Empowered Consent Prevention Program: Evaluation & Assessment Analysis – 3-Year Report

Professor Dana Cuomo, Professor Susan Hannan, & Lucy McShane '25

This report is part of the Gender-Based Violence (GBV) Research Lab Whitepaper Series, a collection of reports produced by Professor Dana Cuomo (Women's, Gender and Sexuality Studies) and Professor Susan Hannan (Psychology).

The GBV Research Lab is a feminist research lab with interdisciplinary research projects centered on examining and addressing issues of gender-based violence at Lafayette College and across the Lehigh Valley.

The GBV Research Lab also prioritizes training Lafayette students in feminist and community-based research design, methods and analysis.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Introduction

This longitudinal project coordinated the evaluation and assessment of the ***Empowered Consent: Preventing Sexual Assault, Relationship Violence and Stalking at Lafayette College*** prevention program.

The Empowered Consent program is an **evidence-based prevention program** that is delivered each fall semester to first year students shortly after their arrival to campus. Developed by members of the GBV Research Lab during the 2020-2021 academic year, the Empowered Consent program is facilitated by [Peer Anti-Violence Educators](#) (PAVE) under the supervision of the [Director of Student Advocacy and Prevention](#).

This project's primary objectives were to analyze and interpret assessment data for the Empowered Consent program over multiple years in order to: 1) establish an evidence-based sexual misconduct prevention program, 2) tailored to Lafayette College, 3) in support of a campus culture working to become free of sexual assault, relationship violence, stalking and harassment. In what follows, we provide a three-year synopsis of this data, which draws on previous annual reports.

Following three years of consistent and positive findings, the GBV Research Lab will no longer collect and analyze assessment data for this program. The Empowered Consent program will continue to be delivered to first year students, and the GBV Research Lab has provided the program's survey instruments to the Office of Student Advocacy and Prevention for future assessment efforts.

Summary of Findings

As an overview of the information contained within this report, we begin by highlighting the primary findings from the Empowered Consent program assessment data. Each subsequent section of this report provides additional information detailing the following:

❖ An overwhelming majority of participants found the Empowered Consent program helpful and important

❖ Most participants felt more confident in giving and getting consent and became more familiar with Lafayette's resources after the training

❖ Many participants reported being more likely to intervene in harmful situations using the bystander intervention strategies that they learned during the training

❖ While most participants found the program helpful, some felt certain content was repetitive, and some disliked role-play activities and high participation demands

❖ Many participants reported using skills learned in the program in real-life situations, including communicating consent, supporting peers who experienced sexual assault, relationship violence, or stalking, and bystander intervention

❖ In the months following the training, 34 participants reported experiencing sexual assault, relationship violence, or stalking on campus. An additional 43 participants reported experiencing a specific behavior (e.g., coercion or pressure to engage in sexual activity) that fits the definition of sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking. These disclosures highlight the risk of the 'Red Zone' - the time period between when a first-year student arrives on campus through Thanksgiving break when they are most at risk for experiencing sexual assault

❖ Participants believed that Lafayette takes harassment and inclusion seriously, but they were less confident in Lafayette's ability to respond effectively

Background

National Context

In 2011, the Obama Administration's Department of Education Office of Civil Rights distributed a "Dear Colleague Letter" with guidance on the responsibility of federally funded schools, including colleges, to respond to campus sexual misconduct.

The guidance reinforced federal requirements such as having a Title IX coordinator, implementing clear grievance procedures, conducting impartial investigations within prompt time frames, and providing notification of investigation outcomes.

While the reporting and investigative components of Title IX compliance largely occupied the attention of both college administrators and public discussion, the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter also charged colleges with proactively preventing sexual misconduct by implementing education programs and making available comprehensive survivor services.

Colleges without robust sexual misconduct prevention programs and survivor services worked to meet the Office of Civil Rights' guidance, and a flurry of survivor advocate, prevention coordinator and Title IX coordinator positions were advertised across the US in the years following the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter.

Notably, the guidance provided within the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter for education programming was fundamentally basic, encouraging colleges to incorporate orientation programs for new students, faculty, staff and employees and to provide programming for specific campus populations, including student RAs, student-athletes and coaches.

Guidance regarding content for such education programs largely centered on providing general definitions of sexual harassment and sexual violence, information on policies and disciplinary procedures, and the consequences of violating these policies.

Although informative, this content is educational and not necessarily preventative.

Despite acknowledging that efforts to prevent sexual misconduct are as essential as a college's response to reports following incidents that have already occurred, the allocation of resources within many colleges continues to prioritize the reporting and adjudication process over comprehensive prevention programming.

As colleges without established sexual misconduct resources worked to meet the basic education requirements outlined in the Dear Colleague Letter, other higher education institutions with decades-old "Women's Centers" (renamed "Gender Equity Centers" in recent years), already established "Violence Prevention Coordinator" positions and tested models of utilizing peer health educators to deliver programs raised the standard for what constitutes comprehensive prevention programming and survivor support services.

Although federal guidance has shifted with subsequent administrations, **the 2011 Dear Colleague Letter arguably continues to guide the spirit in which colleges address sexual misconduct on campus, including its emphasis on the role of prevention programming in reducing campus sexual misconduct.**

Related, the last fifteen years has seen an explosion of multidisciplinary research in the field of prevention education, with a robust body of literature evaluating sexual misconduct prevention programs on college campuses. Prevention educators have access to evidence-based research focused on every facet of prevention education, from primary and secondary prevention, to effective delivery modalities, to the implementation of program evaluation and assessment measures.

Lafayette College Context

We began this project in 2020 alongside nation-wide discussions concerning gendered and racialized violence occurring across the US. These are old conversations, particularly for groups directly impacted, that are extending further into public discourse as a result of new technologies, such as social media.

While not reflective of every influence, the foci of the #MeToo and Time's Up movements on addressing sexual violence and the #BlackLivesMatter movement on eradicating white supremacy plays a role in inspiring activism that works to challenge long-standing systems of oppression and patterns of structural inequality that disproportionately impact historically marginalized people.

The acknowledgement of how direct and indirect forms of violence accompany sexism and white supremacy has also trickled into localized conversations, including at Lafayette. **Largely driven by student activism and in response to specific incidents of violence and a history of systemic injustices within the institution, our campus has seen a reinforced call for change in recent years.**

The formation of student groups like Pards Against Sexual Assault (PASA) and Dear Lafayette, the establishment of awareness raising social media campaigns like the anti.violence.laf and black.at.laf Instagram accounts, and the gathering of survey data to detail what it might mean to "abolish Greek Life", all point to a building and sustained effort by students to disrupt the harms caused by intersecting systems of oppression.

As an institution of higher education that struggles with how to effectively acknowledge, disrupt and prevent systemic oppression, Lafayette is not unique. However, Lafayette's history as a private liberal arts college that predominantly centered on serving the needs and experiences of upper-class white men also cannot be ignored.

