



Hazing Prevention Toolkit FOR CAMPUS PROFESSIONALS®

Elizabeth J. Allan, Jessica M. Payne, Abigail Boyer, and David Kerschner

Campus hazing can have far-reaching negative consequences for individual students, their families, student organizations, groups, and teams, and the broader campus community. Because hazing is a complex issue that reflects campus culture, there is no “one size fits all” solution. The purpose of this Hazing Prevention Toolkit for Campus Professionals is to describe components of a data-driven Hazing Prevention Framework (HPF)® based on key principles of prevention science and findings from a research-to-practice project, the Hazing Prevention Consortium (HPC) led by StopHazing™. While effective responses to hazing are vital, this document emphasizes activities that prevent hazing before it begins. Designed with college and university senior leaders in mind—including Presidents, Provosts, Vice Presidents, Deans, Directors, and other executive and administrative leaders in academic and student affairs—this Toolkit includes action steps to help guide campus professionals in campus-wide, comprehensive hazing prevention.





A framework—e.g., a set of interrelated concepts or processes—is useful relative to public health issues, like hazing, in providing a guide or roadmap for research and practice. The graphic above depicts the eight components of the HPF—including Commitment, Capacity, Assessment, Planning, Evaluation, Cultural Competence, Sustainability, and Implementation—to be carried out in conjunction with one another. Campuses may place greater emphasis on certain components at a given time, but to be comprehensive, hazing prevention requires coordinated work on each of the components over time. As such, the HPF represents hazing prevention as an ongoing, iterative process.

This Toolkit provides sections for each HPF component that include:

- Component definition
- Component characteristics
- Why the component is important
- Action steps indicative of campus engagement in that component

The Toolkit also includes sample scenarios to illustrate interconnected components in action. Readers may wish to review the Glossary of Terms at the end of the document to clarify the terminology used in this Toolkit. Information in this copyrighted document is intended to be used as developed and prepared by StopHazing™ and Clery Center (see notes on Use of Materials on final page).

COMMITMENT

Investment of human, financial, and structural resources and public endorsement of actions to foster a campus climate that is inhospitable to hazing.

Commitment includes:

- Clear expectations and accountability for inclusive and safe student organization, group and team environments that are free from humiliation and abuse (e.g., non-hazing) and support student learning and development.
- Senior-level administrators and other campus leaders with knowledge about campus hazing prevention efforts, who play active and public roles in endorsing and providing resources that support campus-wide prevention.
- Engagement with and among campus stakeholders, including all students, staff, and faculty, as well as alumni, families, and other constituents in the broader community.
- Resources and programmatic infrastructure that incentivize alternatives to hazing, including recognition of individuals, organizations, and teams championing non-hazing strategies for building group cohesion, and opportunities to develop skills in ethical leadership, bystander intervention and other ways to promote healthy social norms.
- Widespread and consistent communication about, and accountability for, behavioral expectations of student organizations, groups, and teams, including consistent enforcement of hazing policies and transparent information about hazing investigations.

Commitment is about leadership and credibility. When senior leaders visibly demonstrate commitment to fostering a campus that is free from hazing, they lend credibility to and model a comprehensive, campus-wide approach in which all members of the campus community have a role and a responsibility to create a safe learning environment.

“According to our data, hazing prevention is a leadership issue.”

HPC Campus Professional

Commitment Action Steps

- Allocate resources to regularly collect campus data (e.g., via new or existing surveys) about hazing and hazing prevention, including data on positive social norms related to non-hazing strategies for building group cohesion.
- Develop an ethical leadership statement – endorsed by senior leaders and other hazing prevention stakeholders – that includes an anti-hazing stance to share publicly and discuss frequently in forums with students and other campus stakeholders.
- Develop a senior leader-endorsed mandate for campus-wide hazing prevention to be carried out by a coalition of diverse campus stakeholders from multiple campus units with the expectation to develop, measure, and meet goals related to hazing prevention, including promotion of ethical leadership.
- Create an institution-wide anti-hazing policy and response process with structures in place and senior leader buy-in for enforcement.
- Allocate funds, staff, and other institutional resources for hazing prevention, including emphasis on ethical leadership and non-hazing strategies for building group cohesion.
- Dedicate campus website pages to information on hazing and hazing prevention disseminated to all campus stakeholders, including clear language about social norms, the Spectrum of Hazing®, and when behavior crosses the line into hazing.

