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“Participation will save the human race”.
What we will cover

- Brief review of programs with efficacy to reduce IPV / SV in educational settings.
- Story of EMPOWER to Green Dot: Practice to Research and back
  - Testing a primary prevention bystander based intervention in statewide randomized intervention trial in 26 high schools
  - UK and KASAP partnership
Moving to PRIMARY Prevention

Primary – Universal OR risk based interventions

Purpose: Prevent SV/DV; Violence does not occur

Examples – Educational & Awareness

What works?

Evidence-based for Efficacy for:

1. Safe Dates
2. Fourth R: Strategies for Healthy Youth Relationships
3. Shifting Boundaries

AND Bystander-Based Interventions
Safe Dates


- **Purpose:** Evaluate school based dating violence prevention program.
- **Methods:**
  - Randomized trial of Safe Dates curriculum in 10 middle schools (8th grade)
  - Between follow-up in years 2-3, a random sample of those in treatment group received a booster.
  - Data collection at baseline data, 1 month, and yearly thereafter for 4 years.
- **Curriculum:**
  - Safe Dates curriculum included 10 45-minute sessions taught by health or physical education teachers, a poster contest, and a theater production.
  - Curriculum available through Hazelden publications.
- **Results:**
  - Using random coefficients models, significant program effects were found at all follow-up periods on psychological, physical, and sexual dating violence perpetration and moderate physical dating violence victimization.
  - Program effects were mediated by changes in dating violence norms, gender-role norms, and awareness
- **(Large CDC trial ongoing with Safe Dates as Best Practice)**

Moving toward Prevention
Fourth R: Strategies for Healthy Youth Relationships


• **Purpose:** Evaluate a community-based intervention to help at-risk teens develop healthy, nonabusive relationships with dating partners.

• **Methods:**
  – 158 14-16-year-olds with histories of child maltreatment who were randomly assigned to a preventive intervention or a no-treatment control group.
  – *Intervention consisted of education about healthy and abusive relationships, conflict resolution and communication skills, and social action activities.*

• **Results:**
  – Unconditional growth models for abuse perpetration revealed that, over time, there was a significant reduction in physical abuse against a dating partner ($\beta_{\text{TIME}} = -.008, p < .01$) and emotional abuse ($\beta_{\text{TIME}} = -.006, p < .05$).
  – Preventive effect stronger in girls than boys.
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• **Purpose:** Evaluate school based dating violence prevention program.

• **Methods:**
  - Randomized trial of Shifting Boundaries intervention in 30 middle schools (6-7th grade) in NYC; 117 classes with >2500 students
  - Classroom intervention of 6 sessions emphasizing
    1. Laws and consequences for perpetrators of dating and sexual violence
    2. Social construction of gender roles
    3. Health relationships
  - Intervention included increased faculty/security presence, building-based restraining orders, and posters to increase awareness and reporting.
  - Building only, Classroom only and Building and Classroom Intervention
  - Follow up to 6 months

• **Results:**
  - ↓ sexual harassment victimization in intervention v comparison
  - ↓ sexual violence victim + perp in intervention v comparison
  - ↓ dating violence victimization in intervention v comparison
Bystander Role in Violence Prevention

• Emerged in Mid 1990’s - Focus on other(s) that may witness (allow?) violence yet does nothing.

• Premise: addressing violence requires a shift in norms. Need to involve both men and women to change the context or environment that may tacitly support violence. Reframing violence as preventable and engaging men as well as women in prevention efforts shifts the blame and increases the number of students willing to be involved.
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Campus Sexual Violence Elimination (SaVE) Act

instructs colleges to provide programming for students and employees addressing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking.

Education programs shall include:

– Primary prevention and awareness programs for all incoming students and new employees.

– Safe and positive options for bystander intervention.

– Information on risk reduction to recognize warning signs of abusive behavior

– Ongoing prevention and awareness programs for students and faculty.

• **CHALLENGE** – No evaluation required. Colleges required to provide bystander based intervention but how are colleges selecting programs? What works?

