

The background of the page features a large, light gray watermark of the University of California seal. The seal is circular and contains the text "UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA" around the top and "1868" at the bottom. In the center, there is a five-pointed star above an open book, and a hand holding a torch with the word "LIGHT" written on it. A banner at the bottom of the seal reads "LET THERE BE LIGHT".

**Report to the President:
President's Task Force on Preventing and
Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual
Assault - July Milestones**

July 2015 | University of California

Contents

- Executive Summary* 3

- Legislative Updates: *Federal and State***..... 6
- State Legislative Activities 6
- Federal Legislative Activities..... 7

- July Milestones: *Implementation Progress*** 8
- Student Adjudication Model 8
- Investigation Standards (Common Elements)..... 10
- The Education and Training Framework 11
- Standard Data Management System..... 14
- Development of the Respondent Services Coordinator 15

- Appendices**..... 18
- Appendix A. Task Force and Work Group Members 19
- Appendix B. Glossary 26

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In June 2014, President Napolitano issued a call to action and formed a cross-functional Presidential Task Force to strengthen and improve the University of California's prevention of and response to sexual violence and sexual misconduct. With increasing national attention and debate, universities across the nation struggled this year to improve their responses to these challenging issues. The University of California is not unique in its desire to protect its community and better its practices. It is however, the first to develop and implement a robust, comprehensive, consistent, and transparent model to address sexual violence and sexual misconduct across its system.

Approach

The Task Force was given a difficult mission and an ambitious timeline, but it was also afforded the strong support of University executive leadership. Given the demanding timeline, Phase II, or the implementation phase, was split into January 2015 deliverables ("milestones") and July 2015 milestones. Over the past 12 months, more than 150 subject matter experts from across the University – including regents, students, staff, and faculty -- examined our efforts in this arena. Reaching consensus in these critical areas required many hours of collective thought, research, and discussion. It also required open and frank communication around current practices and how they could be improved. For example, every party involved in these effort came to recognize that each component of the model meet two criteria: that it be trauma-informed, and that all best practices in this area be considered from the survivor's perspective, as well as the respondent's, or they will not be included. In Phase II, communication with University leadership also fostered the understanding that perfection cannot be the goal—as many outside influences drive larger culture issues concerning gender equity and the dynamics of interpersonal relationships.

A Strong Foundation

With the support of the President and Regents, the Task Force offered eight core recommendations to make the comprehensive, consistent model a practical reality. This report focuses on the implementation process for the remaining four recommendations, or July 2015 milestones, for preventing and responding to sexual violence, sexual assault, and sexual misconduct at all UC locations:

- **Recommendation 2:** Adopt systemwide, standard investigation and adjudication standards—including consistent sanctions—for those accused of sexual violence or misconduct.
- **Recommendation 3:** Develop a comprehensive, consistent training and education plan to inform University students, staff, and faculty about these issues.

- **Recommendation 7:** Develop and implement a systemwide, standard data collection system to measure the effectiveness of University prevention and response programs.
- **Recommendation 8:** Provide equitable respondent support services to those accused of sexual violence or misconduct (added in December 2014).

The July milestones presented great challenges in breadth and scope for a system that encompasses almost half a million people across one of the country's most populous states. Two recommendations (education and adjudication) were particularly difficult to implement due to the sheer enormity of creating a comprehensive or consistent approach in areas where no comprehensive or consistent best practices existed internally or within higher education. There was intense focus on how to craft an education program that clearly communicated nuanced concepts to 500,000 students, faculty, and staff from all engagement and knowledge levels and which drives cultural and behavioral change about a very personal topic. Consistent adjudication standards were equally difficult, as universities are not courts of law, and universities can only adjudicate allegations within an administrative construct. Even with the intelligence and engagement of higher education across the country, no single institution has found the perfect model that ensures due process for complainants and respondents, imposes consistent sanctions for those found responsible, and provides emotional closure for all affected by the sexual violence or misconduct. The Task Force accepted these challenges and crafted two clear, yet sophisticated and flexible, education and draft adjudication plans to address these issues.

Lessons Learned

Changing culture both at the social and administrative levels is difficult and takes time. Many of the people involved in this process initially saw their work as a separate function rather than as part of a cohesive effort. The Task Force, work groups, and campus implementation teams drove cross-functional discussions that helped converge the implementation paths for the Task Force recommendations. Throughout Phase II, those involved became more open to seeing issues and opportunities to create efficiencies, where previously, they would not have recognized them.

A special thank you should be given to the students who participated. The Task Force had student voices from the beginning, but it also received feedback that there were not enough student voices from across our system. In Phase II, not only did we have continuing and excellent Task Force student representatives, but we had more students from throughout the system who devoted their attention to these efforts as part of the work groups. These interested students participated in meetings, calls, and reviewed materials in addition to their normal course work. We also had 60 students attend in-person meetings, including an all-student meeting held on a weekend to better accommodate schedules. Throughout this process, these students provided thoughtful feedback and perspective about how they interact with the University, what messages resonate with their audiences, and how they could better

interact with faculty and staff to support everyone within our University community. As we move forward there will be some transition since several of our student leaders, Rishi Ahuja, Savannah Badalich, and Sadia Saifuddin, have graduated. However, we are fortunate to have continued input from several undergraduate students who have been willing to replace our graduates on the Task Force and in the work groups. We have also realized that more graduate student participation is needed in our efforts as this population has different needs from the undergraduates. As a result, we have formed a small graduate work group and the President has appointed an additional graduate level student to our Task Force, in addition to the three undergraduate students and Student Regent on the Task Force.

Building consensus around a consistent practice that is equitable for all parties, including trauma-informed practices and seeking input from subject matter experts, necessitates broadly disseminating the draft common adjudication model to campuses for vetting. The adjudication standards are too important for the University to proceed without a thoughtful, agreed-upon approach. Despite the best efforts of all involved, this consensus and implementation could not be implemented by July 2015 without undercutting the need for a robust, sustainable framework. Based on the ongoing work, this common adjudication model will be approved by September 2015 and implemented by January 2016. As part of this process, the adjudication working group will continue to develop a complementary, common framework for sanctions. The sanctions framework will also go through the systemwide vetting process prior to approval in September 2015 and implementation in January 2016.

