

6-25-2020

Working Paper: Domestic Violence Prevention Education for Middle School and High School Students in the State of California

Marina Sangit

Pepperdine University, marina.sangit@pepperdine.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/ppr>

Recommended Citation

Sangit, Marina (2020) "Working Paper: Domestic Violence Prevention Education for Middle School and High School Students in the State of California," *Pepperdine Policy Review*. Vol. 12, Article 4.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/ppr/vol12/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Public Policy at Pepperdine Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Pepperdine Policy Review by an authorized editor of Pepperdine Digital Commons. For more information, please contact bailey.berry@pepperdine.edu.

WORKING PAPER: DOMESTIC VIOLENCE PREVENTION EDUCATION FOR MIDDLE SCHOOL AND HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

By Marina Sangit

This article is an excerpt of a master's thesis paper. It is titled working because when this paper is submitted to the Pepperdine Policy Review Journal, the author will still be making edits and changes to the content, recommendations, and organization of her research. This purpose of this excerpt submission is to raise awareness about the inaction of the state of California to prevent domestic violence for middle school and high school students through prevention education, substantiated by the author's case studies analysis.

Executive Summary

California has been a leader in policy across the globe, but still lags behind in responding to research that shows children ages 11-17 are most vulnerable to domestic violence. While California has some of the strongest models of domestic violence prevention education for college campuses, it has failed to institute comparable systems in K-12 public education. States like Virginia and Ohio now surpass California in strong prevention policies, which outline standards for content and mandate timelines for implementation. California should implement a policy that mandates base-level orientation on domestic violence, sets a requirement for California's health framework that includes a section dedicated to domestic violence, and incorporates out-of-classroom awareness programming.

Introduction

Through movements like Take Back the Night, the Clothesline Project, the #MeToo movement, and It's On Us, cultural attitudes and awareness surrounding domestic and sexual violence have shifted to support survivors. This societal shift, in combination with the traction gained from these movements, has catalyzed government actors and other stakeholders to take measures to prevent domestic and sexual violence. Many states, including California, have led the charge by making prevention an educational priority.

California has created strong prevention policies for college campuses, but these prevention policies often come too late for many students. By the time students enter college, "1 in 5 women and nearly 1 in 7 men have experienced rape, physical violence and/or stalking by an intimate partner first experienced it between 11 and 17 years of age." (California Department of Public Health). This is an incredibly alarming statistic, illustrating a clear need to provide education for one of the state's most vulnerable populations—children. Although California is globally renowned as a leader in policy making, it is now lagging behind other states to create a domestic violence prevention education curriculum for its middle school and high school students. One of the many consequences of not having this kind of education is greater negative health outcomes for students. The United States Department of Health and Human Services states that "children who witness or are victims of emotional, physical, or sexual abuse are at higher risk for health problems as adults. These can include mental health conditions, such as depression and anxiety. They may also include diabetes, obesity, heart disease, poor self-esteem, and other problems." This statement acknowledges that domestic violence not only harms the adult population, but negatively impacts adolescents as well. The state of California needs to pass a prevention policy that mandates students in grades 7-12 receive domestic violence education.

Background

For the purpose of this paper, domestic violence will be defined “as a spectrum and often a pattern of behaviors that includes physical, sexual, verbal, emotional, and psychological abuse and/or economic control used by adults or adolescents against their current or former intimate partners in an attempt to exercise power and authority, which has a destructive, harmful effect on individuals, the family and the community” (California Department of Public Health). It is imperative to this paper that the definition for domestic violence is inclusive of adolescents. It should also be noted that supporting evidence in this paper refers to the following terms: teen dating violence (TDV) and adolescent relationship abuse (ARA). For the purpose of this paper, these terms should be treated as synonymous with domestic violence. When the paper refers to prevention policy, it refers to primary prevention as defined by the Center for Disease Control: “[activities] that take place before violence has occurred to prevent initial perpetration or victimization” (Lee, 15). Additionally, there will be times when the paper refers to or uses models of prevention against sexual violence and assault. It should be noted that both sexual violence and assault are broad terms that encompass domestic violence prevention.

California’s Prevention Policies for College Campuses are Strong, but Prevention for Student Populations in Middle School and High School are Weak

The purpose of this section is to identify key legislation in California that made successful prevention education possible. This section will also analyze the prevention models that have been produced by statewide legislation and assess their strengths and weaknesses. The assessment made from studying models of prevention education in combination with relevant legislation will serve as the groundwork that guides this paper’s policy options.

