

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Emilee C. Hunt for the degree of Master of Arts in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies
presented on June 8, 2017.

Title: Institutional (in)Justice: Queer and Trans Survivors' Experiences Accessing Resources at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon

Abstract approved: _____

Patti Duncan

Recent studies have shown that queer, trans, and non-binary students alike are experiencing sexual assault at higher rates than their heterosexual, cisgender counterparts (Cantor et al. IV). While conversations surrounding university sexual assault education and prevention have increased in recent years, this disparity suggests that not enough is being done to combat sexual assault. Drawing upon community-based research methods, this thesis utilizes an interview series conducted by the researcher to explore the current relationship between queer, trans, and non-binary survivors of sexual assault at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon and their access to university-provided resources. Through constructing an analysis of administrative violence, institutional betrayal, and trauma healing, this thesis explores shortcomings in university survivor resources, and identifies institutionally-specific needs for improvement to services.

Key Words: Sexual Assault, Survivor, Resources, Queer, Transgender, Non-binary, Oregon State University, University of Oregon

© Copyright by Emilee C. Hunt

June 8, 2017

All Rights Reserved

Institutional (in)Justice: Queer and Trans Survivors' Experiences Accessing Resources at Oregon
State University and the University of Oregon

by

Emilee Christine Hunt

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the

degree of

Master of Arts

Presented June 8, 2017

Commencement June 2017

Master of Arts thesis of Emilee C. Hunt presented on June 8, 2017

APPROVED:

Major Professor, representing Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

Director of the School and Language, Culture, and Society

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

Emilee C. Hunt, Author

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all of the strong, resilient women, queer individuals, and gender non-conforming folks in my life: those who have come before me, and those yet to come. Your journeys inspire me daily, and allow me to live authentically. This thesis is for you.

I would like to express sincere appreciation first and foremost to my mother, for always picking up the phone. Your steadfastness in supporting me (and your willingness to listen to all my tears, fears, frustrations, and joys) is the reason I can write this today.

A big thanks to my family for their support in this journey. Without your talents for moving family members across state lines (and back again—thanks dad!) this work would have been quite literally impossible. To my sisters, who will be stronger and wiser than I can imagine, thank you for your endless support in both my personal and professional endeavors. To Mimi and Papa, who I can always count on for Memphis adventures, emailing me funny emails to help me survive thesis writing, and being there for me every step of the way. To Coco, for always providing comforting dog energy in my times of need, and to Penny, for being the best cuddle buddy during my countless writing sessions.

I would like to thank my committee for supporting my research as it has developed, and for their feedback along the way. I sincerely appreciate the countless hours of edits we have all poured into this work. Thank you to my chair, Dr. Duncan, for your guidance throughout this process, thoughtful feedback, and countless brainstorming sessions whenever I was “stuck.” To Dr. Driskill, thank you for introducing me to Dean Spade’s work, and for musical theatre breaks in between my grad school journey. Dr. Shirazi, thank you for always being a powerful force I can count on both for processing through institutional barriers, and providing emotional support.

Lastly, thank you to Dr. McComb for agreeing to work with us on this project as the most wonderful Graduate Council Representative that I could ask for. Thanks to Dr. Detar for helping me see my intelligence and inspire this thesis. I would also like to thank all those at CSU Chico, Catalyst Domestic Violence Services, and the Gender and Sexuality Equity Center for guiding me along this path and my passion long before this thesis journey began.

I would like to express my utmost thanks to Vanessa Vanderzee, for being the other half of my brain during my process, and my best accountabilibuddy. Thanks for showing me everything from “—” to authentic Italian gelato. A million thank you’s to Addie Davidove, for dessert runs, holiday decorating, and dance parties in times of trouble.

To my community, each and every person who supported me in this journey. Whether your support was shown by ensuring sure I ate food, reassuring me that I can indeed write a thesis, distracting me from anxiety, or providing comforting words in my most dire time of need over the past two years, I mean it when I say I could not have done this without you. Many thanks to: Danielle, Nichole, Kelsey, eliza, Eileen, Kathlena, Clara, Max, Andrés, Elliott, Alex B., Alex. D, Sam, Taylor, Reyes, Art, Kyla, Brianne, and The Dixons. Additionally, I would like to thank my extended families: my cohort, my acro and aerial family, and my burlesque family.

Most importantly, I would like to thank the participants who entrusted me with their experiences. It has been such an honor and a privilege to hold your stories so close to my heart this past year. In the words of Michelle Cliff, “If I could write this in fire, I would write this in fire.”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	1
Introduction to the Thesis.....	2
Language and Terminology.....	4
Personal Situatedness with Campus Violence.....	5
Intended Audience.....	9
Overview of Chapters.....	10
Conclusion.....	13
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	14
Introduction.....	14
Laws and Policies.....	14
Current Campus Climate.....	14
Title IX.....	16
The Campus SaVE Act.....	19
The Clery Act.....	19
The Violence Against Women Act.....	21
Campus Educational Programming.....	23
Haven Training.....	23
Green Dot Bystander Intervention Training.....	29
Conclusion.....	31

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	33
Introduction.....	33
Systematic Betrayal in Rights-Based Frameworks.....	34
Institutional Betrayal and Trauma Narratives.....	39
University Trauma and Haunting.....	45
Conclusion.....	47
CHAPTER 4: METHODS.....	49
Introduction.....	49
Limitations in the Literature.....	49
Methodological Framework.....	51
Research Design.....	51
Interview Series Overview.....	53
Participant Population.....	55
Procedures.....	57
Conclusion: Initial Analysis.....	62
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS.....	64
Introduction.....	64
Campus Social Scripts.....	65
University Counseling Resources.....	70
(Hyper)Medicalization of Survivors.....	76
Mental Health Symptoms.....	77

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Medicalization.....	80
Withdrawal from the University.....	83
Judicial Processes.....	87
Survivor Advocacy.....	94
Intersectional Services.....	96
Seeking Refuge.....	101
Recommendations.....	103
Language and Visual Aids.....	104
Counseling and Mental Health Resources.....	105
Education.....	107
Conclusion.....	109
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION.....	111
Introduction.....	111
Institutional Betrayal Reparation.....	112
Reimagining Institutional Relationships with Survivors.....	117
Conclusion: Finding Healing in Trauma.....	119
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION.....	121
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	124
APPENDICES.....	132
Appendix A: Participant Messages to Survivors.....	132

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	<u>Page</u>
Appendix B: IRB Approval Notice.....	137
Appendix C: IRB Research Protocol	139
Appendix D: IRB Verbal Consent Guide	149
Appendix E: Interview Questions	155

Institutional (in)Justice: Queer and Trans Survivors' Experiences Accessing Resources at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Purpose of this Study

Conversations surrounding the abhorrent, and often dismissive, responses to sexual assault of students at colleges and universities across the United States have recently broken through the walls of sexual violence prevention centers and into mainstream culture through recent media coverage, federal policy response, and student activism. No longer are conversations surrounding sexual violence limited to campus advocates protesting within their communities in an attempt to improve services: with the help of new, nation-wide coverage on issues of campus assault, previously silent, uninformed bystanders are beginning to learn about their communities and the atrocities occurring on campuses across the nation. Students, faculty, and community members alike are now able to not only learn of organizations set in place to defend survivors of campus assault, but can critically engage with their shortcomings with the help of campus advocates and dedicated student survivors.

While students are witnessing an increase in survivor advocacy centers and Title IX policies on their campuses, structures set in place by university administration to help survivors may have negative outcomes if their implementation of federal and state policy is rushed, or if they exclude the voices of campus survivors in program establishment. As a result, universities (un)intentionally uphold systems which both permit and reinforce a culture of dismissiveness, and in turn, fall into patterns of institutional betrayal. According to University of Oregon professor Dr. Jennifer Freyd, institutional betrayal occurs when an institution “[perpetuates wrongdoings] upon individuals dependent on that institution, including failure to prevent or respond supportively to wrongdoings by individuals (e.g. sexual assault) committed within the

context of the institution” (Freyd). These trusted institutions—in this case, universities—act in ways that create harm toward those relying upon them for safety and well-being, and in turn, patterns of institutional betrayal are established that operate both actively and subconsciously as a tool to silence, shame, and dismiss survivors (Smith and Freyd). Universities have not only committed institutional betrayal against the socially constructed “ideal survivor” (a white, straight, able-bodied, young, cisgender woman), but have enacted added barriers for survivors who fall outside of this “ideal type”: for any “non-normative” groups, such as students of color, students with disabilities, students of varying sexuality or gender identities, immigrant, international, and undocumented students, or other marginalized communities, these patterns of betrayal can incite further harm, as their injustice is compounded. For the purpose of this study, non-normative gendered and sexualized bodies, specifically queer, trans, and non-binary survivors, are centered.

Introduction to the Thesis

This thesis explores the current relationship between queer, trans, and non-binary survivors of sexual assault and their university to facilitate a discussion on strategic improvements to campus organizations and collaborations with the purpose of strengthening resources for queer, trans, and non-binary survivors in the state of Oregon. I call on the work of Carly Smith, Jennifer Freyd, Dean Spade, and Grace Cho to discuss both institutional and interpersonal traumas. I utilize their research to exemplify the need for intentional support networks for marginalized survivors informed by both survivors’ experiential knowledge and campus advocates’ organizational education. To expand upon these points, I have conducted interviews with queer, trans, and non-binary survivors at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon to explore trends of coping and resiliency, shortcomings in university

survivor-aid, and areas for institutional improvement, with the goal of developing survivor-informed strategies to directly assert institutionally-specific needs of queer, trans, and non-binary survivors in the state of Oregon. I connect theories of institutional power, situational knowledge, and both overt and vicarious traumas to the interview series to provide both macro and micro level analysis for future exploration of this topic. Through analysis of these theories—institutional betrayal, betrayal trauma theory, administrative violence, and generational haunting(s)—I explore the following questions and attempt to answer them on an immediate, tangible level that serves to initiate change:

1. In which ways do the identified universities replicate or deviate from the current climate in the U.S. surrounding campus sexual assault?
2. In which ways can these universities better support queer, trans, and non-binary survivors of sexual assault?

In a recent study, greater than 42 percent of LGBT-identified students reported “being forced to have sex against their will”—a rate that is more than double that of heterosexual students (National Sexual Violence Resource Center). The types of secondary-trauma inflicted by institutions are wrapped within a deep-seeded history of cultural violence, administrative silencing, and institutional shame. Although cultural and institutional nuances are complex and ever-developing, this thesis strives to document and analyze myriad institutional trauma through the collection of survivor-centered interviews and response. The survivor’s healing process does not only include processing through lifelong direct trauma observed post-assault, but is wrapped within healing from the very structures that promise to protect them, resulting in queer, trans, and non-binary survivors navigating post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), isolation, and loss.

Language and Terminology

For the purpose of this thesis, I draw from national, state, and university-specific definitions of sexual assault and consent. As defined by the United States Department of Justice, sexual assault is “any type of sexual contact or behavior that occurs without the explicit consent of the recipient,” and includes forced sexual activities such as “sexual intercourse, sodomy, child molestation, incest, fondling, and attempted rape” (Justice.gov). As outlined by the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network (RAINN), it is imperative to recognize that “force” is not synonymous with “physical pressure,” and that sexual assault may not include physical markers of intimidation (RAINN). Assailants may exclusively—or additionally—manipulate, threaten, intimidate, or coerce victims into non-consensual sex (RAINN). In order to position sexual assault in opposition with consensual sexual encounters, I define consent in-line with the University of Oregon Student Code of Conduct. The UO Student Code of Conduct defines consent as a “voluntary, non-coerced and clear communication indicating a willingness to engage in a particular act.” Further, the University clarifies that “‘Explicit consent’ includes an affirmative verbal response or voluntary acts unmistakable in their meaning” (University of Oregon Student Code of Conduct).

While the very idea of gender is ever-changing, and has experienced many terminological shifts throughout history, I construct the following working definition of gender identity for the purpose of this study: one’s personal conception of themselves in relation to modern-day gender constructs. While “transgender” is often used as an umbrella term that encompasses “non-binary” gender identity, I intentionally separate out “non-binary” as its own subset of umbrella terminology. I use the term “non-binary” throughout my thesis to refer to any individual who does not identify within the dichotomy of “woman” or “man.” I find this to be the broadest and

most inclusive term for encompassing alternative Western gender identities such as: genderfluid, genderqueer, gender non-conforming, bigender, androgynous, agender, gender non-binary, and those that exist outside of any recognized gender identity label (Nonbinary.org). For the purposes of my thesis, the term “trans(gender)” will be used to represent one whose gender identity does not align with sex they were assigned at birth, but still identify within a relatively binary (MtF, FtM) transition (Glaad.org). While it is necessary to remember that all individuals possess a gender identity, it is imperative to recognize that the process of gender exploration outside of gender norms—behaviors considered acceptable and desirable based on one’s perceived identity—can result in disproportionate rates of discrimination and violence.

I intentionally use the term queer as a broad, Western mainstream term encompassing a host of sexualities including, but not limited to: lesbian, gay, bisexual, pansexual, asexual, aromantic, queer. In short, I use the term queer to represent any sexual identity that does not fit into the labeling “heterosexual.” As always, it is important to never label one as “queer” without their explicit and direct guidance and approval: it is essential to note that this term is still manifested as an oppressive term for many communities, including people of color, and this umbrella terminology may not apply to all communities.

Personal Situatedness with Campus Violence

I begin this discussion by framing my lived experience and positionality as it relates to the regimes of power discussed throughout this text. As someone who more often than not identifies as cisgender— that is, with the gender I was assigned at birth— as well as white, physically able-bodied, neuro-divergent, and queer, it is incredibly important to examine my power and privilege in relation to this topic, as well as frame why I feel as though this research is vital to discuss. Exposure to violence is rarely a one-time, isolated event, and oftentimes, one is

not privileged enough to be educated on the markers of violent events within institutions such as universities. For this reason, it is difficult for me to pinpoint if my roots of trauma and interest in this field stem from a boundary-violating middle school partner, catcalling aggressors on walks down the street, microaggressions of rape culture by friends and family, or systematic victim blaming from those sworn to serve and protect. Of course, my roots arise from all of these valid points of intersection, and grow daily. For the purposes of laying this specific framework, I zero-in on my college experiences, which are plentiful.

I recall my alma mater's "Safe Start" briefing the day I moved into university dorms at California State University, Chico: not only was this the first conversation centering consent that I was exposed to, it was the first day that I, and many other attendees, learned to name past un-consensual experiences. This experience taught me that coercion does not equate to consent, and, regardless of whether an "allegation" can be legally proven, one's personal experience with sexual encounters should and must be valid: if one expresses violation, all other individuals must validate its occurrence. It was at my first Take Back the Night—an anti-violence march in solidarity with survivors of sexual assault—one term later that I first spoke about my previous experiences with sexual assault. For five years, I considered my story to not be "valid enough" to share my experience: to my surprise, many others in the room expressed similar concerns.

In the coming years, I would channel this newfound energy into my position as Women's Program Coordinator at Chico State, where I worked to develop consent programming, sexual assault prevention advocacy, and dialogue surrounding Title IX's lack of implementation on Chico State's campus. My confidential position of employment would allow me the heartbreaking opportunity to become the point-person for survivors: sometimes leading to me being the first person they connected with days, weeks, months, or even years after their assault.

This work would also lead me to hear infuriating remarks from administration including “there is no Title IX police” (when referring to the necessary and vital enforcement of the federal law), and witness the brief but substantial closing of Chico State’s survivor advocacy program, and pulling of consent programming from the University’s freshman orientation. The experience of hearing these stories and experiencing this silencing propelled me into attending Oregon State University to obtain my MA in Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, with a focus on violence prevention advocacy.

My first night of graduate school, directly after finishing my first Theories of Feminisms course, I spent the evening with a group of new acquaintances, and ended up on a doorstep of my apartment complex without my personal belongings, and without recollection of two hours of my life. While to my knowledge I did not experience sexual assault on this specific occurrence, the haunting that stems from the invasiveness experienced that night, as well as the inability to recall any memories from the evening, carries forward. Not only would I endure a highly unprofessional seven-hour public interrogation by Corvallis’ Good Samaritan medical staff, I would also spend the majority of my time at the hospital trying to piece together what happened to me with no avail. Further, during the forensic exam, I would have every crevice of my body checked for bruises and ten hair strands plucked from my scalp, all while attempting to foster a dialogue about survivorship with a very kind Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE) nurse and Corvallis’ Center Against Rape and Domestic Violence (CARDV) advocates.

I chose not to report my case—a decision I reached after a debilitating period of reflection. In my experience as an advocate, I knew the likelihood of receiving compassion from the justice system was unlikely since I could not offer any details about what happened with my case. After undergoing such an invasive interpersonal experience—and disrespectful hospital

encounter—I was wary of putting myself in a situation where I would experience any more victim blaming or invalidation. In fact, I only know I was slipped a benzodiazepine from the Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner’s diagnosis of my experience and symptoms, as my forensic kit would not be tested for rohypnol due to my doctor stating, point blank, “What difference would it make?” In addition to feeling written-off through this encounter with my assigned doctor, each hospital employee I questioned about receiving benzodiazepine testing on my kit stated that they “did not know” if such testing existed, and none initiated finding an answer on my behalf. From a simple Google search, one could easily learn that the test does indeed exist, and has for close to fifteen years (Negrusz 9). Through this grueling process, my doctor, as well as the other practitioners who questioned me in very public, open spaces, helped echo yet another systematic reason that influenced my choice to not report: victim invalidation on all fronts, even for those attempting to access resources.

My experience led me to the focus of this thesis, exploring unacceptably flawed institutions that fall short of supporting survivors of sexual violence. While I fundamentally know that I do not have to prove my reasons for not reporting, narratives of what constitutes a “good survivor”—in this instance, one who reports their case—have still left me feeling guilty for not reporting, speaking up, or being able to explain what happened to me. This experience has left me feeling both haunted from the event and aftermath itself, as well as shame from not having the emotional energy to undergo secondary trauma through the reporting process. Only due to my extensive self-education and educational privileges do I know that my experience is not an isolated event, and many other individuals have been exposed to horrors equal to and worse than my own.

Intended Audience

This thesis may be helpful and valuable for multiple audiences, including, but not limited to: nonprofits that offer community education and survivor support addressing sexual assault that are looking for cumulative data and survivor-led suggested improvements; researchers within the field of queer studies and/or violence prevention; directors of queer and trans resource centers both on and off university campuses; government officials looking for tools to broaden existing laws and policies; Oregon State University (OSU) and University of Oregon (UO) administration, survivor services, queer resources, and student populations.

This study will contribute to the limited body of research on the experiences of queer and trans survivors on university campuses. Additionally, this research will aid Oregon State University (OSU) and the University of Oregon (UO) survivor resources in assessing if they are meeting the needs of queer, trans, and non-binary survivors on their campus through examining dialogues with survivors themselves. Likewise, it will help survivor resources looking forward to improve and further develop inclusive, comprehensive sexual assault prevention curricula and intervention response at their respective university. As a result of my thesis, OSU and UO student populations at large may benefit by an increase in resource availability. Lastly, participants whose narratives helped frame this thesis may gain enhanced reflection, agency, and advocacy regarding their histories of interpersonal violence, and may share skills gained from this study with their peers, family, friends, and partners to create a network of individuals who hold similar beliefs on necessary improvements to university resources. Participants may also feel an increase in advocating on behalf of other students as a result of participating in a study that has the potential to change policies and resources on campus.

Overview of Chapters

The first chapter of the thesis, the literature review, will lay a groundwork for the study, providing a background on published writings surrounding sexual and gender-based violence on campus, particularly focusing on marginalized members of society. The chapter begins with a broad overview of the United States climate in terms of current policies and laws, discussing how these regulations interplay with one another. I engage in a discussion surrounding the overarching laws influencing campus-based sexual assault prevention and response policies: Title IX, The Campus SaVE Act, the Clery Act, and the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA). In this section, I provide an overview of the language and requirements implemented under each law, and examine gaps in college-based intervention policies. I draw from large-scale, federally-based, quantitative studies to glean insight on these gaps at a national level. To illustrate my claims and showcase gaps in services, I employ multiple national reports centering the voices of survivors that articulate the poor implementation of prevention and response programming. In the second-half of the literature review, I provide an overview and analysis of two campus-based educational tools for violence prevention: Haven and Green Dot trainings. In this section, I draw from Oregon State University and the University of Oregon's Haven statistics, as well as outside opinion pieces on the effectiveness of both trainings, to identify shortcomings in campus "check the box" mentalities.

In chapter two, I offer a theoretical analysis on the works of feminist scholars working on theories of lasting trauma and institutional betrayal. I begin this chapter through the introduction of Dean Spade's three modes of power addressed in his text *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of the Law*, to frame a macro-level discussion on the implementation of power and oppression. I couple each mode of power with information

provided by queer, trans, and non-binary students through studies and lived experience to provide examples for each system of power. Next, I utilize Jennifer Freyd's notion of institutional betrayal as the ultimate form of macro-level haunting as an intermediary piece between systematic and individualized silencing. I position Freyd's work within current laws and policies to examine how and why these patterns are occurring, as well as the ways they manifest on university campuses to (de)value specific bodies. I then frame Grace Cho's work on hauntings in comparison to Freyd's theories, in order to hone-in on the mental and physical side effects of institutional betrayal present in survivors. In addition to highlighting the ways in which introducing a narrative of hauntings and ghosts inform trauma advocacy, I offer Cho's transnational feminist perspective as a perspective for a richer, more nuanced understanding of sexual assault on campus. It is my goal that, through this lens, I can create room to understand how queer and trans students experience sexual assault in racialized, sexualized, and gendered ways. Theories employed include: modes of power, institutional betrayal, betrayal trauma theory, and notions of generational trauma, haunting, and ghosts.

Chapter three reviews the design, procedures, research questions, and methodology used to conduct and analyze the data collected for this study. I begin by exploring the gaps in literature to assert how this thesis can help bolster present survivor-oriented research. In this chapter, I recount the recruitment and consent process, as well as IRB protocol. I present the research design and procedures, and document the process by which consent was obtained with participants. Likewise, I share the research questions used to conduct and analyze the data, and provide an overview of the participant population and interview series. Further, this chapter defines the concept of community-based participatory research, and shares the manners by which this methodology was implemented in this study in order to break down researcher/participant

hierarchies. I conclude the chapter with the initial analysis of the data as an introduction to the narrative-based findings of the research.

The fourth chapter illuminates the themes and findings generated from the interviews with survivors. By exploring resource entities such as university counseling services, student health services, and judicial aid, the findings chapter helps present identifiable gaps in services. This chapter focuses on the findings present in the interview series through the use of direct quotes and narratives arising from each interview. This chapter addresses the silencing, disbelief, and hyper-medicalization of survivors, and calls for the implementation of more intersectional services. This chapter concludes with survivor-driven recommendations for both OSU and UO, and presents suggested improvements for more comprehensive survivor resources.

The fifth chapter offers discussion based upon the findings, synthesizes conclusions of the results, and expands upon final recommendations. In this chapter, I examine the theories through the overarching theme of institutional betrayal. I then discuss the implications of my findings through frameworks presented by Dean Spade and Grace Cho. I begin with a discussion on administrative violence present in Spade's analyses of power to explore topics of (in)justice within the university system—particularly in the case of survivors seeking reparation through the justice system. I then draw upon Cho's theories of memory and trauma to explore the topic of memory and healing through trauma, specifically focusing on survivor's access to care and resources. I offer institutional betrayal, administrative violence, and trauma healing as frameworks for the interpretation and analysis of the data.

The sixth and final chapter concludes the thesis. This chapter synthesizes material from the rest of the thesis to summarize the content presented throughout this study. Additionally, this chapter covers the limitation of my research, and presents improvements for future studies.

Conclusion

As indicated in this introduction, the thesis explores gendered violence against queer, trans, and non-binary college students in the state of Oregon. The thesis examines how structures of power and injustice add barriers toward accessing resources and institutional support, and draws upon the works of feminist, queer, and anti-violence scholars in establishing its framework. In the following chapters, both macro and micro institutionalized power dynamics are positioned in conversation with the healing process of non-normative gendered and sexualized survivors. Further, the thesis analyzes the results of several large-scale campus climate surveys and national anti-violence training coursework in conjunction with personal narratives from queer, trans, and non-binary survivors to meet its goals. Through centering community based participatory research, the thesis utilizes findings from several interviews with previous and current students at the University of Oregon and Oregon State University to identify gaps in services and suggest methods for improving and establishing authentically inclusive resources at both universities.

CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Drawing upon a variety of peer-reviewed literature, government studies, and personal narratives, this chapter aims to explore current literature on the topic of sexual assault covering subtopics such as prevalence of assault on campuses, university (non)intervention, and lasting trauma. The literature review will first provide an overview of federal laws and policies pertinent to the conversation of violence prevention and intervention, complete with data from several studies that measure the ways in which these regulations are falling short on campus integration of federal mandates. The second section of the literature focuses on campus education and training implementation, specifically analyzing Haven and Green Dot trainings. Through the literature review, the following topics will be covered: identifying federal guidelines for prevention education; discussing exposure of sexual assault on college campuses, specifically with regards to the queer and trans communities; highlighting the roles of Greek life and athletics in sexual assault; identifying shortcomings in university prevention and education measures.

Laws and Policies

Current Campus Climate

In January of 2016, the Department Office on Violence Against Women, housed within the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), released an extensive campus climate survey that gathered responses from roughly 15,000 undergraduate women and 8,000 undergraduate men regarding assaults that occurred at 9 unnamed universities in the 2014-2015 school year (Krebs et al. 5). “The Campus Climate Survey Validation Study” (CCSVS) results found that an average of 21% of female identified college students have experienced sexual assault (Krebs et al. 73). Over the

course of their degree, 12%-51% of women in their fourth year identified as a survivor; for trans-identified students, the rate at all nine schools rose to roughly 28% (Krebs et al. 7). The report found that women, younger students, queer-identified, and trans students are the most at risk for assault. Similarly, as referenced earlier, another study found that greater than 42 percent of “LGBT”-identified students reported “being forced to have sex against their will”: a rate that is more than double that of heterosexual students (National Sexual Violence Resource Center). This finding is congruent with the “Campus Climate Survey Validation Study,” which found that at each of the eight examined institutions, sexual assault victimization was higher for “non-heterosexual” students when compared to “heterosexual female” counterparts (Krebs et al. 78).

Building upon this, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s (CDC) 2010 study on intimate partner violence and sexual violence found that 46.4% of lesbian women and 74.9% of bisexual women have experienced sexual violence (Walters et al. 1). Further, the study shows that 40.2% of gay men and 47.4% of bisexual men have experienced sexual violence (Walters et al. 1). Altogether, the CDC study found that 1.7 million lesbian and bisexual women and more than 2 million gay and bisexual men experience sexual violence in their lifetime (Walters et al. 1). When examining campus culture and its impact on queer and trans students, study results follow a similar pattern. According to one survey conducted by the American Association of Universities that surveyed 27 universities across the United States, non-heterosexual students in the 2014-2015 school year experienced significantly higher rates of intimate partner violence, as well as sexual assault and harassment, than their heterosexual peers; 60.4 percent of “non-heterosexual” students reported being sexually harassed by fellow students, faculty, and/or staff, compared to 45.9 percent of heterosexual individuals (Cantor et al. XX). The AAU report states that three in four “LGBT” students experienced sexual harassment, and nine percent of LGBT-

identifying respondents said they experienced sexual assault involving penetration (compared to seven percent of women) (Cantor et al. IX). As a result of this harassment, six percent of these students reported transferring schools or changing their major (Cantor et al. IX). Regarding gender identity, those who didn't provide an answer or identified as transgender, genderqueer or non-conforming, or questioning (TGQN) experienced rape at the highest rates too: TGQN undergraduates experienced sexual assault at a rate of 12.4 percent, followed by cisgender undergraduate females (10.8 percent), and TGQN graduate/professional students (8.3 percent) (Cantor et al. IX).

