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ABSTRACT

This qualitative policy study used key informant interviews to determine the perceptions of systems administrators and Title IX coordinators who work at 12 different Colorado state institutions of higher education (IHE) regarding the compliance, use, and effectiveness of the 1990 Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act) and its subsequent guidance and amendments on campus safety. Document analysis was used to determine compliance of 2015 Annual Security Reports (ASRs) with changes required by the 2013 Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (effective October 1, 2015). Additionally, discourse analysis was used as a qualitative methodology to examine discourses that are used in Colorado IHE ASRs and how these discourses shape Colorado IHE expectations and understandings regarding student behavior in relation to Clery Act issues. Finally, general systems theory was applied in understanding results of the document and discourse analyses, as well as the responses of participants.
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DEDICATION

To Jeanne Clery.

To the men and women who work every day to compile and create their IHE’s ASR as an important component of the safety and security of their campus.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

On a fateful night in April 1986, the rape and murder of a student attending Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, changed the way American universities and colleges approached and reported campus crime and safety. During spring 1986, students living in a Lehigh University residential campus residence hall were complacent about access to their residence. To make it easier for students to gain entry to their building, residence hall residents had gotten in the habit of propping doors open with empty pizza boxes and leaving their room doors unlocked (Fisher & Sloan, 2013; Nicoletti, Spencer-Thomas, & Bollinger, 2010). Unfortunately for Jeanne Ann Clery, a freshman at Lehigh University, this lackadaisical approach toward residence hall security would cost her life.

Lehigh University student, Joseph Henry, took advantage of residence hall complacency by sneaking through three propped open and unlocked security doors intending to commit burglary (Fisher & Sloan, 2013; Nicoletti et al., 2010; Sloan & Fisher, 2011). Finding Jeanne Clery’s room unlocked, Henry entered her residence and proceeded to beat, rape, sodomize, strangle, and murder her (Carter & Bath, 2007; Heacox, 2012; Nicoletti et al., 2010; Sloan & Fisher, 2011). Ironically, Clery and her parents had initially decided to have Jeanne attend Tulane University in New Orleans, but had opted for Lehigh University (which they considered a “safer” university) after learning that a Tulane University co-ed had been murdered off-campus (Fisher & Sloan, 2013, p. 33; Nicoletti et al, 2010). The subsequent investigation into Clery’s murder
uncovered that Lehigh University had received reports about violent crimes and 38 sexual assaults on campus in the three years prior to Clery’s murder and had not shared information regarding the incidents to the student population (Gardella, et al., 2014). Howard and Connie Clery, Jeanne’s parents, contended that Jeanne would not have “attended Lehigh if they had known the prevalence of violent crime at the school” (Heacox, 2012, p. 51). They also claimed that Lehigh University was negligently liable in Jeanne’s death because they “failed to notify Jeanne Ann, other residents of the residence hall, or the larger campus community about security lapses and criminal incidents occurring in or near the [residence halls]” (Sloan & Fisher, 2011, p. 57). As a result of Jeanne’s murder and the subsequent fallout from the investigation, in 1990 the United States Congress passed legislation that, for the first time in history, would require every university and college receiving federal funds to report campus crime statistics and security information to all current and prospective students and employees on an annual basis (Fisher & Sloan, 2013; Gardella et al., 2014; Richards & Marcum, 2015; Sloan, Fisher, & Cullen, 1997; Smith & Fossey, 1995).

Prior to undertaking this policy study, I was not aware of the 1990 legislation requiring universities and colleges to disclose campus security policies and campus crime statistics. Although I served as an assistant professor of History with the United States Air Force Academy (USAFA) for six years during 2007 - 2013, USAFA did not fall under the requirements of the 1990 legislation because of its status under the Department of Defense. I was, however, aware of the problem of campus sex offenses because I served on two military court-martials during this period that involved sexual assault
committed by USAFA cadets. Because of my increased awareness, this study examines a national policy at the state level that addresses sexual victimization and campus safety in 23 Colorado state institutions of higher education (IHE).

For this qualitative policy study, I interviewed 18 Colorado state IHE systems administrators and Title IX coordinators regarding the compliance, use, and effectiveness of the 1990 Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act) (20 USC 1092 (f)) and its subsequent guidance and amendments on campus safety.

Document analysis of 23 Colorado state IHE Annual Security Reports (ASRs) was conducted to determine compliance of 2015 ASRs with changes required by the 2013 Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (effective October 1, 2015). Additionally, discourse analysis was used to examine discourses that are used in the 2015 Colorado IHE ASRs and how these discourses shape Colorado IHE expectations and understandings regarding student behavior in relation to Clery Act issues.

The theoretical framework for this policy analysis is von Bertalanffy’s (1950, 1972) general systems theory. General systems theory examines “interdependencies, relations, interconnectedness, [and] openness” in the inputs, outputs, and transformations in dealing with decision-making organizations (Mulej, et al., 2003, p. 74). The relationship between general systems theory, the perceptions of administrators and Title IX coordinators, and the discourse analysis of ASRs can be useful in providing a phenomenological “trans-disciplinary framework for a simultaneously critical and
normative exploration of the relationship between our perceptions and conceptions and the worlds they purport to represent” (Laszlo & Krippner, 1998, p. 47).

This dissertation is the first phenomenological investigation, in correlation with the precepts of general systems theory, conducted on (a) the perceptions of Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators on the compliance, use, and effectiveness of the Clery Act, (b) a document analysis of 2015 Colorado state IHE ASR compliance, and (c) a discourse analysis of Colorado state IHE ASRs.

**Importance of Clery Act**

Following Jeanne Clery’s murder in 1986, Connie and Howard Clery sued Lehigh University for negligence and used the money from the lawsuit settlement in 1987 to found a national nonprofit organization they named Security on Campus, Inc. (SOC). For three years, SOC lobbied at both the state and federal level promoting “legislation that would require colleges and universities to publish their crime statistics” (Fisher & Sloan, 2013, p. 34). In 1990, Howard Clery stated: “We found there were hundreds and then thousands of students being victimized on their own college campuses, and without exception, the colleges were not telling anybody about it” (Sloan & Fisher, 2011, p. 60). Additionally, Connie Clery said that “there is no way that campuses and their students can be safe unless institutions tell the truth about campus crime” (Carter & Bath, 2007, p. 27). In 1990, the Federal Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act was passed by Congress and signed into law by President George H. W. Bush (the act was renamed in 1998 as the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act) (Heacox, 2012). As a result of the legislation, this was the first time in
United States history that colleges were required to report crimes on their campuses (Gardella et al., 2014). The law was enacted to increase public awareness of violence on college campuses and could be used by parents and students to make college choice decisions.

In 2013, changes required by the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA) affected compliance and reporting requirements for the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (hereafter referred to as the Clery Act). These changes have a significant impact on the information required in annual security reports released by Colorado campuses on October 1st of each year.

**Construction of the Problem**

Colorado state IHEs are required to incorporate the changes made to the Clery Act by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act into their 2015 ASRs. An IHE’s failure to comply with the Clery Act requirements can result in (a) fines up to $35,000 per violation, (b) having federal aid limited or suspended, and (c) having an institution deemed ineligible for participation in federal aid programs (Wies, 2015).

**Purpose of Study**

The purpose of this qualitative policy study was (a) to determine perceptions of Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators on the compliance, use, and effectiveness of the Clery Act, (b) to provide a documentation review of 2015 Colorado state IHE ASRs for compliance with changes required by the 2013 reauthorization of the VAWA, and (c) to develop a discourse analysis of 2015 Colorado state IHE ASRs. By
utilizing qualitative interviews with key informants, the intent was that pertinent domains of participant perceptions of the Clery Act would be revealed. Document review was used to determine how Colorado campuses have complied with amendments made by the reauthorization of the VAWA in their 2015 annual security report. Discourse analysis was used to determine how text discourses shaped Colorado IHE expectations and understandings regarding student behavior in relation to Clery Act issues. Using a phenomenological design approach for qualitative inquiry, utilizing key informant interviews, document analysis, and discourse analysis methods, this study sought to uncover the perceptions and actions of Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators on the compliance, use, and effectiveness of the Clery Act through the theoretical framework of general systems theory.

A gap in the current research on the Clery Act is how IHEs are complying with the federal legal requirements mandated by the Clery Act and the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act. Through a study of an entire state’s IHE, this research will increase understanding not only of how Colorado state IHE ASRs are in compliance with federal legislation, but also how IHE policies have been articulated by campus administrators to promote safety and security measures in addressing sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking and other forms of sexual misconduct. This study also provided the different perspectives of those responsible for policy implementation (Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators) on how the Clery Act and the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act impact the safety of their campus, as well as what Clery Act policy changes could be made to improve campus safety communication and reporting. Results
and insights gleaned from the data can lead to changes in how Colorado state IHE compliance and discourse are used to increase student and parent awareness of campus safety and security in making their college choice decisions.

**Research Questions**

This qualitative policy study was designed to explore the following research questions:

1) What perceptions do Colorado state institutes of higher education (IHE) administrators and Title IX coordinators have about how students and parents use the campus crime information contained in mandated reports?

2) How do Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators perceive the benefits to campus safety made with the implementation of the Clery Act and subsequent amendments?

3) How have Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators complied with new reporting required by U.S. Department of Education policy in campus safety reports released in October 2015?

4) What discourses are used in the 2015 Colorado IHE annual security reports, and how do these discourses shape IHE expectations and understandings regarding student behavior in relation to the Clery Act?

5) What policy changes would Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators recommend be made to improve campus safety communication and reporting?
Theoretical Framework

First conceived as an idea in the 1930s and 1940s, Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1950) first posited his general systems theory (GST) in writing by stating that there are principles considered applicable to “systems in general, whatever the nature of their component elements or the relations or forces between them” (p. 139). Von Bertalanffy contended that “it is the basic characteristic of every organic system that it maintains itself in a state of perpetual change of its components” (p. 155). His depiction of an “organic system” was applicable to organizations, and he posited that open systems allowed for “inflow and outflow, and therefore change of the component materials” (p. 155). He concluded that these changes can lead to “basically new, and partly revolutionary, consequences and principles” that include the use of feedback in the evolution of the organization (p. 156).

In 1972, von Bertalanffy expanded on his theory by contending that GST is “a model of certain general aspects of reality. But it is also a way of seeing things which were previously overlooked or bypassed, and in this sense is a methodological maxim” (p. 424). According to Laszlo (1975), “left to themselves” organizations show an “unwillingness to stake their precious resources on new ventures leading beyond the known disciplinary boundaries” (p. 14). To explain the essence of GST, Bernard, Paoline, and Pare (2005) argued that “GST attempted to explain how related components at different levels interacted with one another in forming a system” and that “the concepts and propositions of GST were a mechanism for providing a more
complete and accurate understanding of the phenomena under study” (p. 204). In their analysis of the theory, Laszlo and Krippner (1998) concluded that GST “provides the constructs for interpreting the processes of change in open dynamic systems and is infused by studies of perception that shed light on how we navigate the diachronic terrain of physical and social reality” (p. 70). From a practical application perspective, GST is a useful tool in understanding societal problems (Laszlo, 1975).

This is the first qualitative document analysis, discourse analysis, and phenomenological investigation conducted on the perceptions of Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators on the compliance, use, and effectiveness of the Clery Act in correlation with the precepts of general systems theory. This study explored how von Bertalanffy’s (1950, 1972) theoretical framework was applicable in understanding how the related components of Clery Act policies, procedures, and programs interact to form a system focused on campus security and safety. How Colorado state IHE ASRs included the amendments to the Clery Act made by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act was examined using document analysis to uncover the inputs and outputs of complying with federal legislation. To demonstrate that Colorado institutions are open systems subject to change, discourse analysis was used to understand how campus administrators use discourse to navigate the terrain of campus safety and security issues within the dynamics of an “organic system” (von Bertalanffy, 1950, p. 155). Consistent with GST, this indicated that Colorado state IHEs have allowed for the inflow and outflow of new policies to improve safety on campus. GST is also very
useful in providing a framework for a critical examination of the relationship between the perceptions and conceptions of Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators. Sexual assault and violence is a constant presence in the literature on campus safety, and this threat requires that universities be open dynamic systems responsive to the physical and social reality of campus crime. In the context of GST, the interactivity of college and university administrators and Title IX coordinators towards compliance with the Clery Act means that a fragmented approach toward problems and solutions involving campus safety and security will not contribute to organizational effectiveness.

Elements of GST. There are five essential, defining elements of GST that support the conceptual framework for this study. These five elements are perception, relationships, inputs, outputs, and open systems (Bernard, et al., 2005; Mele, Pels, & Polese, 2010).

Perception. The first element is perception. Within organizations, individuals are charged with carrying out specific tasks to achieve organizational goals and objectives. The perceptions of these individuals are important in understanding how GST informs compliance with the Clery Act and its subsequent amendments to address “special problems connected with human beings and human society” (Laszlo, 1975, p. 24). The individuals who were interviewed, Clery Act administrators and Title IX coordinators, contribute a set of skills and competence that can contribute to promoting an organizational commitment to campus safety and compliance with Clery Act legislation. As posited by Mele, et al., (2010), the insights of individuals within a system “refers to a
specific point of view and can vary from actor to actor; it strictly depends on the contextualized system’s perception in time and space” (p. 130). The perceptions of Clery Act administrators and Title IX coordinators are crucial in understanding how administrators and coordinators affect organizational compliance with Clery Act federal requirements at differential levels of the Colorado state IHE system (Drack & Wolkenhauer, 2011; Laszlo & Krippner, 1998; Mele, Pels, & Polese, 2010).

**Relationships.** The second defining element is relationships. A GST framework demonstrates that organizations, such as IHEs, are system structures with interrelated parts working toward a common goal. The activities of these interrelated parts can be meaningfully linked to the goals and objectives of the system if we understand the components and the relationship between them (Bernard et al., 2005; Drack & Wolkenhauer, 2011; Mele, Pels, & Polese, 2010; Mulej et al., 2003; Ruben & Kim, 1975). For the purposes of this dissertation, in concert with GST, the relationship between IHE actors was examined through interviews, document analysis, and discourse analysis to uncover (a) the communication channels between actors in promoting safety on campus (e.g., training and awareness programs and the disciplinary hearing process), (b) organizational information flow (e.g., timely warnings, the inclusion of 2013 VAWA Reauthorization requirements, and ASR compilation and distribution), and (c) the discourses used by IHE actors to shape expectations of student behavior towards campus safety. As explained by Mele, Pels, and Polese (2010), for organizations within a GST framework “it is fundamental to consider the compatibility between systematic actors”
and the “effective harmonic interaction between them” in understanding the relationship
dynamics of GST structures (p. 131).

**Inputs.** Third, inputs are a key element in how GST informs this study. Within a
GST framework, an input is the movement of information into the system (Drack &
Wolkenhauer, 2011). The requirements of the Clery Act, and the amendments made to it
by the 2013 Reauthorization Act, are real-world requirements that must (by law) be
addressed by Colorado state IHEs. It is critical that IHEs have a clear concept of what
provisions they must respond to in order to effectively comply with federal legislation.
GST is used to understand how organizations receive, process, and respond to inputs in
dealing with planned compliance (van Gigch, 1974). For Clery Act compliance, there are
four key inputs that need to be read and understood by administrators and coordinators to
create an IHE’s ASR. The first of these is *The Handbook for Campus Safety and Security
Reporting* that is released to IHEs by the U.S. Department of Education to provide them
step-by-step guidelines on Clery Act compliance using procedural information, example
ASR entries, and cited references (Westat & Mann, 2011). The handbook was updated in
June 2016, but since this study was conducted prior to the release of the new handbook,
Colorado state IHE used guidance from the 2011 version of the handbook to create their
ASRs. Administrators therefore had to not only be familiar with the requirements that
affect their organization by the Clery Act legislation (the second key input), but also had
to reference the changes made to it by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act (the third
input that affects this process). Lastly, the fourth key input, Title IX requirements,
requires that administrators and coordinators understand how Title IX legislative
protections (a) establish equal access to educational programs, (b) prohibit sexual discrimination, sexual harassment, and sexual assault in education, and (c) inform “the policies guiding campus sexual violence policy and practice” under the provisions of the Clery Act (Wies, 2015, p. 278). GST shows that these inputs are critical for systems to establish priorities that contribute to IHE organizational improvement and effectiveness in complying with federal legislation (van Gigch, 1974).

**Outputs.** The fourth key element is outputs. Within a GST context, an output is how an organization responds appropriately to an input (Ruben & Kim, 1975). The outputs for an IHE in following the Clery Acts campus safety and security requirements are (a) the compilation and distribution of an ASR, which includes campus crime statistics, (b) the availability of training and awareness programs for campus personnel which include a bystander intervention focus, (c) the inclusion of the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act amendments in 2015 ASRs, and (d) clear explanations provided to campus personnel on the process of reporting crimes and how the campus disciplinary process protects the rights of both the victim and the accused (United States Department of Education, Office of Post-Secondary Education, 2015). As postulated by Bernard et al. (2005), inputs and outputs create “a natural ‘feedback loop’ in which the system adapted to a changing environment” and “increased the chances that the system itself would remain viable” (p. 204).

**Open systems.** The final defining element is the GST concept of open systems. Von Bertalanffy (1950) contended that “we call a system closed if no materials enter or leave it. It is open if there [are] inflow [inputs] and outflow [outputs], and therefore
change of the component materials” (i.e., updated ASR production and dissemination that complies federal legislation) (p. 155). Understanding the difference between open and closed systems is fundamental in using GST as a theoretical framework for Clery Act usage and compliance. The failure of an IHE to act as an open system in the acceptance and establishment of the updated mandates regarding Clery Act campus safety and security can have serious personal, legal, and financial consequences for campus personnel, Colorado states IHEs, and the students.

Figure 1 provides a conceptual framework of this study and displays how GST informed this study. It displays how inputs from federal legislation (i.e., Clery Act, VAWA amendments, and Title IX requirements), as well as U.S. Department of Education guidelines, feed into the campus environment to provide mandates for IHE compliance. Key informant interviews with Colorado state IHE Clery Act administrators and Title IX coordinators uncovered the perceptions and experiences of these individuals in the creation of ASRs that are consistent with the inputs and result in outputs that effectively seek to address campus safety and security issues. Additionally, examination of these ASRs through document analysis and discourse analysis explored how campus relationships within the organization were discussed within the ASR (i.e., training and awareness campaigns and the campus disciplinary process), as well as whether IHEs operated as open systems that welcome change on their campus by complying with federal legislation and guidelines through the incorporation of the 2013 VAWA amendments to the Clery Act.
Figure 1. Conceptual framework of Clery Act use, compliance, and effectiveness study using general systems theory.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review first examines the connection between the establishment of the Clery Act and issues of campus safety. It then describes (a) the requirements for IHEs to create annual security reports, (b) the expectation that parents and students will use the annual security reports in determining which campus to attend, and (c) IHE compliance requirements due to the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act.

