

**COMPREHENSIVE STUDENT
ORGANIZATIONS
RISK MANAGEMENT PROTOCOL**

AUTHORED BY:

**BRETT A. SOKOLOW, ESQ.
MANAGING PARTNER, NCHERM**

www.nchem.org

© NCHERM 2008

UNIVERSITY COMPREHENSIVE STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS RISK MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE

PURPOSE: Recognizing that the activities of student organizations can represent risk* to student organizations, their members and the university, University implements this comprehensive student organizations risk management initiative in cooperation with the recognized student organizations of University. The goal is to enhance the health and safety of members of the University community through strategic risk mitigation practices deployed by and within each student organization. The initiative also comprises an educational curriculum on hazing, sexual misconduct and alcohol/other drugs in which all student organization members will participate annually.

PROCESS: As the hub around which ??? student organizations coalesce, University has a responsibility to empower organizations with specialized knowledge of the risks organizations face, and share specialized techniques for addressing those risks and minimizing them. This initiative is based on shared responsibility, with University providing tools, training and supervision. Responsibility is shared by the student organizations, which will learn the tools, implement the training, and be accountable for activities and results. This initiative has been from its inception a collaboration based on shared desires to enhance the health and safety of the University community.

[VALUES-DRIVEN INITIATIVE: We intended from the outset that this initiative would be based on shared values that the university and its organizations embrace jointly. Rather than assume what those values were, we convened two groups to participate in an iterative process that would tell us what we value as a community. The first group included the Student Affairs Risk Management Task Force, on which sit administrators, staff and student organization representatives. The second group is composed entirely of student organization members. In the fall of 2007, each group engaged in a half-day long facilitation based upon Appreciative Inquiry, led by consultant Brett A. Sokolow, Esq. The facilitations were designed to foster group identification and discussion. As a result, each group identified its most commonly-held values. The staff facilitation yielded the following top five values, in order of importance:

1. INVOLVEMENT (FAITH/COMMUNITY, VOLUNTEERISM, CHARITY)
2. RISK TAKING/CHALLENGING YOURSELF
3. APPRECIATING V. ENTITLEMENT
4. LEADERSHIP/ROLE MODELING
5. FAMILY CLOSENESS

The facilitation involving members of student organizations yielded the following five values:

1. ACCOMPLISHMENT (INDEPENDENCE/LEADERSHIP/CHALLENGING EXPERIENCES/ROLE MODELING)

2. PROBLEM-SOLVING/OVERCOMING OBSTACLES
3. CHARITY/VOLUNTEERISM/SELFLESSNESS/GIVING/HELPING
4. FRIENDSHIP/FAMILY
5. SAFETY/HEALTH/HEALING/NON-VIOLENCE

The similarity is striking. The areas of intersection of these two groups provide us with the values that will shape and undergird this risk management initiative. The values of the community as identified by this process include:

1. ACCOMPLISHMENT/CHALLENGES
2. LEADERSHIP/ROLE MODELING
3. FRIENDS/FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS
4. COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT/VOLUNTEERISM

Each group added one value not identified by the other, and these two will also inform our process:

5. APPRECIATION (NOT HAVING A SENSE OF ENTITLEMENT)
6. SAFETY & HEALTH

All elements of this initiative find root in and reference these values. Framing this as a values-based initiative will answer the question of why we are doing this, and why it is important. It should also help to motivate large numbers of people to voluntarily adopt changes to behavior and organizational practices. Simply put, implementing the provisions of this initiative is consonant with the values of the members of our community. Key values-based expressions of this initiative are:

- Adopting the initiative is a leadership objective for the members of student organizations
- This initiative will be a worthwhile challenge to implement, and addresses the worthwhile challenge facing all student organizations—managing their activities in a way that enhances the educational experience of members, contributes to the community, and minimizes the potential for harm and injury to those who participate in organizational membership.
- This initiative, by design, is a project of involvement and engagement that will yield benefit to the community and its members through acts of selflessness, role modeling, and empowerment.
- This initiative will promote protection of the health and safety of friends and family.
- This initiative will foster appreciation of organizational recognition and membership as a privilege to which responsibilities and obligations attach, and by which the meaning of membership and participation in shared accomplishment will be enhanced.