Given the size and scope of the July 2015 milestones, implementation has been challenging, but also rewarding. This effort could not have been possible without the ongoing support from President Napolitano. The Task Force recognizes that implementing this model is a very significant part of our process, but not the final step. Over time, the University must evaluate and measure the model to test its effectiveness. Modifications will occur as these outcomes become more evident and the model will evolve and improve as we study outcomes over time. With the President, Chancellors, and senior leadership's support, we remain confident that the model we implement is flexible enough to evolve and be sustainable for the future.

Sheryl Vacca

Task Force Lead

LEGISLATIVE UPDATES: *FEDERAL AND STATE*

State Legislative Activities

A number of state bills were introduced in early 2015 to address campus sexual violence. UC has been in discussions with the various authors of these bills, in part to keep the California Legislature apprised of the progress of the Task Force, and to continue to monitor proposed legislation throughout the year. In several instances, the University also incorporated concepts from proposed legislation that would improve University practices. Two bills of particular interest to the University are:

- AB 967 (Williams) - As a condition of receiving state funding for financial aid, this bill would require colleges and universities to have a uniform process across all campuses for disciplinary proceedings in sexual assault cases and would require an institution to implement specified minimum standards of discipline for students found responsible for certain acts of sexual assault. The bill also requires annual reporting of certain data related to cases of alleged sexual assault. The intent of the bill (i.e., to have a uniform process relating to claims of sexual assault) is consistent with the work of the Task Force and the University continues to work with Assembly Member Williams on this important piece of legislation.
- AB 968 (Williams) - Requires that colleges and universities indicate on student transcripts when a student is ineligible to reenroll due to suspension or expulsion. UC campuses already note this information on student transcripts when a student has been suspended or expelled.

Collaboration between UC and the California State Attorney General

On May 13, President Napolitano and California Attorney General Kamala Harris unveiled a new toolkit for California law enforcement agencies and higher education institutions to improve collaboration and transparency on campus sexual assault prevention and response. The toolkit was created, in part, to comply with AB 1433 (Gatto), which requires educational institutions adopt and implement written policies and procedures that ensure reports of crimes like sexual assault are disclosed to law enforcement as soon as practically possible. It was also developed to help higher education institutions and law enforcement better navigate the state and federal legal requirements that expect collaboration and information sharing between law enforcement and campuses in addressing sexual assault and other violent crimes. The toolkit includes a model memorandum of understanding (MOU) that can be adapted and used by California institutions of higher education and local law enforcement agencies that have

jurisdiction over those institutions. It also includes a resource guide explaining the provisions of the MOU and relevant laws and policies related to those provisions.

For students, the MOU ensures local law enforcement will remain in communication with their campus in case of a report of sexual violence in the surrounding community, assuring the campus is aware of the safety of their students and can extend campus resources for those students. For local law enforcement, it ensures better communication and the ability to leverage the specific knowledge and training the UC Police have in responding to sexual violence.

Federal Legislative Activities

Several federal bills on campus sexual violence that had been introduced in 2014 were reintroduced in 2015. These include:

- Senator Claire McCaskill's and Senator Gillibrand's Campus Accountability and Safety Act (CASA);
- Senator Barbara Boxer's and Representative Susan Davis' Survivor Outreach and Support Campus Act (SOS Campus Act); and,
- Representative Jackie Speier's Hold Accountable and Lend Transparency on Campus Sexual Violence Act (HALT Campus Sexual Violence Act).

The proposed legislation includes provisions that impose stricter penalties for Title IX and Clery Act violations and require campuses to establish support services for student survivors, enter into MOUs with local law enforcement agencies, and conduct annual student climate surveys.

UC supports Senator Boxer and Representative Davis's SOS Campus Act, which requires colleges and universities to establish an independent, on-campus advocate to support survivors of sexual assault and sexual violence. On March 11, Senator Boxer and Representative Davis issued a press release praising the University of California and the California State University System, for voluntarily implementing provisions of the bill by placing independent confidential advocates on all of their campuses (Recommendation 5 of the UC Task Force) and noted that other universities are following suit.

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) issued final rules on October 20, 2014 to implement changes to the Clery Act made by the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA), which President Obama signed into law last year. The rules took effect on July 1, 2015. UC issued interim guidelines in compliance with the VAWA requirements at the end of June; the final policy is scheduled to be issued by the end of the year.

JULY MILESTONES: *IMPLEMENTATION* *PROGRESS*

Recommendation 2: Adopt systemwide, standard investigation and adjudication standards—including a consistent approach to sanctions

Background

Adopting systemwide standards for investigation, adjudication, and sanctions that will be used by all campuses for all cases of sexual misconduct involving students required evaluating the legal requirements and community expectations around the University's response to allegations of sexual violence and misconduct. This evaluation was especially challenging and one that every university struggles to complete. Universities around the country are currently grappling with improving and reforming their adjudication, investigation, and sanction processes to ensure equitable treatment and a trauma-informed approach for both complainants and respondents. There is no national consensus around a best practice or an adjudication model; universities and legislators continue to debate the issue in their different venues. The Task Force worked to create a model for students that establishes for the system strong, consistent practices for investigation, adjudication, and sanctions — one that is scalable and applicable to our own culture.

Student Adjudication Model

The Task Force convened a small working group consisting of representatives from the Campus Police, Student Conduct, Title IX, CARE Advocates, Associate Vice Chancellors (AVC), Office of General Counsel, Campus Counsel, Ombuds, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs (VCSA), and student representatives to create a set of consistent practices and a common student adjudication model for the University of California. With the assistance of a nationally-recognized expert in the field, the small working group defined common principles and reviewed industry best practices and adjudication models. The group also reviewed the current practices at each UC campus, as well as systemwide and local student conduct policies.

The University's shared governance structure encourages our campuses to develop their own culture. These distinctions were noticeable in investigation and adjudication standards. For example, every location wanted a fair, equitable process for investigation and adjudication. They also felt strong practices were already in place at their locations. To identify the most effective approach and to bridge differences in process and practices, the work group closely examined the University's legal obligations, community expectations, and model outcomes to arrive at a consistent, scalable model for both adjudication and strong practices for

investigation. The group dedicated time and effort to sort through possible models employing different adjudication processes. The group debated the benefits and detriments of each of these identified models and came to consensus concerning a single model. This model provided the most flexibility to accommodate campus uniqueness, while still providing robust due process for both complainants and respondents. This model also met the initial goal to provide a clear, simple, and streamlined process to ensure consistent quality of investigation and adjudication across the University.

