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INTRODUCTIONS

LEE BARD II (he/him/his)

• MS, Counseling, Villanova University
• BS, Psychological Science, Ball State University
• Clinical Intern, Thomas Jefferson University
• Originally from Indiana
HISTORY & IMPLICATIONS

WHAT IS SAFE ZONE AND WHY SHOULD I CARE?
HISTORY

ORIGINS

• Ball State University – Muncie, IN
• SAFE On Campus, Safe Space, Safe Zone
• Brave Space

TRAINING FORMATS

• Canvassing
• Formal Training
• Formal Training + Continuing Education Opportunities
• Multiple Formal Trainings
HISTORY

• Range from 1 to 4+ hours in length
• Offered to students, staff, faculty, and community members
• Voluntary v. Mandatory
• Most Common Learning Outcomes:
  1. Understand biases
  2. Understand LGBQ+ issues, recognize discrimination, and heterosexual privilege
  3. Becoming support persons to LGBTQ+ individuals
  4. Becoming advocates and create LGBTQ+ affirming campuses
• Advocacy takes more than a sticker^{10}

(Woodford et al., 2014)
IMPLICATIONS

• Symbol not associated with increasing negative attitudes or “backlash” effect

• In one study, nearly half of LGBTQ+ students surveyed identified the classroom as the focal point of their experiences of harassment

• Sexual minority students tend to perceive school climates as more negative than their heterosexual peers

• LGBTQ+ students report perceptions of “gay friendliness” influenced their college choice
IMPLICATIONS

• Non-discrimination policies related to sexual orientation and gender are seen as a symbol of support by LGBTQ+ students.\textsuperscript{8}

• Presence of a symbol improves attitudes about campus climate.\textsuperscript{5}

• LGBTQ+ students who attended institutions with LGBTQ+ programming reported feeling more comfortable, more empowered, less harassed, and less likely to skip class due to safety concerns.\textsuperscript{1}

• Important to examine all systems impacting students.\textsuperscript{6}
IMPLICATIONS

Macrosystem
• Government Policies
• Social Forces
• Cultural Expectations

Exosystem
• University Policies
• Student Life
• Social Media

Mesosystem
• Major/Minor
• Residence Hall
• Student Organizations

Microsystem
• Friends/Family
• Classes
• Roommate

(Bronfenbrenner, 2005)
PLANNING

WHAT WOULD THIS LOOK LIKE ON MY CAMPUS?
PLANNING

• Important to promote collaboration between academic affairs and student affairs professionals

• What programming, if any, exists?

• What kind structure for this type of training exists?

• Who will facilitate?

• Do you have departmental or institutional support?

• How will we receive funding?

• What are the needs of the population?

• Do the goals of the current program align with the needs of the students?
PLANNING

• Initially met 1:1 with an administrator who ran training
• Follow-ups included advisors and student representatives from LGBTQ+ organizations
• Final committee composed of administrators and staff from the following offices:
  – LBGTQ+ Student Organization Representatives
  – Student Life
  – Office of Intercultural Affairs
  – Residence Life
  – Writing Center
  – Campus Library
  – LGBTQ+ Representative from the Community
EVALUATION

WHAT DO PEOPLE THINK OF WHAT WE’RE DOING?
EVALUATION – FORMER TRAINING

• Introductions
• What is a Safe Zone Volunteer?
• Ice Breaker Activity
• Coming Out Simulation
• Confidentiality
• Resources on Campus
• Pledge
 EVALUATION

• When was the last time the program was evaluated?
• Who comes to your trainings?
• What are the intended learning outcomes?
• Do individuals on campus understand the purpose of the program?
• What would participants like to see kept, added, or removed?
• How has program impacted campus community in which you work or live?

Questions modified from (Miller & Leskes, 2005)
EVALUATION

• When was the last time the program was evaluated?
• Who comes to your trainings?
• What are the intended learning outcomes?
• Do individuals on campus understand the purpose of the program?
• What would participants like to see kept, added, or removed?
• How has program impacted campus community in which you work or live?