CAPACITY

Development of human and structural resources needed to effectively implement comprehensive, campus-wide hazing prevention in a college or university setting.

Capacity includes:

- Human resources that support prevention, including staff expertise and skills acquired through professional development, outsourced trainings and speakers, attendance at conferences, and networking with peer institutions, along with the motivation and willingness to be involved in prevention.
- Structural resources that support prevention, including campus infrastructure such as staff, time allocation, and hazing prevention coalitions charged with leading prevention efforts.

Capacity is about structures to create knowledge and skills that support a culture of engagement in hazing prevention. Opportunities to learn about hazing and hazing prevention, and designated staff and time devoted to prevention give key stakeholders the knowledge and skills needed to promote a campus-wide learning environment that is free from hazing.

Capacity Action Steps

- Identify campus professionals across functional units to dedicate time to, and be accountable for, campus hazing prevention, including incorporation of hazing prevention in multiple job descriptions across units (e.g., hiring of staff with previous experience with prevention and hazing).
- Maintain a hazing prevention coalition with members from across functional units and stakeholder groups to guide and support comprehensive, campus-wide hazing prevention.
- Build capacity in hazing prevention by investing in staff training, including engagement with external experts and outsourced trainings to fortify foundational competence of campus staff and other hazing prevention stakeholders.

- Incorporate information on hazing in new employee hiring, orientations, and through regular trainings that build knowledge about hazing and its prevention (e.g., with information on campus policies, reporting, and response process).
- Create partnerships across campus units to support hazing prevention initiatives, including evaluation and research related to these efforts.
- Create or fortify campus partnerships with campus counseling, health services, and other units to support students who report suspected hazing and/or have directly experienced hazing.
- Incorporate information on hazing in new student orientation, first-year seminars, student organization, group, and team meetings, and trainings provided to students throughout their time in college, including information on anti-hazing messages and expectations, campus policies, and reporting and response processes.
- Incentivize participation and provide multiple opportunities and formats for campus stakeholders to gain knowledge and develop skills in hazing prevention (e.g., title addition to job description, certification, public recognition, etc.).
- Replace one-time events with regular in-person and online trainings and discussions.
- Cultivate networks with hazing prevention practitioners, researchers, and stakeholders in other organizations to facilitate learning from, and partnerships with, peer institutions.

“It takes a village. Hazing’s not just in Greek Life, it’s a whole campus issue.”

HPC Campus Professional

ASSESSMENT

Use of multiple methods and sources to measure and characterize campus hazing within a given context.

Assessment includes:

- Collection of data providing insights on experiences and attitudes of campus stakeholders and information on hazing incidents, investigations, and sanctions.
- Inclusion of data collection on positive social norms related to hazing (e.g., student attitudes about acceptable strategies for building member cohesion in student organizations, groups, and teams) to inform programming and social norms campaigns that promote healthy alternatives to hazing.
- Environmental scans that identify students, organizations, groups, and teams at risk for hazing and in need of focused prevention efforts.
- Regular use of assessment data to inform discussion and updates of information on hazing and hazing prevention efforts.
- Widespread dissemination and access to assessment data for campus leaders and stakeholders to foster campus-wide knowledge of hazing and hazing prevention.

Assessment is about evidence-based prevention in context. Collection and dissemination of precise information about campus climate and hazing culture increases understanding and visibility of the problem, informs identification of context-specific prevention goals and at risk audiences and strategies, and promotes a culture of accountability and engagement for hazing prevention.