When analyzing who was committing the crimes, researchers discovered that 94% of assailants were male-identified, and an acquaintance of the survivor 59% of the time (Krebs et al. 102). The rate at which undergraduate men committed an assault ranged from 1-6%: In one study on college men in Massachusetts, it was found that less than 8% of men in college committing more than 90% of sexual assaults (Krebs et al. 4; Lisak and Miller 73). Furthermore, it was found that 20% of assailants identified as student athletes, and fraternity members were three times more likely to commit an assault, providing context as to why the second-most common insurance claim against fraternities is sexual assault, at a staggering 15% (Krebs et al. 139; Flanagan). Through this study, the Department Office on Violence Against Women helps to show the horrific epidemic of sexual assault experienced by college students all over the nation, as well as the systematic ramifications of repeat offenses when institutions do not take action.

Title IX

Title IX, a federal civil rights law passed in 1972, states that "no person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or

be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance" (ACLU 1. 20 U.S.C. § 1681(a)). Under Title IX, all colleges and universities receiving federal funding are to be held legally responsible if found to be ignoring rape and sexual assault allegations; Title IX also stresses that institutions must be proactive in creating comprehensive sexual assault policies (ACLU 1. 20 U.S.C. § 1681(a)). Despite this, one national report published in 2014 found that a meager 16% of institutions observed conducted campus climate surveys (U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight 1). Further, the report, which examined 440 four-year institutions, found that while the majority of universities (90%) had hired permanent Title IX Coordinators, 10% of institutions observed had not (U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight 2).

While Title IX, and its accompanying legislation, requires that institutions provide students with consent training, some universities have expressed discomfort providing consent education to students who may begin school as a legal minor. Of course, it is imperative to recognize that sexual assault is in direct conflict with the very definition of consent, and teaching a minor the language to identify an experience as non-consensual would provide them with the positive opportunity to form coalition networks and better access to services. In fact, in a five-year study conducted by United Educators, 63% of individuals who reported assault (and 88% of individuals who experienced group assaults) were college freshman (Gordon). The "Campus Climate Survey Validation Study" reported similar data, finding that incoming first-year students come face-to-face with their heightened risk for sexual assault during the first several months of the school year: the bulk of campus assaults happen in August, within the first few weeks of the term, and in October around Halloween (Krebs et al. 37). This proves the necessity of sexual

assault prevention, intervention, and response trainings for incoming students the day they come to campus.

The Campus SaVE Act

The Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA), signed into law March 7, 2013, instituted The Campus SaVE Act provision (section 304) as an amendment to the Clery Act (Cleryact.info). Working in conjunction with Title IX, VAWA's reauthorization requires colleges receiving Title IX funding to dedicate both effort and money to sexual assault prevention training on campus (Cleryact.info). In addition to "accountability" and "education," one main component of the Act is its "transparency" requirement: Campus authorities are told to work with students to help them report, leave hostile work and living environments, receive survivor advocacy services, and understand the university's disciplinary process (Cleryact.info). The Act requires that daily crime logs must be updated within 2 days of a report, provided the release will not jeopardize an ongoing police investigation. Furthermore, annual security reports containing the last three years of campus-occurred reported crimes for aggravated assault as well as forcible and non-forcible sex offenses must be released each October (Knowyourix.org). Under VAWA's Campus SaVE Act, colleges and universities must also report cases of intimate partner violence, dating violence, and stalking if the incident was reported to campus security or a local police agency; campuses must additionally adopt discipline procedures and create prevention measures surrounding these occurrences (American Council on Education). Analyzing the Clery Act provides clarity when examining if these "required" regulations are followed through by universities, and the manners in which violations occur (Cleryact.info). Despite these new and existing provisions, many gaps still remain in proper college and

university implementation. In the same Senate report cited above, it was found that, over the past five years, 40% of colleges and universities have not investigated a single sexual assault case (U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight 1). That being said, more than 20% of colleges and universities reported *more* sexual assaults to the Department of Education than they actually investigated, with some reporting up to seven times more incidents of sexual assault than investigated (U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight 1). Ironically, 95% of college presidents believe that their institutions handle sexual assault reports “appropriately,” despite the grave affect their lack of action often has on survivors (Jaschik and Lederman).

The Clery Act

The Clery Act requires that institutions educate their students about procedural regulations, such as who to report to, as well as how long evidence is preserved (Cleryact.info). Unsurprisingly, the Senate’s report found many incongruences between policies and implementation: Only 51% of colleges and universities observed in the study provided a hotline number to survivors seeking services, and only 44% permitted online reporting (U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight 1). While institutions articulate employing a “team approach” for sexual violence response, many did not include representatives from agencies that help support survivors: while over 90% of institutions report that sexual assault survivors have access to advocacy services, only 51% incorporate these survivor advocates into their “team approach” (U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight 2).

Consistent with many other reports, few assaults (7%) were reported to school officials, and even less (4%) were reported to law enforcement (Krebs et al. 107). The “Campus Climate Survey Validation Study” found that institutions where students reported feeling unconfident in the administration’s ability to properly handle cases faced increased rates of sexual assault (Krebs et al. 107). While 12.5% of the surveyed accounts of rape, and 4.3% of “sexual battery incidents,” were ever officially reported—to a police officer, college official or hospital official—survivors were able to provide detailed accounts as to why the justice system was not a source of refuge (Krebs et al. 48). Of those who did not report, 30% cited concerns of retaliation, and 20% expressed fear that their report would not be kept confidential—an interconnection that occurs when survivors are not allowed to hold autonomy over their cases (Krebs et al. 52). These data are consistent with the 2015 “Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct” conducted by the Association of American Universities: Of the 27 campuses observed, 58.6% of survivors who experienced rape did not report the event, citing it to not be “serious enough”; this rate rose to over 73% for other forms of sexual assault, as it is almost “common knowledge” that anything outside of forced penetration—including forced touching, and coercion involving drugs and/or alcohol—are not often “taken up” by universities (Cantor et al. XXI). Likewise, 35.9% of students did not report due to feeling “embarrassed” or “ashamed,” or because they found it “too emotionally difficult,” or “did not think anything would be done about it” (Cantor et al. XXI). Further, 63.3% of students did not believe that reporting would be taken seriously by campus officials (Cantor et al. XXII).

These experiences, and overwhelmingly justified distrust with institutions responsible for taking action against assailants, help to display why colleges and universities must review and modify their sexual assault policies and procedures, as well as improve personnel training within

these realms to provide authentic support and well-written policies. Further, these accounts prove that universities must consult with experts in this field, in order to uphold the agency and confidentiality of survivors.

The Violence Against Women Act

The Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) expands upon Clery Act regulations by requiring institutions to notify victims of their right to, or not to, report to law enforcement and/or campus police, as well as discuss their options to submit a no-contact or restraining order (American Council on Education). Despite this, 30% of institutions have not offered any proactive training on sexual assault to its students (U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight 2). Further, over 70% of institutions do not have protocols explaining how local law enforcement and the institution can work together in providing sexual violence response. In fact, at 30% of the institutions observed, law enforcement received no training on how to respond to instances of sexual violence (U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight 2). The observed statistics provide multiple incongruences and ample barriers in helping educate survivors: if those employed to help survivors through processing restraining orders or filing reports have no training, the experiences of survivors seeking services cannot not be overwhelmingly positive. Further, despite studies showing that confidential reporting is essential for survivors—and despite several laws requiring its availability—roughly 8% of observed institutions did not provide survivors with confidential reporting (U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight 1).

Under VAWA’s disciplinary procedures, officials conducting hearings on sexual assault cases must be trained in a manner that “protects the safety of victims” and “promotes

accountability,” while providing both the victim and the assailant with the same opportunities in the proceeding as well as the outcome of the proceeding (American Council on Education). Despite this, over 40% of the nation’s largest public universities observed in the study allow students to help adjudicate sexual assault cases, though more than 30% of institutions fail to provide training on common “rape myths” to those who adjudicate sexual assault cases (U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight 2). Further, despite a 1995 study finding that the less than 4% of college men who are student athletes commit more than 19% of reported sexual assaults on college campuses, 27% of colleges and universities currently permit their athletic departments to handle sexual assault cases involving student athletes (Crosset et al.; U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight 11).

VAWA requires that new students and employees must attend “primary prevention and awareness programs,” which must include: a statement that the institution prohibits offenses, a definition of said offenses, a university-wide definition of consent, “safe and positive” bystander intervention procedures, tools for recognizing abusive behavior, and alerts of ongoing awareness campaigns on the aforementioned factors (American Council on Education). Sadly, more than 20% of institutions observed in the Senate report did not provide training to faculty and staff regarding sexual assault response, and over 30% did not provide training for students (U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial and Contracting Oversight 1). While reporting rates across universities are low, the large majority of survivors observed in the “Campus Climate Survey Validation Study” did report telling a family member, friend, or roommate: As observed in the Association of American Universities’ study, 75% of students did not believe they were knowledgeable regarding the resources available to help survivors, or discuss acts of misconduct (Cantor et al. V). Of those who reported being a bystander in a potential-assault situation, 54.5%

did not try to intervene (Cantor et al. XXIII). These results provide a tremendous demonstration of the vital need to educate all college students about sexual assault response and support, as well as the need to connect survivors to helpful resources.

Campus Educational Programming

Haven Training

Perhaps the most widely-discussed, university-oriented sexual assault training program, Haven, developed in collaboration with universities by Dr. Alan Berkowitz, boasts an outreach of 700,000 individuals at more than 650 colleges and universities across the Nation (Everfi). Haven meets prevention compliance required under Title IX and the Clery Act, and is utilized to educate students (incoming and transfer students), staff, and faculty on sexual assault prevention and intervention (Everfi). Further, universities are able to measure changes in behavior, engagement and victimization through Everfi's analytics, which provide a set of recommendations for improving their attitudes and investment on campus (Everfi). Interestingly enough, Oregon State University was chosen as the 2015 Haven case study, after looking to establish a program to meet the needs of its students. In the final case study report, Ronnie Sue, Oregon State University's Co-Associate Director of Bias Prevention and Education, shares "we were looking for something that would help us meet all of our compliance requirements...but we also required a program that would drive real positive changes in student attitudes and behaviors" (Everfi). In tackling prevention education at OSU, Haven would need to reach on-campus students, as well as those taking their coursework online through OSU's E-Campus program.

Oregon State University defines Haven as an “interactive course that addresses the critical issues of sexual assault, relationship violence, and stalking,” and helps students reflect on their values, engage with scenario-based learning, challenge harmful language, and support peers who have experienced assault (Student Health Oregon State University, Haven). According to Oregon State University, at the end of their Haven training, students should be able to “identify sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking; be equipped to recognize potentially dangerous real-life situations; learn ways to intervene in risky situations; understand alcohol’s role in consent; know OSU policies, procedures, and resources” (Oregon State University Student Health, Summary).

Haven also aims to “empower” individuals to become “active bystanders,” and stop assaults before they occur (Oregon State University Student Health, Haven). At Oregon State University, Haven is required for first year and transfer students at both the Corvallis and Cascades-based campus, as well as La Grande-based transfer students; graduate students at each campus, Ecampus students, and non-degree students at all locations are required to take Haven Plus, which is tailored toward non-traditional students (Oregon State University Student Health). According to OSU’s Student Health website, failure to complete the required Haven course will “result in a Grades Hold on students' OSU Student Account” (Oregon State University Student Health, Haven). The website goes on to state that the “only way to lift this hold is to complete each part of the required courses. Once students complete the part of the course, the hold will be lifted from their account within 24 hours of completion” (Oregon State University Student Health, Haven). At other universities, such as the University of Alaska Fairbanks, students who fail to complete the course face a fine, some of which get allocated to additional violence prevention programming (Moon). Though Haven has aided in providing an education to Oregon

State University students—95% have completed Haven’s coursework—there are several shortcomings (Everfi). While Haven’s Impact Report is not publicly released from Oregon State University, the 2013-2014 and 2014-2015 reports from the University of Oregon have been published. According to data pulled from Everfi on February 2, 2015, 4,491 University of Oregon students signed up for the Haven program (Haven Impact Report University of Oregon). While 4,388 (97%) of Haven-registered students completed part one of the training, part two’s completion rate fell to 2,988 (68%). In the 2013-2014 school year, 79% of Haven-registered students completed the full training (Haven Impact Report University of Oregon).

Though Haven cannot be identified as a “one-shot” sexual assault intervention training—students have a 30-day waiting period in between completing the two-part course—many folks express concern regarding its effectiveness (Oregon State University Student Health, Summary). According to NotAlone.gov, this short-term practice is not effective in changing students’ attitudes and behaviors long term (NotAlone.gov). For university administration, cost effectiveness is cited as the main concern for developing more comprehensive preventative education. At Oklahoma State University, this issue is coming to the forefront: Vice President for Student Affairs Lee Bird shares that while potentially not the most effective, online training is the most efficient, because on-campus trainings could result in hiring staff to conduct the trainings, and therefore may increase tuition. Bird states “think about the cost of classes...do we want to make students pay for that? Are the feds providing us a check? It would cost students more to graduate” (UWIRE). The university contracted with Haven’s parent company, EverFi, to provide the training course for \$45,000, the majority of which was secured through outside funding (UWIRE). Of course, for those grappling with sexual assault on campus, and for the advocates who work with them, the cost-to-benefit ratio is a worthy investment. Oklahoma State

University professor and prevention advocate John Foubert, shares that the university's approach to prevention training is not one he would recommend, sharing that one-hour presentations and trainings are "not enough" due to its pervasiveness at all universities (UWIRE). In an NPR interview discussing the rise of "click-through" trainings, Foubert asserts "these quick-and-dirty programs online are really good at marketing their product, but I'm not at all convinced that they're effective at doing much of anything except documenting that policy has been met" (Smith). American Association of University Women's Government Relations Manager Anne Hedgepeth echoes Foubert's concern, stating "I hope schools wouldn't think of [Haven] as a checkbox...you really need to think about who are your students, what are the issues facing them, and how do you reach them." Students, like Nadir Nibras, are reflecting on exactly that (UWIRE). Nibras, and others, have channeled their activism into drafting bills and hosting events aimed at mandating in-person sexual assault trainings for students (UWIRE). Nibras shares that Haven is "certainly not enough" and that a "comprehensive approach regarding sexual assault prevention should be something every university offers ... I hope to see a change, and ideally, our program should be research-based and it should not just be efficient, but effective" (UWIRE).

A second concern with Haven's effectiveness is its student representation and course content. Students have asserted that, while Haven states an attempt toward inclusivity for all survivors, it includes shortcomings as a relatively homogenous population in its scenario-based learning (Everfi). While Haven includes representation of people of color and LGBTQ+ relationships, its main pool of actors are white, straight, and cisgender passing. A recent study conducted by Meredith Worthen and Samantha Wallace found that students' lived experiences—particularly in the case of oppression and privilege—impact their perceptions about campus

sexual assault prevention and intervention services (Worthen and Wallace). Haven's current heteronormative representation may leave queer students particularly undereducated about sexual assault prevention and intervention (Worthen and Baker). In fact, one study found that gay and lesbian students were more likely to identify online sexual assault trainings as "biased and impersonal" than their heterosexual counterparts (Worthen and Baker). Similarly, Worthen and Baker's study found that nearly one third of bisexual students—the least supportive of mandatory trainings—indicated the program had "no impact" (Worthen and Baker). Further, while Haven's training discusses the negative impact of gender boxes, Haven's gender selection options for students registering for the training, as well as Haven's data analysis reports, are limited to the categorization of "male" and "female" (Haven). Not only does this represent sex rather than gender, this binary framing of sex virtually erases all other gender identities that exist outside the categories of male/female or woman/man. By presenting sex categorization in this manner, Haven may isolate trans and non-binary students attempting to complete the training. As a result, Haven erases the fact that trans and gender non-binary students are most at risk for experiencing sexual assault. In a 2014 piece, Liat Kaplan, a student who completed Haven, discusses one scenario from the course, in which an athlete was recounting a story of when he asked his teammates to stop making derogatory comments because women would not want to hang out with them (Kaplan). Kaplan's argument, while acknowledging that presenting prevention strategies in a relatable way is important, showcases that the reason for not being sexist or committing assault should not be rooted in women "not wanting" to sleep with them if they exhibit problematic behaviors (Kaplan). Kaplan poignantly states: "A man who doesn't rape women because he wants to get laid is not particularly less threatening to me than an out-and-out

rapist” (Kaplan). Instead, Kaplan calls upon Everfi to shift this narrative toward one that asserts respecting women is vital because they are humans who deserve safety.

A third concern is Haven’s overall effectiveness, and lack of opt-out abilities for survivors. While Oregon State University mentions that students can submit a ticket with Disability Access Services to aid in their completion of the modules, there is no readily accessible tool for opting-out of the program at either Oregon State University or the University of Oregon for survivors who may experience secondary trauma during the course (Oregon State University Student Health). The University of Oregon does provide a link to safe.uoregon.edu for campus and community resources for survivors needing support before or after the course (University of Oregon, Office of the Dean of Students). This inability to opt-out of Haven, while providing students with the same education, may result in a negative mental health impact amongst students who have experienced assault prior to their time at their university. Additionally, at many universities, Haven was not required for those already enrolled in courses prior to when the program was piloted, leaving upperclassmen out of this conversation and creating gaps in knowledge. Kaplan’s piece highlights an additional concern with Haven: investment in completion of an online course. The lack of “hard mandates” securing 100% completion amongst students and faculty at universities across the nation, including Oregon State University and the University of Oregon, leave a percentage of students who have not completed the training, and raises question regarding incentive for completion. Kaplan, and many others, share accounts of muting videos, watching Netflix, and clicking buttons when prompted in order to complete their AlcoholEdu and Haven courses and in turn, not absorbing information—a fact I have seen replicated when interacting with both graduate and undergraduate students at Oregon State University (Kaplan). Kaplan’s concern is that those are engaged with the modules are those

who are already involved in these conversations and interested in evaluating any problematic or victim blaming modules within Haven. Certainly, the thought of people taking this approach raises many red flags, as the education Haven is intending to provide is not occurring. Instead, Everfi should take action to work with universities to develop ways to support survivors through Haven, and secure a higher rate of course completion amongst students.

Green Dot Bystander Intervention Training

Filling in the gaps of Haven’s online-only approach, the Green Dot training, utilized to train college and university campuses, K-12 schools, community organizations on bystander intervention, offers an in-person approach on strategies to end violence. The training operates from the position of developing more “good” people (green dots) in the world, summarizing its content as: “the power of Green Dot is simple: Red dots bad. Green dots good. You decide.” (Green Dot, Overview). Green Dot instructors utilize four “Models of Influence”—relationships, connection, knowledge, and skills—in a way that strives to humanize the instructors and build relationships with those in the trainings to make them feel more invested in its content (Green Dot, Training). The Green Dot curriculum is broken into three parts, the first of which being the Overview Speech. The Overview Speech aims to introduce audiences to Green Dot while establishing buy-in and shift attitudes toward ones of action. Green Dot defines this “persuasive speech” as having five parts: “inspiration, shared vision, individual acceptance, simplicity, and critical mass” (Green Dot, Curriculum). Part two of the training focuses on bystander intervention by drawing upon an interactive approach through the use of role-plays, videos, and other mediums for active application of course concepts. In this part of the training, instructors aid in assisting participants in taking proactive action toward violence prevention. While the

University of Oregon is not a certified Green Dot university, Oregon State University did host a four-day training in 2011 for a cost of \$299 per participant (OSU Today).

While Green Dot helps address some of the concerns with online sexual assault prevention platforms by creating in-person trainings for students, faculty, and other campus community members, it is not immune from challenges. In *Iris Magazine*, a University of Virginia-based (UVA) magazine focused on celebrating women's achievements at the University, UVA student and Women's Center intern Carly Gorelick highlights several structural concerns with the program. Gorelick reflects on their experience with the training citing that the majority of students in attendance were "predictable": women's center interns, future resident advisors, Green Dot members, and others in similar fields. Gorelick cites this community of already-engaged students as her biggest concern, stating: "how will this program be impactful if attendance is comprised of students who are predisposed to being interested in this issue?" It is Gorelick's concern, and my own, that if programs such as Green Dot rely on peer-to-peer networking to spread the word on trainings, Green Dot will be attracting the same pool of students, and effectively limiting their outreach and impact on campuses. Gorelick also reflects on the length of the program as an accessibility concern for students: for those with on-campus classes or work conflicts, taking time off to complete the training at the expense of their assignments or income could result in a large barrier. While UVA established "Overview Talks," lasting 45-90 minutes to meet this need, it establishes a double-bind. The Green Dot training is highly adaptable to meet the needs of any time constraints put forth by a training's organizing entity—its overview section can last "five minutes to an hour" and its bystander intervention component can last "six hours to a weekend retreat" (Green Dot, Curriculum). This vast difference in timing can result in a wide difference in knowledge amongst those who have

“completed” the Green Dot training. Lastly, Gorelick reflects on a closing activity asking attendees to nominate student leaders on campus they identified as individuals who should complete the training. While this practice is good in theory, if it does not involve follow-through in a manner that trains the suggested leaders, Green Dot does not meet its potential impact. To improve its impact Green Dot should consider other outreach techniques, scheduling, and timing.

Conclusion

This chapter examined federal laws and policies in relation to campus implementation. It explored both on and off-campus trainings and workshops for police officers, judiciary committees, faculty, staff, and students, offering a critique for programmatic and structural shortcomings. By reviewing policies such as The Clery Act, Violence Against Women Act, and The Campus SaVE Act in conversation with results from the “Campus Climate Survey Validation Study,” and Association of American Universities report, one can begin to unearth gaps in strategies for improvement. In examining Haven and Green Dot trainings through both statistical feedback and personal narrative, campus advocates and administrative employees are able to critically engage with training modules and develop methods for enhancing content. As exemplified through the above studies and training mandates, more needs to be done to secure campus safety and prevention efforts across the nation. Survivors are slipping through the cracks due to barriers in reporting, inconsistent access to resources, and lack of university action. More so, queer, trans, and non-binary students are facing heightened risk and exposure to acts of violence, and need programs designed specifically for their needs. In order to change this pattern, universities must enhance their violence prevention and bystander intervention programs to

provide students, staff, and faculty alike with a comprehensive understanding of sexual assault, consent, and violence intervention.

In the next chapter, I apply a theoretical foundation of queer theory and women of color feminisms to the content addressed in this chapter. Framing my work within these theories helps to analyze themes of macro-level betrayal, silencing of survivors, and barriers toward survivor healing. I explore Dean Spade's three modes of power, Carly Smith and Jennifer Freyd's work on institutional betrayal, and Grace Cho's theories of hauntings and ghosts as a build up for the data analysis in chapter three. It is from this blend of theoretical insight that I shift from large-scale study results to personal narratives and recommendations for better services. Throughout the following chapters, I call on the works of these scholars to inform patterns of betrayal, haunting, and healing in my interviews to reveal opportunities for interpersonal and structural survivorship.

CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

Building upon the aforementioned studies, my research synthesizes feminist theories with personal narratives that demonstrate the impact of oppressive systems on the individual. I aim to offer these theories of systematic abuses of power in conjunction with the literature review to begin an examination of *how* and *why* some universities are not offering well-rounded, survivor-informed resources on their campuses. I frame my theoretical framework within that of queer theory and women of color feminisms in an attempt to deconstruct mainstream discourse surrounding campus survivors of violence and theorize the dynamics that interplay between the individual and the institution(s) of power, higher education, and social locations. In striving to create an accessible thesis, the theories I draw from are rooted in practice and informed by the subsequent interview findings. Through this framework, my thesis is able to provide theoretical and tangible strategies for sustainable, survivor-focused care.

Specifically, knowledge of institutional betrayal and multilayered, systematic oppression informed my interview questions, and the centering of betrayal trauma theory allowed for a better understanding of emotions that may arise during interviews with survivors. I combined these theories with Cho's analysis of hauntings and ghosts to inform my dialogue with study participants, as well as interpretation of the study results. At all levels, I utilize feminist theories to inform my work with this study, in order to analyze the ways in which intersecting identities, social locations, and power structures establish institutional hierarchies and betray survivors. By examining *both* how we can begin to change cultures of violence *and* social constructions of identity, I believe this theoretical analysis will be more effective at preventing and responding to instances of violence.

In this chapter, I focus on exploring key concepts such as administrative violence, institutional betrayal, betrayal trauma theory, and kinships of trauma; recounting long term effects of trauma and the difficulty in accessing resources; examining the additional impact of institutional betrayal on queer and trans students. To contextualize campus-based violence within the larger context of queer and trans identities, I turn to the sparse but growing articles and studies that center the myriad of intersections arising within identity-based violence. It is essential to note that very few studies have examined the intersections between queer and trans violence and campus violence, and even fewer engage in the explicit examination of non-binary students without lumping them in the broader identity of “trans.” Likewise, one must recognize the contexts that heighten the risk for students of queer and trans identities to come forward and report an assault. Through integrating theories of institutional betrayal, betrayal trauma theory, hauntings, and ghosts, this chapter presents the findings of the literature review in a format that permits both documentation of current policies and the shortcomings surrounding them.

Systematic Betrayal in Rights-Based Frameworks

As attorney, educator, and trans activist Dean Spade articulates in his text *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law*, one must recall that trans and non-binary gender-based violence is produced at many levels: “state programs and law enforcement” are not the “arbiters of justice, protection, and safety” but are instead “sponsors and sites of violence” (21). That is, federal law reform that intends to improve university climate does not always provide remedy for those affected, as it often “fails to address” the very legal issues that establish sites of vulnerability for queer, trans, and non-binary individuals (Spade 35). In short, by adopting a legislative compliance-based model rather than a survivor-informed

model, colleges and universities limit their understanding of the complex social systems which exist within them.

Spade argues that Western society's current extent of "solutions" to violence include creating hate crime legislation, collecting statistics on incidents of violence, and collaborating with local and federal law enforcement to prosecute assailants of gender-violence. Certainly, this can be seen in the literature review through the focus on quantitative-based studies rather than qualitative, intentional interviews with queer, trans, and non-binary survivors. For example, a more intentional focus on queer, trans, and non-binary bodies could reveal that for many of these individuals, fear of retaliation and negative interactions with resource agencies during the reporting process can be a site of anxiety. Police confrontation through victim blaming questions or invalidation of identity in filing a report can re-traumatize survivors. Likewise, trans and non-binary survivors may feel uncomfortable if completing the incredibly invasive DNA kit collection process. Fear of misgendering, or wrongfully-perceived gendered interactions with hospital staff or Sexual Assault Nurse Examiners can also serve as a site of trauma (Gentlewarrior and Fountain). In Spade's work, it is identified that those enforcing this model are oppressors at the macro-level, operating as individuals who have the administrative power to take away power and autonomy from survivors. By adhering to this impersonal, "rights" based model that lacks systematic analysis, rather than one that operates from personal narratives and "justice," privileged identities are valued over non-normative bodies, and the nuanced experiences of survivors is not accounted for. Thus, queer, trans, and non-binary bodies fall through the cracks.

To expand upon these points, Spade addresses three modes of power. The first, the perpetrator/victim model, is akin to "subtraction" (103). This mode can be examined through

instances of “corrective rape,” where the assailant commits a hate crime based on the victim’s real or perceived gender or sexual identity, or in cases where survivors are not offered a transfer of university housing based on their gender identity not matching up to university policies. In both examples, a “right” is taken away from the survivor: the right to bodily autonomy and authentic self-expression, and the right to safe housing. Drawing upon the work of Michel Foucault, Spade stresses that this mode of power perceives power in a reductive top-down model, that often does not equate for the complexities within each case. Foucault shares that this mode of “subtraction” is not the “major form of power but merely one element among others, working to incite, reinforce, control, monitor, optimize, and organize the forces under it” (136). Student writer Elliot Jensen illustrates this argument by highlighting the fact that, due to existing outside of recognized Western gendered categories, non-binary individuals face the “unique challenge” of attempting to create a space to merely *exist* within campus communities (Jensen). Jensen’s piece raises critical questions that draw upon Spade’s first notion of power, perpetrator/victim, in critiquing the impact of campus legislation, stating:

What happens when Title IX’s applications toward trans individuals excludes those who exist in ‘ungendered’ territory? Where can non-binary individuals seek refuge when attempting to access the often-gendered shelter system? Where can they turn if uninsured and needing to access services provided for free at women’s clinics? (Jensen)

Most powerful is Jensen’s overarching question: “Where do you turn to when you don’t, in the eyes of others, exist?” By declaring equality through legislative measures such as bathroom bills or promising vague implementation of “justice” and “protection” in university survivor services through legislative measures, survivors, and those analyzing the university, may fail to question

how this values certain bodies over others—usually reinforcing the power of those who implement these legislative measures.