Reauthorization of VAWA Signed by Obama on March 7, 2013 and includes SaVE
HOW TO Measure Intervention Effectiveness (IMPACT)

• Relative to those not receiving the intervention, did those who did have
  – Lower violence rates (less severe, frequent)
  – Fewer injuries, less depression / anxiety / substance use
  – Less engagement with legal system
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Measuring Outcomes: Think Continuum

- Bullying
- Sexual Harassment
- Intimate Partner / Dating Violence (psychological and physical)
- Stalking
- Sexual Violence (physically forced, coerced or substance enabled unwanted sex)

Continuum of Interpersonal Violence Perpetration

Moving toward Prevention
Hypothesized Effect of Bystander Programs on Social norms, Active bystander behaviors and ↓Violence

Program: Training / Modeling / Practice to safely and effectively engage peers in violence prevention using reactive or proactive strategies

Training diffused through trainees’ peer networks to change norms supporting violence and its acceptance, identify risky situations, and increase bystander behaviors to interrupt or prevent violence.

Ultimate test of program is a reduction in the continuum of interpersonal violence at the community level.

Moving toward Prevention
The Know Your Power™ social marketing campaign was developed by a team of university students, staff and faculty. What distinguishes the Know Your Power social marketing campaign from other social marketing campaigns is the extensive evaluation that has been done to assess the effectiveness of the campaign. read more
Bringing in the Bystander (UNH)

Mary Moynihan, PhD; Developer, Prevention Innovations

Program Components

- One 90-minute session or 2 to 3 sessions delivered within 1 week.

Content/Elements

- Information about sexual and intimate partner violence prevalence, causes, and consequences, including local examples and statistics.
- Intro to concept of bystander responsibility and role played in preventing SV/IPV in risky situations.
- Active exercises to practice intervening safely and support victims
- Information about personal safety and community resources
- A bystander pledge to be prosocial and active bystanders

Administration:

- Professional co-facilitators or trained peer facilitators. Facilitators work in male–female pairs to deliver program to single-sex groups.

Tailored programs — Greek, Athletes, General, Student leaders

Know Your Power (social marketing focus)
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Bringing in the Bystander -

**Purpose** (Banyard, Moynihan, & Plante, 2007, 1st data on bystander behaviors):
- Evaluate Bringing in Bystander among undergraduate men and women ages 18-23.

**Design:**
- Random assignment to one of three groups: one 90 minute vs three 90 minute sessions vs control
- Pre post and followup at 2, 4, and 12 months
- N=389

**Results:**
- Change in IRMS, Date Rape Myth, Bystander Efficacy, Bystander attitudes, and decisional balance for both intervention groups – pre vs post intervention.
- At 2 & 4 months, both interventions > control for bystander behaviors (>1 vs 3 sessions). No effect on behaviors at 12 months.
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Bringing in the Bystander

Banyard et al. 2009
- Pre post evaluation of 90 min training
- In 196 student leaders, 123 resident advisors, and 73 staff.

**Results:** ↓IRMS, ↑ bystander confidence, ↑ willingness to intervene

Amar & Kessler 2012
- Pre post evaluation
- 202 college students; Recruited by invitations; 9 sessions with 15-25 participants
- Bystander intervention (Banyard 2007) adapted to BU campus.
- Training provided by UNH team; Fidelity assessments included.

**Results:** ↓IRMS post v pre test; ↑ bystander intention and taking responsibility for action
interACT Sexual Assault Prevention Program (Ahrens et al 2011)

**Description:** Based on *Theater of the Oppressed*, interACT trains participants to engage in effective bystander interventions.

**Design:**
- pre, post and 3 month follow up
- N=509 (355 with complete data) students in two undergraduate communications studies classes (70% female)

**Results:**
- ↑ in perception of bystander interventions as helpful pre to post test. Yet not at 3 month followup
- ↑ likelihood of bystander intentions from pre, post and followup

Moving toward Prevention
The overarching goal of Green Dot etc. is to mobilize a force of engaged and proactive bystanders.