The following are the core concepts that guided review throughout the adjudication process and were emphasized by the work group and Task Force:

- Student Model: The student adjudication process is oriented to students and model practices are identified in the process of investigation and adjudication that take specific trauma-informed techniques into consideration (i.e.: increasing the collaboration between Title IX and Student Conduct to reduce the number of times a student must re-tell their story, clear communication points in process, etc.). In addition, throughout the process, the University will offer/provide support services for both parties either through the CARE Advocacy Office or Respondent Support Coordinators. The University will also take interim measures as appropriate to protect the complainant and the respondent.
- Clarity of Roles: All investigations are coordinated and conducted by Title IX offices and sanctioning is done by Student Conduct offices (in consultation with Title IX).
- Notice: Joint notice letter will be issued from both Title IX and Student Conduct to provide the student with a unified message on the outcomes of the investigation and potential sanctions.
- Appeals: Consistent appeal grounds and a stage defined in the model where appeals occur were identified for all campuses.
- Training: Each campus will have 1-3 qualified, trained and impartial professionals as the hearing body for appeals. *(In addition to local campus resources, the University Office of Ethics, Compliance, and Audit Services will ensure that systemwide, there are 2 individuals at all times who are qualified, trained, professional, and impartial, that campuses may utilize on any hearing body related to sexual violence or misconduct. This will assist in meeting the appeal body requirements.)*

Due to the importance of input by subject matter experts across the University, the draft common student adjudication model will be broadly disseminated to campuses for vetting. The goal is to approve the common student adjudication model by September 2015 and implement it by January 2016.

Investigation Standards (Common Elements)

Common investigation elements are imperative to the adjudication process. A second, separate small group, led by Berkeley Campus Police Chief Margo Bennett, collaborated across subject matter expertise to develop common investigation elements. This group focused on investigation best practices, such as communication, documentation, and other processes that would increase transparency systemwide. These elements and model practices will be vetted with respective functional groups in July 2015. Moreover, the University will provide a document outlining the investigative process to assist students with expectations about how the University responds to allegations of sexual violence and sexual misconduct. The final, approved investigation standards with information to assist students will be ready for dissemination in Fall 2015.

Sanctions and Next Steps

The small adjudication working group will continue to develop a common framework for sanctioning. The sanctioning common framework is projected to be finalized by September 2015. Student Adjudication, sanctioning, and investigation model practices will be implemented by January 2016.

RECOMMENDATION 3: Develop a comprehensive training and education plan for students, faculty, and staff.

Implementing this recommendation for a system as expansive, diverse, and large as the University of California required a multi-pronged effort with several critical steps. With each iteration of the framework or its components, Task Force and work group members challenged assertions and plans to ensure the selected approach was comprehensive, operational, and sustainable. As a result, the approach provides core concepts, graduated content, and additional information focused on populations in need of specialized messaging. The delivery methods created incorporate best practices, but capitalize on the individuality of our campus cultures to encourage customization above the foundational elements. A key focus of the implementation efforts was to ensure that training and education occurred in regular frequency, with each event expanding upon the audience's understanding of sexual violence and sexual misconduct and avoiding duplication and repetition. Overall, the education framework will encourage behavioral change to help reduce violence, to build a culture of trust, and most importantly, to increase the safety for all populations on campus. Ultimately, to drive culture change, the Task Force recommends the education framework consider the individual and their educational experience, incorporating both into the student's overall experience on campus rather than focusing solely on sexual violence and sexual misconduct compliance concepts.

Background

Step 1: Research Review and Literature Search

A solid evidence-informed foundation was fundamental to creating a comprehensive, consistent training and education framework. Consequently, prior to engaging the Task Force or work group members in deliberations on educational content or approach, UC staff searched the literature, university and college campus websites, curriculums, and research for examples of education and training programs, “best practices,” and research evidence. The staff researched information from more than 100 Universities across the country, considered the state and federal guidance on education and training, and also the practices of UC currently in place. The information was then synthesized into a content framework for the Task Force and work groups to discuss and review.

Step 2: Work Group Review and Discussion

In October 2014, over 100 members of the University community, including faculty, staff, and students, came together to discuss the content framework for training and education. Discussion and critique focused on overarching goals, definitions, key terms, and objectives that would be required across the system to support a consistent and transparent framework. In March 2015, the Task Force lead, and representatives from Student Affairs and Associate Vice Chancellors, met with a group of 60 students at UC Irvine to discuss the educational content, goals, and process. There was significant dialogue about the educational process and goals, and input gleaned from this meeting was incorporated into the ultimate framework for students, faculty, and staff.

Step 3: Review by Campus Subject Matter Experts

In May 2015, a cross-campus group of prevention educators and other subject matter experts involved in advocacy reviewed updates of the framework and input from the Task Force, its work group, and the student-only meeting to refine goals, objectives, timelines, terms, and definitions. Moreover, they confirmed timeline periods for optimal training and learning opportunities for students especially, staff, and faculty. This group also crystallized the core concepts and common definitions for the student education framework. Following this meeting, the Task Force solicited additional subject matter input from the Title IX officers, key University staff, and faculty leadership. It was noted that the student education model was the most critical, and that the staff and faculty content needed more development, which included greater participation from staff and faculty respectively.

The Education and Training Framework

After consensus by almost 200 key University constituents, the student education framework (with the draft staff and faculty frameworks) was put forward which is consistent with Federal and State regulations and can be applied to all populations systemwide. The common framework consists of six core concepts that form a baseline curriculum for students, staff, and

faculty. These core concepts will be incorporated into every education level, and for the foundation for all content:

1. Definitions of Violence
2. Social Norms – attitudes and beliefs that normalize violence
3. Bystander Intervention
4. Trauma Informed Response
5. Support Resources – including confidential resources and respondent services
6. Reporting Rights & Options

From the advice and experience of prevention education staff on each campus, The Task Force recognized the need to deliver information frequently, as opposed to a single large session training event. This means that education opportunities must be provided at regular intervals and should provide escalating information and understanding for the training audiences. The Task Force also recognized the need to develop a framework that complements adult learning theory (i.e., timing of information, individual learning processes, and adult retention of information). In reviewing each population needs, the group developed a three-tiered approach to educating each core population (i.e. faculty, staff, and students). There are specific content points within each tier that tie back to the core population and the six core concepts.

