

**Offices of the Dean of Student Life – Health Promotions**  
**STAND Up Overview and STAND Up Workshop Evaluations**  
**2020-2021**

**Purpose**

Health Promotions within the Offices of the Dean of Student Life (ODSL) offers workshops providing 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. In 2020-2021, two separate programs were offered: The STAND Up Overview, an hour-long, virtual presentation intended to provide general information about the impacts of trauma related to experiencing power-based personal violence, and the STAND Up workshop, a three and one-half hour, in-person and virtual presentation designed to provide a more thorough understanding of impacts of trauma related to experiencing power-based personal violence. Surveys were distributed at the end of the Overviews and STAND Up workshops to measure participants' learning and satisfaction.

**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 of the results and qualitative comments to gain a fuller understanding of participants' experiences.

- The STAND Up Overview workshops were successful as nearly all faculty, staff, and students who responded indicated learning more about available resources and felt more prepared to converse with survivors of trauma. Attendees noted they learned to be more aware of their language and the environment during conversations with survivors of trauma, and the importance of choice remaining with the person reporting trauma.
  - Over 90% of respondents found the facilitation of the STAND Up Overview engaging, organized and indicated that the facilitators effectively answered questions. However, respondents also noted that the facilitation would benefit from more interactive presentations, such as adding more polls, scenarios, and role-play as models for future conversations with survivors.
- Respondents attending the STAND Up workshop, both virtually and in-person, better understood the importance of accepting the experience of the survivor of trauma, the impacts of trauma and the need to support oneself when working with survivors of trauma, similar to that of respondents attending previous years' in-person STAND Up workshops. Although still positive, those attending the virtual workshop this year agreed less than those attending in-person workshops this year or previous years that they were knowledgeable of resources to assist or were confident in having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma.
  - All respondents agreed or strongly agreed that facilitation of the STAND Up workshop was engaging, easy to follow and indicated that the facilitators effectively answered questions during both the virtual and in-person workshops. Respondents also noted that the virtual facilitation would benefit from more or better-spaced breaks, considering its length. Those attending the in-person workshop would like more discussion time.
- Similar to previous years' in-person programs, female student participation in the virtual workshops (both the Overview and STAND Up workshop) was higher than male student 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, Office of Fraternity and Sorority Life or other all-male student organizations on campus in an effort to increase male attendance.

## **Method and Sample**

An electronic survey was developed for the STAND Up Overview workshop using Qualtrics®, a software program for creating web-based surveys. The survey consisted of 12 questions: five were quantitative, three were qualitative, and four were demographic; due to branching technology, not all respondents saw all questions. Quantitative and demographic data were analyzed using SPSS®, a statistical software package, and qualitative data were analyzed using Microsoft Excel®. The survey was available to STAND Up Overview participants via an open link/QR code provided near the end of the Overview workshops, held in virtual form only from August 2020 through July 2021. It is unknown how many STAND UP Overview workshop participants were provided the survey link/QR code so a response rate cannot be determined; however, 276 individuals responded to at least one question in the survey.

Two paper surveys were created as evaluations for the STAND UP in-person workshops: one for students, and another for staff and faculty. These paper surveys were produced using Teleform®, a survey design software that creates scannable forms and databases. The student survey contained 22 questions, of which 13 were quantitative, five were qualitative, two were demographic, one requested the workshop date and one requested the facilitators' name. The quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS®, a statistical software package, and the qualitative data were analyzed using Microsoft Excel®. Surveys were distributed at the end one workshop held on April 8, 2021. This represents four fewer in-person workshops than were held September 2019 through February 2020 (pre-COVID-19 pandemic gathering restrictions). Of the 10 attendees who received a student survey, 10 completed them, for a 100% response rate.

The staff and faculty in-person workshop's paper survey contained 23 questions, of which 13 were quantitative, five were qualitative, three were demographic, one requested the workshop date and one requested the facilitators' name. No staff and faculty in-person workshops were held, so no surveys were returned, unlike the previous year when two staff and faculty STAND Up workshops were held prior to the COVID-19 pandemic gathering restrictions.