It is a long-term goal of this initiative to replicate this values-derivation exercise each year for new members of student organizations, within each organization, as a means of connecting new and returning members to organizational and community values. We hope that each new member will become invested in the risk management ethic and process.]

HISTORY: Based on a perceived growing need to furnish student organizations with better information on risk assessment and risk management, University engaged the services of the National Center for Higher Education Risk Management (www.ncherp.org) during the fall of 2007 and spring of 2008 to design and implement this risk management initiative. Recent legislation in ???? codifies the obligation of colleges and universities to undertake this task. University expects that this initiative will satisfy the mandates of this statute.

GROUPS IMPACTED: All recognized student organizations of University. **All organizations working toward recognition by University? [OPTIONAL]**

ORGANIZATIONAL RISK MANAGERS (ORMs): Fundamental to the success of this initiative is the creation of organizational risk management positions within each student organization. By **September 1st of each year**, every student organization will identify its ORM(s) to the Center for Campus Life, by including name, address, email address, home phone number, campus phone number, and cell phone number. A one week grace period will be extended, and then notice of organizational probation will be given. If an organization does not identify ORM(s) within 48 hours of notice, probation will be imposed. Alternatively, the Center for Campus Life has authority to appoint ORM(s) from the roster of organizational membership when necessary and to remove ineffective ORM(s) from their positions.

Each organization's risk managers will serve for one school year, and may serve more than one-year in the position. If an ORM quits during a term, the organization has one week to fill the position(s) with a replacement(s) and notify the Center for Campus Life of the name and contact information of the new ORM(s). For those organizations, such as fraternities and sororities, that may already have chapter risk managers, this ORM role should overlap with that position. Each organization will determine how it selects its ORM(s), by election, appointment or volunteering.

Each organization with no more than **twenty** members will have one ORM. Each organization having more than **twenty** and less than **sixty** members will have two ORM(s). Each organization with more than **sixty** members will have three ORMs. As organization sizes change through the year, organizations are responsible for monitoring and adjusting the number of ORM(s) needed.

The responsibilities of organizational risk managers (ORMs) is three-fold:

- 1) To train all members of the organization about this initiative and to familiarize them with risk management expectations and techniques.
- 2) To attend risk management events sponsored by the Center for Campus Life, and to report Learning Outcomes back to their organizational membership in timely fashion.
- 3) To complete Risk Management Plans (RMPs) for each organizational activity or event according to the RMP Guidelines established below.

Each ORM is responsible for these three functions. Both individual and group sanctions may result from failure of the ORM(s) to accomplish these tasks. ORMs who misrepresent the risk profile of events or activities, or intentionally miscategorize events or activities according to the risk rubric may also subject their organizations to group sanctions and/or face individual sanctions.

ADVISORS (if you choose not to use advisors in this way, this function may be centralized within the Center for Student Life): Currently, advisors to student organizations play a minor role. This initiative re-envision that role as considerably more engaged and responsible. Student organization advisors will need to take the position seriously, be accountable to the Center for Campus Life, and devote more than minimal time and attention to the organizations they advise. **Clarify/revise advisor duties and criteria for selection and identification and incorporate here.**

The faculty/staff advisor for each student organization is the primary liaison in this initiative between the organization and the Center for Campus Life. All Risk Management Plans completed by organizational risk managers must be submitted to organizational advisors at least **72** business hours (not including weekends, holidays or breaks) prior to the event or activity planned by the student organization. If an RMP for an event or activity is not submitted according to this timeline, the event or activity cannot be held, on or off-campus. RMPs are the sole responsibility of the ORMs. Events or activities held without an RMP filed are grounds for organizational and/or individual conduct sanctions.