Philosophy

*Given the extraordinary human cost of failure, we must inform every aspect of what we do with the most current science, then divest personal ego and scrutinize our work with objectivity and scientific rigor, course correcting each step of the way.*

The Green Dot etc. curriculum is informed by concepts and lessons learned from bodies of research and theory across disciplines including: violence against women, diffusion of innovation, public health, social networking, psychology, communications, bystander dynamics, perpetration, and marketing/advertising. Additionally, since the foundation of Green Dot etc. is built upon the necessity of achieving a critical mass of individuals willing to engage in new behaviors, it is important that we strive to recognize and address anything within our efforts that might be limiting engagement including historical obstacles in the field of violence prevention and professional and personal obstacles we all face. Finally, in contrast to historical approaches to violence prevention that have focused on victims and perpetrators, the Green Dot etc. strategy is predicated on the belief that individual safety is a community responsibility and shifts the lens away from victims/perpetrators and onto bystanders. The overarching goal is to mobilize a force of engaged and proactive bystanders.
Green Dot Bystander Intervention
Dorothy Edwards, PhD, Developer, Live the Green Dot

Program Components

• Overview Speech (~1 hour)

• Bystander Training (6 hours to weekend) focused on peer opinion leaders who “carry the most social influence across sub-groups”. Throughout training - video, role-plays, and other exercises are used.

• Social Marketing – Green Dot products to open conversations.

• Green Dot built on the premise that in order to measurably reduce the perpetration of power-based personal violence, a cultural shift is necessary. In order to create a cultural shift, a critical mass of people will need to engage in a new behavior (Green Dot) or set of behaviors that will make violence less sustainable within any given community.
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What might work? College-Based Green Dot

Purpose: Evaluate Program among college students by examining actual and observed bystander behaviors and violence acceptance by intervention.

Methods:
Intervention: UK= Green Dot (Bystander Intervention since 2008)
Comparison: USC and UCinn (non bystander) campuses

Cross-sectional survey of 15,347 college students randomly sampled from registrar data by year and sex between March, April 2010, 2011, 2012
2$ incentive in letter describing study (campus mail)
Email survey link in 2 day; Reminders sent ~every 3 days x 2 wks

Response rate was 43%; 88% of those linking on link across 3 campuses
N=15,347 for all three campuses
N=5,892 for UK alone

### College Green Dot Evaluation (2010-2012)

**Outcome = Norms and Bystander Behaviors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes (Intervention Campus ONLY)</th>
<th>Bystander Training</th>
<th>Speech Alone</th>
<th>No Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=808</td>
<td>n=2660</td>
<td>n=2324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Acceptance¥</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 items; 7-28; α=0.88</td>
<td>Adj* Mean</td>
<td>T test p value</td>
<td>Adj* Mean T test p value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>-2.19 .03</td>
<td>11.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bystander Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 items; 5-20; α=0.71</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>6.39&lt;.0001</td>
<td>13.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging Peers in Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 items; 0-24; α=0.82</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>15.88&lt;.0001</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence Intervention Bystand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 items; 0-30; α=0.76</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>6.89&lt;.0001</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety Drinking Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 items; 0-42; α=0.82</td>
<td>13.06</td>
<td>4.52&lt;.0001</td>
<td>11.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed Bystander Behaviors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 items; 0-72; α=0.89</td>
<td>14.05</td>
<td>5.88&lt;.0001</td>
<td>11.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MANCOVA: Adjusting for age, gender, race, year in college, sexual attraction, current relationship status, parental education and fraternity / sorority membership; ¥ Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale

**What does this mean?** As hypothesized, training within the intervention campus was associated with ↓ violence acceptance scores (social norms), ↑ bystander efficacy, engaging peers in prevention activities, active and observed bystander behaviors.
**Green Dot Evaluation: Violence Victimization**

