Clery Center Collaborative:
2013 Pilot Program Impact Report
Dear Colleague,

In 2013, the Clery Center created the Collaborative, a groundbreaking program that helps multidisciplinary campus teams tackle common campus safety compliance challenges together through training, resources, and self-assessment.

In our travels across the country for our Jeanne Clery Act Training Seminars, we met hundreds of higher education and campus safety professionals who were inspired by the spirit of the Clery Act but frustrated with the difficulties inherent to implementation. We designed the Collaborative to help address those challenges: lack of institutional support or buy-in, coordination issues, training and professional development needs, and scarce resources, among others.

Since piloting on July 1, the Collaborative has become a full-fledged program, built from the feedback, solutions, and frustrations communicated by professionals in campus safety and higher education. The report that follows is the result of many conversations with the Collaborative’s 38 pilot members, who generously gave their time and talent to these discussions.

We’d also like to thank and acknowledge the incredible work and support of Xero Associates’ Jennifer Panagopoulos, Ph.D., who helped turn our evaluation and outcomes measurement ideas into a reality. This report would not be possible without her help. It reflects much of Dr. Panagopoulos’s findings through her conversations with Collaborative pilot members.

We are excited to share the results of our first formal evaluation of the Collaborative with our current members and the larger campus safety community. It’s our hope that these findings will not only create a more dynamic and effective Collaborative Program, but will also spark a much-needed dialogue across the sector about the ways we can come together to create sustainable and innovative solutions.

Sincerely,

Alison Kiss, MS
Executive Director
Clery Center for Security On Campus
Executive Summary

The Clery Center for Security On Campus created the Collaborative to help solve common problems related to campus safety and Clery Act compliance.

To make sure that the program makes a positive impact in these areas, the Clery Center invests in program evaluation and outcomes measurement efforts to assess how well the program is working for member institutions.

In December 2013, the Clery Center received an initial evaluation report from Xero Associates regarding the Collaborative, which surveyed 69% of pilot members via phone interviews and online surveys. Among the report’s key findings were the following:

- **89%** of members reported being either extremely satisfied or very satisfied with their overall experience in the Collaborative;

- Most pilot members joined the Collaborative to work together with other institutions and the Clery Center, access high-quality trainings and other resources, and keep abreast of campus safety policy updates and promising practices;

- **89%** of members stated that the Collaborative helped improve compliance efforts on their campus;

- **93%** of members would recommend the Collaborative to other institutions;

- **Majority (64%)** reported that the Collaborative was either very effective or effective in sharing resources;

- **87%** said they were extremely satisfied or very satisfied with the quality and availability of resources through the Collaborative;

- Members reported improved internal communications, including the creation of multidisciplinary teams, involving students and other key stakeholders in campus safety and compliance efforts, and raising awareness of the Clery Act and other requirements on their campus;

- **Nearly half (46%)** of members reported updating campus policies and/or procedures as a result of participating in the Collaborative.

During evaluation, members also provided feedback on how to make the Collaborative better. Suggestions included developing new resources and updating existing ones, including a campus security authority (CSA) training video and tools for evaluating the annual security report (ASR), as well as providing more frequent communications on policy updates and upcoming events.

As a result of this feedback, the Clery Center will launch an updated version of its CSA training video for members, as well as provide more opportunities to review ASR requirements in 2014.
The Collaborative is a learning membership program that provides training, resources, and other tools to enhance institutional Clery Act compliance and promote campus safety best practices.

The Collaborative Program (“Collaborative”) is a learning membership program that provides training, resources, and other tools to enhance institutional Clery Act compliance and promote campus safety best practices. Through participation in the Collaborative, individuals and institutions are empowered to create safer learning environments through improved policies and procedures, increased resources, and enhanced collaboration and coordination.