As a campus that only admitted women students in the last fifty years, that has historically struggled to meaningfully recruit, enroll, retain and graduate students of color, that ranked the most homophobic college in the country as recently as 1992, and which was largely out of reach of students without financial means to attend, the institution wrestles with the tension of its exclusionary past and its goals for a more inclusive future.

With appreciation that any student can experience sexual assault, relationship violence and stalking, the students who are disproportionately vulnerable to experience sexual misconduct – women and LGBTQ+ students – are also some of the most historically marginalized on campus.

Related, the students who are most likely to perpetrate sexual misconduct – men involved in Greek Life and athletics – are some of the most historically privileged on campus.

Prevention Programming at Lafayette

Historically, sexual misconduct prevention programming at Lafayette College has been under-resourced, inconsistent and ad hoc. Lafayette established its first full-time staff position dedicated to prevention programming and advocacy support services for students in 2021. Prior to this position, student groups - including Pards Against Sexual Assault - were largely responsible for designing and delivering prevention programs to their peers.

While peer education is a nationally recognized best practice approach for prevention programming and PASA's dedication to this work was remarkable, relying on volunteer and unsupervised student labor resulted in inconsistent programming, burnt out student leaders, and an institution without a long-term strategic plan for preventing sexual misconduct on its campus.

The lack of institutional support for sexual misconduct prevention programming cannot be disentangled from the college's historic privileging of some students over others, and is connected to how decisions are made regarding the allocation of resources - including staffing and budgets – across all divisions, programs/departments, centers and other entities on campus.

It is this national and local context that motivated this project.

Methodology

The Empowered Consent program is a 75-minute, peer-led, interactive, discussion-based prevention program. Each session is facilitated by two peer educators and delivered to small groups of 25-40 students.

The program includes 5 learning objectives: 1) Identify our community's shared values; 2) Understand power dynamics at Lafayette; 3) Learn about communicating consent; 4) Practice bystander intervention skills; and 5) Identify where to seek resources and support.

To support these learning objectives, the program's modules focus on building awareness of the qualities of healthy/unhealthy relationships, what constitutes rape culture and consent, practicing skills around bystander intervention and how to respond to a peer disclosure of sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking. The program concludes with an overview of local and campus support resources.

We used two survey assessments to evaluate the program. Both were anonymous, administered through Qualtrics, and included quantitative and qualitative questions.

The first assessment occurred immediately after the program concluded: participants received a QR code to complete a survey that asked them to provide information about what they learned during the program and aspects of the program that they found most and least helpful (see Appendix A).

The second assessment occurred approximately 3-6 months later, when participants were invited via email by the Dean of Advising to complete a survey that assessed information that they had retained from the program and skills that they had used since attending the program.

The follow up survey also included questions to assist in evaluating the campus climate regarding sexual assault and prompted students to provide feedback regarding what additional information or resources would be helpful and how future iterations of the program might be improved (see Appendix B). Those who participated were given the opportunity to enter a raffle to win one of two $25 Amazon gift cards.

While the program's content has remained consistent, there were minor changes made to the timing of the program's delivery and follow-up survey following Year 1.

The first delivery of the Empowered Consent program occurred during First Year Orientation (FYO). The entire class of 2025 - as well as transfer students - received the program in one day, delivered by pairs of volunteer peer educators, who each facilitated the program three times to small groups of first year students. The follow up survey was sent 3 months later at the end of the fall semester.

While there were benefits to delivering the program during FYO to all participants on the same day, there were also logistical challenges that made this schedule difficult to replicate in subsequent years. **Following feedback from both peer educators and student participants, the program's delivery shifted in 2022 and 2023 and occurred throughout the first 8 weeks of the fall semester.** Under this staggered program delivery schedule, the follow up survey was distributed in late February, approximately 3 months after the final sessions were delivered.

In what follows, we present findings from data collected over three years (2021, 2022, and 2023). To provide a comprehensive overview, we have aggregated the data from all three years into a single dataset for analysis. We report the findings from the immediate and follow-up surveys separately. Before each section, we provide a brief summary of our approach to analyzing both the quantitative and qualitative data.

Assessment Participation

Table 1. Assessment Participation

Program Year	Class Year	FTFY	Transfer Students	Total Eligible	Attended Program	Immediate: Provided Informed Consent	Immediate: Started Survey	Follow-up: Provided Informed Consent	Follow-up: Started survey
Year 1: Fall 2021	2025	782	17	799	799	333	271	101	98
Year 2: Fall 2022	2026	757	19	776	578	498	419	105	103
Year 3: Fall 2023	2027	697	19	697	318	272	227	59	57
Totals		2,236	55	2,272	1,695	1,103	917	265	258

Notes: FTFY = First-time, first-year student; 'Immediate' refers to the assessment survey immediately given after the program; 'Follow-up' refers to the assessment survey that was emailed to participants 3-6 months after completing the program.

Year 1 (Fall 2021): Formal attendance was not taken during Year 1 of the program. However, the program took place during FYO, which all FTFY and transfer students were required to attend.

Year 2 (Fall 2022): The program was no longer held during FYO and was instead overseen by the Office of the Student Advocate and Prevention Coordinator. Students attended the program in their LEO groups (they were given a specific day/time to attend). The program took place between 9/11/2022 – 10/27/2022.

Year 3 (Fall 2023): Participation during Year 3 of the program was likely negatively affected by the departure of the Student Advocate and Prevention Coordinator. Transfer students did not participate during Year 3. FTFY students did not participate in the program through their LEO groups; instead, they selected a time slot that worked best for them. The program took place between 9/10/2023 – 10/01/2023.

Immediate Survey: Quantitative Data Analysis

Quantitative variables – along with demographic variables – were analyzed using JASP, an open-source statistics program.

