- Given the critical importance of student participation, what is the responsibility of students in ensuring the success of restorative practices? What training should students receive, and how might that training be organized?

- In what higher education contexts (if any) have restorative justice programs been used for adjudicatory purposes, and are there learnings that could be relevant to Princeton's development of restorative practices?

It is the expectation that the Working Group may choose to organize trainings, workshops or consultations with external experts in order to explore these topics.

## **Appendix D: Training and Educational Programming**

Some students have expressed a desire for more training regarding sexual misconduct prevention, with a focus on peer leaders. Annually, the SHARE Office and the Office of Gender Equity and Title IX Administration conduct more than 110 in-person prevention and/or awareness trainings for undergraduate and graduate students.

Mandatory training for students has expanded significantly, both in terms of online and in-person training. Prior to 2014, the only students who received mandatory training related to sexual misconduct were RCAs and SHARE Peers. Today, all undergraduate and graduate students receive two mandatory online trainings during their enrollment at Princeton (covering topics such as sexual misconduct prevention, prevalence, and bystander intervention, as well as resources and reporting information), and students with certain types of leadership roles (e.g., RCAs, Resident Graduate Students, eating club officers) receive additional in-person training, as do eating club members and varsity athletes. As the training program has expanded, the goal has been to provide additional learning opportunities that reinforce key concepts at appropriate intervals throughout the student tenure.

In addition, the University has made a commitment to the development of a four-year curricular model. In May 2017, the Faculty Student Committee on Sexual Misconduct recommended that ...the University develop a comprehensive mandatory four-year sexual violence prevention and education program for undergraduate students. The Committee recognized that developing the proper curriculum will necessitate a careful review of what is developmentally appropriate to each year, careful consideration of the various mediums and approaches through which different students absorb information, and an evaluation of the efficacy of the proposed programs. As such, the Committee recognized that this will be a long-term project.

The SHARE Office, which oversees the University's prevention efforts, continues to work to build out this four-year curriculum, with a similar, appropriately customized curriculum for Graduate Students. Stage one of this process was to develop the SHARE Office's theory of change and logic model, in order to undertake a gap analysis (stage two) of the current violence prevention efforts. The theory of change and logic model are now complete and a gap analysis is underway.

In addition to the extensive schedule of mandatory trainings for students listed in Appendix X, numerous additional trainings are provided to student groups upon request. Topics include consent, responding to rejection, and mindful allyship.

**Current mandatory training offerings as of September 1, 2019**

First year undergrads	1.5 hour online sexual assault prevention training (“Not Anymore!”) - course registration hold applied until completed (includes other first time students (transfers, exchange students))  1.5 hour in-person play and debrief by SHARE staff (“The Way You Move”)  30 minute in-person debrief by SHARE peers
Juniors	30 minute online training- course registration hold applied until completed
RCAs	1 hour small-group Title IX training for all RCAs  1 hour Title IX training for new RCAs  30 minute Title IX training for returning RCAs  1 hour SHARE training for returning RCAs  1 hour SHARE training for new RCAs  30 minute “Behind Closed Doors” role play training for all RCAs with SHARE staff (6 rounds, 3.5 hours)
SHARE peers	4 full days of training by SHARE staff
Varsity athletes	Annual training through SCORRE by SHARE staff and trained team facilitators (30 minutes to 2.5 hours, over 3 year cycle)
Club/intramural leaders	15 minute Title IX training  15 minute SHARE training
Eating club officers (all)	1 hour Title IX/SHARE training  1.25 hours training by SHARE peers
Eating club officers	30 minute Title IX training, specifically to support healthy practices related to Club admissions  30 minute SHARE training, specifically to support healthy practices related to Club admissions
Eating club members	30 minute SHARE training
Eating club new members	15 minute training by SHARE peers
Bridge Year students	30 minute SHARE training
Bridge Year site supervisors	1.5 hours SHARE training
Outdoor Action	1 hour U Matter training with SHARE staff and other administrators
Community Action	1 hour U Matter training with SHARE staff and other administrators
Fall Athlete Leaders	1 hour U Matter training with SHARE staff and other administrators
Dialogue in	1 hour U Matter training with SHARE staff and other administrators