Launched on July 1, 2013, the Collaborative piloted with 38 colleges and universities in Pennsylvania.*

As part of their membership application, each Collaborative member is required to develop a multidisciplinary team of 5-7 professionals from different departments within the institution. Members are also encouraged to include individuals from organizations that have working relationships and/or formal agreements (i.e. MOUs, etc.) related to campus safety. These could include local law enforcement, emergency responders, or victim service agencies.

Exhibit 1: Collaborative Team Members by Area

The Collaborative provides a number of membership benefits, including free and discounted online and in-person learning opportunities,** access to extensive resources,*** and free technical assistance.

Exhibit 2: Collaborative Members by Type

---

* A list of current Collaborative members is available at the Clery Center’s website at www.clerycenter.org/collaborative.

** Collaborative members receive discounts for the organization’s in-person Jeanne Clery Act Training Seminars, as well as the recently-launched Online Jeanne Clery Act Training Course. In addition, members receive free access to live and recorded webinars on various campus safety topics.

*** Resources include a secure, members-only website that features an online discussion board and idea exchange, online resource library, member directory, upcoming events, and a discounted online store. Collaborative members also receive exclusive access to the Clery Center’s Jeanne Clery Act Self-Assessment Tool for Multidisciplinary Campus Teams, a comprehensive guide that helps institutions evaluate their compliance efforts and document action items.
Program Evaluation Goals & Approach

Evaluation and assessment are at the heart of the Collaborative’s program design.

Evaluation and assessment are paramount to the Collaborative’s program design. The Collaborative piloted in 2013 with a group of 38 colleges and universities in Pennsylvania who committed to help the Clery Center improve the program’s effectiveness by providing feedback and suggestions along the way. Recognizing the ever-changing landscapes of campus safety and higher education, the Collaborative operates as an adaptive initiative that quickly and effectively responds to the needs of its members. By evaluating the Program’s impact on an ongoing basis, the Clery Center can adapt program content and membership benefits to respond to changes in the field and feedback from members.

In the spring of 2013, the Clery Center engaged Jennifer Panagopoulos, Ph.D., of Xero Associates, to develop an evaluation strategy to track and monitor progress relating to members’ satisfaction with the Collaborative processes, services, and benefits.

Dr. Panagopoulos has over 25 years of professional management, training, facilitation, evaluation, and instructional development related experience. She has developed delivered, and evaluated trainings and workshops covering a wide variety of areas, including prevention of alcohol and drugs, sexual assault and stalking, date rape, child victimization, hate and bias crimes, domestic violence, etc.

To evaluate the Collaborative Pilot Program, Dr. Panagopoulos worked with the Clery Center’s member services and program staff to develop a short phone interview schedule to achieve the following:

- Assess the degree of satisfaction with the partnership
- Understand which service/programs were being used
- Assess the quality of the services/programs provided
- Ascertained where there are opportunities for improvement
- Learn if participation resulted in any changes or plans to change policies/procedures

It is worthwhile to note that while this summary report reflects data and insights gathered through a formal, independent evaluation process, the Collaborative is an adaptive program that relies on ongoing evaluation efforts.

**Spotlight: Evaluation Goals**

- Measure member satisfaction with quality of services and resources (process evaluation)
- Measure knowledge gained through the program, specific to institutionalizing compliance through a multidisciplinary team approach (outcomes evaluation)
- Understand the effectiveness of the learning collaborative to scale to a larger, national model (process and outcomes evaluation)

**Outcomes Evaluation Objective:** Identify outcomes for members (i.e. benefits achieved through participation in the Collaborative); for the Collaborative, this will primarily focus on improved learning and knowledge, as well as how the program enhanced working relationships within institutional teams as well as between campuses.