RISK MANAGEMENT PLANS: (RMPs) are to be submitted electronically, using the form found at <http://www.???.edu>. Forms will be automatically copied to the Center for Campus Life, and will be addressed to the email address of the advisor by the ORM completing the online form. Hard copies of each plan should be maintained by the student organization for a period of three (3) years. Once the advisor is in receipt of the form via email, it is their responsibility to communicate any needed advice, modifications or prohibitions to the ORM promptly (usually within 24 hours of receiving the RMP).

ACCOUNTABILITY: The RMP process involves categorizing each event or activity with a three-level risk rubric. Each advisor will, in annual training, receive education about risk assessment, risk management and risk mitigation techniques. Advisors will teach these

techniques to the ORMs, and additional training will be provided by the Center for Campus Life. The initial duty of the advisor is to review the RMP to determine if the event has been accurately described, and to determine if the event has been accurately characterized by the ORMs according to the risk rubric.

If the event or activity is accurately described and categorized, the advisor should so note on the RMP and upload that conclusion for notification to the submitting ORMs and to the Center for Campus Life. If the event is miscategorized or the description needs to be revised, that will be noted by the advisor, and the RMP will be electronically returned for revision by the ORMs. When an RMP is returned, the 72 business hour submission requirement resets, such that any revision must be received by the advisor at least 72 business hours prior to the planned event or activity, unless the advisor waives that requirement on the RMP (usually because the needed revisions are minor or quick).

Where an event or activity is categorized as low-risk by the ORMs, and the advisor concurs, no further action is needed by the organization.

Where an event or activity is categorized as moderate-risk by the ORMs, and the advisor concurs, the event or activity may take place pending approval of the risk mitigation strategy (RMS) offered by the ORMs to offset the anticipated or potential risk(s). A field for RMS descriptions is included in the electronic RMP. An RMS is not necessary for low-risk events or activities, but is required for moderate-risk and high-risk activities. The advisor has discretion to determine whether to refer RMPs identifying a moderate-risk level on the rubric to the Center for Campus Life for assistance in addressing risks unanticipated or unaddressed by the RMP or beyond the advisor's comfort level (based on training and expertise). Referring an RMP to the Center for Campus Life provides an added level of risk insulation to advisors, vis-à-vis their potential exposure.

When an RMP indicates a high-risk level on the rubric, it must be referred to the Center for Campus Life immediately for approval. Advisors cannot approve high-risk level events or activities. The Center for Campus Life has a list of high-risk activities and events that can be approved. If the event or activity is not on that list, the Center will work collaboratively with the ORMs to create an RMS that will permit the event or activity to be reclassified from high-risk to a lower category on the risk rubric. If the risk profile of the event or activity cannot be successfully mitigated, it will not be approved.

EVENT/ACTIVITY: Adopt a version of the University Function definition already in place, or develop one

RISK OVERVIEW: Risk is inherent in all human activities. We accept it, but don't want to engender more risk than is necessary for the nature of the activity/event. We also don't want to engender risk for which the potential consequences far exceed the potential benefits or merits. There are complex risk formulae and categories that help

to determine the risk profile of an activity or event (risk profile is defined as the measurement of exposure to risk posed by an activity or event). For our purposes, a very simple way to designate a risk profile is needed (perhaps even an over-simplification). This initiative proposes a three-level risk rubric to accomplish that task:

1. HIGH RISK
2. MODERATE RISK
3. LOW RISK

A very simple example is that taking a walk generally has a low-risk profile. Taking a jog, or walking on rugged terrain or in heavy traffic would have a moderate-risk profile. Taking that same walk or jog in rugged terrain or heavy traffic while blindfolded is going to present a high-risk profile. Each event or activity of a student organization will be categorized according to its risk profile with this rubric. In order to determine an accurate risk profile, each ORM will conduct a risk assessment on EVERY planned event or activity. **One potentially problematic area is that organizations looking to circumvent this process may resort to “spontaneous” rather than planned events. You should discuss how you would like to control this and potentially create a pertinent policy.**

RISK ASSESSMENT:

A risk assessment is based on criteria for categorizing risk. It is recommended that you automate this process to some extent, where ORMs can use the online RMP to answer questions about an event or activity, and determine an accurate risk profile from the answers. The online RMP should be developed from the question set below. It is suggested that you keep average completion time to a half-hour or less, and that you construct your questions accordingly.

- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY INVOLVE TRANSPORT BY MOTOR VEHICLE?
 - Will the transport be provided by a common carrier?
 - Can the organization/University be named as an additional insured on any insurance policies covering the carrier?
 - What are the carrier’s insurance coverages?
 - Will the transport be provided by university vehicle?
 - Will drivers be supplied by the university?
 - Will drivers be supplied by the organization?
 - Have they been trained?
 - Have their driving records been checked?
 - Are members of the organization driving their own vehicles?
 - Have they received training?
 - Have their driving records been checked?
 - Are they adequately insured?
 - Will rental cars be used in the activity/event?

- Will all terms of the rental agreement be satisfied?
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY INVOLVE ANY POTENTIAL KNOWN ILLEGAL ACTS?
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY INVOLVE ANY KNOWN POTENTIAL VIOLATIONS OF UNIVERSITY POLICIES OR REGULATIONS?
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY INVOLVE KNOWN ILLEGAL SUBSTANCES OF ANY KIND (Alcohol, drugs, chemicals, toxins, etc.)?
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY INVOLVE THE PRESENCE OR SERVICE OF ALCOHOL?
 - Will service be controlled according to university policy?
 - Will admittance be controlled according to university policy?
 - How will alcohol be distributed?
 - 3rd Party vendor?
 - BYO?
 - Other?
 - How many sober party monitors will be on-duty?
 - How many guests are expected?
 - Who will control attendance if this number is exceeded?
 - How will control over unauthorized guests be handled?
 - How will control over out-of-control and/or drunk guests be handled?
 - How will access to the event by already-drunk guests be prohibited?
 - How will safe transport for inebriated guests be arranged?
 - Will a guest list be utilized?
 - Will any admission fee be charged by the organization?
 - Will the organization profit financially in any way from the event?
 - Is the risk of driving-under-the-influence being addressed?
 - How?
 - Will underage guests be permitted?
 - If so, how do you plan to prohibit their access to alcohol?
 - Will non-alcoholic, non-carbonated alternative beverages be provided?
 - Will sufficient quantities of food be provided?
 - At guest expense?
 - Free-of-charge?
- WILL THE EVENT/ACTIVITY TAKE PLACE ON-CAMPUS OR OFF-CAMPUS?
 - Specify location _____
- WILL THE EVENT/ACTIVITY INVOLVE NON-STUDENTS?
 - Who are the generally anticipated attendees/participants?
- WILL THE EVENT/ACTIVITY INVOLVE AIR, TRAIN OR BOAT TRANSPORT?
 - Specify _____
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY AS CURRENTLY PLANNED PRESENT A RISK OF DAMAGE TO PROPERTY?
 - Specify _____

- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY AS CURRENTLY PLANNED PRESENT MORE THAN AN EVERYDAY RISK OF PHYSICAL INJURY TO PARTICIPANTS?
 - Specify _____
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY INCLUDE ANY INHERENTLY DANGEROUS ACTIVITY (e.g. skydiving, mountain climbing, base jumping. etc.)?
 - Specify _____
- IS THE EVENT/ACTIVITY INSURED?
 - By general liability?
 - By specific rider or one-time event coverage?
 - By a third-party?
 - Are any of the activities the event contemplates specifically excluded from coverage by the terms of the policy?
 - Are the insured coverages the right type for the activity/event?
 - Are the insured coverages adequate to the nature of the risks involved?
- IS THE EVENT/ACTIVITY CO-SPONSORED?
 - By whom?
- DO UMBRELLA ORGANIZATIONS IMPOSE SEPARATE RISK MANAGEMENT PARAMETERS ON THE EVENT/ACTIVITY?
 - Have those parameters/conditions been met?
- IS AN EMERGENCY PLAN IN PLACE FOR THE ACTIVITY/EVENT?
- WHO IS THE EMERGENCY CONTACT FOR THE EVENT
 - _____ cellphone number
- WILL AN ORGANIZATIONAL ADVISOR BE PRESENT AT THE ACTIVITY/EVENT?
 - _____ name _____ contact number
- WILL CHAPERONES BE PRESENT AT THE ACTIVITY/EVENT
 - _____ name _____ contact number
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY REQUIRE THE SIGNING OF A CONTRACT OR AGREEMENT BY THE ORGANIZATION?
 - Have the contracting/agreement approval requirements set by the Center for Campus Life been met?
- HAVE APPROPRIATE POSTING AND ADVERTISING GUIDELINES BEEN FOLLOWED FOR PROMOTING THE EVENT/ACTIVITY?
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY INVOLVE, RECRUITMENT, INITIATION OR INDUCTING FOR THE ORGANIZATION?
 - Specify _____
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY POSE A RISK OF EMBARRASSMENT, HUMILIATION, COERCION OR EMOTIONAL ABUSE TO PARTICIPANTS?
 - Specify _____
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY POTENTIALLY POSE A RISK OF SEXUAL ASSAULT TO ANY PARTICIPANTS?
 - Specify _____
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY POTENTIALLY POSE A RISK OF PHYSICAL ASSAULT TO ANY PARTICIPANTS?

- Specify _____
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY POTENTIALLY POSE A RISK OF TARGETING, DEMEANING, DISCRIMINATING OR INSTIGATING ANY PERSON OR GROUP ON THE BASIS OF RACE, GENDER, RELIGION OR ANY OTHER CLASS OF PERSONS PROTECTED UNDER UNIVERSITY POLICY?
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY POTENTIALLY POSE A RISK OF INCITEMENT TO IMMEDIATE LAWLESS ACTION BY PARTICIPANTS?
- WILL THE ORGANIZATION BE RENTING, LEASING OR OTHERWISE PROCURING A LOCALE FOR PURPOSES OF HOSTING THE EVENT/ACTIVITY?
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY INVOLVE COMPETITIVE ACTIVITIES?
- DOES THE EVENT/ACTIVITY INVOLVE PROBLEM-SOLVING, OBSTACLE COURSES, TEAM BUILDING, OR OTHER PHYSICAL CHALLENGE-BASED ACTIVITIES?
- WILL YOU BE PROUD OF THE PICTURES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE EVENT/ACTIVITY WHEN YOU SEE THEM ON FACEBOOK, MYSPACE, ETC., THE NEXT DAY?
- HAVE ALL APPLICABLE WAIVER FORMS, INDEMNIFICATIONS, PERMISSIONS OR OTHER NECESSARY FORMS OR PAPERWORK RELATED TO THE EVENT/ACTIVITY BEEN COMPLETED AND RETURNED AS REQUIRED?

RISK MANAGEMENT: Based upon the foregoing questions, does the event/activity:

- 1) Pose low or no potential for harm, loss, injury, embarrassment or other risk?
- 2) Pose moderate potential for harm, loss, injury, embarrassment or other risk?
- 3) Pose high risk of harm, loss, injury, embarrassment or other risk?

RISK MITIGATION STRATEGY: Based upon the categorization by the ORM as a result of the answers to the questions from the RMP, action is to be taken as follows:

LOW-RISK: No action required except to ensure that the parameters making the event/activity low-risk are maintained throughout the event/activity

MODERATE-RISK: The event may proceed with an appropriate RMS in place. The ORMs will complete the field in the RMP for RMS to cover each of the identified potential risks. For moderate-risk activities, strategies for risk acceptance (such as increased insurance limits) are expected, as are risk transfer techniques, such as co-sponsorship and the shifting of partial risk to third-parties (vendors, facilities, carriers, etc).