Students

Content for the student education framework is being utilized now as incoming students are being prepared for their schooling in the fall. Beginning in Fall 2015, all incoming students (undergraduate, graduate and professional) will receive mandatory Level 1 content education by the last day of their first 6 weeks at the University. Level 1 education content includes topics such as the different sexual violence definitions, on-campus resources, and bystander strategies. Going forward, incoming students will have three points of education prior to beginning their first term with UC that can be delivered through welcome letters, orientation, and in-person education occurring within the first 6 weeks of school. The campus can define the specific delivery methods for these three points of education (at least one will be in-person training during the first 6 weeks).

Mandatory Level 2 content will be delivered on an ongoing basis during the student education lifecycle. Level 2 content will revisit the foundational concepts of Level 1, but offer additional specific information for students who have already had the initial baseline training. Each campus will provide multiple opportunities for education each year to ensure students receive additional information on these topics. In person, online, small group sessions, and case scenarios discussed in meetings are some of the methods the campuses can utilize. A consistent online training with several modules was also made available for any campus that wishes to utilize this delivery method for ease of tracking and accessibility. In addition to providing this ongoing education, campuses will use existing campus infrastructures to

mandate education specific to self-identified student populations, including Greeks, Athletics, student leadership, Resident Assistants, and other student activity groups.

Lastly, recommended Level 3 content will be provided to students. Level 3 content includes tailored content and training for students connected with campus resource centers and will use common content to tailor messages to the specific audiences. These audiences include, but are not limited to LGBTQI, international student groups, cross-cultural centers, veterans, students with children, underrepresented groups, and undocumented-student centers, etc. In addition to the Levels 1 and 2 content, these resource centers will offer educational events and trainings on Level 3 content, such as nuanced concepts specific to issues faced by these specific audiences. For example, LGBTQI students and students with children might discuss gender equity and power dynamics in relationships—both common features of dating and domestic violence.

Staff

Using the same three-tiered approach and six core competency concepts, it is proposed that all UC staff will receive the same level of detail within its framework. All incoming staff will complete an initial training within the first six weeks of their start with the University, followed by mandated annual training. All supervisors and mandated reporters will receive baseline and repeat trainings on their legal obligations, as well as trauma-informed training and appropriate responses in referring survivors and respondents to appropriate resources. Additionally, employees who work directly with complainants and respondents will receive additional skillset training to aide them in the completion of these duties. The staff training and education plan, which includes the framework core concepts, will be finalized by September 2015 and implemented by December 2015.

Faculty

The University will utilize the current Sexual Harassment Prevention Training (SHPT) program for faculty that must be completed every two years. Using Task Force recommendations, a work group including Academic Personnel will revise this training content to match the requirements of the common education model. It is proposed that all incoming faculty will receive mandatory trauma-informed education within the first 2 months of the service date at UC as required by AB1825, which could be offered online or in-person. At campus discretion, in addition to the mandated SHPT, training may be offered during events such as faculty, divisional, or department meetings. Additional training will be made available to specific faculty and academic personnel who may work directly with complainants and respondents; for example, those who serve as faculty graduate advisors and faculty undergraduate advisors. The content and delivery method is being developed currently by an Academic Personnel work group with feedback from the Academic Senate leadership and faculty representatives. The faculty training and education plan, which includes the framework core concepts is expected to be finalized by November 2015 and will be implemented by January 2016.

RECOMMENDATION 7: Initiate/develop a systemwide standard data management system

Background

From the outset, the Task Force recognized the need to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the Task Force recommendations. Recommendation 7 was included to ensure appropriate and uniform metrics were developed and collected throughout the implementation process. By collecting, trending, and analyzing data on a systemwide level, the University will not only track compliance with the recommendations and measure their effectiveness, but also identify areas for improvement and provide information to appropriate decision-makers to implement corrective actions, as well as provide systemwide focused training efforts in these areas.

A working group, which included representation from Title IX, CARE Advocates, Student Conduct, and students, was tasked with designing and initiating a multifaceted approach for collecting metrics. Over the course of the last few months, there has been significant progress in establishing uniform systemwide metrics. The group developed consensus criteria, which has received ongoing refinement. Definitions for uniform reporting of metrics data and a standard reporting form have also been developed. These will serve as the foundation for the comprehensive collection of metrics.

Current State of Affairs

Ultimately, campuses will integrate metrics collection into their standard processes for handling sexual misconduct via case management systems. At this point, many campuses are still in the process of implementing a case management system. To institutionalize systemwide data collection, the initial phase began with development of a standardized metrics form to report basic quantitative data on incidents of sexual misconduct. These monthly reports have been collected, and aggregated on a systemwide basis since March 2015 to provide baseline data on the initial implementation of the recommendations. This baseline will be used to measure progress over time.

The current data collection focuses on campus-level activities of the CARE (Advocacy Office), Title IX, and UC Police Department (UCPD) offices, as well as ongoing implementations of the Campus Management Team (CMT) and Campus Coordinated Review Team (CCRT). Data is also being collected to support compliance with the “response team” model as established in Recommendation 1 by tracking meeting frequency and attendance.

Systemwide efforts are currently focused on ensuring consistency, conformity, and confidentiality in the reported data. An FAQ document has been developed, and is being constantly revised with input from the campuses, to achieve common understanding and uniformity in reporting. Importantly, the metrics and data collection practices encourage

reporting data using smart practices around small cell sizes and identification. Much of the data associated with sexual violence and sexual misconduct is sensitive and confidential. The Task Force focused on creating a model that preserves privacy, and these practices were followed in developing metrics. Given these revisions and limited collection period, it is premature to report on trends or make inferences based on the current data set.

Future Plans

With the many changes occurring throughout the system, developing metrics is a dynamic process. While the current metric collection methodology creates an initial standardized institutional baseline, future efforts will include a broadening of the scope of the data collected. The University plans not only to broaden the criteria, but to expand it to measure the progress of all eight recommendations. The Metrics work group plans to continue working with the campuses to develop quantifiable criteria that will support the sustainability of the recommendations. In addition, the Task Force will seek expertise in this area within the University community to assist in refining the metrics collection process to assure we can measure changes in behavior and culture.