**Process Evaluation Objective:** Understand how to most effectively administer the Collaborative Pilot Program in order to plan for program expansion and to communicate these processes more effectively to internal and external stakeholders.
At the onset of evaluation planning, the Clery Center’s member services and program staff worked with Dr. Panagopoulos to establish the following impact targets, key performance indicators, and data methods for the following areas:

### 1. In-Person Learning: Outcome Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased knowledge of campus safety compliance requirements and promising practices</td>
<td>75% of training participants demonstrate increased knowledge of Clery Act and related laws, as well as campus safety promising practices</td>
<td>(1) Knowledge of Clery Act, (2) knowledge of related laws</td>
<td>Hard copy pre- and post-tests (distributed and collected in-person)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Online Learning: Outcome Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased knowledge of campus safety compliance requirements and promising practices</td>
<td>75% of training participants demonstrate increased knowledge of Clery Act and related laws, as well as campus safety promising practices</td>
<td>(1) Knowledge (checkpoints), (2) Knowledge (pre- and post-tests)</td>
<td>Electronic pre- and post-surveys; online checkpoints; post-webinar/online training survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3. Resources & Networking: Outcome Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Improved awareness of campus safety resources and networking with peers | • 75% of participants (individuals) report satisfactory and/or excellent experience using the member website  
• 30% of participants use the discussion board feature at least once  
• 75% of participants log-in at least once a month | (1) Online discussion boards used frequently, (2) member website rated favorably, (3) website used frequently (active log-ins) | Website analytics data via Google Analytics and website platform |
4. Technical Assistance (TA): Outcome Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Develop and maintain a comprehensive TA system (online, email, phone and onsite; provide information/materials) | • 25% use some type of TA assistance – call, online, onsite, etc.  
• 75% of recipients have a positive TA experience | (1) Number/type of TA experience,  
(2) Participants’ TA experience survey  
(3) Consultants’ TA experience survey | Tracking spreadsheet for technical assistance requests; follow-up phone interviews with members receiving TA |

5. Self-Assessment: Outcome Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Key Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Institutions use Self-Assessment Tool to develop in-house working groups to review existing policies, identify potential gaps and challenges, and implement new policies and programs | • At least 75% of pilot members report reviewing and/or revising their existing policies  
• At least 50% of program participants report enhanced internal collaboration (i.e. committee-building, MOUs, etc.) | (1) Existing policies reviewed, (2) new policies implemented, (3) existing procedures reviewed, (4) new procedures implemented, (5) committees and/or panels built to review campus safety policies and procedures | Mid- and post-program phone interviews; self-assessment half-day workshops (in-person) |

**Phone Interview Schedule & Methodology.** The survey comprised 23 guiding questions with multiple parts and covering four major areas: (1) the Collaborative Program itself, (2) technical assistance, (3) resource sharing, and (4) online training and resources. (You can view a copy of these phone interview questions in Appendix A of this report.)

Respondents were not required to answer all questions designed for the survey. For example, respondents who didn’t ask for or receive technical assistance would not be asked to describe nature or type of technical assistance requested. Questions were mostly open ended, although a few used a rating scale. Respondents were informed that their responses would be confidential and results reported in aggregate form only.

Calls to schedule a phone interview were placed to each of the 36 participating institutions. Twenty-seven interviews were scheduled of which 20 were completed. The 20 who completed phone interviews represented 20 institutions. The length of the phone interview ranged from 20 minutes to a little over an hour. Interviews were conducted in November of 2013. Conversations were not recorded; however, copious detailed notes were taken.

Seven interviews were completed online, with one duplicate who had already completed a phone interview. Another was a representative of an institution whose colleague had also completed a phone interview. The
seven online interviews completed represented an additional five institutions, bringing the total number of institutions represented to 25 or 69% of the 36 participating institutions.

The online and telephone interview questions, while similar, were not identical. Another difference between the phone and online survey is the quality of the responses. Online responses resembled a closed-ended format rather than open-ended guided interview process format. They were short and very concise, offering little, if any, description.

The phone interview process allowed respondents to elaborate and fully explain their responses. Analysis of open-ended results are often grouped by category rather than attributed to a respondent, thus, the number of actual responses may, in certain instances, exceed the number of respondents. For example, a respondent could provide three to four benefits in joining the Collaborative. These benefits are then grouped by type, i.e., ensure compliance, reduced rates for products/materials, opportunity to collaborate with other professionals.