**Intervention v Comparison Colleges over 3 years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Violence Victimization</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>T test</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N=5,867</td>
<td>N=9,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Violence Types</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>-6.76</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 items; 0-36; α=.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical dating violence</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 items; 0-12; α=.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological dating</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-3.78</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 items; 0-12; α=.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-7.09</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 items; 0-6; α=.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted Sex</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-2.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 items; 0-9; α=.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-6.61</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 items; 0-6; α=.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MANCOVA: Adjusting for age, gender, race, year in college, sexual attraction, current relationship status, parental education and fraternity / sorority membership*

**WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?** Green Dot exposed campus (Intervention) has ↓ **victimization** rates of all forms of violence, psychological DV, sexual harassment, stalking and unwanted sex.
Green Dot Evaluation: Violence Perpetration
Intervention v Comparison Colleges over 3 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Violence Perpetration</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>T test*</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=5,867</td>
<td>N=9,480</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Violence Types</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 items; 0-39; α=.80</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-3.30</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical dating violence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 items; 0-12; α=.69</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological dating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 items; 0-12; α=.65</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 items; 0-6; α=.35</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-4.01</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 items; 0-9; α=.79</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 items; 0-6; α=.60</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-3.93</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MANCOVA: Adjusting for age, gender, race, year in college, sexual attraction, current relationship status, parental education and fraternity / sorority membership

**WHAT DOES THIS MEAN?** Green Dot campus has ↓perpetration rates of all forms of violence, psychological DV, sexual harassment, and stalking (not unwanted sex)
Summary: Evidence for Bystander Programs

• Do Bystander Programs
  – Change attitudes / norms?
    • Yes in 7 of 10 college studies
  – Increase bystander knowledge and skills?
    • Yes in all 11 studies
  – Increase bystander behaviors
    • Yes in 4 of 6 studies
  – Reduce sexual violence perpetration
    • Yes in 3 of 4 studies

Moving toward Prevention
Green Dot Across the Bluegrass:
Evaluation of a primary prevention intervention to reduce dating and sexual violence

Practice – Research Partnership

• KASAP and UK = Green Dot Across the Bluegrass
• Rape Crisis Center Educators train to deliver Green Dot in intervention high schools
• Educators are partners in research activities
• Researchers’ role is assistance with evaluation.
• Oct 2014 VAW special issue
Brief overview: From EMPOWER to a Randomized Intervention Trial

1. Through CDC Rape Prevention and Education (RPE) funding states were encouraged to move from sexual assault awareness and risk reduction education to prevention (VAWA 1994).

2. In Kentucky, Rape Crisis Centers actively partnered with state HHS to understand prevention.

3. Through this partnership, capacity to provide primary prevention education began, including selection of Green Dot program, and its evaluation.
History of RPE and KASAP partnership

Natalie Kelly, LCSW
Program Administrator with the Cabinet for Health and Family Services

- Funder for RPE and EMPOWER
- Move toward primary prevention
- Setting some guiding principles
Process of Selecting Intervention

Eileen Recktenwald, MSW
Executive Director, Kentucky Association of Sexual Assault Programs

• Initial consideration of prevention
• Board to leave a legacy
• Community based strategic planning
Green Dot Program  
(30 min)

Dorothy J. Edwards, Ph.D.
Green Dot, et cetera, Inc.
(formerly University of Kentucky)

• Developing new approach to prevention
• Implementing on college campus
• Preliminary evaluation
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What is a Green Dot?

A green dot is any behavior, choice, word, or attitude that promotes safety for everyone and communicates utter intolerance for rape, domestic violence, child abuse, and stalking. A green dot is intervening in a high risk situation – a green dot is sponsoring a fundraiser for prevention efforts – a green dot is responding to a victim blaming statement with words of support – a green dot is hanging a prevention poster in your office or business – a green dot is teaching your kids about respect – a green dot is putting a link on your website to your local prevention program - a green dot is providing safety information on the counter at your business. A green dot is simply your individual choice at any given moment to make our state safer.
Intervention Implementation

• Two phases
  – Green Dot persuasive speeches (now overview)
  – Peer Opinion Leaders (early adopters) Bystander training
Green dot talks

• Trained Center Educators deliver Green Dot persuasive speeches each semester beginning Winter 2009 through 2014.

