

**Offices of the Dean of Student Life – Health Promotions**  
**STAND Up Workshop Evaluation**  
**2018-2019**

**Background**

The STAND Up workshops provide educational support for the STAND Up campaign on the Texas A&M University campus inviting Aggies to Step In and Stand Up against sexual harassment and sexual violence. Two separate workshops are offered; one developed for student attendees, the other for faculty and staff. Surveys distributed at the end of the workshops measure learning and satisfaction of participants attending each workshop.

**Method and Sample**

Two paper surveys, one for students, another for staff and faculty, were produced using Teleform® survey design software that creates scannable forms and databases. The student survey contained 26 questions, of which 16 were quantitative, six were qualitative, two were demographic, one requested workshop date input and one requested facilitator name input. The staff and faculty survey contained 26 questions, of which 16 were quantitative, six were qualitative, three were demographic and one requested workshop date input. The quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS®, a statistical software package, and the qualitative data was analyzed using Microsoft Excel®. Surveys were distributed at the end of the workshops held between September 1, 2018 and August 31, 2019; staff and faculty surveys from nine workshops and student surveys from eight workshops were returned to Student Life Studies for analysis. Of the 210 attendees who received a student survey, 210 completed them, for a 100% response rate. Of the 242 attendees who received a staff and faculty survey, 242 completed them, for a 100% response rate.

**Key Findings with Recommendations**

Student Life Studies identified several key findings and developed actionable recommendations Health Promotions may take based on the results. However, Health Promotions staff may identify other findings using their knowledge and understanding of the community. Staff members are strongly encouraged to read all the results and qualitative comments to gain a fuller understanding of students' experiences.

- The STAND Up workshops were successful as faculty, staff, and students indicated learning more about reporting incidents, and increased their confidence in conversing with survivors of trauma. They identified possible effects of trauma on survivors and many could offer at least one technique they could employ when interacting with a trauma survivor.
- Faculty, staff and students were most critical regarding the time allotment of the workshops and the coverage of topics within the workshops. They indicated workshops were not long enough to cover all the topics included, and found that some content was repetitive. Students, staff and faculty would like more and clearer coverage of the mandatory reporting rules for sexual assault and harassment and found coordination between the workbook and presentation lacking somewhat. Health Promotions staff could review the presentation and the workbook in effort to improve coordination between them, and identify repetitive content for possible removal. Adding clearer coverage of current Title IX mandatory reporting rules and providing "real life" scenarios or examples that require reporting might also be beneficial for attendees.
- Female participation in the student programs were much higher than male participation. As STAND Up organizers market future programs, they may want to look at means to attract more male participants. Perhaps working with the Corps of Cadets, Offices of Fraternity and Sorority Life or other all male student organizations on campus in effort to increase male attendance.

## Results

Results include frequency percentages, means, and standard deviations (sd) for the number of people (n) who responded to the question. For ease of reading, frequency percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole percent, so totals may not add up to exactly 100%. Comparisons to previous years' data will be made where appropriate. In addition, summary themes are contained within this report, while the full qualitative responses can be found in a separate document. The report is divided into two sections: Staff and Faculty Survey and Student Survey.

### Staff and Faculty Survey

Table 1 provides the demographics for the staff and faculty participating in the Stand Up Workshop. Ethnicity was asked in a check-all-that-apply format. Similar to the previous year, a majority of participants were staff members, female, and White. Although those who selected the option "not listed" when asked for ethnicity/ race could write in an identity, no one chose to do so.