---

**Spotlight: Program Evaluation Process & Data Sources**

Data was collected from participating pilot members through the following channels:

**Quantitative:**
1. Pre- and post-tests from training events (in-person and online)
2. Surveys
3. Website metrics

**Qualitative:**
1. Observations (focus groups, program events and activities, website interactions, etc.)
2. Mid- and post-program phone interviews (Xero Associates)
3. Regular monitoring and review of program records (phone/email requests, member website, etc.)
Member Participation & Satisfaction

In the spring of 2013, the Clery Center engaged Jennifer Panagopoulos, Ph.D., of Xero Associates, to conduct phone interviews with Collaborative Pilot Program participants.

Program Participation Goals. Prior to the launch of the Collaborative Pilot Program on July 1, 2013, the Clery Center’s staff established several participation goals for members (see Exhibit 3).

Through Dr. Panagopoulos’ formal evaluation of the Collaborative and an analysis of registration reports for in-person and online events, the Clery Center was able to determine participation rates for its Collaborative offerings (see chart in Exhibit 4).

For the most part, participation goals were clearly met. The overwhelming majority of member institutions participated in training opportunities, whether online or in-person, as well as engaged the Clery Center’s staff with technical assistance requests related to campus safety and Clery Act compliance questions.

The Collaborative’s online discussion board, however, failed to warrant the level of activity staff hoped for when establishing participation goals (30% of members using the online resource).

The feedback members provided during Dr. Panagopoulos’s phone interviews provided some insights into why the discussion board has been fairly dormant six months into the program: many identified the discussion board as a highlight of the program in terms of communications and resource sharing. Overall website activity also lagged slightly below expectations (75% monthly active use).

Finally, while technical assistance use and satisfaction goals for the Collaborative were met successfully, many Collaborative members did not identify the services they received as technical assistance. In the future, it may be helpful to create more clearly-defined opportunities to receive technical assistance services so more members are aware of the availability of these services.

Exhibit 3: Collaborative Participation Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Method of Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At least 50% of members participate in Collaborative-specific training/education opportunities (online webinars, special trainings, etc.)</td>
<td>Registration reports (Cvent, GoToWebinar) cross-referenced to Collaborative participants list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources on member website viewed and downloaded regularly, including member communications and newsletters</td>
<td>Website analytics (Google Analytics, Drupal), ConstantContact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in other Clery Center programs and events (NCSAM, in-person or online CATS, annual conference, etc.)</td>
<td>Registration reports (Cvent, DigitalChalk, GoToWebinar)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products ordered by Collaborative members (i.e. use of product resources)</td>
<td>Web store purchase records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular interaction and engagement through online discussion board and other technical assistance options (email, phone, web form)</td>
<td>Qualitative (online discussion board monitoring, questions/TA request web form, time tracking spreadsheet)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Deciding Factor(s) for Joining and Expectations of the Collaborative.** Members joined the Collaborative Pilot Program primarily to work with other institutions and the Clery Center. Members also reported that they joined the Program to gain access to resources, trainings, and guidance regarding new policy developments (VAWA Amendments to Clery). In addition, the Clery Center’s working relationships with experts and the U.S. Department of Education was cited by many as a determining factor in joining the Program.

Pilot members’ reported deciding factors for joining and expectations of the Collaborative were often aligned. The greater majority of respondents (15 of 28) joined to work collaboratively with other institutions and the Clery Center. Benefits attributed to working with other institutions included to: “discuss pressing issues, find common ground, jointly work to standardize reporting formats, and hear what peer institutions were doing.”

Expectations and benefits of working with the Clery Center were primarily twofold. First, respondents recognized the Clery Center as the ultimate authority on the Act: develop a “closer relationship with those who can help us best understand the Clery Act;” or “get information directly from the Clery Center was a selling point.”