• Objective – Cover entire school with speeches in year 1 and all new students each subsequent year.

• Setting for speeches ranged from small groups (~25 students) to larger auditorium settings.

Moving toward Prevention
Green Dot In-depth training

- Each semester beginning in Winter 2010-14.
- 5 hour bystander training
- Focus on identified Peer Opinion Leader (POL)
- Educator invites POLs to participate
  - “You have been nominated by (principals, teachers etc.) to participate in a Green Dot program training”
- Goal uniform POL training across high schools but 2 options for format are provided:
  - One 5 hr block during school time for training (preferred)
  - Two blocks during school time for training of 3 hrs.

Moving toward Prevention
Center Educators

Moving toward Prevention
High School Selection

At least two schools per region; then randomized (UK) to intervention and control; MOUs

Moving toward Prevention
Evaluation of Active Bystander Approaches in High Schools (CDC U01CE001675) 2009-2014

Coker, Cook-Craig, Bush

- Green Dot across the Bluegrass: Evaluation of a primary prevention intervention,
- **Randomized Intervention Trial**
- 26 high schools across Kentucky recruited by (Rape Crisis Center) Educators.
- Green Dot Implemented in 3 phases
  - Green Dot persuasive speeches
  - Peer Opinion Leader Bystanding training of 5 hrs.
  - Lunch time booster sessions
- Anonymous Panel and cohort surveys annually for 5 years.

**AIM 1.** To prospectively determine whether relative to students in high schools without Green Dot, students in high schools with Green Dot report (a) more bystander behaviors, (b) fewer social norms supporting violence, and (c) lower dating and sexual violence perpetration rates.

**AIM 2.** To determine how Green Dot is diffused through students' social network

Moving toward Prevention
Data Collection (1): Panel Surveys Changes in Behavior overtime

- Addresses Aims 1-3
  - Change in dating and sexual violence, bystander and social norms supporting violence among those in high schools with Green Dot compared with delayed intervention high schools.

- Every Spring beginning 2010-14

- Anonymous survey given to all students in 26 high schools
  - All day in English / History courses OR
  - Coordinated one period administration across entire school
  - LOTS of coordination required!
In the field.... Spring 2010-2015
Research Questions
Does Intensive Bystander Training (using Green Dot curriculum), over time and relative to untrained peers,
  a. increase active bystander behaviors and
  b. reduce social norms (measured as violence acceptance)?

Methods
• Survey students in intervention schools before training and at 1 and 3 months after training (Exposed).
• Survey untrained students in intervention schools at the same times and intervals used for trained students (Unexposed).
• All students paid $10 (gift certificate) for completing each survey.
• Training and evaluation conducted at least twice a year
• Center Educators (with support for schools and Centers) administer the surveys and provide data to UK for analyses.

• Began Spring 2012
• Confidential surveys (link student over time)
Others

- Fidelity assessment
- Process evaluation
- School level event data
Center Educator Training

• Explain DJE’s process for training Center Educators
  – Green Dot speeches
  – POL training
Green Dot implementation

• 13 Center Educators (GD Speeches)
  • Trained by DJE
  • Speeches began Spring 2010
  • Center educators in all intervention schools gave speeches

• 13 Center Educators (POL training)
  • ~24 approved by DJE to conduct POL training
  • POL training began late Spring 2010
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Training on Green Dot Model

• Educators attend a mandatory 4-day training prior to delivery of Green Dot components
  – Major topics/experiential pieces
    • Scientific basis of prevention model
    • Public speaking skills practice
    • Elements of the persuasive speech
    • Four POL’s training modules