Additionally, mitigation of specific risks will require strategies for policy development and dissemination, monitoring schemes, enhanced supervision, event control, guests lists, driver training, emergency plan development, alcohol transport, and other effective self-policing mechanisms. Upon submission of an RMS, and advisor or Center for Campus Life approval, an event with moderate-risk profile will be approved.

HIGH-RISK: Certain high-risk activities are pre-approved. If the profile of an event/activity is high-risk and is not pre-approved, the event will not be approved. Risk transfer and risk acceptance are not sufficient to cover the level of potential harm or loss. In order to be approved, high-risk events/activities must be accurately assessed by the ORMs, and an RMS must be proposed that the Center for Campus Life agrees will reduce the risk profile from high-risk to a lower risk profile. The event/activity need not fall into the low-risk category to be approved. A moderate-risk profile is usually enough to permit the event/activity, as altered, to proceed.

[PILOT GROUPS: The Task Force, in collaboration with the consultant, identified a small number of student organizations which formed the pilot group for this initiative. Both Greek and non-Greek organizations participated in the pilot. The pilot was organized in the spring, to run for the entirety of the fall, at which time was evaluated and assessed by University. Training and materials were provided to advisors and to the ORMs of the pilot organizations. Paper RMPs were utilized during the pilot. Technical assistance was provided to the organizations and advisors by the Center for Campus Life as needed. At the end of the pilot semester, the pilot was scaled up to a greater number of student organizations after modifications and improvements were made].

EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT: University was responsible for evaluation and assessment of the pilot (potential collaboration with the consultant is contemplated). Additional outside consultants may be needed.

[2ND PHASE IMPLEMENTATION: The second phase of this initiative involves scaling the pilot to a larger number of student organizations, if not all. Trainings will be provided for all advisors and ORMs. Consultant may be engaged for this process. A full year of implementation will be completed, at which time a full evaluation and assessment will be performed by University].

EVALUATION AND ASSESSMENT: It is expected that surveys and self-study will be the primary instruments for validating this initiative across all student organizations.

[3RD PHASE IMPLEMENTATION: The 3rd Phase of this initiative is the development and implementation of a comprehensive health & safety risk management curriculum for student organization members. At some point, all students should participate, but this is a starting point. The 3rd Phase will focus on the topics of hazing, sexual assault/harassment and alcohol and other drugs. A successful four-year educational strategy has a number of elements which are discussed below. We expect to be able to plan and implement this phase in years two and three. The consultant may be engaged to develop the curriculum. Adequate funds will be needed to underwrite the educational initiatives of the 3rd Phase. The elements of a comprehensive health & safety risk management curriculum include:

- a points-based attendance mandate
- a pre-planned curriculum;
- centralized organization and coordination;
- assessment;
- make-up program options;
- and enforcement/consequences.

Creating an Attendance Mandate Based on a Points System

This section is designed to help meet the requirements of the state risk management statute. Creating a successful mandate requires you to develop some sort of bureaucracy. This bureaucracy gives you the mechanism for tracking attendance, so that your mandate has teeth. Some use of sign-out sheets, attendance lists, check-ins, card swipes, password entry, or other proof of attendance will be needed. The mandate is based on a point requirement. In order to maintain participation in any student organization, students must annually accrue a minimum number of risk management points based on participation in and attendance at risk management programs and education programs on hazing, sexual assault and problem drinking/other drug issues.

If students don't complete the point requirement, you can provide a consequence, such as ineligibility for student organization membership, a registration hold, an inability to graduate, etc. I dislike fines, though many campuses use them. I guess if you used them to fund the educational programs that might be productive. Some campuses use conduct sanctions for students who fail to earn the required points, and this is the negative consequence paradigm. The continuum from carrot to stick goes from a need to do make-up education when points are not earned in time—to registration holds or housing lottery implications—to fines and other conduct sanctions—to making points a graduation requirement. This most severe consequence is actually my favorite because when graduation is dependent on the achievement of extra-curricular education, the mandate becomes cultural. There is no better way to infuse it within the academic environment, though an initiative impacting only student organization members may not be the right inception-point for such a broad-ranging goal.