Spade’s second mode of power, the “disciplinary” mode, provides commentary on the internalization process of “proper” behaviors that serve to fit people within the constructed norm (104). Oftentimes, this results in both personal and external policing, and discourages the types of qualities, traits, and expressions that are not considered normative. In “This Was My Hell: The Violence Experienced by Gender Non-Conforming Youth in U.S. High Schools,” Shannon Wyss examines the experiences of seven gender non-binary youth in U.S. high schools, and draws conclusions that can be replicated within a university setting. Most prevalent in Wyss’ survey were accounts of non-binary students constructing their self-presentation as a violence prevention strategy and act of survival: Students reported hiding their gender identity through “looking and acting” like their assigned birth sex, “acting masculine,” “[combining] clothes and actions to be taken as a heterosexual girl,” and “[looking] to the behaviors of others in their birth sex category” to learn codes that they needed to follow in order to present a “solid front of ‘normality’ to an audience of their peers” (Wyss 15). Through this observation process, non-binary individuals come to learn that their social location is “causally relevant” to their experiences: the source of pain and violence inflicted upon them is a result of identifying inconsistently with mainstream frameworks of gender. The interpretation of an individual’s experiences with violence, and society at large, becomes heavily influenced by identity: as long as non-binary individuals do not acknowledge the ways in which their identity varies from others, they do not face ridicule from society. Wyss’ study directly illustrates Spade’s mode of disciplinary power, as a narrative of silencing is established in asking non-binary students to leave pieces of their identity at the door. This model can instill secondhand violence by creating

an environment where survivors feel like they must hide their identity to access resources. By accessing university counseling and hiding pronouns out of safety concerns, talking to survivor advocates and using the wrong name for fear of not being taken seriously, or hiding the gender identity of their assailants, queer, trans, and non-binary survivors are coerced and forced into assimilation and are not given the opportunity to access holistic resources.

The third mode of power, “population-management,” requires identification of the “other,” and operates from a standpoint of both security and insecurity (Spade 109). By decentering law, this mode of analysis positions law as a tactic that distributes security and insecurity, rather than the “most important” form of power that grants what is perceived as wrong and right in society (Spade, 110). Spade summarizes this mode as “operat[ing] in the name of promoting, protecting, and enhancing life of the national population and, by doing so, produc[ing] clear ideas about the characteristics of who the national population is,” as well as who is socially “othered” (Spade 110). Programs that fall into this categorization are positioned as being neutral in nature for the safety and benefit of society. For college and university campuses, this can be seen through judicial hearings for sexual-assault based student conduct code violations that include victim blaming questions such as “what were you wearing?” or “how much did you have to drink?”, or through campus safety emails that include “safety” tips such as “wear or bring flat shoes so you can run away from potential assailants faster” or “never leave a party with someone you did not previously know”: both of which operate under the neutral guise of keeping students safe. What this does not take into account, however, is that its sweeping generalization overlooks its skewed nature. In continuing rhetoric that “good” survivors do not drink or go to parties—or if they do, that “good” survivors fight back—universities have effectively created categories of “good” and “bad” students. This structure serves to pathologize

survivors who did not meet these constructs, such as those who went into “freeze” rather than “fight” mode, were assaulted by partners, or had a lot to drink. Further, it assumes that individuals who do not wear revealing clothing or who do not drink cannot be assaulted, creating an experience of invalidation for those who have been assaulted while sober or while dressed in societally “correct” clothing. This population-management strategy operates to shame and silence survivors who do not fit within the construction of “good” survivorship, and silences their narrative and access to resources as a result of its action.

Spade’s body of work is incredibly important for developing a fundamental understanding of power structures that operate not only in society, but within university institutions. By examining Spade’s three modes of power, one can learn about the power structures set in place that (un)intentionally exclude narratives of queer, trans, and non-binary survivors. Further, Spade’s third mode of power, “population-management,” helps name several of the flaws found within programs that replicate narratives of “good” and “bad” survivors. To help develop this examination of power—and abuses of power—within university institutions more directly, I turn to the work of Carly Smith and Jennifer Freyd.

Institutional Betrayal and Trauma Narratives

In “Institutional Betrayal,” a 2014 American Psychological Association journal article by Jennifer J. Freyd and Carly Smith, Freyd discusses her theory of “institutional betrayal.” Institutional betrayal occurs when “trusted and powerful institutions,” such as a college or university, “acts in ways that visit harm upon those dependent on them for safety and wellbeing” (Smith and Freyd 575). Smith and Freyd discuss the role of institutions in contributing to psychological distress through identifying how universities shield acts of betrayal from survivors, underprivileged members of institutions, and mental health providers (575). By

constructing this narrative of institutional survivor betrayal, Smith and Freyd create a viable framework for addressing the problem of sexual assault on college campuses. Smith and Freyd argue that doubts of reporting, coupled with experiencing unresponsive legal systems, serve to construct a “second assault” faced by many survivors navigating institutional victim blaming and stigmatization (575). While this theory can be applied to many institutions survivors interact with in their course toward healing—such as the medical institution, police force, community structures, and more—Freyd’s work posits this “secondary injury” as directly connected to experiences of college and university students healing from sexual assault (Smith and Freyd 579). For those at Oregon State University and the University of Oregon, examples of this “secondary injury” can be observed in the “check the box” mentality that meets federal standards but does not provide access to long term avenues for healing, as well as the inadvertent devaluing of minority students through the lack of specific programing for communities facing heightened victimization. Though institutional betrayal is a systemic problem, for those entrenched within its system, such as queer, trans, and non-binary students, it may appear to be an isolated experience, as they are often kept unaware of previous cases and overarching systematic oppressions (Smith and Freyd 579).

According to Smith and Freyd, several factors that contribute to observable effects of institutional betrayal include: membership, prestige, and priorities (580). Through clearly defined groups which play into identity development, such as athletics and fraternity-life, conformity to group think becomes highly valued, self-correcting any deviance from within in order to “keep up” the societal value of the in-group (Smith and Freyd 581). This self-correcting behavior can be observed by colleges and universities allowing athletic departments and Greek Life employees to decide what occurs with sexual assault allegations arising within their departments.

Likewise, one's interactions with a university may contribute to their value in society, creating an unequal power distribution. While, after an assault, remaining "loyal" to a university may result in retraumatization, severing ties with that dynamic and not receiving the prestige (diploma, association, etc.) could be even more detrimental. For example, one's decision to not report, in addition to fears of retaliation and exposing vulnerabilities such as gender or sexual identity, can be wrapped up within the fear of being unable to complete their degree if branded as a "troublemaking" survivor. Perhaps more influential than this are the priorities of the observed institution, which may include valuing its reputation over the well-being of its student members. Rather than help survivors to mediate ties with the institution when abuse comes-to-light, institutions often react by practicing "damage control" and "maintaining appearances" in place of taking accountability (Smith and Freyd 580). As observed by the lack of comprehensive compassionate training provided to college and university leadership cited in the literature review, this "damage control" mentality results in "institutional denial," which permits an "us versus them" framework to maintain a group-think that questions the validity of sexual assault reporting (Smith and Freyd 581). Smith and Freyd argue that cases of sexual assault are often overlooked by both school administration and fans of the university, in order to protect buy-in to the institutional structure: this obsession with "saving face" must become centralized when examining the experience of survivors (Smith and Freyd 575).

Smith and Freyd name three central barriers to institutional change. The first is the absence of consistent language around sexual assault instances that are pervasive on campus. By failing to define terms such as consent and sexual assault, campus administration is able to write off scenarios of sexual assault as being seen for the first time, each time (Smith and Freyd 581). By failing to provide institution-wide definitions of consent, rape, sexual assault, and other

terminology, colleges and universities are able to negate their responsibility to protect students out of self-induced naivete. Secondly, institutional bodies—such as administrative staff, university presidents, Title IX offices, and judiciary committees—often adopt a notion of “not knowing” how to approach these issues, which allows them to acknowledge sexual abuse, but leave it unaddressed in a manner that does not hold assailants accountable, thus creating a systematic cycle of abuse (Smith and Freyd 581). By claiming to implement “team” approaches to combatting assault, but not in a manner that allows for the integration of survivor advocates, universities do not have to be held accountable by activists and/or survivors, out of continued systematic silencing and disempowerment. The third barrier addressed arises from the institution’s own notion of trauma experienced in receiving alerts of assault, essentially in feeling a collective reprimanding for not taking action to support survivors (Smith and Freyd). Of course, by unearthing this “pain” in a constructive manner that proactively ends sexual violence, collective institutional “reprimanding” will no longer occur. Through current government policy and data collection implementation, the excuse of “not knowing how” is no longer valid.

The institution’s lack of commitment to prevent sexual violence can be observed in its absence of consistent policies and trainings, normalization of abusive contexts, and its general lack at screening potential perpetrators in more than a one-time screening upon hiring—quite concerning when one recalls that perpetrators often commit acts of sexual violence multiple times before survivor reporting occurs (Smith and Freyd). Institutions may also promote misinformation by creating stereotypes of “ideal survivors”; this can be seen in administration and advocacy services which center the voices of white, heterosexual, cisgender women, while negating programming that specifically focuses on marginalized identities (Smith and Freyd 583). For those who do not see themselves represented in outreach materials, survivor

communities, or event planning committees, survivor advocacy centers may not be identified as a safe space for accessing resources. Likewise, institutions may discourage filing charges, and invalidate the feelings and experiences of survivors: as noted previously in the literature review, it is vital to recognize that the most common reasons college survivors list for not formally reporting sexual assault is out of fearing maltreatment or being disbelieved (Smith and Freyd). For example, in 2009, the National Online Resource Center on Violence Against Women examined the prevalence of culturally competent services for LGBT survivors of sexual violence (Gentlewarrior and Fountain). The study notes that even the act of collecting statistics on these survivors can be difficult when they are not safe and/or comfortable disclosing their identity to service providers: For queer and trans students, a fear of being outed to their campus and family network, misgendering of themselves or their abuser through heteronormativity, or disbelief over queer and trans experiences of sexual assault can hinder their ability to ask for help (Gentlewarrior and Fountain). This narrative is woven within a larger theme of violence perpetrated against those challenging norms who fall victim to hate crimes, and reaffirms the need for culturally competent services which affirm both gender and sexual identity through combining assault-based healing practices with queer resources (Gentlewarrior and Fountain). Likewise, colleges and universities punish survivors who come forward, resulting in both direct silencing, as well as discouragement of making future reports. This creates a “secondary victimization” through implementing victim-blaming behavior patterns and charging survivors for underage drinking, “sex,” and so forth (Smith and Freyd 583).

Developing research, such as the work of Smith and Freyd, has displayed the manner in which institutions play a role in becoming either a supportive, healing resource, or source of further inflicting trauma resulting in post-traumatic symptomology. This can be observed by

analyzing the percentage of survivors who withdraw from their college out of academic disengagement and an inability to succeed within the constructed oppressive institution. For example, the “Campus Climate Survey Validation Study” displays the negative ripple effects of sexual assault, noting the inability to complete homework, desire to transfer, and decision to dropout (Krebs et al. 116). If universities truly strive for the success of their students, they must address sexual assault and counter its toll on academic performance and retention. Continuing their analysis of institutional harm, Smith and Freyd introduce “betrayal trauma theory,” which suggests that more harmful outcomes occur when abuse occurs within a formed relationship, because it incurs a violation of trust (Smith and Freyd 577). Betrayal trauma theory is affiliated with higher rates of PTSD, anxiety, dissociation, depression, and borderline personality disorder (Smith and Freyd). According to Smith and Freyd, this occurs due to the coping mechanisms that must be enlisted by survivors for survival within their institutional relationships: “blindness” to betrayal trauma in order to maintain necessary relationships with the power-unit (in this case, their academic institution) (577). That is, in order to reap the benefits a college or university has to offer, one must effectively silence any narrative of sexual trauma. While one may not express explicit trust with their respective institution, the dependency that arises within a student/university partnership can create a system that results in extensions of trauma much like those experienced in interpersonal relationship sexual assault (Smith and Freyd). Furthermore, the overwhelming reluctance toward discussing these sources of trauma results in a pattern of naiveté that can become magnified to maintain complacency within power structures (Smith and Freyd).

Smith and Freyd’s work becomes increasingly valuable when examining the lasting effects of trauma on campus survivors. By examining the institution as a key component in the

survivor's healing process, one can analyze survivor trauma not as an individualized experience, but a collective journey influenced by the positive and/or negative administrative response on their campus. In doing so, one is able to name instances of institutional betrayal and betrayal trauma theory to identify patterns of injustice within college and university structures. To expand upon this concept of collective healing—and examine it from a place of interpersonal connection—I turn to the work of Grace Cho.

University Trauma and Haunting

In her text *Haunting the Korean Diaspora: Shame, Secrecy, and the Forgotten War*, Grace Cho states that “the traumatic effects of [a] system [of power] are carried forward,” resulting in historical traumas that are transmitted unconsciously “across the diaspora” (Cho 136, 150). While Cho's work does not center on survivors of university-based sexual assault specifically, her work on traumatized collective-community memories and ambiguous personal histories parallel the theme of haunting amongst university survivors. In this way, Cho's analysis can build upon betrayal trauma theory to explain lasting effects of trauma on survivors, and the community network that is often associated with survivorship. Cho conceptualizes the notion of a “monstrous family of reluctant belonging” to argue that multi-generational, multi-family trauma is transpired “not just down through the generations, but across them” (Cho 58). For example, the silencing and erasure of violence against women in university settings perpetuates “monstrous” trauma through uniting survivors in a manner that transcends beyond boundaries of the body (Cho 61). By silencing survivors, universities create a kinship structure amongst those who have endured these traumas. Cho builds upon this idea with her concept “kinship[s] of trauma”: these “ties” of kinship are not limited to individual families or communities, but

connected through sources of trauma, thus leading to a collective kinship in shared traumatic experiences (194). Employing this framework allows for the exploration of “haunting,” and the ways in which the observed system of dominance links many survivors both throughout history as well as transnationally (Cho 29). No longer are survivor narratives individualized in nature—they are connected through commonalities to bring survivors together in community. Knowingly, “haunting” is comprised of deep, multiple layers of trauma that both the oppressor and the oppressed interact with and contribute to through observable complicity and resistance (Cho). Advocates can see this incarnation of “haunting” play out when observing secondary trauma such as court outcomes in sexual assault cases, (mal)treatment of survivors on campuses, and those whose lives become valued through the reporting process. Much like the women Cho observed in her work who “emerge as the ghostly figure[s]” arising from their erased histories, so do survivors facing secondary assault from their academic institution. Through institutionalized methods of silencing, ignoring, and perpetuating voicelessness, the ghosts of survivors are coerced into a realm of “shame and secrecy” in the hopes that survivors will remain isolated and not further challenge universities in their responses to sexual assault (Cho 4).

Cho argues that the refusal to apologize for one’s lack of action, or the outright denial of said actions, directly contributes to unresolved trauma. That is, through constantly discounting and actively silencing experiences of survivors, and covering-up the lack of attention given to assault cases through claiming to provide resources, colleges and universities are merely feeding into the vicious cycle of abuse. By claiming to support these survivors through providing resources and refuge only if matters of sexual violence are not brought to light, an ultimatum of silence in exchange for meager-at-best reparations is instituted. Essentially, the choice to exclude narratives of violence is also violent (Cho). Cho, like Smith and Freyd, shares that survivors of

trauma often experience subconscious memories of trauma when experiencing forced assimilation, which serve as disruptions to this observed erasure: Again, this can be applied to survivors assimilating into structures of university silencing for survival, as well as those conforming to university and societal norms in order to access resources (Cho). As Cho articulates, “trauma disrupts the discourse of assimilation because trauma is precisely that which cannot be assimilated” (161). While this haunting of assimilation unsettles frameworks of “check-the-box” mentalities, in that it directly responds to the ways in which universities are not meeting the needs of survivors, it also results in survivors of sexual assault reclaiming their experiences, memories, ghosts, and hauntings in a manner that allows for the creation of meaningful change (Cho).

Cho’s research helps bring to light issues of community-based trauma that is inflicted upon survivors at the institutional level. Through Cho’s work, narratives of survivorship are no longer singular, isolated events, but a collective memory that can be used to analyze shared narratives and form bonds amongst survivors with similar traumas. By connecting Cho’s work in her text *Haunting the Korean Diaspora: Shame, Secrecy, and the Forgotten War*, to themes of power and betrayal addressed in the works of Spade, as well as Smith and Freyd, one can examine how memory-based and assimilation-based haunting influences the healing process of survivors on university campuses.

Conclusion

This chapter examined the works of feminist scholars in relation to the experiences of survivors on university campuses. I explored both interpersonal and structural instances of power and control through the works of Spade, Smith and Freyd, and Cho. First, I examined Spade’s three modes of societal power—perpetrator-victim, disciplinary, and population management—

to create a more well-rounded analysis of structural power breakdowns on university campuses. Next, I explored Smith and Freyd's work on institutional betrayal and betrayal trauma theory to construct a university-wide institutional analysis of the power dynamics introduced by Spade. Lastly, I utilized the work of Cho to enhance Smith and Freyd's betrayal trauma theory analysis, creating a framework for discussing the lasting trauma of survivors and the bonds that can be built amongst survivors. By holding these theories in conversation with the laws and policies found in the Literature Review, one is able to develop an analysis for how and *why* these patterns of injustice directed toward queer, trans, and non-binary survivors are occurring on college campuses. It is imperative to develop a theoretical analysis that holds marginalized identities at its center in order to accurately and authentically engage with the themes of the thesis found in the following chapters.

In the next chapter, I detail my methodological framework used in this thesis. I identify gaps found in the development of the literature review and theoretical framework, and posit my research as one that attempts to fill several of these literary and theoretical holes. I outline the importance of centering my research within community-based participatory research methods, and stress the importance of breaking down power dynamics between the researcher and participants. It is in this chapter that I move into the specific methods, processes, and analysis of the thesis.

CHAPTER 4: METHODS

Introduction

In the previous chapter, I utilized the works of feminist scholars to explore themes of power and control in relation to the experiences of marginalized survivors on university campuses. In this chapter, I draw upon the research found in my theoretical framework to develop my methods and analysis of this study. This chapter outlines the methodological framework used in this study, and explains in depth the study's design, methods, research questions, and theoretical framework used to conduct and analyze the data collected for this study. This chapter will provide background to the interview method, and both apply and contextualize the study within the goals of the thesis. Throughout the thesis, I respond to the following research questions: (1) How do the identified universities (Oregon State University and the University of Oregon) replicate or deviate from the current U.S. climate surrounding campus sexual assault? And, (2) In which ways can these universities better support queer, trans, and non-binary survivors of sexual assault?

Limitations in the Literature

Throughout the process of assembling the literature review, I found myself at a standstill with the abrupt gaps between mainstream conceptions of campus sexual assault, such as campus climate surveys and federally-published studies, and the theories that discuss their themes, such as those referenced in the previous chapter describing my theoretical framework. At each juncture, a multitude of limitations arose in attempting to draw from studies addressing themes similar to this project. While I had hoped for points of comparison within similar studies, I discovered that most mainstream conversations about campus sexual assault draw from overarching statistics from studies such as the "Campus Climate Survey Validation Study" or the

“Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct,” both of which fail to centralize the nuance of queer and trans voices. While some of these more widely-distributed studies may assert regionally-based work, or mention queer and trans identities for the purpose of collecting quantitative data, no mainstream studies explicitly focus on the experiences of queer and trans survivors as the focus of their research. Further, many reports did not release the names of the examined institutions when publishing campus climate surveys. Therefore, I was not surprised to learn that no data had been collected on a widely-publicized, public, federally-based, or more private, archived, student-based study on the experiences of queer and trans survivors of sexual assault at Oregon State University and/or the University of Oregon.

From this juncture, I hope to bridge the gaps between more macro-level theory and regional, identity-based specificity in study design, in order to create a pivotal discussion on the experiences of multiply-marginalized survivors in the state of Oregon. To do so, I turned to several theoretical frameworks to understand campus responses to sexual violence against queer and trans students, with the goal of understanding the resources that are, and are not, available to survivors. Further, I work to identify whose identities and lives are valued in the university system to help explain how and why crimes committed against marginalized bodies often result in a lack of action. These theories include the works of Smith and Freyd, Cho, and Spade, as examined in the previous chapter. Again, I ran into a barrier with the lack of crossover. While the theorists I draw from help fill in gaps on systematic violence, the impacts of trauma, or, in the case of Smith and Freyd, even the nuanced experiences of survivors of campus assault at the University of Oregon and beyond, none include sustained discussion of queer and trans survivors of sexual assault. In order to address this absence, I aim to draw from methods which bridge

these gaps to aid in the assertion of my goals, as well as to identify how and *why* assaults are occurring to these communities in disproportionate numbers.

Methodological Framework

My methodology is a community-based qualitative study informed by intersectional feminist perspectives. I draw on community-based participatory research, intersectional feminist methodologies, and researcher/participant co-learning to develop this methodology. It was my priority to assert that research needs to be conducted *from within* the communities participating (“being researched”), as well as those affected by the research in order to create the most beneficial and tangible changes. Feminist research commonly values a tangible application of theory, and in centering this practice, it became my goal to draw from explicitly feminist research methodologies. In short, my methodology centers participants and those identifying as queer, trans, and/or non-binary survivors of sexual assault, as they deserve to have their thoughts, experiences, and feelings valued and validated. To achieve the goals of co-learning, tangible theory application, and centering survivor voices, I draw upon methodologies which breakdown institutionalized power hierarchies and make the interview space one that does not position the researcher as the center through both physical space and interview design. I conduct this study as one that exposes participants to alternative forms of justice-work that validates forms of resistance they engage with throughout their healing process, and that values experiential knowledge as equal to that gained from reading academic scholarship.

Research Design

The design of this study is informed by community-based participatory research through the form of firsthand interviews. While this study consists of a small sample size, I approach this

research through community-engaged methodologies, and draw from those utilized in larger studies. Widely associated with the health field, community-based participatory research can, for the purpose of this study, be defined as: “A collaborative approach to research that equitably involves all partners in the research process and recognizes the unique strengths that each brings...with the aim of combining knowledge and action for social change” (W.K. Kellogg Foundation Community Health Scholars Program).

This methodology upholds the principles of researcher/participant co-learning, participant self-empowerment, and the equal valuing of theoretical research *and* tangible action in the qualitative research process. In short, this paradigm moves away from the researcher as the bearer of knowledge, and allows for combining the researcher’s theoretical expertise with the participant’s lived knowledge to view the two as equally credible in creating a mutually beneficial collaboration with all parties feeling ownership over the piece (Community-Based Participatory Research for Health: From Process to Outcomes). Through this approach, the researcher can gain a more holistic insight to the attitudes and feelings of research participants. It is in this capacity that I position the role of “researcher” as a collaborator with the participants—where power is more balanced through the value of all knowledges, experiences, and understandings.

Further, this study relies on an intersectional feminist research methodology that centralizes gender, sexuality, class, race, disability, sexism, homophobia, and transphobia as its lens for interrogating barriers, as well as identifying hallmarks of social justice advocacy. As outlined in the previous chapter, this thesis relies heavily on the work of feminist researchers who utilize participatory methods such as: Carly Smith and Jennifer Freyd, Dean Spade, and Grace Cho; each of these theorists interrogate the world by centering gender, race, class,

sexuality, disability, and other historically marginalized communities in their analyses, and in doing so, call attention to identities which benefit from community-based participatory research methods. In both of these perspectives, feminist research and community-based participation, social transformation is centralized with the goal of building up the voices of historically marginalized communities.

Interview Series Overview

I construct my thesis by exploring the way three individuals experience the campus climate at two Oregon-based universities. Through this work, I identify how these survivors experience campus culture in ways that both reflect and deviate from the current U.S. culture surrounding campus-based sexual assault. This research is vital because evidence has shown that queer, trans, and non-binary survivors face heightened violence, and that access to resources when facing multiple oppressions can be incredibly complex (Wyss). Furthermore, few studies have included interviews with non-binary individuals specifically for reasons other than constructing medical frameworks (Wyss). The purpose of my research is to center survivor-based suggestions for accountability, resources, and sustainable programming to improve the campus climate and culture surrounding survivors moving forward. Specifically, I hope to improve resources for those who identify as queer, trans, and non-binary survivors. It is my hope that my work will instigate change in the policies and practices of university administration and student affairs, as well as provide an outlet for survivors of overlooked identities to feel heard.

I employ a first-hand community-centered methodological approach through the form of interviews with survivors in order to garner suggestions to better support queer and trans students who endure sexual assault during their time at Oregon State University and/or the University of Oregon. In order to integrate community-based participatory research into my project, I practiced

“going back” to communities I identify with as a queer-identified survivor of violence: I interacted with many of the on-campus organizations prior to engaging with my thesis, and intentionally shared parts of my identities with participants in an attempt to help them feel more comfortable in their vulnerability. In order to fully integrate community voices, I incorporated their thoughts, opinions, and contributions beyond interview-question responses by actively asking for participants’ feedback throughout the research process. Prior to the interview, each participant was asked to identify any gaps in the interview question guidelines that they would like to edit, or suggest for addition, so as to compile a more comprehensive list of questions that survivors would find both viable and valuable. At the conclusion of each interview, each participant was asked if they thought any questions should be reworked, as well as if anything needed to be added or deleted. This provided an opportunity to review and revise the project as it unfolded, in order to improve future interviews with the implemented suggested changes. This also enhanced interviews as they unfolded by providing the opportunity for constant interviewee feedback.

Perhaps the greatest outcome of this practice was the addition of a question about “self-care” suggested by the first interview participant at the end of their interview. Due to this community-driven interaction, the thesis is able to include responses of coping and resiliency present in each of the survivors. Additionally, I shared with respondents at the conclusion of the interview process any sections I was considering reworking in order to hear their feedback and ask if they agreed with my edits. This action allowed my interview questions to become more nuanced and applicable to survivors, and helped me meet my overarching goal of improving resources for survivors. Lastly, participants were informed that at any point after the interview process prior to thesis completion, they could reach out to redact any statements made during the

interview: I found this to be an important point of transparency that allowed each survivor to feel more agency over their narrative. To round out the community-driven approach of this project, survivors will have access to the completed thesis through Oregon State University's ScholarsArchive database.

Participant Population

I chose to analyze both the University of Oregon and Oregon State University due to the multitude of commonalities between the universities. Both universities have comparable enrollment numbers: for the 2016-2017 school year, the University of Oregon is home to 23,634 students, while Oregon State University houses 30,354 students (University of Oregon Facts at a Glance; Oregon State University Enrollment Summary). At Oregon State University, 46.7% of students enrolled are women, compared to 53.2% of students at the University of Oregon (University of Oregon Facts at a Glance; Oregon State University Enrollment Summary). Neither university collects enrollment demographics for gender identities outside of this binary. According to the University of Oregon, 25.3% of enrolled students are ethnic minorities, which includes all identities outside of "white, non-Hispanic": This is comparable to Oregon State University's 23.7% (University of Oregon Facts at a Glance; Oregon State University Enrollment Summary). International students make up 11.6% of Oregon State University's total enrollment, and 12.7% of enrollment at the University of Oregon (University of Oregon Facts at a Glance; Oregon State University Enrollment Summary). By examining this data, it is evident that the universities are comparable in both size as well as relatively-homogenous demographic populations.

Both university cultures center both athletics and Greek Life, and are comparable in their football culture as Pac-12 rivals in the famous "Civil War" game each November. Likewise, the

universities were founded less than 10 years apart in the 1800s, and offer in-state tuition and on-campus housing for less than a \$1,000 difference, have an application fee with a \$5 difference, and an acceptance rate difference of less than five percent (U.S. News Higher Education University of Oregon; U.S. News Higher Education Oregon State University). In addition to these commonalities, the universities are central to the economies of the towns they are housed within, as well as Oregon itself. While, in 2013, the city of Eugene was home to more than 100,000 more individuals than the city of Corvallis (159,190 and 55,298, respectively), the roughly 25,000 students in each city offer a great shift in priorities (United State Census, Corvallis; United States Census, Eugene). For example, a large part of the culture in both cities center upon the Ducks/Beavers rivalry, and thus, economy is in part driven due to football culture. As a result, both universities have a larger investment to protect institutional branding over student safety to ensure that more students enroll, attend, and, in turn, support the economy. Through this work, I aim to answer: Whose voices are silenced? Which student voices are missing? What is the impact of this silence?