“It was amazing to see in print where we were and where we could go based on the interviews with students and staff. Until you shine a light on each of the areas that need work, you don’t know how much work there is to do.”

HPC Campus Professional

Assessment Action Steps:

- Administer regular cycles of surveys, focus groups, interviews, and environmental scans focused on campus climate and hazing culture and experiences and attitudes about hazing among campus stakeholders.
- Develop systems for tracking hazing reports, incidents, investigations, and sanctions to assess change over time.
- Assess the dissemination and effectiveness of hazing policy and reporting and response processes to measure the impact of these prevention efforts.
- Regularly use data to inform hazing prevention strategies, including reviews of assessment data and environmental scans to help identify risk and protective factors for student organizations, groups, teams, and other campus stakeholders at risk of hazing.
- Share assessment data widely with internal stakeholders via meetings, memos, reports and campus webpages to promote transparency and to inform and engage stakeholders.

PLANNING

Use of assessment data to develop data-driven, intentional, and measurable prevention goals, including the development of prevention strategies tailored to specific populations in a given context.

Planning includes:

- Regular use of campus assessment data to understand the scope of the problem of hazing on campus and to devise prevention plans and strategies.
- Customization of prevention strategies to address specific aspects of campus climate and hazing culture relative to campus stakeholders and student organizations, groups, and teams.
- Design of prevention strategies to achieve clearly defined and measurable goals that are evaluated, reviewed, and updated as needed (e.g., as understanding of the problem evolves, planning is used to adjust goals accordingly).
- Regular reporting to senior leaders and campus stakeholders about successes and opportunities to continue improving hazing prevention efforts in measurable ways.
- Continued development of relationships with campus partners and stakeholders to build campus commitment to hazing prevention.

Planning builds accountability by facilitating use of campus data to establish specific prevention goals that can be measured to determine progress in cultivating campus environments free from hazing.

“We did hazing prevention for Fraternity and Sorority Life but we didn’t think about other audiences that should be involved or student groups to be involved. All of the programs focused on the Greek population. Now our target changed to include other student areas on campus like athletics and student leaders.”

HPC Campus Professional

Planning Action Steps:

- Engage campus hazing prevention coalition in a strategic planning process using assessment data to develop hazing prevention plans, including continued review and adjustment of plans and goals as work progresses.
- Use assessment data to prioritize risk and protective factors to be addressed through hazing prevention strategies that build stakeholder knowledge and skills (e.g., trainings, student organization, group, and team activities, and special events).
- Identify measurable prevention goals, proposed interventions, and expected outcomes that address campus risk and protective factors.
- Use assessment data to prioritize specific at-risk audiences for hazing prevention activities.
- Engage in planning process regularly to develop strategies as new problems are identified.

EVALUATION

Formal documentation of the process and impact of prevention strategies as a means to measure and promote strategies with evidence of efficacy.

Evaluation includes:

- Rigorous methods to measure the characteristics, delivery, and impact of hazing prevention strategies relative to hazing prevention goals.
- Strategies to measure effectiveness, refine focus, assess successes and opportunities for improvement, and enhance support for ongoing prevention efforts.
- Collection of data to improve prevention strategies so as to better achieve established goals.
- Continual, iterative processes to refine evaluation instruments and test strategies.

Evaluation is about efficacy and sustainability. Capturing and sharing evaluation data grounds an evidence-based prevention approach that factors in attention to whether and how prevention strategies achieve established goals and ways to improve so that prevention efforts are effective and sustainable over time.

“Emphasize data driven work. You have to look at what you’re doing to see if it works and that’s what we’re looking for here—evidence based solutions.”