The Four-Year Strategy

Once you have engineered the mandate as the vehicle for effective content-delivery, you need to develop the content. Your goal should be for your programmatic efforts to be developmental, progressive, consistent, and message-reinforcing. First, a campus programming master calendar must be functioning in order for you to make event space and timing decisions. Next, you need a centralized programming office or committee. Maybe your committee includes representatives from all campus departments that have programming responsibilities, so that centralized coordination becomes possible.

We need to recognize that student activities personnel and athletics may not be topic specialists in many of the program areas they are called on to address. Maybe there are faculty and student reps., including SGA or campus programming board members who would be helpful. The health educator, alcohol educator, sexual assault educator and other key stakeholders should be involved in the planning process. It may help to require that all programming efforts that are not centralized be pre-approved by the committee, so that the committee has a mechanism for keeping the master calendar accurate. It may also be helpful to centralize programmatic funding with this committee (or at least approval for programmatic expenditures related to its purview) as this will help to stay “on message” campus-wide.

Themes or topics need to be chosen and narrowed. Maybe one year the focus will be on hazing. Maybe alcohol and sexual assault are your top priorities. This proposal will use the example of sexual assault, but will be broadened if it meets with Task Force and budgetary approval. Centralizing the planning process will allow you to program strategically with respect to timing. Are there times of each year when programming on this topic makes more sense than others? Yes. Ask your conduct officers or campus police, and they may tell you that September, October and April are the months in which they probably receive the most reports. If so, we could then program during or just before these critical periods. Are students vulnerable at orientation? Sure. Before Spring Break? That might be good timing. Before a notorious campus event that is unique to your environment? Definitely.

Once you have highlighted timing that makes sense, you can begin to envision what topics within sexual assault are important to your campus. For example, we might come up with a list of topics like this:

- Lack of victim empathy; victim-blaming
- Feelings of invulnerability/NIMBY (not-in-my-backyard)
- Absence of risk-reduction decisions
- Lots of drunk sex
- Students misinterpreting consent
- Students who don't know how to draw the line between seduction and coercion
- Predation issues; characteristics of date rapists
- Rape drugs
- Difference between stranger rape and date rape
- Male defensiveness
- Mens' fear of false accusations
- How to help a victim
- How to intervene in/avoid uncomfortable situations
- Self-defense
- Criminal prosecution of sexual assault
- Male and female socialization and communication

- Gendered assumptions of sexual entitlement/availability
- Sexual respect
- Social norms around sexual assault and protective behaviors
- Bystander empowerment
- Etcetera

Sometimes, we do not even realize there are so many different issues within sexual assault. There are more, but this gives us a good start. The same is true of problem drinking/drugs and hazing. Suppose this became our hit list, and we decided that by the time student organization members graduated, we wanted each of them to be exposed to programming on each of these topics. Then, we can strategize what combination of active and passive programming is going to give us the topical coverage we desire. We could set the goal of starting with more basic concepts and progressing to topics of greater sophistication, using each program to build on the ones before it. Or, we could choose to build basic competence on each issue in the course of a year.

Many campuses use a program by a survivor in the fall, and this is strategic. The feeling of invulnerability for new students in an unfamiliar environment may place potential victims at enhanced risk. Maybe you invite an outside speaker, or an outspoken survivor on your own campus. But, what are you doing to address the potential perpetrators? Could you use small-group discussion following this program, or some other programming opportunity not just to encourage potential victims to reduce their risk, but also to encourage potential perpetrators to learn the rules? Can you facilitate discussion on how consent works? When do alcohol and other drugs cut someone off from sexual permission? How much pressure is too much?

Later in the fall, what types of messages will build on this beginning? A men's pledge to end sexual violence? A discussion of sexual respect by Jean Kilbourne and/or Jackson Katz? A viewing of the "Spin the Bottle" CD-ROM? Maybe you prefer Sex Signals' humorous introduction to sexual respect over programs that build empathy, so that the topics aren't too heavy early on. Maybe you want Mike Domitrz, Alan Berkowitz, LuoLuo Hong, One-in-Four, Steve Thompson, Gail Stern or any one of a fine pool of respected educators? There are many wonderful guest lectures available to you, but don't just pick the few who send you a tape or call you on the phone. Pick those who fit best thematically and topically with your goals.