The insights collected for this thesis arises from interviews conducted with three current and former students of Oregon State University and the University of Oregon. Each participant self-identified with the following requirements as stated in the IRB protocol for this study:

Participants will include adults over the age of 18 who self-identify as queer and/or non-binary and/or trans individuals. Participants will also self-identify as survivors of sexual assault who are current or previous students from Oregon State University, or the University of Oregon. Participants will have experienced this trauma while attending, or prior to attending, one of the surveyed universities. Participants will be recruited to participate in interviews (Hunt).

The decision to include previous traumas prior to the student's time at the university is a result of survivors' need to access resources throughout their life. For example, students transferring to one of these universities after experiencing sexual assault still need support. Participants did not need to be currently based in Corvallis or Eugene, Oregon to participate in the interview process. Each interview provided rich insight to the strengths and areas for improvement at the two universities concerning programs and organizations that serve survivors of sexual assault. In accordance with IRB protocol, I coded the interview series but still provide nuances brought forth in each interview through the form of direct quotations and narrative summary.

Procedures

Due to the gaps in firsthand, conversation-based research on queer and trans survivors both nation-wide and in local communities, my study emphasizes the importance of working directly with survivors to conduct in-depth, one-on-one interviews. While the sample size is small, I prioritized centering the narratives and knowledge from those who have experienced silencing from the university, in the hopes of providing an outlet to best represent their experience, rather than base my research in quantitative data. All three survivors who expressed interest in the study and completed the interview process are represented in this thesis.

Prior to beginning my study, I completed OSU's required evaluation process through the Institutional Review Board. As stated by OSU's Office of Research Integrity, "all research projects involving human subjects must be submitted for IRB review" in compliance with "Common Rule (45 CFR 46) by the Department of Health and Human Services" (Oregon State University Research Office). OSU defines the purpose of the Institutional Review Board (IRB) as a "commitment to research by working to protect the rights and welfare of human subjects

who participate in research” that “promotes the ethical principles of respect for persons, beneficence, and justice” (Oregon State University Research Office). I submitted my initial application for Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval in April of 2016, and received approval August 24, 2016 after several full-board review revisions. While the delay in IRB approval left less than two months to complete the call-out and interview process, resulting in a small number of participants, it yielded several strengths to this study. First, it was of the highest importance to build strong, meaningful, authentic connections with those willing to be open and vulnerable in their participation in this study: the small, interview-based, experience provided closeness and richness in conversation that could not have been replicated through a digital survey. Second, it was through this process that the previously estimated “one hour” interview slots expanded to two and a half, sometimes three, hours for completion. The small number of interviews also provided a richness in themes that displayed an across-the-board cohesiveness in barriers toward accessing resources.

I began recruiting participants by researching resources for queer, trans, and non-binary students, as well as resources for survivors of university-based assault, in an attempt to find overlap in provided services. Once I had compiled a list of relevant organizations at each university involved in conversations on queer and trans inclusivity on campus and/or sexual assault prevention and response, I reached out to each organization via email and requested that they share outreach materials for the study. These materials included an email call-out for survivors that could be sent via listserv, a poster that could be displayed online or in print, and a combination call-out and poster display that could be shared to social media platforms such as Facebook or Instagram. Correspondence with potential participants was conducted via email, and consisted of clarifying the participant commitment, and responding to any questions the potential

participant might have. Those inquiring about the interview process were informed that the study was entirely voluntary, and that they could elect to remove themselves from the study at any time.

During the IRB process, it was decided that, due to my work as a Graduate Teaching Assistant, my “responsible employee” guidelines would be held in effect during the process of the study, raising the question of researcher-versus-teacher carryover and boundaries. In fact, it wasn’t until OSU alumna Stephanie McClure conducted her study on OSU’s sexual and dating violence curriculum in 2013 and discovered that OSU did not have a policy on Graduate Teaching Assistants conducting research with survivors that this was put into effect (McClure). This IRB requirement states:

All OSU employees are required to consult with the University Title IX Coordinator in the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access if they receive information about sexual harassment or sexual violence that meets one or more of the following criteria: 1.) Is alleged to have been perpetrated by an OSU student, staff, or faculty member, OR 2.) Has occurred on OSU property or during an OSU activity, OR 3.) Has created continuing effects in the educational setting (Oregon State University Office of Research Integrity).

As a result of the “responsible employee” reporting requirement present for Graduate Teaching Assistants at Oregon State University, potential participants were informed that through the IRB process, any survivor currently attending Oregon State University who had experienced sexual assault while enrolled as a student would be reported to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access. While this did not affect participants from the University of Oregon, it meant that participants who were currently attending Oregon State University and who experienced sexual assault while attending the University would need to have their name and email reported to the

Office of Equal Opportunity and Access and sent a copy of the University's resource list.

Additionally, each report was filed in the aggregate data compiled each academic year regarding the number of assaults occurring at OSU. It is important to note that the reportable assaults were not exclusive to the 2016-2017 school year, and therefore, did not aid in OSU's Clery Act reporting process. This requirement could have resulted in a barrier to participation, as participants may have been more comfortable disclosing their story and need of resources to a researcher, while not feeling comfortable being contacted by an office they may feel had left them in the dark during their healing process.

Once I completed the recruitment process and participants had agreed to the interview process, I emailed the consent documents and interview questions to provide a model for what the interview would look like prior to the in-person meeting. This step was important in ensuring that the survivor was comfortable with the process before consenting, and allowed participants to add and/or edit any questions as they saw fit to enhance the community-based emphasis of this study. After I sent the confirmation of interest email, I set up interviews either in-person or via Skype for the survivor's mobility and convenience. All survivors who responded to the confirmation of interest email were accepted into the applicant pool. I requested consent at each interview meeting, prior to the start of the study activities. I read through the consent form with the survivor as they followed along. I assessed participant comprehension of the consent document through open-ended dialogue that included questions about the study's consent process such as: Can you share with me your understanding of this study's requirements and consent process? What is your understanding of the circumstances in which a mandatory disclosure to EOA would occur? Do you have any further questions regarding the consent process? Once questions had been answered and it was clear participants understood the consent

requirements and guidelines for the interview process, I obtained verbal consent from the participants regarding their agreement to participate in this study, and signed my name as a witness to the consent process to ensure participant privacy to the full extent possible.

After I received consent, I began the interview process with the participant. I began the interview with demographic questions, before moving into the subsets of questions for data collection. These subsets included: the survivor's experience(s) with assault, the impact their assault had on their education and sense of community, their understanding of campus resources at the time of their assault and present day, and their suggestions for improvements to services. After participants answered the interview guideline questions, I asked respondents if they had any questions or if they would like to respond to that were not on the list provided. Based on their response, participants shared more about their experiences with the above themes and connected material.

I conducted interviews at a time of day most convenient to the participant, and in a location they were most comfortable with, either in person or online through Skype. I asked each participant during the consent process whether or not they would like to be audio recorded. I took notes on the main themes and important details of each survivor's story during the interview process. I transcribed the audio recordings, and began to analyze my interviews in conjunction with the interview notes to identify emerging themes. The interview was presented through a semi-structured, discussion-based conversation with broad open-ended questions, in order to foster a more authentic, flowing conversation with participants. The interview process was intended to take place in a roughly 60-minute session, but each interview lasted between two and two-and-a-half hours.

Conclusion: Initial Analysis

In transcribing the audio from the interview participants who consented to being recorded, I coded names and redacted any identifying information in order to protect each survivor's identity. Since the interview process was qualitative in nature, I highlighted compelling quotes within the interviews transcriptions that stood out as central to the participant's narrative order to identify main themes for my analysis. This coding method helped identify patterns among interviews, and overarching barriers within specific organizations, each university at large, and across the universities. I then compiled themes by reading the highlighted text across interviews, allowing for further data analysis and findings, which will be discussed in the following chapters.

In the initial data analysis, I found emerging themes of experiential knowledge, institutional betrayal, and trauma healing. These themes led me to explore the work of Spade, Smith and Freyd, and Cho in depth to sharpen my insights on my findings. It is through Spade's work on administrative violence that one begins to see how these systems of power and situational knowledge influence the experiences of survivors on a macro-level. This analysis operates as a starting point for conceptualizing the data trends present in the thesis findings. As asserted earlier, in defining the concept of "state violence," which one can connect to Cho's conception of generational hauntings, and Smith and Freyd's theorizing of institutional betrayal, Spade states: "They [marginalized communities] have exposed that state programs and law enforcement are not the arbiters of justice, protection, and safety but are instead sponsors and sites of violence" (21). The following chapter builds on this notion of state violence replicated in universities to explore main themes raised in the interviews, and draws from interviews to highlight the importance and power of the personal voice. By utilizing the works of Spade, Smith

and Freyd, and Cho to sharpen previous theoretical gaps in the conversation on campus sexual assault, I hope to both better inform and discover new knowledge for better supporting queer, trans, and non-binary survivors.

CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS

Introduction

In listening to the respondents, I found that each survivor expressed feelings of betrayal, particularly by the campus entities charged with protecting and supporting them as university students. In this chapter, I explore what the interview data suggests, in response to my research questions: (1) How do the identified universities (Oregon State University and the University of Oregon) replicate or deviate from the current U.S. climate surrounding campus sexual assault? And (2) In which ways can these universities better support queer, trans, and non-binary survivors of sexual assault? As stated in the previous chapter, the data were informed by community-based participatory research methods, establishing a collaborative approach to data collection and dissemination. In order to center survivors' voices in both identifying university gaps in support and highlighting survivor-suggested improvements to services, I prioritize direct quotes and personal narratives that arose from the interview series. In this chapter, I begin with a brief overview of overarching key findings from the interview series. I then explore the main themes identified in the interviews, all of which focus on elements of institutional betrayal. This chapter synthesizes narratives of queer, trans, and non-binary survivors and provides a more comprehensive understanding of how institutional gaps in services have led to additional hardships and secondary trauma. Additionally, this chapter offers recommendations for improvement to services that arise directly out of the interview data. Themes addressed in this chapter for university improvement include: visibility and outreach, institutional reflection, counseling and student health intervention, queer and trans care, education, and healing. Though I assert my own claims and recommendations, in resistance of researcher-participant power

imbalances, it is critical to recognize that these conclusions are wholly a community effort between myself and the survivors who participated in the interview series.

As stated in the previous chapter, research was conducted in collaboration with three individuals who attended Oregon State University (OSU) or the University of Oregon (UO). All participants in the interview series are between the ages of twenty and twenty-five, and were assaulted during their first year of college. All participants lived in university housing during the time of their assault. Each participant experiences mental health needs, including anxiety, depression, and PTSD. Further, all participants took a leave of absence from school or withdrew from the university altogether. Participant one, pseudonym Adrien, shares their experience during their time at OSU. Adrien, who identifies as a “white-identified individual with Native ancestry,” also identifies as a gender non-conforming or gender-fluid bisexual individual, and uses female/feminine pronouns. Participant two, pseudonym Nyx, also narrates their experience with OSU. Nyx identifies as a white, bisexual woman, and uses she/her pronouns. Lastly, participant three, pseudonym Camille, who attended UO, identifies as a Latina woman and uses she/her pronouns. In exploring the histories of these three survivors, I discuss the following themes: Campus Social Scripts, University Counseling Resources, (Hyper)Medicalization of Survivors, Withdrawal from the University, Judicial Processes, Survivor Advocacy, and the need for Intersectional Services.

Campus Social Scripts

The first theme I identified through the interview process was campus social scripts surrounding survivors. I position this as the first essential theme in beginning to understand how and why survivors are underserved on both OSU and UO’s campuses, as the following themes

arise out of the social frameworks survivors observed and experienced during their time at the universities.

For all survivors, whether or not the assailant was known prior to their assault directly influenced their desire, and ability, to access resources. In the case of Camille, her assailant was a stranger—the roommate of the friends she stayed with the night of her assault. She shares:

I think if he wasn't a stranger, if he was a friend or someone that I knew through something I was involved with, I probably wouldn't have wanted to advocate for myself so adamantly. I think since it was a stranger it made it a lot easier to report and go through this whole process. I think if it was someone that I knew, I don't think I would have.

Certainly, Camille's assertion reflects the experience of the other two participants, who chose not to proceed with the reporting process. For Adrien, one of her assailants was a friend she had known since earlier in the year that was a well-liked "harmless fellow" supported by those around him. Adrien's second assailant was a friend of the first, and less well-known by Adrien. Adrien describes the second assailant as having gone through a lot of trauma herself, and someone who sought out support in their friend group, something Adrien viewed as harmless—until the assault. For Nyx, her assailant was more well known. When describing her assailant, Nyx poignantly shares:

I did know the assailant. He was my boyfriend at the time. That did affect my ability to access resources because I didn't know that I had to. I didn't know that intimate partner violence was a thing ... Because he was my boyfriend, I don't think he knew that he was being violent or non-consensual even though I definitely was just like "why is this happening," crying, or just like being under the influence and just not asking. Or

sleeping. There are a lot of things that blow my mind, like how could he have not known that it was inappropriate to do? But at the same time, I guess I didn't know that it was inappropriate. I definitely felt uncomfortable about the situation- but I didn't realize how severe that was because it was a relationship.

Nyx's reflection propelled us into a conversation that I would identify as a larger theme of social scripts directed toward the very definition of "survivor" on university campuses, as well as who can claim that identity. For Nyx, she herself did not identify as a sexual assault survivor until around six months after her breakup with her assailant. She describes the experience as a "very upsetting" realization, in part due to the fact she had never learned that intimate partner violence and assaults within relationships exist. In fact, the only "lesson" Nyx recalls receiving on sexual assault was a skit put on at OSU's Welcome Week that included no explicit lesson on topics of sexual assault. She describes it as being very "stereotypical" in that it did not show any diverse representations of gender or sexual identity, nor did it display that assaults can occur within partnerships. Instead, she shares that the skit upheld university stereotypes of survivorship: The scenario took place at a frat party, the assailant was "always a stranger," and the overarching message involved things "women can do to stay safe around men." She reflects:

There was no responsibility taken [by assailants] and it was really just like 'you need to be with your friends,' or 'you shouldn't pick up any drink that's just out there because maybe there's date rape drugs in them.' What else? 'Say no!' I think that was a thing too, like really make sure you're the one that's saying no.

She relays the experience as "very strange," especially because there was no de-briefing upon conclusion of the skit, and "no room for discussion." She summarizes her experience of the event, stating "it was like they shuttled us into LaSells and it was a theater-type [performance] so

it was just us watching what they were trying to throw at us...and we're just like 'what the fuck just happened?' and then we left."

As shared above, Nyx did not identify as a survivor of assault until six months after breaking up with her assailant. Nyx's original reflection may have been impacted by not receiving university education on the prevalence of intimate partner violence and partner assaults. Nevertheless, by becoming an advocate herself, she has made tremendous progress with her healing and ability to name abusive behaviors, stating the following about survivorship and the all too common narrative of "good survivors" practicing fight or flight:

There's a huge misconception that it is the survivor's fault because maybe they didn't say no or they didn't fight back hard enough or whatever reason but like, you could fight or flight—that is a normal response. But a lot of the time in sexual assault situations it's freeze because first of all you're shocked that it's even happening in the first place. Your body is doing the best that it can at the time with the resources that it has to keep you safe.

Particularly powerful to me is Nyx's emphasis on the physical manifestation of sexual assault, and the body's response being based in the best safety it can provide. Building upon this discussion on societal expectations of survivors, Nyx reflected on her feelings of not sharing her case publicly with those in contact with her assailant, stating:

So definitely with people in a relationship with the person that abused me I do feel really guilty because, like, you want other people to know that this person doesn't know what consent looks like. Or feels like they need to be really powerful in a relationship that they put people down...and like, you don't want that to happen to other people. I don't know

if I still feel guilty, probably a little bit, but back then I was like ‘I need to tell these other people that they need to watch out.’

This began a discussion on the broader narrative of invisibility and disbelief amongst bystanders, which Nyx tied back to her experience as a survivor of intimate partner assault. Nyx believed that telling a person in a new relationship that their partner is an assailant would be met with resistance and a social script of a “jealous ex.” She shares “that’s not something I think that they would really hear,” going on to process that social scripts instead practice disbelief toward survivors, making them out to be mad at being broken up with, or upset and jealous of a new partnership. In disclosing survivorship to current partners of assailants, she states, “I almost don’t think it even matters,” arguing that a lack of education on partner assaults results in a social script of disbelieving ex-partners who come forward to share their story.

Adrien described a similar experience of not knowing what to do after their assault due to a lack of institutional education and direction on what to do after an assault, as well as who assault can happen to. She states, “It was the same year when the mattress scandal happened [at Columbia University]. So it was only spoken about by students, really. We knew that the frat houses were not to be trusted. That was the other part.” In Adrien’s case, narratives surrounding her identity as a bisexual individual impacted her experience even while the assault was occurring. She shares: “I felt intense shame through a lot of it because I was bisexual, like, there was this part of me that, like a cultural narrative that said ‘you should enjoy this’ or something... and I wasn’t...because the faculties were not within me to say no at any point.” After their assault, Adrien recalls the following:

I remember doing the thing that you see in all media: getting into the shower and completely disassociating, uh, because I was just so shocked that such a thing had

happened...and like so close to where I made residence. Where I lived. It was on the same floor that I lived at the time...and they were my friends. I didn't feel like people would believe me. I didn't know if I should tell anybody.

Not knowing who to tell, where to turn, or what to do following sexual assault became an overarching theme within the interview findings. After deciding how to approach resources, each survivor found themselves in contact with university counseling services.

University Counseling Resources

Participants Adrien and Nyx both discuss the lack of mental health resources at OSU, as well as the lack of survivor competency present at OSU's Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS). Nyx was introduced to CAPS through general resources suggesting where students should go to seek health-care. Being an out of state student, Nyx shares "I always wanted to make sure I was healthy so I was like 'better go to this place all the time!'" Nyx recalled that her introduction to CAPS was not ever promoted as a service for survivors, but recommended to individuals facing broader mental health issues and stress. She reflects on a barrier in this mentality, stating, "there needs to be something said for survivors needing mental health help." Adrien echoes this fact, stating that OSU "didn't seem to have a lot specifically tailored for survivors of sexual assault," at their time of attendance, but did make it clear that there were psychological resources available on campus. They state:

The first clue that there were pretty extensive psychology resources was before I even stepped foot on campus. They tried to put that in the hands of freshmen that that existed ... It was done through some of the physical stuff that they handed out to prospective members of OSU ... I knew from the first meet-up of when I went there with my parents that there were services.

Unlike in high school when they felt that nothing could be done by teachers or administrators to help them, Adrien shares that college made it evident that resources existed through events such as freshman orientation, which gave an overview of services included with tuition. Adrien mentions that while they would not necessarily recommend OSU's counseling and psychological services, their services are better in a crisis situation than what the broader Corvallis community has to offer. That being said, they caution against the following: "[bear] in mind that it's a very traditional treatment methodology that they go by, so if people aren't into that, it might not be for them." Both Adrien and Nyx expressed concern with CAPS' services. They perceived that CAPS had an "invite only" mentality for specific support groups, skepticism toward and dismissal of survivors, lack of personalized care, and wrongful focus on short-term solutions to long term problems.

Adrien reflects on this short-term solution bind by highlighting the sheer volume of students accessing CAPS, and the staff's inability to meet the tailored needs of students:

They had such a volume of kids with anxiety disorders that didn't get to come in on a regular therapeutic basis, but having short-term therapeutic solutions...it was crazy. It was very packed all the time. So, it was a short therapy session and I was just trying to like, tell them all the really messed up things that had happened in the time I had been there.

Adrien's powerful statement on trying to process through the entirety of their experience in a short session leads to further reflection on CAPS' services. At the time of her assault, Adrien was still seventeen, and technically underage. When Adrien initially sought out CAPS, she was met with a response of victim blaming that left her not only considering if her personhood attracted abusers, but that she should not access resources for fear of getting in trouble. While she accessed many psychology resources through CAPS, and psychiatry resources as well through

Student Health Services, she mentions being dissuaded from moving forward with her personal experience as a case of sexual assault because she was under the influence at the time of her assault, and felt that the university would put the liability on her. She shares: “I had to get up the gumption to take myself to student services where they would then tell me that, like, I shouldn’t file any complaints or anything, uh...and then I was, I don’t know, it seemed like a bigger issue that I had been doing drugs on campus, honestly.” Adrien reflects on the impact of this response and its impact on her willingness to access resources by stating that in that same juncture, the university was discouraging her from reporting and accessing further resources through their implicit statements of disbelief and shaming. Nyx shares a similar experience, in which accessing CAPS for anxiety led her into discussing sexual assault, and her frustration with the quick dismissal she received:

I told a counselor there that I was sexually assaulted ... they told me to go to the Academic Success Center and learn how to manage my time ... But weirdly later, the counselor I was seeing that I didn’t really like asked me when we were going to start talking about the hard stuff. And I was like ‘what the hell are you talking about?’ because every time I walked into an appointment with her she would lead it to where she thought would be a good thing, which was really just being better at school, and like, kind of my anxiety. So, I was really thrown off by that question, and she was just like ‘oh, well this is your fault that you’re not talking about your experience.’

Nyx goes on to say that this encounter of being told it was “her fault” for not talking about what happened to her was her first experience with counseling. In addition to that jarring statement, she recalls that her therapist opened their first session together with the statement “you’re going to hate me.” Nyx shares that this was a “weird” experience to her, as she believes a therapist-

patient relationship should be based in comfort from the vulnerability it requires to open up to someone. She shares that she attempted to re-frame her discomfort by considering that the therapist might have meant she was going to push her to accomplish difficult things. She states, “that’s kind of how I took it afterwards because I didn’t want to hate this person. This is the person that was supposed to help me...but she was right, I ended up hating her, but not for the good reason she thought that she was promoting.”

In both instances, survivors temporarily halted their attempts to access resources. Nyx explains that the incident above led her to quit meeting with their therapist. While they continued attempting to set up appointments, Nyx also kept missing them. Nyx states, “I didn’t know that I was doing it on purpose but like, I just think it was because I didn’t feel comfortable with her ... I didn’t really know what the relationship was that I needed to have with a therapist because she was the first I saw more than once.” This experience of discomfort upon disclosing a sexual assault extends beyond OSU. Camille, a UO student, shares that at the time of her assault, she had “no clue or indication that there were any services at all to use in terms of for survivors of sexual assault.” Upon taking a step to access counseling resources at UO once she heard about them, she shares the following experience:

I went to see a nurse practitioner at the University Health Center and she met with me and took down notes and took notes about my health at that time and um, anxiety and depression, PTSD diagnosed. The counseling was for a few weeks, and then I just didn’t feel very comfortable anymore going there because it didn’t feel very personal and sometimes you just don’t vibe with your counselor ... I knew it was very necessary for me to go and talk about it and get help and figuring out what actually happened and what I was feeling in my body so I knew I needed to talk it out and that was helpful, but trying

to establish a relationship with her and trying to feel very comfortable it wasn't that helpful.

Camille's experience helps to illustrate a complex decision survivors often have to make in deciding if continuing care that does not meet one's needs is better than receiving no care at all. Throughout our conversation, Camille made it clear that while she knew she *needed* help, the aid she received was less effective due to her discomfort with her counselor. In addition to negative experiences with one-on-one counseling interactions, one survivor focused on the impact of counseling-led support groups. Adrien explains that while it was expected in many support groups offered through CAPS that survivorship would be a topic, many were coordinated by psychiatrists and operated as a sort of invite-only, not widely advertised support network. She explains that one specific service offered through CAPS that gave her "any faith in returning whatsoever" was a specific trans and non-binary support group. While Adrien shares that it was very small with "trepidatious members," she reflects on the group as a "good environment to safely express and explore gender outside of classrooms for Queer Studies." Adrien came to learn of this resource after being referred by another service provider within OSU, mentioning that in order to join the group, or learn of its existence, one needed to have an "in." While this referral-only process may help with maintaining group confidentiality, the lack of advertisement may serve as a barrier those who do not wish to come out to an advisor without the assurance of resources. Adrien shares the following about their experience as a gender non-conforming student accessing resources at OSU:

Following my assault, I felt very uncomfortable female presenting out in public anymore. I felt compelled to explore the strictly masculine part of my gender identity so I went by male pronouns for a while and was even interested in top surgery...but in order to go

anywhere with that, I had to do a specific amount of therapy with a specific amount of psychologists and psychiatrists, had to come away with a definitive diagnosis of gender identity disorder, and then I had to shell out a bunch out of pocket if I wanted to ... so I was discouraged at literally every step, but in order to proceed whatsoever, I had to go to group therapy.

That group therapy was the queer and trans support group Adrien described above. Most striking to me was Adrien's emphasis on survivorship beyond assault, and the importance of remembering marginalized bodies as constantly subject to violence, often resulting in increased resiliency. Adrien states:

The survivorship [other students] talked about were mostly things they had survived before they ever came to college. So, if things happened in college, they were vastly overshadowed by events that had already occurred. Honestly, that was my experience too. Even though I was assaulted in college, it still didn't match up to what my upbringing was like, so I was able to bounce back a lot faster.

When asked to reflect on queer and trans inclusivity and resources beyond this specific support group, participants alluded to a key finding: queer representation was sorely lacking. Both Adrien and Nyx discussed how their resource access overlapped with the groundbreaking marriage equality vote, which, while initiating a shift in campus culture, had not yet impacted OSU's resources beyond small visual aids. Adrien shares the following about visual-markers of safe spaces: "those were just popping up when I was coming in. There were lots of rainbow flags and, you know, pink triangles to symbolize that psychiatry was beginning to become inclusive of the queer community but that was just beginning that year." Nyx echoes Adrien's observation, sharing that "at Student Health Services the nurse that I was seeing had a rainbow sticker on her

door so I knew that she was queer friendly. I didn't really see that anywhere else though."

Instead of taking measures to enhance the inclusivity of services provided by the university, the three respondents expressed that the services they accessed seemed to be based in a mentality of short term care. Further, all participants expressed concern that there were not enough intentional resources for survivors and queer, trans, and non-binary students. While short term care and absence of inclusive resources were focal points in accessing counseling resources, through the continuation of my findings, I found that this issue extended far beyond campus counseling services.

(Hyper)Medicalization of Survivors

In addition to the instances of institutional betrayal described above, all survivors discussed a more nuanced form of betrayal through the experience they had with accessing university psychiatric services. Each survivor highlighted a trend within university-provided mental health services: hyper-medicalization of survivorship. When summarizing campus-based psychiatric and medical services, Adrien states the magnitude of the problem:

It's hard because the problems are the problems that are also faced in the medical community at large. It's a really specific intersection of college world and medical world, you know, so there's attitudes from both brought into it, which means that it's probably more progressive overall than general medical care ever will be. That's a positive...just because of the conversations already happening on campus.

While Adrien's reflection helps provide insight to how prevalent a "medicine first" mentality is within the United States, Adrien also acknowledges how universities can initiate a proactive response. Due to the recent increase in university-based conversations surrounding mental health, intervention that moves away from hyper-medicalization and instead prioritize alternative

forms of care may be more well-received on university campuses. While conversations surrounding mental health were indeed happening at the university level, I noticed two facets within survivor's post-assault experiences when accessing psychiatric aid: heightened mental health symptoms, and over-medicalization.

Mental Health Symptoms

In addition to direct mental health concerns I explore below, each survivor mentioned the impact of secondary trauma: fear of seeing their assailants again was an overarching theme amongst interviewees. I call attention to this because of its direct impact on mental health and everyday quality of life. For one participant, this experience occurred after seeking out their assailants, which occurred even before accessing resources. Adrien recalls talking with her assailants two or three days after the assault occurred, because she wanted to discover whether or not they knew she had been inebriated. While one assailant said that he did not know, the other said she did not care, and even proceeded with an attempt to grab Adrien again during the encounter. For Camille however, her run-in with her assailant was an unexpected, jarring encounter much like a nightmare. She shares:

I actually ran into him in the library and I mean, it was a quiet place and I walked past him and it was just like, the scariest moment of my life because he gave me the dirtiest looks and just like, his face was full of anger and full of hate ... you could just feel it. The energy changed in the room, and the way he stared me down...it was so scary. I turned and went through a different way and I thought that maybe he was going to follow me but I had to run out of the library and I didn't care who was watching. I just like ran out of there.