Unexpected by the organization’s staff, a significant number of respondents pointed to the Clery Center’s transformation from a “watch dog, an adversarial” organization to one whose “new leadership conveys that they want to help us” as a deciding factor. Respondents further stated that “We can go to this group for support – ask them are we doing this right” without fear. Additionally, respondents mentioned the Clery Center’s close working relationship with U.S. Department of Education as an attractive element.

The second-most mentioned draw was having access to resources, trainings and new development to stay current and up-to-date. Other benefits and expectations included ensuring that their institution is compliant, identifying best practices, being informed of program reviews, and reduced rates for services/trainings. Of interest, and possibly troubling, are those respondents who believed that participating in the Collaborative implied that the U.S. Department of Education would be “fairer to them” in terms of enforcement of the Clery Act. It’s important to note that participation in the Collaborative does not make member institutions immune to program reviews from the U.S. Department of Education or any other regulatory body (federal, state, local). This was an inaccurate assumption made by a small number of pilot members.
Meeting Expectations. All in all, respondents’ expectations were met and, in many cases, were exceeded. Only two respondents’ stated that their expectations were only partially met for one of the following reasons: since the initial offering “the resource materials have lagged a bit but seem to be catching up…”; “resources on the [annual security report] are not as helpful as the [U.S. Department of Education] Handbook;” and “was hoping to solicit more support from the administration, excite others on this campus to take more interest in the overall responsibility of campus security.”

Four responses fell into the undecided category for one of the following reasons: “too premature; haven’t taken full advantage, will see if quality is maintained.” Three respondents were unsure of what the expectations were going into the Collaborative because the decision to join the program was someone else’s.

Greatest Benefits of Participating in the Collaborative. Responses regarding the greatest benefits of being a member fell into the following categories in descending order:

1. access to resources, webinars and trainings (mentioned by eight respondents);
2. staying current and/or confirmation of compliance, as well as being part of a collaboration effort (each category mentioned by five respondents); and
3. initiated the creation of an on-campus multidisciplinary team; reduced rates for services/materials; and participation demonstrates effort to comply – advance notice of a program review (each mentioned by two respondents).

Overall Satisfaction with the Collaborative. As seen in Exhibit 5 (right), the majority of respondents (25 of 28) rated their overall experience as either extremely satisfied (a 5 rating) or satisfied (a 4 rating). Typical justifications for a satisfied rating was there is “always room for improvement; we haven’t used it to the fullest; will be better able to rate once we use all the resources; and keep moving forward with it – it is still young.”

The three who rated their experience as neutral (a 3 rating) explained their rating “as not displeased just haven’t used it that much.”

Likely to Recommend Collaborative to Other Institutions. The vast majority (17 of the 28) of the respondents are very likely to recommend the Collaborative to other institutions (see Exhibit 6 below).

Six of the 17 stated they already have recommended the Collaborative to others; further asserting that their recommendation generated three new applicants. One would only recommend the Collaborative to institutions that “haven’t actively engaged in Clery compliance so as to focus their efforts.” Of the remaining 10, nine are likely and one somewhat likely to recommend the Collaborative.
The Collaborative’s Impact on Campus

To ensure the Collaborative is meeting its goal of helping members improve their on-campus safety- and compliance-related efforts, evaluation focused on the direct impact the program had in key areas.

1. Learning

**Online Resources (Training) Useful, Imparted New Knowledge, Instructors Helpful and Knowledgeable.** Thirteen respondents stated the training was useful, that new knowledge was obtained (“always able to take something new away”), and that instructors were knowledgeable and helpful.

Three respondents hadn’t participated; however, two of the three indicated that others from their institution did participate and found the training beneficial.

Suggestions for further training were to offer more training on VAWA Amendments to Clery (Campus SaVE Act). Other suggestions included providing discounted on-site consultations for members as well as offering more regional, in-person workshops for members to attend.

