

## **Student Life – Health Promotions**

### **STAND Up Overview and STAND Up Workshop Evaluations**

#### **2021-2022**

#### **Purpose**

Health Promotions within Student Life 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 2021-2022, two separate programs were offered: The STAND Up Overview, an hour-long 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 workshop 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. This is the fourth time Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research worked with Health Promotions to assess the STAND Up trainings.

#### **Key Findings with Recommendations**

Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research 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 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 and organized, and they 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 workshops, both student and staff, 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' workshops.
  - All respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the 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 two times 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 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, held in virtual form only from August 2021 through July 2022. It is unknown how many STAND UP Overview participants were provided the survey link/QR code so a response rate cannot be determined; however, 95 individuals responded to at least one question in the survey.

Two paper surveys were created as evaluations for the STAND UP workshops: one for students and another for staff and faculty. These paper surveys were produced using papersurvey.io®, a survey design software that creates scannable forms and databases. The student survey contained 22 questions, of which 12 were quantitative, 6 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®. A total of 332 paper surveys were collected across multiple workshops that were conducted between August 2021 through July 2022.

The staff and faculty workshop's paper survey contained 23 questions, of which 12 were quantitative, 6 were qualitative, three were demographic, one requested the workshop date, and one requested the facilitators' name. A total of 114 surveys were received across multiple workshops from August 2021 through July 2022.

## **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**

Table 1 shows the classification of respondents; about one-quarter of respondents indicated they were sophomores and staff.

<b>Self-Reported Classification</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2021-2022 [n=95]</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 [n= 276]</b>
Sophomore	24%	26%
Staff	22%	25%
Senior	18%	13%
Freshman	15%	7%
Junior	13%	18%
Faculty	6%	4%
Graduate Student	2%	7%

Table 1: Self-Reported Classification

Those who indicated a student classification when responding to the first question were asked to provide their Universal Identification Number (UIN). Table 2, on the next page, 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 seniors, female, White, and not first generation students.

<b>Demographic</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2021-2022</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2020-2021</b>
<b>Classification</b>	<b>n=69</b>	<b>n=184</b>
Senior	26%	26%
Freshman	26%	4%
Junior	19%	30%
Sophomore	17%	29%
Undergraduate Nondegree	12%	2%
Masters	--	4%
Doctoral	--	5%
<b>Sex</b>	<b>n=69</b>	<b>n=184</b>
Female	80%	68%
Male	20%	32%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>n=69</b>	<b>n=184</b>
White	42%	43%
Hispanic/Latinx	33%	34%
Asian	12%	13%
Multi-racial excluding Black	7%	3%
Black or multi-racial with Black	4%	5%
International	--	2%
American Indian	--	1%
<b>First Generation Status</b>	<b>n=69</b>	<b>n=184</b>
Not First Generation	62%	67%
First Generation	26%	28%
Unknown	12%	5%

Table 2: Student Demographics based on UIN

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, 73% identified themselves as White.

	<b>Frequency Percentage 2021-2022 [n=13]</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 [n=62]</b>
White	73%	81%
Hispanic/Latinx	27%	10%
African American/ Black	18%	5%
I prefer not to respond	--	10%
Asian American, Asian/Pacific Islander	--	3%
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 with 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>2021-2022 Mean (sd) [n]</b>	<b>2020-2021 Mean (sd) [n]</b>
I know more about relevant resources available to me, either on-campus or within the community.	57%	40%	2%	--	--	4.57 (.54) [89]	4.52 (.54) [268]
I feel better prepared to have a conversation with someone who discloses a trauma to me.	60%	38%	2%	--	--	4.55 (.54) [89]	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, 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, and that the facilitators were able to effectively answer the questions presented to them.

<b>Statement</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>2021-2022 Mean (sd) [n]</b>	<b>2020-2021 Mean (sd) [n]</b>
The facilitators were able to effectively answer questions about the topic presented.	66%	28%	6%	--	--	4.72 (.48) [89]	4.56 (.58) [268]
The organization of the workshop content made it easy to follow.	65%	34%	1%	--	--	4.64 (.51) [89]	4.58 (.54) [265]
The facilitators made the content engaging within the learning environment.	73%	26%	1%	--	--	4.61 (.60) [89]	4.47 (.73) [267]

Table 5: Workshop and Facilitator Evaluation

Respondents were asked to share one new thing they learned from attending the presentation. There were 52 responses to this question. 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 and on campus.

Next, respondents were asked how they would define trauma-informed care to someone unfamiliar with the term. Forty-eight of the Overview attendees responded, with a variety of definitions of trauma-informed care. Most of the

responses were similar to attending to a trauma survivor by listening to them, getting them the resources and help they need, and being informed and trained in going about this.