SB967 - Student Safety: Sexual Assault

The success of the University of California (UC) and California State University (CSU) systems prevention education programs can be attributed to Senate Bill 967 (SB967): Student Safety: Sexual Assault. Passed by Senator Kevin De Leon, the bill states the following: “In order to receive FAFSA, all ‘governing boards of each community college district, the Trustees of the California State University, the Regents of the University of California, and the governing boards of independent postsecondary institutions’ will be required to adopt the following:

- 1) Adopt policies concerning sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking that include certain elements, including an affirmative consent standard in the determination of whether consent was given by a complainant
- 2) Adopt policies/protocols to enter into a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or other agreements with on and off campus partners to provide services for students
- 3) Implement comprehensive prevention and outreach programs” (De Leon).

SB967 is crucial because it fiscally incentivizes all secondary institutions to implement comprehensive prevention programs and creates definitive standards for prevention education. The standard the bill sets for comprehensive prevention and outreach programming includes empowerment programming for survivors, awareness campaigns, and outreach programs to make students aware of campus policies. SB967 also sets a minimum content standard for

programs, requiring that programs must include the following: “process for contacting/informing student body, campus orgs, athletics, and student groups about campus sexual assault policy and the practical implications of affirmative consent, rights and responsibilities of students under campus policy” (De Leon). These standards served as a guiding framework for both the UC and CSU systems when they crafted their own unique prevention policies.

The University of California Prevention Education Model

In response to SB967, the University of California developed the UC Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault in 2014. This system-wide initiative brought together a diverse set of members who were most involved with sexual violence including the Board of Regents, Title IX officers, Campus Police, Student Affairs Coordinators, and students. The task force “examined the myriad of interconnected psychological, social, emotional, legal, and administrative issues concerning how to best prevent and respond to sexual violence and sexual assault” (UCOP). In addition, this group looked at current UC policies, academic research, and practices to form recommendations for prevention across the UC system. In the task force’s initial report, released in September 2014, one of the recommendations to prevent sexual violence was implementing a “Comprehensive Training and Education Plan.” Nested underneath this broad recommendation were the following:

1. **Mandatory Education:** in which undergraduate, graduate, and professional students are mandated to participate in training and education related to sexual violence, dating/domestic violence, and stalking
2. **Awareness Programming:** a strategy that requires students and staff to participate in a pledge against violence or watch a video, etc.
3. **Ongoing Education:** where all students, staff, and faculty are given different levels of training throughout their education or tenure at a UC campus

These recommendations reflect an understanding that *continued* education and awareness are critical in prevention. In order for primary prevention to work, the UC task force came to a consensus that this kind of education necessitated interfacing with students more than once. The recommendations were eventually adopted into the UC-wide “Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy.” Under “Local Responsibilities,” each campus was mandated to adopt the following regarding prevention:

1. Establish an independent, confidential Advocacy Office for addressing Sexual Violence called CARE: Advocacy Office for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence and Misconduct.
2. Offer primary prevention programs and awareness campaigns to the University community to promote ongoing awareness of Sexual Violence. These campaigns will include, but are not limited to, education about the definition of consent, consensual relationships, options for bystander intervention, trauma-informed approaches, and risk reduction awareness information. These programs are to promote behaviors that foster healthy and respectful relationships while also encouraging a safe environment for bystanders to intervene in a potential case of Sexual Violence.

The implementation of the UC Task Force’s initial recommendations is important. In light of administrative considerations, the UC system opted to create an entirely new department to provide survivors resources, separate from the Title IX office. The addition of the CARE department effectively split prevention tasks between the Title IX and CARE. It is important to note that this approach forced these two departments to create a partnership model for prevention

education. The second mandate required campuses to incorporate primary prevention programs and awareness campaigns as their primary method of continued education. UC Campuses have typically used this recommendation as an avenue to collaborate with high risk populations on college campuses like housing and residence life, fraternities/sororities, athletics, and ethnic minorities. By fostering collaborative relationships with these communities, each UC campus has been able to create tailored prevention education and programming models that best address the needs of their students and campus climate.