While Nyx's encounter with her assailant was also a surprise, it reveals an overarching flaw within the university regarding access to education. Upon attending her first day of class, Nyx discovered that her assailant was enrolled in the same course, something she had vehemently been trying to avoid stating that it "freaked her out." Nyx's emphasizes how scary it is to face the uncertainty of running into your assailant while completing schooling by sharing the following:

I was only able to go to this class because I made my friend and my boyfriend come to the class with me so that there wasn't any confrontation and so I could feel safe and it was a distraction away from the already distraction. But I wouldn't have been able to focus in that class knowing he was sitting not far behind me.

In addition to this classroom instance, Nyx describes the experience of no longer accessing shared-spaces out of fear of further interaction. She explains that, outside of the fear that stemmed from potential run-ins on campus while trying to keep up with school, she felt unable to "get involved" with the social aspects of campus culture. While she had worked hard to find a club or community to engage with on campus freshman year, her abuser's increasing presence and leadership in the group made her feel extremely uncomfortable at the thought of continuing her engagement with the activity because she did not want to see him. She states, "I didn't want to interact with him ... I was like 'well, this is never going to happen again- a fun thing on campus that I liked to do'—I didn't feel comfortable doing that." Nyx's decision to stop participation in order to avoid her assailant reflects the burden survivors often face in compromising parts of themselves to avoid further trauma. Whether that compromise results in disengaging with academics, friend groups, or hobbies, its impact can be incredibly detrimental to one's healing and mental health, as it requires processing a secondary loss.

As mentioned previously, each survivor found themselves experiencing additional mental health needs after their assault, whether as a result of internal processing, or fear of the external (such as running into their assailants). Often, post-assault trauma brings to the forefront mental health needs survivors did not know existed; others face heightened symptomatology for diagnoses they already had. For some, it is difficult to even identify the source of one's mental health concerns. Adrien calls attention to the lack of clarity in identifying this "source," stating: "I don't have any clear idea of where the somatization of my PTSD begins and where my other physical problems begin." For Nyx, their experience with sexual assault left them with heightened mental health needs which they are still unraveling to this day. While Nyx did not access any assault-specific resources immediately after their assault, they identified with indirectly seeking care due to their mental health problems that ensued afterward. Nyx shares that while they identified with having anxiety before "the situation," they had only experienced one panic attack in their life, and would say that their symptomatology increased "tremendously" following the assault. Over the past four to five years, Nyx expresses having "too many panic attacks to count." In our interview, Nyx describes the sheer range of panic attacks she has faced, grouping them into non-physical, cyclic thoughts, compulsory flashbacks, "medium" panic attacks in which she cannot breathe, feels like her heart is exploding, and cannot stop shaking, and "very violent" panic attacks in which she "actually feels like [she's] going to die." Nyx also reflects on symptoms she did not previously identify as tied into her assault, including her history with an eating disorder. She shares that while it was lying "pretty dormant" prior to the assault, something she did not realize until later was how the aftermath of her assault propelled it into full force. This reflection led us into a very powerful discussion on mental health's impact on school, as Nyx highlighted how experiencing violent panic attacks directly impacts one's ability

to attend classes, as the exhaustion that comes with them is often too much to bear. Nyx also led us to a conversation on mental health needs that arise after an assault that were not previously a concern: For her, navigating developing depression, PTSD, and suicidal thoughts were all previously uncharted territory, but now something “incredibly scary” that she has been forced to navigate.

Both Nyx and Adrien reflect on their inability to accomplish tasks in the aftermath of their assault due to mental health challenges. Adrien shares that their dorm “became such a horrible mess” because they were “too mentally ill” to make it as clean as they would have wanted for a guest to enter their dorm, going on to say “I just gave up after a point, because I gave up on myself, so cleaning would follow.” Nyx echoes this mentality, calling upon her low self-esteem after her assault, and feeling like she was a “worthless person.” As a result, Nyx asserts that she did not take care of herself because she “didn’t think [she] was worth it.” While she has improved upon these barriers through counseling, Nyx shares that it was incredibly confusing realizing that these newfound traits she had been trying to deal with separately outside of her identity as a sexual assault survivor were indeed tied together. She asserts that this realization was even more confusing when the providers she decided to tell at CAPS “do not decide to connect that together.” Instead, Nyx advocates for a shift in provider-care that addresses how mental health issues often stem from one thing, and the importance of treating them from the source.

Medicalization

Adrien called attention to the over-reliance on psychiatric medicine during our one-on-one interview, which quickly became an overarching finding of the research. When reflecting on psychiatric medicine as a singular treatment methodology, they share:

It's a short-term fix for a lot of survivors of trauma, and they have a lot of the normal symptoms that come with trauma pathologized. It's really counter-intuitive to their care both in the short and long term. Like, normal things like grief and anger and shame and stuff like that "oh, that's anxiety! That's, you have GAD, here's something for that." I'm not trying to generalize, but that's genuinely what I hear every time. I hear of friends that go to get care... That happens to me every time I get care...

When beginning to explore treatment and provider-care for survivors at each university, I learned that the three survivors in this study experience both OSU's and UO's care method as the "treat the symptom now, and the source never" mentality that Adrien describes. Camille shares:

I was offered a lot of drugs and I made a personal choice to not take anything ... They were like 'oh you're depressed you went through a sexual assault here are these medications here are things you can take.' I said, 'that's not going to help me. I want actual tools. I want actual psychology things, tools that you can give me to stop thought processes and negative down spirals.'

Similarly, when Nyx sought out Student Health Services for help with her anxiety, she was prescribed Citalopram, a commonly-administered SSRI for depression, by a nurse. After this, she moved forward with seeking care from a psychiatrist at OSU for her anxiety, as it was getting a lot worse now that she was experiencing physical anxiety symptoms (Epocrates). Nyx shares that since her anxiety was now impacting her ability to attend school, staff at Student Health Services believed that medication was the "best option." Nyx rejects this mentality as fact, recounting that when her psychiatrist believed that the medication was not working, they repeatedly upped her dose. Nyx suggests that a better treatment plan would have included critical interrogation of her medical record, including questions such as "maybe she shouldn't be on this medication" or

“maybe we’re not incorporating therapy good enough” or “what if these symptoms are from something medical and not mental?” Nyx asserts, “there were so many things they didn’t check up on...and they didn’t check the symptoms I was having with the medication, which is something that they tell you to do online.”

During this process, Nyx also discovered that the medication prescribed by Student Health Services included a Black Box Warning, which is the highest-level warning assigned by the Food and Drug Administration for medications with potentially serious side effects (Epocrates). In this case, the warning included a side effect of depression or suicidal thoughts (Epocrates). While Nyx remembers brushing off the warning because she was not experiencing depression or suicidal tendencies at the beginning of her treatment, it resulted in exactly that. Nyx tapered off her medication as a result of the side effects, a process she shares as being just as exhausting and debilitating as the depressive symptoms she was already experiencing. She explains that tapering was “comparable to anxiety where it physically depletes you and you can’t really do anything.” Upon successfully weaning herself off of Citalopram, the psychiatrist requested immediately starting Nyx on a new medication. Nyx was highly opposed to this, being quite fearful of adjusting her body to a new medication if only to experience negative symptoms and another awful tapering process as a result. Nyx’s particular situation suggests the way survivors may be written off and disbelieved by service providers, as well as the over-reliance on Western medication as a solution to the mental health issues among survivors as a result of sexual assault. Unsurprisingly, for each participant, utilizing medication as the sole form of intervention never proved effective—ultimately, more holistic measures were needed.

Withdrawal from the University

Oftentimes, participants were referred by university psychological or psychiatric services to both academic advisors, and/or Academic Affairs under the guise that it would help improve their mental health. Unfortunately—and perhaps in part due to insufficient services—mental health issues ultimately dictated a withdrawal from the university for the three respondents in this study. Each survivor took a leave of absence from school, or, in the case of two survivors, dropped out of the university entirely. Nyx, who withdrew from OSU on two separate occasions, shares the following:

There's a lot to be said, which I don't think is addressed ever, is when you're dealing so heavily with mental illness—like anxiety, depression—so much of that takes place in your frontal lobe, and when you go to school you kind of need that frontal lobe for critical thinking. I was not even able to answer the most basic essay questions. Like, even on syllabus week when the teacher would ask you online to just give a simple run-down of who you are, I didn't know how to answer that. Like wow—you can't even say what your name is? What your major is? It was just such a difficult task, and not being able to know why and then blaming yourself for that and feeling like you're worthless because you can't do that is like, super frustrating.

Nyx recalls being told by a counselor to seek out the Academic Success Center and learn to “manage her time” to improve her anxiety. Unfortunately, a lack of university action often results in exacerbating the issue. As a result of not being able to have her needs met, Nyx's lack of ability to focus led her to stop attending classes, and seek out online coursework in an attempt to mediate this disparity after withdrawing from fall coursework completely. Unfortunately, Ecampus coursework proved to be just as difficult for Nyx, and as a result, she failed all of her

classes that winter. Due to her withdrawal and flunking coursework winter term, Nyx lost all financial aid, which she relied upon as an out-of-state student already working one job to offset the cost of housing and tuition. As a result of her loss in aid, Nyx had to remove herself from her intended spring coursework. Despite removing herself from enrollment in the university before the term began, OSU processed this as another withdrawal from the university. The flaw in this, Nyx learned during the process, is that students are only allowed to withdraw from the University four times. She shares:

I can't even explain the money anxiety that is behind that...and when you have to appeal multiple times to financial aid to tell them like, this is what's happening and this is why my reason is good enough. Like, proving that you're even going to be better or do better in the future when you're not really sure yourself is incredibly scary...but like, you know you can't live here unless you have financial aid, so the best you can do is hope that you're going to be good enough to go back to school so you can continue living here and getting on with your life because this happened to you four years ago.

Nyx's experience helps draw attention to the hardship survivors face in needing to disclose their identity as a survivor in order to continue attending school and secure housing. She highlights the issue with requiring such vulnerability through sharing the following:

In my appeals, I didn't say I was sexually assaulted because I don't know if it's relevant or if they would care or if they'd think I was just another person lying because I needed money. So, I'm very, very, just like scared to ever include that in my letter...and I think also something people don't understand is how long after something like this can affect you for. So, if I said 'oh yeah this happened to me 5 years ago,' they'll just be like, 'why does it matter now though?' So that's also why I feel uncomfortable telling them that.

Nyx's reflection is particularly concerning in that it highlights a fear of dismissal so deep-rooted that it impacted her ability to request aid. In Nyx's case, social scripts that assert a survivor should feel comfortable immediately identifying to themselves and others that they were assaulted, as well as the belief that, upon disclosing an assault, one is healed and does not have lasting trauma, impacted Nyx's ability to write a more thorough appeal. Not only was Nyx fearful of not being approved for aid, she also expressed fear of being perceived as a "liar" since she did not reach out for help earlier in her education. Nyx's expression of being "scared" to include her identity as a survivor for fear of financial aid employees denying her appeal as a "lie" is particularly important to reflect on, as it showcases that students may be compromising parts of their identity that in reality significantly impact their ability to succeed in school, because they perceive non-disclosure to have better odds in appealing university decisions.

For the other two participants, mental health concerns and lack of comprehensive resources led to complete withdrawal from the university. Adrien managed to "scrape by" their first term with low grades, but was put on academic probation second term. Following that, they were put on academic probation level two for the third time. They state, "I was chewed out by my academic advisors even though I was attempting to convey to them that, you know, things had happened on their campus." They continue: "There aren't ways, there aren't programs, for completing coursework when you're having crises, and uh, it keeps the disabled out of higher education." Adrien's reflection is particularly powerful in that she suggests a link between survivorship and disability. While Adrien shared pre-existing disabilities during the interview process, her experience with heightened PTSD, depression, and anxiety following her assault insinuates that the ramifications of sexual assault are in itself disabling. This powerful connection between survivorship and disability helps suggest how a lack of mental health

resources may exacerbate one's desire to withdraw from the university. This was exactly how their time at OSU concluded, as Adrien chose to remove herself from the university upon completion of her first year, in favor of educational settings outside of the academic industry.

For Camille—who had to re-enroll fall term in order to hold a trial hearing—transferring to another university was an incredibly positive experience. She explains, “I got permission from my professors to take my finals early, and I told my roommates that I no longer felt safe on the campus and that they didn't really care about me as a student and that I needed to leave and move.” Upon leaving, she shares, “moving felt very good. Moving was my resource. Leaving that place and knowing that they weren't going to be getting any more of my money and any more of my talent, any more of my skills, and me as a student—that felt good.” While Adrien and Camille's academic journeys vary greatly—with one leaving the university system and the other transferring to another institution—both experiences offer extremely powerful reflection. For Adrien, removing herself from formal university education allowed her to reclaim ownership over her learning process by prioritizing the topics she most authentically cared about, including the impact of PTSD on non-normative bodies. Conversely, Camille was able to pursue her right to higher education by enrolling in a new university that did not evoke memories of trauma and feelings of betrayal. Examining these experiences in comparison with one another allows for a powerful reflection on the importance of survivor ownership over their educational pathway.

While Camille's ultimate departure from UO aided in her healing as a survivor, the process of coming to closure with the university through her trial hearing was an absolute nightmare. I examine Camille's experience with the judicial process at her university in the next section.

Judicial Processes

Upon examining the judicial side of survivor justice, many institutional flaws emerge.

Nyx, who chose not to report, identifies several of those flaws:

Lawsuits are incredibly intimidating and a lot of the time they don't turn out positive for the survivor, and I definitely did not want to go through that. It takes a long time...you have to explain your whole story again against the word of the abuser, and unfortunately, it's like a 'he said she said' situation because a lot of the time there's not really any hard physical evidence that would be able to prove to people that this really happened...and it's really frustrating that survivors have to work so hard to get people to believe them.

While only one participant chose to report their case, just by examining her personal experience, I identified major gaps in the following services: Title IX, UO's student fee distribution, and trial hearings. For the purpose of this theme, I draw from Camille's narrative of her own trial hearing. To begin identifying this vicious cycle, it is easiest to start with the background process leading up to the trial. Upon deciding to pursue a trial hearing, Camille had to meet with UO's Title IX Coordinator, relaying her story while both notes and audio recording were documented. After providing transcriptions that Camille approved, transcripts were sent to multiple offices, including the Dean of Students and the University of Oregon Police Department. Camille was not, however, informed that this distribution would occur when she provided her story, or when she approved the transcriptions. Despite this, Camille states, "I had to keep re-telling my story even though it was sent out." After this, Camille met with the Director of Community Affairs and Student Conduct, and was given a packet of about 100 pages on the process of holding a trial hearing and reporting process. Camille was also given a copy of UO's Student Conduct Code by

the Title IX Coordinator, complete with highlights of terms and identifying where the assailant violated student conduct.

After filing her case, Camille began the search for an advocate. She shares a shocking fact that came to light at that time:

There's a campus resource at University of Oregon that's basically for students if they get convicted of a crime or breaking student conduct code and only students who are defendants can use that resource: not plaintiffs. But it's a resource that every student pays their student fee for the campus, you know? And it goes to the ASUO, and then the ASOU decides who gets funding—which clubs and which things get funding. And so, it was funded—this legal resource was funded by the ASUO student fee. So, my student fees went to a lawyer that could protect the defendant in a sexual assault case, but I couldn't use that resource.

After coming to this awful discovery, Camille searched tirelessly for an advocate of her own to help her with the trial. Camille had to personally reach out to law professors and professors outside of UO's law program to see if someone would be willing to advocate for her, pro bono. Eventually, she was able to find a professor who had worked on a similar case—and won. According to Camille, both she and her law advocate were very confident about the trial going in their favor, with her law advocate even stating that she was confident the assailant would be kicked out of school, and felt “very strongly” that they were “definitely going to win this case.”

Over summer, the Director of Community Affairs and Student Conduct sent a notice to the assailant and his parents notifying them that the student was being accused of sexual assault and breaking the Student Conduct Code, which included Camille's identity as the plaintiff in the case. Unsurprisingly, Camille's assailant met with the legal resource on campus paid for through

UO's funds, utilizing the very resource survivors pay into but cannot access. Camille then discovered that her transcription was sent to the assailant, who was able to request a copy of the record. In doing so, he accessed the entire narrative Camille shared with the Title IX Coordinator. Camille reiterates the problem with this disclosure, stating, "he had a whole summer and a month after that to come up with a whole different story, and to use it against me in the trial hearing."

While Camille's assault happened in May, her trial hearing did not occur until that December: more than half a year later. She shares:

It happened in May and they told me that they can't do a trial hearing and turn it around that fast before the end of the school year because the school year ended in June. So, they said that I needed to return to UO in the fall and still be a registered student so that I can go through a trial hearing with this guy, and that they weren't going to conduct any in the summer.

As a result, Camille was left with an impossibly difficult decision of how to move forward: She could either forego her trial hearing and, with that, her desire to seek out legal justice, or elect to spend another term at a university that had repeatedly provoked emotional pain. She states:

I had to decide and make the decision, 'okay I really want to get justice for this so I'm going to stay at this university.' So, I decided to go part-time for the fall because I wasn't going to be able to handle a full-time load of school and I could be a part time student still, pay less money for school, and still get this trial hearing done.

After making the decision to continue with school in the fall, the process of establishing a trial hearing panel began. UO chose panel members, but would not let Camille know how the panel was selected, or who would be serving on it. Camille recalls being told that there was a rule

stating trial hearings could not be held until a certain amount of days after the start of the term, resulting in her having to wait over a month into fall term to receive a trial hearing date.

Originally, she was granted a date midway through the term. Then, Camille was informed that one of the panel members could not make the hearing date and they needed to reschedule. No members of the panel could be absent during the trial, and none could be replaced. Camille describes the stress this caused, stating, “I’m trying to have my advocate, the law professor be at my date and she has other dates going on and other dates going on. So, I told her ‘ok! This is definitely the date’ after they changed it three times.” Finally, the Director of Community Affairs and Student Conduct requested that the date be moved to December. Upon hearing this, Camille took action:

They just kept putting it off and off and off and like, I was not a priority and then I finally asked after the third time, ‘what are these excuses that these people are making that they can’t make it to the panel. Is it that they’re going to a wedding? Is it that they’re sick? Is it that they just don’t want to do it? Are they going to a party that night and they don’t want to go through a panel hearing? Can I know?’ And they said, ‘no. We can’t tell you why they haven’t been able to make it.’

At this point, after shifting Camille’s trial date three times, Camille’s law advocate was unavailable for the trial hearing. Camille recalls this scary realization, stating “I had to decide ‘ok I’m going to have zero advocates and will just have to advocate for myself without anyone there to help me. Or, I’m going to have to wait until December.’” After having to put her life on hold for so long to be constantly available for her unknown trial date, she decided it would be best to move forward with the trial hearing in order to mentally prepare for both finals and a huge Nationals athletic tournament. Losing the presence of her advocate, unsurprisingly, was

incredibly jarring. In fact, when the Director of Community Affairs and Student Conduct—who had coordinated the trial—offered to be present in the room with Camille as a familiar face, the assailant’s lawyer attempted to have him removed from the hearing, citing a conflict of interest due to his obligation to the University to help resolve sexual assault cases.

Camille could not even find support or refuge outside the courtroom on the morning of her trial. After seeking out a free massage offered through the University Health Center as a form of self-care in preparation for her trial hearing, she experienced yet another assault at the hands of a UO-provided masseuse. She reflects:

That day. The day of my trial hearing. I got assaulted that morning by the masseuse.

Yeah. And I couldn’t back out of that trial hearing at that point because it had taken so long for me to get a date and even- I just- I couldn’t. I couldn’t push it off again. So, I had to brush it off, pretend like that didn’t happen for that day, and like, check out of that...but it kept bothering me the entire day.

Camille recalls the masseuse asking horribly inappropriate questions for someone who worked at a university-employed health center, including questions about her relationship with her father and boyfriend, what she liked sexually, and stating that he “loves Latina women and really gets off by dark brown skin” while touching her exposed back. She describes the experience as even scarier due to the fact she could not run out without him seeing her body. She states, “I felt very afraid ... I mean, it was horrible.”

Unfortunately, the rest of Camille’s trial date did not get any better, but instead reiterated themes of victim blaming, silencing, and a toxic campus culture. The first barrier Camille faced was the physical arrangement of the trial room. The room was set with four tables, with the assailant facing across from only the panel leader—Camille, on the other hand, was positioned

sitting with the eyes of six panel members staring at her. She recounts, “They were all looking at me and then he was here with his lawyer facing across just one person—just the panel person.” Camille shared that this evoked more nerves and discomfort, as it not only meant all eyes were on her, but structurally, felt as though people were watching her every move as if she were in the wrong. Right off the bat, Camille was met with victim-blaming questions. She reflects on several examples: “‘What were you wearing?’ One of the panel members [asked that]. ‘Can you describe what you were doing that evening?’ Which, why is that even relevant. ‘How many parties did you go to that night?’” The question that struck Camille the most was one asked by a student panelist: “‘On a scale of 1-10, how intoxicated were you?’” Shockingly, the leader of the panel found this to be an “excellent” question. At the time, Camille had asserted that the question, which was purely subjective, was not appropriate. She states, “I had said, ‘you can’t really ask that. Everyone’s going to have a different answer. Maybe you can ask what my BAC level was, but you can’t ask on a scale of 1-10 to everybody else.’” Camille proves this point, asserting that answers ranged from four to nine, with the assailant answering a nine; Camille notes that her two witnesses admitted that they found the question to be weird. She continues, “it was a terrible question and it should not be asked in a trial hearing case.”

Being subject to such questions did not stop there. The assailant’s UO-provided lawyer decided not only to use this position to her advantage, but actively participated in rape culture and victim blaming mentality for the entirety of the hearing. Camille recalls that her assailant “didn’t say much at all” in the hearing. She states, “Basically, his lawyer said everything for him, and I said everything for myself...and I didn’t have my advocate there.” As a result of this, she was exposed to countless unacceptable, awful claims against her. One argument the lawyer created was that since Camille has a boyfriend, that she had cheated on her boyfriend with the

assailant and “didn’t want to hear it,” and was choosing to put everyone through a trial hearing in order to not admit to cheating. Going one step further, the lawyer cited the illusory truth effect, a psychological theory arising out of the 1970s that argues if one re-tells the same story repeatedly, they will start to believe a lie as truth (Hasher et. al.). The assailant’s lawyer drew upon this theory to say that Camille had had “such a long time and long opportunity to tell the same story over and over again” that she had “convinced [herself] that that’s what happened that night.” The lawyer failed to acknowledge the reason for the extended delay in holding a trial hearing was a result of UO administration dragging their feet, not Camille.

Despite not being a witness, the lawyer made the argument that Camille had “wanted it,” “asked for it,” and asserted that she “wanted to have sex.” Camille had shared with the panel that she had said no multiple times, and was crying into a pillow, and her assailant agreed. During the trial hearing, the assailant admitted that Camille was crying, “had body language that shows that [she] was not happy and was not excited,” and that she was shaking her head “no.” He further countered his lawyer’s argument by confirming that Camille said she “didn’t want to do anything with him” because she had a boyfriend that she cared about. He asserted all of these things in the trial hearing, in front of the panel. Camille reflects not only the assailant’s verbal confirmation of the assault, but reflects on his body language as well. She states, “The assailant, he looked very guilty the whole time. And he looked very sick to his stomach the whole time.” Most shockingly, though, is the moment when Camille’s assailant admitted in the trial hearing that he did not have a clue as to what consent was. She states, “He said that in the trial hearing: ‘I don’t know what consent is.’ And his lawyer like, grabbed his arm and was like ‘oh my god you did not just say that’—she whispered that to him...and that he didn’t know the law around consent.” With an admission of guilt as seemingly obvious as this one, I was incredibly disheartened yet again to

learn that despite admitting that he did not understand the fundamental definition of consent—yet could identify Camille’s active crying, disagreement, and disgust with the situation—the trial did not end in Camille’s favor.

And so, the decision that was made was that he was found not guilty at all. That he wasn’t going to get any consequences. Nothing. And he got a slap on the hand and the leader of the panel said [to me] ‘you know, sometimes your actions...they can really hurt other people, and you need to be aware of that.’ And that’s it. And the lawyer basically wanted to rub it in my face even more and said, ‘see, lying doesn’t take you very far, does it?’

I find Camille’s experience particularly haunting because it exemplifies how, even when following the exact steps constructed by “good survivor” myths, the institution may still fail to protect survivors. Instead of finding justice, Camille faced additional traumas, arising directly from the university, far beyond what one could expect when seeking “justice.” Camille’s experience is not an isolated one, and is one of the reasons many survivors reject a legal approach in favor of direct survivor resources.

Survivor Advocacy

For those who choose to not report to the university, many often turn to survivor advocacy services on campus, but for Nyx, this option did not fare well either. After hearing about negative experiences with OSU’s Survivor Advocacy and Resource Center (SARC), Nyx states:

It’s really hard to talk about this and not laugh in rage because I don’t understand, because at first when they came out with this I thought ‘okay maybe they’re doing a good thing,’ but seeing the fallout and the failure of the system really just tells me that

they did not do this for the survivor. They did not do this for us. They did this to make themselves as a university look good so they cannot be one of the universities in the spotlight that has such a bad track record with sexual assault survivors. And they can get ‘those people’—I don’t know who ‘those people’ are—off their backs about not trying to cater to survivors. So yeah.

Certainly, this reflection reiterates the important step of authentic, intentional integration of resources on campus. Nyx reflects on attending 2016’s Take Back the Night, which was put on by SARC, an event intended for survivors of sexual assault (Take Back the Night). While she asserts that she knows the event is supposed to be survivor-centered, she calls attention to the over-focus on administrative presence at the event commending OSU for its accomplishments:

I feel like it was supposed to be survivor-centered but OSU came out with all these services and they were very proud. So, most of the time they were talking about how great it was that they had these resources now and really just patting themselves on the back that they did such a good job ... I mean, as a survivor I am thankful that they took steps to go in the right direction, but...I feel like they did it to make themselves look good and that’s why they were patting themselves on the back so hard [at TBTN].

Further, Nyx highlights the impact of focusing on OSU’s PAC-12 ordinance at an event like Take Back the Night (Canzano). While OSU’s zero tolerance policy regarding student-athletes is a step in the right direction, in Nyx’s case, her assailant was not on a sport’s team. This left her feeling frustrated, as it did not help her individual case and took valuable time away from survivor-narratives to, yet again, commend OSU for their “revolutionary” progress. She shares:

It just blew my mind seeing them pat themselves so fucking hard on the back about the services that they implemented and then seeing the fallout later of survivors trying to use

these services and them failing. Them not working. Them not using the services that they implemented properly.

The reflection Nyx shared with me regarding her frustration with survivor resources was particularly impactful because of how many emotions it appeared to produce. It was clear through both Nyx's word choice and body language that this experience left her feeling silenced in a time when she thought she would be absolutely able to seek support. While narrating this experience to me, Nyx groaned, sighed, laughed frustratingly, and, overall, conveyed an experience that clearly generated a lot of anger and sadness. I find this story to be particularly heartbreaking in that it recounts the disenfranchising experience one must reflect upon when recognizing a resource one thought would be essential to their healing process was not as it appeared. Nyx's reflection on the poor implementation of survivor services—even within survivor centers—emphasizes the vital need for institutional reflection and implementation of survivor services that authentically incorporate the individual needs of each student.

Intersectional Services

In talking with survivors, we identified a large gap in intersectional services on university campuses, and found that not many intersectional survivor-based services exist on OSU's or UO's campus. Survivors called attention to the need for services that intentionally and authentically integrate all identities of student survivors, rather than focusing most attention and outreach on survivors who are white, straight, young, able-bodied, cisgender women. When discussing the lack in intersectional services, we focused on: whiteness, pathologization of queer and trans identities, and lack of education surrounding queer and trans identities.