The Clery Act and Campus Safety

Studies have shown that one in five women will experience an attempted or completed sexual assault while attending an institution of higher learning (Cantalupo, 2014; Fisher, Daigle, & Cullen, 2010; National Institute of Justice, 2005; Smith, Wilkes, & Bouffard, 2014; Vladutiu, Martin, & Macy, 2010; White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, 2014; Yung, 2015). The threat of victimization (especially for women) means that they are in danger of assault on campuses where they live and learn on a daily basis and are at higher risk of assault than their general population counterparts (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000; Jordan, 2014; National Institute of Justice, 2005). A survey of 2,001 female graduate and undergraduate students in a southern American university conducted in 2014 showed that 34.1% of the students reported sexual, physical, or stalking victimization, with 19.1% asserting that their sexual victimization included coercion, sexual assault, and rape (Cantalupo, 2014). According to Fisher et al. (2000), “almost 60 percent of the completed rapes that occurred on campus took place in the victim’s residence, 31 percent occurred in living quarters on campus,
and 10.3 percent took place in a fraternity” (p. 18). Women in college are more susceptible to sexual assault because of (a) easy contact with young men in both public and private on- and off-campus locations, (b) social gatherings that can lead to incapacitation when drugs and alcohol are involved, (c) strong peer pressure to engage in sexual activity, and (d) a “disproportionate number of rapes when the perpetrators are athletes, and a disproportionate number of gang rapes reported when the perpetrators are fraternity members” (Schroeder, 2014, p. 1200). Additionally, Sampson (2011) contended that “college students are the most vulnerable to rape during the first few weeks of the freshman and sophomore years,” with the first week of the freshman year being the “riskiest” time of vulnerability (p. 7).

The protection of students from sexual harassment, sexual assault, and sexual violence has been the focus of legislation passed by the U.S. Congress over the past 42 years. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 was passed, and later interpreted by the courts, to address sex discrimination, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and sexual violence in institutions that receive federal funding for educational programs and activities. Title IX also required that institutions respond in an effective manner when discrimination or an assault is reported (Duncan, 2014; Marshall, 2014; White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, 2014). The Clery Act legislation was passed in 1990 as a response to the perceived and real violence on American university and college campuses and does not “alter a school’s responsibility under Title IX to respond to and prevent sexual violence” (White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, 2014, p. 4). However, Title IX enforcement falls under the Office
for Civil Rights and the Justice Department’s Civil Rights Division. On the other hand, Clery Act enforcement and compliance is overseen by the Department of Education’s Federal Student Aid office because of Title IV’s relationship with school federal financing. Additionally, although Title IX applies to all schools, the Clery Act only applies to universities and colleges (Cantalupo, 2014; Wood & Janosik, 2012).

The Clery Act required that universities and colleges receiving Title IV federal financial aid funding report crime statistics for their campus on an annual basis and disseminate their prevention policies and statistics to students and campus employees (Marshall, 2014). According to Sloan et al. (1997), “a key assumption of the act was that the policies it mandated would, in fact, produce valid and reliable statistics concerning on-campus crime” (p. 149).

**Annual Security Report (ASR)**

Every October 1st, universities and colleges are required to report campus crime statistics for the previous three years in their ASR. The ASR must also explain the policies and procedures the campus uses to report crimes, as well as the rights of sexual assault accusers and the accused. The ASR also includes a listing of crime awareness and prevention programs available both to students and employees. Offenses that must be addressed in a campuses ASR include: (a) murder and non-negligent homicide, (b) negligent manslaughter, (c) forcible sex offences, (d) non-forcible sex offenses, (e) robbery, (f) aggravated assault, (g) motor vehicle theft, (h) arson, and (i) hate crimes (Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, 1998; Lentz, 2010). Changes to the Clery Act made by the 2013 reauthorization of the
VAWA included the addition of dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking as offenses tracked in campus ASRs (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013). In addition to reporting the numbers of crimes committed during the previous year, ASRs must also list the location of these crimes using the categories of on-campus, non-campus, public property, or residence hall crime statistics (a subset of on-campus data) (Lentz, 2010).

In addition to tracking crime statistics and prevention programs in the ASR, universities and colleges must also maintain a daily crime log for at least 60 days and make the logs publicly available during campus business hours during Monday through Friday (Wood & Janosik, 2012). The Clery Act also requires that colleges and universities issue timely warnings about any “serious or ongoing threat to students and employees and devise an emergency response, notification, and testing policy when incidents occur on campus” (Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, 1998; Schroeder, 2014, p. 1213).

The General Accounting Office (now, Government Accountability Office) (GAO) conducted a report in 1997 that reviewed and analyzed ASRs from 25 IHEs and interviewed campus administrators from eight states (however, Colorado IHEs were not included in this study). The GAO report (1997) found that “colleges are having difficulty applying some of the law’s reporting requirements. As a result, colleges are not reporting data uniformly” (p. 8). This finding was attributed to confusion among schools regarding compliance with reporting requirements for completing their ASRs. The GAO recommended that there needs to be “uniformity and consistency in reporting campus
crime statistics to students, parents, and employees” (p. 3). To increase consistency in reporting by IHEs, the U.S. Department of Education released *The Handbook for Campus Crime Reporting* (2005). The handbook was designed to guide IHEs “in a step-by-step and readable manner, in meeting the regulatory requirements of the Clery Act by guiding [IHEs] through the regulations and explaining what they mean and what they require [IHEs] to do” (p. vii). An updated edition of the handbook was released in 2011 and renamed *The Handbook for Campus Safety and Security Reporting*. However, despite step-by-step guidance from the U.S. Department of Education, Wood and Janosik (2012) concluded that the “current regulations are difficult to understand and follow,” and that “as the [Clery Act] continues to evolve, university officials must stay apprised of new amendments and regulations to educate themselves and campus constituents” in completing their IHE’s ASR (p. 15).

**Awareness and Usage of Clery Act ASR by Parents and Students**

One of the outcomes from the investigation into Jeanne Clery’s death was the perception that institutions of higher learning were covering up incidents of sexual assault to protect their reputation and avoid a decrease in student applications for admission (Jordan, 2014; Yung, 2015). Proponents of the Clery Act believed that the publication of campus safety statistics would allow students and parents to make knowledgeable decisions about school choice (Cantalupo, 2014; Fisher, Hartman, Cullen, & Turner, 2002; Janosik & Gregory, 2009; Marshall, 2014; Wood & Janosik, 2012). Although the Clery Act legislation was enacted and came into force 25 years ago, there have only been eight studies conducted and reported in scholarly journals on the perceptions of campus
officials, students, and parents on the impact and outcome of the legislation on their institutions and the use of ASRs in school selection. All eight studies were conducted during 1997-2009 by Janosik, Gehring, and Gregory (Janosik & Gehring, 2003; Janosik & Gregory, 2009).

In the first study, Janosik (2001) surveyed 795 community college, college, and university students and found that 71% of students were unaware of the Clery Act, with 88% unable to recall even receiving their school’s ASR. Of the students that did read the ASR, less than 4% used the crime statistics in making college choice decisions. In a subsequent study, Janosik and Gehring (2003) surveyed more than 300 higher education institutions and found that only 22% of students reported reading their campus’ ASR, and only 8% used an institution’s ASR to make their choice for college attendance. In a later study, Janosik (2004) found that only 6% of 450 parents surveyed reported using a school’s ASR in assisting their children with college selection. This led the researcher to conclude that “parents were no more aware and knowledgeable of the Clery Act than students” (p. 55). In analyzing survey responses, Janosik (2001) concluded that factors such as the quality of academic programs offered by a school, as well as cost and location, are considered more important by students and parents when deciding on a university of college to attend.

When considering the link between the Clery Act and campus safety, Gregory and Janosik (2002b) found that 57% of college administrators believed that crime reporting and campus safety were improved by implementation of the Clery Act. However, in a survey of 944 campus law enforcement officers, Janosik and Gregory (2002a) reported
that only 10% of the officers credited the Clery Act with reducing crime on campuses. The researchers also found that only 2% of campus judicial affairs officers believed that the Clery Act was responsible for a reduction in crime on their campus, and that 4% of the officers believed that “there is any evidence that students have made college choices as a result of the crime statistics” (Gregory & Janosik, 2003, p. 776).

In 2005, Janosik expanded his research on perceptions of the Clery Act and campus safety by interviewing 147 directors of women’s centers who served as advocates for assault victims on campuses. The research showed that 13% of the directors felt that the ASRs influenced student behavior towards crime prevention, and that 17% of the directors believed that the ASRs were used by students in selecting a college to attend (Janosik & Plummer, 2005). In their final study, Janosik and Gregory (2009) surveyed 327 senior student affairs officers (SSAOs) and found that only 10% of the SSAOs “thought that students used the reports of crime statistics to make [an] admissions decision” (p. 222).

Logic would dictate that the fewer incidents included in a college or university’s ASR, the safer the campus. On the other hand, Cantalupo (2014) contended that there is a counterintuitive logic regarding universities and colleges when they report sexual assaults in their crime statistics. The higher the number of incidents reported could also mean that colleges and universities are more dedicated to collecting accurate data, and are therefore promoting a safer campus environment (particularly as it relates to the tracking of sexual assault statistics).
Clery Act Compliance Requirements for October 2015 ASRs

There were 11 changes made to the Clery Act in the reauthorization of VAWA in 2013 that involved the issues of (a) dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking, (b) the voluntary reporting of crimes, (c) the use of campus programs to educate students and employees to promote the awareness of rape, acquaintance rape, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, (d) the definition of consent, (e) education programs that provide safe and positive options for bystander intervention, (f) the importance of preserving evidence for proof of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, (g) procedures for campus disciplinary action in case of alleged domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, and (h) the rights of accuser and the accused following the outcome of any disciplinary proceeding that arises from an allegation of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013).

The amendments to the Clery Act made by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization (signed into law on March 7, 2013) were put into place to “increase transparency, accountability, and education surrounding the issue of campus violence, including sexual assaults, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking” (Duncan, 2014, p. 444). The U.S. Department of Education, Office of Post-Secondary Education (2014) directed that “institutions must make a good-faith effort” to include the changes made to the Clery Act by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization in their 2014 ASR (p. 3). However, the final regulations and policy changes made to the Clery Act by the VAWA Reauthorization officially went into effect on July 1, 2015, and the changes are required to be
incorporated into all ASRs released on October 1, 2015 (United States Department of

**Dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking.** The addition of dating
violence, domestic violence, and stalking were made to the Clery Act to address the
common misperception of sexual assaults being committed by strangers rather than
acquaintances (Marshall, 2014). The concept of “rape myths” promoted the idea that a
“real rape” happened when a stranger surprised and attacked a victim who fought back
and reported the assault to the police (Sampson, 2011). Acquaintance rape is most often
committed by “a boyfriend, ex-boyfriend, classmate, friend, acquaintance, or coworker”
(Fisher et al., 2000, p. 17). Additionally, the issues of domestic violence, dating violence,
and stalking have historically been treated “as private family matters” (Ames, Glenn, &

A key aspect of understanding these three categories of victimization is to provide
definitions in a college or university’s ASR. Basic definitions of these crimes not only
enhance student and employee understanding of what the crimes entail, but also allow for
more effective awareness and prevention training. As concluded by Stein (2007),
“colleges can build positive, pro-social communities by conveying a clear message that
[students, and especially] men must participate in preventing sexual violence” (p. 84).

**Stalking.** Stalking is defined as a person “engaging in a course of conduct
directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to (a) fear for his or her
safety or the safety of others, or (b) suffer substantial emotional distress” (United States
Department of Education, Office of Post-Secondary Education, 2014, p. 3). Research has
shown that 18-20% of women in college will be victims of stalking behavior; however, less than 20% of stalking victims will report their stalker to law enforcement or campus officials (Jordan, Wilcox, & Pritchard, 2007; Wilkes & Bouffard, 2014). The most common reason for not reporting included a belief that the stalking was not serious enough to report or the victim believed they could handle the situation on their own (Buhi, Clayton, & Surrency, 2008). Additionally, 70% of stalking victims will be able to identify their stalker as “a former intimate [partner] (20 percent) or a friend, roommate, or neighbor (15 percent)” (Catalano, 2012, p. 5; Jordan et al., 2007). To avoid their stalker, victims of stalking in the college environment often (a) dropped their classes in which the stalker was in or taught, (b) changed their majors, (c) attended a different college or university, or (d) moved back home to recover from the experience (Boon & Sheridan, 2002; Buhi et al., 2008; Fisher et al., 2000). Cupach and Spitzberg (2004) recommended that victims “end all contact with the pursuer, to be unresponsive to pursuer contact attempts, and to maintain records in case legal intervention may be required” (p. 162).

**Dating violence.** Dating violence, also referred to as “intimate partner violence,” is defined as violence committed by a person (a) “who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the victim,” or (b) “where the existence of such a relationship shall be determined based on a consideration of the following factors: the length of the relationship; the type of relationship; and the frequency of interaction” of those involved (United States Department of Education, Office of Post-Secondary Education, 2014, p. 3). Researchers have found that physical, sexual, or emotional violence associated with a dating relationship affected 21% of college students
Studies have also shown that “psychological aggression occurs in approximately 80 percent of college student dating relationships; physical aggression in 20-30 percent; and sexual aggression in 15-25 percent,” with males more likely to commit dating violence (Shorey, et al., 2012, p. 290). Unfortunately, findings have also shown that dating violence is not considered by students as a serious crime (Sabina & Ho, 2014), and that victims were more likely to report sexual assault or violence if the accused was not in a romantic relationship with them (Cleere & Lynn, 2013). As concluded by Buhi et al. (2008) “The line between what is normal courtship behavior and what is deviant behavior is not very clear” (p. 424).

**Domestic violence.** Domestic violence is defined as a “felony or misdemeanor crime of violence” committed by (a) “a current or former spouse or intimate partner of the victim,” (b) “a person with whom the victim shares a child in common,” (c) “a person who is cohabiting with or has cohabitated with the victim as a spouse or intimate partner,” (d) “a person similarly situated to a spouse of the victim under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction receiving grant monies [under VAWA],” or (e) “any other person against an adult or youth victim who is protected from that person’s acts under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction” (United States Department of Education, Office of Post-Secondary Education, 2014, pp. 2-3). Research has shown that the rate of domestic violence negatively impacts women four times more than men (Abrahamson & Cantrell, 2013). One of the great myths surrounding domestic violence situations is that “people must enjoy the battering since they rarely leave the abusive relationship” (Paludi, 2008, p. 160). The reality is that many victims do not leave
because of (a) “threats to their lives and the lives of their children, especially after they have tried to leave the batterer,” (b) “fear of not getting custody of their children,” (c) “financial dependence,” (d) “feeling of responsibility for keeping the relationship together,” (e) and “lack of support from family and friends” (Paludi, 2008, p. 160). In the context of Clery reporting, the U.S. Department of Education in the final rule of the Violence Against Women Act (2014) has clarified that for an incident to be classified as domestic violence “requires more than just two people living together; rather, the people cohabitating must be spouses or have an intimate relationship” (p. 62,757).

**Voluntary and confidential reporting of crimes.** Prior to the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization, critics of the Clery Act believed that it was limited in its effectiveness because it relied on victim reporting resulting in the underreporting of sexual assaults and violence (Jordan, 2014). Studies have shown that less than 10% of victims report that they have been assaulted (Cantalupo, 2014; National Institute of Justice, 2005; Schroeder, 2014; Strout, Amar, & Astwood, 2014). Yung (2015) concluded that “the actual rate of sexual assault is likely at least an estimated 44 percent higher than numbers that universities submit in compliance with the Clery Act” (p. 7). The most commonly cited reasons for not reporting an assault are “fear of retaliation by assailant, mistrust of the campus judicial system, and fear of blame and disbelief by officials” (Schroeder, 2014, p. 1197). However, studies have shown that victims of sexual assault often tell friends of an incident but are reluctant to tell family members or campus officials (Fisher et al., 2000). Walsh, Banyard, Moynihan, Ward, and Cohn (2010) found that students also failed to report victimization because they were unaware of campus locations that could be used to
seek assistance in the event of an assault. As a result, sexual assault is considered one of the most underreported crimes against women (Fisher et al., 2002; National Institute of Justice, 2005). Additionally, research has shown that of men who admitted to committing attempted or completed rape on a campus, 63% admitted to committing “an average of six rapes each” (White House Council on Women and Girls, 2014, p. 2). The promotion of voluntary reporting could have a positive effect on identifying and apprehending serial rapists.

Sloan et al. (1997) posited that the “unwillingness [of victims] to report on-campus incidents to campus authorities has clear implications for the accuracy of crime statistics generated by the [Clery] act” (p. 154). Allowing for the voluntary reporting of crimes would make it “impossible for a campus to hide behind non-reporting and provide the school with information it needs to address the problem properly” (Cantalupo, 2011, p. 259). After the reauthorization of VAWA, the Clery Act now requires victims be given the option to report an assault on a voluntary, confidential basis, and be assisted by campus authorities in either reporting an assault or deciding not to notify law enforcement (Marshall, 2014; Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013). As concluded by Sampson (2011): “Increased reporting—even anonymous reporting—may push colleges to further invest in more effective acquaintance rape prevention” (p. 15).

**Definition of consent.** Acquaintance rape at universities and colleges accounts for 90% of sexual assaults (Schroeder, 2014). The “more intimate the relationship, the more likely it is for a rape to be completed rather than attempted” (National Institute of
Justice, 2005, p. 2). Additionally, research has shown that “direct verbal expressions of consent are likely to be less common than indirect and nonverbal expressions of consent” (Joskowski et al., 2014, p. 905). As a result, many victims of acquaintance rape do not report their assault because they were unsure whether an actual crime occurred (Flowers, 2009). The ambiguity of what is considered rape is evident in student comments such as “rape is hard to define” and “it depends” (Burnett, et al., 2009, p. 474). Also, men in a relationship are more likely to expect intercourse, and therefore they are less likely to conclude that their behavior could be construed as coercive, even if consent is not clearly communicated to them by their female partner before intercourse (Adams-Curtis & Forbes, 2004; McMahon, 2007).

By providing students “a clear definition of what constitutes consent, sexual assault survivors should be able to more clearly recognize an incident that warrants reporting and potential legal action” (Marshall, 2014, p. 285). As concluded by Joskowski et al. (2014), “helping college students achieve successful communication and interpretation of consent and nonconsent is, at the very least, a minimal requirement for ensuring consensual and enjoyable sexual interactions” (p. 915).