Once you do an introductory program, what can come next? Do you want to get deep into consent, explore male fears and gender stereotypes, talk about helping a victim? All of these topics can give you a cohesive message when you schedule them strategically. And, don't be afraid to ask a programmer to customize his/her program for you. Many will. Do you want them to talk about your policies, your campus survey results, a recent incident? Canned programs are fine, but it doesn't take much effort from a speaker to give you something more focused on YOUR campus, and they will have a better educational impact for you and your students.

Lay out your plan, semester-by-semester. Make sure to discuss how each peer theater program, condom-distribution campaign, poster, Clothesline project, ribbon event, Take Back the Night, Sexual Assault Awareness Week (or Month) will fit into the overall educational objectives you have outlined. Are dating doctors and better sex lecturers going to reinforce a good program on sexual respect, or may they undermine your efforts by a casual approach. Do your students feel tricked when the sex program turns out to be the rape program? How are you marketing your efforts? Inquire into the content to make sure that your educational programs are getting your students to where you want them to be.

Once you launch your four-year strategy, you will need to begin to assess the programs. Assess whether students like them, but also survey to find out what students take from them. There are lots of funny, hip, emotional, or scary programs that connect with students and that they rate highly. But, the educational content is secondary to the gimmick. Not only do students need to enjoy what you provide, assessment needs to show that your learning objectives are being accomplished. If they are not, modifications to the strategy will be needed. Viewing the strategic plan as a flexible framework rather than as a fixed requirement will help you to adjust as you progress. With each incoming class or generation of students, you may need to alter the strategy to address changing mores or times. Cyber-stalking is not on the list of topics, above. Maybe it is a big issue for your students, or perhaps surreptitious picture-taking and harassment are more important to you? We can anticipate some issues, but not all.

Variety, in terms of message, format, delivery and content is something to strive for as you plan. You can plan to segment audiences, if you desire, either by sex, age, affiliation, campus activity, or otherwise. Will programming for your fraternities get them to open up more, or will it just reinforce a strong perception of privilege because the campus is willing to cater to them with their own special program? Can you get faculty to support your strategy with curriculum infusion, by giving extra-credit for attendance, or by taking classes to events and lectures? Can first-year experience sections discuss topics, taking the reach beyond just student organization members? Can the library stock and display topical books and articles during theme periods?

Overall, the goal is to achieve a progressive, consistent programmatic strategy. By the time your students graduate, they will have built competencies on a large number of issues by regular attendance at worthwhile events. You should make this strategy transparent to your community, and invite support from off-campus resources as well as your own campus experts, activists, peer educators, and programmers. Once you have effectively devised and implemented a strategy, you can expand it and replicate it to address hazing, problem drinking and other drugs, and any other critical health and safety issues that are a priority. Existing educational programs should be integrated.

* risk, defined as the potential for injury, pecuniary loss, reputational harm, disruption of operations, loss of institutional prestige and organizational prestige

Brett A. Sokolow, JD, is President of the National Center for Higher Education Risk Management (NCHERM) in Malvern, Pennsylvania. Mr. Sokolow serves 16 colleges as outside counsel, and has served as a consultant to over 1,300 colleges and universities. Mr. Sokolow holds memberships to the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA), the Association for Student Judicial Affairs (ASJA), the American College Personnel Association (ACPA), where he is Vice President for Education of the Commission for Student Conduct and Legal Issues. He is a member of the Council on Law in Higher Education (CLHE), where he also serves as a member of the Board of Trustees. He is Editor Emeritus of the Report on Campus Safety and Student Development. Mr. Sokolow has authored ten books and dozens of articles on campus security, Clery Act compliance, student conduct, risk management, problem drinking, and sexual misconduct. www.ncherm.org