Camille, who identifies as Latina, points out that she was the only person of color present at her trial hearing. The assailant's lawyer, as well as the entire selected panel were all white

women, including professors, administrators, and students. Camille explains that being a person of color in general on UO's campus is already jarring because of its overwhelming white majority, because it results in people of color standing out "a lot." She states,

You feel like an outcast and you feel like people treat you differently all of the time. Or you get like, special treatment which you don't want really because you just want to be seen as equal. So, people get very excited about you being a leader on campus or being involved because you have colored skin and it's—that's just as discriminatory.

She recalls being told by white students on multiple occasions throughout her freshman year: "Oh, you probably got into this school because you're brown. You probably got accepted here because you're Latina and you had good grades so it was a no-brainer for them to let you in." She summarizes this impact, stating that UO did not offer "very many places or spaces where you can celebrate or amplify your joy for being Latina...but almost like, a forcing of assimilation to college culture and to white college culture." When reflecting on the overwhelming lack of diversity in her trial hearing, she says, "Being in a room of all white people that were making the decision—is very hard...because you don't feel like there's anyone that you can identify with in the room, or that there's anyone who can know what an experience is like as a Hispanic or Latina." Her words call attention to the vital importance of survivors being able to see themselves reflected not only in trial hearings, but on campus as a whole.

Calling attention to further nuances of identity representation on university campuses, Adrien shared with me an experience their best friend had at OSU when accessing services. When their friend came out to their psychologist as asexual, the psychologist responded, "are you sure?" Adrien went on to say that after this, their friend did not seek any more services through the university, turning instead to private providers in the community. They recall that at

this time, asexual visibility was also lacking within the Pride Center. Aside from a sign acknowledging asexual and agender identities, Adrien recalls the main focus on campus was “the huge fight” between whether or not the “A” in “LGBTQIA” stood for asexual or ally.

They continue this point by addressing invisibility of bisexual identities on campus as well, stating: “There is a degree of awareness for trans students and for gay and lesbian students, um, bisexuals get bundled in, but they’re not necessarily welcome everywhere. It’s sort of a point of contention.” Nyx echoes a similar experience, sharing that she has been to the Pride Center once, but only once. She explains:

I almost, as someone who identifies as bisexual, which is kind of sad, I don’t feel like I’m gay enough to go to the Pride Center. I know that I am gay enough, but I feel like maybe the people there wouldn’t be as accepting because there is—it’s a known fact in the queer communities, not everyone is like this, but bisexual people are often discriminated against by both straight communities and ‘fully gay’ communities because ‘we can’t decide’ or ‘we’re not full on each side’ or ‘we’re pretending to be cool.’

When speaking to the absence of queer and trans narratives on campus, Nyx states, “we don’t even have to talk about the fact that it’s just not talked about enough in general, but even when it is talked about it’s the glaring stereotype that I just discussed in the [welcome week] skit that they used.” They continue:

So, with talking about it more we also need to make sure that people know that it can happen to everyone of any race, class, sexual identity, sexual orientation, gender, if you’re in a relationship, if you’re not in a relationship, if it’s a stranger or someone you know—I mean, mostly it’s someone you know. There just needs to be more of a diverse approach rather than your typical young, white, pretty girl that’s just too drunk at a party.

Speaking more precisely, Nyx went on to talk about the specific targeting of trans-identified individuals as a result of their gender identity, and the prevalence of hate crimes directed toward queer and trans survivors. Likewise, she discussed the lack of conversation surrounding women-identified abusers, and the abuser's ability to "manipulate" the survivor into thinking abuse is non-existent because of campus social scripts reiterating that "women can't do that" due to a lack of comprehensive education. Nyx's conversation on the lack of discussion surrounding assailants of all genders not only brings into conversations erasure of queer and trans violence, but showcases the ways in which male survivors may be hesitant to come forward and share their experiences. To alleviate survivors' concerns of shame or embarrassment often cited in instances where the assailant is a woman, it is imperative for these discussions to be included in campus education.

When reflecting further on educational gaps surrounding queer and trans histories of violence and survivorship, Nyx shared with me a powerful statistic. She states:

The statistic that I want to talk about that really resonates with me is that both one in two bisexual women and one in two bisexual men have been raped or have experienced sexual violence in their lifetime. That's fucking...that's 50% of men and women who are bisexual that experience that, and that really freaks me out because of me identifying as bisexual and knowing that I'm part of the half that have experienced sexual violence. It really resonated with me and really freaked me out that my community in that sense has experienced that much and that no one talks about it. No one talks about how 50% of both bisexual men and women are targeted that much. When I saw that I was like, 'whoa, I'm part of that statistic.'

Nyx continued by reflecting on the underrepresentation of bisexual identities in conversation surrounding sexual assault, citing a statistic she learned in her human sexuality course that described only a small percent of the population identifying as bisexual. To Nyx, this statistic, much like those regarding trans identities, allows for easier dismissal from the campus community and providers under the guise that those who identify this way are “so small” that it is a minority that does not need addressing. She states, “I have a hard time believing that. Just seeing that statistic I was like wow—that is very concerning and we never talk about that ever.”

When asked about the process of coming out to service providers on campus, Adrien shares that she was never asked directly about her sexual orientation, and would classify her provider’s responses as “ambivalent.” When she did disclose bisexual identity on several occasions, it often became a question of whether or not she was having relations with women. Adrien recalls this question led to an internal dilemma: While she felt as though she should respond “yes” in order to access adequate care, her experience had been non-consensual. Adrien believed this created a barrier to discussing her care, as it required her to disclose her identity as a survivor of sexual assault. Unlike with sexuality, Adrien “tried to be out at every step” with providers about her gender identity as gender non-conforming/gender-fluid. She states “I tried to be honest with my providers and it sort of worked to my detriment, because I was always taught that if I was truthful with my doctors that I would have the most favorable outcome but like, if the years have taught me much, it’s that that’s probably not true.”

Unfortunately, all three survivors identified interactions with counselors and student health service providers that felt unwelcoming. This feeling often resulted in participants feeling they could not truly be themselves, and in several cases, survivors chose to compromise their identities in order to access care. Survivors either practiced non-disclosure, or feared disbelief,

patronization, or dismissal upon sharing their identities. However, each survivor was able to find respite through different entities within the campus community.

Seeking Refuge

While each participant mentioned multiple struggles within the university during the process of seeking support, each also reflected on a space of refuge that aided them in their healing. Connections with supportive faculty and staff on campus, safe transportation to one's living space, and safe housing were essential in seeking refuge. I call attention to the following services in an attempt to recognize campus organizations—and individuals—that are channeling their impact positively, as well as to create an avenue to discuss the importance of survivor-based trainings for the broader campus community.

Two participants reflected on the positive impact professors had in their healing process as a result of providing both validation and leniency with university deadlines. Camille states:

I actually personally told my English professor because that class was a very intensive research/writing class where you spend a lot of time...by myself writing, and that was really hard for me. He, um, was really accommodating and let me turn in my final research project two weeks after it was due so that was great.

Another participant describes impact of having a professor with shared identities, reflecting on how their particular connection with a professor who was open about their identities allowed the participant to feel more comfortable living authentically. Adrien states, “through that particular connection with that professor, I was able to more safely explore my gender identity which was super crucial to my surviving that whole year, and they helped me to understand that intergenerational trauma is really important to address.” Similarly, Camille reflects on the importance of having administrative advocates on the side of survivors. It was only after meeting

with a co-worker in her role with ASUO that Camille was able to finally get UO to commit to an official date for her trial hearing. This individual, who held a role within the Dean of Students, was steadfast in her effort to hold UO accountable, stating to Camille that it was not okay that her trial date kept changing. Camille reflects on this moment, stating, “She helped me make that happen and if I didn’t have her as a resource I don’t know...they would have pushed it until December or January or maybe the next quarter and kept me around...kept pushing it off.”

In addition to professors and other campus advocates, survivors sought out various campus organizations for refuge, including housing access, safe transportation, and identity-validating spaces. Adrien highlighted OSU’s SafeRide as a resource they utilized on multiple occasions since they did not have transportation in Corvallis. SafeRide thus helped a survivor access safe transportation, and in turn, aided them in continuing both their education and access to resources. It is worth highlighting that both OSU’s SafeRide and UO Safe Ride services actively draw from feminist pedagogies to provide trauma-informed care to their employees who interact with survivors in their drives.

For Camille, who had to transfer dorms as a result of her assault, UO’s trauma-informed residential advisors and housing programs were tremendously valuable. Camille recalls needing to move dorms, as living in such tight quarters was difficult because she could not cry, talk on the phone, or do what she needed for her healing process and accessing support because the dorm room was so small. She visited University Housing, and, after sharing her story, was given an individual room. She recalls that the room she moved to was on a floor with lots of windows and natural light, and that the room next door was empty, allowing her to process her story over the phone in a confidential setting. Most importantly, University Housing did not bill Camille extra for the single bedroom. She shares that her experience with the resident director and

advisors was fantastic, and they were the “best staff” in helping with her transitions. She states, “I felt like they were very trained in like, how to deal with survivors and knowing the very realness of living on campus while this happens.” In terms of organizational refuge within the university, Adrien calls attention to the Pride Center, one of the resources independent of the counseling groups they attended. They share: “It was a really nice alcove on campus and it was really close to where I was living at the time so it was pretty convenient on top of that.” Adrien’s experience not only showcases the importance of peer-driven resources that align with one’s sexuality and gender identity, but highlights the important need for making such resources accessible to students by guaranteeing a close proximity to university housing.

Through these specific examples of inclusive campus organizations and individuals that provided a space of refuge, I was able to gain further insight as to what developing more inclusive resources on campus might look like. Discussing the need for compassionate staff, safe housing, and accessible transportation helped transition my conversations with survivors into one based in recommendations for replicating these spaces of refuge, as well as improving university resources overall.

Recommendations

As a researcher and violence prevention advocate, I find the most essential step in advocacy to be making much-needed improvements to existing systems. For this reason, I concentrate this section of the findings on survivor-centered recommendations based within the indications of my findings: Survivor services at OSU and UO were consistently insufficient. In this section, I explore survivor-driven recommendations for the services described above in order to establish action-based goals. In this exploration, I worked with the participants of this thesis to brainstorm intersectional, long-term, healing-focused solutions in an attempt to establish more

authentic, helpful solutions for survivors seeking care at both OSU and UO. In doing so, I assert three spaces for change: language and visual aids, counseling and mental health resources, and campus and peer education.

Language and Visual Aids

When analyzing a broad level of institutional change, respondents repeatedly raised issues of visibility and outreach. Survivors focused on the need for visual markers that display buildings, practitioners, and campus resources as a safe space for queer, trans, and non-binary students. Survivors reflected on newfound frustration with the university after learning about resources that could have been shared with them, but were not at the time of accessing resources. In Adrien's experience, while she knew support groups were likely to have existed for survivors as well as queer and trans students, by not being introduced to them when she first sought out care, she was actively discouraged from seeking further resources. This experience led to feelings of confusion, dismissal, and betrayal. When reflecting on queer and trans resources specifically, participants shared detailed descriptions of where and when they saw "safe space" or rainbow stickers and flags on campus, displaying not only the long-term impact of visible markers of safe spaces for those seeking services, but describing the important need for more.

Additionally, participants requested the use of gender-neutral pronouns by service providers to help showcase how sexual assault can happen to anyone, regardless of gender identity or sexual orientation. Survivors mentioned feeling outcast by service providers who assumed the pronouns of their partners and/or assailants, and asserted that a transition to gender-neutral pronouns could be an easy and powerful shift in helping queer and trans survivors feel more comfortable accessing care. As Nyx brought forward in the previous chapter, it can also be

difficult for survivors to even name that they were assaulted, because of the lack of language and conversation surrounding such dynamics of abuse. For Nyx, non-abrasive language was a big aid in accessing resources, and she shares that a powerful way to harness the attention of those who need to access services could be to provide resources that “check-up” on their relationship. Many of these cards, flyers, and handouts exist online, and do not use language such as “rape,” “abuse,” or “domestic violence,” which can be helpful for those who do not understand what they are experiencing, as well as for those who associate these terms with non-relationship based, solely physical violence.

I assert that in order to show survivors that they are truly supported by the university, outreach materials should be attentive to the diverse and specific identities of students, and acknowledge them in ways that are meaningful. Universities should implement inclusive visual aids such as stickers, pamphlets, and flyers across campus—especially within campus organizations and centers which provide survivor aid—in order to help survivors begin to see their identities reflected in collegiate materials. Not only should these materials incorporate different identities survivors hold, they should recognize the multiplicity of romantic, platonic, and sexual relationships that assault can occur within.

Counseling and Mental Health Resources

Bolstered by the suggestions of the respondents, I argue that both OSU and UO should take more direct action toward providing survivors with counselors who will better meet their needs. In addition to suggestions such as providing confidential feedback forms and training all counselors in the unique needs of queer and trans survivors, participants mentioned several key suggestions for counseling providers. The narratives gleaned from the research revealed that

OSU's Counseling and Psychological Services provides an intake form, but no biographies of their counselors. University counseling centers should consider expanding their intake process to not only directly ask what individuals are hoping to get gain from their counseling experience, but provide a space for individuals to select their desired focus for care. By providing a place on intake forms that focuses on specific needs, students could share if they need someone competent in queer and trans identities, and/or sexual assault response. By implementing this practice, counseling center staff can ensure they match survivors with an appropriate therapist trained in the specific areas of their needs. Further, this practice could help campus counseling employees provide students with tailored recommendations for who will best meet their needs. Additionally, I suggest these services consider implementing an online or in-person resource that shares biographies and specialties of each therapist so individuals can take control of their care and self-select their therapist—thereby preventing discomfort and dismissal. Lastly, survivors mentioned the importance of having counselors and service providers they can personally identify with, and see themselves reflected in; this would include employing staff with a diverse array of racial identities, languages, and physical and mental (dis)abilities, who also uphold queer, trans, and non-binary identities. Such a practice would better recognize and address the intersecting identities of survivors—and of all students—universities employ.

Building off of this, survivors asked for “more therapy and less medical intervention,” and pointed out how, for those experiencing mental health needs, current practices assert a “medicine first, therapy only if you can afford it approach” (Adrien). In short, survivors advocated for educating students about the impact of trauma on the brain, and explaining to survivors why they are exhibiting certain emotions and symptoms, instead of relying solely on medical intervention. Adrien's statement that “if providers can't address any fears that patients

might bring in, then a relationship of trust will never be established” suggests that a more beneficial approach toward care for queer and trans students would be explicitly validating queer and trans identities. Survivors shared that helpful counselors, doctors, and nurse practitioners included those who had warm communication styles, openly validated their sexuality and gender identity, acknowledged their survivor status, and were welcoming toward their mental health needs. By resisting gender identity pathologization, universities can aid in validating the experiences of trans and non-binary students, and increase the comfortability of survivors who hold these identities. Moving forward, I assert that a more beneficial approach toward care for queer and trans students would be to move away from cis-sexism present in traditional medical services. Instead, practitioners should explain to their patients the natural gradient in gender, sex, and gender presentation. De-stigmatizing gender identities and dysphoria is essential for providing better university care, and may increase the likelihood of non-binary and trans survivors accessing resources on campus.

Education

Throughout the interview series, participants reflected on the vast amount of outreach from on-campus organizations and services, and I learned that, while helpful, the process needs a great deal of streamlining. Survivors reflected on the experience of outreach education at first-year orientation, sharing that they were most likely to select the information that was most relevant to them in the present moment—how to get funds out of their student account, where to eat food, and where to get a flu shot—for respondents, sexual assault services were not on their radar. To mediate this, survivors discussed the importance of continuing education on survivor resources. For example, survivors reflected on their life’s conditions being different every term,

and the impact that had on which resources they needed to access. Instead of trying to recall the slew of information shared at Welcome Week, participants proposed that the universities share an all-students email at the beginning of each term to aid in resource accessibility, as well as to remind students of the resources available on campus.

In addition to educational outreach materials, the findings indicate that campus education on sexual assault is in dire need of both design and implementation overhaul. Survivors advocated for more workshops, discussions, and trainings that focus on bystander intervention, survivor support, and consent. I assert that this practice should be implemented for students, faculty, and staff alike. Likewise, I argue that educational tools should take an additional step to address the roots of violence, focusing on relationship dynamics platonically, romantically, and sexually. Since many students enter into college without a solid example of what interpersonal dynamics should look like—as a result of not seeing positive representation in their upbringing, peer, or media interactions—it is imperative that universities take a proactive approach with educating students on these matters. In short, if more individuals gain education on healthy relationship dynamics, it will become easier for friends, service providers, and partners of survivors to provide compassionate advice and a listening ear for those who need to be met with empathy. Throughout this discussion, survivors reiterated the importance of familial and peer support trainings, citing that if their loved ones had education on these topics, they may have been able to spot unhealthy dynamics in their partnerships earlier on. For this reason, I argue that universities must educate students on the dynamics of healthy, unhealthy, and abusive relationship dynamics.

Additionally, universities must prioritize education that specifically focuses on marginalized survivors and identities. Further, it must be recognized that the current violence

prevention techniques do not help people learn about roots of violence. Rather than merely addressing sexual assault through online trainings such as Haven, or a brief conversation during welcome week, universities need to practice education consistently. In developing continuing education, it is essential that universities prioritize marginalized survivors in their programming, to ensure that all survivors have their identities reflected in sexual assault prevention education. By fostering queer, trans, and non-binary politics as a site for coalition building, survivors can find their niche for healing.

Conclusion

Through the themes addressed above, the participants in this study suggest multiple flaws within both OSU's and UO's institutional values and priorities. Through observing the lasting impact of short-term treatments from both campus psychological and psychiatric services, I was able to learn more about institutional practices that dismiss survivors' mental, emotional, and psychical needs. In exploring the impact of trauma on the brain, and consequently on school participation, I was able to identify gaps in services that call for a greater focus in both academic and personal-life support. By examining flaws in two methods of healing—both the university judicial process and survivor advocacy services—I began to question how, even when taking action with services established to support their needs, survivors were met with exorbitant barriers. Lastly, by dialoguing with survivors about the need for intersectional services and places of refuge, I was able to begin my exploration into avenues for healing and reparation.

Institutions must practice continuous self-reflection that does not rely upon students to initiate action. Rather than wait for survivors to come forward and state their barriers in accessing resources, universities must consistently reflect on how they can make improvements with survivors in mind. In reflecting upon the need to create sustainable, systematic change, I

argue that institutions need to practice transparency with those accessing services, as well as conduct internal studies of past instances of abuse and gaps in student-protection services. Further, utilizing the experiences of survivors in relevant studies, roundtable discussions, workshops, and committees is essential. Instead of relying solely on quantitative-based federal studies and online intervention trainings, universities must drastically revise their efforts to include personal voices of survivors. In order to provide constructive resources that truly center survivor voices, universities must implement practices which engage in dialogue with survivors of trauma at each stage of development.

In the next chapter, I call upon the work of Carly Smith and Jennifer Freyd, Dean Spade, and Grace Cho to examine the implications of my findings. I position institutional betrayal reparation, survivor justice, and trauma healing in conversation with the data collected in this interview series in order to identify how universities can begin to move forward to initiate institutional change.

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION

Introduction

In exploring themes of institutional betrayal with participants, I quickly identified major barriers toward accessing university resources. These included, but were not limited to: an absence of queer and trans resource visibility on campus; interactions with service providers who were not trained to meet the needs of (queer and trans) survivors; a lack of comprehensive campus education regarding sexual assault, survivor support, and bystander intervention. Through sharing stories of dismissal, silencing, and injustice, it was easy to identify why survivors did not feel their needs—and rights as students—were being met. The results of this research indicate that queer and trans students experience additional barriers when accessing university resources for survivors of sexual assault.

In the previous chapter, I discussed facets of betrayal including university counseling and health services, judicial services, and survivor advocacy resources. Additionally, I presented survivor-based recommendations for suggested improvement to university resources. In this chapter, I draw upon the theorists from my theoretical framework to synthesize the implications of my findings with feminist and queer theories. First, I call upon Smith and Freyd's arguments to construct strategies for intentional, powerful resistance in the practice of institutional betrayal reparation, that is: the process of improving services for survivors on campus in order to mediate the impact betrayal has had on campus culture. I then present two overarching themes which I analyze through the work of Spade and Cho. First, drawing upon Spade's framing of administrative violence, I examine what institutional transformation might look like in terms of establishing a framework of justice within universities. Drawing upon examples brought forth in the interview series—such as trial hearings and withdrawal from the university—I question if

justice is possible within university frameworks, and begin to frame how that might occur. I then utilize Cho's work on collective trauma and healing to help construct the lasting impact of untreated university-based trauma. In this, I position both patterns of dismissal and suggestions for improvement present in the findings to indicate the powerful and complex ways survivors can become agents of change if the university validates and listens to their experiences.

Institutional Betrayal Reparation

In synthesizing the findings of the interviews with Smith and Freyd's work on universities, it becomes abundantly clear that simply advertising campus resources is not enough, and that failing to address the root causes of violence can be incredibly detrimental. The findings suggest that systematic changes must be made to the manner in which universities approach sexual assault cases, as well as how universities react when narratives of betrayal arise. In addition to focusing on specific acts of interpersonal violence occurring within each case, the findings suggest that institutions must begin to focus on acts of violence more broadly. In doing so, universities obtain the ability to analyze systematic violence across campus, as well as the manner in which institutional betrayal has played into sexual assault casework. In addition to confronting sexual violence through individual cases, the findings indicate universities must examine these cases on a macro level to see that there is a larger epidemic within campus culture. In this regard, Smith and Freyd's literature on the prevalence of universities establishing resources that do not treat the root causes of violence is particularly valuable. It is imperative to recognize that a practice which aims to eradicate institutional betrayal must push far beyond advertising resources such as on-campus survivor advocacy centers and annual Take Back the Night or Sexual Assault Awareness Month events. Instead, it requires institutional changes that

drastically intervenes in the repeated cycle of sexual violence, rather than shifting this secondary trauma into another sector of resources.

Smith and Freyd posit that merely acknowledging institutional betrayal assumes a great deal of risk, as unveiling the hand institutions play in initiating and/or building upon a survivor's trauma relies upon one examining how trusted institutions can produce and reproduce abuse. To solve this, Smith and Freyd assert that colleges and universities must begin to practice "institutional betrayal reparation" by establishing sustainable changes (584). As shown in the findings, I spent a lot of time in conversation with the survivors in this interview series documenting what those changes might look like, and how they could benefit current and future students. Continuing my analysis of Smith and Freyd's recommendations, the findings reveal a need for clinicians, survivor advocates, and mental health providers to educate themselves about institutional betrayal in order to better understand and validate trauma experienced by students both interpersonally and institutionally. Likewise, the findings suggest that universities must implement practices that not only assert survivor voices will be heard, but that their voices will be prioritized in making institutional changes. I argue that it is imperative for universities to welcome and encourage survivors who come forward to share their stories in order to gain a better understanding of what survivors are facing on campus.

Further, the findings reveal a dire need for institutions to begin to authentically protect their students, and confirm their intention to become a safe haven that will support those who have experienced sexual abuse. Additionally, the survivor narratives indicate that the universities are not currently prioritizing prevention and intervention efforts that communicate their commitment toward actively helping future survivors. As asserted in the findings, all survivors withdrew from resources either temporarily or permanently in response to providers who failed

to assert their nuanced understanding of survivor trauma. The findings show that the universities are inadequate in their efforts to ensure both current and future survivors will be met with compassion when accessing resources. To combat this, it is essential that university outreach efforts center the validation of survivors first and foremost, so individuals may grow in their comfortability of accessing resources. These practitioners must, like the institution, practice self-reflection to become a source of supportive healing, rather than perpetuate multi-layered betrayal within the institution. Through implementing these practices, university staff, researchers, and survivor advocates will be able to experience increased understanding of traumatic stress, survivor-centered healing, and institutional betrayal.

Implementing Justice-Based Frameworks

In analyzing the findings—particularly with narratives surrounding access to justice in trial hearings and withdrawal from the university—I was left reflecting upon the work of Dean Spade. As asserted in the Theoretical Framework, Spade’s work helps to argue that in approaching survivor advocacy through a legislative compliance-based model, universities cannot readily meet the nuanced needs of survivors. Instead, the findings indicate that a survivor-informed model is needed. Returning to Spade’s three modes of power (perpetrator/victim, disciplinary, and population-management) helps articulate what it means for survivors to try and seek justice through normative systems. First, Spade’s “perpetrator/victim” model that occurs when a “right” is taken away from the survivor, led me to reflect on how each participant withdrew either temporarily or permanently from the university, effectively revoking their right to higher education (103). Rather than provide help upon request, each survivor faced barriers that negatively impacted their ability to continue their studies. Secondly, Spade’s “disciplinary” mode of power, in which individuals must conform to normative behaviors for survival, made

me consider the lasting impact of Adrien's realization that being honest with their provider (i.e. disclosing their gender identity) would not necessarily lead to better care (104). Instead, Adrien practiced normative behaviors by choosing not to disclose their gender identity in order to receive aid (104). Lastly, Spade's "population-management" model, which occurs when resources positioned as "neutral" classify individuals as the "other," called attention to pathologizing survivors based on "good survivor" narratives (110). Throughout the interview series, each survivor referenced interactions that included victim-blaming language which served to "other" them from those who are perceived as "deserving" care: Camille was interrogated with "what were you wearing?" in her trial hearing, Adrien was asked "why were you underage and under the influence?" by health providers, and Nyx faced dismissal with statements such as "why didn't you come forward sooner?" by counselors. As displayed both by Spade's literature and the findings of the thesis, this present model of a rights-based framework, operating under these three modes of power, is intentionally constructed by those in power, and does not currently serve survivors of marginalized identities. Instead of approaching survivor advocacy through a rights framework, university advocates must shift to one of justice.

While current federal, state, and university-specific intervention strategies often reinforce the institutionalization of violence prevention, Spade calls upon the desire to re-envision avenues of intervention, asserting the importance of both dismantling present power structures and envisioning alternatives to present methods of change. Spade advocates for transformative change through the development of solutions that center the wellness of the survivor and the prevention of future harm through "support[ing] collective healing and accountability" (211). In addressing the root causes of these issues to create concrete goals for political reform, as well as rooting university reformation work in the understanding that meaningful change is created from

those entrenched within injustice rather than a top-down distribution, resources can become increasingly focused with survivor's needs in mind.

As alluded to in the theoretical framework, Dean Spade's work centers on a large-scale reimagining of Western society that eliminates gender hierarchies that contribute to gendered violence, as well as the assumption that there are only two categories of gender. While university counseling providers, advocates, or administrative employees may question why queer and trans survivors, as well as students of color, disabled students, or undocumented students, need specific resources attentive to their identities, reflecting upon this point reminded me of several conversations I had with participants. In reflecting upon this need for authentic integration of marginalized identities, I was reminded of the discomfort Camille felt surrounded by only white people in her trial hearing, how Adrien felt her health care faced wider barriers *after* disclosing their gender identity, and how Nyx expressed fear of disclosing her identity as a survivor of violence when appealing her financial aid status. These findings, along with the broader themes of this study, highlight how, in order to truly provide security and resources to marginalized students, universities must first recognize genders beyond cisgender and binary frameworks, and identities beyond white and able-bodied. In doing so, it is imperative to demand more than mere legal recognition through inclusive campus housing and bathrooms, or the acknowledgement of queer and trans students and survivors through a simple one-time statistic or scenario in advocacy services. In addition to including a glance-over of queer and trans identities at sexual assault prevention trainings, or handing out a flyer narrating that sexual assault can happen to anyone, universities should strive to engage more critically with outreach materials. Instead, these identities must be prioritized, humanized, and authentically integrated into survivor advocacy work at the micro and macro levels.

Through participant reflection on negative interactions with university staff, the findings indicate that universities, and society at large, must participate in consciousness-raising that centers queer, trans, and non-binary histories to inform individuals about structural disparities in an attempt to change this truth. As Spade argues, Western society must implement mass mobilization through fostering grassroots campaigns, establishing a space for shared struggle, fostering new leadership, and “expos[ing] contradictions within systems of control in order to shift gendered paradigms” (39). In short, universities must no longer keep those who are affected by sexual assault out of leadership, but instead both employ and collaborate with survivors in order to create long-term, proactive results. Though this change will not occur overnight—instead, requiring a struggle for generations to come—Spade provides those willing to engage in conversation with a tangible way to begin building a more supportive environment for queer, trans, and non-binary individuals.