Participants were asked to write suggestions on how the workshop could be improved. About half of the 47 responses were complimentary of the program, indicating 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 as well as more activities and examples.

## STAND UP Workshops Student Evaluation

Participants were asked to provide their UIN. Table 6 provides the classification drawn from the students information system based on the UIN's provided. The demographics were retrieved from the student database using each student's universal identification number (UIN) that they provided in the surveys. Data presented in Table 6 is in descending frequency percentage of the 2021-2022 workshops for each category

<b>Demographic Data</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2021-2022 Virtual</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 Virtual</b>	<b>Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 In-Person</b>
<b>Classification</b>	<b>n=308</b>	<b>n= 32</b>	<b>n=10</b>
Senior	44%	13%	90%
Junior	20%	44%	--
Sophomore	25%	22%	--
Masters	7%	6%	10%
Freshman	3%	9%	--
Doctoral	<1%	3%	--
Pharmacy, First Year	<1%	--	--
<b>Sex</b>	<b>n=308</b>	<b>n=32</b>	<b>n=10</b>
Female	68%	56%	40%
Male	32%	44%	60%
<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>n=308</b>	<b>n=32</b>	<b>n=10</b>
White Only	54%	53%	70%
Hispanic or Latino of any race	26%	41%	20%
Asian Only	9%	6%	--
Black or multi-racial with Black	6%	--	--
Multi-racial excluding Black	4%	--	10%
International	2%	--	--
American Indian Only	<1%	--	--
<b>Primary College</b>	<b>n=308</b>	<b>n=32</b>	<b>n=10</b>
Engineering	21%	19%	40%
Education	18%	3%	10%
Liberal Arts	15%	22%	20%
Science	10%	9%	10%
Agriculture	10%	19%	10%
Business	9%	13%	10%
Veterinary Medicine	7%	6%	--
Public Health	4%	3%	--
General Studies	3%	6%	--
Geosciences	2%	--	--
Architecture	2%	--	--
Dentistry	<1%	--	--
Nursing	<1%	--	--
Pharmacy	<1%	--	--
<b>Generation Student</b>	<b>n=308</b>	<b>n=32</b>	<b>n=10</b>
Not First Generation	71%	77%	90%
First Generation	20%	31%	10%
Unknown	9%	3%	--

Table 6: Student Demographics based on UIN

Respondents were provided the opportunity to share their gender. Table 7 shows the frequency of the gender responses provided by respondents. Responses show that there were far more female participants than male participants this year. The difference between male and female participation has gone up significantly from last year and is similar to the year before that.

	Frequency Percentage 2021-2022	Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 Virtual	Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 In-Person	Frequency Percentage 2019-2020
<b>Gender</b>	n=273	n=25	n=10	n=82
Female	68%	48%	30%	63%
Male	30%	44%	60%	37%
Gender-fluid/Non-binary/Genderqueer	2%	--	10%	--
Trans	--	*	*	*
Intersex	--	*	*	*
Two-spirit	--	*	*	*

Table 7: Self-Reported Gender

\*Question not asked

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 8, 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)	2021-2022 Mean (sd) [n]	2020-2021 Virtual Mean (sd) [n]	2020-2021 In-person Mean (sd) [n]	2019-2020 Mean (sd) [n]
I understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience. (before)	36%	46%	14%	3%	1%	4.14 (.81) [328]	4.27 (.69) [45]	4.40 (.70) [10]	4.27 (.64) [85]
I understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience. (after)	83%	16%	1%	--	1%	4.78 (.57) [327]	4.83 (.38) [42]	5.00 (.00) [10]	4.84 (.37) [83]
I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual. (before)	18%	43%	26%	12%	1%	3.66 (.93) [328]	3.58 (.94) [45]	3.50 (1.27) [10]	3.71 (.96) [85]
I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual. (after)	73%	25%	1%	--	1%	4.69 (.61) [326]	4.76 (.43) [42]	5.00 (.00) [10]	4.63 (.49) [83]
I understand the need for support of self when working with people who have experienced trauma. (before)	14%	42%	32%	12%	1%	3.55 (.91) [330]	3.82 (.98) [45]	3.30 (.95) [10]	3.91 (.88) [83]
I understand the need for support of self when working with people who have experienced trauma. (after)	68%	29%	1%	--	1%	4.63 (.64) [325]	4.62 (.49) [42]	4.60 (.52) [10]	4.65 (.55) [83]
I believe that I have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses a trauma to me. (before)	5%	20%	36%	32%	8%	2.80 (1.00) [330]	2.78 (1.13) [45]	3.10 (1.20) [10]	2.98 (.90) [85]
I believe that I have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses a trauma to me. (after)	58%	38%	2%	<1%	1%	4.51 (.68) [328]	4.50 (.55) [42]	4.80 (.42) [10]	4.65 (.48) [83]
I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me. (before)	5%	26%	35%	30%	4%	2.98 (.97) [330]	3.06 (.94) [47]	3.60 (1.08) [10]	3.32 (.95) [85]
I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me. (after)	42%	51%	5%	1%	1%	4.33 (.69) [326]	4.30 (.59) [44]	4.50 (.53) [10]	4.36 (.62) [83]