Questions modified from (Miller & Leskes, 2005)
EVALUATION

• Demographic Information
• When did you complete the training?
• How did you hear about the training?
• Effectiveness
  – LGBTQ+ Experience in General
  – Knowledge of LGBTQ+ Topics
  – Discussing LGBTQ+ Topics
  – Confidence to Refer to Resources On Campus
• Satisfaction
  – With Safe Zone Volunteer experience
• Feedback / Suggestions
• 45% Response rate (194/426)

Questions modified from (Miller & Leskes, 2005)
FORMER PROGRAM DATA

Identifier:
Total Responses - 194

- Staff: 104 (53.6%)
- Undergraduate Students: 26 (13.4%)
- Graduate Student: 5 (2.6%)
- Faculty: 59 (30.4%)
When were you trained?

Total Responses - 179

- Spring 2018: 22 (12.3%)
- Fall 2017: 33 (18.4%)
- Spring 2017: 13 (7.3%)
- Fall 2016: 13 (7.3%)
- Spring 2016: 11 (6.1%)

Prior to 2016: 87 (48.6%)
FORMER PROGRAM DATA

I was referred by:

Total Responses - 190

- Colleague: 65 (34.2%)
- Email: 33 (17.4%)
- Campus Currents: 62 (32.6%)
- Newswire: 3 (1.6%)
- Other: 14 (7.4%)
- Friend: 11 (5.8%)
FORMER PROGRAM DATA

Would you support continuous training?

Total Responses - 188

- Yes: 175 (93.1%)
- No: 13 (6.9%)
Satisfaction as Safe Zone Volunteer

Total Responses - 181

- Very satisfied: 34.8%, 63 responses
- Moderately satisfied: 39.8%, 72 responses
- Moderately dissatisfied: 3.3%, 4 responses
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 19.9%, 36 responses
Satisfaction Themes
Total Responses - 72 (4 Omitted)

- Success: 2.9% (2 responses)
- Student has not: 26.5% (18 responses)
- Structure: 2.9% (2 responses)
- Material: 17.6% (12 responses)
- Important: 4.4% (5 responses)
- Marketing: 7.4% (3 responses)
- Continued Training: 14.7% (10 responses)
- Had Knowledge: 23.5% (16 responses)
FORMER PROGRAM DATA

Suggested Changes Themes

Total Responses - 52 (9 Omitted)

- Role Play: 11.6%
- Resources: 14.0%
- Language: 11.6%
- Intersectionality: 20.9%
- Continuous: 9.3%
- Experience: 9.3%
- Gender: 18.6%
- Depth: 4.7%
“A majority of the students come from the same economic, ethnic, political and religious backgrounds … I feel like not many students have met an LGBTQ+ [community] member, so they don’t know how to interact with one.”

“The Villanova admins do a great job of treating the community well. They provide students with support and help if they need it. … I do believe the admin can relook at a lot of their policies. Many of their systems exclude the gay community.”
“I work with a student who told me they always check to see if a staff member is Safe Zone trained before going to speak to them.”

“The specific information has long since faded, but I continue to like the aspect of the Safe Zone that makes resources and people more visible to students than they otherwise might be.”

“I don’t need a sticker to show my support.”
“I think it might start opening their minds a little bit and get them to start realizing, ‘Maybe all my friends who sit there and make homophobic remarks, maybe they’re not right.’”
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

HOW DO WE USE WHAT WE’VE LEARNED?
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

• Introductions
• What to Expect
• LGBTQ+ Terminology Matching Activity
• Activity – Will Share Later
• Coming Out Simulation
• Student Panel
• Resources
• Processing / Wrap Up
• Pledge
MARKETING

PRIOR TO 2016
• Safe Zone “Volunteer”
• Promoting equity for all minorities on campus
• One 2.5 hour training

2016 – PRESENT
• Safe Zone “Trained”
• Promoting equity and visibility for LGBTQ+ students on campus
• One 2.5 training + voluntary additional trainings
UPDATED PROGRAM DATA