Participant demographic information (listed from most to least frequent):

Gender Identity of Participants (N = 886):
- **Women:** 461 participants (52.03%)
- **Men:** 385 participants (43.45%)
- **Genderqueer:** 8 participants (0.90%)
- **Non-binary:** 8 participants (0.90%)
- **Gender-nonconforming:** 4 participants (0.45%)
- **Genderfluid:** 2 participants (0.23%)
- **Agender:** 1 participant (0.11%)
- **Two-spirit:** 1 participant (0.11%)
- **Self-described:** 2 participants (0.23%)
- **Prefer not to say:** 14 participants (1.58%)

Sexual Orientation of Participants (N = 871):
- **Heterosexual/Straight:** 604 participants (69.35%)
- **Bisexual:** 101 participants (11.60%)
- **Asexual:** 42 participants (4.82%)
- **Questioning:** 25 participants (2.87%)
- **Lesbian:** 18 participants (2.07%)
- **Pansexual:** 16 participants (1.84%)
- **Queer:** 16 participants (1.84%)
- **Gay:** 15 participants (1.72%)
- **Self-described:** 3 participants (0.34%)
- **Prefer not to say:** 31 participants (3.56%)

Transgender Identification of Participants (N = 884):
- **Did not identify as transgender:** 856 participants (96.83%)
- **Identified as transgender:** 12 participants (1.36%)
- **Prefer not to say:** 16 participants (1.81%)

Race/Ethnicity of Participants (N = 851):
- **Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American:** 576 participants (67.68%)
- **East Asian or Asian American:** 48 participants (5.64%)
- **Multiple races/ethnicities:** 44 participants (5.04%)
- **Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American:** 46 participants (5.40%)
- **Latino/a/x or Hispanic American:** 46 participants (5.40%)
- **Self-described race/ethnicity:** 20 participants (2.35%)
- **South Asian or Indian American:** 15 participants (1.76%)
- **Middle Eastern or Arab American:** 12 participants (1.41%)
- **Native American or Alaskan Native:** 3 participants (.35%)
- **Prefer not to say:** 41 participants (4.82%)

Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were conducted to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in participants' knowledge before and after the training. The analyses revealed the following results:

1. Results indicated that participants felt significantly more confident in knowing how to give and get consent in an intimate encounter after attending the training (M = 4.56, SD = .81) than before (M = 4.05, SD = .89), z(916) = -17.12, p < .001. A matched rank biserial correlation was used to determine the size of the effect, which was large (-.918). **This indicates that almost all participants reported an increase in confidence levels from before to after the training.**

2. Results also indicated that participants reported significantly greater familiarity with Lafayette resources for responding to sexual assault, relationship violence, and stalking after attending the training (M = 4.36, SD = .69) than before (M = 3.09, SD = 1.08), z(915) = -22.87, p < .001. A matched rank biserial correlation was used to determine the size of the effect, which was large (-.978). **This indicates that almost all participants reported an increase in familiarity levels with Lafayette resources from before to after the training.**

3. Finally, results indicated that participants felt significantly more likely to intervene (e.g., by using a bystander strategy) if they witnessed someone else being harassed or harmed after attending the training (M = 4.52, SD = .64) than before (M = 3.98, SD = .87), z(916) = -17.77, p < .001. A matched rank biserial correlation was used to determine the size of the effect, which was large (-.980). **This indicates that almost all participants reported an increase in reported likelihood to intervene from before to after the training.**

Notes:
Response options for #1 were: 1 (very unconfident), 2 (unconfident), 3 (neutral), 4 (confident), 5 (very confident).
Response options for #2 were: 1 (very unfamiliar), 2 (unfamiliar), 3 (neutral), 4 (familiar), 5 (very familiar).
Response options for #3 were: 1 (very unlikely), 2 (unlikely), 3 (neither likely nor unlikely), 4 (likely), 5 (very likely).
Participants knowledge *before the training* was assessed retrospectively (i.e., participants were asked after the training to reflect on and rate their knowledge prior to the training).

The table below provides participant frequency information in response to the question, "*How helpful did you find the following sections of today's training?*":

Table 2. Frequencies with Valid Percent in Parentheses

	Very unhelpful	Unhelpful	Neither unhelpful nor helpful	Helpful	Very helpful	Average (SD)
Identifying our community's shared values	10 (1.09%)	14 (1.53%)	121 (13.20%)	492 (53.65%)	280 (30.53%)	4.11 (.76)
Definitions of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking	11 (1.20%)	11 (1.20%)	75 (8.21%)	434 (47.48%)	383 (41.90%)	4.28 (.76)
Party culture/debunking college drinking myths	10 (1.10%)	12 (1.31%)	112 (12.27%)	439 (48.08%)	340 (37.24%)	4.19 (.78)
Rape culture/power dynamics related to sexual misconduct	9 (.98%)	6 (.66%)	65 (7.11%)	438 (47.92%)	396 (43.33%)	4.32 (.72)
Communicating consent	7 (.77%)	7 (.77%)	53 (5.80%)	410 (44.91%)	436 (47.75%)	4.38 (.70)
Practice being an active bystander	8 (.88%)	3 (.33%)	59 (6.47%)	384 (42.10%)	458 (50.22%)	4.40 (.70)
Unhelpful/helpful reactions to sexual misconduct disclosure	8 (.88%)	12 (1.32%)	58 (6.37%)	371 (40.72%)	462 (50.71%)	4.39 (.74)
Where to seek resources and support	8 (.88%)	1 (.11%)	37 (4.06%)	373 (40.94%)	492 (54.01%)	4.47 (.66)

Note: SD = standard deviation; Response options were: 1 = very unhelpful, 2 = unhelpful, 3 = neither unhelpful nor helpful, 4 = helpful,, 5 = very helpful

Immediate Survey: Qualitative Data Analysis

The immediate survey also included three short answer prompts:
1. What was most helpful or interesting to you about this training?
2. What was least helpful or interesting to you about this training?
3. Please use the space below to provide any additional feedback/comments you have about the training.

We developed 32 inductive codes (see Appendix C) to qualitatively analyze thematic content from the responses to the above three questions. We used the qualitative software program Atlas.ti to support the qualitative analysis, which included developing inductive codes to analyze thematic content from the qualitative responses.

Across the three time points, 726 participants submitted responses to at least one of the three short answer prompts in the immediate survey.

Most Helpful/Interesting

In response to the first prompt, **three primary themes** emerged from participant responses as participants highlighted the **knowledge** and **skills** that they learned during the training, and the aspects of the **program design** that they found helpful or interesting.

Knowledge

Reinforcing the Empowered Consent learning modules and the quantitative data above, participants identified **six thematic areas** of information presented during the training as helpful and interesting: FRIES/Consent; Resources, Data and Statistics, the "Red Zone", Rape Culture, and Mandated Reporting:

➤ *FRIES/Consent*: Regarding consent, participants identified that the information presented about consent was helpful in a variety of ways. Participants specifically mentioned "FRIES" in their responses, an acronym introduced during the training to introduce nuance to the discussion of consent, teaching participants that consent is **F**reely Given, **R**eversible, **I**nformed, **E**nthusiastic, and **S**pecific. Participants explained that the acronym was useful in helping them to remember this information. Participants also explained they found it helpful that the program discussed the concept of consent as relevant to intimate relationships and our everyday interactions too.

➤ *Resources*: Regarding resources, participants identified that receiving information about available support resources, including the availability of confidential resources and where to find those resources as helpful.

➤ *Data and Statistics:* Participants identified two areas of data presented during the presentation as helpful: data focused on alcohol consumption and data focused on prevalence of GBV. Participants identified information provided about alcohol and drinking culture at Lafayette as helpful, specifically information that "debunked" myths about "party culture" (e.g.: "*Knowing how little first year students drink at Lafayette*"). Participants found the data provided about GBV on campus helpful as well, specifically the content from the anti.violence Instagram account.