Full implementation of the campus case management systems will allow the University to streamline and automate the reporting process, as well as provide greater depth and detail of campus processes related to sexual violence. Campus management systems will be more efficient and will include additional detailed demographic and timing information that will allow for a more proactive identification and resolution of trends and problem areas within University prevention and response processes. The ultimate result of this proactive process is a values-based, data-driven approach to help improve the overall safety of everyone within the University.

RECOMMENDATION 8: Provide Equitable Respondent Support Services

Background

The Task Force agreed that a fair and balanced process should be provided to both complainants and respondents. While campuses currently provide services to respondents, they are not uniform, comprehensive, or consistent across the system.

A Task Force subcommittee comprised of representatives from across the UC system—including students and administrators—developed recommendations about the services that should be available to respondents, using a similar, deliberative process that the Task Force used to develop the Advocacy Office (CARE). The goal was to develop core responsibilities and

services for respondents as they navigate the adjudication and investigation process that would be available and consistent across the system.

While the Respondent Services Coordinator (RSC) cannot provide confidentiality in the same manner as the CARE Advocates, the RSC will typically not share information disclosed in the course of facilitation and support without a signed release and consent from the respondent.

Development of the Respondent Services Coordinator

Step 1: Review of current campus processes

A core group of students and administrators started a dialogue in November 2014 to discuss the current programs and support which was offered to respondents at each campus. This discussion was instrumental in developing an understanding on campus resources and services currently available to respondents. Based on these discussions, the work group developed a list of model practices or necessary services for respondents to help the respondent navigate the adjudication process and also assist respondents with certain campus needs.

Step 2: Develop Respondent Services Coordinator recommendation

In February 2015, the work group finalized the recommendation to the Task Force for the Respondent Services Coordinator (RSC) position. The work group outlined 10 recommendations for implementing and developing the role responsibilities for a RSC, as well as outlining which services would be provided to respondents. It was recognized that this role would be an additional role someone may perform in their assigned duties and not necessarily a full-time position dedicated to this support. Flexibility of location was key to the recommendation; although each location will provide similar services, the campuses have the authority to designate an appropriate office to provide respondent support.

Step 3: Implementation of the Respondent Services Coordinator (RSC) position

Based on extensive discussions and feedback from work group and Task Force members, the RSC position and recommendations were developed by students, staff, and faculty.

First, the RSC must be made available to all students accused of sexual misconduct. The RSC will be trained on how to handle incidents of sexual misconduct and will have the necessary knowledge and appropriate resources to assist those students. Although RSCs are not confidential resources, the RSC will not disclose information without a signed release and consent from the respondent, if possible.

Understanding that each campus is unique, the Task Force has left it to the campus's discretion on where to house the RSC to be most effective and accessible. Some recommended locations include the Office of the Dean of Students, case managers or social workers, student conduct, or student legal services. Campuses will make their own evaluation when deciding where the most appropriate location would be for the RSC—keeping in mind that there must be a clear separation between the RSC and the CARE Advocacy Office.

To facilitate the RSC's communication with respondents, the RSC would have access to the Case Management Team (CMT). This access will allow RSC's to be informed of the status of each case they are handling. However, to maintain confidentiality, the RSC would be recused from the CMT meetings during discussions of active investigations, or at such times as directed by the CMT chair.

The RSC will be clearly established and communicated to the campus communities, including providing RSC contact information on the systemwide and campus websites that are easily and readily available to the community, by no later than September 2015.

NEXT STEPS FROM THE PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE

Since the last report, the Task Force and work groups have made robust strides in implementing the milestone recommendations. The University plans to measure the effectiveness of the implementation efforts ongoing.

As we move forward towards our final steps in implementation, there will be a concerted effort to maintain momentum in changing our culture and integrating these activities in the educational experience of our students. We are focusing our efforts to be sustainable and transparent in order to drive and enhance a culture of prevention and safety.

APPENDICES

A. Task Force and Work Group Members

B. Glossary

Appendix A. Task Force and Work Group Members

Acknowledgements

The Task Force and work groups contain members from across the UC system and included faculty, Regents, staff, and students. A special thank you and recognition should be given for the input and work of each member for their time, energy, and passion in helping to bring these recommendations to fruition. The members took these recommendations and created implementation plans and detail to support a trauma-informed, efficient, and sustainable model for UC.

The Task Force would also like to thank the UC Chancellors for their support of these efforts, their work to implement the recommendations, and also for supporting those recognized below who took on this challenge in addition to their ongoing responsibilities.

Task Force Members	
Karen Leong Clancy (Completed Term on June 2015)	UC Regent
Bonnie Reiss	UC Regent
Abraham (Avi) Oved	Student Regent
Sadia Saifuddin (Graduated)	Student Regent
Sheryl Vacca	Task Force Lead, Senior Vice President & Chief Compliance and Audit Officer
Deidre Acker	Staff Advisor to the Regents – Designate
Rishi Ahuja (Graduated)	Undergraduate Student
Susan Allen-Ortega	Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs - Health & Wellness
Adele Anfinson	Director, Student Health and Counseling Services
Savannah Badalich (Graduated)	Undergraduate Student
Margo Bennett	Chief of Police
Lori Chamberlain	Director of the Office for the Prevention of Harassment & Discrimination
John C. Daly	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
Wendi Delmendo	Chief Compliance Officer
Dwaine Duckett (Ad Hoc)	Vice President for Human Resources
Jill Dunlap	Director, Campus Advocacy, Resources & Education Women’s Center
Jerlena Griffin-Desta	Deputy to the Vice President and Executive Director, Student Services
Paul Henisey (Retired)	Chief of Police
James D. Herren	Chief of Police
Hallie Hunt	Director, Center for Student Conduct and Assistant Dean of Students
David Lane	Systemwide Deputy Compliance Officer

Task Force Members	
Janet Lockwood	Manager, Academic Policy and Compensation
David Lopez-Carr	Professor of Geography, UCSB Chair, University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
Janina Montero	Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs
Nelson Peacock (Ad Hoc)	Senior Vice President of Government Relations
Luanna Putney	Associate Chancellor
Emily Roxworthy	Professor of Theater, UCSD Chair, University Committee on Affirmative Action
Binnie Singh	Assistant Vice Provost, Academic Affairs
Eleanor Skarakis (Retired)	Chief of Staff to the Vice President of Human Resources & Director of HR Policy
Holly Swift	Graduate Student
Tracey Tsugawa	Title IX Officer
Linda Williams (Retired)	Associate Chancellor
Allison Woodall	Deputy General Counsel