One respondent expressed how overwhelming education and training can be, saying “it’s hard to say if we need more training. We’ve had so much. Need to step back and assess/digest what we have learned.”

**Timing, Frequency, Convenience and Quality of Online Training and Related Resources.** As shown in Exhibit 7 (right), the greater majority of the respondents (21 of 23) rated the convenience and quality of the online training and related resources as excellent or above average. Similarly, 19 of the 23 respondents rated the timing and frequency of online training and related resources as excellent or above average.

Four respondents assigned an average rating for the timing and frequency, whereas only two assigned an average to convenience and quality.

2. Networking & Support

**Improved Internal (On-Campus) and External Communications.** Twelve institutions indicated that the Collaborative effort helped to improve internal communications by getting more and a diverse number of individuals engaged in the Clery compliance effort, getting help from the administration, creating multi-disciplinary teams, involving students, raising awareness and meeting regularly.

External communications also improved for a number of members predominately by attending the trainings. Also noted was the improved communication with the Clery staff. Eighteen responses fell into the no improvement at this time, unsure or probably will improve in the near future.

**Facilitating Communications.** Responses confirmed that interactive events are the most useful, i.e., in-person events/trainings and online discussion boards.
Suggestions regarding face-to-face events included: more regional meetings, workshops strategically located that address specific topics determined by members’ needs, providing speakers to campuses, forming sub-committees with institutions facing similar problems, and encouraging institutions to send more individuals to training. More interactive webinars along with volunteer teams that would conduct audits of each other’s campuses were also suggested.

**Type, Nature and Quality of Technical Assistance Provided – Resolution and Recommendations.** Trying to assess the type, nature and quality of the technical assistance proved to be challenging. Respondent often indicated that they hadn’t received any technical assistance. Yet, during the conversation, it became evident that some did but failed to recognize it as such. No attempt was made to alter this perception. Fourteen respondents stated that they didn’t receive technical assistance for one of four reasons: (1) no need or unsure; (2) use other consultants; (3) unaware that technical assistance is provided; (4) asked and was turned down.

Clarification of the role of campus security authorities (CSAs) and reporting crimes were the two areas which technical assistance was most often requested. In all instances, the technical assistance resolved the issue. Respondents were quick to praise the staff, indicating that they were “helpful,” “gave good advice,” and “liked the new direction of being partners and not enemies.”

The Collaborative fared well when compared to other technical assistance providers. Nine respondents who received technical assistance rated it better or somewhat better than that of other providers. Three responses fell into the neutral/can’t compare because respondents “hadn’t used” or “don’t use other technical assistance providers.”

Recommendations for improvements centered on face-to-face trainings in general. More assistance was requested on topics relating to students abroad, Title IX, and off-campus issues.

**3. Resources**

**Sharing Resources and Addressing Problems.** The greater majority (18) stated that the Collaborative was either very effective or effective in sharing resources. More important, were the remarks pointing out that the resources were “accurate and the quality high;” “all encompassing – no need to go anywhere else;” and that staff was very responsive, i.e., “quick in getting out new information;” “doing a great job;” “never too busy to provide help... quick to respond to emails;” and “very helpful in connecting you to others.” Embedded within these responses was praise for addressing “partners’ concerns.”

Conversely, nine respondents attributed a somewhat effective or a qualified effective rating for the following reasons: “haven’t used it extensively,” “could do a better job with bulletin chats by engaging respondents,” “early resources were good and not too many after initial ones,” and “our campus doesn’t buy into the team concept.”

Those who had sought assistance from the Clery Center’s staff were satisfied with the resolution and the assistance provided to them. Three respondents indicated that they hadn’t taken any problems to the Clery Center. One of the respondents indicated that they had dialogue around an issue with staff and found their answers to be inconsistent.