➤ *Red Zone:* Participants also identified learning about the "Red Zone" – the period lasting from when a first-year student arrives to campus to Thanksgiving break, when they are at increased risk to experience sexual assault – as helpful.

➤ *Rape Culture*: Participants also identified that the information provided about rape culture, including the "Iceberg model" and the need to address the "root of the problem" as helpful.

➤ *Mandated Reporting*: Students also identified that the information provided about mandating reporting was helpful, specifically information that clarified who on campus is a mandated reporter and who is not.

"Learning a bit about consent outside of sexual relations"
-Participant

"Consent outside of [the] bedroom"
-Participant

"The sheer amount of resources available to students in case of any event that takes place."
-Participant

"The statistic about the Red Zone was helpful so I can be more aware."
-Participant

"The discussion of rape culture on campus. It's normally swept under the rug, so it's good that it was directly addressed and condemned."
-Participant

In response to the first prompt, **three primary themes** emerged from participant responses as participants highlighted the **knowledge** and **skills** that they learned during the training, and the aspects of the **program design** that they found helpful or interesting.

Skills
Participant responses also highlighted **three thematic areas** of skill-based information from the Empowered Consent training that they found to be helpful or interesting: Responding to Disclosures, Bystander Intervention and Asking For/Giving Consent:

➢ *Responding to Disclosures*: Participants identified that learning how to respond to disclosures, including specific examples of what to say and what not to say, was a helpful component of the training. For example, a participant explained, "*Ways to extend compassion and empathy when a friend disclose[s] something to you*". Participants also noted specific tactics that they had not realized before the training would be important when responding to a disclosure, such as active listening, keeping the focus on the person disclosing, remaining calm and not over promising.

➢ *Bystander Intervention*: Participants also identified that learning how to intervene as an active bystander, including different tactics for intervention, was a helpful component of the training. In particular, participants noted that tactics focused on intervening in "subtle" ways, like creating a distraction, were useful. Participants also highlighted that the practice-based elements of the training that allowed them to see skills being modeled were also useful.

➢ *Asking For/Giving Consent*: Participants also identified that learning different strategies and tactics for giving and getting consent was also a useful component of the Empowered Consent training. Participants explained that the suggestions were realistic and normalized communication around consent.

"*Learning how to properly listen to someone who is disclosing*"
                    -*Participant*

"*I didn't realize that I needed to stay calm when a victim shares their story*"
                    -*Participant*

"*That you shouldn't tell a victim everything is going to be okay, when you don't know that.*"
                    -*Participant*

"*Ways to obtain consent in a way that isn't awkward or forced.*"
                    -*Participant*

In response to the first prompt, **three primary themes** emerged from participant responses as participants highlighted the **knowledge** and **skills** that they learned during the training, and the aspects of the **program design** that they found helpful or interesting.

Program Design
Participant responses also highlighted **two primary themes** related to the program design that they found to be helpful or interesting: that the program was interactive and included realistic examples:

➢ *Interactive:* Regarding the program design, students found the interactive components of the program to be helpful and interesting, specifically that the program included group discussions and roleplaying scenarios with the facilitators modeling various skills introduced during the training. For example, a participant explained, "*Talking in groups about how we would handle different situations. It gave different perspectives and helped bounce different ideas off of each other.*"

➢ *Realistic Examples*: Although related to the theme described immediately above concerning the interactive components of the training, participants specifically explained that the program design incorporated realistic examples, and that they found these "real life" examples helpful.

"*I liked their acting out scenarios of what to do and what not to do in sexual assault cases*" and "*The scenarios that helped us act how we would react in situations that we may encounter*"

-Participant

"*I liked getting actual examples and getting to discuss.*"

-Participant

Least Helpful/Interesting

Four themes emerged from participant responses to the prompt of what they found least helpful or interesting:

➢ *Nothing/All Useful*: The **most common** participant responses to this prompt were N/A, "*nothing*" or "*It was all useful*", indicating that many participants found the entirety of the training helpful.

➢ For participants who identified specific aspects of the program that were unhelpful or not interesting, three themes emerged: content from the program, repetitive information and the program format:

➢ *Content*: Regarding content from the program that participants found unhelpful or not interesting, the most common responses referenced the various definitions or statistics that were introduced in the program, such as GBV definitions or alcohol-related statistics pertaining to party culture. Participants also identified the brief section of the program that established "community values" as unhelpful.

➢ *Repetitive Information*: Participants also explained that the Empowered Consent program was repetitive to information they have already received about these topics. This included participants who explained that they had learned similar content before enrolling at Lafayette, specifically definitions of consent and how to give/get consent. For example, a participant explained, "*Learning about consent because I've already learned about it*." Participants also explained that content from the Empowered Consent program was repetitive to the required online training they completed during the summer before arriving to campus and/or was presented during FYO programming. Participants referenced alcohol statistics, consent definitions, GBV definitions and support resources as specific areas of repetitive information to previous Lafayette programming. Although notably, when identifying repetitive programming as unhelpful, participants also acknowledged the information was important.

➢ *Program Format*: Participants identified aspects related to the program format and program delivery as unhelpful or uninteresting, including the roleplay and scenarios, the lack of participant engagement, and the program's length (too long) and high level of active participation required.

"It was all useful."
-Participant

"Learning about consent because I've already learned about it."
-Participant

"Repeated information from orientation, though I understand its importance."
-Participant

Additional Qualitative Information

Participants were also offered the opportunity to provide additional feedback and/or comments about the training. Most responses offered words of appreciation for offering the program, positive feedback directed toward the peer educators who facilitated the program, and reiterating that the content was helpful.

Participants also used this prompt as an opportunity to identify additional content that they would like to see included in the program, such as discussing other substances beyond alcohol when discussing consent and more information about repercussions for those who perpetrate gender-based violence.

It was very good and thank you for educating students about important information about consent and sexual assault"
-Participant

"Great presenters!"
-Participant

"Everything was very informative"
-Participant

Follow-up Survey: Quantitative Data Analysis

As a reminder, 'Follow-up' refers to the assessment survey that was emailed to participants 3-6 months after completing the program.

Quantitative variables – along with demographic variables – were analyzed using JASP, an open-source statistics program.