Reimagining Institutional Relationships with Survivors

In reflecting upon Cho’s work in connection with the findings, I am drawn to the participants’ allusions to memory, secondary trauma, and access to care. While it is not my intention to equate participants in this study to Korean war survivors, the form of violence survivors face within the institution should be acknowledged as a collective memory that links their experience to Cho’s body of work. This theoretical framework proves to be incredibly powerful and similar in analyzing the data, as so much of the interview content present in this study centers memory and trauma frameworks. In connecting Cho’s body of work with the findings of my research, I was left reflecting upon the impact of PTSD, depression, and anxiety that occur within institutional spaces, and the ways in which this trauma, if left untreated, transforms into a collective, complex spiral. This collective body not only suggests far reaching

implications of trauma for the individual, their community, and their family, but for the university as well.

Cho argues that traditional methods of intervention serve to confine, dictate, and erase expressions of violence by marginalized bodies. She argues that “what gets subjugated, erased, and generated through these forms of knowledge production are the undocumented, illegible, and irrational” (32). I find this to be particularly powerful in connecting to the findings of this thesis, in that it mirrors the experiences of dismissal shared by campus survivors. In reflecting upon this further, I recall the institutionalized tools utilized to erase survivor narratives, including the absence of intentional, specific resources for queer and trans survivors, as well as the invisibility of discussions surrounding partner assaults. Cho states “The apparent absence of violence is the result of another act of violence, such as subjugation or explicit erasure”: I believe this is the same for survivors who are unable to achieve care and justice from the institution (31). Survivors’ trauma gets erased from their personal subjecthood, but also fades public memory within the institution itself. That being said, Cho asserts that manifestations of trauma are far-reaching, and extend beyond the boundaries of any one body. When reflecting on this power of trauma to transcend the individual, she asserts “repetition of trauma ... resists all attempts to erase it from personal and public memory” (Cho 50).

The findings indicate that presently, universities are conforming to both intentional and unintentional attempts to erase narratives of trauma. The survivors’ experiences suggest that universities must instead begin to work with survivors to create institutional change. As Cho articulates brilliantly, a survivor “is a ghost who is not just an apparition of the dead or a melancholic reminder of the past but also a productive and powerful force of the present” (Cho 18). Through implementing the suggestions of survivors, locations of solidarity-building can

begin to construct a counter narrative to this systematic erasure of sexual and gender-based violence, instead creating dialogue about these issues. The findings indicate that engaging in restorative dialogue with survivors themselves allows for better intervention techniques that benefit both the survivor and the university at large. Rather than merely opening up to researchers and getting “stuck” in retraumatization, restorative dialogue may allow for authentically resolving this disparity amongst survivors. Additionally, this active reflection permits survivors to engage with their ghosts in a manner that allows for learning about healing and survival constructively. In doing so, advocates and survivors alike can create modes of resistance that push beyond the presently envisioned solution tactics.

Conclusion: Finding Healing in Trauma

In dialoguing how to move forward after experiences of institutional injustice, survivors reflected on the impact of personal healing and personal closure. Survivors often sought out refuge in communities outside the university, through engaging in practices such as nature therapy, art therapy, and music therapy. In doing so, survivors shared that they regained confidence in their mind, body, and capabilities as autonomous individuals. First and foremost, before taking care of others, survivors discussed the impact of taking care of oneself first. Survivors shared stories of life-course changes as a result of assault, as well as burnout, emotional exhaustion, and guilt over not wishing to center their lives in trauma-informed activism. Participants shared their sense of empowerment and desire to be an agent of change on campuses in the years after their assault, explaining that they discovered powerful methods for healing within activist work. Likewise, survivors reflected on what it looks like to reclaim one's power and agency. Camille reflected on holding space for both the guilt she feels when voicing that she wishes to continue working in the field she is called for instead of dedicating her life to

helping other survivors speak out, and the importance of not letting her assault define who she is. Similarly, Nyx mentioned the importance of survivors knowing and learning their boundaries, and not feeling pressure to take any one-action toward healing. Survivors stressed the importance of regaining control in one's life, and starting small with asserting one's needs. Further, survivors reflected on the need to be patient with themselves throughout their healing process, citing that it requires a great deal of work and reflection for years to come.

The findings of this study indicate the grave need for reformation surrounding university-based survivor resources. The participants in this study helped reveal new opportunities for supporting survivors on both OSU and UO's campuses through developing new frameworks of analysis. The interview series helped inform what more comprehensive, inclusive survivor resources could look like on campus. At the center of this re-structuring should be campus collaboration with survivors and authentic implementation of survivor-based recommendations. Through the work of Smith and Freyd, Spade, and Cho, I integrated survivor experiences with analyses of power, betrayal, and healing to present the implications of findings for this study. Through this discussion, I have analyzed the ways in which universities can improve campus education, outreach, and support for survivors to create more intersectional, long-term solutions.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSION

The community-centered research method applied to this thesis utilized one-on-one interviews to capture the experiences of queer, trans, and non-binary students from OSU and UO accessing resources for survivors of sexual assault on campus. In doing so, this thesis responded to the following research questions: (1) How do the identified universities (Oregon State University and the University of Oregon) replicate or deviate from the current U.S. climate surrounding campus sexual assault? (2) In which ways can these universities better support queer, trans, and non-binary survivors of sexual assault? Though the sample size of this study does not represent the experiences and attitudes of all survivors at these universities, the results of this research demonstrated that each survivor who participated in this study faced multiple barriers when accessing university resources.

The findings of this study show that students faced barriers when interacting with psychological and psychiatric services, judicial services, and survivor advocacy resources. This is likely because of the current social context which has been dependent on large-scale, federal, qualitative-based studies in analyzing gaps in campus resources, rather than institution-based studies with the purpose of improving campus resources. Results also exhibited that failure to provide comprehensive resources for survivors can result in exacerbated mental health needs, increased feelings of betrayal, and even withdrawal from the university. The increase in campus assault education over the past several years through films such as *The Hunting Ground* and the Obama administration's "It's on Us" campaign may have impacted the study participants' ability to name their experiences of campus betrayal and interpersonal conflict with such clarity.

Results also demonstrate that although queer, trans, and non-binary survivors can name the importance of accessing university resources, they still feel uncomfortable seeking them out

in their healing process. This is likely due to survivors' inability to see their identities represented in resources, trainings, and educational services from providers on-campus. Since the survivors interviewed in this study identified as queer, trans, and/or non-binary, I suggest that individuals with these identities face added barriers in accessing resources as a result of the marginalization of queer, trans, and non-binary identities on campus. Additionally, since the findings of this study indicate that survivors' mental health improved when seeking out resources outside of the university—through counseling, nature therapy, music therapy, art therapy, and more—I assert that universities must begin to take a more comprehensive, non-medicalized approach to survivor care.

Future research should continue this work across a multitude of campuses, prioritizing community-based participatory research in its efforts. Rather than rely on solely quantitative-based studies, future studies should attempt to gather as much complex research as possible on survivors facing multiple barriers in accessing resources. In doing so, future studies should continue vital collaboration with survivors, as well as continue to learn from the literature on queer, trans, and non-binary survivors as this area of research grows. In collaborating with survivors, future studies should prioritize a diverse representation of the student population, particularly focusing on gathering data from the experiences of students facing multiple marginalizations. To build upon this study, a more comprehensive analysis of the intersections between gender and sexuality, and race, class, ability status, immigration status, and more should be examined. Further, while this study centers the experiences of three respondents, future research may consider working with a larger participant pool in order to analyze data informed by a wider range of experiences. Future research may also consider interviewing service providers on campus—as was the original intention of this thesis—to gain a more comprehensive

understanding of resources on campus. Lastly, it is essential that future researchers utilize their findings to improve resources on campus by providing their recommendations to the university/universities examined.

Recommendations for both OSU and UO include utilizing the findings of this thesis to move forward with the improvement of survivor resources. These universities should incorporate authentic collaboration with survivors in their practice, and conduct internal studies to determine gaps in services, as well as how to improve upon these gaps in future years. Likewise, universities should improve their campus education surrounding consent, bystander intervention, and survivor support, and should do so throughout the entire academic year, rather than at the beginning of fall term. Service providers could also increase visual markers of inclusivity for survivors holding marginalized identities across-campus, and focus attention toward hiring practices that prioritize working with staff of diverse identities. Lastly, universities must ensure that the practitioners working with survivors are trained in meeting their needs and validating the experiences of queer, trans, and non-binary survivors. At all stages, universities must practice self-reflection, and welcome the experiences of survivors in establishing new practices of sexual assault prevention, intervention, and response.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cantor, David, et al. "AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct." American Association of Universities, 2015. Web. Accessed 1 March 2016.
- "About AlcoholEdu and HAVEN Online Prevention Programs." *OSU Student Health*. Oregon State University, N.d. Web. Accessed 7 March 2017.
- "AlcoholEdu and Haven." *UO Dean of Students*. University of Oregon, N.d. Web. Accessed 11 March 2017.
- American Psychological Association. "Definitions Related to Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity in APA Documents." American Psychological Association, n.d. Web. Accessed 17 May 2017.
- Carter, Daniel. "The Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act." *CleryAct*, n.d. Web. Accessed 28 Jan. 2016.
- Canzano, John. "Oregon State takes stand on transfers, will call upon Pac-12 to follow." The Oregonian/Oregon Live. 30 Nov. 2015. Web. Accessed 16 March 2017.
- Center Against Rape and Domestic Violence*. "About." n.d. CARDV. Accessed 16 May 2017.
- Cho, Grace. *Haunting the Korean Diaspora: Shame, Secrecy, and the Forgotten War*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008. Print.
- "The Clery Act in Detail." *Know Your IX: Empowering Students to Stop Sexual Violence*. Know Your IX, n.d. Web. Accessed 09 Feb. 2016.

"Clery Act: The Basics." *Know Your IX: Empowering Students to Stop Sexual Violence*. Know Your IX, n.d. Web. Accessed 28 Jan. 2016.

Crosset, T. Benedict, J., & McDonald, M. "Male Student-Athletes Reported for Sexual Assault: A Survey of Campus Police Departments and Judicial Affairs Offices." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*. 19.2 (1995): 126-140. Web. Accessed 7 Feb 2016.

"Curriculum." *Green Dot, etc.* Green Dot, etc., N.d. Web. Accessed 13 March 2017.

"Enrollment Summary." *Administration*. Oregon State University, 2016. Web. Accessed 17 Dec. 2016.

Epocrates. Celexa Black Box Warnings, n.d. Accessed 28 April 2017.

Everfi. *Going Online: Sexual Assault and Alcohol Abuse Prevention at Oregon State University*. 2015. Web. Accessed 7 March 2017.

Everfi. "Haven Impact Report University Of Oregon 2013-2014." Everfi, 2014. Web. Accessed 14 March 2017.

Everfi. "Haven Impact Report University Of Oregon 2014-2015." Everfi, 2015. Web. Accessed 14 March 2017.

"Experts doubt effectiveness of OSU's sexual assault training." UWIRE Text, 19 Aug. 2014. Academic OneFile. Accessed 11 Mar. 2017.

"Facts at a Glance." *Registrar*. University of Oregon, 2016. Web. Accessed 17 Dec. 2016.

"Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act." *ED.gov*. U.S. Department of Education, n.d. Web. Accessed 28 Jan. 2016.

Flanagan, Caitlin. "The Dark Power of Fraternities." *The Atlantic*. March 2014. Web. Accessed 16 March 2017.

Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. Vintage Books ed. New York: Vintage, 1990. Print.

Freyd, J.J. "The Psychology of Betrayal Trauma: Memory, Health, and Gender." Lecture.

University of Puget Sound, Tacoma, Washington, 2008. Web. Accessed 15 Nov. 2015.

Freyd, Jennifer. Institutional Betrayal and Betrayal Blindness, n.d. Dynamic.UOregon. Web.

Accessed 15 Nov 2015.

Gentlewarrior, S., & Fountain, K. "Culturally competent service provision to lesbian, gay,

bisexual and transgender survivors of sexual violence." National Online Resource Center on Violence Against Women, 2009. Accessed 12 Nov. 2015.

Gordon, Claire. "Study: College Athletes are More Likely to Gang Rape." *Aljazeera*, 2015. Web.

Accessed 14 March 2017.

Gorelick, Carly. "The Complications with Green Dot." *Iris Magazine*, 2016. Web.

Accessed 14 March 2017.

Harrison, J., Grant, J. & Herman, J. "A Gender Not Listed Here: Genderqueers, Gender Rebels,

and OtherWise in the National Transgender Discrimination Survey." *Lgbtq Policy*

Journal at the Harvard Kennedy School 2 (2011). Web. Accessed 9 Nov. 2015.

Hasher, L. Goldstein, D., & Toppino, T. "Frequency and the conference of referential validity."

Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior. 16.1 (1977): 107-112. Web. Accessed 15 March 2017.

"Haven." *OSU Student Health*. Oregon State University, N.d. Web. Accessed 7 March 2017.

"Haven – Understanding Sexual Assault™." *EverFi*. EverFi, 28 Sept. 2015. Web. Accessed 28 Jan. 2016.

The Hunting Ground. Prod. Amy Ziering. Dir. Kirby Dick. Chain Camera Pictures, 2015. DVD.

Jaschik, S. & Lederman, D. "The 2014 *Inside Higher Ed* Survey of College and University presidents." Gallup. 2014. Accessed 18 March 2017.

Jensen, Elliot. "The Journal of Gender, Race & Justice." *What Do Non-Binary People Want?* The University of Iowa, 2015. Web. Accessed 23 Nov. 2015.

Kaplan, Liat. "The Disappointment of CMC's Not-So-Safe Haven Comments." *UWIRE Text*, 2014. *Academic OneFile*. Web. Accessed 11 Mar. 2017.

Lisak, D. & Miller, P. "Repeat Rape and Multiple Offending Among Undetected Rapists." *Violence and Victims*, 17.1 (2002): 73-84. Web. Accessed 15 March 2017.

McClure, Stephanie. *Voices within a Gray World: An Evaluation of Oregon State University's Sexual and Dating Violence Prevention Curriculum*. MA Thesis. Oregon State University, 2014. Web. Accessed 12 Dec. 2016.

Minkler, Meredith., and Wallerstein, Nina. *Community-Based Participatory Research for Health From Process to Outcomes*. 2nd ed. Hoboken: Wiley, 2010. Print.

Moon, Megan. "Required trainings inspire privacy concerns." *UWIRE Text*, 13 Sept. 2016, p. 1. *Academic OneFile*. Accessed 11 Mar. 2017.

Mullins, Dexter. In *Epidemic of Campus Sex Crimes, LGBT Cases Often Neglected*. Aljazeera. 20 Oct. 2013. Web. Accessed 2 Nov. 2016.

“Sexual Violence and Individuals Who Identify as LGBTQ Research Brief.” *NSVRC*, n.d.

National Sexual Violence Resource Center. Web. Accessed 27 Jan. 2016.

Negrusz, Adam. *Detection of "Date-Rape" Drugs in Hair and Urine, Final Report*. NCJRS.

2003. Accessed 18 May 2017.

"New Requirements Imposed by the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act." *ACENet*.

American Council on Education. Web. Accessed 28 Jan. 2016.

Noble, Bobby. *"Trans-". Rethinking Women's and Gender Studies*. New York: Routledge, 2012.

Print.

"Nonbinary.org." *Nonbinary*, n.d. Web. Accessed 25 Nov. 2015.

“Sexual Assault.” *Office on Violence Against Women*, n.d. Accessed 16 May 2017.

“Oregon State University.” *U.S. News and World Report Higher Education*, n.d. Web. Accessed

17 Dec. 2016.

Oregon State University Research Office. Frequently Asked Questions, n.d. Accessed 17 March

2017.

Oregon State University Research Office. Human Research Protection Program and Institutional

Review Board, n.d. Accessed 17 March 2017.

“Overview.” *Green Dot, etc.* Green Dot, etc., N.d. Web. 13 March 2017.

Potrafke, Lindsay. “Checking Up on Student-Athletes: A NCAA Regulation Requiring Criminal

Background Checks.” 17:1 (2006): 427. *Marq. Sports L. Rev.* Web. 16 March 2017.

RAINN. Sexual Assault, n.d. *RAINN*. Accessed 16 May 2017.

U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Financial & Contracting Oversight. *Sexual Violence on Campus:*

- How Too Many Institutions of Higher Education Are failing to Protect Students*. Rep. McCaskill, 9 July 2014. Web. Accessed 1 Mar. 2016.
- Smith, Carly Parnitzke, and Freyd, Jennifer J. "Institutional Betrayal." *American Psychological Association* 69.6 (2014): 575-87. Web. Accessed 1 Mar. 2016.
- Smith, C.P. & Freyd, J.J. Dangerous Safe Havens: Institutional Betrayal Exacerbates Sexual Trauma. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*. 26 (2013): 119-124. Accessed 1 March 2016.
- Smith, Tovia. "Curbing Sexual Assault Becomes Big Business On Campus." *NPR*. NPR, 12 Aug. 2015. Web. Accessed 14 May 2017.
- Spade, Dean. *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics and the Limits of Law*. New York: South End Press, 2011. Print.
- Take Back the Night*. About, n.d. Take Back the Night. Accessed 16 May 2017.
- "Title IX and Sexual Assault." *American Civil Liberties Union*. Women's Rights Project, 2015. Web. Accessed. 28 Jan. 2016.
- "Today in the News Media." *OSU Today*. Oregon State University, 19 Jan. 2013. Web. Accessed 13 March 2017.
- "Training." *Green Dot, etc.* Green Dot, etc., N.d. Web. Accessed 13 March 2017.
- University of Alaska Fairbanks*. Haven and AlcoholEDU, 2017. Accessed 14 May. 2017.
- University of Oregon Division of Student Life*. Student Conduct Code, n.d. University of Oregon. Accessed 16 May 2017.
- University of Oregon Police Department*. Sex Offense and Consent Definitions, n.d. University of Oregon. Accessed 16 May 2017.

USA. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Justice Department's Office on Violence Against Women.

Climate Surveys: Useful Tools to Help Colleges and Universities in Their Efforts to Reduce and Prevent Sexual Assault. NotAlone, Web. Accessed 28 Jan. 2016.

Krebs, Christopher, et al. USA. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Justice Department's Office on Violence Against Women. *Campus Climate Survey Validation Study Final Technical Report.* BJS, Jan. 2016. Web. Accessed 28 Jan. 2016.

United States Census Bureau. "Corvallis." census.gov, n.d. Web. 17 Dec. 2016.

United States Census Bureau. "Eugene." census.gov, n.d. Web. 17 Dec. 2016.

"University of Oregon." *U.S. News and World Report Higher Education*, n.d. Web. Accessed 17 Dec. 2016.

USA. U.S. Department of Education. Office of the Assistant Secretary. *Dear Colleague Letter.* U.S. Department of Education, 4 Apr. 2011. Web. Accessed 28 Jan. 2016.

USA. The White House. The Press Secretary. *FACT SHEET: Launch of the "It's On Us" Public Awareness Campaign to Help Prevent Campus Sexual Assault.* USA.gov, 19 Sept. 2014. Web. Accessed 28 Jan. 2016.

USA. The White House. White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault. *Not Alone: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault.* The White House, Apr. 2014. Web. Accessed 28 Jan. 2016.

"Welcome." *OSU Student Health.* Oregon State University, N.d. Web. Accessed 7 March 2017.

W.K. Kellogg Foundation. Community Health Scholars, n.d. WKKF. Accessed 17 March 2017.

- VandeLinde, Victoria. *The Current State of University Sexual Consent Education and the Sexual Consent Curriculum Proposal for NCBI*. Undergraduate Thesis. University of Montana, 2015. Web. Accessed 12 March 2016.
- Vendituoli, Monica. "A Scripted Response to Sexual Assault." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. 25 Aug. 2014. Web. Accessed 17 May 2017.
- Worthen, M. G. F., & Baker, S.A. "Consent is sexy? University student reactions to a mandatory online sexual misconduct training program." *Sexual Assault Report* 17 (2014) 65–75. Web. Accessed 15 May 2017.
- Worthen, M. G. F. and Wallace, S. A. (2017), "Intersectionality and Perceptions About Sexual Assault Education and Reporting on College Campuses." *Fam Relat* 66 (2017): 180–196. Web. Accessed 15 May 2017.
- Wyss, Shannon E. "'This Was My Hell': The Violence Experienced by Gender Non-conforming Youth in US High Schools." *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 17.5 (2004): 709-30. Web. Accessed 17 Nov. 2015.

APPENDIX A

Participant Messages to Survivors

Camille:

“I think one of the hardest things and the tools that you get is to move forward you know? And I think like a really hard thing ... in the few years after the assault, you get very empowered. You want to be a leader. You want to make change. Being an activist is a very powerful way to heal. What I’ve been struggling with is, as a survivor, if I was to go into a new career field or something that was different than my dreams and my hopes and my vision and my hopes for my life before I was assaulted, and then start working with survivors or join different groups...is that giving that person power because they got to change the trajectory of my life based on an experience? That has been very, very challenging to me. I had to re-discover and think back to my 18-year-old self and what I was dreaming of before, and what my goals were of what I wanted to do before that happened to me, and then I got to look back now as an adult who’s working in the field that I think I’m called for, but it’s still, it’s totally molded who I am, and I don’t know if I agree with if that’s okay...but then I feel like, really terrible if I don’t want to be in that work anymore. I feel like I’m not helping the fight and it makes me feel sad and guilty and like ashamed for following dreams that are different than that trajectory because I know that I can be very powerful and help a lot of other people but it’s a very hard place to be in ...

Because it’s like ‘wow now I’m a survivor of sexual assault and I’m going on tour and like, speaking out about it all over the world’ you know? And that’s not necessarily what I wanted to do with my life, but it’s like being called to duty for that. So that’s been very challenging. Like, where does the work stop? How do you continue doing that without re-triggering yourself and re-inviting those memories back into your mind? At what point can you let go of it and heal? You did your part. And that you are healed. And at what point do you remember it and continue to use it, and acknowledge it and still keep it as a part of your life? What time is ok to let it go,

completely, and forget about it? You know? To live on and live forward and chase after your dreams. I don't know. That's something I've struggled with a lot. So, it's good, but like, is it really following your heart? It feels very unfair because everyone else who isn't a survivor gets to do what they want to do still. And it didn't change their lives. It feels very unfair, because you look to the left and to the right of you and you see people going gung-ho on their things, you know? And you're like...man, what if you were a survivor? What would you actually be doing right now? And what am I doing? And why can't I be...it feels so unfair and like so hurtful to compare. It's comparison, you know? And it's really unhealthy."

Adrien:

"I use Facebook to get in touch with these resources. There's two big things that stand out beyond that: art and research ... Using that as a medium to channel what I can't even convey verbally in therapy-it's huge. And not caring about the themes that I'm addressing as well. Just using it for pure catharsis and knowing that as messed up as I view my own experiences, there's millions of others who can equally if not more-so relate to what I'm saying. It's, I don't know...it's powerful and reassuring ... If I'm going to research, I'm going to do it on my own terms. It's going to be about the kind of topics that are going to save me life. So, I, uh, jumped into the study of post-traumatic stress disorder. Of its manifestations which I think stretch further into the DSM than the DSM allows for. Um, the implications of trauma are hardly addressed at all and like, that has to change. But no, understanding the phenomena and how it's a larger issue that affects humanity as a whole- it was huge. I wondered for a long time after that, had my upbringing made me a person that attracted abusers to me? Was it something within me? But...no. I don't think that that's valid."

Nyx:

“Doing things to empower yourself. One thing that’s really difficult for survivors afterward is just not feeling empowered. You don’t feel like you can do anything anymore. You feel like people need to make decisions for you. You, well, and also, you’re really scared. So, you just feel like you need to protect yourself. And that’s normal. Everything that’s happening to you is normal. It doesn’t mean that it feels good, but you’re not crazy or weird and it’s definitely a thing that you just have to go through unfortunately. And also talking to survivors, if you don’t recognize it for like six months or five years that’s okay. It still doesn’t change the fact that it happened or the validation of how you feel about it. You’re going to have times where you fucking forget about it, and that’s a good time. And then you’re going to have periods of time where that’s all you could think about. It’s really just a roller coaster and your thoughts and feelings about it come in waves, but not all of it is bad. You’re going to feel numb to it. You’re going to feel happy and empowered that it’s over and that you’re doing great things about it. You’re going to feel sad about it. You’re going to feel guilty. You’re going to feel really fucking pissed off. Oh my god. So, with the empowerment thing, you feel like you lost all sense of control and that’s where a lot of addictions come from. I mean, and like the eating disorder thing- not a lot of people realize that’s an addiction but it’s just a way of being able to control your environment or your body because you lose bodily autonomy from someone else manipulating your body. So instead of turning to those things, empowering yourself in healthy ways. And just like, I don’t even know—I’m still working on that. Being able to make your own decisions and I don’t know, your therapist will tell you. I’m just kidding. Like, being assertive. Just really knowing what you want and like, with all of these healing things and just getting there, it’s going to take a lot of time and you’re not going to be successful at first so don’t feel

bad about not being empowered the first time. Because you're not. Like maybe a little bit and then you're like 'ok I'm a piece of shit.' That's ok. That's ok. Just know that it takes a lot of hard work. Talking to people that have had the same situation that are really validating, because they definitely know what's happening in your brain. For that, I mean well sometimes it may not be great because maybe you don't want to hear about it but then again, you just have to know your boundaries and limits of being able to talk about things like that."

APPENDIX B

IRB MATERIALS APPROVED AUGUST 24, 2016

Approval Notice



Human Research Protection Program
 Institutional Review Board
 Office of Research Integrity
 B308 Kerr Administration Building, Corvallis, Oregon 97331-2140
 (541) 737-8008
IRB@oregonstate.edu | <http://research.oregonstate.edu/irb>

APPROVAL NOTICE

Date of Notification	08/26/2016	Date Approved	08/24/2016
Principal Investigator	Patti Duncan	Study ID	7439
Study Title	Queer and Trans Survivors' Access to University Resources		
Study Team Members	Emilee Hunt		
Review Level	Full Board	Category(ies)	N/A
Submission Type	Initial Application		
Waiver(s)	Documentation of Informed Consent		
Risk Level for Children	N/A		
Number of Participants	35 Do not exceed this number without prior approval		
Funding Source	None	PI on Funding	N/A
Proposal #	N/A	Cayuse #	N/A

The above referenced study was reviewed and approved by the OSU Institutional Review Board (IRB).

EXPIRATION DATE: 08/23/2017

Continuing review applications are due at least 30 days prior to expiration date

Comments: Waiver of documentation of consent for all participants

Principal Investigator responsibilities for fulfilling the requirements of approval:

- All study team members should be kept informed of the status of the research.
- Any changes to the research must be submitted to the IRB for review and approval prior to the activation of the changes. **This includes, but is not limited to, increasing the number of subjects to be enrolled.** Failure to adhere to the approved protocol can result in study suspension or termination and data stemming from protocol deviations cannot be represented as having IRB Approval.
- Reports of unanticipated problems involving risks to participants or others must be submitted to the HRPP office within three calendar days.
- Only consent forms with a valid approval stamp may be presented to participants.
- Submit a continuing review application or final report to the HRPP office for review at least four weeks prior to the expiration date. Failure to submit a continuing review application prior to the expiration date will result in termination of the research, discontinuation of enrolled participants, and the submission of a new application to the IRB.

APPENDIX C

IRB MATERIALS APPROVED AUGUST 24, 2016

Research Protocol



Institutional Review Board
Office of Research Integrity | Oregon State University
B308 Kerr Administration Building, Corvallis, OR 97331-2140
Telephone (541) 737-8008
irb@oregonstate.edu | <http://research.oregonstate.edu/irb>

RESEARCH PROTOCOL

RESEARCH PROTOCOL

Version Date: 7/31/2016

1. Protocol Title: Queer and Trans Survivors' Access to University Resources (STUDY ID: 7439)

PERSONNEL

2. Principal Investigator Dr. Patti Duncan, Ph.D., Associate Professor and Coordinator, Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies
3. Student Researcher(s) Emilee Hunt
4. Investigator Qualifications

Dr. Patti Duncan is an associate professor and coordinator of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies at Oregon State University. She earned her PhD in Women's Studies at Emory University. She has supervised several other studies involving human subjects. She specializes in transnational feminist theories and movements, women of color feminisms, feminist media studies, feminist motherhood studies, queer studies, and critical mixed race studies.