**Most Useful, Satisfaction and Need for Additional Resources.** As seen in Exhibit 8 below, satisfaction with the available resources was remarkably high – 9 of the 15 stated they were extremely satisfied with the available resources; four were satisfied and one was neutral.
The online resources (e.g., webinars, video on CSA, threat assessment) were identified as the most useful. Trainings, in particular, face-to-face events were second. Also mentioned was the newly distributed assessment tool, materials explaining the Campus SaVE regulations, and the model stalking policies.

Respondents had many and varied suggestions for additional resources/trainings including more local/regional trainings; enhancing the online training by making it more interactive as well as incorporating internal assessments/knowledge checkpoints; developing boutique type trainings that address specific topics (VAWA Amendments to Clery, Title IX, CSAs); offering a graduated course on CSA responsibilities and training (basic course followed by a refresher as well as an advanced course); course on developing relationships with external police; updating educational videos, especially those geared toward students, to be more appealing and current; reviewing and providing feedback on a sampling of crime statistics; and providing checklists that distill the law into normal language.

An underlying theme was that the Collaborative needs to continually improve and increase services to sustain member satisfaction and, in turn, program enrollment.

4. Self-Assessment

**Improved Compliance.** Twenty-five of the 28 respondents (or 89%) stated that the Collaborative advanced compliance efforts on their campus. Examples of improvements included strengthening the overall compliance efforts, i.e., “knowing what are the requirements and what needs to be done to meet them.”

Others credited the Collaborative effort with promoting internal communications, bringing more “people to the table,” “establishing a compliance committee,” “heightened awareness,” and “brought more conversation and understanding of Clery compliance.” CSA trainings, including who should be trained, along with tweaking or restructuring the annual security report (ASR) and other publications were also cited as areas that improved as a result of participating in the Collaborative. In addition, an improved crime prevention effort was an outcome mentioned by a respondent. The newly distributed Jeanne Clery Act Self-Assessment Tool for Multidisciplinary Campus Teams was noted as having great potential to improve compliance efforts.

**Changes to Policies and Procedures.** A considerable number of respondents (13) attributed changing their policies and/or procedures because of their participation in the Collaborative effort. Most of the changes mentioned were considered tweaks to or clarification of existing policies rather than a major overhaul as evidenced by the following statements: “clarified what to put into our policy statements, “tweaked our policies and procedures by providing more detail;” or, “having procedures in place along with policy statements.”

Others noted that participation resulted in “helping us streamline our ASR;” improved the CSA training by making “everyone better understand what we have to do;” and promoted prevention programs “added sex violence and [alcohol and other drugs] programming during our orientation for first year students.”

Six respondents stated no changes, unsure, or still too early to tell if any changes were made.
Appendix: Collaborative Phone Interview Questions

Introduction and Purpose
Responses to questions will be confidential, reported in aggregate form only. The purpose of the interview is to:

- Understand which services/programs are being used;
- Assess the quality of the services/programs provided;
- Ascertain where there are opportunities for improvement;
- Learn if changes or plans to make changes to policies/procedures were a result of the services provided and/or programs attended; and
- Assess the degree of satisfaction with the partnership.

A primary objective of the interview is to assess member’s level of involvement and satisfaction with the Collaborative Pilot Program.

Collaborative Pilot Program – General Questions
1. What was the deciding factor in joining the Collaborative Pilot Program?

2. Comments on expectations: What were your expectations of the Collaborative Pilot Program when you joined the program? Did your experience live up to those expectations?
   - If not, what expectation(s) was/were not met? What change(s) would make it easier for your institution to be more active in the Collaborative Program?

3. Comments on benefits: From your perspective what is the greatest benefit of being a member?
   - Do you feel your institution was able to take full advantage of the activities and resources offered through the Collaborative Program? Why/why not?

4. Communications: In your opinion, has the Collaborative helped you improve your communications with your peers (within the institution as well as at other institutions)?
   - If yes: What specific features were most helpful? (In-person events, online discussion board, member directory, etc.)?
   - If no: What features would help to better facilitate this kind of collaboration?