**Sexual assault awareness and prevention programs.** The use of sexual assault awareness and prevention programs can have an impact on student and staff knowledge about the impact of sexual assault and violence on campus. These programs must include (a) definitions of covered crimes by the school’s ASR, (b) a discussion of bystander intervention options, and (c) how to reduce the risk of assault and violence on campus (Gomez, 2015, p. 9). The most effective programs are those that are “sustained (not brief,
one-shot educational programs), comprehensive, and address the root individual, relational and societal causes of sexual assault” (White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, 2014, p. 9). A study conducted by Rothman and Silverman (2007) found that a first-year college student prevention program “was associated with a reduction in the reported prevalence of sexual assault victimization (12 percent among those exposed, 17 percent among those unexposed)” (p. 287). Additionally, the National Institute of Justice (2005) found that 90% of school administrators believed that sexual assault awareness and prevention programs targeting athletes and fraternities would encourage reporting of sexual violence. The 2013 VAWA Reauthorization required that awareness and prevention programs be bolstered to not only discuss rape, acquaintance rape, sexual assault and violence, but also dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking for all students and campus employees (Schroeder, 2014; Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013).

Two other issues that can be addressed by prevention programs are bystander intervention (as discussed below), and the potential harm of microaggressions. Microaggressions are “subtle, intentional, or unintentional acts that communicate hostile, derogatory, or sexualizing insults toward women generally and rape survivors specifically” (McMahon & Banyard, 2012, p. 9). Awareness of how sexist language, jokes (especially rape jokes), and pornographic images demean women, and how students can recognize unwanted advances and harassment in a college social environment can make a difference in combatting sexual assault and violence on college campuses (McMahon & Banyard, 2012).
**Bystander intervention.** One of the main recommendations of Clery Act administrators has been the need for more effective training programs. Although presenting information on the impact of sexual assault and violence to students and campus employees is being done, advocates urged that the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization provide additional training and resources that will encourage bystanders to intervene when they witness sexual assaults and victimization of fellow students and campus staff (National Center for Campus Public Safety, 2014). Banyard, Plante, and Moynihan (2004) contended that “a bystander focused prevention message, with its emphasis on shared responsibility, will work to foster such a sense of community and promote more competent communities around the issue of sexual violence” (p. 70). Exposure to bystander education could possibly encourage college students to speak up when confronted with aggressive, violent, or coercive behavior (Casey & Ohler, 2011).

Gidycz, Orchowski, and Berkowitz (2011) found that college men who attended bystander intervention training reported less sexual aggression in the four months following the training when compared with men who did not receive the training. Researchers have concluded that effective intervention efforts need to address cultural misperceptions and assumptions about sexual assault and violence (Cares, Moynihan, & Banyard, 2014; McMahon & Banyard, 2012). These misperceptions include the acceptance of rape myths that promote “the belief that the way a woman dresses or acts indicates that ‘she asked for it,’ or that rape occurs because men cannot control their sexual impulses” (McMahon, 2010, p. 4). Additionally, studies have shown that the acceptance of rape myths and “rape supportive attitudes” are greater among athletes who
participate in aggressive team sports such as football (Burnett et al., 2009, p. 466). A study conducted by McMahon (2010) found that “students who endorse more rape myths are less likely to intervene as bystanders” (p. 9). She contended that bystander intervention programs should address both the need for intervention and the prevalence and impact of stereotypical rape myths.

This type of training is expected to allow students to recognize dangerous situations in campus environments and give them the skills to be first responders in recognizing “the warning signs of a predatory rapist so students can help each other” (Schroeder, 2014, p. 1230). Peer support that discourages sexual assault and coercion can be essential in preventing violence against women and the perpetuation of a “rape culture” (Strain, Hockett, & Saucier, 2015). Effective bystander strategies include: (a) how to identify warning signs of aggression or violence, (b) the use of role models for the prevention of violence, (c) opportunities to practice prevention efforts, and (d) the creation of social norms that promote and encourage bystander interventions (Ahrens, Rich, & Ullman, 2011).

**Preservation of evidence.** Sexual assault is defined “as any vaginal, oral, or anal penetration that is forced upon another, regardless of sex and sexual orientation, using any object or body part” (Aronowitz, Lambert, & Davidoff, 2012, p. 173). Universities and campuses are now required to explain in their ASRs the importance of evidence preservation following sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, or stalking incidents (Gomez, 2015). An incident in which there is “little or no physical evidence” makes it less likely for college women to report a crime to campus officials (Marshall,
For example, the preservation of evidence in stalking situations means retaining written texts, electronic communications, and documentation of the pursuer’s behavior (Fisher, 2001).

**Campus disciplinary proceedings.** According to the VAWA Reauthorization, disciplinary action must include a clear statement in the ASR that such proceedings shall provide a “prompt, fair, and impartial” investigation and resolution for both the accuser and accused stalking (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013). Bennett (2015) contended that although campuses must protect “the campus environment and student safety,” this must be “balanced by providing an equitable and fair resolution process” for students (p. 7). The 2013 updates to the Clery Act are intended to address this balance. In connection with another change discussed above, the use of awareness and prevention programs also allows campus officials to receive their annual training to participate in disciplinary proceedings in accordance with the VAWA amendments (Marshall, 2014). The U.S. Department of Education asserted that “ensuring officials are properly trained will greatly assist in protecting the safety of victims and in promoting accountability” (Violence Against Women Act, Final rule, 2014, p. 62,773). As concluded by Walsh et al. (2010):

> the issue of sexual assault provides an ideal opportunity for university constituencies to work together on awareness campaigns, education and prevention interventions, and the coordination of effective responses” to victimized students “who have myriad social, legal, physical, and mental
health – and likely even academic and residential – concerns following sexual assault (p. 148).

**Conclusion**

For over 25 years, IHEs throughout the United States have been required to comply with the Clery Act (and its subsequent amendments) in dealing with the issues of campus safety and security. Research studies on the Clery Act legislation have shown that a majority of students and parents do not use campus ASR crime statistics in deciding on which campus to attend (Janosik, 2001; Janosik & Gehring, 2003). Also, studies have shown that the majority of campus administrators do not believe that IHE ASRs have influenced student behavior toward crime prevention, nor have students used the ASRs in selecting a college (Janosik & Gregory, 2009; Janosik & Plummer, 2005). The goal of the literature review is to “survey what is known about a given topic, how that topic has been investigated, and the intellectual and analytic tools that might help you to understand it better” (Ravitch & Riggan, 2012, p. 11). New reporting criteria, established by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act, has mandated that IHEs update their 2015 ASRs with information on dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, consent, reporting of crimes, prevention programs, and disciplinary proceedings to increase campus transparency and accountability in handling sexual violence. This study sought to learn more about perceptions and practices of Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators in dealing with the changes made by these new reporting requirements. In addition to key informant interviews, both document analysis
and discourse analysis of Colorado state IHE ASRs were used to better understand how campuses have incorporated these safety and security issues into their ASRs.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

The following chapter examines the decision to use a phenomenological approach, supported by key informant interviews, document analysis, and discourse analysis methods, to answer the five research questions. The sample selection and data collection processes are discussed, followed by the limitations of this study. Finally, the data analysis section explains how the data answered the research questions.

Research Questions

This phenomenological study was designed to explore the following research questions:

1) What perceptions do Colorado state institutes of higher education (IHE) administrators and Title IX coordinators have about how students and parents use the campus crime information contained in mandated reports?

2) How do Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators perceive the benefits to campus safety made with the implementation of the Clery Act and subsequent amendments?

3) How have Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators complied with new reporting required by U.S. Department of Education policy in campus safety reports released in October 2015?

4) What discourses are used in the 2015 Colorado IHE annual security reports, and how do these discourses shape IHE expectations and understandings regarding student behavior in relation to the Clery Act?
5) What policy changes would Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators recommend be made to improve campus safety communication and reporting?

Research Design

In order to gain insight into the perceptions and actions of Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators toward the compliance, use, and effectiveness of the Clery Act, a phenomenological approach was chosen for this study (Bazeley, 2013; Moustakas, 1994; Rubin & Rubin, 2005). As asserted by Detmer (2013), one of the major goals of phenomenological research is “descriptive fidelity” to “describe accurately what is given in experience precisely as it is given, and with the limits of how it is given” (p. 18). According to Creswell (2013), understanding what individuals have experienced, and how they have experienced it, is the “essence” of phenomenological study (p. 79). The phenomenological research design for this policy study utilized document analysis, discourse analysis, and key informant interview methods to examine lived experiences, built themes that describe a phenomenon, and presented a discussion about findings that are meaningful and useful within the context of general systems theory (GST). Additionally, this study sought to analyze Colorado state IHE perspectives and compliance with amendments made to the Clery Act by the 2013 Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) Reauthorization (Gomez, 2015; United States Department of Education, Office of Post-Secondary Education, 2015). These changes to annual security reports (ASRs) included:
1) Definitions of stalking, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and consent (in reference to sexual activity).

2) Reporting of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking incidents.

3) IHE procedures for victims to report crimes, as well as what procedures an IHE will follow once an incident is reported.

4) Information about prevention and awareness programs that promote the awareness of rape, acquaintance rape, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

5) Provide information on education programs that promote bystander intervention.

6) Provide information on the importance of preserving evidence for incidents related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

7) Procedures for IHE disciplinary actions and the conduct of disciplinary proceedings in ways that protects the safety of victims and promotes accountability (Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013).

This is a two-phase policy study. The first phase focused on qualitative interviews with seven Clery Act administrators working at five Colorado state IHEs. The first phase of this study was approved by the University of Colorado Colorado Springs Institutional Review Board (IRB) on May 11, 2015 (IRB Protocol No. 15-196). The interviews of seven self-selected Colorado state IHE administrators were conducted over a period of 61 days (June 3 – August 3, 2015). The second phase of this study included interviews with six Colorado state IHE administrators and six Title IX coordinators. The interviews of
these 11 self-selected Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators were conducted over a period of 72 days (January 4 – March 15, 2016). Additionally, the second phase of this study included a document analysis of 2015 Colorado state IHE ASR compliance with the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act, along with a discourse analysis of all 23 Colorado state IHE ASRs.

**Sample Selection**

The Clery Act, Title IX legislation, and the Violence Against Women Act (and its subsequent 2013 reauthorization) are national policies, and it is anticipated that the findings and interpretations of this study in analyzing IHEs from one state has provided a broad perspective on Clery Act use, compliance, and effectiveness. The intent was to conduct key informant interviews with a purposive sample of 44 Colorado state IHE Clery Act administrators and Title IX coordinators from 23 state IHEs, as well as the document analysis and discourse analysis of 23 ASRs from these same institutions (two IHEs, University of Colorado Denver and University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, share the same Clery Act administrator and Title IX coordinator). However, even though 44 key informants were invited to participate, only 18 invitees chose to participate in the key informant interviews. Although this study was limited to Colorado state IHEs, that does not mean that the results cannot apply to IHEs in other states.

Phenomenological research explores how people perceive, understand, and experience a phenomenon (Creswell, 2013; Moustakas, 1994). After conducting data analysis, qualitative research findings can be transferred “on the basis of revealed qualities, and so on, but it must be done in relation to concepts, categories, theoretical propositions and
models of practice, not populations of people” (Watts, 2014, p. 12). Bazeley (2013) contended that “each singular person or event embraces a degree of universality, reflecting dimensions of the social structures and order of their time” (p. 411). This possible transferability, given enough detail of the data in context, is the concept that findings in one setting or context can be applied to similar contexts, groups, or settings (Cope, 2014; Malagon-Maldonado, 2014; Noble & Smith, 2015; Patton, 2015). Clery Act administrators and Title IX coordinators from around the United States may be able to associate the findings of this research (which seeks to provide key informant interviews, document analysis, and discourse analysis results as all equally important) in the context of their own experiences in dealing with Clery Act and the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act requirements.

**Key informant interviews.** Phenomenological researchers use interviews to elicit more in-depth information about the phenomenon being studied (Jones, Brown, & Holloway, 2013; Marshall & Rossman, 2016). A purposive sample of 44 Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators were asked to participate in this study to obtain data that addresses the research questions and the issues of importance to the sampled population (Emmel, 2013). The two criteria for participation were (a) serving as a staff member or Title IX coordinator for a Colorado state IHE campus and (b) being involved with campus compliance and documentation of Clery Act reporting during the 2015-2016 academic school year. For the purposes of this study, an administrator is considered an individual who is responsible for the compilation and creation of an IHE’s ASR to ensure an IHE’s compliance with federal regulations, and a Title IX coordinator
oversees an IHE’s policies, procedures, and practices to ensure the IHE is compliant with Title IX legal requirements and contributes to ASR compilation. Although 44 invitations were sent to the 23 Colorado state IHEs, only 18 of the invited Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators opted to participate in this study.

**Document analysis.** Document analysis was used for this policy study to compare all 23 Colorado state ASRs to determine IHE compliance with the VAWA Reauthorization Act of 2013. All 23 ASRs were downloaded from the Internet from the applicable IHE website, and each report was thoroughly analyzed using document analysis. The advantages of analyzing textual data revealed (a) the richness of presented information, (b) how relevance regarding the topic was generated by the ASR authors, (c) what information was important to the authors of the ASRs, and (d) information that was readily available without access limitations. A document analysis approach therefore allows researchers “to get a better overall picture of how a social institution operates” (Silverman, 2014, p. 276).

**Discourse analysis.** Discourse analysis, which was employed in this study, “is a form of interpretive analysis just as much as it is an approach to how social worlds are constructed” (Manning & Kunkel, 2014, p. 155). Discourse analysis is not focused on linguistics, such as syntax, phonetics, or grammatical rules, but instead relies on the examination of how discourse in language and text are used to convey meanings and knowledge of how we understand the world, or a particular aspect of the world, related to social, cultural, or political usage (Czarniawska, 2014; Jones, 2012; Phillips & Hardy, 2002; Wood & Kroger, 2000). According to Gee (2014), “what we say, do, and are in
using language enacts practices” in the social world (p. 33). Discourse analysis is therefore useful for researchers in establishing the link between the content of a text and the relevant language-in-use in uncovering contextual information (Fairclough, 2003; Gee & Green, 1998; Livholts & Tamboukou, 2015; Starks & Trinidad, 2007; Wetherell, Taylor, & Yates, 2001). For the purposes of this policy study, a systematic approach of discourse analysis was utilized to examine the intertextuality of 2015 Colorado state ASRs discourses in establishing the expectations and understandings regarding student behavior on campus in relation to the Clery Act and its subsequent amendments. This analysis also considered how 2015 Colorado state ASRs use discourse to frame and promote the process of social change regarding sexual assault, violence, and educational awareness in campus environments (Antaki, Billig, Edwards, & Potter, 2003; Gasper & Apthorpe, 1996; Gee, Michaels, & O’Connor, 1992; Jones, 2012; Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002; Marston, 2004). Additionally, this study analyzed how social semiotics (images, signs, and symbols) and textual function were used in ASRs to create meaning-making in the “relationship between language and behavior” in the campus environment and in the establishment of sociocultural practices (Bazeley, 2013, p. 216). As explained by Cheek (2004), “texts are both constitutive of and, in turn, constructed by their context” (p. 1144).

For the document analysis, 23 ASRs from Colorado state IHE campuses were reviewed. The ASRs from these 23 Colorado state IHEs were also examined for the discourse analysis portion of this study. The sample included two ASRs from the CSU system (CSU in Fort Collins and CSU-Pueblo); four ASRs from the University of
Colorado system: (a) University of Colorado Denver, (b) University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, (c) University of Colorado Boulder, and (d) University of Colorado Colorado Springs; ASRs from ten Colorado state two-year institutions: (a) Aims Community College, (b) Colorado Mountain College, (c) Colorado Northwestern Community College, (d) Community College of Aurora, (e) Lamar Community College, (f) Morgan Community College, (g) Northeastern Junior College, (h) Pikes Peak Community College, (i) Pueblo Community College, (j) Trinidad State Junior College, and (k) Western Colorado Community College; and ASRs from seven Colorado state four-year institutions: (a) Adams State University, (b) Colorado Mesa University, (c) Colorado School of Mines, (d) Fort Lewis College, (e) Metropolitan State University of Denver, (f) University of Northern Colorado, and (g) Western State Colorado University. Table 1 lists the Colorado state IHEs that participated in the sample population of ASRs.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IHEs</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams State University</td>
<td>Alamosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aims Community College</td>
<td>Greeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Mesa University</td>
<td>Grand Junction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Mountain College</td>
<td>Glenwood Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado Northwestern Community College</td>
<td>Rangely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado School of Mines</td>
<td>Golden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University</td>
<td>Fort Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado State University-Pueblo</td>
<td>Pueblo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College of Aurora</td>
<td>Aurora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Lewis College</td>
<td>Durango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamar Community College</td>
<td>Lamar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan State University of Denver</td>
<td>Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Community College</td>
<td>Fort Morgan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern Junior College</td>
<td>Sterling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pikes Peak Community College</td>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo Community College</td>
<td>Pueblo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad State Junior College</td>
<td>Trinidad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus</td>
<td>Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Boulder</td>
<td>Boulder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Colorado Springs</td>
<td>Colorado Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado Denver</td>
<td>Denver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>Greeley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western State Colorado University</td>
<td>Gunnison</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collection**

Following approval by the UCCS IRB (IRB Protocol No. 16-107 – see Appendix A), a request e-mail for volunteers was sent out to Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX staff associated with Clery Act compliance (see Appendix B). For the second phase of this study, the interviews of an additional 11 self-selected Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators was conducted over a period of 72 days (January 4 – March 15, 2016) at nine Colorado state IHE campuses using a nine-question protocol (see Appendix C).

The intent of this study was to provide a phenomenological approach that collected data from individuals who have experienced the phenomenon of dealing with Clery Act use, compliance and effectiveness. In qualitative research, the use of “thick description” provides enough substantive detail to allow the context and meaning of a key informant’s perceptions to be illuminated within the findings of a study (Patton, 2015). The data obtained through interviews can be enhanced “through the description of the [informant’s] location and the people within it, the events and situations, and participants’ ideas and perceptions placed into [the] context” of lived experiences.
In-person interviews are also useful in understanding the environment in which Clery Act administrators and Title IX coordinators work in everyday situations dealing with Clery Act requirements. If it was not possible to conduct an in-person interview with a key informant, a telephone interview would have been conducted instead using the PI’s landline home phone combined with a recording device. None of the invited participants agreed to be interviewed by telephone. Before an in-person interview, participants read and signed a UCCS IRB approved consent and confidentiality agreement, and information about the use of a recording device was shared with each interviewee. In the event of a phone interview, participants would have been e-mailed a UCCS IRB approved consent and confidentiality agreement in advance of the interview. The interview was not conducted until a signed and scanned copy of the agreement had been returned. All participants were asked if they had any questions, and then the interviews began. The key informant interviews lasted approximately 45 – 60 minutes and were audio recorded, transcribed, coded, and erased after each interview by the PI.