An electronic survey was developed for the STAND Up virtual workshop using Qualtrics®, a software program for creating web-based surveys. The survey consisted of 23 questions: 14 were quantitative, five were qualitative, and four were demographic. Due to branching technology, not all responders saw all questions. Quantitative and demographic data were analyzed using SPSS®, a statistical software package, and qualitative data were analyzed using Microsoft Excel®. The survey was available to STAND Up workshop virtual participants via an open link/QR code provided near the end of the STAND Up workshops, held in virtual format from August 2020 through July 2021. It is unknown how many STAND Up workshop virtual participants were provided the survey link/QR code so a response rate cannot be determined; however, 50 individuals responded to at least one question in the survey.

## **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, the 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. This report is divided into two sections: STAND Up Overview and STAND Up Workshop.

### **STAND Up Overview**

The first question of the survey asked respondents to indicate their classification. Table 1, on the next page, shows those responses; about one-quarter of respondents indicated they were sophomores and staff.

<b>Self-Reported Classification</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2020-2021</b>
Sophomore	26%
Staff	25%
Junior	18%
Senior	13%
Graduate Student	7%
Freshman	7%
Faculty	4%

Table 1: Self-Reported Classification (n=276)

Those who indicated a student classification when responding to the first question were asked to provide their Unique Identifying Number (UIN). Table 2 shows the student respondents' demographics based on the provided UIN referenced to the student record database. Students participating in the STAND Up Overview and responding to the survey were most frequently juniors, female, White and not first generation students.

<b>Demographic</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2020-2021</b>
<b>Classification</b>	n=184
Junior	30%
Sophomore	29%
Senior	26%
Doctoral	5%
Masters	4%
Freshman	4%
Undergraduate Nondegree	2%
<b>Sex</b>	n=184
Female	68%
Male	32%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	n=184
White	43%
Hispanic/Latinx	34%
Asian	13%
Black or multi-racial with Black	5%
Multi-racial excluding Black	3%
International	2%
American Indian	1%
<b>First Generation Status</b>	n=184
Not First Generation	67%
First Generation	28%
Unknown	5%

Table 2: Student Demographics based on UIN

All respondents were provided the opportunity to share their gender in a text response option and 149 respondents chose to do so. The most frequent responses were female, male, M and F. A list of all responses can be found in the documents attached to this report.

Those respondents who indicated their classification as staff or faculty in question one were asked to share their ethnic and racial identity from a select -all-that-apply response choice list. As shown in Table 3, more than three-quarters identified themselves as White. Those who selected “I identify as” could add an identity as a text entry; however, no one added text to that response choice.

	<b>Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 n=62</b>
White	81%
I prefer not to respond	10%
Hispanic/Latinx	10%
Asian American, Asian/Pacific Islander	3%
African American/ Black	5%
I identify as	2%
Native American/American Indian	--

Table 3: Staff and Faculty Self-Reported Ethnicity/Race

The workshop participants were asked their level of agreement or disagreement with statements about their awareness of and confidence in sharing resources related to the subject of trauma. Table 4 shows that nearly all the Overview survey respondents agreed or strongly agreed to both statements.

<b>Statement: As a result of this presentation....</b>	<b>Strongly Agree (5)</b>	<b>Agree (4)</b>	<b>Neither agree nor disagree (3)</b>	<b>Disagree (2)</b>	<b>Strongly Disagree (1)</b>	<b>2020-2021 Mean (sd) [n]</b>
I know more about relevant resources available to me, either on-campus or within the community	54%	44%	2%	--	--	4.52 (.54) [268]
I feel better prepared to have a conversation with someone who discloses a trauma to me	40%	57%	3%	--	--	4.37 (.54) [267]

Table 4: Learning Outcome Statement

Respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement about the organization of the Overview workshop and the facilitation quality. As shown in Table 5, on the next page, over 90% of participants agreed or strongly agreed that the workshop was easy to follow, facilitators made the content engaging and were able to effectively answer questions.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2020-2021 Mean (sd) [n]
The organization of the workshop content made it easy to follow.	60%	39%	1%	<1%	--	4.58 (.54) [265]
The facilitators were able to effectively answer questions about the topic presented.	60%	35%	5%	--	--	4.56 (.58) [268]
The facilitators made the content engaging within the learning environment.	58%	35%	5%	2%	1%	4.47 (.73) [267]

Table 5: Workshop and Facilitator Evaluation

Respondents were asked to share one new thing they learned from attending the presentation. One hundred ninety-seven provided comments. Many mentioned they learned how to respond to someone who has experienced trauma, the importance of the language used during that conversation, awareness of the environment and the importance of choice for the person reporting the trauma. Others mentioned learning about all the resources available locally, learning what the acronym STAND means, and that freezing is a response to trauma, as well as fight and flight. Some wrote that they learned that the Baylor Scott and White Medical Center was the place locally for forensic exams and who on the Texas A&M University campus are mandated to report incidents shared by students.