• Demographic Information
• Effectiveness:
  – Increasing Awareness of LGBTQ+ Experiences on Campus
  – Increasing Awareness of LGBTQ+ Experiences in General
  – Building Skills for Competent Interactions with LGBTQ+ Community
  – Increasing Familiarity of LGBTQ+ Terminology and Language
  – Increasing Knowledge of On and Off Campus LGBTQ+ Resources
  – of Facilitators Overall
• Satisfaction
  – with Training Overall
• Feedback / Suggestions
**UPDATED PROGRAM DATA**

**Effectiveness - LGBTQ+ Experiences on Campus**

- Total Responses: 79
  - Very Effective: 40 (50.6%)
  - Moderately Effective: 31 (39.2%)
  - Moderately Ineffective: 7 (9.1%)
  - Neither Effective nor Ineffective: 1 (1.3%)

*Not evaluated in first iteration*
COMPARISON – EXPERIENCE

BEFORE

Effectiveness - LGBTQ+ Experiences in General
Total Responses - 181
- Very Ineffective: 3.3%
- Moderately Ineffective: 6.6%
- Neither Effective nor Ineffective: 15.5%
- Moderately Effective: 30.1%
- Very Effective: 44.5%

AFTER

Effectiveness - LGBTQ+ Experiences in General
Total Responses - 79
- Neither Effective nor Ineffective: 12.7%
- Moderately Effective: 35.4%
- Very Effective: 51.9%
COMPARISON – EXPERIENCE

BEFORE

Effectiveness - LGBTQ+ Experiences in General
Total Responses - 181

- Very Ineffective: 10
- Moderately Ineffective: 12
- Neither Effective nor Ineffective: 60
- Moderately Effective: 60
- Very Effective: 71

AFTER

Effectiveness - LGBTQ+ Experiences in General
Total Responses - 79

- Neither Effective nor Ineffective: 10
- Moderately Effective: 28
- Very Effective: 41

*15% increase from former training
COMPARISON - SKILLS

BEFORE

Effectiveness - Discussing LGBTQ+ Topics
Total Responses - 181

- Very Ineffective: 22.1%
- Moderately Ineffective: 9%
- Neither Effective Nor Effective: 10%
- Very Effective: 51%

AFTER

Effectiveness - Building Skills
Total Responses - 79

- Very Ineffective: 3.9%
- Moderately Ineffective: 1.3%
- Neither Effective nor Effective: 19.0%
- Very Effective: 41.8%

Moderately Effective: 39.0%
COMPARISON – SKILLS

BEFORE

Effectiveness - Discussing LGBTQ+ Topics
Total Responses - 181

- Very Ineffective: 9%
- Moderately Ineffective: 5.5%
- Neither Effective Nor Effective: 22.1%
- Very Effective: 51%

AFTER

Effectiveness - Building Skills
Total Responses - 79

- Moderately Ineffective: 1.3%
- Neither Effective nor Effective: 19.0%
- Very Effective: 41.8%

*13% increase from former training
COMPARISON – TOPICS / TERMS

BEFORE

Effectiveness - Knowledge LGBTQ+ Topics
Total Responses - 179

Very Effective: 56 (31.3%)
Moderately Effective: 62 (34.6%)
Neither Effective Nor Moderately Effective: 39 (21.8%)
Slightly Ineffective: 10 (5.7%)
Very Ineffective: 12 (6.7%)

AFTER

Effectiveness - Language & Terminology
Total Responses - 79

Very Effective: 47 (59.5%)
Moderately Effective: 24 (30.4%)
Neither Effective nor Very Effective: 8 (10.1%)

**COMPARISON - TOPICS / TERMS**

**BEFORE**

**Effectiveness - Knowledge LGBTQ+ Topics**
Total Responses - 179
- Very Ineffective: 3.9%
- Moderately Ineffective: 6.7%
- Neither Effective Nor: 21.8%
- Moderately Effective: 34.6%
- Very Effective: 31.3%