The first question, “Demographics,” elicited information on the age, sex, years working in the field with Clery Act compliance, and their administrative level. The next eight questions were designed as standardized, semi-structured questions that were asked in a specified sequence to engender open-ended responses (Marshall & Rossman, 2016). Probing follow-up questions were used in all 18 interviews to delve further into interviewees’ responses. The interview questions were used to determine (a) their role at the campus level and how this related to the creation, use, and/or dissemination of the
Clery Act and its subsequent amendments, (b) how campus training, orientations, and primary prevention and awareness programs they have participated in included information on the Clery Act and its subsequent amendments, (c) how they perceived student and parent awareness of Clery Act reporting of campus crime statistics in influencing college choice decisions, (d) how they perceived the safety of their campus as a result of Clery Act reporting, (e) how they perceived the additional reporting criteria on domestic, dating violence, and stalking crimes under the 2013 amendments to the Clery Act, (f) what factors and techniques they perceived as contributing to the dissemination of the Clery Act and its subsequent amendments to current students and employees, as well as prospective students and employees, (g) how discourses used in their Colorado IHE annual security report were used to shape IHE expectations and understandings regarding student behavior in relation to the Clery Act and its subsequent amendments, and (h) what policy changes they recommended be made to improve campus safety and Clery Act communication and reporting.

**Theoretical Framework**

A theoretical framework “informs data analysis in direct, meaningful, transparent ways” (Ravitch & Riggan, 2012, p. 81). As posited by Bernard et al. (2005), GST can “explain how related components at different levels interacted with one another in forming a system” (p. 204). The linkage between GST and the methodological approaches used in this dissertation (key informant interviews, document analysis, and discourse analysis) are critical in establishing valid findings for this study.
The phenomenologically informed perceptions of Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators were uncovered using key informant interviews supported by research questions that addressed the important factors regarding the use and effectiveness of the Clery Act and its subsequent amendments on campus safety. Consistent with GST, responses to the questions supported how the participants view the organizational effectiveness of their campus in addressing safety and security concerns for students. The first interview question collected key informant demographic information. The second question focused on the role of the interviewees at their IHE and how their role relates to the creation, use, and/or dissemination of Clery Act and the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act policies. This question is in line with GST in that it shed light on the perceptions of key informants in how they navigate the requirements of federal legislation (an input) for policies related to campus safety and security. Additionally, this question uncovered the perceptions of actors within the system to better understand the relationships they have with other actors involved in the creation and use of their IHE’s ASR. In line with a phenomenological approach, this question aimed to not only understand a participant’s perspective, but also sought to uncover a key informant’s preferences and assumptions about their experience in the use and compliance of Clery Act requirements.

The third question focused on key informant perceptions of their IHE’s output related to campus training, orientations, and primary prevention and awareness programs. Understanding how this output included information on Clery Act and 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act policies demonstrated how a system adapted to change, as well as
uncovering an IHE’s commitment to remaining viable in handling safety and security issues.

The next question had two parts. The first part sought to find out how their IHE’s ASR information is shared with prospective parents and students. The second part strove to determine a key informant’s perception of student and parent awareness of Clery Act reporting of campus crime statistics in influencing their college choice decisions. Consistent with GST, this question focused on how a system actor perceived the dissemination, use, and effectiveness of the information presented in an ASR (an output) in promoting the safety and security of their IHE. Similarly, the next question focused on a key informant’s phenomenological perception of the safety of their campus as a result of Clery Act reporting, and the effectiveness of their IHE’s ASR. This question was also connected to an IHE’s output of ASR creation and distribution and addressed the perception of whether the annual compilation of crime statistics had contributed to an IHE’s image as a safe campus.

The sixth question sought to uncover a key informant’s perception of additional reporting criteria on domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking crimes under the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act amendments in improving campus safety. This question addressed the GST concept of an open system that “leads to basically new, and partly revolutionary, consequences and principles” (von Bertalanffy, 1950, p. 156). The inclusion within an ASR (as an output) of the amendments made to the Clery Act by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act represented how an open system deals with societal concerns that move beyond traditional conceptions of sexual assault and violence in
promoting campus safety and security. Additionally, using a phenomenological approach towards this question allowed for the “exploration of change” in altering the key informant’s perception about their environment and interaction in the context of life experiences (Malagon-Maldonado, 2014, p. 120).

The seventh question focused on a key informant’s perspective on what changes they had seen in student reporting as a result of the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization changes in training or reporting. Consistent with the GST concepts of an output and an open system, this question was connected to an IHE’s ASR dissemination to address the perception of whether ASR information and education has changed the behavior of students in reporting incidents of sexual assault and violence.

The next question sought to determine what are some factors and techniques that contribute to the dissemination of Clery Act and 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act policies to current students and employees, as well as prospective students and employees. This question also used GST to uncover the perceptions of key informants in how their IHE system distributed a key output (IHE’s ASR) to campus personnel to more effectively comply with the intent of the Clery Act (which is to increase public awareness of violence on college campuses and promote the use of an ASR for parents and students in making college choice decisions).

The ninth interview question examined the perceptions of key informants regarding how their campuses’ ASR looked and the manner in which it presented content to readers to determine what goals or objectives the IHE was trying to meet through its presentation. GST informed this question in that the inputs into the system (federal
legislation) were translated into the written expectations of IHEs regarding campus personnel (actors within the system) to promote safety and security on campus.

The tenth, and final, interview question explored key informant perceptions on what policy changes they would recommend to improve campus safety communication and reporting. This is linked to GST in that it demonstrated how a system benefits from a dynamic input and output process that is consistent with an open system open to change and adaptation. As stated succinctly by Davidson (1983), von Bertalanffy believed “that GST would help us think more clearly about whatever our goals happen to be, and about what methods we should use to achieve them” (p. 25). Additionally, this question drew upon a phenomenological approach to understand the contexts that have “influenced or affected” their life experiences in dealing with the use, compliance, and effectiveness of the Clery Act on their campus (Creswell, 2013, p. 81). Table 2 shows how GST elements linked to the key informant interview questions.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Informant Interview Questions and Connection to GST Elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Please describe your role at your school, and how this role relates to the creation, use, and/or dissemination of Clery Act and the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How have campus training, orientations, and primary prevention and awareness programs you have participated in included information on Clery Act and 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act policies?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued)

4. What is your perception of student and parent awareness of Clery Act reporting of campus crime statistics in influencing their college choice decisions?

5. How do you perceive the safety of your campus as a result of Clery Act reporting?

6. What is your perception of the additional reporting criteria on domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking crimes under the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act amendments in improving campus safety?

7. What are some factors and techniques that contribute to the dissemination of Clery Act and 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act policies to current students and employees, as well as prospective students and employees?

8. How is your campuses’ annual security report written to convey expectations regarding student behavior in relation to the Clery Act and 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act policies?

9. What policy changes would you recommend be made to improve campus safety communication and reporting?

Perceptions on the use and effectiveness of an output in school selection and the promotion of IHE safety and security.

Perceptions whether an output has promoted the image of a safe campus.

Perceptions of inputs and an open system’s ability to incorporate changes into an output.

Perceptions on the distribution and use of an output.

Perceptions on how inputs are translated into written expectations of safety and security at an IHE.

Perceptions of input and output process consistent with an open system’s ability to change and adapt.

Document analysis of the 23 ASRs sought to bring to light the GST focus on inputs and outputs of complying with federal legislation. Compliance with the Clery Act and the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act will demonstrate that Colorado state IHEs are dynamic systems committed to the physical and social realities of campus safety and security. Each ASR was analyzed to determine how IHEs have incorporated required information from federal legislation (a system input) into their 2015 reports. This included the addition of information on sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, and consent to increase transparency on issues related to campus sexual violence. How an IHE addressed these inputs also had an impact on how they...
designed their ASR (a system output). The ASRs were studied to see if an IHE included key input information on (a) training and awareness programs, (b) procedures for reporting crimes, (c) the preservation of evidence, and (d) the campus disciplinary process.

Finally, discourse analysis of the 23 ASRs showed whether Colorado state IHEs are open systems aligned within a GST framework that are willing and able to incorporate discourses of legal and social change. Within a system, von Bertalanffy (1950) contended that “true purposiveness is characteristic of human behavior, and it is connected with the evolution of the symbolism of language and concepts” (p. 160). How an IHE system adopted the required language-in-use from inputs is indicative of how an open system adapts to societal and cultural structures in addressing issues of campus violence and sexual assault in their ASR output (Ruben & Kim, 1975). Discourse analysis also uncovered the relationships within the system that are used to (a) provide training, awareness, and intervention education, (b) explain the interrelated components and actors involved in the campus disciplinary process, and (c) describe the collaboration between campus agencies, local law enforcement, and community resources available to campus personnel. Lastly, how discourse is used by IHEs to establish expectations of student behavior and social relationships in the promotion of campus safety within the context of an open system responsive to social and cultural changes also shaped this data analysis (Fairclough, 1992).
Limitations

This study had an important limitation because it relied on the volunteer status of all interviewees who work only for Colorado state IHEs. The sample size of 18 Colorado state IHE participants, “with a group of individuals who have all experienced the phenomenon,” is larger than the 10 to 15 individuals recommended by Creswell (2013, p. 78). However, although the findings apply only to Colorado state IHEs, according to Ritchie and Lewis (2003), it is the “range of views, experiences, outcomes or other phenomena under study, and the factors and circumstances that shape and influence them, that can be inferred to the researched population” (p. 269). The purpose of qualitative research is to identify themes that are “transferrable” rather than “generalizable to all settings” (Strout et al., 2014, p. 141). As such, I contend that the sample size and techniques used in my research has not negatively affected the results of this policy analysis.

For the discourse analysis portion of this study, the primary limitation was a focus on the textual and semiotic aspects of the 2015 Colorado state IHE ASRs. This textually oriented discourse analysis failed to capture body expressions and other non-verbal aspects of communication associated with the ASR authors (Marston, 2004).

Data Analysis Process

Key informant interviews. The process of coding allows a researcher to assign “units of meaning to the descriptive or inferential information compiled during a study” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 56). For this study, each of the key informant interviews were audio recorded, transcribed and hand coded. Phenomenological analysis required
the PI to conduct numerous readings of the transcripts to locate the similarities and differences of interviewees’ experiences (Diehm & Lupton, 2012). Constant comparative method analysis of participant comments resulted in coded statements that were be clustered into a relevant number of themes. As defined by DeSantis and Ugarriza (2000), themes bring “meaning and identity to a recurrent experience and its variant manifestations. As such, a theme captures and unifies the nature or basis of the experience into a meaningful whole” (p. 362). The phenomenological approach for this study was based on “a desire to engage with and understand the words and viewpoints of a participant on their own terms [emphasis in original]” (Watts, 2014, p. 3). Initial open coding was conducted to identify “patterns and key ideas in the data” (Marshall & Rossman, 2016, p. 222). The second phase of focused coding identified how each interviewee’s responses were associated with the five elements of GST. Additionally, during the second phase of coding, key informant statements were identified and clustered for their relevance to both research from the literature review and the research questions to identify regularities or differences in the responses (Saldaña, 2013). Lastly, connections were identified and categorized within the data to determine common themes expressed by the key informants in the use, compliance, and effectiveness in dealing with the Clery Act and its subsequent amendments (Marshall & Rossman, 2016; Merriam, 2009; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Pickard, 2013). Following transcription and analysis, member-checking was conducted to accomplish validation by sending major themes to the interview participants (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Additionally, all interview
responses were equally handled with coherent code-sets to ensure trustworthiness and credibility (Boeije, 2002; Sinkovics, Penz, & Ghauri, 2008).

**Document analysis.** For the document analysis, two criteria were used to determine how an ASR was selected for a compliance check. The first criterion, authenticity, applied to the “origin and authorship of a document” (Wellington, 2015, p. 214). The Colorado state IHE ASR had to be accessible from the IHE’s official website and have the IHE’s name on the document. The second criteria was the document’s credibility. The document had to be posted on the IHE’s website as the official 2015 ASR for that institution and had to include data for campus crimes covering the years 2012, 2013, and 2014. Compliance for this study was determined by the PI through the comparison of the 11 changes made by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act with information published by the IHE in their 2015 ASR (see Table 3).

Table 3

**Clery Act Compliance Factors for 2015 Colorado State IHE ASRs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clery Act policy change requiring compliance in 2015 ASRs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Collection and reporting of information regarding incidents of dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Procedures for victims to report crimes on a voluntary, confidential basis for inclusion in the institution’s crime statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Include a statement of policy regarding campus programs to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and the procedures that such institution will follow once an incident of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking has been reported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provide information on education programs to promote the awareness of rape, acquaintance rape, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide the definition of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provide the definition of consent, in reference to sexual activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (continued)

8. Education programs that provide safe and positive options for bystander intervention that may be carried out by an individual to prevent harm or intervene when there is a risk of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking against a person other than such individual.

9. Information in writing about the importance of preserving evidence as may be necessary to the proof of criminal domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking.

10. Procedures for disciplinary action in cases of alleged domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, which shall include a clear statement that such proceedings shall provide a prompt, fair, and impartial investigation and resolution; and be conducted by officials who receive annual training on the issue related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and how to conduct an investigation and hearing process that protects the safety of victims and promotes accountability.

11. Statement that accuser and the accused shall be simultaneously informed, in writing, of (a) the outcome of any disciplinary proceeding that arises from an allegation of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, (b) the institution’s procedures for the accused and the victim to appeal the results of the institutional disciplinary proceeding, (c) of any change to the results that occurs prior to the time that such results become final, and (d) when such results become final.

Adapted from the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (as enacted March 7, 2013).

**Discourse analysis.** After the document analysis, discourse analysis was conducted using techniques that search for “the social and cultural positions of text, the cumulative nature of conversation and the shared meanings built within” the text of the ASRs (Wellington, 2015, p. 218). The ASRs were examined by the PI for (a) intertextuality in how the ASR refers to other texts, (b) knowledge provided to the reader regarding definitions of consent, sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, and other acts of sexual misconduct, (c) social expectations of IHEs regarding student behavior on campus, (d) framing of activities available to students and staff regarding intervention options, the importance of preserving evidence following a sexual
assault, and how a campus handled reports of sexual misconduct, (e) the context of language-in-use provided to students regarding disciplinary proceedings for both the victim and the accused following an incident of sexual misconduct, (f) the use of images, signs, and symbols (semiotics) as textual function to convey sociological variables, and (g) how meaning is conveyed to students and parents regarding campus safety and security through a deep understanding and interpretation of the discourses used throughout the ASRs (Antaki, Billig, Edwards, & Potter, 2003; Baker & Ellece, 2011; Bazeley, 2013; Gee, 2014; Graddol, 2006; Jones, 2012; Livholts & Tamboukou, 2015; Paltridge, 2012; Wellington, 2015).

The initial coding of the ASRs identified how the content of the reports used both the standard of federal guidance from the U.S. Department of Education (The Handbook for Campus Safety and Security Reporting) and legislative inputs available from Congress (Clery Act, Title IX and VAWA legislation). This analysis examined how intertextuality was used in ASR construction in response to current social and cultural expectations regarding campus safety and security. The second phase of coding scrutinized how IHEs used discourses to set expectations of student attitudes and norms (reinforced by training and awareness programs) in dealing with campus sexual assault and violence. The language-in-use articulated in the ASRs was also examined to determine how IHEs establish representations of cultural norms, as well as the expectations of social practices in campus venues, in dealing with Clery Act issues. As explained by Fairclough (1992), “discourse is a mode of action, one from which people may act upon the world and especially upon each other, as well as a mode of
representation” (p. 63). Additionally, the discourse analysis of the data explored all 23 Colorado state IHE ASRs for examples of campus relationships (consistent with GST) in handling sexual misconduct.

Throughout the data analysis process, constant comparative method of the discourses in ASRs was used to create coded statements that were clustered into themes (DeSantis & Ugarriza, 2000; Manning & Kunkel, 2014). As posited by Potter and Wetherell (1987), discourse analysis “should let us see how the discourse fits together” to promote coherence in the data analysis and the development of themes (p. 170). Additionally, the discourse analysis uncovered patterns in the data that demonstrated differences between the ASRs, as well as those discourses which are shared by the ASRs (Wellington, 2015). Following discourse analysis, and similar to the data analysis of the key informant interviews, all ASR data was equally handled with coherent code-sets to ensure trustworthiness and credibility (Boeije, 2002; Sinkovics, Penz, & Ghauri, 2008).

Trustworthiness in qualitative research contributes greatly to the belief that a study’s findings are worth the attention of the reader and the research community (Elo, Kääriäinen, Kanste, Pölkki, Utriainen, & Kyngäs, 2014). There are five criteria that used to assess trustworthiness in a study:

1) Credibility which relies on the researcher accurately presenting the perspectives of participants in a study. Credibility of a study can also be enhanced through the use of member-checking (Cope, 2014; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Patton, 2015).
2) Dependability of “the process of the inquiry and the inquirer’s responsibility for ensuring that the process was logical, traceable, and documented” (Patton, 2015, p. 685).

3) Confirmability by how a researcher links findings and interpretations directly to the data. Confirmability can be enhanced by the use of rich quotes that are derived from the data themselves (Cope, 2014; Patton, 2015).

4) Transferability which requires a researcher to provide “sufficient information on the research context to enable the reader to assess the findings’ capability of being ‘fit’ or transferable” to other contexts, groups, or settings (Cope, 2014, p. 89).

5) Authenticity requires that the researcher faithfully describes the experience of participants by documenting their feelings and emotions toward the phenomenon under study (Cope, 2014).

This study sought to use a phenomenological approach that was informed by GST elements of perception, inputs, outputs, relationships, and an open system, combined with the methodologies of key informant interviews, document analysis, and discourse analysis, to conduct a data analysis that resulted in trustworthy findings and interpretations that reflected the qualitative criteria of credibility, dependability, confirmability, transferability, and authenticity.