The California State University Prevention Model

Unlike the UC system, the CSU system did not create an additional department to house prevention education. This is a crucial difference in the two prevention models because CSU's model provides a more representative model for what prevention looks like across most college campuses. The CSU system houses prevention policies in its Title IX Office, meaning that Title IX has the sole responsibility for creating prevention curriculum systemwide and on each CSU campus. Therefore, in response to SB967, the CSU system created the "Systemwide Sex Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking Policy, Executive Order 1095." (The California State University). Nestled in this policy is a standard for primary prevention mandating:

"Programs must include primary prevention and awareness programs: (1) for all **new** Students and **new** Employees; (2) refresher programs at least annually for all Students; (3) twice a year for all Students who serve as Advisors in residence halls; (4) annually for all Student members of fraternities and sororities; (5) annually for all Student athletes and coaches; and, (6) annually for all Employees consistent with their role in responding to and reporting incidents. Ongoing prevention and awareness campaigns for **all** Students and Employees shall also be conducted." (See Appendix 1).

Similar to the UC system, the CSU system made a point to create standards for both first-time and continuing education. Moreover, they identified high risk populations such as first responders in residence halls, fraternities and sororities, and athletes, and mandated that these high-risk populations receive annual training. Their policy also goes into detail about domestic and dating violence continued education standards. The policy for domestic violence prevention includes defining what healthy relationships are, recognizing abusive behavior, helping those who have experienced domestic violence, sanctions for survivors, and the reporting process. This piece of education is critical in ensuring that students understand what domestic violence is and how to see the signs in order to prevent it. An essential observation is that individual CSU colleges, while abiding to the system-wide Title IX prevention policies, often collaborate with gender-specific or gender equity offices. Many CSUs partner with Women's Resource Centers or Gender Equity departments to do cross-departmental awareness campaigns or workshops such as the Clothesline Project and It's On Us.

California Prevention Education Policies for K-12 Education

California's two core pieces of prevention education legislation for K-12 are Senate Bill 48, "The Fair Education Act of 2011" and Assembly Bill 329, "Pupil Instruction: Sexual Health Education." Senate Bill 48 effectively expanded current education codes to include,

“...a study of the role and contributions of both men and women, Native Americans, African Americans, Mexican Americans, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, European Americans, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender Americans, persons with disabilities, and members of other ethnic and cultural groups, to the economic, political, and social development of California and the United States of America, with particular emphasis on portraying the role of these groups in contemporary society.” (California Department of Education).

This was landmark legislation in including the LGBTQ community into the education curriculum, but it is a symbolic policy at best. It is symbolic because it still leaves the implementation to local districts. Since the state does not oversee the implementation of its policies, it is unlikely that all localities have properly incorporated the LGBTQ population into their curriculum. The second defining piece of in-state legislation is Assembly Bill 329 (AB329). Previously, the bill’s language simply opened up a pathway for local school districts to provide comprehensive sexual health education. AB329 rewrites the language, transforming it from a passive to an active bill. The new language says, “the bill would instead require school districts to ensure that all pupils in grades 7 to 12, inclusive, receive comprehensive sexual health education and HIV prevention education, as specified. By imposing additional requirements on school districts, this bill would impose a state-mandated local program.” (cite).

However, neither of these bills discuss domestic violence. In fact, the California Department of Education solely provides teen dating and domestic violence definitions on its Violence Prevention site. Even more disturbing is that the Department of Education’s Health Content Standards do not include prevention curriculum on domestic violence. The absence of domestic violence from this curriculum is proof of a systemic failure to protect students, especially when students ages 11-17 have already had their first experience with domestic violence (California Department of Public Health).

States as Case Studies for Primary Prevention Models in Grades 7-12

Although California has not yet passed an active policy to incorporate domestic violence as a core health standard, other states have taken a leap forward in prevention. This section looks at state trends in domestic violence prevention policy and identifies model policies that the state of California should follow. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, 22 states have already implemented versions of domestic violence prevention policies. Many of these states have passed legislation that “encourage” or “allow” K-12 schools to provide domestic violence prevention education. However, this paper focuses on states with legislation that requires schools to implement domestic violence education in the general curriculum.