HPC Campus Professional

Evaluation Action Steps:

- Allocate resources to collect systematic evaluation data on hazing prevention strategies, including trainings, programs, policies, reporting and investigation processes, and related hazing prevention activities.
- Develop and use evaluation instruments to measure prevention strategies, including surveys, pre and post-program tests or questionnaires, focus groups, interviews, and tracking of participation, communication, incidents, reporting, investigations, and other hazing and hazing prevention phenomena.
- Use evaluation data to refine prevention strategies and processes, evaluation instruments, and to otherwise inform hazing prevention planning and implementation.
- Engage institutional research staff and faculty with knowledge of data collection to assist in evaluation design, implementation, and data analysis for hazing prevention.
- Report on and disseminate evaluation data widely via campus website and other platforms to educate stakeholders and demonstrate continued institutional commitment to hazing prevention.

CULTURAL COMPETENCE

Understanding sociopolitical and other identity-based characteristics of students and student organizations, groups, and teams, and of the institutions and societal contexts in which they are situated.

Cultural Competence includes:

- Knowledge and mindsets that foster understanding of, and responsiveness to, broader power dynamics, sociocultural identities, and social systems that shape hazing within a given context.
- Commitment to inclusivity through continued training and use of cultural and intersectional lenses to inform understanding of hazing and design of prevention and ethical leadership promotion strategies.
- Representation by diverse stakeholders in hazing prevention coalitions.

Cultural competence is about inclusivity and relevance. Involvement and training of diverse stakeholders ensures that individuals developing hazing prevention efforts bring diverse perspectives and possess knowledge of identity-based variables that shape hazing behaviors and responses to hazing. That knowledge also informs understanding of the relevance and efficacy of approaches used to prevent hazing and promote ethical leadership.

“We were dealing with some serious bias-related incidents and that led to more attention to cultural competence training. Our work in this area is a result of crossover between hazing prevention and other work with students on cultural competence.”

HPC Campus Professional

Cultural Competence Action Steps:

- Provide ongoing training for students, staff, faculty, and other campus stakeholders to ensure cultural inclusivity and relevance of hazing prevention activities.
- Use an intersectional lens to consider how different aspects of identity (e.g., race, gender, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and ability) inform and shape hazing behaviors, responses to hazing and hazing prevention efforts.
- Build hazing prevention coalitions that reflect the cultural diversity of the institution.
- Discuss diverse institutional histories, traditions, and demographics and factor them into development of hazing prevention coalitions and strategies.
- Tailor hazing prevention to unique institutional history and demographics.
- Avoid “one size fits all” approaches to hazing prevention.

SUSTAINABILITY

A process of maintaining commitment and momentum through persistent cultivation of programs, relationships, resources, and communication.

Sustainability includes:

- Systems that are in place to support sustained commitment to, continuity, and growth of hazing prevention efforts.
- Sufficient and consistent funding, staffing, and time dedicated to maintaining and advancing hazing prevention efforts.
- Senior leader support for a campus-wide orientation to hazing prevention that engages stakeholders and functional units across the institution.
- Recognition that momentum with hazing prevention may not be consistent, but rather entails alternating lulls and periods of intensive activity related to academic schedules, incidents, staff turnover, budgets, and other unpredictable variables in campus settings.

Sustainability is about presence and persistence. Comprehensive hazing prevention is a culture change process that progresses and builds credibility through consistent and substantive engagement, activity, communication, infrastructure, resource allocation, and enforcement.

“The funding for hazing prevention changed when we were able to show our assessment data. At least now our hazing prevention program has a presence so funds for the program are easier to get than they were before.”

HPC Campus Professional

Sustainability Action Steps:

- Dedicate resources for hazing prevention, including staff with time for hazing prevention work included in job descriptions and program funds to support ongoing hazing prevention efforts.
- Establish training processes for coalition members to establish a shared mission and vision and to continue expanding the cadre of knowledgeable staff and hazing prevention stakeholders on campus.
- Establish systems for transition to replace coalition members so as to maintain momentum and leadership amidst turnover of staff, students, and other hazing prevention stakeholders.
- Consistently articulate and model a vision for a campus-wide approach that holds all campus stakeholders accountable for promoting a safe learning environment that is free from hazing.
- Ensure that senior leaders and hazing prevention stakeholders articulate consistent, clear, and highly visible anti-hazing messaging and follow through relative to hazing programs, policies, reports, and response processes.
- Collaborate with other institutions that are committed to developing and evaluating innovative hazing prevention strategies.