• Pre-post test evaluation
  – Change in knowledge on the model elements
  – Self-perception of ability to deliver the model
Evaluation: Panel Surveys

- **Constructs covered**
  - Dating and sexual violence victimization and perpetration in the past 12 months
    - Physical, sexual, psychological, contraceptive interference by a dating partner
  - Sexual harassment, bullying (victimization and perpetration)
  - Bystander behaviors observed and engaged in
  - Demographics
  - Home and social environment
    - Parental IPV, alcohol abuse, friends engaging in dating /sexual violence, current depressive symptoms
  - Acceptance of dating violence and rape myth acceptance
  - Exposure to Green Dot training (speeches and training)

Moving toward Prevention
Consent for Participation (Panel)

• Parental (Passive) consent
  – Opt-out method
  – YRBS model of obtaining consent

• Anonymous student participation
  – No ability to link student to responses
  – No ability to identify child abuse
  – Therefore no ability to report child abuse.
  – WILL provide ALL with link to depression and violence resources.

Moving toward Prevention
Process evaluation

1. Implementation of the Green Dot curriculum with fidelity in 13 high schools
2. Attendance and knowledge acquisition of educators who deliver Green Dot Curriculum
3. Use of the curriculum by the educators as well as the use of Green Dot student workbook
4. Assessment of community-led efforts to support proactive engagement of student bystanders to prevent perpetration of violence.

Moving toward Prevention
Training on Green Dot Model

• Educators attend a mandatory 4-day training prior to delivery of Green Dot components
  – Major topics/experiential pieces
    • Scientific basis of prevention model
    • Public speaking skills practice
    • Elements of the persuasive speech
    • Four POL’s training modules

• Pre-post test evaluation
  – Change in knowledge on the model elements
  – Self-perception of ability to deliver the model

Moving toward Prevention
Process Evaluation: Fidelity Assessment

• Fidelity to Curriculum
  – Audio recordings of EACH training or speech given in an intervention schools
  – Data collected as speeches are given
  – Periodic download of data to be analyzed by multiple reviewers

• Debriefing logs
  – Qualitative and quantitative data on each speech or training collecting data on details/problems/ successes in trainings
  – Logs completed 24-48 hours after each speech or training
Process Evaluation:
Green Dot in High Schools

• Annual focus groups
  – Qualitative data on how Green Dot is experienced in each intervention high school
  – Groups include key informants (teachers, administrators, community prevention team members)
  – Beginning in Fall 2010 (completed annually)

• Monthly Coaching Calls
  – Monthly reporting of Green Dot activities in intervention high schools
  – Beginning in October 2010
Process Evaluation: Community Efforts to Support Green Dot

• Asset assessment
  – Web-based survey—Summer—Fall 2010
  – Snowball sample of community stakeholders
  – Instrument based on external assets identified in the literature (Search Institute)

• Community Prevention Team minutes
  – Minutes from community teams formed to support Green Dot in each intervention high school
  – Collected as meeting minutes are approved

Moving toward Prevention
Results?

• Coming June / July 2014!
• 5 years data collection in 26 schools >100,000 students surveyed (spring of each year)
• Early evidence that program
  – Increases bystander behaviors among those trained and diffused at the school level.
  – Changes in sexual and dating violence attitudes (violence acceptance)
  – Reduces in more common forms of VAW

Moving toward Prevention
Peak at preliminary findings....

Type III Tests of Fixed Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th># DF</th>
<th>Den DF</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.0162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVENTION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32.94</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVENTION*TIME</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Peak: Violence Victimization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Num DF</th>
<th>Den DF</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVENTION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVENTION*TIME</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Type III Tests of Fixed Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Num DF</th>
<th>Den DF</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>Pr &gt; F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVENTION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERVENTION*TIME</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps

• Plans to provide Green Dot to other high schools based on final findings (late July 2014)

• KASAP funding model to provide training
Challenges Ahead!

• What works? In what settings?
• What programs are acceptable to schools (relative costs)?
• What programs are sustainable?
Questions?

Discussion?