In 2010, Florida passed Senate Bill 642 and House Bill 467 requiring that, “comprehensive health education taught in the public schools [must] include a component on teen dating violence and abuse for students in grades 7 through 12.” (Blackman). These bills also require school boards to adopt dating violence policies for students and personnel. Similarly, Louisiana created a state policy that mandates students in grades 7-12 enrolled in a health education be taught about dating violence. Illinois also revised its previous plan in 2009 House Bill 973 that now,

“requires school boards to adopt a policy that: states that teen dating violence is unacceptable and is prohibited and that each student has the right to a safe learning environment; and incorporates age-appropriate education about teen dating violence into new or existing training programs for students in grades 7 through 12.”

All three of these states mandated prevention policies for grades 7-12 on domestic violence. This is an important trend to follow because it highlights the student population that education policies are focused on. In addition, states like Ohio revised their old education codes by passing House Bill 19 in 2009, which requires school districts to include dating violence prevention in their health education curriculum. Finally, Virginia’s policy stands out from the rest as the first to set a standardized timeline for ongoing education in middle school and high school. In 2011, the state passed an act that “requires that any family life education curriculum offered by a local school division is to include the Standards of Learning objectives related to dating violence and the characteristics of abusive relationships to be taught at least once in middle school and at least twice in high school”(Blackman).

In summation, state policies that mandated the implementation of domestic violence prevention education focused on students in grades 7-12, housed prevention under health education, and set curriculum standards for school boards and districts to follow.

What Can We Learn from California Policy and Other State Policies?

This section will summarize key findings gathered from California state policies and other state policies. These findings will inform the criteria set to evaluate the policy options this paper proposes.

The success of the UC prevention model is grounded in the standards set by the state and the UC system’s willingness to engage in the thorough research needed to create effective programming. The model works because it has a core set of educational standards that all campuses must meet but has the flexibility for prevention programming to meet the needs of its students educationally and demographically. Similarly, the successful implementation of CSU’s prevention model is largely due to the guidance and incentives set forth by the state. Both systems took the state’s core standards and implemented them in a way that made sense for their respective campuses.

On the flipside, California’s policy for domestic violence prevention for grades 7-12 is essentially non-existent. California policies for early prevention education include posting information on the Department of Education website, and a Health Contents Standard document that has not been updated since 2008. This illustrates an area of growth and opportunity for the State of California. It was the authoritative SB967 bill that required their most prominent secondary institutions to create and adopt model prevention education policies. If leadership at the state level can do it for college campuses, it is a reasonable assertion that the state can do it for students in grades 7-12.

Moreover, other states have shown the feasibility of legislation mandating school boards and local districts implement domestic violence prevention education. The states that were most successful developed content standards, established criteria, and set timelines for respective local agencies to implement these policies. Based on these policies, and the statistics regarding

childhood experiences with abuse, it is imperative that prevention education starts as early and frequently as possible. States like Ohio, Illinois, and Virginia have gone back to revise their bills and the significant changes have been starting prevention earlier and increasing frequency where possible. The California standards set by the UC and CSU systems support this by having quarterly and semester awareness and education programs.

Research by the Center for Disease Control is in agreement that continued and on-going education for “prevention strategies at this level promote[s] attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that prevent violence” (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention). Their Socio-ecological model supports the belief that prevention must be widespread, intentional, and initiated as early as possible.

Policy Options Driven by Data and Models of Success

This section discusses possible policy options informed by data from academic research on prevention policy and the discussed models of success. In addition, this section provides criteria for evaluating policy options.

Criteria

The criteria that will evaluate the options are:

1. *Administrative Efficiency*

This paper will define efficiency as the clear and expedient administration of core content standards, curriculum, and requirements to the correct state or school agents. The policy must consider staffing and space needed to implement policy. It must consider what agencies will be held responsible for the implementation and evaluation. It must also consider whether schools are reasonably able to sustain these policies.

2. *Political/Cultural Support*

The policy option must have enough support to pass legislation in the current political landscape. It must identify stakeholders who will support it and conversely consider those who may oppose it.

3. *Fiscal Feasibility*

The policy considers funding streams and options. The policy can be funded.

4. *Effectiveness*

This paper defines effectiveness as a policy that best educates students on domestic violence.