5. Have you had the opportunity to reach out to other members in the partnership?
   - Do you communicate regularly with members of the partnership? How often?
   - What is the nature of the communication?
   - What can the Clery Center do to assist/promote more communications between members?

6. Resource Sharing: Is the Collaborative Program effective in sharing resources and addressing problems? How can the Clery Center help make the tools and resources provided through the program more accessible for your institution’s key stakeholders? (i.e. build internal awareness)

7. Compliance Efforts: Overall, would you say the Collaborative Program has helped improve Clery Act compliance efforts on your campus? If so, how? (e.g., any success stories that illustrate how participating in the Collaborative Program has averted problems.) Do you have any upcoming plans/projects to improve campus safety/Clery Act compliance on your campus that are inspired by the Collaborative? How have you benefitted from the Collaborative Program on an individual level (rather than on an institutional level)?

Member Satisfaction/Recommendation
8. How would you rate your overall experience with the Collaborative Program on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest (extremely satisfied) and 1 the lowest (not satisfied at all)?
• If 3 or under: What changes could the Clery Center make to improve your experience with the Collaborative?

9. How likely is it that your institution will renew its membership in the Collaborative Program? (Definitely, very likely, somewhat likely, unsure/neutral, somewhat unlikely, very unlikely, definitely no)
   • If neutral or below: What would need to improve for you to renew?

10. How likely are you to recommend the Collaborative Program to other institutions on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest (very likely) and 1 the lowest (not likely at all)?
    • If 3 or under: What would need to change in order for you to recommend the Program?

Technical Assistance
The Clery Center provides the following technical assistance (TA) opportunities for Collaborative members:

• Answer questions regarding compliance with the Clery Act, Title IX, and other campus safety regulations;
• Conduct cursory, non-legal review of documents and materials related to Clery Act compliance (i.e. annual security report) on an as-requested basis;
• Provide resources related to Clery Act compliance (i.e. Handbook, educational materials, products, trainings, sample documents, etc.); or,
• Refer to experts or other organizations who may be able to better assist.

Have you received technical assistance from the Clery Center staff? Yes____  No____

11. If no, were you aware that the Clery Center provided technical assistance services to Collaborative members?
    Yes____  No____

12. Were there any scenarios or instances in the past six months where you needed technical assistance? (Detail problem area, type of TA needed)

13. Comments on type and quality of the technical assistance provided: What was the nature of your TA request(s)? Was staff able to assist you? Was the issue(s) resolved? Were staff members prompt, professional and courteous? Do you have any suggestions for improvement/recommendations?

14. Overall, how satisfied were you with the technical assistance service provided to you by staff (on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being very satisfied and 1 being not satisfied at all)?

15. Compared with other organizations or technical assistance providers you’ve worked with in the past, how did the Clery Center’s technical assistance services rate? (Much better, somewhat better, about the same/neutral, somewhat worse, much worse)
   • If neutral or below: What needs to improve?

Resources
16. Which resources did you find most useful? Were the right topics covered? What are the topics that you are thinking about on a day-to-day basis that the program is missing?

17. What if any resources have you seen work well in similar programs (not necessarily campus safety related) that might add value to the Collaborative moving forward? (e.g. cost-sharing partnerships, online collaboration tools, virtual conferences, more in-depth consultation services, etc.)? Any suggestions regarding tools or features that would make navigating easier?

18. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with the available resources on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest (extremely satisfied) and 1 the lowest (not satisfied at all)?
Online Resources and Training

19. Did you participate in any of the online training opportunities? If yes, how many?

20. If interviewee or anyone from their institution did not participate in any of the online trainings ask, why not?

21. Was the online training useful? Did you gain new knowledge? Were the instructors knowledgeable / helpful? Do you see a need for additional training?

22. Did the online training result in any changes in or plans to change policies/procedures? If yes, what were the changes?

23. How would you rate on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest (excellent, above average, average, below average and poor) the overall: 1) timing, 2) frequency, 3) convenience, and 4) quality of the online training and related resources?