AVC/ Dean of Students		
Berkeley	Joseph Defraime Greenwell	Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students
Davis	Milton Lang	Associate Vice Chancellor
Irvine	Lisa Cornish	Executive Director, Student Housing
	John C. Daly*	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
	Rameen A. Talesh	Assistant Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students
Los Angeles	Maria Blandizzi	Interim Dean of Students
Merced	Charles Nies	Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students
	Brian O'Bruba	Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Life & Director, Center for Career & Professional Advancement
Riverside	Susan Allen-Ortega*	Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs - Health & Wellness
San Diego	Gary Ratcliff	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Life
Santa Barbara	Angela Andrade	Associate Dean, Student Wellness Services
	Debbie Fleming	Senior Associate Dean of Student Life
Santa Cruz	Alma Sifuentes	Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students

Chief of Police		
Berkeley	Margo Bennett*	Chief of Police
Davis	Matthew Carmichael	Chief of Police
Irvine	Paul Henisey* (Retired)	Chief of Police
Los Angeles	James D. Herren*	Chief of Police
Merced	Rita Spaur (Retired)	Chief of Police
Riverside	Mike Lane	Chief of Police
San Diego	David Rose	Chief of Police
San Francisco	Pamela E. Roskowski (Retired)	Chief of Police
Santa Barbara	Dustin Olson	Chief of Police
Santa Cruz	Nader Oweis	Chief of Police

CARE: Advocacy Office for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence and Misconduct (CARE)		
Berkeley	Christine (cici) Ambrosio	Director of Women's Resources and Sexual Harassment/Assault Resource Specialist
	Mari Knuth-Bouracee	Director of Sexual Assault Prevention & Student Advocacy
	Marcia Gee Riley	Ombuds for Students and Post-doctoral Appointees
	Meghan Warner	Undergraduate Student
Davis	Jacquelynn Lira	Victim Advocate, CVPP
	Sarah A. Meredith	Education and Outreach Coordinator, Campus Violence Prevention Program
Irvine	Mandy Mount	Director, Campus Assault Resources and Education
Los Angeles	Nicole Green	Interim Executive Director of CARE and CAPS
	Victoria Molino	CARE Advocate
	Mark Veldkamp	Student Care Manager/Advocate
	Zahabiyah Yamasaki	Assistant Director of CARE at CAPS
Merced	Kari Mansager	Director of Violence Prevention Program
Riverside	Romaine L. Arterberry	Student Affairs Officer
	Rhonda Dixon	Harassment Sexual Assault Resource Service Specialist
San Diego	Jessica Heredia	Assistant Director, Sexual Assault & Violence Prevention Resource Center
	Nancy Wahlig	Director, Sexual Assault & Violence Prevention Resource Center
San Francisco	Denise Caramagno	Confidential CARE Advocate

CARE: Advocacy Office for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence and Misconduct (CARE)		
Santa Barbara	Briana Conway	Assistant Director, Campus Advocacy, Resources & Education Women's Center
	Jill Dunlap*	Director, Campus Advocacy, Resources & Education Women's Center
Santa Cruz	Emily Crutcher	Confidential State Certified Sexual Assault Crisis Coordinator

Student Conduct		
Berkeley	Hallie Hunt*	Director, Center for Student Conduct and Assistant Dean of Students
Davis	Donald Dudley	Director, Student Judicial Affairs
Irvine	Crystal Rae Lugo-Shearer	Director, Office of Student Conduct
Los Angeles	Debra F. Geller	Executive Director, Community Standards
Merced	Le'Trice Curl	Director, Student Life and Judicial Affairs
Riverside	Tasha Yules	Interim Deputy Director, Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs
San Diego	Benjamin White	Director of Student Conduct
San Francisco	Carol Takao	Executive Director of Student Life
Santa Barbara	Suzanne Perkin	Director, Judicial Affairs
Santa Cruz	Ross Maxwell	Assistant Director, Student Conduct
	Lucy Rojas	Interim Judicial Affairs Director
Office of the President	Eric Heng	Assistant Director, Student Services

Title IX		
ANR	Linda Manton	Executive Director for Staff Personnel and Affirmative Action and Title IX Officer
Berkeley	Will Mallari	Assistant Director/Deputy Title IX Officer
	Denise Oldham	Director & Title IX Officer
Davis	Wendi Delmendo*	Chief Compliance Officer/Title IX Compliance Officer
Irvine	Theresa Gerrior-Truman	Senior Investigator/Deputy Title IX Officer
	Kirsten Quanbeck	Director, OEOD, Title IX/Sexual Harassment Officer
Los Angeles	Kathleen Salvaty	Title IX Coordinator
Merced	Wendy Smith	Director of EEO/AA/Title IX & Accommodations Management

Title IX		
Riverside	Debbie L. Artis	Title IX Director
San Diego	Lori Chamberlain*	Title IX Compliance Coordinator/Sexual Harassment Officer
San Francisco	Cristina Perez-Abelson	Director, Equal Employment Opportunity, Affirmative Action & ADA Compliance, Title IX Officer
Santa Barbara	Ricardo A. Alcaino	Director and Title IX Coordinator
Santa Cruz	Tracey Tsugawa*	Title IX Officer
Office of the President	Jennifer Chin	Office of the General Counsel
	Katya Nottie	Title IX Officer/HR
LBNL	Christel Cantlin	Title IX Officer/HR

Adjudication and Sanctions		
Board of Regents	Abraham (Avi) Oved*	Student Regent
Berkeley	Rishi Ahuja (Graduated)	Undergraduate Student
	Margo Bennett*	Chief of Police
	Joseph Defraime Greenwell	Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students
	Hallie Hunt*	Director, Center for Student Conduct and Assistant Dean of Students
	Marcia Gee Riley	Ombuds for Students and Post-doctoral Appointees
	Leah Romm	Undergraduate Student
Davis	Wendi Delmendo*	Chief Compliance Officer/Title IX Compliance Officer
	Donald Dudley	Director, Student Judicial Affairs
	Michael Sweeney	Campus Counsel
Irvine	Mandy Mount	Director, Campus Assault Resources and Education
	Kyhm Penfil	Campus Counsel
Los Angeles	Savannah Badalich (Graduated)	Undergraduate Student
	Lane Dilg	Campus Counsel
	Janina Montero*	Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs
Merced	Luanna Putney*	Associate Chancellor
Riverside	Susan Allen-Ortega*	Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs - Health & Wellness
San Diego	Lori Chamberlain*	Title IX Compliance Coordinator/Sexual Harassment Officer