Passive Policy Option

California passes a policy that requires schools to pass out educational materials such as pamphlets and infographics to students on an annual basis. Further, informational posters with school and local resources as well as reporting options should be hung in high visibility areas around schools. This policy option is low cost because it requires no staffing or extra administrative fees. It most fully meets the administrative efficiency requirement because the policy does not call for collaboration or multiple investments from different stakeholders; however, it may not be effective in educating students about domestic violence. This policy is predicted to be the most efficient with the lowest effectiveness.

Active Policy Option

California passes a policy that takes the best from its own models (i.e. SB967 and models of prevention from the UC and CSU systems) in combination with the best practices gathered from other states. This policy approach would mandate that middle school and high schools include a section on domestic violence during orientation, set a requirement in the health framework including a section dedicated to domestic violence, and introduce out-of-classroom awareness programming. This policy would incorporate the most amount of collaborative legwork. This policy would have to designate who would create content standards, decide on whether or not schools have the jurisdiction to create prevention content, and would necessitate engaging the student body. This may not be the most administratively efficient, but this policy is predicted to have the highest educational impact on students.

Recommendation

This paper recommends that California implement an Active Policy Option. The recommendation is supported by the success of the “Close to Home Community Mobilization Project” initiated by the California Department of Public Health. The project engaged youth leaders and the community to educate and combat the effects of domestic violence. Through a survey conducted by the Department of Public Health the project showed that a collaborative approach produced positive results. By using pre- and post-test methods, it was concluded that students’ learning improved significantly and that adults were more likely to be supportive and involved because of student participation.

California has the ability to amass political support for this measure given the established facts involved and the overall importance of educational outcomes. The state will also find natural partners in education efforts to curb domestic violence. The state has access to resources that the UC and CSU systems collect on the impacts of their prevention models and the data presented from other states. The most successful prevention programs show that involving students as well as the community at large produce the best results in preventing domestic violence. It is the recommendation of the paper that California create content standards for domestic violence education, mandate that schools incorporate it into their health education courses for students in 7th-12th grade and establish outreach/awareness components involving student participation. If the state does not take action, it is likely that students will continue to be harmed by domestic violence and subsequently suffer long term negative health impacts.

Implementation

Some factors that should be considered in regard to implementation are appropriate ways of evaluating the effectiveness of the education modules. For students in grades 7-12, using a medium like Kahoot is a fun and easy way to gather data through pre- and post-tests and surveys. This will be important in tracking progress. Additionally, the state should utilize the California Domestic Violence Advisory Council in tandem with a task force to create core education standards for domestic violence specific to this population. The task force should consider bringing in students as agents of change. The Close to Home Mobilization Project as well as UC peer group show that peer-to-peer education is often more effective than staff or faculty education. Finally, the state should consider setting standards for how extensive health courses are and at what grade levels they are offered. This could help streamline school districts’ determination of content standards and the need for out of classroom awareness programming.

Conclusion

Over 15 million children nationwide are impacted by domestic violence before the age of 18. In California 1 in 5 women and 1 in 7 men have already experienced their first act of violence from an intimate partner between ages 11 and 17. Children who experience domestic violence are at much higher risks to have long term health issues, greater rates of mental health disorders, and are more likely to be abused again. California has led the charge in prevention of violence on college campuses but has neglected to lead the charge against harm of one of its most vulnerable populations—children. California must adopt a holistic, active prevention policy in order to prevent children from being harmed by domestic violence.

Appendix

1. California State University Training, Education and Preventative Measures in Executive Order 1095

Each Campus must assess which Student organizations participate in activities that may place Students at risk and ensure that they receive annual supplemental trainings focused on situations the group's members may encounter.

Primary prevention programs include programming, initiatives, and strategies informed by research or assessed for value, effectiveness or outcome that are intended to stop Sexual Misconduct, Dating or Domestic Violence, or Stalking before they occur through the promotion of positive and healthy behaviors that foster mutually respectful relationships and sexuality, encourage safe bystander intervention, and seek to change behavior and social norms in healthy and safe directions.

Bystander intervention means safe and positive options that may be carried out by an individual or individuals to prevent harm or intervene when there is a risk of Sexual Misconduct, Dating or Domestic Violence, or Stalking. It includes recognizing situations of potential harm, understanding institutional structures and cultural conditions that facilitate violence, overcoming barriers to intervening and identifying safe and effective intervention options, and taking action to intervene.

Awareness programs include community-wide or audience-specific programming, initiatives, and strategies that increase audience knowledge and share information and resources to prevent violence, promote safety, and reduce perpetration.