Emilee Hunt earned a BA in Multicultural and Gender Studies with an option in Women's Studies, as well as minors in Sociology and Gender and Sexuality Studies from California State University, Chico in 2015. While at Chico State, she worked as the Women's Program Coordinator at the AS Gender and Sexuality Equity Center, where her work centered around consent programming, Title IX policies, and sexual assault prevention and response. While at Oregon State University, she has co-facilitated the WGSS 270, Violence Against Women, course, and is currently working with the Women's Center to create programming around Sexual Assault Awareness Month. Altogether, she has 2.5 years of experience working with and supporting survivors of sexual assault on university campuses. She is currently enrolled in the Master of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (WGSS) program at Oregon State University. She has received training in informed consent, confidentiality, supporting survivors, and standards of conduct in research throughout her coursework and career path. Additionally, she has completed both the CITI and NIH ethics course trainings as required by Oregon State University.

5. Training and Oversight

The PI is responsible for the conduct of the study, all human subject protections issues, and for the timely and complete submissions of IRB related documents. The student researcher is responsible for collecting data and running interviews; and for the qualitative analysis of the data collected under the supervision of the PI and the co-investigators. The student researcher has received training in human subjects protection in their Oregon State University coursework and through Oregon State University's CITI training. The PI will monitor participant enrollment, ensuring that the number of participants does not exceed the number approved by the IRB without first obtaining an official revision.

The contents of this protocol were written by the student researcher and reviewed by the PI. Both the student researches and the PI will continue to meet regularly over the next year and



communicate via email each week in order to adhere to both the protocol described below and the ethics of qualitative research. While the student researcher is in the field, the PI will be available via email and phone.

6. Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest in this study.

FUNDING

7. Sources of Support for this project (unfunded, pending, or awarded)

This project is unfunded.

DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH

8. Description of Research

The intended thesis will examine the campus climate at Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Portland State University in order to identify the ways in which these campuses both reflect and deviate from the current U.S. culture surrounding campus-based sexual assault. In particular, this research will center the experiences of queer, trans, and gender non-binary student survivors of sexual assault.

The researcher will employ a first-hand community-based methodological approach through the form of interviews with both survivors and university stakeholders. The purpose of interviewing stakeholders will be to identify the current resources and gaps in resources available to survivors. The purpose of interviewing survivors is to garner suggestions in order to better support queer and trans students who have endured, or will endure, sexual assault. The central research questions will include: In which ways do the identified universities (Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Portland State University) replicate or deviate from the current climate in the U.S. surrounding campus sexual assault? In which ways can these universities better support queer, trans, and non-binary survivors of sexual assault?

9. Background Justification

This research is vitally important, as evidence has shown that these demographics face heightened violence, and that access to resources when facing multiple oppressions can be incredibly complex (Wyss). Furthermore, very few studies have ever interviewed non-binary individuals specifically for reasons other than constructing medical frameworks (Wyss). The context for this examination will be developed through literature review sources, which will include national governmental documents, campaigns, laws, and policies that contribute to current sexual assault prevention and response on college and university campuses. Furthermore, the thesis will hone in on literature that pertains to the state of Oregon directly by examining state documents as well as other relevant research and past theses. One contributing theory to the literature review will be Dr. Jennifer Freyd's lens of "intentional betrayal" which will be incredibly valuable when examining gaps in current survivor support networks (Smith & Freyd). Further literature will include theories of trauma employing metaphors of ghosts and haunting, as elucidated by Grace Cho and others.



The purpose of this thesis is to create a space that includes survivor-based recommendations for accountability, resources, and sustainable programming to improve the campus climate and culture surrounding survivors moving forward- specifically those who identify as: queer, trans, and non-binary survivors. It is the researcher's hope that this thesis will instigate change in university administration and student affairs, as well as provide an outlet for survivors of overlooked identities to feel heard.

10. Multi-center Study

Oregon State University is the only institution conducting this survey.

11. External Research or Recruitment Site(s)

Recruitment will occur external to Oregon State University, both on-site and at the University of Oregon and Portland State University (through flyer dispersal and in-person introductions to relevant organizations), as well as off-campus at locations that approve posting of the flyer. Additionally, email call-outs will be sent to staff members at stakeholder and community organizations (such as, but not limited to women's centers, pride centers, survivor advocacy centers, etc.) on and around the University of Oregon and Portland State University Campus. The researcher has contacted the respective IRB offices at the University of Oregon and Portland State University. Both universities have stated that they do not require a letter of support, and that forwarding the IRB approval notice from Oregon State University will suffice to recruit students at both sites. See the attached flyer and email callout files.

Research will occur external to Oregon State University both on-site at the University of Oregon and Portland State University in order to make the study interviews more accessible to individuals willing to be interviewed from either site.

12. Subject Population

Participants will include adults over the age of 18 who self-identify as queer and/or non-binary and/or trans individuals. Participants will also self-identify as survivors of sexual assault who are current or previous students from Oregon State University, Portland State University, or the University of Oregon. Participants will have experienced this trauma while attending, or prior to attending, one of the three universities. The reasoning for including previous traumas is a result of the survivor's need to access resources throughout their life- for example, students transferring to one of these universities after experiencing sexual assault still need support. Participants will be recruited to participate in interviews.

Participants in the survivor group must meet the following conditions (1) 18 years or older; (2) self-identify as queer, trans, and/or non-binary (3) self-identify as a survivor of sexual assault who has experienced assault while attending, or prior to attending, either Oregon State University, Portland State University, or the University of Oregon (3) speaks English; and (4) is able to provide verbal consent.

The second group of participants will include individuals employed at, but not limited to, University stakeholder organizations such as women's centers, pride centers, and sexual assault resource



centers on the campuses of Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Portland State University. They will be recruited to participate in interviews.

Participants in the stakeholder group must meet the following conditions (1) 18 years or older; (2) be a current or former employee of either Oregon State University, Portland State University, or the University of Oregon; (3) speaks English; and (4) is able to provide verbal consent.

The research team will collect data from up to 35 participants. Up to 20 participants will be survivors. Up to 15 participants will be grouped as stakeholders.

This research will include queer and trans individuals. This research may include, but will not target, pregnant women, and Indigenous people or Alaska Natives. There will be no additional risks for these individuals. The research will target Oregon State University employees as well as Oregon State University students. Due to the nature of the research, the researcher will interact with queer and/or trans identified young adults. While queer and trans adults are not an official category of a vulnerable population, the researcher is aware of unique issues facing these populations, such as high rates of suicide, increased difficulty in accessing services, and mental health disorders affecting this population, and will be mindful in researcher/participants interactions, as well as through providing information about mental health and survivor advocacy resources to participants, should any discomfort arise from participating in the study.

Participants will be recruited via flyers and in person announcements at outreach sites such as campus pride centers and survivor advocacy centers, as well as community-based support networks for queer and trans individuals. The researcher will also be using a snowball sampling method in that flyers and social media announcements may be shared and distributed at recruitment sites and online by people who are not on the research team and may or may not be participants in interviews. The researcher will also recruit on campus at Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Portland State University through introductions to relevant stakeholder organizations. The researcher will reach out to contacts at those schools (pride centers, etc.) and distribute flyers as well as advertise through email, and potentially through stakeholder social media if the organizations choose to share the outreach materials. See attached files.

13. Consent Process

Participants will consent via the Verbal Consent Guide (see attached). The consent will be obtained prior to involving subjects in any study activities. The researcher will give participants the consent form, and go through all the points of this document orally with the participant as they read the document. The form will contain an explanation of the purposes of the research, the duration of the subject's participation, descriptions of the procedures that will be followed, description of any foreseeable risks or discomforts to the subject, a description of any benefits to the subject or to others which may reasonably be expected from the research, a statement describing the extent to which confidentiality of records identifying the subject will be maintained, an explanation of whom to contact for answers to pertinent questions about the research and research subjects' rights, and a statement that participation is voluntary, refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled, and the subject may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which the subject is otherwise entitled. For Oregon State University students, the consent form will note that their name and email address must be forwarded over to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access in order for the researcher to be compliant with Responsible Employee guidelines.

In the event that an in-person interview is not possible, the researcher will provide participants with



the option of phone or skype interviews. If the interview is to be conducted over the phone or via Skype, the researcher will read the consent document and obtain verbal consent. When possible, the consent document as well as a preview of the interview questions will be sent via email to participants individually prior to the arranged interview time.

After the researcher and interview participant review the consent form together, the participant will be asked if they consent to participating in the interview and if the researcher can audio record the interview. The researcher will ask the participant whether they would be comfortable with having the interview audio taped and the participant will be informed that they will not be audio taped if they are not comfortable.

The comprehension of consent information will be assessed by asking if the participant feels comfortable in participating of the research, if they foresee any risks or have any questions, and if they understand that they can interrupt the process at any given moment. The researcher will also ask participants the following questions, "Do you understand what could trigger a report? If so, do you still choose to proceed with the interview?"

The student researcher's reporting obligations are as follows: Under the current policy, if the researcher has information about or reason to believe any form of sexual harassment has been perpetrated by an OSU student, staff, or faculty member; has occurred on OSU property or during an OSU activity; or has created continuing effects in the educational setting, the student researcher will immediately contact the Title IX Coordinator (Clay Simmons) or EOA. The student researcher will disclose all details possessed by the interviewed student that are necessary for EOA to conduct an investigation.

14. Eligibility Screening

Eligibility of participants will involve stating the inclusion criteria and asking participants whether they are interested in participating. (listed below, as well as in the "Subject Population" section).

Participants in the survivor group must meet the following conditions (1) 18 years or older; (2) self-identify as queer, trans, and/or non-binary (3) self-identify as a survivor of sexual assault who has experienced assault while attending, or prior to attending, either Oregon State University, Portland State University, or the University of Oregon (3) speaks English; and (4) is able to provide verbal consent.

Participants in the stakeholder group must meet the following conditions (1) 18 years or older; (2) be a current or former employee of either Oregon State University, Portland State University, or the University of Oregon; (3) speaks English; and (4) is able to provide verbal consent.

15. Methods and Procedures

One-time interviews will be conducted and the resulting data will be analyzed using qualitative content analysis. The interviews will be conducted one-on-one in-person with participants over the age of 18. Interviews will be conducted in a private location of the participant's choice to protect the privacy of the participants. See the attached files for the list of interview questions. Data collected



and analyzed as part of this research project may also be included in scholarly publications. No personally identifiable information of survivors will be included in the final report or future scholarly publications. Additionally, the researcher will not record direct identifiers about the perpetrator. Personally identifiable information of stakeholders, such as their job title, will be included in the final thesis or future scholarly publications. The data collected will be presented in the form of general themes and topics as much as possible to avoid identification of the subjects who participated in the interviews, however, sub-themes will include a breakdown for each university. Although the researchers will write results aiming to keep participant anonymity, the respondents will be informed that their identity may be deduced due to the small sample respondent pool (see attached consent form). All field notes and audio recordings (optional) will be kept in a secure location.

In the event that individually identifying information about the research participant is disclosed to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access or other non-study team members, the student researcher will fill out the anticipated adverse event form and submit it to the IRB within 30 days of this disclosure.

The researcher has consulted with both Darci Heroy, Title IX Coordinator at the University of Oregon, and Julie Caron, Title IX Coordinator at Portland State University regarding this study. Both have asserted that this protocol is in line with their policies. Under the University of Oregon policy, "emergency policy excludes information obtained during an IRB approved research project from the definition of credible evidence which would trigger required reporting" (Darci Heroy, email communication with student researcher, June 28th). Portland State University also follows this guideline (Julie Caron, phone communication with student researcher, June 13th).

16. Compensation

Participants will not receive any monetary compensation for participating in the study.

17. Costs

There are no monetary costs associated with the participation in this study.

18. Anonymity or Confidentiality

In-person interviews will be used to ask research questions and gather data. Participants will be recruited via flyers, social media, and in-person announcements (see attached forms/scripts). As a result of the email correspondence necessary to schedule interviews, potential participants who respond to the callout via email will only have preliminary data collected, including: availability for a meeting time, email address, and their name if they disclose it in the email. All recruitment emails will be password protected through Oregon State University's email server and only the student researcher will have access to the emails. During interviews, data will be collected in two ways: audio recording (optional) and field notes. During collection of data, all material will be stored securely on the student researcher's laptop which is password protected, has up-to-date anti-virus software with current virus definition, and access to this laptop storing data is restricted only to the student researcher. Federal regulations and OSU policy require that de-identified data be stored in an audit-accessible location for at least three years post-study termination. After the interviews



have been conducted, de-identified data will be stored for three years post-study completion digitally through written transcriptions of interviews. there will be no record linking either or both cohorts to the research.

In accordance with the OSU Office of Information Security, all mobile computer systems or portable storage media containing data will be encrypted with at least 256-bit encryption. All computers have a host-based firewall enabled in addition to being behind a networked firewall context. For all computers storing data, data will be stored in a local server/approved cloud on a computer with access to the internet. Routine back-ups of all data will occur after each interview, with appropriate security measures for that data, including the encryption listed above, and physical security. If data and study documents are transmitted to the PI via email, the email will be encrypted and the key disseminated via a secure mechanism other than email. At the conclusion of the study, the PI will be given an encrypted flash drive containing data and study documents. Identifiable information will not be stored on the student researcher's computer after the study has ended.

The original data, which contains personally identifiable information about the respondent, will be coded by number. The individually identifying information will be removed and replaced with the code. Access to these documents is restricted to the researcher listed in this protocol as well as the PI. The audio from the interviews will be transcribed only by the researcher and the transcription files will be kept on the student researcher's laptop. Once audio recordings have been transcribed and verified, the audio recording will be destroyed. A copy of all audio transcriptions and field notes will be stored the student researcher's laptop for three years after the completion of this study.

Confidentiality will have to be breached for current Oregon State University students who have experienced sexual assault while attending Oregon State University, as the student researcher must be held responsible to "responsible employee" guidelines. Therefore, direct identifiers of Oregon State University students who participate in the study, including their name and Oregon State University's email address, will be sent to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access (EOA) once the student agrees to be interviewed for the study. The Office will reach out to students post-interview to provide them with resources, in order to check-in with students and ensure that their mental-health needs are being met. Additionally, EOA collects numerical data regarding instances of assault: this would not release any information about the survivor, only add a number to the count for the annual report. Aside from EOA, direct personal identifiers will not be released to anyone outside of the research team. The student researcher will clearly state in all recruitment fliers and emails that this process will have to occur, so as to not receive the names of any students who would wish to remain confidential. No record of consent forms or other research study information will be placed in the student file of any student who participates in this study.

Additionally, the identities of stakeholders interviewed will be released, in terms of the title of their position held on their respective campus, so as to illustrate the organizations interviewed for this study. In the thesis, their job positions at their respective organization will be identified when using direct quotes from the interview. Further, direct references to centers/organizations on respective campuses may be made when sharing findings and results, in order to illustrate the manners in which campuses/centers interact with queer and trans survivors of sexual assault. This should not provide a risk, as the stakeholders are not a vulnerable population within the purpose of this study.

Except in the cases listed above, information provided by participants will be confidential to the



extent permitted by law. Under Oregon law, researchers are required to report to the appropriate authorities any information concerning child abuse or neglect. The researchers may also report threats of harm to self or to others.

All employees at OSU are required to report Title IX complaints to EOA. Under the current policy, if the researcher has information about or reason to believe any form of sexual harassment has been perpetrated by an OSU student, staff, or faculty member; has occurred on OSU property or during an OSU activity; or has created continuing effects in the educational setting, the researcher must immediately contact the Title IX Coordinator (Clay Simmons) or EOA. The reporting employee must disclose all details possessed by the interviewed student that are necessary for EOA to conduct an investigation. At that point, EOA will assess the report and reach out to the survivor to begin the investigation process. A report could trigger an investigation and the information provided to researchers could be further disclosed by EOA to others (e.g., Student Affairs, Student Life, appropriate authorities). The survivor will also be provided resources they can access on campus.

Data will be published in the form of direct quotes, summaries of findings as well as in percentage breakdowns of identified common themes. Direct quotes from survivors that arise in interviews will be used, and the name of the university they attend(ed) may be released in attachment to any quotes used, but their identities will not be made identifiable directly in the study. Any published findings from the data collection and analysis will not include any information or quotations that could immediately identify the respondent. However, due to the small sample of respondents, their identity may be deduced by other agents in survivor-circles. The participants will be informed of this risk before participating in this study. Additionally, the publication of the thesis will be published to the ScholarsArchive, as required by the thesis process. Individual interview transcriptions will not be made available- the thesis itself will be published, which may include direct quotes.

Research findings may be shared with organizations both internal and external to Oregon State University. For example, the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access has requested for the student researcher to prepare a brief presentation of findings after thesis-completion in order to help them better assess the needs of queer and trans survivors on Oregon State University's campus. Similar requests may arise with other on-campus organizations, as well as sites at the University of Oregon and Portland State University. Survivors will not be made identifiable in any presentation process. Stakeholders may be made identifiable in that their job title may be discussed in said presentations. The purpose of any research presentations will be to allow the universities examined in the study to learn more about incongruences in survivor support, with the purpose of helping the universities begin steps toward creating sustainable change to better support queer and trans survivors of sexual assault.

19. Risks

Participants will be asked questions relating to their experiences or the experiences of others they know (in the case of stakeholders) in accessing survivor services. They will be asked to provide suggestions for improvements and/or expansion of services. Resources for support groups and counseling services will be available, should participants experience any emotional or psychological discomfort in response to participating in our research. Additionally, survivor participants attending Oregon State University will be connected with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access for



additional support, as required by law. Although the research team has a documented plan to maintain confidentiality (described in the previous section), due to the small sample of interviews, identities may be deduced in the final report. All participants will be informed of this risk prior to their participation in this study.

20. Benefits

Respondents should not expect any direct benefit from participating in the study. However, participants may inform recommendations for policy change, which may improve the performance of university organizations and university administration when working with queer and trans survivors of sexual assault, and improve the amount or quality of services available to their population at Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Portland State University. This research benefits the broader queer and trans community attending these universities, as well as university entities interacting with survivors of sexual assault by potentially enabling them to improve their services and outreach efforts.

21. Assessment of the risks and benefits.

Participation in the study involves very little risk for stakeholders, and minimal risk for survivors—such as bringing up triggers of past assault—which is offset by potential benefits to the queer and trans population of Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Portland State University. Additionally, participation has the potential benefit to better the performance of the organizations that provide services to queer and trans survivors at the identified universities.

APPENDIX D

IRB MATERIALS APPROVED AUGUST 24, 2016

Verbal Consent Guide



Women, Gender & Sexuality Studies
School of Language, Culture and Society
252 Waldo Hall
Corvallis, Oregon 97331
Telephone: 541-737-2826

Human Research
Protection Program
Oregon State University
Study # 7439

Current Approval: 08/24/2016
Do Not Use After: 08/23/2017
Approved

CONSENT FORM

Project Title: Queer and Trans Survivors' Access to University Resources
(STUDY ID: 7439)

Principal Investigator: Dr. Patti Duncan

Student Researcher: Emilee Hunt

Version Date: 07/31/2016

Information Regarding Your Consent to Participate: Queer and Trans Survivors' Access to University Resources

Purpose of this form. This form contains information you will need to help you decide whether to be in this research study or not. Please read/listen to the form carefully and ask the study team member(s) questions about anything that is not clear.

Purpose of this research. The purpose of this thesis research study is to (1) identify current services for queer and trans students who have experienced sexual assault while attending college and (2) examine the experiences of queer and trans survivors in accessing those services in order to (3) improve support for queer and trans survivors. Once this information is gathered and the analysis is completed, recommendations for potential changes will be made. The student researcher aims to identify possible gaps in services as well as offer suggestions to service providers regarding how they can better serve queer and trans survivors at Oregon State University, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon.

Invitation to this study. You are being asked to take part in this study because you have identified yourself as a queer, trans, and/or gender non-binary survivor of sexual assault who has experienced sexual assault while attending, or prior to attending, Oregon State University, Portland State University, or the University of Oregon.

Activities. You will be asked questions about your knowledge of services for queer and trans survivors of sexual assault, your experiences of sexual assault, and suggestions for improving services for queer and trans survivors. You will have the option of having your interview audio recorded and will be given the choice to opt out of audio recording. The audio (if permitted) from the interview will be transcribed (written out word for word) by the researcher for data analysis and kept in a secure location. The interview will last about one hour.



Risks. While your identity will not be made public through the published results of this project, it may be deduced due to the small number of interviews. You may refuse to answer any question and may leave at any time. A list of local resources will be provided to you should you experience any emotional or psychological discomfort.

Injury. Oregon State University has no program to pay for research-related injuries. Resources for support groups and counseling services will be provided to you, should you experience any emotional or psychological discomfort in response to participating in our research. Additionally, survivor participants attending OSU will be connected with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access for additional support, as required by law.

Benefits. Respondents should not expect any direct benefit from participating in the study. However, participants may inform recommendations for policy change, which may improve the performance of university organizations and university administration when working with queer and trans survivors of sexual assault, and improve the amount or quality of services available to their population at Oregon State University, the University of Oregon, and Portland State University. This research benefits the broader queer and trans community attending these universities, as well as university entities interacting with survivors of sexual assault by potentially enabling them to improve their services and outreach efforts.

Payment. You will receive no payment for participating in this research.

Confidentiality. The information you provide during this research study will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. Your name will not be included in any reports or findings that are published or otherwise shared with members outside the research team, however, your identity may be deduced due to the small number of interviews. Any field notes, audio recordings, and transcriptions of the interview that contain research information will be kept in a secure location only accessible by the research team. Audio recordings and any field notes or transcriptions with de-identifiable information will be destroyed after three years.

The collected data may be shared with organizations on Oregon State University, Portland State University, and the University of Oregon's campus for educational purposes. The goal of research presentations is to help improve resources for queer and trans survivors at relevant organizations that can create change. While the researcher will share themes and responses, they will not include your name.

Study results will be made publically accessible through the University Scholars Archive. If you personally would like a copy of the final thesis, please contact the researcher. While the researcher will share themes and responses, they will not include your name. In both instances, individual interview transcriptions will not be made publically accessible.



PLEASE NOTE: Due to the researcher's employment status, survivors participating who have experienced sexual assault while attending Oregon State University will have their name and email address released to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Access (EOA). All employees at OSU are required to report Title IX complaints to EOA. Under the current policy, if the researcher has information about or reason to believe any form of sexual harassment has been perpetrated by an OSU student, staff, or faculty member; has occurred on OSU property or during an OSU activity; or has created continuing effects in the educational setting, the researcher must immediately contact the Title IX Coordinator (Clay Simmons) or EOA. The reporting employee must disclose all details possessed by the interviewed student that are necessary for EOA to conduct an investigation. At that point, EOA will assess the report and reach out to the survivor to begin the investigation process. Please note that a report could trigger an investigation and the information provided to researchers could be further disclosed by EOA to others (e.g., Student Affairs, Student Life, appropriate authorities). You may also file a report without participating in this research. The survivor will also be provided resources they can access on campus. Additionally, EOA collects numerical data regarding instances of assault: this would not release any information about the survivor, only add a number to the count for the annual report. The survivor is not required to take any further action, but will be connected to resources. Please only give consent if you are willing to adhere to these guidelines.

Under Oregon law, researchers are required to report to the appropriate authorities any information concerning child abuse or neglect. The researchers may also report threats of harm to self or to others.

Voluntariness. Your participation in this study is voluntary. Your decision to take part or not take part will not impact your grades, your standing in the university, your ability to access resources, or your relationship with your professors. There is no penalty for choosing not to participate or for leaving the study at any time. You are allowed to request that any information disclosed during the focus group or interview be destroyed or not used in the research. You may refuse to answer any question.

Contact information. If you have any questions about this research project, please contact the Principal Investigator, Dr. Patti Duncan, at Patti.Duncan@oregonstate.edu. If you have questions about your rights or welfare as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Office, at (541) 737-8008 or by email at IRB@oregonstate.edu

Recordings: You have the option of having your interview audio recorded. The audio (if permitted) from the interview will be transcribed (written out word for word) by the researcher for data analysis and kept in a secure location.

_____ I agree to be audio recorded.
Check Mark

Human Research Protection Program Oregon State University Study # 7439 Current Approval: 08/24/2016 Do Not Use After: 08/23/2017 Approved

_____ I do not agree to be audio recorded.

Check Mark

Signature. The signature of the researcher indicates that this study has been explained to you, that your questions have been answered, and that you agree to take part in this study. You will receive a copy of this form.

Do not sign after the expiration date: 08/23/2017

APPENDIX E

Interview Questions

Project Title: Queer and Trans Survivors' Access to University Resources

Principal Investigator: Dr. Patti Duncan

Student Researcher: Emilee Hunt

Version Date: 04/14/2016

Interview Guidelines: Survivors

Queer and Trans Survivors' Access to University Resources

Please answer the following demographic/experience-related questions:

1. Demographics: Preferred alias for thesis (if you have one), age, race, ethnicity, ability
 - a. Please state your gender identity
 - b. Please state your gender pronouns
 - c. Please state your sexuality
 - d. Please state the University you were attending at the time of your assault
2. What year in your degree process did your assault occur?

We are going to be moving on to some questions that reflect on personal experiences regarding access to resources:

1. How familiar are you with organizations in your community that serve and/or promote resources for survivors of sexual assault?
2. How familiar are you with organizations in your community that serve and/or promote resources for queer and trans survivors?
3. What services do you know about/could you tell someone about who might need them?
4. Did you access any resources after your assault?
 - a. If so:
 - i. What services do you utilize/have you utilized in the past?
 - ii. What types of services do these organizations provide?
 - iii. What helped you feel comfortable accessing this/these resources?
 - iv. How did you become familiar with these organizations? Was it through a friend? A campaign?
 1. Were there visual markers on the building that signaled that they were safe place for queer and trans survivors?
 - b. If no:
 - i. Were you aware of any resources on your University's campus or community?
 - ii. If yes, why did you feel uncomfortable accessing resources?
 1. If "not interested," why?

- iii. If no, which way(s) do you think the University could have reached out so you would have known about these resources?
 - iv. If no, did you seek support from friends, family, etc.?
 - 1. If yes, whom? Why did you feel uncomfortable accessing resources?
 - 2. If no, how could people have better supported you?
 - 5. Was your assailant known or a stranger?
 - a. Did the status of your assailant (known/stranger) affect your desire/ability/comfortability to access resources?
 - i. If yes, how?
 - 6. Did anything change in your life or experience as a student afterwards?
 - a. For example: Did it affect your relationship with family/friends/partners? Did it affect your participation in school?
 - i. Ex: Intimate partner violence, homelessness, alcoholism, drug use, moving, miss class, forced to access a resource, mental health, changed major
 - 7. [If applicable] Were you encouraged/discouraged to report?
 - i. If so, by whom?
 - 1. If yes, what was the outcome? How did you feel?

We're going to move on to questions for suggested improvement to services:

- 8. Are there other services that are needed for queer and trans survivors that are not provided at these organizations?
- 9. What services do you wish you had? What services would be beneficial to queer and trans survivors?
- 10. How do you find out about services? Do you have recommendations for ways to make finding out about services better/easier?
- 11. What services do you know about that might be valuable to queer and trans survivors seeking at your University/in your town?
- 12. What information would you like service providers to know so that they can better understand and serve queer and trans survivors?
- 13. How can organizations reach out to queer and trans survivors and let them know the resources available?
- 14. What can be done to make service providers more accessible to queer and trans survivors?
- 15. What do service providers usually struggle with the most in serving queer and trans survivors?

We are going to be moving on to some questions that reflect on personal experiences.

- 16. Were you, or someone you know able to be "out" to the service providers?
- 17. How did you know that you could be "out" to this organization?
- 18. How can you tell if an organization or service provider is queer and trans friendly?
- 19. Have you had negative experiences with service providers in the past? What happened and what could have gone differently?

20. Have you had negative experiences with service providers in the past due to your known or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity? What happened and what could have gone differently?
21. Have you, or someone you know, been turned away from receiving resources and help because of your known or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity? How did that impact your ability to process and heal from your experience?
22. What cities/towns have you sought services in? Were there specific places that were more welcoming than others?
23. What are some self-care or healing strategies you have used either currently or in the past?