Adjudication and Sanctions		
	Benjamin White	Director of Student Conduct
Santa Barbara	Jill Dunlap*	Director, Campus Advocacy, Resources & Education Women's Center
Santa Cruz	Tracey Tsugawa*	Interim Judicial Affairs Director
Office of the President	Jennifer Chin	Office of the General Counsel
	Jerlena Griffin-Desta*	Deputy to the Vice President and Executive Director, Student Services
	Eric Heng	Assistant Director, Student Services
	David Lane*	Systemwide Deputy Compliance Officer
	Sheryl Vacca*	Senior Vice President & Chief Compliance and Audit Officer
	Allison Woodall*	Office of the General Counsel

Additional Phase II Work Group Members		
ANR	John Sims	ANR
Berkeley	Andrew Goldblatt	Risk Manager
	Dylan Howser	Coordinator, Fraternity & Sorority Advising and Leadership Development
	Sara Thacker	Ombudsperson
	Brandon Tsubaki	Associate Director, Fraternity & Sorority Advising and Leadership Development
Davis	Lisa Brodkey	Sexual Harassment Officer
	Susan Park	Ombudsperson
Irvine	J. Michael Chennault	Ombudsperson
	Dyan Hall	Work Life and Wellness Program Manager
	Joan Tenma	Academic Affairs
Los Angeles	Ellen Bui	Staff Diversity & Compliance
	Kathy Canul	Ombudsperson
	Kevin Dougherty	Assistant Dean of Students
	Thomas Kosakowski	Ombudsperson
	Petrina Long	Associate Athletic Director
	Roxanne Neal	Director of New Stud & Transition Progs
Merced	Deidre Acker*	Ombudsperson
	Myrla Seibold	CAPS

Additional Phase II Work Group Members		
Riverside	Andrew Larratt-Smith	Ombudsperson
	Elizabeth Mondragon	CAPS
San Diego	John L. Armijo	Ombudsperson
San Francisco	Randy Daron	Ombudsperson
	Leigh Kimberg, MD	HS Clinical Professor of Medicine, UCSF PRIME-US, Program in Medical Education for the Urban Underserved Intimate Partner and Family Violence Prevention, SF DPH
	Patricia O' Sullivan	Director of Research and Development in Medical Education in the UCSF School of Medicine
Santa Barbara	Dawn Arviso	Detective
	Kirsi Aulin	Ombudsperson
	Cathy Farley	Assistant Chief of Police
	Carol Saucedo	Sr. Training and Education Analyst
Santa Cruz	Cliff Dochterman	Athletic Director
	Cliff Golz	Student Conduct Officer
	Mary Knudtson	Executive Director of Student Health Center
Office of the President	Marie-Ann Hairston	Systemwide Employee Relations Director
	Mary Anne Rasmussen	Systemwide Talent Management Director
	Donna Salvo	Executive Director, Talent Management

Appendix B. Glossary

Adjudication

Process of deciding or resolving a dispute between two parties.

ASCA

Association for Student Conduct Administration, whose mission is to support higher education professionals by providing education materials and resources, professional development opportunities, and a network of colleagues.

Campus

Any UC location (e.g., campus, medical center, Office of the President) or the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab and Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Campus SaVE Act

Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act; an amendment to the Clery Act that requires higher education institutions to increase transparency about the scope of sexual violence on campus, guarantee victims enhanced rights, provide for standards in institutional conduct proceedings, and provide campus community wide prevention educational programming.

CARE: Advocacy Office for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence and Misconduct (CARE)

This office focuses on sexual misconduct and is charged with providing confidential advocacy, participating in case management of reported complaints, assisting with providing professional training in coordination with key stakeholders, and providing input regarding policy creation and revision.

CARE serves as the primary point of contact for all complainants, if desired by the complainants, of sexual misconduct, and other members of the University community who receive reports of sexual misconduct will take proactive steps to refer the complainants to CARE.

Case Management Team

A team—comprised of student conduct, Title IX, campus police, advocacy and other subject matter experts as needed—maintains consistent coordination of reported cases, provides case management for all ongoing cases, ensures all cases are addressed efficiently and effectively, and coordinate communications with claimant and respondent. The Title IX Officer provides oversight of this team function.

Complainant

Includes a survivor, victim, and someone who files a report of sexual misconduct.

Clery Act

Jeanne Clery Act is a federal law that requires colleges and universities across the United States to disclose information about certain crime statistics on and around their campuses.

Clery Coordinator

A campus officer responsible for ensuring compliance under the Jeanne Clery Act, which includes collecting, maintaining, and reporting campus crime statistics to Department of Education.

Consent

Consent is informed. Consent is an affirmative, unambiguous, and conscious decision by each participant to engage in mutually agreed-upon sexual activity.

Consent is voluntary. It must be given without coercion, force, threats, or intimidation. Consent means positive cooperation in the act or expression of intent to engage in the act pursuant to an exercise of free will. Silence does not mean consent.

Consent is revocable. Consent to some form of sexual activity does not imply consent to other forms of sexual activity. Consent to sexual activity on one occasion is not consent to engage in sexual activity on another occasion. A current or previous dating or sexual relationship, by itself, is not sufficient to constitute consent. Even in the context of a relationship, there must be mutual consent to engage in sexual activity. Consent must be ongoing throughout a sexual encounter and can be revoked at any time. Once consent is withdrawn, the sexual activity must stop immediately.

Consent cannot be given when a person is incapacitated. A person cannot consent if they are unconscious or coming in and out of consciousness. A person cannot consent if they are under the threat of violence, bodily injury or other forms of coercion. A person cannot consent if their understanding of the act is affected by a physical or mental impairment.