Demographic Statements	Frequency Percentage 2018-2019	Frequency Percentage 2017-2018	Frequency Percentage 2016-2017
<b>Classification</b>	n=221	n=286	n=100
Staff	70%	73%	53%
Faculty	18%	11%	9%
Graduate Student	12%	11%	24%
Senior	‡	2%	6%
Junior	‡	2%	5%
Sophomore	‡	1%	2%
Freshman	‡	<1%	1%
<b>Gender</b>	n=220	n=283	n=101
Female	73%	81%	81%
Male	25%	18%	16%
Prefer not to answer	1%	--	--
Transgender	1%	--	--
I identify as:	--	<1%	1%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	n=262	n=297	n=102
White	73%	74%	69%
Hispanic/Latino	16%	12%	11%
African American/Black	11%	10%	9%
Asian American, Asian/Pacific Islander	6%	4%	9%
Prefer not to answer	3%	1%	2%
Native American/American Indian	2%	1%	1%
Not listed	1%	<1%	--

Table 1: Demographics

‡ Option not offered

The workshop participants were asked their level of agreement or disagreement to a series of questions about their knowledge, affect and behavior related to the subject of trauma before and after attending the workshop. On the next page, Table 2, in descending "after" mean order, shows that the workshop respondents most agreed that they understood the importance of accepting the speaker's experience. Respondents expressed increased agreement

regarding their knowledge and confidence surrounding all the learning outcomes from the before to after conditions, although at levels below that of the previous year.

<b>Statement</b>	<b>Strongly Agree (5)</b>	<b>Agree (4)</b>	<b>Neutral (3)</b>	<b>Disagree (2)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree (1)</b>	<b>2018-2019 Mean (sd) [n]</b>	<b>2017-2018 Mean (sd) [n]</b>
<b>I understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience (before)</b>	36%	54%	8%	1%	<1%	4.24 (.69) [241]	4.35 (.63) [288]
<b>I understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience (after)</b>	72%	27%	--	1%	1%	4.70 (.54) [215]	4.77 (.49) [255]
<b>I understand the need for support of self when working with people who have experienced trauma (before)</b>	31%	48%	15%	5%	1%	4.02 (.87) [242]	4.17 (.81) [287]
<b>I understand the need for support of self when working with people who have experienced trauma (after)</b>	68%	31%	1%	--	1%	4.65 (.59) [215]	4.70 (.52) [256]
<b>I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual (before)</b>	17%	53%	21%	8%	1%	3.77 (.86) [242]	3.83 (.90) [287]
<b>I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual (after)</b>	60%	38%	2%	1%	1%	4.55 (.61) [213]	4.59 (.59) [256]
<b>I believe that I have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses a trauma to me (before)</b>	10%	28%	29%	27%	6%	3.10 (1.09) [242]	3.36 (1.04) [288]
<b>I believe that I have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses a trauma to me (after)</b>	52%	44%	3%	1%	1%	4.47 (.63) [215]	4.60 (.54) [257]
<b>I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me (before)</b>	15%	41%	27%	16%	2%	3.52 (.99) [242]	3.69 (.92) [288]
<b>I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me (after)</b>	45%	44%	8%	2%	1%	4.31 (.77) [215]	4.43 (.63) [255]

Table 2: Learning Outcome Statement

Respondents were asked to list two ways a person may respond during or after a traumatic incident occurs. The majority of the 198 who responded, listed two ways a person may respond. The most frequent were fight, flight, freeze, shock, denial, scared, loss of memory and withdrawn. Next, respondents were asked to list one technique

they can use to respond to a survivor of trauma, and 198 responded. Many listed listening, active or reflective listening, letting them talk, affirm and validate the survivor.

When asked how this workshop prepared them to have conversations with survivors of trauma, 194 responded. Respondents often mentioned feeling more confident to have those conversations after attending the workshop, and becoming more aware of resources available to help the survivor and offer as a reference. Others indicated the techniques and practice during the workshop helped them feel better equipped to navigate conversations with survivors of trauma, although many indicated more practice would be helpful. Many said learning about the perspectives of the survivors was helpful, as was learning about appropriate language to use in conversations with survivors.