At the conclusion of this dissertation, it is anticipated that readers and the research community will understand both the “what” and “how” of the phenomenological lived experiences of Colorado state IHE Clery Act administrators and Title IX coordinators in
dealing with the use, compliance, and effectiveness of Clery Act requirements and its amendments (Creswell, 2013, p. 79). It is anticipated that document analysis will demonstrate IHE compliance at the Colorado state level with changes made by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act. Additionally, it is planned that discourse analysis will provide readers a transparent description of how ASR extracts can convey IHE expectations regarding student behavior in relation to the Clery Act and 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act policies.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The following chapter reports and analyzes data for this study’s document analysis, discourse analysis, and qualitative interviews. Document analysis was used to determine how the 23 Colorado state IHE ASRs included the amendments to the Clery Act made by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act in compliance with federal legislation. Discourse analysis was utilized to determine how the 23 ASR text discourses shaped Colorado state IHE expectations and understandings regarding student behavior and conduct in relation to Clery Act issues. Finally, the data from 18 qualitative key informant interviews was analyzed to uncover the perceptions and actions of Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators on the compliance, use, and effectiveness of the Clery Act.

Document Analysis

All 23 Colorado state IHE ASRs are accessible from the IHE’s official website and had the IHE’s name on the document. Each document’s credibility was confirmed because each ASR was posted on the IHE’s website as the official 2015 ASR for that institution and included data for campus crimes covering the years 2012, 2013, and 2014. All 23 ASRs were downloaded from the Internet from the applicable Colorado state IHE website, and the document analysis of the 23 ASRs was conducted for compliance within the context of 11 amendments to the Clery Act made by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act. Results from the document analysis are listed in Table 4, Table 5, Table 6, and Table 7.
The document analysis showed that 13 ASRs are in full compliance with changes made to the Clery Act by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act. Western State Colorado University’s ASR was not in full compliance because the campus did not discuss the importance of preserving evidence related to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking as required by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act. Additionally, although 10 of the 23 ASRs discussed the importance of preserving evidence related to sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence, these ASRs did not discuss evidence specifically related to stalking (more discussion on this in the document analysis section). The other two exceptions to full compliance concerned the requirement that an IHE’s programs provide for bystander intervention training. Both the Colorado Mesa University (Grand Junction, CO) and Northeastern Junior College (Sterling, CO) 2015 ASRs included programs for sexual assault awareness and prevention programs, but neither of their ASRs mentioned or described bystander intervention techniques or awareness training.
Table 4

*Clery Act Compliance for Colorado state IHE ASRs (October 2015) – Part 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>ASU</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>CMU</th>
<th>CMC</th>
<th>CNCC</th>
<th>CSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Collection and reporting of information regarding incidents of dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Procedures for victims to report crimes on a voluntary, confidential basis for inclusion in the institution’s crime statistics</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Include a statement of policy regarding campus programs to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and the procedures that such institution will follow once an incident of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking has been reported.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provide information on education programs to promote the awareness of rape, acquaintance rape, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide the definition of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provide the definition of consent, in reference to sexual activity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Education programs that provide safe and positive options for bystander intervention that may be carried out by an individual to prevent harm or intervene when there is a risk of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking against a person other than such individual</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Information in writing about the importance of preserving evidence as may be necessary to the proof of criminal domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Indicates information specific to Colorado state requirements.
### Table 4 (continued)

| 10. Procedures for disciplinary action in cases of alleged domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, which shall include a clear statement that such proceedings shall provide a prompt, fair, and impartial investigation and resolution; and be conducted by officials who receive annual training on the issue related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and how to conduct an investigation and hearing process that protects the safety of victims and promotes accountability |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |

| 11. Statement that accuser and the accused shall be simultaneously informed, in writing, of (a) the outcome of any disciplinary proceeding that arises from an allegation of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; (b) the institution’s procedures for the accused and the victim to appeal the results of the institutional disciplinary proceeding; (c) of any change to the results that occurs prior to the time that such results become final; and (d) when such results become final |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ | ✔ |

Adapted from the *Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013* (as enacted March 7, 2013).

*Note.* ASU = Adams State University (Alamosa, CO); ACC = Aims Community College (Greeley, CO); CMU = Colorado Mesa University (Grand Junction, CO); CMC = Colorado Mountain College (Glenwood Springs, CO); CNCC = Colorado Northwestern Community College (Rangely, CO); CSM = Colorado School of Mines (Golden, CO).

*a*There was discussion about preservation of evidence related to sexual assault, but no discussion of preservation of evidence for stalking.*
Table 5

**Clergy Act Compliance for Colorado state IHE ASRs (October 2015) – Part 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th>CSU-Pueblo</th>
<th>CCA</th>
<th>FLC</th>
<th>LCC</th>
<th>AHEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Collection and reporting of information regarding incidents of dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Procedures for victims to report crimes on a voluntary, confidential basis for inclusion in the institution’s crime statistics</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Include a statement of policy regarding campus programs to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and the procedures that such institution will follow once an incident of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking has been reported.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provide information on education programs to promote the awareness of rape, acquaintance rape, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide the definition of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provide the definition of consent, in reference to sexual activity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Education programs that provide safe and positive options for bystander intervention that may be carried out by an individual to prevent harm or intervene when there is a risk of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking against a person other than such individual</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Information in writing about the importance of preserving evidence as may be necessary to the proof of criminal domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 (continued)

| 10. Procedures for disciplinary action in cases of alleged domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, which shall include a clear statement that such proceedings shall provide a prompt, fair, and impartial investigation and resolution; and be conducted by officials who receive annual training on the issue related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and how to conduct an investigation and hearing process that protects the safety of victims and promotes accountability |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

| 11. Statement that accuser and the accused shall be simultaneously informed, in writing, of (a) the outcome of any disciplinary proceeding that arises from an allegation of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; (b) the institution’s procedures for the accused and the victim to appeal the results of the institutional disciplinary proceeding; (c) of any change to the results that occurs prior to the time that such results become final; and (d) when such results become final |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

Adapted from the *Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013* (as enacted March 7, 2013).

*Note. CSU = Colorado State University (Fort Collins, CO); CCA = Community College of Aurora; FLC = Fort Lewis College (Durango, CO); LCC = Lamar Community College; AHEC = Auraria Higher Education Center (ASR for Metropolitan State University of Denver).*

*There was discussion about preservation of evidence related to sexual assault, but no discussion of preservation of evidence for stalking.*
### Table 6

**Clergy Act Compliance for Colorado state IHE ASRs (October 2015) – Part 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>MCC</th>
<th>NJC</th>
<th>PPCC</th>
<th>PCC</th>
<th>TSJC</th>
<th>Anschutz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Collection and reporting of information regarding incidents of dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Procedures for victims to report crimes on a voluntary, confidential basis for inclusion in the institution’s crime statistics</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Include a statement of policy regarding campus programs to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and the procedures that such institution will follow once an incident of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking has been reported.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provide information on education programs to promote the awareness of rape, acquaintance rape, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide the definition of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provide the definition of consent, in reference to sexual activity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Education programs that provide safe and positive options for bystander intervention that may be carried out by an individual to prevent harm or intervene when there is a risk of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking against a person other than such individual</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Information in writing about the importance of preserving evidence as may be necessary to the proof of criminal domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>MCC</th>
<th>NJC</th>
<th>PPCC</th>
<th>PCC</th>
<th>Anschutz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Procedures for disciplinary action in cases of alleged domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, which shall include a clear statement that such proceedings shall provide a prompt, fair, and impartial investigation and resolution; and be conducted by officials who receive annual training on the issue related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and how to conduct an investigation and hearing process that protects the safety of victims and promotes accountability</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Statement that accuser and the accused shall be simultaneously informed, in writing, of (a) the outcome of any disciplinary proceeding that arises from an allegation of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; (b) the institution’s procedures for the accused and the victim to appeal the results of the institutional disciplinary proceeding; (c) of any change to the results that occurs prior to the time that such results become final; and (d) when such results become final</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (as enacted March 7, 2013).

Note. MCC = Morgan Community College (Fort Morgan, CO); NJC = Northeastern Junior College (Sterling, CO); PPCC = Pikes Peak Community College; PCC = Pueblo Community College; TSJC = Trinidad State Junior College; Anschutz = University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus (Denver, CO).

*aThere was discussion about preservation of evidence related to sexual assault, but no discussion of preservation of evidence for stalking.
Table 7

*Clery Act Compliance for Colorado state IHE ASRs (October 2015) – Part 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>UCB</th>
<th>UCCS</th>
<th>UCD</th>
<th>UNC</th>
<th>WSCU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Collection and reporting of information regarding incidents of dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Procedures for victims to report crimes on a voluntary, confidential basis for inclusion in the institution’s crime statistics</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Include a statement of policy regarding campus programs to prevent domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and the procedures that such institution will follow once an incident of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking has been reported.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provide information on education programs to promote the awareness of rape, acquaintance rape, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Provide the definition of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Provide the definition of consent, in reference to sexual activity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Education programs that provide safe and positive options for bystander intervention that may be carried out by an individual to prevent harm or intervene when there is a risk of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking against a person other than such individual</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Information in writing about the importance of preserving evidence as may be necessary to the proof of criminal domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)
Table 7 (continued)

10. Procedures for disciplinary action in cases of alleged domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking, which shall include a clear statement that such proceedings shall provide a prompt, fair, and impartial investigation and resolution; and be conducted by officials who receive annual training on the issue related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking and how to conduct an investigation and hearing process that protects the safety of victims and promotes accountability

11. Statement that accuser and the accused shall be simultaneously informed, in writing, of (a) the outcome of any disciplinary proceeding that arises from an allegation of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, or stalking; (b) the institution’s procedures for the accused and the victim to appeal the results of the institutional disciplinary proceeding; (c) of any change to the results that occurs prior to the time that such results become final; and (d) when such results become final

Adapted from the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (as enacted March 7, 2013).

Note. UCB = University of Colorado Boulder; UCCS = University of Colorado Colorado Springs; UCD = University of Colorado Denver; UNC = University of Northern Colorado; WSCU = Western State Colorado University.

There was discussion about preservation of evidence related to sexual assault, but no discussion of preservation of evidence for stalking.
Discourse Analysis

Discourse within each of the 23 ASRs is understood and analyzed in the context of Colorado state IHE campus environments. The ASRs were analyzed for (a) intertextuality in how the ASR referred to other texts, (b) knowledge provided to the reader regarding definitions of consent, sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, and other acts of sexual misconduct, (c) social expectations of IHEs regarding student behavior on campus, (d) framing of activities available to students and staff regarding intervention options, the importance of preserving evidence following a sexual assault, and how a campus will handle reports of sexual misconduct, (e) the context of language-in-use provided to students regarding disciplinary proceedings for both the victim and the accused following an incident of sexual misconduct, (f) the use of images, signs, and symbols (semiotics) as textual function to convey sociological variables, and (g) how meaning was conveyed to students and parents regarding campus safety and security through a deep understanding and interpretation of the discourses used throughout the ASRs (Antaki, Billig, Edwards, & Potter, 2003; Baker & Ellece, 2011; Bazeley, 2013; Gee, 2014; Graddol, 2006; Jones, 2012; Livholts & Tamboukou, 2015; Paltridge, 2012; Wellington, 2015). Discourse within each of the 23 ASRs is understood and analyzed in the context of Colorado state IHE campus environments. A final level of discourse analysis was conducted to compare the factual versus narrative approaches used by IHEs to stylize representations of sexual assault concepts in shaping campus culture.
Intertextuality and definitions. All 23 ASRs were examined to determine how publicly circulated texts were explicitly linked into the ASRs to address campus safety and security. Throughout all 23 ASRs, the concepts, issues, and statistical reporting included in the ASRs were consistent with the federal requirements of the Clery Act. All definitions of Clery sex offenses (rape, fondling, incest, and statutory rape), as well as definitions of the VAWA Reauthorization Act offenses (dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking) were consistent with definitions adapted from the Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook (United States Department of Justice, 2004) as clarified and updated by the Violence Against Women Act: Final rule (United States Department of Education, 2014).

Social expectations of students. The information contained within each ASR sought to “help students, faculty and staff understand the potential hazards of campus life” (Aims Community College, 2015, p. 20). Adams State University (2015) contended that their campus “is a place where we look out for one another” (p. 15). A common strand of thought throughout the ASRs is that students and employees should be aware of the responsibility for their own security and the security of others. Colorado Northwestern Community College (2015) clearly stated that “all members of the College community have the responsibility to refrain from any sexual misconduct” (p. 26). Additionally, Fort Lewis College (2015) contended that “as a community of trust governed by standards of conduct, men and women should be free to socialize without fear of bodily harm or psychological coercion” (pp. 1-18). This expectation of social standards also included that Fort Lewis College should adjust their personal routines to
focus on safety and that students and staff should “become actively involved in campus crime prevention programs” (pp. 1-8). The University of Northern Colorado (2015) clearly stated that they expected students to understand the importance of security and safety because it is “the philosophy of UNC that we would much rather prevent crimes from occurring than react to crimes after they occur” (p. 9). Statements such as these highlight the relationship between discourse and the social actions expected of students as these standards relate to sexual assault.

In addition to safety and security, the issue of consent is clearly defined and presented in all 23 ASRs as an expectation of all campus personnel in the way students regulate their own actions and shape social behavior. In an environment of consent, students “should be free to socialize without fear of bodily harm or psychological coercion” (Fort Lewis College, 2015, pp. 1-18). To understand the importance of consent and proper interaction with other students, Western State Colorado University (2015a) stated that one of the expectations of student conduct was for students to develop “self-insight and self-initiated change of behavior” (p. 8). Colorado Northwestern Community College (2015) contended that all “students must be aware of the policies and procedures” related to sexual assault awareness “so that they may act in an educated, responsible manner when dealing with sexually coercive and/or violent situations” (p. 26). Adams State University (2105) stated that when it comes to sexual assault, students need to (a) know how to find information, (b) know what to expect, (c) be treated fairly, (d) not be judged or isolated, (e) be supported, and (f) have a transparent process (p. 18). Additionally, as it relates to social expectations and consent, Metropolitan State
University of Denver advised readers that “consent can be given by words or actions, as long as those word or actions create mutually understandable permission regarding the conditions of sexual activity” (Auraria Higher Education Center, 2015, p. 11).

Although not directly referencing the circumstances surrounding the death of Jeanne Clery, the Colorado State University-Pueblo ASR (2015) reminded students to “not prop open doors or allow strangers into campus buildings that have been secured” (p. 7). The propping open of doors using pizza boxes was the primary factor that allowed Jeanne Clery’s murderer to enter her campus residence facility. Fort Lewis College (2015) included a similar statement in their ASR by stating that “students have the responsibility to assist in maintaining their safety by keeping [residence hall] doors closed at all times and are encouraged to report unsafe conditions or maintenance, if needed” (p. 1-6). Additionally, although not mentioning that Jeanne Clery’s room was unlocked the night of her murder, students are urged in the Northeastern Junior College ASR (2015) to “lock [residence hall] room doors at all times” (p. 4). A similar warning is provided by Trinidad State Junior College’s ASR (2015) which states that “with the exception of halls that house offices with business hours, exterior doors are locked at all times,” adding that doors would be monitored “regularly to prevent them from being left propped or ajar” (p. 5). Although the majority of ASRs did not specifically address the consequences of violating safety rules regarding the propping open of doors, Adams State University (2015) posited that “propping doors allows opportunities for unauthorized persons to enter” (p. 11). However, Western State Colorado University (2015) warned
that “students found responsible for propping doors can expect judicial sanctions, and even potential legal action” (p. 47).

A unique approach was taken by both the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus (2015) and the University of Colorado Denver (2015) ASRs (both written by the same person) to advise students how to engage in risk reduction and avoid sexual assault and sexual harassment situations. Advice to students included recommendations such as (a) “be aware of your surroundings,” (b) “trust your instincts,” (c) “don’t allow yourself to be isolated with someone you don’t trust or someone you don’t know,” (d) “don’t accept drinks from people you don’t know or trust,” and (e) “don’t feel obligated to do anything you don’t want to do” (University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, p. 20; University of Colorado Denver, p. 19). A similar listing on how to reduce the risk of sexual assault was compiled by Morgan Community College (2015) in which they also advised students that (a) when you go to a party, go with a group of friends, (b) [they should not] leave a beverage unattended or accept a drink from an open container, and (c) [they should] think about the level of intimacy you want in a relationship and clearly state your limits (p. 17)

The majority of ASRs did not address the issue of rumors surrounding sexual assaults on campus. However, the University of Northern Colorado (UNC) (2015) ASR was the only report that stated “it is the policy of the UNC Police Department to fully investigate all rumored or reported sexual assaults or sexual violence occurring on campus, and forward any reports occurring off-campus to the appropriate police
jurisdiction” (p. 14). Additionally, the UNC report is the only ASR that posited that it would investigate sexual assault cases “even if the case would be considered ‘cold’ by criminal standards, the police department can help you in identifying appropriate services and resources to partner with for assistance on campus” (p. 19).

Each of these social expectations of students demonstrate that IHEs expect their students to be aware of their own safety and security, as well as the safety and security of others. How students make inferences and decisions regarding consent underlie social situations on campus, and IHEs regard student conduct as a key element of reducing and eliminating sexual assault.

**Intervention and preservation of evidence.** One of the changes made by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act was the requirement for all IHEs to incorporate bystander intervention training into their educational awareness concerning sexual assault. As found in the document analysis, only two IHEs failed to incorporate bystander intervention into their prevention and awareness programs. Bystander intervention was a key element of the changes instituted under the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act. Colorado Northwestern Community College (2015) encouraged bystander engagement “through safe and positive intervention techniques and by empowering third-party intervention and prevention such as calling for help, using intervention-based apps, identifying allies and/or creating distractions” (p. 8). In implementing bystander intervention training, “students are provided with examples of when and how to intervene in various situations” (Colorado State University-Pueblo, 2015, p. 18).
The document analysis of all 23 ASRs showed that except for one Colorado state IHE, each IHE complied with the requirement to incorporate procedures regarding the preservation of evidence for victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, and dating violence. For example, to preserve evidence, University of Colorado Colorado Springs (2015) readers are told not to “bathe, shower, douche, eat, drink, smoke, brush your teeth, urinate, defecate or change clothes” before a sexual assault exam (p. 29). However, not all ASRs discussed the need to preserve evidence regarding stalking. Only 57% of the analyzed ASRs discussed the importance of saving social media such as text and phone messages, photographs, or other evidence related to a possible stalking event or events. Colorado Northwestern Community College (2015) recommended that retaining such evidence could be “useful to College hearing boards/investigators or police” (p. 10).

The incorporation of bystander intervention programs allows students to understand that every campus member has a role to play in stepping in to prevent comments or actions that could lead to sexual violence. In the event a sexual assault does occur, students need to understand the importance of preserving evidence that is both physical and social media related.