Difference Leaders	
Orientation Leaders	1 hour U Matter training with SHARE staff and other administrators
ROTC cadets	1.75 hours training with SHARE peers
First year graduate students	2.0 hours online sexual assault prevention training (“Not Anymore!” for graduate students) – course registration hold applied until completed
First year graduate students	1.5 hour “Fostering Inclusion” training by Title IX staff and other administrators
Second year graduate students	45 minute online training (“Preventing Sexual Harassment”) – course registration hold applied until completed and cannot serve as AIs/preceptors
RGs	1 hour Title IX/SHARE training for new RGs
FSI RCAs	1 hour Title IX/SHARE training
FSI students	1 hour Title IX/SHARE training
SIFP head/graduate fellows	1 hour Title IX/SHARE training
DBar staff	1 hour SHARE training

### **SHARE’s Research-Based Pedagogy**

SHARE’s online violence prevention programming is designed to facilitate an equitable foundation of knowledge and skills for incoming Princeton students, who hail from all over the world with varying exposure to education about relationships and interpersonal harms. Online programming used in this way fosters asynchronous (not simultaneous/concurrent in time) learning by giving students the flexibility to complete the course in their own time and from any location with internet. Princeton’s current online violence prevention programs are interactive and reflective, both of which are supported practices of asynchronous online education<sup>15</sup>. In fact, data trends from the last three years about the undergraduate online program, “Not Anymore!”, shows significant improvement of knowledge/skills from pre to post, and over 93% of students responding to a post-program survey (>90%) consistently express support of the online course (see table below).

---

<sup>15</sup> Garrison, D. R. (2017). *E-Learning in the 21st Century: A Community of Inquiry Framework for Research and Practice* (3rd Edition). London: Routledge/Taylor and Francis

Fiscal Year	# Complete	Consent to data analysis	Avg. Pre-test	Avg. Post-test	“Overall, this program is...” (Excellent/Good)	“It is important for colleges to provide this program” (Strongly Agree/Agree)
2019	1356	1002 (74%)	67%	95%	89%	94%
2018	1319	1017 (77%)	67%	95%	88%	94%
2017	1337	1008 (75%)	68%	94%	89%	93%

In addition to online training, which is considered to provide baseline information, SHARE’s pedagogical approach to violence prevention adheres to a blended learning environment, including providing in-person trainings (facilitated by SHARE staff and SHARE peers) to students. Collectively, these online and in-person efforts were developed using current research-supported practices for early/primary [violence prevention](#), which includes, but is not limited to: promoting healthy social norms and prevention skills, such as [bystander intervention](#); [targeting the risk and protective factors of interpersonal violence](#); using an intersectional approach to address the intersections of interpersonal violence with other forms of oppression; and addressing violence from each of the [socio-ecological levels](#). Furthermore, SHARE’s provision of survivor-support enables SHARE to center the experiences of Princeton students to inform its prevention and advocacy work every day.

## Appendix E: the SHARE Peers

Members of the SHARE Peer Program (SPP) serve as spokespersons, student mentors, and liaisons for students and the SHARE Office. Members also provide educational workshops and awareness programming to empower students with healthy relationship skills and to promote active bystander behavior. As first responders for survivors of interpersonal violence, SHARE Peers are trained annually to support survivors using a trauma-informed validation and referral model. As a result, SHARE Peers are recognized as specialized allies who assist in connecting students to the SHARE Office and other resources on/off campus. Annually there are approximately 40 SHARE Peers.

The recruitment of SHARE Peers is methodical and multifaceted. Given the focus on and sensitive nature of interpersonal violence and in order to ensure that Peers have the capacity (skills, commitment, academic, etc.) to serve effectively, SHARE Peer membership is highly selective. Diversity is an important consideration, and the recruitment process includes outreach and promotion to a variety of student populations. The application and review process use a structured rubric and interview process in order to mitigate unconscious bias and identify core competencies, as well as motivations for joining the program.

Each fall, the SPP participates in a four-day training, which is an essential part of team-building. During the training, SHARE Peers learn about the intersectionality of interpersonal violence, trauma-informed response, reflexive practices, self-care, and allyship. Based on evidence-informed frameworks, the SHARE Peers develop critical skills and build a foundation of knowledge that can help them empower the student community with healthy relationship skills and prosocial bystander behavior. Peers also receive ongoing development trainings throughout the year; in the last two years, SHARE Peers have participated in workshops to strengthen their understanding of the LGBT Center and supporting affiliated student survivors; regarding Title IX policy and procedures; and regarding boundary setting strategies.

