

Offices of the Dean of Student Life STAND Up Workshop Evaluation 2017-2018

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, and staff – to step in as active participants to end sexual harassment and sexual violence in our community, and stand up to support the survivors of these behaviors. 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."

The Offices of the Dean of Student Life (ODSL) Health Promotion trains the STAND Up workshop facilitators and coordinates the workshops. In the fall of 2017, ODSL contacted Student Life Studies for the second time to help develop an assessment for the workshops, in effort to measure 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.

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 each workshop; staff and faculty surveys from 11 workshops and student surveys from nine workshops were returned to Student Life Studies for analysis. Of the 221 attendees who received a student survey, 221 completed them, for a 100% response rate. Of the 192 attendees who received a staff and faculty survey, 173 completed them, for a 90% response rate.

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 year's 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.

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

Table 1: Demographics

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 2, 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.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2017-2018 Mean (sd) [n]
I understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience (before)	43%	51%	6%	<1%	<1%	4.35 (.63) [288]
I understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience (after)	79%	20%	<1%	--	<1%	4.77 (.49) [255]
I understand the need for support of self when working with people who have experienced trauma (before)	37%	49%	10%	4%	<1%	4.17 (.81) [287]
I understand the need for support of self when working with people who have experienced trauma (after)	71%	28%	<1%	--	<1%	4.70 (.52) [256]
I believe that I have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses a trauma to me (before)	10%	43%	24%	19%	4%	3.36 (1.04) [288]
I believe that I have knowledge of resources to assist someone who discloses a trauma to me (after)	62%	37%	<1%	--	<1%	4.60 (.54) [257]
I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual (before)	22%	48%	21%	8%	1%	3.83 (.90) [287]
I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual (after)	62%	34%	3%	--	<1%	4.59 (.59) [256]
I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me (before)	16%	52%	19%	12%	1%	3.69 (.92) [288]
I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me (after)	49%	48%	2%	1%	<1%	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 141 who responded listed two ways a person may respond. The most frequent were fight, flight, freeze, shock, denial, scared and withdrawn. Next, respondents were asked to list one technique they can use to respond to a survivor of trauma, and 139 responded. Many listed listening, active or reflective listening, letting them talk and validate the survivor.

When asked how this workshop prepared them to have conversations with survivors of trauma, 141 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. 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 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.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2017-2018 Mean (sd) [n]
The facilitators were knowledgeable.	74%	26%	<1%	--	--	4.74 (.45) [285]
The facilitators were well prepared.	74%	23%	2%	<1%	--	4.71 (.52) [285]
The facilitators were engaging.	71%	27%	2%	<1%	<1%	4.67 (.57) [280]
Workshop content was organized and easy to follow	54%	43%	2%	<1%	<1%	4.49 (.61) [283]
The time allotted for the workshop was sufficient	49%	40%	7%	4%	--	4.34 (.78) [282]

Table 3: 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 icebreakers to one and improving the table set up.

When asked if they felt all topics were given adequate time in the program, 89% of the 264 respondents said yes, 11% said no. 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 were n/a, but a few identified the politics, information on requiring to report, neurobiology, environmental factors, less talking and more doing. Topics which were identified as needing more time were skills practicing, scenarios, who and how to report, and more self-care information.

Participants were asked to write in suggestions on how the workshop could be improved. A few of the 85 suggestions focused on the room set-up and comfort, wanting a larger space to move around and interact with hands-on activities, more breaks and more coffee and snacks. Some indicated how the pace was a bit fast, and how the packet was an overload of information. Many suggested sharing the answers to the fill-in-the-blank questions and including videos during the presentation.

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. A majority of participants were sophomore, female, and white, unlike last year, where the largest percentage were seniors. Most of the participants were not first generation students with primary colleges being engineering and liberal arts. The 2016-2017 frequency percentages came from students self-reports.

Demographic Data	Frequency Percentage 2017-2018	Frequency Percentage 2016-2017
Classification	n=205	n=100
Sophomore	30%	2%
Junior	26%	5%
Senior	24%	6%
Masters	9%	‡
Freshman	8%	1%
Doctoral	3%	‡
Sex	n=205	n=101
Female	57%	81%
Male	43%	16%
Ethnicity	n=205	n=102
White	42%	69%
Hispanic or Latino of any race	30%	11%
Black or multi-racial with Black	11%	9%
Asian	9%	9%
International	6%	‡
Multi-racial excluding Black	2%	‡
Primary College	n=205	--
Engineering	21%	‡
Liberal Arts	20%	‡
Agriculture	11%	‡
Education	10%	‡
Business	9%	‡
Veterinary Medicine	8%	‡
Science	6%	‡
General Studies	4%	‡
Architecture	3%	‡
Bush	2%	‡
Geosciences	2%	‡
Public Health	2%	‡
Generation Student	n=205	--
Not First Generation	58%	‡
First Generation	34%	‡
Unknown	8%	‡

Table 4: Demographics
‡ Demographic content not reported

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 gender nonconforming, trezkin, helioadsaultus and apache attack helicopter.