Coordinated Community Review Team (CCRT)

Brings together a cross-section of campus and community constituents to guide the campus in preventing and responding to sexual misconduct at a campus level. The team is responsible for a campus collaborative approach to address sexual misconduct, and focuses on developing and reviewing policies, developing community relations (internal and external), discussing legal updates, providing cross training, and coordinating communication and prevention education and outreach efforts. The designated individual from each campus will provide oversight for this team and this team will report to the Chancellor (or designee).

Dating Violence

Abuse committed by a person who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the complainant and is determined by length and type of relationship and the frequency of interactions.

Dear Colleague Letter

Guidance issued by the Office for Civil Rights on April 4, 2011 to assist colleges and universities with meeting their obligations under Title IX and to provide members of the public with information about their rights.

Domestic Violence

Abuse committed against an adult or minor child who is a spouse or former spouse, cohabitant or former cohabitant, or someone with whom the abuser has a child, has an existing dating or engagement relationship, or has had a former dating or engagement relationship. It can be physical, sexual, emotional, economic, or psychological.

ED

U.S. Department of Education, whose mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

DOJ

Department of Justice, whose mission is to enforce the law and defend the interests of the U.S., ensure public safety, prevent and control crime, and ensure justice for all Americans.

Governance

Oversees the principles and program, ensures compliance and provides high-level strategic direction (the “what”).

Incapacitation

Defined as the physical and/or mental inability to make informed, rational judgments. States of incapacitation include, but are not limited to, unconsciousness, sleep, and blackouts. Where alcohol, drugs or other medication are involved, incapacitation is defined with respect to how the alcohol or other drugs consumed affects a person’s decision-making capacity, awareness of consequences, ability to make fully informed judgments, and inability to communicate.

Being intoxicated by drugs, alcohol or other medication does not absolve one’s responsibility to obtain consent. The factors to be considered when determining whether consent was given include whether the respondent knew, or whether a reasonable person should have known, that the complainant was incapacitated.

LGBTQI

Individuals who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, Intersex.

OCR

Office for Civil Rights, within the DOJ, whose mission is to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation through vigorous enforcement of civil rights.

Ombuds

The Office of the Ombudsman provides a safe and comfortable environment to discuss complaints, concerns or problems confidentially. When appropriate, the office initiates an informal intervention with the goal of facilitating a resolution that is acceptable to all parties involved.

The ombudsman acts as an independent, impartial resource. If a matter cannot be resolved through our office, a referral will be made. When appropriate, the office can make recommendations regarding policy review and change. The Office of the Ombudsman serves all students, faculty, staff, and administrators of the campus community.

Ongoing Prevention and Awareness Campaigns

Programming, initiatives, and strategies that are sustained over time and focus on increasing understanding of topics relevant to and skills addressing dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual violence, and stalking, using a range of strategies with audiences throughout the institution.

Operations

Each unit must implement the program as appropriate, in accordance with management directives (drives toward the “what” with the “how”).

Police

Campus police are sworn police officers employed by a public school district, college or university to protect the campus and surrounding areas and the people who live on, work on and visit it. Campus police officers are commissioned through their state Peace Officer Standards and Training after completing established training and pre-licensure preparation. A university police officer has equivalent authority as a municipal or state peace officer. Funding for campus police are provided by the universities.

Primary Prevention Programs

Programming, initiatives, and strategies informed by research or assessed for value, effectiveness or outcome that are intended to stop dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual violence, and stalking before they occur through the promotion of positive and healthy behaviors that foster healthy, mutually respectful relationships and sexually, encouraging safe bystander intervention, and seek to change behavior and social norms in health and safe directions.

PSA

Public Service Announcement/Ad; messages in the public interest disseminated by the media with the objective of raising awareness and changing public attitudes and behaviors toward a social issue.

Records and information management

Policy, regulations, and general principles for appropriately managing, accessing, and preserving administrative records throughout their lifecycle and schedules for their final disposition

Respondent

A person against whom a report of sexual misconduct is filed.

Response Model Teams

The response model consists of two teams. 1. A case management team that includes, at a minimum, student conduct, Title IX, campus police and advocacy; team will meet regularly. 2. A team responsible for a campus collaborative approach to addressing sexual violence; to ensure success the team must include key stakeholders across the campus and community.

Sexual Assault

Any type of sexual contact or behavior that occurs without the explicit consent of the recipient. This includes, but is not limited to, forced sexual intercourse, fondling, and attempted rape.

Sexual Harassment

Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature. It is conduct that explicitly or implicitly affects a person's employment or education or interferes with a person's work or educational performance or creates an environment such that a reasonable person would find the conduct intimidating, hostile or offensive.

Sexual Misconduct

Includes dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual violence, and stalking.

Sexual Violence

Physical sexual acts engaged without the consent of the other person or when the other person is unable to consent to the activity.

Stalking

When a person repeatedly engages in conduct directed at a specific person that places that person in reasonable fear of his or her safety or the safety of others.

Student Advocate

A student who has the experience, skills, and knowledge to train students on how to recognize and address sexual misconduct and provide advice and assistance to survivors of sexual misconduct (dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual violence, and stalking).

Student Conduct Officer

University Official responsible for handing resolution meetings or conduct reviews with an individual alleged to have violated the Code of Conduct and to assign or recommend sanctions.

Title IX Officer

The designated coordinator or agent of the University with the responsibility for coordinating University Title IX compliance efforts.

Trauma-Informed Approach

Services designed to acknowledge the impact of violence and trauma on people's lives and the importance of addressing trauma in education. A Trauma-Informed Approach realizes the widespread impact of trauma and understands potential paths for recovery; recognizes the signs and symptoms of trauma in clients, families, staff, and others involved with the system; responds by fully integrating knowledge about trauma into policies, procedures, and practices; and seeks to actively resist re-traumatization.

Trauma-Informed Services

Trauma-informed services are those in which service delivery is influenced by an understanding of the impact of interpersonal violence and victimization on an individual's life and development. To provide trauma-informed services, all staff of an organization, from the receptionist to the direct care workers to the board of directors, must understand how violence impacts the lives of the people being served, so that every interaction is consistent with the recovery process and reduces the possibility of re-traumatization.

VAWA

The Violence Against Women Act is a federal law meant to improve the criminal justice response to violence against woman.

University of California Policy On Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence

Policy that applies to all UC employees and students at its campuses and University programs and activities and furthers the University's commitment to compliance with the law and to the higher standards of ethical conduct