Next, respondents were asked how they would define trauma-informed care to someone unfamiliar with the term. One hundred and eighty-two of the Overview attendees responded, with a variety of definitions of trauma-informed care. Some provided simple definitions, such as a sophomore who defined trauma-informed care as “being able to listen and support someone, understanding what they are going through due to the effects of trauma” and another sophomore who defined it “as a response and care that emphasizes understanding, safety and healing.” Other definitions provided were a bit more complex, like a senior who noted that they would “describe it [trauma-informed care] to them {someone unfamiliar} by telling them that it is an approach that medical professionals take. They assume the patient has had trauma. The practice promotes empowerment, a safe place and healing.”

Participants were asked to write suggestions on how the workshop could be improved. About one-third of the 168 responses were complimentary of the program, indicated no improvements were needed and many appreciated the polls to keep them engaged. Those who suggested improvements would like a bit more interaction during the Overview, through more polls or question and answer involving the attendees. Others noted that adding more scenarios and role-play to model the suggested behaviors when interacting with someone who had experienced trauma. Others just indicated it would be beneficial to attend the presentation in-person.

### **STAND UP Workshops (In-person and virtual)**

The first question of the paper survey offered to attendees of the in-person STAND Up workshop asked respondents for the date; only one workshop was held on April 8, 2021. The electronic survey offered to attendees of the virtual STAND Up workshop opened by asking the attendees to share their classification. Table 6 shows that over one-quarter of respondents indicated they were staff and juniors.

<b>Self-Reported Classification - Virtual Workshop</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 n=43</b>
Staff	28%
Junior	26%
Sophomore	18%
Graduate Student	10%
Freshman	10%
Faculty	6%
Senior	2%

Table 6: Virtual Workshop Self-Reported Classification

Those who selected a student classification on the electronic survey offered during the virtual workshop were then asked to provide their UIN. Table 7, on the following page, provides the classification chosen by those students. The demographics were retrieved from the student database using each student's university identification number (UIN) that they provided in the surveys. Table 7 also shows the demographics of students who provided their UIN in response to the second question of the paper survey distributed during the in-person STAND Up workshop. Data presented in Table 7, on the next page, is in descending frequency percentage of the 2020-2021 virtual workshops for each category.

<b>Demographic Data</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 Virtual</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 In-Person</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2019-2020</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2018-2019</b>
<b>Classification</b>	n= 32	n=10	n=82	n=180
Junior	44%	--	15%	16%
Sophomore	22%	--	17%	28%
Senior	13%	90%	41%	13%
Freshman	9%	--	11%	30%
Masters	6%	10%	7%	12%
Doctoral	3%	--	6%	1%
Post Baccalaureate, Nondegree	3%	--		
Pharmacy, First Year	--	--	1%	--
Vet, Third Year	--	--	1%	--
<b>Sex</b>	n=32	n=10	n=82	n=180
Female	56%	40%	63%	67%
Male	44%	60%	37%	33%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	n=32	n=10	n=82	n=180
White	53%	70%	40%	37%
Hispanic or Latino of any race	41%	20%	24%	27%
Asian	6%	--	15%	24%
International	--	--	11%	2%
Black or multi-racial with Black	--	--	7%	7%
Multi-racial excluding Black	--	10%	2%	3%
Unknown or not reported	--	--	--	1%
<b>Primary College</b>	n=32	n=10	n=82	n=180
Liberal Arts	22%	20%	18%	26%
Engineering	19%	40%	40%	20%
Agriculture	19%	10%	6%	8%
Business	13%	10%	5%	7%
Science	9%	10%	6%	8%
Veterinary Medicine	6%	--	5%	6%
General Studies	6%	--	4%	6%
Education	3%	10%	9%	16%
Public Health	3%	--	4%	1%
Geosciences	--	--	1%	2%
Architecture	--	--	1%	1%
Bush	--	--	--	1%
<b>Generation Student</b>	n=32	n=10	n=82	n=180
Not First Generation	77%	90%	65%	66%
First Generation	31%	10%	19%	32%
Unknown	3%	--	16%	2%

Table 7: Student Demographics based on UIN

Attendees taking both the electronic and paper surveys (virtual and in-person workshops, respectively) were provided the opportunity to share their gender in a text response option. Table 8, on the next page, shows the frequency of the gender responses provided by respondents. Responses of the survey from the 2020-2021 virtual workshop include those from faculty and staff as well as students. Those from 2020-2021 and previous years include responses from only student workshops.

	Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 Virtual	Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 In-Person	Frequency Percentage 2019-2020	Frequency Percentage 2018-2019
<b>Gender</b>	n=25	n=10	n=82	n=205
Female	48%	30%	63%	63%
Male	44%	60%	37%	36%
Foma.u	--	10%		
Woman	8%			
*I identify as:	--	--	--	1%

Table 8: Self-Reported Gender

\*Response choice for 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 only

Some faculty and staff attended the virtual version of the STAND Up workshop, and if they identified themselves as faculty and staff in the first question of the electronic survey, they were asked to identify their race/ethnicity in a select-all-that-apply choice question. Of the eight who responded, 88% (n=7) identified themselves as White and 13% (n=1) identified themselves as Hispanic/Latinx.

The workshop participants were asked their level of agreement or disagreement with a series of questions about their knowledge, affect and behavior related to the subject of trauma before and after attending the workshop. Table 9, on the next page, in descending “after” mean order, shows that the workshops’ 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. Like previous years, after the workshop, participants agreed least that they felt confident to have conversations with someone who discloses trauma to them, in comparison to the other learning outcome statements. Respondents of the survey from the 2020-2021 virtual workshop included faculty and staff as well as students. Those from 2020-2021 in-person and previous years include responses from only student workshops.



Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2020-2021 Virtual Mean (sd) [n]	2020-2021 In-person Mean (sd) [n]	2019-2020 Mean (sd) [n]	2018-2019 Mean (sd) [n]
I understood the importance of accepting the speaker's experience (before)	40% Virtual	47% Virtual	13% Virtual	--	--	4.27 (.69) [45]	4.40 (.70) [10]	4.27 (.64) [85]	4.39 (.64) [209]
	50% In-person	40% In-person	10% In-person	--	--				
I understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience (after)	83% Virtual	17% Virtual	--	--	--	4.83 (.38) [42]	5.00 (.00) [10]	4.84 (.37) [83]	4.80 (.48) [181]
	100% In-person	--	--	--	--				
I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual (before)	11% Virtual	53% Virtual	20% Virtual	13% Virtual	2% Virtual	3.58 (.94) [45]	3.50 (1.27) [10]	3.71 (.96) [85]	3.91 (.85) [210]
	20% In-person	40% In-person	20% In-person	10% In-person	10% In-person				
I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual (after)	76% Virtual	24% Virtual	--	--	--	4.76 (.43) [42]	5.00 (.00) [10]	4.63 (.49) [83]	4.66 (.56) [180]
	100% In-person	--	--	--	--				
I understand the need for support of self when working with people who have experienced trauma (before)	22% Virtual	51% Virtual	18% Virtual	4% Virtual	4% Virtual	3.82 (.98) [45]	3.30 (.95) [10]	3.91 (.88) [83]	4.11 (.76) [210]
	10% In-person	30% In-person	40% In-person	20% In-person	--				
I understand the need for support of self when working with people who have experienced trauma (after)	62% Virtual	38% Virtual	--	--	--	4.62 (.49) [42]	4.60 (.52) [10]	4.65 (.55) [83]	4.75 (.50) [181]
	60% In-person	40% In-person	--	--	--				
I believe that I have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses a trauma to me (before)	9% Virtual	18% Virtual	24% Virtual	40% Virtual	9% Virtual	2.78 (1.13) [45]	3.10 (1.20) [10]	2.98 (.90) [85]	3.20 (1.04) [209]
	10% In-person	30% In-person	30% In-person	20% In-person	10% In-person				
I believe that I have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses a trauma to me (after)	52% Virtual	45% Virtual	2% Virtual	--	--	4.50 (.55) [42]	4.80 (.42) [10]	4.65 (.48) [83]	4.54 (.60) [180]
	80% In-person	20% In-person	--	--	--				
I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me (before)	4% Virtual	32% Virtual	32% Virtual	30% Virtual	2% Virtual	3.06 (.94) [47]	3.60 (1.08) [10]	3.32 (.95) [85]	3.65 (.94) [210]
	20% In-person	40% In-person	20% In-person	20% In-person	--				
I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me (after)	36% Virtual	57% Virtual	7% Virtual	--	--	4.30 (.59) [44]	4.50 (.53) [10]	4.36 (.62) [83]	4.46 (.64) [181]
	50% In-person	50% In-person	--	--	--				