Demographic Statement	Frequency Percentage 2017-2018
Gender	n=213
Female	57%
Male	42%
I identify as:	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.

Statement	Strongly Agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly Disagree (1)	2017-2018 Mean (sd) [n]	2016-2017 Mean (sd) [n]
I understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience (before)	48%	42%	9%	<1%	<1%	4.35 (.72) [221]	4.38 (.61) [102]
I understand the importance of accepting the speaker's experience (after)	75%	22%	3%	--	<1%	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)	40%	44%	12%	3%	<1%	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)	70%	27%	3%	--	<1%	4.66 (.58) [191]	4.72 (.45) [89]
I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual (before)	31%	45%	17%	6%	1%	3.98 (.92) [221]	3.72 (0.91) [102]
I have an understanding of the impacts of trauma on an individual (after)	65%	31%	3%	<1%	<1%	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)	18%	41%	28%	11%	2%	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)	57%	39%	3%	--	<1%	4.52 (.61) [189]	4.57 (.50) [89]
I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me (before)	20%	52%	19%	9%	<1%	3.83 (.86) [221]	3.66 (0.95) [102]
I feel confident having conversations with someone who discloses a trauma to me (after)	51%	44%	4%	--	<1%	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 197 who responded listed two ways a person may respond. The most frequent were fight, flight, freeze, fear, stress, embarrassment, and sadness. Next, respondents were asked to list one technique they can use to respond to a survivor of trauma, and 197 responded. Many listed listening, active or reflective listening, and creating an atmosphere of respect.

When asked how this workshop prepared them to have conversations with survivors of trauma, 192 responded. Respondents often mentioned feeling more confident and prepared 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 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 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)	2017-2018 Mean (sd) [n]	2016-2017 Mean (sd) [n]
The facilitators were knowledgeable.	78%	21%	1%	<1%	--	4.76 (.48) [209]	4.81 (.40) [103]
The facilitators were well prepared.	79%	18%	2%	<1%	--	4.75 (.51) [206]	4.75 (.48) [103]
The facilitators were engaging.	63%	30%	5%	2%	--	4.53 (.70) [206]	4.73 (.45) [102]
Workshop content was organized and easy to follow	52%	44%	2%	1%	--	4.47 (.62) [208]	4.49 (.59) [103]
The time allotted for the workshop was sufficient	48%	36%	11%	5%	--	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 times topics are repeated and adding videos in the presentation.

When asked if they felt all topics were given adequate time in the program, 93% of the 193 respondents said yes, 7% said no. 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 were n/a, but a few identified stereotypes of victims, scenarios, neurobiology of trauma information, and icebreakers. Topics, which were identified as needing more time, were scenarios, self-care information, how to report, and more response techniques.

Participants were asked to write in suggestions on how the workshop could be improved. A few of the 146 suggestions focused on the flow of the workshop, wanting more demonstrations and more activities. Some indicated that the information was a bit repetitive, and the presentations were too long. Many suggested minimizing the amount of printed packets, and would appreciate video examples of a conversation.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The STAND Up workshops were successful as faculty, staff, and students indicated learning more about reporting incidents, and increasing 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. Most found the workshops engaging, the facilitators knowledgeable and prepared, and the interactive nature of the workshop helpful in increasing their confidence.

Generally, respondents found they would like more time in the workshops dedicated to practice and the scenarios in interacting with survivors of trauma. Respondents also found that the information packets were a lot to handle at once, and would prefer a few short videos within the presentations. They also indicated they would like to have more breaks to interact with each other and possibly be accommodated with coffee and snacks. If possible, organizers of the STAND Up workshops may want to consider incorporating more practice, if possible, and at least for those workshops directed towards faculty and staff, include practice scenarios and videos involving reporting incidences. Reviewing all the information in the packets ahead of time, may prevent unnecessary amounts of information and prevent repeated information.

Demographic data provided by participants continue to indicate that female participation in the program was much higher than male participation, although the percentage of males did increase from the previous year. The amount of sophomores who participated drastically increased. There was also an increase in the amount of participants who were Hispanic or Black from the previous year. Also, a larger amount of assessments were received from staff/faculty and student participants this year. STAND Up organizers may want to keep the marketing techniques for future programs to keep attracting more participants, specifically males to the program.

The staff coordinating the STAND Up workshops and its facilitators are encouraged to read all qualitative comments to gain a better understanding of the themes seen this report. The results and changes made based on the assessment results should be shared with participants, as well as other stakeholders on campus.

Report prepared for: Ryan Jackson, CLEAR, Offices of the Dean of Student Life
Report Prepared by: Shicoyia Morgan, Student Life Studies
Report Prepared on: August 22, 2018
Analysis Prepared by: Alyssa Gonzalez, Student Life Studies
Survey Created by: Barbara Schumacher, Student Life Studies

***Services provided by Student Life Studies are funded, in part, by Texas A&M University Advancement Fee.
Find Student Life Studies on Facebook.***