To ensure that all Students receive the necessary information and training enumerated above on Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking, Campuses should impose consequences, such as registration holds, on those Students who do not participate in and complete such mandatory training.

These education and training programs shall include the following information:

- A statement that the CSU prohibits Sex Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking.
- What constitutes Sex Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking.
- The definition of Affirmative Consent.
- A statement that Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking violate University policy and may also violate criminal law.
- Common facts and myths about the causes of Sexual Misconduct. (See Attachment B, *Myths and Facts about Sexual Misconduct*, to be posted and published alongside Attachment A, *Notice of Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Gender or Sex*.)
- Safe and positive options for bystander intervention that may be taken by an individual to prevent harm or intervene in risky situations involving these offenses.
- Methods of encouraging peer support for victims.
- Information regarding Campus, criminal, and civil consequences of committing acts of Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking.

- A statement explaining that the University's primary concern is the safety of members of the Campus community; that the use of alcohol or drugs never makes the victim at fault for Sexual Misconduct; that Students or Employees who experience or witness Sexual Misconduct should not be deterred from reporting incidents out of a concern that they might be disciplined for related violations of drug, alcohol, or other University policies; and that Students or Employees who experience or witness Sexual Misconduct shall not be subject to discipline for related violations of conduct policies at or near the time of the misconduct unless the violation is egregious (including actions that place the health or safety of any other person at risk or involves plagiarism, cheating, or academic dishonesty.)
- A statement that "CSU policy prohibits retaliation against a person who: reports Sex Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Dating or Domestic Violence, or Stalking; assists someone with a report of such conduct; or participates in any manner in an related investigation or resolution. Retaliation includes threats, intimidation, reprisals, and/or adverse actions related to employment or education."
- How to recognize warning signs of abusive behavior and how to avoid potential attacks.
- Information on risk reduction, including options designed to decrease perpetration and bystander inaction, and to increase empowerment for victims in order to promote safety and to help individuals and communities address conditions that facilitate violence.
- What someone should do if s/he has experienced or witnessed Sex Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Dating or Domestic Violence, or Stalking.
- Individuals to whom incidents may be reported along with information regarding what degree of confidentiality may be maintained by those individuals.
- The availability of, and contact information for, Campus and community resources for victims of Sexual Misconduct, Dating or Domestic Violence, or Stalking.
- A description of Campus and systemwide policies and disciplinary procedures available for addressing alleged violations and the consequences of violating these policies, including the fact that such proceedings shall:
 - Provide a prompt, fair, and impartial investigation and resolution; and,
 - Be conducted by officials who receive annual training on issues related to Sex Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking, and how to conduct an investigation and hearing process that protects the safety of victims and promotes accountability.
- The fact that the victim and the Respondent will be afforded the same opportunities to have others present during a disciplinary proceeding, including the opportunity to be accompanied to any related meeting or proceeding by the Advisor of their choice.
- The fact that both the victim and the Respondent shall be simultaneously informed in writing of:
 - The outcome of any disciplinary proceedings that arises from an allegation of a Sex Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Dating or Domestic Violence, or Stalking;
 - The University's procedures for the victim or Respondent to appeal the results of the disciplinary proceeding;

- Any change to the disciplinary results that occurs prior to the time such results become final; and,
 - When disciplinary results become final.
- Possible sanctions or protective measures the University may impose following the final determination of a University disciplinary procedure regarding Sexual Misconduct, Dating or Domestic Violence, or Stalking.
- How the University will protect the confidentiality of victims, including how publicly-available recordkeeping (e.g., Campus Clery reports) will be accomplished without the inclusion of identifying information about the victim to the extent permissible by law.
- That persons who report being a victim of Sexual Misconduct, Dating or Domestic Violence, or Stalking *must receive written* notification of:
 - Existing counseling, health, mental health, victim advocacy, legal assistance, and other services available for victims, both on Campus and in the community.
 - Options for, and available assistance in, changing academic, living, transportation, and working situations, if requested and if such accommodations are reasonably available, regardless of whether the victim chooses to report the incident to Campus police or local law enforcement.
- Procedures victims should follow if Sexual Misconduct, Dating or Domestic Violence, or Stalking has occurred, as well as the fact that the following *written* information must be provided to victims:
 - The importance of preserving evidence as may be necessary to prove Sexual Misconduct, Dating or Domestic Violence, or Stalking, or to obtain a temporary restraining or other protective order;
 - The name and contact information of the University Employee(s) to whom the alleged offense should be reported;
 - Reporting to law enforcement and Campus authorities, including the option to: (a) notify law enforcement authorities, including on-Campus and local police; (b) be assisted by Campus authorities in notifying law enforcement authorities if the victim so chooses; and, (c) decline to notify such authorities;
 - Where applicable, the rights of victims and the University's responsibilities regarding orders of protection, no contact orders, restraining orders, or similar lawful orders issued by a criminal, civil, or tribal court.