Participant demographic information (listed from most to least frequent):

Gender Identity of Participants (N = 212):
- **Women:** 145 participants (68.40%)
- **Men:** 61 participants (28.77%)
- **Gender-nonconforming:** 2 participants (0.94%)
- **Genderqueer:** 1 participant (0.47%)
- **Self-described:** 1 participant (0.47%)
- **Prefer not to say:** 2 participants (.94%)

Sexual Orientation of Participants (N = 211):
- **Heterosexual/Straight:** 136 participants (64.45%)
- **Bisexual:** 29 participants (13.74%)
- **Questioning:** 10 participants (4.74%)
- **Queer:** 9 participants (4.26%)
- **Asexual:** 8 participants (3.79%)
- **Pansexual:** 5 participants (2.37%)
- **Lesbian:** 4 participants (1.90%)
- **Gay:** 2 participants (.95%)
- **Prefer not to say:** 8 participants (3.79%)

Race/Ethnicity of Participants (N = 203):
- **Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American:** 148 participants (72.91%)
- **Multiple races/ethnicities:** 13 participants (6.39%)
- **Latino/a/x or Hispanic American:** 11 participants (5.42%)
- **South Asian or Indian American:** 8 participants (3.94%)
- **East Asian or Asian American:** 7 participants (3.45%)
- **Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American:** 6 participants (2.96%)
- **Middle Eastern or Arab American:** 3 participants (1.48%)
- **Self-described race/ethnicity:** 3 participants (1.48%)
- **Prefer not to say:** 4 participants (1.94%)

Transgender Identification of Participants (N = 212):
- **Did not identify as transgender:** 208 participants (98.11%)
- **Prefer not to say:** 4 participants (1.89%)

Self-Reported Experiences of Sexual Misconduct Since Prevention Training:

Participants were asked, **"*During the training, you were introduced to Lafayette's definitions of sexual assault, relationship violence and stalking. Since attending the training, have you experienced anything that you think fits one of those definitions?*"**
o 34 participants replied "Yes" (16.19%)
o 164 participants replied "No" (78.09%)
o 12 participants replied "Unsure" (5.71%)

Participants were also asked, **"*Since attending the training, have any of the following behaviors been directed at you? (check all that apply).*"** Participants were given the following response options:
❏ Control or manipulation within a relationship
❏ Monitoring or surveillance within a relationship, including with technology
❏ Unequal power dynamics within a relationship
❏ Physical abuse within a relationship
❏ Coercion or pressure to engage in sexual activity
❏ Sexual activity that happened without consent
❏ Sexual activity in which you could not consent due to intoxication
❏ Other (short answer fill in option)

43 participants responded to the question above (i.e., checked at least one box). The most frequently checked responses included the following:
o 12 participants (25.53%) endorsed "coercion or pressure to engage in sexual activity"
o 9 participants (19.15%) endorsed "other"
o 6 participants (12.77%) endorsed "sexual activity that happened without consent"

Post-Training Use of Support Resources and Witnessed Incidents of Gender-Based Violence:

Participants were asked, **"*Since attending the training, have you used any of the following support or reporting resources following an incident of sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking? (check all that apply).*"** Participants were given the following response options:

❏ Confidential student advocate
❏ Title IX and Educational Equity
❏ Department of Public Safety
❏ One Pard form
❏ Bailey Health Center
❏ Counseling Center

❏ College Chaplain
❏ Off Campus Confidential Resource
❏ Department Faculty/Staff
❏ Friend/Laf student
❏ Family
❏ Other (write-in):

54 participants responded to the question above (i.e., checked at least one box). The most frequently checked responses were the following:
o 22 participants (40.74%) endorsed "friend/Laf student"
o 6 participants (11.11%) endorsed "friend/Laf student" and "family"
o 3 participants (5.56%) endorsed "other"

Participants were also asked, **"*Since attending the training, did you witness anything you think constitutes sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking? (check all that apply).*"** Participants were given the following response options:

❏ Control or manipulation within a relationship
❏ Monitoring or surveillance within a relationship, including with technology
❏ Unequal power dynamics within a relationship
❏ Physical abuse within a relationship
❏ Coercion or pressure to engage in sexual activity
❏ Sexual activity that happened without consent
❏ Sexual activity in which you could not consent due to intoxication
❏ Other (short answer fill in option)

68 participants responded to the question above (i.e., checked at least one box). The most frequently checked responses were the following:
o 9 participants (13.23%) endorsed "coercion or pressure to engage in sexual activity"
o 6 participants (8.82%) endorsed "control or manipulation within a relationship"
o 6 participants (8.82%) endorsed "sexual activity that happened without consent"
o 5 participants (7.35%) endorsed "sexual activity in which you could not consent due to intoxication"
o 5 participants (7.35%) endorsed "other"

Post-Training Engagement in Supportive and Skillful Behaviors:

Participants were asked, **"*Since attending the training, have you done any of the following? (check all that apply).*"** Participants were given the following response options:

❑ Supported a friend who disclosed to you that they had experienced sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking
❑ Practiced communicating your boundaries/consent in an interaction with someone else
❑ Created a distraction in an attempt to disrupt a situation you thought was problematic
❑ Checked in with someone who you thought may have experienced sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking to see if they were okay
❑ Tried to change the subject when you heard someone talking about others in a degrading way
❑ Asked someone in a position of power to get involved in a situation where it seemed someone was being harmed
❑ Directly told someone that you thought their behavior (e.g., jokes, flirting, touching, etc.) was inappropriate

153 participants responded to the question above (i.e., checked at least one box). The most frequently checked responses were the following:
o 15 participants (9.80%) endorsed "practiced communicating your boundaries/consent in an interaction with someone else"
o 12 participants (7.84%) endorsed "supported a friend who disclosed to you that they had experienced sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking"
o 9 participants (5.88%) endorsed "tried to change the subject when you heard someone talking about others in a degrading way"
o 8 participants (5.23%) endorsed "practiced communicating your boundaries/consent in an interaction with someone else" and "tried to change the subject when you heard someone talking about others in a degrading way"
o 7 participants (4.57%) endorsed "supported a friend who disclosed to you that they had experienced sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking" and "checked in with someone who you thought may have experienced sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking to see if they were okay"
o 7 participants (4.57%) endorsed "practiced communicating your boundaries/consent in an interaction with someone else," "tried to change the subject when you heard someone talking about others in a degrading way," and "directly told someone that you thought their behavior (e.g., jokes, flirting, touching, etc.) was inappropriate"

Participants were asked about their perceptions of how Lafayette administrators, faculty, and peers respond to issues of harassment, equity, and inclusion. The table below presents the frequency of responses to these items. Participants were asked, "*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?*"

Table 3. Frequencies with Valid Percent in Parentheses

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Average (SD)
Lafayette Administrators take issues of harassment, equity, and inclusion seriously	4 (1.90%)	18 (8.57%)	55 (26.19%)	97 (46.19%)	36 (17.14%)	3.68 (.92)
Lafayette Faculty takes issues of harassment, equity, and inclusion seriously	5 (2.38%)	6 (2.86%)	37 (17.62%)	118 (56.19%)	44 (20.95%)	3.90 (.84)
My peer group takes issues of harassment, equity, and inclusion seriously	2 (.95%)	6 (2.84%)	25 (11.85%)	86 (40.76%)	92 (43.60%)	4.23 (.84)
Lafayette can effectively respond to issues of harassment	5 (2.38%)	23 (10.95%)	72 (34.29%)	88 (41.90%)	22 (10.48%)	3.47 (.91)