**Disciplinary procedures.** Analysis of all 23 ASRs showed that the IHEs included clear statements that students would receive prompt, fair, and impartial investigations and resolutions of sexual assault cases. Assistance for both victims and accused was made available consistent with the requirements of the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act. To address the issue of non-reporting, IHEs urged victims to come forward. For example, the Community College of Aurora (2015) stated that their IHE “strongly encourages all
members of its community to report violations” and that “it is the victim’s choice whether or not to make such a report and victims have the right to decline involvement with the police” (p. 15). However, Pueblo Community College (2015) recommends that if a victim chooses not to make a report “he or she nevertheless should consider speaking with the PCC Department of Public Safety or other law enforcement to preserve evidence in the event that the victim changes her/his mind at a later date” (p. 36).

Consistent with the requirements under the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act, all 23 ASRs specified that disciplinary hearings would be conducted by officials who receive annual training on the issue related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Each of these officials “are taught how to conduct an investigation and hearing process that protects the safety of the victim and promotes accountability” (Lamar Community College, 2015, p. 18). Additionally, each IHE ensured that the “victim and accused have the same opportunities for assistance during a hearing, including the opportunity to have another individual present during a disciplinary hearing, and both will be notified of the outcome in a timely manner” (University of Northern Colorado, 2015, p. 20).

Discourse analysis of the disciplinary procedure showed that all ASRs discussed the need to conduct disciplinary hearings in a manner that not only protected the safety of victims, but also promoted accountability within the IHE’s disciplinary system. Additionally, all ASRs discussed the importance of notifying both the accuser and accused of the outcome of disciplinary proceedings and the right for both the accuser and accused to appeal the results of a hearing. Lastly, all ASRs discussed the need to notify
both the accuser and accused on the outcome of a hearing when IHE decisions are finalized.

All 23 Colorado state IHE ASRs clearly outlined the need for fair and prompt hearings for both the accuser and accused, and discussed procedures that provide significant protections for all parties involved in the disciplinary process.

**Semiotics.** Each of the 23 ASRs were examined to determine how images, signs and symbols were used to represent concepts, ideas and feelings related to the issue of sexual assault. For this analysis, there were two levels assigned to each image. The first level of semiotic understanding was to view the image in the ASR at the “denotation” level. At this level, images are of objects at the “simple, basic, descriptive level, where consensus is wide and most people would agree on the meaning (‘dress’, ‘jeans’)” The second level, “connotation,” connects the images to “broader themes and meanings” (Hall, Evans, & Nixon, 2013, p. 23). Using semiotics to associate an ASRs connection to the Clery Act was done in different ways, or not at all, by IHEs. The discourse analysis showed that only six of the 23 ASRs used semiotics within the text section of their reports, and the majority of these images were at the denotation level.

The semiotics associated with Jeanne Clery, for example, was handled differently by four different IHEs, and shows how the denotation and connotation levels of semiotics can affect the reader’s understanding of an image. Aims Community College (2015) put an image of Jeanne Clery on the cover of their report, alongside the words “Clery Act and crime reporting” (p. 1). Students and parents who pick up the Aims Community ASR will see a picture of a young woman at the denotation level, but I believe they would have
difficulty directly connecting the photo of Ms. Clery at the connotation level with the description located within the Aims Community College ASR that the Clery Act “is named in memory of Jeanne Clery, a 19-year-old female who attended school in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania at Lehigh University. Jeanne was a freshman who was assaulted and murdered in her residence hall room on April 5, 1986” (Aims Community College, 2015, p. 5).

On the other hand, the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, University of Colorado Colorado Springs, and University of Colorado Denver ASRs included the same photo of Jeanne Clery used by Aims Community College, but the photo was placed right next to paragraphs that stated, as in the case of University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus and the University of Colorado Denver, that the “Clery Act is named in memory of Jeanne Clery who was raped and murdered in her residence hall room by a fellow student she did not know on April 5, 1986” (University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, 2015, p. 6; University of Colorado Denver, 2015, p. 5). The use of Jeanne Clery’s photo, placed alongside the text associated with the reason for the Clery Act, is very useful in moving the reader’s impression of the image from the denotation level to the connotation level of semiotic discourse analysis.

Most ASRs were very minimalist in their use of semiotics. For example, other than an unidentified photo of Jeanne Clery on the cover of their ASR, the only other semiotic that Aims Community College included in their report was a screen shot of their Public Safety web page to allow students to know where to “report a concern” about sexual assault (Aims Community College, 2015, p. 17).
Although not a minimalist approach, Adams State University’s ASR used a series of eight simple images interspersed throughout their report of buildings and locations from around the campus. Most of the photos of campus buildings were at the denotation level, but the image of a well-lit building located next to a discussion of safety lighting “installed throughout the campus to increase evening visibility” may help readers make a connection to campus safety at the connotation level (Adams State University, 2015, p. 10). Similarly, Colorado State University-Pueblo used campus images throughout their ASR, but most of the buildings used were at the denotation level and not directly related to the text within the report.

On the other hand, Colorado State University (CSU) used semiotics throughout their ASR to link images used to their campus sexual assault awareness programs. In a section on “Alcohol and Other Drugs,” a good example is an image of students holding signs for the CSU “Party smart” campaign to address the use and abuse of alcohol on campus. At the connotation level, one female student in the photo holds a sign that states “I will pour my own drink” (an association with substances that could be used to incapacitate a young woman in an acquaintance rape scenario) (Colorado State University, 2015, p. 2). CSU also used images of police badges and security personnel throughout their ASR to reinforce a police presence on the CSU campus. One image included a photo of a police officer on a motorcycle with the caption “Motorcycle officer patrols campus” (Colorado State University, 2015, p. 29).

The most comprehensive use of semiotics was employed in both the University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus and University of Colorado Denver ASRs.
Investigation by the PI uncovered that the same person prepared both reports for the two IHEs. Although the reports included photos of each respective campus that were different, there were two photos used within both reports that moved each photo from the denotation level to the connotation level by their placement within the text. The first of these is a photo of a female student bending down with her hand on her forehead while sitting on a couch and sitting alongside her is a woman with a clipboard. Placed under a section entitled “Counselors with Confidential Reporting Procedures,” the reader is given the impression that someone will sit with a student and listen to their private concerns about sexual assault and issues related to campus safety and security (University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, 2015, p. 14; University of Colorado Denver, 2015, p. 13).

The second photo used within both ASRs is that of what appears to be the two arms of a woman placed next to each other. On the inside of the left arm and the outside of the right arm, the word “respect” is written. To make the connotation connection clear with the photo, both images are located within the Title IX section of each IHE’s ASR, with the heading of “Respect expected” at the top of the pages in both reports (University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, 2015, p. 21; University of Colorado Denver, 2015, p. 20).

With the exception of a random campus photo on the cover of an ASR, Colorado Mesa University, Colorado Mountain College, Colorado Northwestern Community College, Colorado School of Mines, Community College of Aurora, Fort Lewis College, Lamar Community College, Metropolitan State University of Denver, Morgan
Community College, Northeastern Junior College, Pikes Peak Community College, Pueblo Community College, Trinidad State Junior College, University of Colorado Boulder, University of Colorado Colorado Springs, University of Northern Colorado, and Western State Colorado University did not use semiotics within their ASRs.

Safety on campus. All 23 ASRs similarly stated the IHE’s commitment to safety and security on campus. When it comes to safety, IHE’s contend that safety is everyone’s concern. For example, Aims Community College (2015) stated that “personal safety and security is everyone’s responsibility. Staying informed is the first step to ensure that our campus facilities will be as safe and secure as possible for all to use and enjoy” (p. 20). Adams State University (2015) emphasized that it promotes an “environment in which personal safety is taken seriously by all members of the college community” (p. 3). Similarly, Fort Lewis College’s ASR (2015), promoted the idea that “a campus community relies on a peaceful, safe, and secure environment,” adding that “preserving this environment is a responsibility everyone on campus must share” (p. 1-4). However, the Colorado School of Mines (2015) stated in their ASR that although “safety is a shared responsibility on campus,” it is imperative that students use “common sense when going about their daily activities” (p. 3).

Students and parents reading each of the ASRs can be assured that the respective IHE is concerned about the safety of every student. A consistent theme throughout the 23 ASRs is that the entire campus community needs to work together to provide all members of the IHE a safe and secure campus. Colorado Mesa University (2015) wrote in their ASR that they are “committed to maintaining the campus community as a place of study,
work and residence that is free from abuse, intimidation and harassment and where everyone is treated with respect and courtesy. Similarly, Colorado Mountain College’s ASR (2015) stated that their “goal is to enable all students to work toward your educational goals in an inclusive, student-centered, and most important, safe environment” (p. 4). Fort Lewis College (2015) simply stated that “the College’s primary concern is safety” (p. 1-21). Safety is so important to Northeastern Junior College (2015), that they twice stated on one page that “the college wishes to provide a safe and secure environment for its students, employees and visitors” in both their “Access to Campus Facilities” and “Security Considerations” sections (p. 4).

In addition to providing a safe and secure environment on campus, all 23 ASRs discussed working relationships with local police departments to collect crime data for their campus locations. A good example is Pueblo Community College’s (2015) commitment to work with the local police and sheriff offices to collect information on “any crimes to which they responded to on our campuses in which they did not previously report to the [Pueblo Community College] Department of Public Safety” (p. 4). Similar statements of cooperation with local law enforcement were embedded within every Colorado state IHE report.

Each of the 23 reports made it clear to readers that “the majority of sexual assaults that occur in campus communities are committed by people known by their victims, such as casual acquaintances through academic, living, work, social, or recreational interactions, including dating” (University of Colorado Colorado Springs, 2015, p. 28). Although all 23 ASRs discussed this concept of acquaintance rape, several of the ASRs
also made reference to safety concerns that are traditionally associated with stranger rape. The University of Northern Colorado (2015) report stated that “shrubbery, trees, and other vegetation on campus are trimmed on a regular basis both for aesthetics and safety” (p. 8). To ensure that students could feel safe anywhere on Aims Community College (2105), readers were reassured that “Aims has a very dynamic CCTV system with numerous cameras encompassing all the campuses” (p. 15).

The discourse analysis of safety on campus showed that IHEs consider a safe environment for students and all IHE personnel to be a top priority that involves the commitment of the entire campus community. Although acquaintance rape is discussed as an aspect of interpersonal safety, campuses still want to ensure students the campus grounds are also a safe environment that can address and prevent stranger rape.

**Factual versus narrative representation.** In creating knowledge of a concept, discourses “establish preconditions and parameters for the possibility of action” (Dunn & Neumann, 2016, p. 61). Analysis of the 23 ASRs showed that the majority of sexual assault concepts are presented in a straightforward, factual approach. As discussed in the document analysis, to be compliant all ASRs are required to include the definitions for domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking and consent. However, several Colorado state IHEs chose to present the concepts of sexual assault in a more narrative format. For example, Trinidad State Junior College (2015) devoted two paragraphs to the factual definitions of domestic violence and dating violence. Domestic violence was defined as “an act or threatened act of violence upon a person with whom the actor is or has been involved in an intimate relationship.” Dating violence was
specified as “violence committed by a person who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the victim” (p. 18). Although Colorado State University (2015) offered two similar definitions, an additional paragraph stated that “sadly, domestic and dating violence is a ‘modern reality’ to which students in academic settings are not immune” (p. 45). Readers are advised that “often, police receive calls from the victims, from friends, or from concerned neighbors who hear the noise of an argument or fight. When probable cause exists and officers believe that a crime occurred during a domestic situation, an arrest(s) will be made” (p. 45).

Another example of stylized representation can be found in comparing the discussion of consent. Lamar Community College (2015) provided readers a definition of consent as:

cooperation in act or attitude pursuant to an exercise of free will and with knowledge of the nature of the act. A current or previous relationship shall not be sufficient to constitute consent. Submission under the influence of fear shall not constitute consent (p. 7).

Interestingly, Lamar Community College printed the exact definition again later in their report on page 47. On the other hand, Colorado State University (2015) not only provided the definition of consent, but explained to the reader that:

it is best to be very explicit with dates about how you expect the relationship to be. Don’t assume that a person knows that you are comfortable with ‘going so far.’” The IHE added that “unfortunately, some people believe that consent to any
level of intimacy implies consent to sexual intercourse. This is not true – anyone can say ‘no’ or ‘stop’ at any time (pp. 49-50).

To link the issue of consent to the social reality of sexual assault, the IHE then explained that in “Colorado, it is a criminal offense to have sexual contact or intercourse with someone who has been using drugs or other intoxicants to the extent that they are unable to indicate their consent or lack of consent” (p. 50). Additionally, Colorado Northwestern Community College (2015) extended this level of narrative approach by explaining that “consensual sex requires sober, verbal communication free of threats or other coercion. College policy recognizes that someone who is drunk is unable to give consent” (p. 27).

The examples presented here of factual definitions compared to narrative approaches within an ASR demonstrated that interpreting discourses is not just examining “particular representations and representational practices,” but also requires “a deeper contextualization with the larger structures of meaning of which they are a part” in understanding the issues of safety and security on Colorado state IHE campuses (Dunn & Neumann, 2016, p. 106).

**Key Informant Interview Analysis**

The interviewed participants’ age ranged from 34 to 72 years ($M = 47.5, SD = 9.95$). Five were female and 13 male. Although 44 prospective interviewees from 23 IHEs were contacted, only 18 key informants from 12 Colorado state IHEs opted to participate in the key informant interviews. From the sample of 18 participants, their experience in working with the Clery Act as a campus official ranged from one to 26
years ($M = 8.83, \ SD = 5.92$). To preserve the anonymity of the key informants, and since the sample population is derived from a small community of Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators, the years of their experience in working with the Clery Act has not been associated with their comments. Twelve of the interviewees considered themselves administrators, three stated that they were both Title IX coordinators and administrators, two were Title IX coordinators, and one a legal advisor. For the purposes of this study, the following definitions apply to the campus positions of the key informants: (a) an administrator is considered an individual who is responsible for the compilation and creation of an IHE’s ASR to ensure an IHE’s compliance with federal regulations, (b) a Title IX coordinator oversees an IHE’s policies, procedures, and practices to ensure the IHE is compliant with Title IX legal requirements and contributes to ASR compilation, and (c) a legal advisor who provides legal guidance to administrators and Title IX coordinators in the compilation of their IHE’s ASR.

Phenomenological analysis requires a researcher to conduct numerous readings of the transcripts to locate the similarities and differences of interviewees’ experiences (Diehm & Lupton, 2012). Constant comparative method analysis of participant comments resulted in coded statements that were clustered into five themes. Following transcription and analysis, member-checking was conducted to accomplish validation by sending major themes to the interview participants (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Although none of the participants made any alterations, one participant commented that “I agree (in general) with these themes, and believe there is much room for improvement within Clery itself.” Another informant stated that he had reviewed the five themes and found
“they are spot-on. I can’t think of anything to add.” One other participant stated that “I think your synthesizing of the qualitative data makes sense.” Additionally, one key informant concluded that the five themes are “accurate, and mirror what I hear around the country when teaching Clery to practitioners.” Finally, one participant noted that although he did not have specific feedback, it was “nice to know I am not far off from others on my views.” Additionally, all interview responses were equally handled with coherent code-sets to ensure trustworthiness and credibility (Boeije, 2002; Sinkovics, Penz, & Ghauri, 2008).

**Central Themes**

Five central themes emerged from analysis of the key informant interview data. The participants perceived that (a) Clery Act information is not used by parents and students in campus selection, (b) Clery Act ASRs have not had a significant impact on campus safety, (c) Clery Act ASR creation is focused more on compliance than presentation, (d) VAWA changes to the Clery Act have improved the current policy for ASRs, and (e) a dedicated Clery Act administrator position is preferable to it being an additional duty.

**Theme 1: Clery Act Information is Not Used by Parents and Students in Campus Selection**

Consistent with previous research, the majority perception of interviewees is that students and parents do not use Clery Act statistics when making a decision about university or college selection. Ann, an administrator, stated that:
my perception is [that Clery information is] probably not used except maybe by a minority that have heard of it and know to look for it. I think a lot of work and man hours [are] put into something that people don’t have an awareness or an understanding of until something happens to them and they go looking for assistance.

When evaluating student and parent awareness of even the existence of the Clery Act, Carol, also an administrator, reflected that “I am a parent of two college students and I knew nothing about the Clery Act until I applied for this position.” She added that “when I got this position, and I started to tell people what I was going to do, not one person knew [about] the Clery Act. I have colleagues, probably hundreds of people I spoke with and none of them knew what it was.”

Dave, an administrator, contended that while students and parents are “not familiar with the name of what it is, they are familiar with the expectation that they’re going to be made aware of something that’s happening on campus.” He added that “when you talk to parents and students they expect that there are laws that protect them, that give them access to information and that are going to alert them when there’s a serious incident on campus.” He posited that although parents and students may not know the compilation of statistics is “related to Jeanne Clery, but they know what they’re expecting from the law.”

In assessing student awareness of ASR crime statistics, Bob, an administrator, contended that “students are clueless. I don’t think most students think about it until something happens, and then they become experts.” Eli, also an administrator, stated that
although some parents may reference the ASR statistics, “I don’t think many parents look beyond the crime tables in the reports. From everyone I’ve talked to over the last five years, typically the questions I’ve received have been directly off the crime table and not policy.” Expressing frustration, Eli explained that:

my exercise in life is to produce a report that nobody reads, it’s a sad day for America. Ultimately, I would like longer-term to find a way to get this information into their hands and make it where it’s digestible by a 17 to 20-year-old student, or a busy parent.

In reflecting on an interaction he had with a parent on a plane, Bob reminisced about a trip he was taking from Colorado to Louisiana in which he took a copy of the Handbook for Campus Safety and Security Reporting on board the plane for reading. He recounted:

I was sitting on the airplane next to an older lady. She was probably twenty years older than I was. She kept noticing what I was reading. I had headphones on. When I took my headphones off she asked me, ‘Can you tell me what that is?’ I explained what the handbook was, [and] I said you're free to look at it. It's a federal publication you can get off the web. She looked through it and she spent the next hour looking through it. Her daughter was a student at Louisiana State University. She goes, “I don't think my daughter's ever mentioned anything about Clery.” She goes, “I've never heard of Clery.” That kind of impact is invaluable.

Fred, an administrator, admitted that he lacked the “factual data to tell you how many parents and how many students actually are aware of the Clery Act, how many read
the reports, how many of those who do really report [that they] might be influenced by it in making a decision where to attend.” On the other hand, he added that when considering whether “the statistics themselves, are they helpful directly to students? Probably not, in my opinion.” Upon further reflection, he posited that the ASR could be useful as a reference for students seeking “resources when needed, [but] whether it influences a decision to go to a particular institution or not, I’m not so sure.”