IMPLEMENTATION

Use of specific strategies and approaches considered particularly promising for hazing prevention.

Implementation includes:

- Coordinated activities related to hazing prevention commitment, assessment, capacity, cultural competence, planning, evaluation, sustainability, and implementation.
- Training and sharing of consistent information on hazing and hazing prevention with all campus stakeholders to reinforce policy, anti-hazing messaging, and comprehensive, campus-wide orientation.
- Activities that build hazing prevention knowledge and skill in a progressive way that avoids repetition and instead builds and deepens over time and experience in a campus setting.
- Promotion of positive, non-hazing behaviors and attitudes that align with institutional missions to develop ethical leaders and bystanders actively engaging in positive social norms.

Implementation is about a positive, proactive learning environment. Creation of progressive learning activities for campus stakeholders that promote positive organization, group, and team norms fosters behaviors and attitudes that are inhospitable to and preventive of hazing.

“The coalition made it so folks other than Greek Life were talking about hazing prevention as an important issue.”

HPC Campus Professional

Implementation Action Steps:

- Implement multiple strategies tailored to students, staff, faculty, alumni and families to develop their knowledge and skills in hazing prevention.
- Include target audience members in designing and testing prevention strategies to improve their relevance and impact.
- Provide trainings on topics such as campus hazing policies, reporting, response processes, the Spectrum of Hazing®, positive social norms, skill-building for bystander intervention, initiatives to cultivate ethical leadership, and the development of non-hazing strategies for building group cohesion.
- Mobilize social norms campaigns based on campus data to promote attitudes and behaviors that support a safe and positive environment for learning and group cohesion.
- Develop and disseminate web content, newsletters, poster campaigns, media, anti-hazing messaging, and student-designed programs and events that build skills for ethical leadership and the development of healthy social norms for student organizations, groups, and teams.
- Utilize prevention strategies with evidence of efficacy and maintain fidelity with the evidence-base while also tailoring strategies to meet the needs of each unique campus context.
- Develop implementation strategies nested within, and aligned with broader, campus-wide prevention initiatives related to sexual and relationship violence, bullying, suicide prevention, substance use, and other areas of student wellness and campus safety.

SAMPLE COMPREHENSIVE HAZING SCENARIO

College B

For years, staff member, Dr. Tyra Jones, in the student leadership division at College B was widely recognized as the person spearheading and responsible for issues related to hazing. Dr. Jones developed a PowerPoint presentation about hazing for students and another for staff to outline College B's policy on hazing and introduce bystander intervention as a prevention strategy, along with non-hazing strategies for building group cohesion. When Dr. Patricia Cowl, College B's Vice President of Student Affairs happened to see the presentation, she determined that all staff needed to gain more knowledge on this issue. Dr. Cowl and Dr. Jones began co-presenting the PowerPoint. Working together, they developed an anti-hazing statement signed by Dr. Cowl to convey College B's stance on hazing. The statement is highlighted on the first page

of College B's hazing website. While Dr. Jones continues to be a go-to person for hazing at College B, students and staff associate campus hazing initiatives with Dr. Cowl, especially because she is one of the main people who presents on the issues, shares information with the campus about hazing investigations and sanctions, and talks about other ways of building group unity without hazing. Since writing the anti-hazing statement, Dr. Cowl made other changes as well. Whereas Dr. Jones was working on hazing because it was an area of special interest, now this work is included in her job description, with 20% of her time allocated to hazing, and 20% of her program budget targeted towards costs associated with hazing prevention programming, activities, and professional development.