SHARE Peers are volunteers. Despite the time demands of their roles, it is challenging to pay them without raising a compliance requirement that they serve as mandatory reporters. However, it is acknowledged that opportunities to enhance the inclusivity of the SPP merit further consideration. The SHARE staff are committed to continuing this exploration.

## **Appendix F**

### **Emergency Funds Review Working Group: Charge**

The Faculty-Student Committee on Sexual Misconduct and the University Student Life Committee, meeting jointly, recommend the establishment of an Emergency Funds Review Working Group. The Working Group, to be composed of administrators with responsibility for managing funding related to emergency funding for mental health and other medical services, will operate during academic year '20 and make an initial report by the end of the fall semester. Vice President Rochelle Calhoun will serve as executive sponsor for the Working Group and receive periodic reports regarding the Working Group's activities and recommendations.

The Working Group will consider the following strategic questions:

- How can the availability of emergency medical funds be made more visible to students?
- How can the process of accessing emergency medical funds be streamlined and made more efficient?
- Where are emergency medical funds currently located institutionally, and for what purposes? What are the utilization patterns? Are the funds sufficient to address student demand, and/or are the funds allocated to the right purposes?

## Appendix G: Members of the Joint Committees

The following individuals served as members of the joint Faculty-Student Committee on Sexual Misconduct and University Student Life Committee in order to prepare this report.

Co-chairs of the joint Committees:

- W. Rochelle Calhoun, Vice President for Campus Life (USLC)
- Nicolas Gregory '22 (USLC)
- Mai Nguyen GS Psychology (USLC)
- J. Nicole Shelton, Stuart Professor of Psychology (Faculty-Student Committee)
- Abigail Novick 'GS Neuroscience (Faculty-Student Committee)

Members of the joint Committees:

- Brandice Canes-Wrone, Donald E. Stokes Professor of Public and International Affairs and Professor of Politics (USLC)
- Kathleen Deignan, Dean of Undergraduate Students (Faculty-Student Committee and USLC)
- Frederick M. Hughson, Professor of Molecular Biology (Faculty-Student Committee)
- Michele Minter, Vice Provost for Institutional Equity and Diversity (Faculty-Student Committee)
- Chitra Parikh '21 (USLC)
- Lisa M. Schreyer, Associate Dean for Student Life, the Graduate School (USLC)
- Zarnab Virk '20 (USLC)
- Michael W. Zhang 'GS Art and Archeology (Faculty-Student Committee)

The joint Committees thank the following additional members of the Faculty-Student Committee on Sexual Misconduct and USLC who provided valued input:

- Sandra L. Bermann, Cotsen Professor in the Humanities and Professor of Comparative Literature (USLC)
- Peyton L. Lawrenz '19 (Faculty-Student Committee)
- Bridgett M. vonHoldt, Associate Professor of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (USLC)
- Nick Wu '19 (Faculty-Student Committee)

## Appendix H

### Continuing the Conversation: Contact Information

The joint Committees can be reached by email at [facultystudentcommittee@princeton.edu](mailto:facultystudentcommittee@princeton.edu).

The Faculty-Student Committee on Sexual Misconduct can be reached by contacting its co-chairs:

- J. Nicole Shelton J. Nicole Shelton, Stuart Professor of Psychology  
([nshelton@princeton.edu](mailto:nshelton@princeton.edu))
- Michele Minter, Vice Provost for Institutional Equity and Diversity ([mminter@princeton.edu](mailto:mminter@princeton.edu)).

The University Student Life Committee can be reached by contacting its co-chairs:

- W. Rochelle Calhoun, Vice President for Campus Life ([rochelle.calhoun@princeton.edu](mailto:rochelle.calhoun@princeton.edu))
- Nicolas Gregory '22 ([njg2@princeton.edu](mailto:njg2@princeton.edu))
- Mai Nguyen GS Psychology ([mnguyen@princeton.edu](mailto:mnguyen@princeton.edu)).