Helen, a Title IX coordinator and administrator, contended that people were more aware of Title IX than the Clery Act. When it comes to the IHE’s ASR, Helen concluded that her perception was that “a lot of our students aren’t reading it.” She stated that she feels like [the ASR] goes into this big void. Like there’s no feedback on it.” She believed that the only time you get feedback on an ASR is when you are doing something wrong. Ian, a Title IX coordinator and administrator, also believed that parents and students were more aware of Title IX than the Clery Act.

Kevin, an administrator, believed that:

I think it’s like anything. I think there are some who clearly take a look at it and are concerned. I think most people don’t. If you want my honest opinion, I think most people don’t spend a whole lot of time. I think there are parents who are very concerned about the safety of their children who go in and try to understand it. I don’t think very many students take it all that seriously.

Martin, an administrator, posited that when it comes to the ASR, “RAs [research assistants] and other staff know it exists, but really the amount of people who would actually go through this and pour through it before making a decision about a college I
think is absolutely minimal.” He also added that he believed “very few students are reading the report, and I think the statistics themselves don’t necessarily make a significant difference in behavior.” Martin concluded his assessment whether students and parents use the ASR by stating “I just don’t think the students are going through it unless they’re ticked off about something and then they start going through it.”

Neal, an administrator, contended that he believed “a lot of students aren’t even familiar with the Clery [Act]. They don’t know there’s an act and they don’t know where it originated from and why and what the point of it is.” Oscar, an administrator, echoed Neal’s sentiments by stating that even after the ASR is e-mailed out to all students on October 1st, and he discusses the ASR with students, “the kids pick up their iPads, and start pulling it up, and have no idea. ‘I don’t know what this is. I’ve never seen this before.’” He added that “nobody knows what it is. There’s a lot of staff and faculty that have no idea what it is. They haven’t read it.”

Peter, a Title IX coordinator and administrator, contended that if a parent or student ever asked him about his IHE’s ASR “they’d probably have to call medical for me, because I’d just pass out. I’d be very surprised if they did.”

Throughout the interviews it became clear that key informants did not believe that students and parents used their IHE’s ASR in selecting a school to attend. Ironically, as discussed in Chapter 2, the main purpose of the Clery Act is to provide statistics and an annual document that parents and students can use to make campus selection decisions.
Theme 2: Clery Act ASRs Have Not Had a Significant Impact on Campus Safety

In considering the impact that the Clery Act compilation of statistics has had on campus safety, Fred stated that “I’m not sure that I perceive the safety of the campus to be directly related to Clery Act reporting.” He contended that “I think the annual security report is a great resource. It provides explanation of policies, about alcohol and drugs, of sexual assault, and it’s a very effective tool in getting information out about those things.” However, he added that “I think the statistical reporting of it is probably not very directly related to how safe the campus is.”

Eli posited:

I think in large part, the reporting aspect of Clery hasn’t impacted campus safety whatsoever. If anything, the need to create a universal document make the faculty and staff aware of their responsibilities. Ultimately, really, the aspect of Clery that is most visible to a student would be timely warnings and emergency notifications. Much beyond that, I don’t know that it has really impacted students much.

Although, not attributing the safety on campus to the compilation of crime statistics and Clery Act policies, Dave stated that “I perceive the safety of our campus to be exceptional.” Similarly, Ann posited that “I think we have a safe campus because of the staff on this campus and the students on campus.” She also reflected that “my perception is this has always been a safe campus.” This perspective was shared by Greg, a campus legal advisor, who believed that:
overall I feel as though we have a reasonably safe campus and we have a very robust law enforcement organization, we have a lot of emphasis that gets put on safety, and we have a good safe campus overall. That doesn’t mean things don’t happen, but statistically speaking, we feel we’re a pretty good safe campus. I don’t know that it’s a result of having an annual security report and the fact that we’re reporting numbers, I just don’t know that those two things connect. However, Greg did add that although “every piece of Clery doesn’t necessarily contribute to [campus] safety, but [for] the big picture, intent to the law, the focus, and emphasis on campus safety, I suspect that it improves safety in the long run.”

Greg also made the point that:

there are safety measures on this campus simply because they’re the right thing to do, not necessarily to comply with Clery. For example, the blue light poles, the poles that have a blue light on top that they automatically connect you to a dispatch center. They are really there because it’s the right thing to do, not because of any Clery mandate. The same thing with emergency buttons all over the place or badge access on this campus, I’m going to say that it does not drive us.

He also posited that while most Clery Act administrators may perceive their campus as safe, this is because “Clery would be driving us to get that done in a specific way, but the rest of it on this campus is really just sound security practices in my opinion.”
Helen stated that she did not “know that I’ve seen that it’s improved safety other than making people kind of conscious that we need to get the word out about folks reporting and some of those pieces which I think is really helpful.” She added that “I don’t know if it has done anything to improve campus safety, but it definitely makes us take notice.”

Ian posited that he did not know what impact the ASR had on his IHE’s safety, but he posited that he would like to do a study “to see if there’s any kind of impact as a result of our implementing this.” Julie, a Title IX coordinator, also believed that a campus climate survey would be useful. She contended that “I feel our campus is quite safe. We are in the midst of building a campus climate survey, and I think that will probably inform us in some respects a lot more than what you’re seeing in [the ASR], because it’ll give out perceptions which I don’t think the Clery Act does.”

On the other hand, Kevin contended that “I think overall we’re pretty safe. Do I think Clery is driving it? Part of that, certainly, because we’re certainly more aware.” Martin also believed his IHE is safe despite the availability of the ASR. He posited that he doesn’t “think that this is really on the radar for students.” He did, however, have:

parents say “It feels like your campus is really safe. It seems like it’s really safe.”
I’ve had those statements, but I’ve never heard anyone say, “I read the ASR and your campus is really safe.” I’ve never heard anyone say that.

Neal mirrored this assessment by stating “I’ll be very frank with you. I don’t think it alters [safety on campus] in any way.”
Without exception, all key informants believed that their IHE’s campus is safe. In retrospect, the case could be made that the key informants could not know if access to an ASR has an impact on campus safety because they do not know what could have happened without it. Although student access to the information contained within the ASRs is intended to promote safety and security on campus (and assist in campus selection), the perception of the key informants is that they do not believe student access to the policies and concepts outlined in the ASR contribute to campus safety because of the perception, as seen in Theme 1, that students and parents are not reading and using the ASR.

**Theme 3: Clery Act ASR Creation is Focused More on Compliance than Presentation**

When considering how their ASR looks in presenting information to the reader, seven of 18 participants believed that the focus on compliance superseded the desire to create an ASR focused on presentation to lure readers. Helen stated bluntly that “at this point it’s compliance. We don’t put a lot of thought into whether this is a student friendly document.” She continued that “I think for a lot of this it’s really been, how do we make sure this gets done because it has to get done.” Additionally, she stated that “I don’t know if we’ve ever looked at [the ASR] as a document to reach students,” adding that “I’ve never heard a conversation even about how do we want to make this something that people would want to read truly.” Helen explained that she believed this approach is taken by IHEs because “we feel like we’re constantly being thrown more compliance things with no more resources and no more support to do anything about them.”
conclusion she contended that “I don’t think it comes from the spirit of we want to make a safer campus. It comes from the spirit of we want to make sure we’re compliant and don’t get a big fine.”

Kevin also agreed that the focus on compliance meant that in ASR compilation that “one of the things that we do is make sure that we’re hitting all of the targets on the many, many compliance requirements we have across all the spectrum.”

Neal believed that what goes into an ASR “comes from the system [referring to federal regulations]. A lot of it comes from the system and a lot of it comes from the [Clery Act] handbook that says there needs to be certain policy statements in here. It needs to reflect certain information.” He added that if the: Clery Handbook says it needs to say this and, “Okay, well, we got to remain within compliance,” so that’s exactly what it’s going to say. Is it the easiest to get through? Are people going to read it? Probably not. Hopefully, but maybe parents. I don’t know.

In conclusion, Neal dryly added that the focus on compliance was related to the sentiment of “yeah, let’s not get sued by the DOE.”

Martin also contended that the focus on compliance versus presentation is because of the Department of Education. He stated:

Now I like to look at Clery and the Department of Education much like I look at the State Patrol. You may think you’re entirely in compliance but State Patrol will always find a reason to pull you over if they want to pull you over. They can find
something. I don’t care if you just drove a car off the lot, they’ll find something, and the Department of Education appears to be much the same way.

However, Martin also stated that he would like to move beyond mere compliance and add more imagery in his IHE’s ASR because “you have to find ways to break that information up because most people are just not interested in reading a bunch of text.”

Quincy, an administrator, echoed the sentiments expressed by Martin by stating an ASR compilation should “accomplish compliance and add value to it by talking a little more about what we are and who we are and not just providing a document that satisfies a check box for the federal government.” He added:

From my perspective, it’s that value add piece. Utilization of a report that is all text is going to be very, very low. If somebody’s flipping through and they can grab a meaningful graphic and spend that extra 10 or 15 seconds of their eyeballs on that point, I think we’re going to get a better value add from our product. It reflects a lot more about our institutions culture, which is, I believe here we have a culture of safety.

It became evident from the comments from the majority of the key informants perceived that the most important criteria for ASR compilation and presentation is to ensure that it is within compliance of the federal requirements of the Clery Act and the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act. The fear of being audited by the Department of Education and having to pay a $35,000 fine, as discussed in Chapter 1, appeared to be the greatest motivation driving the presentation and discourse found within Colorado state IHE ASRs. However, five of the key informants expressed a desire to move beyond
focusing on just compliance and would like to orient their IHE’s ASR discourse so it is tailored to the students and personnel on their campus. This aspect of ASR discourse is covered in the discussion section of this chapter, as well as within the recommendation section of Chapter 5.

**Theme 4: VAWA Changes to the Clery Act Improve the Current Policy for ASRs**

Regarding the changes made by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization, Fred contended that the additional information on sexual assault, consent, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking were a “useful” change to his IHE’s ASR. He posited that “adding those additional dimensions to what we talk about can’t be bad. That’s got to be a positive thing for the campus.” Greg concurred stating that the additions “can’t be a bad thing and you only hope that it helps.”

Dave believed that the changes, especially as they relate to dating violence, were an excellent addition that fit “within the spirit of the law and really the focus right now on gender-based violence and interpersonal violence in higher education. I think it’s a very promising thing.”

Oscar was not sure if safety had increased on campus because of the VAWA inclusions, but he did believe that “from the Student Life side of it these are all new things that [students] now know that have to be more cognitive of, or more conscious about.”

Helen believed that the inclusion of the VAWA amendments could have a positive effect on student reporting. She believed that “maybe we have had some
interactions with students [in the past] we were looking at immediate behaviors, but maybe not tagging them as dating violence.”

Eli especially saw the inclusion of stalking as a positive change to the Clery Act. He believed that “stalking as a whole, is severely underreported,” and that awareness of what stalking is by students and campus personnel will result in an increase of reporting.

Eli also praised the new focus on bystander training that was provided by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act. He recounted that bystander training is something that his campus had already been doing before the required changes, but he hoped that the use of bystander intervention on his campus would be driven down “even to lower levels where it’s not necessarily sexual assault in progress,” but could also allow for intervention in social situations that involve “drinking behaviors that aren’t good.”

Martin summed up the importance of bystander intervention on his IHE by stating:

I think bystander intervention is a good training process, so when they say, “Hey, you see a female or male who’s too drunk to give consent, obviously they’re falling all over somebody or something like that, is there a way to help them out? Is there a way to prevent an assault from occurring? Can you go ahead and do something low key that will help prevent an assault? Those things I think are important and they’re successful.

Peter contended that the inclusion of VAWA issues in prevention training had resulted in an increase in the number of students and employees reporting incidents after taking the training. Kevin also agreed that there had been an increase in reporting on
campus as a result of the VAWA additions, especially as they relate to training programs. However, he added that:

It’s a double-edged sword. Whenever you put something out and you start educating people, you see an increase and a bump in anything. If you do bullying training, you get an increase in bullying reports. I wouldn’t say that we’ve seen an increase in the number of claims that were founded. I think we’ve seen more reporting, but I don’t know that we’ve actually seen an increase in the claims that we could process through.

All of the key informants believed that the additional information included in their IHE’s ASR regarding sexual assault, consent, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking added value to the discourse of their reports. The inclusion of bystander intervention was especially welcomed by each of the participants. There was a perception that the campus prevention programs and trainings led to greater awareness of the issues associated with the VAWA Reauthorization Act changes, and that this increased awareness could be associated with a perceived increase in the reporting of incidents on campus.

Theme 5: A Dedicated Clery Act Administrator Position is Preferable to an Additional Duty

Thirteen out of 18 interviewees were adamant that having a dedicated individual responsible for Clery Act compliance is a great benefit to their campus. Ann, who is responsible for several duties in her office, was concerned that Clery Act compilation is too great a burden to be considered an additional duty. She stated that “it is a full-time
position and I’m not doing it justice.” She would rather it be a year-round position that would allow her to have more time to read what is coming out on Clery Act compliance.

To Ann, having a dedicated Clery Act administrator meant that “we could be actively out training the [Campus Security Authorities]. We could be actively out training the staff and faculty on VAWA. We could actively be involved in the crime prevention in writing.” She added that “if I have that one job, maybe we could make [the Clery Act] more apparent on campus.”

Bob contended that having a full-time Clery Act manager for his campus would be a great benefit to the institution because “one thing I’ve learned [is that] you’re never compliant with Clery. You never will be, you can’t.” He explained that:

you can’t be 100%. That [Handbook for Campus Safety and Security Reporting] is so ambiguous; you can tell that lawyers wrote it. You can never be 100%, you can’t be. They leave so many things for judgment, so many things in that grey area. You always try and err on the best side.

Eli concurred with the need for a dedicated Clery Act manager (a position he fills for his institution). He stated that “at least [my university] realized that it is a full-time endeavor to monitor Clery and truly be compliant. They’ve allocated funds, but it has come from just general fund money for essentially what used to be a police officer’s position.”

Dave also addressed this issue by contending that he:

felt a really strong need to have a dedicated person in the police department related to Clery Act and records compliance. What we did was we took a vacant
dispatcher position. We assessed what we had there and said, "Could we live with one less dispatcher?" The answer was yes and so we hired somebody who's going to focus specifically on Clery Act compliance and records management. What we had before was our communication supervisor or dispatch supervisor was also doing records and was also our Clery person. There's a lot of burden there. That's a lot of responsibility for one person. That's one way that we've tackled it.

Carol stated that she was the first person to fill the role of a dedicated Clery Act administrator for her campus. She recalled that “previously it was filled by a police officer who is the community resource officer, and it was just one of many duties this person had. They pulled them over, so it’s all under one person now.”

On the other hand, Fred (whose campus relies on a team approach towards ASR compilation) contended that:

I would say this; we have been able to achieve compliance without a full-time Clery manager. I would be hesitant to say, “You really need one.” If you could have one, would it be helpful? Sure. It would take some of the pressure off other people, but you'd still have to have all the same people who are involved now, still involved, because they are the ones dealing with the students. They are the ones hearing the reports.

But, Fred also posited that it would be a “boon” to the police department if a full-time position to work on the ASR was created. Greg (who works at the same campus as Fred) contended that he “could see where it might be a full-time job that could staff
someone at more of a mid-level position. It depends a bit on where you place that and the person you put in the position will oversee it.”

Ian stated that he supported the concept of using a single point-of-contact for Clery Act compilation, but he also contended that the ASR process should be done in a group setting “in making decisions and just talking about our policies and our procedures as it relates to that.” He also added that “we have a collaborative decision-making process here.”

Julie also liked the idea of single point-of-contact for ASR compilation, but she also believed that agreeing on what goes into the ASR is “a team effort” because “we feed much of the data to them but I think in terms of, it’s maybe 60% one person, 40% team, if that makes any sense.”

Kevin believed that although it takes one point-of-contact to compile the information needed for the ASR from contacts around the campus, it did not necessarily require a full-time position. He contended that the current Clery Act point-of-contact (who serves as the Program Assistant to the Dean of his IHE) has “got this down to a science, I think. She’s been doing it for a while. She’s pretty good at it. I don’t think she’d want to do it full-time all the time.”

Conversely, Martin is convinced that the ASR compilation requires a full-time point-of-contact. He stated that he even recently hired a Clery Compliance Officer because his IHE:

absolutely had to have that position in order to feel any comfort level that we’re touching all the people we’re supposed to touch and gathering all the information
we’re supposed to gather. She’s in the process of learning and she’s in her education process, but obviously as it becomes normal for her, we will be that much further down the road in making sure that we’re in full compliance.

Oscar contended that he would like his IHE to have a full-time Clery Act administrator. He has tried over the last two years to convince his IHE to create the position, but there has not been the money available to hire someone. However, Oscar stated that he would not give up, “and we’ll just keep putting it in as a request, and I don’t know. I don’t know historically what it takes, and I hope three, four years I think I’m on year two. I’ll keep making a push for it.”

The majority of key informants expressed a desire to have one person act as a full-time point of contact on their campus to coordinate with other agencies on campus and compile the required inputs needed to create their IHE’s ASR. The main issue raised by participants that prevents them from having a single Clery Act point of contact for their IHE is funding and the lack of a dedicated billet available within their IHE’s staffing structure.

Each of the five themes, along with sample quotes, are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes or Quotes</th>
<th>Sample Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 1: Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators perceive</td>
<td>“RAs [research assistants] and other staff know it exists, but really the amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that the majority of students and parents are unaware of, and do not use,</td>
<td>of people who would actually go through this and pour through it before making a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clery Act information for campus selection.</td>
<td>decision about a college I think is absolutely minimal.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8 (continued)

Theme 2: Colorado state administrators and Title IX coordinators perceive that the reporting of Clery Act information in ASRs has not had a significant impact on campus safety.

“I think in large part, the reporting aspect of Clery hasn’t impacted campus safety whatsoever. If anything, the need to create a universal document makes the faculty and staff aware of their responsibilities. Ultimately, really the aspect of Clery that is most visible to a student would be timely warnings and emergency notifications. Much beyond that, I don’t know that it has really impacted students much.”

Theme 3: Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators perceive that ASR creation is more focused on compliance with federal requirements than the way information is presented to students and parents.

“At this point it’s compliance. We don’t put a lot of thought into whether this is a student friendly document.”

Theme 4: Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators perceive that the VAWA changes to the Clery Act improve the current policy requirements for campus ASRs.

“I think that it fits within the spirit of the law and really the focus right now on gender based violence and interpersonal violence in higher education. I think it’s a very promising thing. I’m glad that here was an inclusion for dating violence because there’s a lot of interpersonal violence that happens where there’s a relationship that doesn’t meet this criteria of domestic violence.”

Theme 5: Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators perceive that a dedicated Clery Act manager position coordinating with other campus agencies is preferable to treating it as an additional duty.