Table 8: Learning Outcome Statements



Respondents were asked to list two ways a person may respond during or after a traumatic incident occurs. A total of 326 people responded to this question, and the most frequent responses with around a hundred responses were fight, flight, freeze, fear, forgetting the incident or details of the incident, change behavior, withdrawal, and sadness.

Next, respondents were asked to list one technique they can use to respond to a survivor of trauma. Of the 328 respondents, nearly half of them 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 accepting their truth.

When asked how this workshop prepared them to have conversations with survivors of trauma, 323 students 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.

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 9, almost 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)	2021-2022 Mean (sd) [n]	2020-2021 Virtual Mean (sd) [n]	2020-2021 In-person Mean (sd) [n]	2019-2020 Mean (sd) [n]
The facilitators effectively answered questions about the subject presented.	80%	19%	1%	<1%	<1%	4.77 (.49) [319]	4.88 (.33) [34]	4.89 (.33) [9]	4.80 (.46) [85]
The organization of the workshop content made it easy to follow.	68%	28%	4%	<1%	1%	4.61 (.64) [322]	4.74 (.45) [34]	4.67 (.50) [9]	4.74 (.47) [85]
The facilitators made the content engaging within the learning environment.	68%	24%	7%	1%	<1%	4.58 (.70) [321]	4.76 (.43) [34]	4.78 (.44) [9]	*

Table 9: 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. When asked what topics needed adjustment and less time given to them, most of the 246 respondents said that no change was needed, and a few of the respondents said that the car accident scenario could have been shortened.

For which topics needed adjustment and more time given to them, more than half of the 254 respondents said that no change was needed. Almost everyone else felt that resources should be given more time, and a few students felt that the scenarios should as well.

Participants were asked to write suggestions on how the workshop could be improved. Most of the 256 students responding to this question did not think any change was necessary. Most of the attendees who wanted something changed about the workshop wanted there to be more breaks during the workshop. Some people wanted more interactions and activities as well.

Respondents 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.

### STAND UP Workshops Faculty/Staff Evaluation

Respondents were asked to provide their gender information. A majority (82%) of the faculty/staff this year were female, a large increase from last year when the male – female ratio was almost the same. Respondents were also asked their ethnicity, with a majority of the respondents being white. The demographic data is displayed in Table 10.

	Frequency Percentage 2021-2022	Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 Virtual	Frequency Percentage 2020-2021 In-Person	Frequency Percentage 2019-2020
<b>Gender</b>	n=110	n=25	n=10	n=82
Female	82%	48%	30%	63%
Male	17%	44%	60%	37%
Trans	1%	--	10%	--
Trans	--	*	*	*
Intersex	--	*	*	*
Two-spirit	--	*	*	*
<b>Ethnicity</b>	n=106			
White	70%	--	--	--
Hispanic/Latinx	19%	--	--	--
African American/Black	14%	--	--	--
Asian American/Pacific Islander	4%	--	--	--
Native American/American Indian	2%	--	--	--
Prefer not to answer	1%	--	--	--