WHY IT WORKS

In this example, the partnership between hazing prevention staff and a senior-level vice president demonstrated a growing leadership commitment to hazing prevention. Because of the vice president's influence on campus, there is broader support for the issue. The incorporation of hazing prevention efforts into Dr. Jones' job description also makes the work more sustainable as the position specifically allocates time and funding to these efforts, regardless of whether Dr. Jones remains in that particular role.

“We learned that having key staff members there to keep things moving is really important. At times where there wasn't a lot of action, we were still keeping hazing on that radar, making sure people didn't lose sight of it and the need to continue addressing it. The staff keep the conversations at the forefront. They've taken a problem over the past three to four years now and turned the tides.”

HPC Campus Professional

SAMPLE COMPREHENSIVE HAZING SCENARIO

College M

A campus assessment conducted by the Office of Institutional Research every three years with students, staff, and faculty confirmed that 58% of College M students had experienced some form of hazing, that for 23% of those students, staff and advisors were aware of the hazing, that students and staff have a strong sense of campus tradition, and students attend expecting a heavy emphasis on athletics and partying. Based on these data, the campus hazing prevention coalition decided to focus its initial efforts on educating staff and faculty who they viewed as gatekeepers for students. They created trainings to prepare faculty and staff to guide students towards non-hazing activities to build group cohesion, to

develop cultural competence related to hazing prevention, and to support them should a hazing incident occur. Each year, all staff and faculty complete a 30-minute hazing prevention review outlining the campus hazing definition, policy, reporting and investigation processes, staff contacts, and review of employee roles in hazing prevention. Information in these educational activities aligns with hazing prevention trainings targeted to students and with the goals and activities of the hazing prevention coalition. Coalition membership across campus units and stakeholder groups has expanded and been more consistent since the trainings began to be implemented.

WHY IT WORKS

In this example College M demonstrates a commitment to hazing prevention through administration of regular campus assessments. Through its collaboration with the Office of Institutional Research, the coalition builds capacity for evidence-based prevention, including an intentional planning process that uses available data to identify at risk audiences—in this case staff and faculty with limited knowledge of hazing and hazing prevention—to shift the culture of hazing. The resulting implementation of trainings highlights the importance of hazing cultural competence and conveys consistent information and messaging for staff, faculty and students about their roles in hazing prevention.

“Being consistent with providing information about what we are doing on campus was important. Letting senior staff and other staff know they can listen to webinars, providing information about what hazing is, and presentations about our campus hazing data. All of those things keep being visible and consistent and that’s helped demonstrate that hazing prevention isn’t just happening when there’s a problem but it’s continuing to happen on our campus when there’s not any problem.”

HPC Campus Professional

SAMPLE COMPREHENSIVE HAZING SCENARIO

College K

At College K, several students walked out of a new member initiation event for a highly regarded honor society because they didn't want to participate in hazing. Later, they submitted anonymous reports on the incident. After two of the students in the group wrote an op-ed in the student newspaper, they secured a meeting with College K's president to express their concerns. Uncertain about whether there was enough interest in the issue in the president's office, they decided to take other proactive steps. After meeting with hazing prevention staff and learning about the campus hazing prevention coalition, they started a student-led subcommittee of the coalition to focus on ways to promote alternatives to hazing in student organizations, groups, and teams.

In their first year, they developed an ethical leadership training so that student leaders and new members of student organizations could learn about and establish common expectations for leadership, membership, and healthy group cohesion. They piloted the training with the honor society and other campus organizations, received positive feedback from students and staff, and continued to collaborate with staff on promotion of non-hazing group norms. Their subcommittee continued to function, with new members nominated each year by students and appointed by the president. The group serves as a subcommittee of the hazing prevention coalition with representation on the coalition, and now leads regularly offered programs on non-hazing strategies to build group cohesion.