Note: SD = standard deviation; Response options were: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

Participants were asked about their beliefs regarding their own role and the broader community's responsibility in fostering a healthy and safe campus culture. The table below presents the frequency of responses to these items. Participants were asked, "*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?*"

Table 4. Frequencies with Valid Percent in Parentheses

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Average (SD)
I believe I have a role to play in cultivating a healthy and safe culture at Lafayette	1 (.48%)	1 (.48%)	11 (5.24%)	96 (45.71%)	101 (48.09%)	4.40 (.66)
I know how to play a role in cultivating a healthy and safe culture at Lafayette	1 (.48%)	4 (1.90%)	16 (7.62%)	110 (52.38%)	79 (37.62%)	4.25 (.72)
I feel confident that most people at Lafayette share a sense of responsibility for cultivating a healthy and safe culture	2 (.95%)	23 (10.95%)	55 (26.19%)	94 (44.76%)	36 (17.14%)	3.66 (.92)

Note: SD = standard deviation; Response options were: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, 5 = strongly agree

Follow-up Survey: Qualitative Data Analysis

The follow-up survey also included two short answer prompts:
1. What has stuck with you from the Empowered Consent training?
2. What additional training, resources, or support would be useful to you?

We developed 16 inductive codes (see Appendix D) to qualitatively analyze thematic content from the responses to the above three questions. We used the qualitative software program Atlas.ti to support the qualitative analysis, which included developing inductive codes to analyze thematic content from the qualitative responses.

Across the three time points, 112 participants submitted responses to at least one of the two short answer prompts in the follow-up survey.

In response to the first prompt, two primary themes emerged from participant responses as participants highlighted the **knowledge** and **skills** that they have retained and/or used since attending the Empowered Consent program:

Knowledge

Reinforcing the Empowered Consent learning modules, participants identified **four thematic areas of knowledge** retained from the training: Consent, Gender-Based Violence (GBV) Prevalence & Definitions, the Red Zone, and Resource Information.

➢ *Consent:* Regarding knowledge of various aspects of consent, participant responses indicated that they have retained knowledge about the importance of consent, what does and does not constitute consent (e.g.: "*Coercion is not consent*"), that consent is ongoing, and how alcohol impacts giving/getting consent. Participants specifically referred to the consent-related acronym "FRIES" from the training, indicating that the acronym was useful in helping them remember different aspects of consent. Participants also explained that the way that the peer educators presented information about consent played a role in helping them retain consent-related information.

➢ *GBV Prevalence & Definitions:* Participants also noted that they retained knowledge about the prevalence of gender-based violence and what constitutes gender-based violence. For example, one participant explained, "*The prevalence of this, because before I thought it was rare for such a thing to happen, but I have realized that it is much more common than I previously believed, especially on a college campus.*"

➢ *The Red Zone:* Related, participants also identified learning about the "Red Zone"- the period lasting from the start of the semester to Thanksgiving break in which first year students are at increased risk of experiencing sexual assault - as specific knowledge that they retained from the training. As a participant noted, "*The red zone information was really impactful.*"

➢ *Resource Information*: Participants also highlighted retaining knowledge about available support resources on campus and how to access those resources. As a participant responded, "*That if I went through a negative experience, I have a lot of resources at my disposal to help me deal with it.*"

"'Consent is sexy.' Although most of the people in the room laughed, it is very true."
                -Participant

"*In cases of violent assault, it seems clear what has happened. However, in more gray situations, it becomes harder to know if an assault actually occurred. I think the training helped solidify my idea of what assault is and what can be done about it.*"
                -Participant

"*The resources that are available. I was able to put them in my phone and write them down from that presentation to reference in case I need to.*"
                -Participant

In response to the second prompt, two themes emerged from participant responses: **Additional Resources** & **Support and Additional Training.**

➢ *Additional Resources & Support*: In providing feedback about additional resources and support, participants identified a need for clarity around *how* to access support resources. While this feedback tended to be general and nondescript, some participants indicated that it was challenging to navigate websites to locate resource information. Some participants also identified specific concerns, such as "*Where to go if Bailey's is closed*" and offered specific suggestions (e.g.: to develop an app with available support resources). Participants also provided feedback about the need to reduce barriers to accessing counseling resources. Participants also identified interest in specialized support services, including resources specifically for male survivors of sexual assault and LGBTQ+ survivors. Finally, participants provided feedback about wanting to better understand reporting options.

➢ *Additional Training:* In providing feedback about interest in additional training, participants identified follow up training opportunities to build upon the information they learned in the Empowered Consent program. They identified interest in 2.0 or advanced versions of trainings focused on how to support a survivor/friend and how to cope following an experience of assault. They also identified interest in 'booster' trainings to help reinforce what they learned during the Empowered Consent program, specifically identifying a need for redistributing information about available support resources during the year.

"I think another course halfway through the year to help reiterate the resources available would be helpful, also to remind people they aren't alone and check in with them."
                -Participant

Discussion of Findings

In summary, data from both the immediate and follow-up surveys suggest that participants found the Empowered Consent program helpful and important. Participants also indicated that they are not only retaining what they learned during the program but actively applying the skills in their daily lives on campus.

Immediately after attending the Empowered Consent program, nearly all participants reported increased confidence in giving and getting consent in intimate encounters. They also indicated greater familiarity with Lafayette's resources for addressing sexual assault, relationship violence, and stalking. Additionally, most participants stated that after attending the training they were more likely to intervene (e.g., by using bystander strategies) if they witnessed someone else being harassed or harmed.

Participants reported that the majority of the information presented in the program was valuable. They particularly appreciated learning about consent, available support resources at Lafayette (especially confidential services), the 'Red Zone,' rape culture, and mandated reporting. Many also found it helpful to learn practical skills for supporting someone who discloses an unwanted sexual experience. Additionally, participants valued the training's bystander intervention strategies, especially subtle tactics like distraction. Finally, they found the guidance on asking for and giving consent especially useful, noting that the suggested approaches were realistic and helped normalize communication around consent in a natural, non-awkward way. Overall, participants appreciated the program's interactive design.

While most participants found all aspects of the program helpful, some felt that certain parts were repetitive. Some participants noted that they had already learned about consent, as well as definitions and statistics related to GBV and alcohol use, either before enrolling at Lafayette or through FYO programming. Additionally, some participants did not enjoy the role-play activities or the high level of active participation required.