Through a series of statements participants were asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement about the organization of the workshop and the facilitation quality. As shown in Table 3, the majority of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the facilitators were engaging, knowledgeable and well prepared. However, this year's participants rated all statements lower than did last year's participants, especially in regards to time allotted for the workshop was sufficient.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2018-2019 Mean (sd) [n]	2017-2018 Mean (sd) [n]
<b>The facilitators were engaging.</b>	68%	28%	3%	<1%	--	4.64 (.56) [232]	4.67 (.57) [280]
<b>The facilitators were knowledgeable.</b>	66%	31%	3%	--	--	4.63 (.54) [235]	4.74 (.45) [285]
<b>The facilitators were well prepared.</b>	64%	29%	6%	1%	--	4.57 (.64) [235]	4.71 (.52) [285]
<b>Workshop content was organized and easy to follow</b>	49%	43%	6%	2%	--	4.38 (.68) [235]	4.49 (.61) [283]
<b>The time allotted for the workshop was sufficient</b>	36%	45%	10%	8%	2%	4.06 (.96) [234]	4.34 (.78) [282]

Table 3: Workshop and Facilitator Evaluation

Participants were requested to provide any additional feedback for the facilitators. Feedback was primarily complimentary of the facilitators as many found them engaging, informative, and found the scenarios and interaction useful. A few suggestions were provided, specifically that some facilitators seemed not as familiar with the car accident scenario/activity or that it was new, providing some confusion, and some would like more reflection time and bathroom breaks.

When asked if they felt all topics were given adequate time in the program, 79% of the 214 respondents said yes, fewer than the 89% of the 264 respondents who said yes last year. Respondents were then able to write in the topics they thought needed adjustment. Many of the respondents indicated n/a or nothing identified as needing less time; however some listed the car accident scenario, neurobiology, the introduction and ice breakers. Topics which were identified as needing more time were skills practicing, scenarios, who and how to report (mandatory reporting), and self-care information.

Participants were asked to write in suggestions on how the workshop could be improved. Some of the 141 suggestions included making it a bit longer with hands-on activities, more breaks, and ensuring the slides and the workbook coordinate. Some suggestions came from those who were attending a train the trainer workshop, and their suggestions included receiving an outline regarding how previous trainings ran, add page numbers to the slides to track where activities go, and more practice for the complex sections and less on the simpler activities like icebreakers.

## Student Survey

Table 4 provides the demographics retrieved from the student database, using each student’s university identification number (UIN) that they provided in the survey. The largest percentage classification attending the workshops this year were freshmen; last year sophomores attended at the highest rate. This year saw more females in attendance compared to last year, and Asian students attended this year at a much higher rate than in the 2017-2018 academic year. Most of the participants were not first generation students with primary colleges being engineering and liberal arts.

<b>Demographic Data</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2018-2019</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2017-2018</b>
<b>Classification</b>	n=180	n=205
Freshman	30%	8%
Sophomore	28%	30%
Junior	16%	26%
Senior	13%	24%
Masters	12%	9%
Doctoral	1%	3%
<b>Sex</b>	n=180	n=205
Female	67%	57%
Male	33%	43%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	n=180	n=205
White	37%	42%
Hispanic or Latino of any race	27%	30%
Asian	24%	9%
Black or multi-racial with Black	7%	11%
International	2%	6%
Multi-racial excluding Black	3%	2%
Unknown or not reported	1%	--
<b>Primary College</b>	n=180	n=205
Liberal Arts	26%	20%
Engineering	20%	21%
Education	16%	10%
Agriculture	8%	11%
Science	8%	6%
Business	7%	9%
Veterinary Medicine	6%	8%
General Studies	6%	4%
Geosciences	2%	2%
Architecture	1%	3%
Bush	1%	2%
Public Health	1%	2%
<b>Generation Student</b>	n=180	n=205
Not First Generation	66%	58%
First Generation	32%	34%
Unknown	2%	8%

Table 4: Demographics

On the survey, students were asked to identify their gender. Table 5, below, provides the demographic statement for the students participating in the Stand Up Workshop. Those who chose "I identify as" could write in that identity and those responses included non-binary.