WHY IT WORKS

In this example, students take the initiative to increase commitment to hazing prevention on their campus. They were active bystanders in declining to participate in hazing and seeking to discuss their experiences with campus leaders. They contribute to capacity building by taking an active role in the campus coalition and developing opportunities for implementation of trainings focused on alternatives to hazing. The president's commitment became more visible through coalition nominations and contributed to sustainability when trainings and the subcommittee became permanent aspects of campus hazing prevention efforts.

“Our vice president selected members of the university to serve and did a charge to the hazing prevention committee. It created credibility for the group and a sense of importance because it came from the vice president.”

HPC Campus Professional

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Bystander intervention

A prevention strategy to build awareness and skills for individuals who observe problematic behavior—including hazing, bullying, sexual assault, sexual harassment, intimate partner violence, and other high risk behavior—to step in and take action to prevent potential harm before, during, and after instances of interpersonal violence.

Campus stakeholders

All individuals with a stake in fulfilling and benefiting from a campus mission, including senior executive and administrative leaders, staff, students, alumni, families, and individuals within the broader community surrounding campus.

Campus-wide

A prevention approach that is relevant to and engages all divisions on campus and all campus stakeholders, including senior leaders and administrators, staff, students, alumni, families, and individuals within the broader community surrounding campus.

Comprehensive

A prevention approach that is relevant to and engages campus stakeholders and units at various levels of an institution—e.g., individual, group, institutional, and broader community levels--through use of multiple strategies and components, relative to the HPF.

Divisions or Units

Departments or sections of the campus infrastructure, such as student affairs, athletics, academic affairs, and alumni affairs.

Ethical leadership

An approach to building positive, non-hazing social norms through student leadership development activities that focus on ethical beliefs and values related to respect, dignity, and the rights of others, as a foundation for enhancing students' capacity to lead change, manage conflict, and take risks.

Hazing prevention

Campus initiatives that address the problem of hazing through pro-active measures—such as programs, activities, processes, and infrastructure—to prevent it before it happens (primary prevention) but to also support and strengthen intervention and response (secondary and tertiary prevention) to hazing.

Hazing prevention coalition

A group, committee or task force of campus stakeholders charged with developing and meeting measurable prevention goals related to hazing, which may also encompass a focus on non-hazing strategies for building group cohesion; prevention of violence, sexual assault and harassment and drug and alcohol use; and other campus safety and prevention issues commonly associated with hazing.

Infrastructure

Foundational physical and organizational structures—including funds, policies, and personnel—needed for the operation of an institution, institutional endeavor, or program.

Intersectional lens

A perspective that considers the intersecting and overlapping nature of sociocultural identity categories such as race, class, gender, sexual orientation, and ability in order to understand the complexity of human experiences.

Mandate

A written authorization, charge or command to take a certain course of action.

continued on next page

Non-hazing strategies for building group cohesion

New member activities among student organizations, groups, and teams that build connections, belonging, and unity among new and established members in ways that do not include hazing. Examples include community service activities or trips; group outings (e.g., attending a campus event, movie, concert, or going bowling together); ropes courses; leadership trainings; problem solving games; and other interactions among members that do not involve humiliation, degradation, or elements that could place an individual at risk of physical or emotional harm.

Risk and protective factors

Aspects of campus culture and context—including attitudes, behaviors, norms, infrastructure, resources, personnel, etc.—that increase the likelihood of hazing (risk factors) or decrease that likelihood (protective factors). To be effective, campuses use data to identify risk and protective factors for hazing at all levels of the campus culture (e.g., individual, group, institution, and broader community and society) in order to plan for and implement strategies that mitigate against risk factors and promote protective factors.

Senior leaders

Senior executive and administrative leaders on campus, such as the President and Vice Presidents, Deans, and Directors of divisions and units across campus, including the Dean of Students, and Directors of Student Conduct, Student Activities, Greek Life, Campus Recreation, Athletics, etc.