Notably, 34 participants directly indicated on the follow-up survey that they had experienced sexual assault, relationship violence, or stalking since attending the Empowered Consent program. Furthermore, 43 participants selected a behavioral descriptor (e.g., coercion or pressure to engage in sexual activity) that aligns with experiences of sexual assault, relationship violence, or stalking. These findings underscore the significance of the 'Red Zone,' as these incidents occurred within a relatively short time after students' arrival on campus. Participants also noted that since attending the training, the most frequently used support resources following an incident of sexual assault, relationship violence, or stalking were friends, other Lafayette students, and/or family members.

A majority of participants agreed or strongly agreed that Lafayette administrators, faculty, and peer groups take issues of harassment, equity, and inclusion seriously. However, participants expressed less confidence in Lafayette's ability to effectively respond to incidents of harassment. Furthermore, while most participants agreed or strongly agreed that they have a role in cultivating a healthy and safe culture at Lafayette - and that they understand what is needed to fulfill that role - they were less confident that most people at Lafayette share a similar sense of responsibility in cultivating a healthy and safe culture.

Participants who completed the follow-up survey indicated that they had the opportunity to apply many of the practical skills learned in the program. For example, many reported actively communicating boundaries and consent in their interactions with others. Some participants shared that they had supported a friend who disclosed experiencing sexual assault, relationship violence, or stalking. Additionally, participants reported using bystander intervention strategies to address concerning situations.

Recommendations

Following analysis of three years of assessment data and the consistently positive feedback that participants have provided about the Empowered Consent program, we offer the following four recommendations:

Recommendation 1: Continue facilitating the Empowered Consent Program
We recommend continuing to use the Empowered Consent program as the introductory prevention program for first-year students. As an evidence-based and tested program, we recommend that the program's content and delivery format remain consistent moving forward. Specifically, we recommend that the program's learning objectives continue to focus on the following: definitions of sexual assault/domestic violence/stalking, how to communicate consent, bystander intervention strategies, information about available support resources, and how to respond to a disclosure. We recommend that the structure and presentation style remain peer-led, discussion-based, and facilitated within small groups to encourage participation among participants. We recommend that small laminated placards with support service information be created for distribution at the end of the program. Finally, we recommend a regular review of the program's content for opportunities to add additional examples and scenarios attentive to intersectional experiences across gender, sexuality and racial identities and that address realistic scenarios that are specific to Lafayette's campus and culture.

Recommendation 2: Adjust Program Timing & Increase Program Attendance
The first delivery of the Empowered Consent program occurred during FYO. Following feedback from both peer educators and student participants, the program's delivery shifted in Year 2 (Fall 2022) to occur throughout the first 6-8 weeks of the fall semester. There are benefits and limitations to delivering the program during FYO vs. throughout the fall semester. Moving forward, we recommend that the delivery of the Empowered Consent program occur as early as possible upon first year students' arrival to campus, with the goal of providing all first-year students with knowledge, skills and resources necessary to support their safety during the time period in which they are most vulnerable to experiencing assault. Program attendance rates varied across the three years of assessment data that we analyzed, with the highest attendance occurring in Year 1 (Fall 2021), when the program was delivered during FYO. We recommend that stakeholders in Student Life develop a plan to incentivize student attendance at the Empowered Consent program, regardless of the timing of when the program is facilitated.

Recommendation 3: Develop 'Booster' Sessions and Materials

We recommend developing "booster" sessions and materials that reinforce information from the Empowered Consent program that are distributed to first year students throughout the fall and spring semesters. We recommend that these booster sessions reinforce the primary training topics and skills that students are using, as indicated by the follow-up survey, such as bystander intervention, supporting a friend after a disclosure, intervening in an unhealthy relationship, and reminders about college resources/Title IX processes. We recommend thinking "outside the box" regarding where and how booster messaging is displayed and distributed. For example, PAVE might consider hosting tabling sessions in Farinon, or information might be included in "stall stories" or be reinforced by RAs and LEOs, or infographics might be provided to faculty who teach FYS courses for distribution in class or faculty advisors to share when meeting with first year students to discuss spring course registration. We also recommend the distribution of booster information ahead of spring break, for students who may be partaking in more social spring break trips.

Recommendation 4: Develop a Strategic Plan for Sexual Misconduct Prevention Programming

Led by the Director of Student Advocacy and Prevention, we recommend that stakeholders develop a long-term strategic plan for sexual misconduct prevention programming. We recommend that this strategic plan also establish metrics and goals for long-term change regarding prevalence of sexual misconduct on campus. A long-term strategic plan should consider incorporating prevention programming that targets at-risk populations for experiencing and perpetrating sexual misconduct, while also extending programming campus-wide to include all students. Such programming should be survivor-centered, trauma-informed, build on the knowledge and skills gained in earlier programs, incorporate prevention education across a student's enrollment at the college, and incorporate emerging sexual misconduct trends (e.g.: tech abuse and deepfakes). The successful development and launch of a long-term strategic plan for sexual misconduct prevention programming will require a well-supported Office for Student Advocacy and Prevention. We recommend that this office is appropriately staffed and resourced to accomplish this important goal. Additionally, as turnover within this work is common, we recommend that the division consider retention efforts to stabilize this still relatively new office to better ensure the success of a strategic plan for sexual misconduct prevention programming.

Appendix A – 'Immediate' Survey Questions

1. Before this training, how confident were you in knowing how to give and get consent in an intimate encounter?
   - ○ Very unconfident
   - ○ Unconfident
   - ○ Neutral
   - ○ Confident
   - ○ Very confident

2. After this training, how confident are you in knowing how to give and get consent in an intimate encounter?
   - ○ Very unconfident
   - ○ Unconfident
   - ○ Neutral
   - ○ Confident
   - ○ Very confident

3. Before this training, how familiar were you with Lafayette resources for responding to sexual assault, relationship violence and stalking?
   - ○ Very unfamiliar
   - ○ Unfamiliar
   - ○ Neutral
   - ○ Familiar
   - ○ Very familiar

4. After this training, how familiar are you with with Lafayette resources for responding to sexual assault, relationship violence and stalking?
   - ○ Very unfamiliar
   - ○ Unfamiliar
   - ○ Neutral
   - ○ Familiar
   - ○ Very familiar

5. Before this training, how likely were you to intervene (e.g., by using a bystander strategy) if you witnessed someone else being harassed or harmed?
   - ○ Very unlikely
   - ○ Unlikely
   - ○ Neither likely nor unlikely
   - ○ Likely
   - ○ Very likely

6. After this training, how likely are you to intervene (e.g., by using a bystander strategy) if you witnessed someone else being harassed or harmed?
   - ○ Very unlikely
   - ○ Unlikely
   - ○ Neither likely nor unlikely
   - ○ Likely
   - ○ Very likely