**AFTER**

**Effectiveness - Language & Terminology**
Total Responses - 79
- Neither Effective nor: 10.1%
- Moderately Effective: 30.4%
- Very Effective: 59.5%

*24% increase from former training*
COMPARISON - RESOURCES

BEFORE

Effectiveness - On Campus Resources
Total Responses - 179
- Very Effective: 72 (40.2%)
- Moderately Effective: 68 (38.0%)
- Moderately Ineffective: 9 (5.0%)
- Neither Effective nor Ineffective: 4 (2.2%)

AFTER

Effectiveness - Knowledge of Resources
Total Responses - 79
- Very Effective: 33 (41.8%)
- Moderately Effective: 37 (46.8%)
- Neither Effective nor Ineffective: 9 (11.4%)

COMPARISON - RESOURCES

BEFORE

Effectiveness - On Campus Resources
Total Responses - 179
- Very Ineffective: 26
- Moderately Ineffective: 9
- Neither Effective Nor: 4
- Moderately Effective: 68
- Very Effective: 72

AFTER

Effectiveness - Knowledge of Resources
Total Responses - 79
- Neither Effective nor: 9
- Moderately Effective: 37
- Very Effective: 33

*11% increase from former training
**COMPARISON - SATISFACTION**

**BEFORE**

- Satisfaction as Safe Zone Volunteer
  - Total Responses - 161
  - Moderately dissatisfied 3.3%
  - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 19.9%
  - Very satisfied 34.8%
  - Moderately satisfied 39.8%

**AFTER**

- Satisfaction as Safe Zone Trainee
  - Total Responses - 74
  - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 6.8%
  - Moderately Satisfied 31.1%
  - Very Satisfied 62.2%

*18% increase from former training*
**Updated Program Data**

**Effectiveness - Presenters**

- Total Responses: 74
- Neither Effective nor Moderately Effective: 2.7% (2 responses)
- Moderately Effective: 27.0% (20 responses)
- Very Effective: 70.3% (52 responses)

*Not evaluated in first iteration*
• “I have been dealing with my own issues as a faculty member and woman of color on this campus and this training opened my eyes to the possibilities for advocacy I can provide both to my LGBTQ+ students and my students of color.”

• “I’d never thought of adding something like this to my syllabus until you mentioned it. I am going to speak to the head of my department. Can I email you if I have questions?”
ACTIVITY

DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING I CAN USE FOR MY CAMPUS?
ACTIVITY

Take a sheet of paper and write out anything you can think of about yourself. Some examples might be your favorite foods, your family, where you work, what you like to do for fun, who your friends are, etc.
CASE STUDIES

HOW DOES THIS RELATE TO MY EXPERIENCE?
CASE 1 – APPREHENSIVE ADMIN

As a counselor, you feel the LGBTQ+ population on campus is not being heard or represented. LGBTQ+ students have been reporting to your counseling center speaking about some bias they experience on campus. Yet, when you bring it to the attention of your administrator, they say, “I just don’t know this is something we need on our campus.”

1. How do you respond?
2. How might you gather evidence for your claim?
CASE 2 – CONTROVERSY

A Safe Zone program currently exists on your campus as an outreach program facilitated by your office. Student organizations, without your consent, start to require that all members to participate in the training. Conflict arises because some students feel they don’t align with the teachings of the program and feel that their views are being oppressed by being required to attend. Others feel attendance should be mandatory to promote inclusivity. You are asked to intervene.

1. How might you address the students?
2. What impact might this have on the program and campus culture?
CASE 3 – PARTICIPANT CONFLICT

You are facilitating the “new and improved” Safe Zone training. As you wrap up the program and open the floor for questions, one participant who has not engaged throughout the entire program raises their hand and says, “Aren’t all spaces on campus supposed to be safe? I just don’t really get this.” You see some participants nodding in agreement and others have a look of disgust.

1. How do you handle this situation in the moment?
2. How might a statement like this impact your advocacy?
QUESTIONS?

CONTACT INFO:
LBARD@VILLANOVA.EDU
REFERENCES