<b>Demographic Statement</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2018-2019</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2017-2018</b>
<b>Gender</b>	n=205	n=213
Female	63%	57%
Male	36%	42%
I identify as:	1%	1%

Table 5: Self-Reported Gender

The workshop participants were asked their level of agreement to a series of questions about their knowledge, affect and behavior related to the subject of trauma before and after attending the workshop. Table 6, on the next page, in descending "after" mean order, shows that the workshop respondents most agreed that they understood the importance of accepting the speaker's experience. Respondents expressed increased agreement regarding their knowledge and confidence surrounding all the learning outcomes from the before to after conditions, and at an equal or higher level that last year's participants.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2019-2018 Mean (sd) [n]	2017-2018 Mean (sd) [n]	2016-2017 Mean (sd) [n]
I understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience (before)	47%	45%	8%	--	--	4.39 (.64) [209]	4.35 (.72) [221]	4.38 (.61) [102]
I understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience (after)	81%	18%	--	--	1%	4.80 (.48) [181]	4.71 (.57) [191]	4.75 (.43) [89]
I understand the need for support of self when working with people who have experienced trauma (before)	32%	49%	16%	2%	--	4.11 (.76) [210]	4.20 (.81) [221]	4.25 (.78) [102]
I understand the need for support of self when working with people who have experienced trauma (after)	77%	23%	--	--	1%	4.75 (.50) [181]	4.66 (.58) [191]	4.72 (.45) [89]
I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual (before)	24%	50%	19%	7%	--	3.91 (.85) [210]	3.98 (.92) [221]	3.72 (0.91) [102]
I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual (after)	69%	29%	1%	--	1%	4.66 (.56) [180]	4.59 (.63) [190]	4.47 (.57) [89]
I believe that I have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses a trauma to me (before)	10%	33%	30%	23%	4%	3.20 (1.04) [209]	3.61 (.98) [221]	3.30 (1.06) [102]
I believe that I have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses a trauma to me (after)	58%	39%	2%	--	1%	4.54 (.60) [180]	4.52 (.61) [189]	4.57 (.50) [89]
I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me (before)	17%	45%	26%	11%	1%	3.65 (.94) [210]	3.83 (.86) [221]	3.66 (0.95) [102]
I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me (after)	53%	43%	4%	--	1%	4.46 (.64) [181]	4.46 (.63) [191]	4.42 (.62) [88]

Table 6: Learning Outcome Statement

Respondents were asked to list two ways a person may respond during or after a traumatic incident occurs. The majority of the 172 who responded listed two ways a person may respond. The most frequent were fight, flight, freeze, fear, forget the incident or details of the incident, change behavior, withdraw and sadness. Next, respondents were asked to list one technique they can use to respond to a survivor of trauma, and 188 responded. Many listed listening, active or reflective listening, affirming, nurture the individual and creating an atmosphere of respect.

When asked how this workshop prepared them to have conversations with survivors of trauma, 193 responded. Respondents often mentioned feeling more confident, less anxious and more prepared to have those conversations after attending the workshop. Others said they became more aware of resources available to help the survivor and could offer those as a reference. Others indicated the techniques and practice during the workshop helped them feel better equipped as the listener in conversations with survivors of trauma. Many said learning about ways to respond was helpful, as was learning about appropriate language to use in conversations with survivors and learning about mandatory reporting.