References

- Blackman, Kate, et al. *Teen Dating Violence*, www.ncsl.org/research/health/teen-dating-violence.aspx.
- California Department of Public Health. "Safe and Active Communities Branch." *Safe and Active Communities Branch: Domestic Violence Prevention*, www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DCDIC/SACB/Pages/DomesticViolencePrevention.aspx.
- "California Laws & Codes." *California Laws & Codes - Laws & Regulations (CA Dept of Education)*, www.cde.ca.gov/re/lr/cl/.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. "The social-ecological model: A framework for prevention." *Atlanta, GA: CDC (2015)*.
https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/publichealthissue/social-ecologicalmodel.html?CDC_AA_refVal=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.cdc.gov%2Fviolenceprevention%2Foverview%2Fsocial-ecologicalmodel.html
- De Leon, Kevin. "SB-967 Student Safety: Sexual Assault." *Bill Text - SB-967 Student Safety: Sexual Assault.*,
leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201320140SB967.
- "Domestic Violence and Children." *Womenshealth.gov*, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2 Apr. 2019, www.womenshealth.gov/relationships-and-safety/domestic-violence/effects-domestic-violence-children.
- "Frequently Asked Questions: Senate Bill 48." *Frequently Asked Questions: Senate Bill 48 - Curriculum Frameworks & Instructional Materials (CA Dept of Education)*, California Department of Education, www.cde.ca.gov/ci/cr/cf/senatebill48faq.asp.
- "Health Education Framework." *Health Education Framework - Health Education (CA Dept of Education)*, www.cde.ca.gov/ci/he/cf/.
- Lee, David S., et al. "Sexual violence prevention." *The prevention researcher* 14.2 (2007): 15-20. "The goal of primary prevention education sessions is to prevent first-time perpetration or victimization by improving knowledge and attitudes that correspond to the origins of sexual violence (such as adherence to societal norms supportive of sexual violence, male superiority, and male sexual entitlement); build skills for respectful interactions; and empower participants to become agents of change." (15)
- "Safe and Active Communities Branch." *Safe and Active Communities Branch*, www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DCDIC/SACB/Pages/DomesticViolencePrevention.aspx.
- "Systemwide Title IX Office." *UCOP*, www.ucop.edu/title-ix/resources/campus-resources/index.html.

“Viewing: Systemwide Sex Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking Policy; Executive Order (EO) 1095.” *PolicyStat*, The California State University, calstate.policystat.com/policy/6741651/latest/#autoid-awynv.

Supplemental Sources

About Dating Matters

<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/datingmatters/about.html>

California Health Education Initiatives

<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ci/he/cf/cahealthfaq.asp>

Education Code for Age Appropriate Sexual Health Education

http://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/codes_displaySection.xhtml?lawCode=EDC§ionNum=51931

Effects of Domestic Violence on Children

<https://www.womenshealth.gov/relationships-and-safety/domestic-violence/effects-domestic-violence-children>

Report Says LAPD Failed To Investigate Nearly 4,000 Cases of Child Abuse

<https://losangeles.cbslocal.com/2019/10/20/report-says-lapd-failed-to-investigate-nearly-4000-cases-of-child-abuse/>

Safe Schools and Prevention - CalEd Facts

<https://www.cde.ca.gov/ls/ss/vp/cefsafeschools.asp>

Understanding Teen Dating Violence Fact Sheet

<https://www.cdph.ca.gov/Programs/CCDPHP/DCDIC/SACB/CDPH%20Document%20Library/Teen%20Dating%20Violence/TeenDatingViolenceFactsheet2016.pdf>

Violence-Prevention Curriculum ‘Second Step’

<https://achieve.lausd.net/Page/6411>