“It is a full-time position and I’m not doing it justice.”

Policy Change Feedback

Recommendations for improving IHE use and compliance of Clery Act regulations and ASR creation are made in Chapter 5. These recommendations are derived from a synthesis of the data associated with the interviews, document analysis and discourse analysis methods used for this study, as well as recommendations made by the key informants. However, there were two policy considerations expressed by the key informants that participants believed would improve IHE interaction with the Department of Education, as well as campus safety, communication, and reporting,

Several of the key informants expressed a frustration with the lack of consistent guidance provided by the Department of Education on Clery Act compliance. The perception was that contacting the Department of Education for assistance meant
confronting a caveat that, as summarized by Quincy, anything they say “can’t be construed as actual advice.” He recommended that the Department of Education give IHEs “some bright lines to operate with. The sense I have is that the lines are always blurred. We’re always doing our best, but always nervous that our best may still not be enough.” This recommendation for consistent guidance from the Department of Education was also expressed by Peter who was concerned that IHEs were not getting the right message, and that some IHEs were wasting their time “doing something that’s not going to produce the result that they’re actually looking for.” Even though the Department of Education provides guidance to IHEs through the Handbook for Campus Safety and Security Reporting, the perception of Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators is that there are too many grey areas for comfort in complying with federal regulations. When an IHE contacts the Department of Education for guidance, they would prefer straightforward guidance that is not perceived as vague and inconsistent.

Another concern for key informants was the requirement for IHEs to issue a timely warning to campus personnel “as soon as the pertinent information is available” (Westat, Ward & Mann, 2011, p. 111). Several participants expressed frustration that campus officials were being pressured by Clery Act guidance to issue timely warnings as soon as any information was available so that campus personnel could have the time and information necessary to take the appropriate precautions for safety and security. This pressure to release timely warnings was perceived as an aspect of not only protecting campus personnel, but also a tool in which to protect the campus’ reputation by releasing
the timely warning. However, Rita believed that releasing too much information “may discourage reporting” by others in the future. Although the Department of Education guidance states that the “responsibility for getting the warning out rests solely with the institution” (Westat, Ward, & Mann, 2011, p. 114), several key informants posited that the Department of Education needs to understand that the pressure to release information in timely warnings in a quick (and possibly too informative) manner could result more in instilling fear than feelings of safety in campus personnel and discourage future reporting. They recommended that the Department of Education needs to be more understanding of the dynamics related to an IHE’s decision to hold or delay timely warnings when assessing a timely warning situation.

**Theoretical Framework Link**

This is the first qualitative phenomenological investigation conducted on the perceptions of Title IX coordinators, administrators and campus officials on the compliance, use, and effectiveness of the Clery Act in correlation with the precepts of general systems theory. My conclusion is that von Bertalanffy’s (1950, 1968, 1972) theoretical framework was applicable in understanding how the related components of Clery Act policies, procedures, and programs interact to form a system focused on campus security and safety.

**Inputs.** The inclusion of inputs through changes made by the amendments to the Clery Act by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization showed how Colorado universities are open systems in the Colorado state IHE system. In accordance with GST, the findings from the interviews, document analysis, and discourse analysis showed that Colorado
state IHEs have allowed for the input and output of new policies to improve safety on campus.

**Outputs.** Consistent with GST, the outputs associated with IHEs for this study included (a) the compilation and distribution of an ASR, (b) the availability of training and awareness programs for campus personnel with a bystander focus, (c) the inclusion of the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act amendments in 2015 ASRs, and (d) clear explanations on the process of reporting crimes and how an IHE disciplinary process protects the rights of both the victim and the accused.

**Perceptions and relationships.** GST was also very useful in providing a framework for a critical examination of the relationship between the perceptions and conceptions of Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators. Sexual assault and violence is a constant presence in the literature on campus safety, and requires that universities be open dynamic systems responsive to the physical and social reality of campus crime. Each of the ASRs established expectations of student conduct on campus as it relates to consent, respect, and sexual assault awareness in campus relationships. The perceptions and experiences of the key informants in the compilation and creation of their IHE’s ASR informed the outputs that were used to address campus safety and security issues.

**Open system.** Additionally, as open systems, the interactivity and relationships of college and university administrators, Title IX coordinators, and campus security authorities with local law enforcement towards compliance with the Clery Act demonstrated the importance of relationships within a GST framework, and demonstrated
that a fragmented approach toward problems and solutions involving campus safety and security will not contribute to organizational effectiveness.

**Discussion**

Overall, participants were praiseworthy of the intent of the Clery Act in addressing crime on campus. Key informants felt that the issues covered under the act were useful in educating students and campus employees. The changes made by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization were welcomed by all 18 participants in this study. Information on dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, consent, and bystander intervention were especially seen as positive additions to ASR compliance. Document analysis showed that 20 out of 23 Colorado state ASRs were in full compliance with amendments made to the Clery Act by the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act. However, document analysis revealed that all 23 IHEs correctly linked definitions for the VAWA additions into their ASRs.

One of the main purposes of passing the legislation in 1990 was to allow students and parents to make knowledgeable decisions about school choice. However, consistent with findings from surveys of Clery Act administrators conducted by Janosik and Gregory (2001, 2002, 2003, 2004), not one of the interviewees had the perception that students and parents actually use the Clery Act crime statistics in selecting a campus for attendance. The impression of several participants was that students and parents are aware of the concepts associated with the Clery Act (such as timely warnings and emergency notifications), but they cannot identify the Clery Act itself.
Only one key informant had the perception that the campus was safer because of Clery Act reporting. Although several participants did believe that ASRs are an excellent resource to make policy and statistics publicly available, the perception of the majority of key informants could not state categorically that the Clery Act made their campus safer. However, interviewees unanimously believed that their campuses were safe for students, and that the presence of campus security devices and law enforcement contributed to a safe environment. Discourse analysis showed that all 23 ASRs included information that students should be aware of the responsibility for their own security and the security of others. The discourses associated with consent, sexual assault awareness, prevention, bystander intervention, disciplinary procedures, safety, and social expectations on campus were dominant in the ASRs analyzed. With the exception of one ASR, the importance of preserving evidence following a sexual assault was clearly stated in each IHE’s report. However, ten of the 23 ASRs did not clearly address the requirement to preserve evidence in stalking situations.

The main focus of all interviewees was on complying with federal legislative guidelines on what should be included in their IHE’s ASR. However, interviewees did express a desire to include more graphics if they could overcome time constraints related to spending more time on their IHE’s ASR by hiring a full-time Clery Act point-of-contact for their campus. The discourse analysis showed that only six of the 23 ASRs analyzed used semiotics within the text of their report. The majority of images used were at the denotation level. However, those IHEs that opted to use images at the connotation level did so in an effective manner to convey (a) the story of Jeanne Clery, (b)
availability of prevention programs, (c) availability of counseling, and (d) students being treated with respect.

With the exception of two participants from one institution, key informants strongly believed that having a dedicated, full-time Clery Act manager position on a campus was important. Considering the changes made under the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act, interviewees contended that a dedicated position would allow for enhanced compliance, training coordination, and awareness of the Clery Act on campus.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

Policy and Practice Implications

When President Obama signed the VAWA Reauthorization Act of 2013, he was implementing amendments to the 1990 Clery Act legislation that would transform the way institutions of higher education report interpersonal crimes. For the 2015 ASRs, universities and colleges were required by the new VAWA amendments to include incidents of domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. This change was an important step in revising policies, procedures, and programs to focus less on the concept of stranger rape and more on the reality of acquaintance rape on campuses.

The recommendations made for this paper represent almost two years of research, discussion, and reflection on the Clery Act and its implications for Colorado state IHEs. The trustworthiness and confirmability of this study has been demonstrated by the feedback provided through member-checking, as well as the rich quotes that were derived from the data. The findings have been presented in a logical and documented approach for dependability, and the authenticity of the study has been enriched by the phenomenological lived experiences of the key informants interviewed for this study.

The recommendations made in this section are derived from a synthesis of the data associated with the interviews, document analysis and discourse analysis methods used for this study, as well as recommendations made by the key informants. Implementing the recommendations presented in this chapter at Colorado state IHEs, and through transferability to other IHEs which must comply with the federal regulations of
the Clery Act, will improve an IHE’s compliance, use and effectiveness of the Clery Act. One future research recommendation is that a major study of parents and students be conducted to determine how Colorado state IHE’s ASRs are used in school selection.

Four key recommendations include (a) hiring a full-time point-of-contact to enhance the efficiency of an IHE’s ASR compilation and creation process, (b) conducting an annual climate survey to determine how ASR statistics and information enhances the knowledge of campus personnel on the issues related to campus safety and security, (c) employing a narrative approach toward ASR information discourse to better explain and set IHE expectations of student attitudes and norms (reinforced by training and awareness programs) in dealing with campus sexual assault and violence, and (d) enhancing Colorado state IHE ASRs through the use of semiotics at the connotation level to interest campus personnel, parents, and students in reading and understanding their IHE’s ASR.

**Recommendations**

**Full-time Clery Act Administrator**

Except for one of the five campuses involved in this policy study, the main recommendation that came out of the key informant interviews was an advocacy for the creation of a full-time, dedicated campus position to address compliance and dissemination of Clery Act information. Key informants were adamant that treating ASR compilation as an additional duty does not do justice to the importance of the ASR as an information resource for campus safety and security and federal legislation compliance. Creating a full-time position for a Clery Act administrator would allow for an individual who could (a) attend Clery Act training seminars and provide their IHEs guidance on the
latest changes and trends in Clery Act compliance, (b) assist in actively training the
Campus Security Authorities, staff, and faculty on Clery Act and 2013 VAWA
Reauthorization Act requirements, and (c) act as a liaison to enhance the relationships of
campus agencies and community organizations in contributing to ASR compilation and
creation.

Like many policy requirements, the U.S. Department of Education does not
provide universities and colleges the funds to ensure compliance with Clery Act
mandates. Creating a full-time position for a Clery Act administrator would have to come
out local funding and require a manning impact review by the institution. However, the
perception of the majority of key informants is that making such a commitment would be
vital to the betterment of the organization and improve Clery Act compliance.

**Conduct Annual Campus Clery Assessments**

In addition to surveying students and parents about ASR usage for future
research, it is also recommended that Colorado state IHEs conduct annual Clery
assessment surveys. Similar to the campus climate survey discussed by one of the key
informants, a campus Clery assessment could enable IHEs to determine student
perceptions and experiences in dealing with issues related to Clery Act, Title IX, and
VAWA Reauthorization Act issues such as sexual assault, consent, dating violence,
domestic violence, and stalking. An assessment would allow IHE officials to assess the
prevalence of sexual assault on their campus, as well as student perceptions of the
effectiveness of an IHE in responding to personal safety and security issues. Additionally,
this would provide insight into the campus community’s assessment whether, as one key
informant asked, access to an ASR’s statistics and discourse has an impact on campus safety.

An annual Clery assessment would allow IHEs to determine (a) awareness and usage of an IHE’s ASR by campus personnel, (b) how aware the campus community is of the definitions and issues associated with sexual assault, consent, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking, (c) how effective campus crime prevention and awareness programs are in educating campus personnel on the issues surrounding bystander intervention, campus safety and security, (d) the extent of student victimization and reporting experiences associated with sexual assault and sexual harassment, (e) the context in which sexual assault took place (e.g., location, stranger or acquaintance, presence of alcohol), and (f) how the effectiveness and usage of the IHE’s disciplinary process is perceived by campus personnel. An annual campus Clery assessment would allow an IHE to understand the knowledge level and impact of Clery Act, Title IX, and 2013 VAWA Reauthorization policies on the campus community. Additionally, the hiring of a full-time Clery Act administrator could allow that individual to be a key lead in conducting, analyzing and distributing the results of their IHEs annual Clery assessment.

Present ASR Information in a Narrative Format

After conducting the discourse analysis of the 23 Colorado state IHE ASRs, it became evident that the presentation of information in a factual definitional approach only in ASRs was insufficient for understanding the impact of sexual assault on college campuses. Representations of the context of sexual assault presented in ASRs in a
narrative format will allow readers to understand the larger structures inherent in the
discourse. For example, instead of just providing the required definition of consent, IHEs
should consider presenting examples of situations of how consent can be provided by
words or actions, along with scenarios in which consent could be considered
questionable. This presentation of discourse could better enable students to agree on
mutually understandable permissions regarding the initiation of sexual activity.

Another example of how the narrative could be improved would be through
providing examples of bystander intervention techniques within the text of the ASR.
Campus personnel could be presented with situations in campus social environments to
provide examples of how intervention could prevent an assault from occurring. This will
allow readers to better understand not only what bystander intervention requires, but also
explain why it is important to utilize helping behaviors in social situations and provide
readers an understanding of why it is important to not only be aware of their own safety,
but take actions to ensure the safety and well-being of other on campus. Although not
specifically addressed in the ASRs and the key informant interviews, and consistent with
the findings in the literature review section of this paper, narratives should address both
the need for intervention techniques and incorporate a discussion on the prevalence and
impact of stereotypical rape myths on bystander attitudes. Additionally, IHEs could also
use narratives to explain problems associated with safety on their campus (such as not
propping open doors in residence halls), or unique situations that campus personnel may
encounter (e.g., IHE locations with open campuses in urban settings).
It is highly recommended that IHEs adopt a more narrative approach toward information presentation to better explain the interpersonal issues addressed by the addition of the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act, as well as providing readers a better understanding of the implications and consequences associated with the expectations of student conduct on campus.

Include Semiotic Usage in ASRs

To improve the presentation of information in ASRs, and based on feedback from the key informants, it is recommended that Colorado state IHEs include more semiotics (images, signs and symbols) within their reports, especially at the connotation level, to hopefully encourage more students and parents to take the time to read, identify with, and understand the important material included with each IHE’s ASR. As expressed by one of the key informants, the hope of an IHE is to craft an ASR that is “digestible by a 17 to 20-year-old student, or a busy parent.” The inclusion of semiotics could be used to represent concepts, ideas and feelings related to the issue of identifying and preventing sexual assault on campus. This could be done through the inclusion of photos and images associated with an IHE’s training and prevention programs, as well as campus locations that readers can relate to and readily identify.

An excellent example of the use of graphics can be found in Colorado State University’s ASR. The image of students holding signs from the IHE’s “Party smart” campaign provides the campus community ideas to better protect themselves from sexual assault. Signs held up by the students read “I will pour my own drink” and “I will help my friends stick to their limits” (Colorado State University, 2015, pp. 2, 16). The use of
semiotics not only engages the reader to understand self-defense and prevention strategies, but also seeks to raise awareness within the campus community to engage in broader conversations about the social expectations of students on campus.

Additionally, it is recommended that all Colorado state IHEs include a photo of Jeanne Clery in their ASRs. Her photo should be accompanied by text that explains her story, why it is important to the creation of the Clery Act, and how campus safety and security issues affect the lives of all campus personnel.

**Recommended Future Research**

It has been 15 years since a major study surveyed students on the usage of ASRs for campus selection. As discussed in Chapter 2, Janosik (2001) found that 71% of students were unaware of the Clery Act, with 88% unable to recall even receiving a copy of their school’s ASR (despite the ASR being distributed to the entire campus community every October 1st). Janosik also found that of the students that did read the ASR, less than 4% used the ASR in making college choice decisions.

Analysis of the data from this study showed that Colorado state IHE administrators and Title IX coordinators believe that, even after 25 years of Clery Act legislation implementation, student and parents are unaware of the existence of the Clery Act. It is recommended that future research be conducted by surveying both students and parents who have selected a university in Colorado to determine if campus Clery Act statistics and ASRs were used for campus selection. This would enable researchers to determine if parents and students are actually using Clery Act policies and Colorado state IHE ASRs to make knowledgeable decisions about school choice.
Conclusion

The results of this qualitative interview, document analysis, and discourse analysis have reflected much of what has been found in previous literature regarding Clery Act compliance, use, and effectiveness. The 2013 VAWA Reauthorization amendments required that Colorado universities under the CSU and University of Colorado systems substantially review and revise their policies, procedures, and programs designed to protect students and employees on campus. A commitment to campus security and safety must be taken seriously by all involved in the process, and full enforcement of the policies associated with Clery Act compliance is critical. IHEs acting on the recommendations included in this study, along with the full inclusion of the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act revisions to the Clery Act in their ASRs, can be instrumental in creating a campus environment that further protects the safety of victims, promotes accountability within the system, and provides students and parents a report that somebody will read.
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Questions will consist of the following:

1. Demographics:
   - How old are you? ________________________________
   - What is your gender? ____________________________
   - How many years do you have in the field? ________________
   - What is your administrative level?
     - a. Administrator   b. Title IX Coordinator   c. Other ________________
(2) Please describe your role at your school, and how this role relates to the creation, use, and/or dissemination of Clery Act and the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act policies.

(3) How have campus training, orientations, and primary prevention and awareness programs you have participated in included information on Clery Act and 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act policies?

(4) How is your campuses’ Annual Security Report information shared with prospective parents and students? What is your perception of student and parent awareness of Clery Act reporting of campus crime statistics in influencing their college choice decisions?

(5) How do you perceive the safety of your campus as a result of Clery Act reporting?

(6) What is your perception of the additional reporting criteria on domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking crimes under the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act amendments in improving campus safety?

(7) What changes have you seen in student reporting as a result of the 2013 VAWA Reauthorization changes in training or reporting?

(8) What are some factors and techniques that contribute to the dissemination of Clery Act and 2013 VAWA Reauthorization Act policies to current students and employees, as well as prospective students and employees?

(9) If you think for a moment about the way the ASR looks and the manner in which it presents content to readers, what goals or objectives were you trying to meet through its presentation?

(10) What policy changes would you recommend be made to improve campus safety communication and reporting?

Is there anything else you would like to add? Thank you very much for your time.
Dear ________________________________.

Two weeks ago, we talked about your possible participation in a policy study dealing perceptions of Colorado state Institute of Higher Education (IHE) Clery Act administrators and Title IX coordinators regarding the use and effectiveness of the Clery Act and the 2013 reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). If you are still considering whether to participate, please be assured that your participation will be entirely confidential and could not only result in recommendations to improve campus safety communication and reporting, but your perspectives could enhance the effectiveness and use of Clery Act compliance by Colorado state IHEs.

As mentioned in my previous e-mail, participants are requested to participate in a 60-minute interview. If you are willing, please let me know a date/time/location in the near future that would work for you by responding to this e-mail. All interviews will take place either in person or by telephone. I will get back to you to confirm a date/time/location for your interview.

I look forward to the opportunity to include your unique perspective on this important topic.

If you have any questions regarding the study, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you for your consideration!

Warmest regards,

John L. Donovan

I have received Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval for this study.
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