7. How helpful did you find the following sections of today's training?

	Very unhelpful	Helpful	Neither unhelpful nor helpful	Helpful	Very helpful
Identifying our community's shared values	○	○	○	○	○
Definitions of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking	○	○	○	○	○
Party culture/debunking college drinking myths	○	○	○	○	○
Rape culture/power dynamics related to sexual misconduct	○	○	○	○	○
Communicating consent	○	○	○	○	○
Practice being an active bystander	○	○	○	○	○
Unhelpful/helpful reactions to sexual misconduct disclosure	○	○	○	○	○
Where to seek resources and support	○	○	○	○	○

8. What was most helpful or interesting to you about this training?

9. What was least helpful or interesting to you about this training?

10. How effective were the presenters at delivering the training material?
    ○ Very ineffective
    ○ Ineffective
    ○ Neither ineffective nor effective
    ○ Effective
    ○ Very effective

11. Please use this space below to provide any additional feedback/comments you have about the training.

Demographic questions:

1. What is your gender identity?
   - Woman
   - Man
   - Non-binary
   - Gender-nonconforming
   - Agender
   - Genderqueer
   - Genderfluid
   - Two-spirit
   - Prefer to self describe:
   - Prefer not to say

2. Are you transgender?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Prefer not to say

3. Which of these best describes your sexual orientation?
   - Asexual
   - Bisexual
   - Gay
   - Lesbian
   - Heterosexual/straight
   - Pansexual
   - Queer
   - Questioning
   - Prefer to self-describe:
   - Prefer not to say

4. Which of the following best represents your racial and ethnic heritage? (choose all that apply)
   - Black, Afro-Caribbean, or African American
   - East Asian or Asian American
   - Latino/a/x or Hispanic American
   - Middle Eastern or Arab American
   - Native American or Alaskan Native
   - Non-Hispanic White or Euro-American
   - South Asian or Indian American
   - Prefer to self-describe:
   - Prefer not to say

Appendix B – 'Follow-up' Survey Questions

1. Please confirm that you are either a first-year or fall 2022 transfer student.
   - Yes
   - No

2. During the training, you were introduced to Lafayette's definitions of sexual assault, relationship violence and stalking. Since attending the training, have you experienced anything that you think fits one of those definitions?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Unsure

3. Since attending the training, have any of the following behaviors been directed at you? (check all that apply)
   - Control or manipulation within a relationship
   - Monitoring or surveillance within a relationship, including with technology
   - Unequal power dynamics within a relationship
   - Physical abuse within a relationship
   - Coercion or pressure to engage in sexual activity
   - Sexual activity that happened without your consent
   - Sexual activity in which you could not consent due to intoxication
   - Other:

4. Since attending the training, have you used any of the following support or reporting resources following an incident of sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking? (check all that apply)
   - Confidential Student Advocate
   - Title IX and Educational Equity
   - Department of Public Safety
   - One Pard form
   - Bailey Health Center
   - Counseling Center
   - College Chaplain
   - Off Campus Confidential Resource
   - Department Faculty/Staff
   - Friend/Laf student
   - Family
   - Other:

5. Since attending the training, did you witness anything you think constitutes sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking? (check all that apply)
   - Control or manipulation within a relationship
   - Monitoring or surveillance within a relationship, including with technology
   - Unequal power dynamics within a relationship
   - Physical abuse within a relationship
   - Coercion or pressure to engage in sexual activity
   - Sexual activity that happened without your consent
   - Sexual activity in which you could not consent due to intoxication
   - Other:

6. Since attending the training, have you done any of the following? (check all that apply)
   - Supported a friend who disclosed to you that they had experienced sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking
   - Practiced communicating your boundaries/consent in an interaction with someone else
   - Created a distraction in an attempt to disrupt a situation you thought was problematic
   - Checked in with someone who you thought may have experienced sexual assault, relationship violence or stalking to see if they were okay
   - Tried to change the subject when you heard someone talking about others in a degrading way
   - Asked someone in a position of power to get involved in a situation where it seemed someone was being harmed
   - Directly told someone that you thought their behavior (e.g. jokes, flirting, touching, etc.) was inappropriate

7. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Lafayette Administrators take issues of harassment, equity, and inclusion seriously	○	○	○	○	○
Lafayette Faculty takes issues of harassment, equity, and inclusion seriously	○	○	○	○	○
My peer group takes issues of harassment, equity, and inclusion seriously	○	○	○	○	○
Lafayette can effectively respond to issues of harassment	○	○	○	○	○

8. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I believe I have a role to play in cultivating a healthy and safe culture at Lafayette	○	○	○	○	○
I know how to play a role in cultivating a healthy and safe culture at Lafayette	○	○	○	○	○
I feel confident that most people at Lafayette share a sense of responsibility for cultivating a healthy and safe culture	○	○	○	○	○

9. What has stuck with you from the Empowered Consent training during orientation?

10. What additional training, resources, or support would be useful to you?

Note: The follow-up survey included the same demographic questions as the immediate survey.

Appendix C – Immediate Survey: Short-Answer Codebook

Most Helpful / Interesting

    Knowledge: FRIES/consent
    Knowledge: Drinking stats
    Knowledge: GBV stats
    Knowledge: Mandated reporting
    Knowledge: Other
    Knowledge: Rape culture
    Knowledge: Red Zone
    Knowledge: Resources
    Skills: Asking For/Giving Consent
    Skills: Bystander Intervention
    Skills: Responding to Disclosures
    Program Design: Framed around shared values
    Program Design: Grounded examples
    Program Design: Interactive
    Program Design: Other
    Program Design: Presentation Content
    Most Helpful/Interesting: Other
    Most Helpful/Interesting: Appreciation

Least Helpful/Interesting

    Repetitive Info: Alcohol/Party Stats
    Repetitive Info: Consent
    Repetitive Info: GBV Definitions
    Repetitive Info: Other
    Repetitive Info: Title IX
    Least Helpful/Interesting: Other
    Least Helpful Interesting: General Program Content
    Least Helpful/Interesting: N/A
    Learned Before Lafayette: Consent
    Learned Before Lafayette: GBV Definitions
    Learned Before Lafayette: Other

Additional Feedback

    Appreciation
    Other
    Presentation Content

Appendix D – Follow-up Survey: Short-Answer Codebook

What additional training, resources, or support would be useful to you?
Additional Training: Info about prevalence
      Additional Training: info about reporting/legal options
      Additional Training: Nothing N/A
      Additional Training: Other
      Additional Training: Refresher and 2.0 trainings
      Additional Training: Resources and Support

What has stuck with you from the Empowered Consent training during orientation?
      Knowledge learned: Consent/FRIES
      Knowledge learned: GBV prevalence
      Knowledge learned: Other/General
      Knowledge learned: Red Zone
      Knowledge learned: Resource Info
      Nothing / I don't know
      Skills learned: Bystander intervention
      Skills learned: Responding to a disclosure
      Everything
      Other