Table 9: Learning Outcome Statements

Respondents were asked to list two ways a person may respond during or after a traumatic incident occurs. Thirty from the virtual workshop responded, and the most frequent responses were fight, flight, freeze, fear, forgetting the incident or details of the incident, change behavior, withdrawal and sadness. Nine who attended the in-person workshop responded similarly, noting that victims may have memory loss of the incident, freeze, isolate from others and react with varying emotions.

Next, respondents were asked to list one technique they can use to respond to a survivor of trauma. Many of the 30 virtual workshop respondents and nearly half of the eight in-person workshop respondents listed active or reflective listening and using affirming language when responding. Some mentioned being aware of body language, creating an atmosphere of respect, providing privacy and equality by sitting level with the survivor when conversing, and acknowledging their experience and accept what they say as truth.

When asked how this workshop prepared them to have conversations with survivors of trauma, 30 virtual workshop attendees and eight in-person workshop attendees responded. Respondents often mentioned feeling more confident and more prepared to have difficult conversations with someone who has experienced trauma 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 specifically 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 or disagreement about the organization of the workshop and the facilitation quality. As shown in Table 10, all participants agreed or strongly agreed that the facilitators were able to effectively answer questions, made the content engaging and the organization of the workshop content made it easy to follow.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2020-2021 Virtual Mean (sd) [n]	2020-2021 In-person Mean (sd) [n]	2019-2020 Mean (sd) [n]	2018-2019 Mean (sd) [n]
<b>The facilitators effectively answered questions about the subject presented.</b>	88% Virtual	12% Virtual	--	--	--	4.88 (.33) [34]	4.89 (.33) [9]	4.80 (.46) [85]	4.87 (.34) [206]
	89% In-person	11% In-person	--	--	--				
<b>The facilitators made the content engaging within the learning environment.</b>	77% Virtual	24% Virtual				4.76 (.43) [34]	4.78 (.44) [9]	*	*
	78% In-person	22% In-person							
<b>The organization of the workshop content made it easy to follow.</b>	74% Virtual	27% Virtual				4.74 (.45) [34]	4.67 (.50) [9]	4.74 (.47) [85]	4.69 (.50) [206]
	67% In-person	33% In-person	--	--	--				

Table 10: Workshop and Facilitator Evaluation

\*Question not asked

Respondents were asked to write in the topics they thought needed adjusting, given either more time or less time. Only one written response was given in response to a topic needing less time during either workshop, and that virtual workshop respondent indicated “discussing.” Topics identified as needing more time by seven respondents from the virtual workshops were scenarios, break-out rooms, Title IX and the student conduct process. Two respondents who offered suggestions needing more time during the in-person workshop included everything and resources as responses.

Participants were asked to write suggestions on how the workshop could be improved. A few of the 18 suggestions from the virtual workshop wanted breaktime adjusted, more scenarios and break out sessions and spreading the breakouts over the length of the workshop. One thought it was too long, and one staff member wanted more information about what constitutes a hostile work environment. A majority of respondents were complementary of the workshop as it was presented. The eight responding who attended the in-person workshop primarily wanted more time for discussion and practice.

Respondents of both the virtual and in-person STAND Up workshops were asked to select from a list of facilitators’ names the facilitator who led the workshop they attended. The frequency percentage of those selections for both the virtual and in-person workshops can be found in the attached documents.

## **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) train the STAND Up workshop facilitators and coordinate 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 know resources to assist someone who discloses trauma.

## **Project Details**

Both the STAND Up Overview and STAND Up virtual workshop electronic surveys included faculty/staff and student responses. Please contact Student Life Studies if data analysis for students or faculty/staff only are desired.

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, anyone 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: November 30, 2021  
Analysis Prepared by: Robert Tirso, Ph.D. Student Life Studies  
Surveys Created by: Susan Fox-Forrester, and Barbara Schumacher, Student Life Studies