Through a series of statements participants were asked to rate their level of agreement about the organization of the workshop and the facilitation quality. As shown in Table 7, the majority of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the facilitators were engaging, knowledgeable and well prepared.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2018-2019 Mean (sd) [n]	2017-2018 Mean (sd) [n]	2016-2017 Mean (sd) [n]
<b>The facilitators were knowledgeable.</b>	87%	13%	--	--	--	4.87 (.34) [206]	4.76 (.48) [209]	4.81 (.40) [103]
<b>The facilitators were well prepared.</b>	87%	13%	--	--	--	4.87 (.33) [206]	4.75 (.51) [206]	4.75 (.48) [103]
<b>The facilitators were engaging.</b>	78%	19%	3%	1%	--	4.73 (.54) [204]	4.53 (.70) [206]	4.73 (.45) [102]
<b>Workshop content was organized and easy to follow</b>	70%	29%	1%	1%	--	4.69 (.50) [206]	4.47 (.62) [208]	4.49 (.59) [103]
<b>The time allotted for the workshop was sufficient</b>	53%	33%	10%	4%	--	4.35 (.83) [205]	4.27 (.85) [208]	4.21 (.87) [102]

Table 7: Workshop and Facilitator Evaluation

Participants were requested to provide any further feedback regarding the workshop facilitators. Feedback was primarily complimentary of the facilitators as many found them engaging, informative, and found the scenarios and interaction useful. A few suggestions were provided, such as limiting the amount of information given, as it was a challenge to process and less technical talk that lost the attention of the participants.

When asked if they felt all topics were given adequate time in the program, 91% of the 193 respondents said yes, slightly fewer than the 93% respondents who said yes last year. Respondents were then able to write in the topics they thought needed adjustment. The majority of written responses that were identified as needing less time or more time were none or n/a. Feedback for topics needing less time included identified stereotypes of victims, scenarios, think and accept, neurobiology of trauma information, and the car scenario. Topics identified as needing

more time were scenarios, self-care information and the definitions of harassment, assault and how to report. Some wanted more strategies for helping and nurture.

Participants were asked to write in suggestions on how the workshop could be improved. A few of the 152 suggestions focused on the length of the workshop some indicating it was too long with repetitive content and others said it needed to be longer. Quite a few wanted more demonstrations and more activities that got the participants out of their seats. A few thought the presentation and the workbooks need better coordination.

## **Background**

The Step IN, STAND Up campaign on the Texas A&M University campus invites Aggies to Step In and Stand Up against sexual harassment and sexual violence. Per its website, <https://stepinstandup.tamu.edu/>, the campaign proclaims, "It is up to us – students, faculty, staff and the rest of the Aggie community- to step in as active participants to reduce the incidents of sexual harassment and sexual violence on our campus, and stand up against it by starting courageous conversations and sharing information. What harms even one of us harms us all." As an educational component of the campaign, the STAND Up workshop "is designed to assist individuals in learning positive and helpful ways to have conversations with individuals who have been involved in a traumatic event." <https://studentlife.tamu.edu/hp/prog/>

The Offices of the Dean of Student Life (ODSL) Health Promotion (HP) trains the STAND Up workshop facilitators and coordinates the workshops. In part, the assessment measures the following learning outcomes:

- Participants will have increased confidence regarding their ability to have a conversation with someone who discloses a trauma to them.
- Participants will understand the need for support of self when working with individuals who have experienced trauma.
- Participants will understand the impacts of trauma on an individual.
- Participants will understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience.
- Participants will have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses trauma.

## **Project Details**

The Department of Student Life Studies provides quality assessment services, resources and assessment training for departments in the Texas A&M University Division of Student Affairs and student organizations. Services by Student Life Studies are funded, in part, by the Texas A&M University Advancement Fee. Results of this project and other assessment projects done through Student Life Studies can be found at <https://studentlifestudies.tamu.edu/results/>. Additionally, division staff can follow Student Life Studies on Facebook.

To work with Student Life Studies for future assessment projects, please fill out the Assessment Questionnaire at <https://slsform.dsaapps.tamu.edu/>.

Report prepared for: Lauren Dorsett and Denise Cristafi, Health Promotions, Offices of the Dean of Student Life  
Report Prepared by: Susan Fox-Forrester, Student Life Studies  
Report Prepared on: October 24, 2019  
Analysis Prepared by: Shaun Ko, Student Life Studies  
Surveys Created by: Barbara Schumacher, Student Life Studies