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GOALS

To identify what constitutes high-risk dating or domestic violence variables

To discuss how these high-risks connect to the campus environment

To discuss implications for addressing these high risks on campus

Note: This presentation will include triggering content
STATISTICS ON DATING VIOLENCE ON CAMPUS

• 16 TO 24-YEAR-OLDS ARE AT A HEIGHTENED RISK FOR EXPERIENCING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

• 21% OF COLLEGE STUDENTS REPORT EXPERIENCING IPV BY A CURRENT PARTNER

• 32% OF COLLEGE STUDENTS REPORT EXPERIENCING IPV BY A FORMER PARTNER

• 70% OF COLLEGE STUDENTS DO NOT KNOW WHAT DATING/DOMESTIC VIOLENCE IS

• 52% OF COLLEGE STUDENTS DO NOT THINK YOU SHOULD GET INVOLVED IF YOU WITNESS IPV

Cantor et al, 2020; Dating Violence Resource Center, 2022; Healing Abuse Working for Change, 2017
• 60% of college student survivors report that no one helped them in their IPV situation.

• 42% of college student survivors told no one about what they were experiencing - the rest told a friend (88%) or the criminal justice system (20%).

• 6 in 10 acquaintance rapes occur in dating relationships on campus.

• More than one-third of college survivors (36%) share passwords.
UNIQUE CONTEXT FOR THE CAMPUS ENVIRONMENT

- Impact of social circle / social pressures / friend group
- Family does not know about the relationship or extent of the relationship
- Isolation from family / friends / supports
- Being away from home
- Use of social media / technology
- Being in the same general, and perhaps, the same location for classes
- Perpetrator having keycard access to residence halls
- Prior exposure to violence – dating violence, ACE's
- Stress of College Experience
- Limited relationship experience
• The majority (91%) of women that are killed know the person – in 2019 that number was 1,476 women.

• Of that number, 62 percent or 915 were killed by an intimate partner – that is 2.5 women each day.

• Victims were 3 times more likely to be murdered if a gun was in the residence.

• Black women were murdered at a rate 2.4 times higher than white females and were more likely to be killed during the course of an argument.

• Everytown for Gun Safety, 2019; Violence Policy Center, 2021.
WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT DOMESTIC VIOLENCE FATALITIES CONTINUED

• American Indian and American native Alaskan women were 1.7 times more likely to be killed compared to white females.

• Every month, an average of 70 women are shot and killed by an intimate partner – access to a gun makes it 5 times more likely that an abusive partner will kill the victim.

• 4.5 million victims report being threatened by a gun and 1 million have been shot or shot at by an intimate partner.

• Everytown for Gun Safety, 2019; Violence Policy Center, 2021.
REMEmBERING
VICTIMS OF
DATING
VIOLENCE
FATALITIES ON
COLLEGE
CAMPUSes

• LATASHA NORMAN, JACKSON STATE UNIVERSITY, 11/13/2007*
• YEARDLEY LOVE, UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA, 05/03/2010
• CECILIA LAM, SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY, 10/10/2014
• DIAMONEY GREENE, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA, 11/11/2014
• SHANNON JONES, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, 11/27/2014
• NADIA EZALDEIN, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO, 11/28/2014
• LAUREN MCCLUSKEY, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, 10/22/2018
RED FLAGS AND THE COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

• USE OF ALCOHOL OR DRUGS
• A HISTORY OF VIOLENCE (ON/OFF CAMPUS)
• ABUSE OF ANIMALS
• LOSS OF JOB / INCOME
• EXCESSIVE JEALOUSY
• PREGNANCY
• HOSTAGE TAKING/FALSE IMPRISONMENT
RED FLAGS AND THE COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT CONTINUED

- STRANGULATION / CHOKING
- STALKING
- DESTROYING PROPERTY
- THREATENING HOMICIDE OR SUICIDE
- ACCESS TO FIREARM (ON/OFF CAMPUS)
- VIOLATION OF PROTECTION ORDER
- SEPARATION
- *ARGUMENTS / ESCALATION
IMPLICATIONS FOR CAMPUSES

1. KNOWLEDGE OF LOCAL LAWS, RESOURCES AND PARTNERSHIPS (I.E.; STALKING, MANDATORY ARREST)

2. ALL PRACTICES, POLICIES AND PROTOCOLS MUST BE TRAUMA INFORMED AND CULTURALLY-RESPONSIVE

3. OPTIONS FOR ACADEMIC ACCOMMODATIONS & INTERIM MEASURES

4. OPTIONS FOR RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATIONS / ON AND OFF CAMPUS

5. EMERGENCY HOUSING PLAN

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS FOR VICTIMS – EMERGENCY FUNDS

7. CAMPUS PLAN FOR FIREARMS

8. REPORTING AND PROCESS FOR ORDERS OF PROTECTION / NO-CONTACT ORDERS
9. PROCESS FOR RESPONDING TO TECHNOLOGY-FACILITATED STALKING AND ABUSE

10. SAFETY PLANNING AND LETHALITY ASSESSMENT – IMPORTANCE OF TRAINING AND PARTNERSHIPS

11. INCLUDE ADDRESSING ISOLATION IN YOUR PLAN / WHO DO YOU NOT SEE?

12. HAVE A MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS PLAN, PARTICULARLY AROUND SUICIDAL IDEATION AND ACCESS TO CARE

13. BYSTANDER EDUCATION IS NOT ENOUGH – CAMPUS-WIDE RED FLAG EDUCATION IS NEEDED WITH INFORMATION ON WHAT TO DO PRIOR TO AND AFTER A BREAKUP, HEALTHY RELATIONSHIP EDUCATION

14. IDENTIFY STRATEGIES FOR MENTAL HEALTH, CAMPUS HEALING, SURVIVOR NEEDS
The threat assessment team identifies, assesses and manages a threat.

The team should take a comprehensive and multidisciplinary approach.

The team should utilize a fact-based/fact-gathering approach.

The team is charged with identifying what constitutes a threat.

The team identifies the intent, motive, and ability to carry out the threat.

Someone on the team should have knowledge and experience with addressing high-risk dating and/or domestic violence cases.

Core members should be identified and provided with training on high-risk.

There should be identification of key resources and when they should be utilized.

Roles and responsibilities of each member should be clearly outlined.

Annual drills should be conducted to keep the team.
Some situations do not pose a threat to the campus but require a crisis response.

The CMT should have confidentiality / privacy guidelines.

The Communication strategy, on and off campus, should be clear.

Roles and responsibilities should be outlined for each member, including point persons and coordinator.

The CMT should assist with removing barriers to care.

Determinations should be made when and how to engage family and friends.

This group should be a smaller version of the CCRT.
CONCLUDING REMARKS

• THERE IS A LOT THAT WE CAN DO TO ADDRESS HIGH-RISK DATING AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE CASES TO AID IN PREVENTING CAMPUS DATING AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE FATALITIES.

• IT IS VITAL TO HAVE AN ORGANIZED, PLANNED AND INTENTIONAL RESPONSE TO HIGH-RISK CASES. IT CANNOT BE DONE ALONE. THESE CASES REQUIRE SIGNIFICANT ON- AND OFF-CAMPUS PARTNERSHIPS TO BE EFFECTIVE.

• THE ROLE OF A CAMPUS ADVOCATE IS EVEN MORE PRONOUNCED IN THESE CASES.

• CONSIDER YOUR NEXT STEPS ON WHAT YOUR CAMPUS CAN DO TO BETTER ADDRESS THESE ISSUES.