Social norms

A behavior that is expected and accepted in a given situation. Hazing social norms refer to rules of behavior that are expected and considered acceptable by members of an organization, group or team. People who conform to expected social norms may be more readily accepted within a group, while those who do not may be shunned or suffer some kind of consequence. Norms change according to the environment or situation and may change or be modified over time.

Social norms approach

A data-driven prevention and culture shift approach designed to emphasize positive behavior. For example, students on a given campus may believe that hazing is the norm, but data from a campus assessment indicate that the majority of students believe it is never acceptable to humiliate, degrade, or abuse someone in order to join a club, team, or organization. These data can serve as a basis for a social norms campaign (e.g., posters, social media info graphics, table tents) that highlight the positive norm in an effort to correct the misperceived norm.

Spectrum of Hazing®

A formulation that depicts hazing behaviors on a spectrum from intimidation, to violent hazing relative to frequency of occurrence and recognition of the behavior as hazing. The formulation facilitates discussion of hazing relative to location on the spectrum as a constructive alternative to an either/or approach to whether behavior is, or is not, hazing. Further, the formulation supports a hypothesis that strategies to increase awareness of low recognition, high frequency intimidation hazing could increase the recognition threshold and lower frequency of those behaviors, which may, in turn, reduce the frequency and increase recognition of harassment and violent hazing.

Staff

Entry, mid, and senior-level staff in divisions across campus, including student activities, leadership, health and wellness, student conduct, residential life, Greek Life, athletics (including coaches), alumni affairs, campus police, and other student service roles associated with new student orientation, counseling, recreational sports, advisors to honorary societies, etc.

Use of Materials

The information contained in this Hazing Prevention Toolkit for Professionals® is based on the developers' best efforts to interpret and translate a body of research and literature into practical considerations. The materials are informational and educational in nature, and are intended to be used as developed and prepared by StopHazing™ and Clery Center, as follows:

- The content is not to be modified, altered, or revised in any way.
- StopHazing and Clery Center make no representation or warranty express or implied regarding any particular outcome from the use of the materials.
- Use in part or whole is permitted with attribution to the authors and to StopHazing and Clery Center as follows:
Allan, E. J., Payne, J.M., Boyer, A., & Kerschner D. (2018). Hazing prevention toolkit for campus professionals. StopHazing, Orono, Maine and Clery Center, Strafford, PA.

For more information on the Hazing Prevention Framework, upon which the Hazing Prevention Toolkit for Campus Professionals® is based, see Allan, E. J., Payne, J. M., & Kerschner, D. (forthcoming, 2018). Transforming the Culture of Hazing: A Research-based Hazing Prevention Framework, *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*.

Acknowledgements:

The Hazing Prevention Framework presented in this Toolkit builds directly from the Strategic Prevention Framework developed by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Service Administration or SAMHSA (see www.samhsa.gov).

StopHazing and the Clery Center wish to thank the following individuals and campus members of the Hazing Prevention Consortium for their contributions during the research that informs this document:

Travis Apgar, M.S., Trace Camacho, Ph.D., Michelle Gayne, M.S., Germaine Graham, Ph.D., Tim Marchell, Ph.D., Jenny Nirh, Ph.D., Anne Reber, Ph.D., Laura Beth Santacrose, MPH, Elizabeth Shayler, M.Ed., Lauri Sidelko, M.Ed., Jane Stapleton, M.A., Hal Turner, Ed.D., Susan West, M.Ed., Cornell University, Lehigh University, Texas A&M University, University of Arizona, University of Central Florida, University of Kentucky, University of Maine, and University of Virginia. We also wish to thank the following individuals for their contributions to the review and completion of this document: Germaine Graham, Ph.D., Anne Reber, Ph.D., Laura Beth Santacrose, MPH, Lauri Sidelko, M.Ed., Jane Stapleton, M.S., Kristen Sweeney, and Hal Turner, Ed.D.



207.581.3166 • info@stophazing.org
stophazing.org



484.580.8754 • info@clerycenter.org
clerycenter.org



stophazing.org/hazing-prevention-consortium