Table 10: Self-Reported Demographic Data

\*Question not asked

The respondents 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 11, 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.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2021-2022 Mean (sd) [n]	2020-2021 Virtual Mean (sd) [n]	2020-2021 In-person Mean (sd) [n]	2019-2020 Mean (sd) [n]
I understood the importance of accepting the speaker's experience. (before)	27%	49%	19%	4%	1%	3.98 (.84) [110]	4.27 (.69) [45]	4.40 (.70) [10]	4.27 (.64) [85]
I understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience. (after)	85%	14%	--	--	1%	4.82 (.51) [112]	4.83 (.38) [42]	5.00 (.00) [10]	4.84 (.37) [83]
I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual. (before)	18%	51%	24%	6%	1%	3.79 (.85) [110]	3.58 (.94) [45]	3.50 (1.27) [10]	3.71 (.96) [85]
I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual. (after)	75%	24%	--	--	1%	4.73 (.55) [114]	4.76 (.43) [42]	5.00 (.00) [10]	4.63 (.49) [83]
I understand the need for support of self when working with people who have experienced trauma. (before)	24%	49%	18%	7%	2%	3.85 (.93) [110]	3.82 (.98) [45]	3.30 (.95) [10]	3.91 (.88) [83]
I understand the need for support of self when working with people who have experienced trauma. (after)	68%	31%	1%	--	--	4.68 (.49) [114]	4.62 (.49) [42]	4.60 (.52) [10]	4.65 (.55) [83]
I believe that I have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses a trauma to me. (before)	12%	31%	27%	27%	4%	3.20 (1.08) [108]	2.78 (1.13) [45]	3.10 (1.20) [10]	2.98 (.90) [85]
I believe that I have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses a trauma to me. (after)	74%	24%	2%	--	1%	4.69 (.60) [114]	4.50 (.55) [42]	4.80 (.42) [10]	4.65 (.48) [83]
I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me. (before)	15%	37%	19%	22%	7%	3.30 (1.18) [110]	3.06 (.94) [47]	3.60 (1.08) [10]	3.32 (.95) [85]
I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me. (after)	55%	40%	5%	--	--	4.50 (.60) [114]	4.30 (.59) [44]	4.50 (.53) [10]	4.36 (.62) [83]

Table 11: Learning Outcome Statements

Respondents were asked to list two ways a person may respond during or after a traumatic incident occurs. A total of 111 people responded to this question, and almost all the responses were fight, flight, freeze, fear, forgetting the incident or details of the incident, change behavior, withdrawal, and sadness.

Next, respondents were asked to list one technique they could use to respond to a survivor of trauma. Of the 111 responses, most listed active or reflective listening and using affirming language when responding. Some mentioned being aware of body language, repeating what the trauma survivor is saying back to them, creating an atmosphere of respect, providing privacy and equality by sitting level with the survivor when conversing, and acknowledging their experience and accepting their truth.

When asked how this workshop prepared them to have conversations with survivors of trauma, 110 respondents 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.

Through a series of statements, respondents were asked to rate their level of agreement or disagreement about the organization of the workshop and the facilitation quality. As shown in Table 12, almost all respondents 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, however, these percentages were slightly less than in previous years.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2021-2022 Mean (sd) [n]	2020-2021 Virtual Mean (sd) [n]	2020-2021 In-person Mean (sd) [n]	2019-2020 Mean (sd) [n]
The facilitators effectively answered questions about the subject presented.	82%	17%	1%	--	1%	4.78 (.55) [108]	4.88 (.33) [34]	4.89 (.33) [9]	4.80 (.46) [85]
The facilitators made the content engaging within the learning environment.	70%	27%	2%	--	1%	4.65 (.61) [110]	4.76 (.43) [34]	4.78 (.44) [9]	*
The organization of the workshop content made it easy to follow.	61%	36%	1%	1%	1%	4.56 (.66) [111]	4.74 (.45) [34]	4.67 (.50) [9]	4.74 (.47) [85]

Table 12: Workshop and Facilitator Evaluation

\*Question not asked

Respondents were asked to write the topics they thought needed adjusting, given either more time or less time. Most of the 66 respondents said that no changes were needed, and a few of the respondents said that the car accident scenario and the environment activity could have been shortened.

For which topics needed adjustment and more time given to them, more than half of the 71 respondents said that no change was needed. Almost everyone else felt that mandatory reporting should have been given more time, and a few respondents felt that the scenarios should as well.

Participants were asked to write suggestions on how the workshop could be improved. Most of the 71 responses did not think any changes were necessary. Most of the suggestions were to include more breaks during the workshop. Some people wanted more interactions and more scenarios as well.

Respondents were asked to select from a list of facilitators' names the facilitator who led the workshop they attended. The frequency percentage of those selections 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 department of Student Life's Health Promotion (HP) trains 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**

The Department of Student Affairs Planning, Assessment & Research (SAPAR) 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 SAPAR are funded, in part, by the Texas A&M University Advancement Fee. Results of this project and other assessment projects done through SAPAR can be found at <https://sapar.tamu.edu/results/>. Additionally, anyone can follow SAPAR on Facebook.

To work with SAPAR for future assessment projects, please fill out the Assessment Questionnaire at <https://sapar.tamu.edu/aqform/>.

Report prepared for: Lauren Dorsett and Denise Cristafi, Health Promotions, Student Life  
Report Prepared by: Avanish Shah and Susan Fox-Forrester, SAPAR  
Report Prepared on: November 10, 2022  
Analysis Prepared by: Robert Tirso, Ph.D., SAPAR  
Surveys Created by: Susan Fox-Forrester and Barbara Schumacher, SAPAR