

CART Disclaimer: This rough edit transcript, which may contain missing, misspelled or paraphrased words, is only provided for your immediate review and is not certified as verbatim and is not to be cited in any way.

CART provided by A La CARTe Connection, LLC.

Stetson University - College of Law
Dating and Domestic Violence, Threat Assessment, and Emergency
Removals on College Campuses
Tuesday
May 12, 2026
3:30 PM-4:54 PM EST

[Captioner standing by]

[Recording in Progress]

>> JENNIFER LAKE: Hello, good afternoon, everyone! We're going to give folks just another couple seconds to filter in.

All right, well, welcome to today's webinar. I'm Jennifer Lake and I'm the Coordinator at the Center for Excellence in Higher Education Law and Policy at Stetson University - College of Law.

And if you're here for the webinar on Dating and Domestic Violence, Threat Assessment, and Emergency Removals on College Campuses, you're

in the right place.

We have Jody Shipper from Grand River Solutions and Laura Sims from RAINN here today to deliver this webinar for our Center. We're very grateful to both of them for taking the time to do this for us at the Center.

Just a couple of housekeeping items:

First, I want to thank our Closed Captioner, Bonnie, who is here captioning. And I put the StreamText link in the chat in case you would rather look at the captioning on that page.

Also, if you do have questions, you can type the questions into the chat and the speakers will probably be focusing on their content, but when, for example, Jody is going to start, when she switches out of her speaking role and hands it over to Laura, she will be looking through your questions and she can answer those.

Also, we have Jessica here from RAINN and she will be also helping to monitor the questions, too.

And before I forget to mention, you will be getting, after today's webinar, a version of the PowerPoint. You'll be getting, I believe, a resource list from RAINN. You'll get the recording link from today's webinar and Bonnie's transcript. So be on the lookout for those later this week, as well as information if you need CLE credits. We will get all of that to you later this week.

So without further ado, I'm going to stop talking and I'm going to hand it over to the wonder of Jody Shipper to kick off our webinar.

Thank you.

>> JODY SHIPPER: Thank you, Jennifer. And thank you, as always, to

Stetson's great partnership, always so grateful. And thank you to all of you who are here today.

Laura and I are going to spend some time talking about dating and domestic violence as we see it on College campuses. Laura is also going to spend some time talking about some of the realities of what is involved in dealing with those issues. I'm going to talk about dating and domestic violence as we deal with it through our processes and also how we should be thinking about our Threat Assessment process and Emergency Removal process, in which you might consider when and how.

Without further ado, here is us, your lovely Co-Facilitators here today.

Our good friends at RAINN were kind enough to share some data with us and I think it's really important that we start off by acknowledging that these are not problems that have gone away. We haven't talking about some of these issues nationally in the ways that we did perhaps in the past, that some of you are more familiar with, but, unfortunately, we know not only from this data, but from those who are conducting Climate Surveys on campus, those who are paying attention to the national picture, dating and domestic violence continue to be tremendous risks for the general population and really significant risks for those who are College and University students.

I've heard comments as I've been talking to people saying we're going to be holding this webinar saying, oh, well, we've been doing all this training on College campuses, hasn't that worked? Hasn't that sort of gone away?

And, unfortunately, again, just because we're not talking about it nationally, we know that these problems are continuing. One in four women, one in nine men experiencing severe intimate partner violence, which can

include both physical and sexual violence. One in seven women and one in 18 men experiencing stalking by an intimate partner during their lifetimes. And when we say "stalking", I want to be really clear, when I talk about it today, it's not a term we use colloquially, but where it's truly fear-inducing where they fear someone will harm them or someone close to them and that causes distress.

According to the National Domestic Violence Hotline we know that one in three College women have been the victim of dating abuse and 43% report being subjected to violence by a partner.

Okay, with that as a background, knowing that this problem exists and continues to exist, I want to talk about for a moment about the mechanisms that we have on a College or University campus for dealing with this.

So first of all, as many of you know, we have Title IX possibly. If someone makes a report, which doesn't always happen, and if it falls within the jurisdiction of Title IX, which I'm not going to spend a lot of time going through for purposes of this webinar, but we need a type of conduct that meets the definition in a program or activity in the United States or if not on campus, in a building owned or operated or controlled rather by a recognized organization, and by a Complainant and Respondent over who you have jurisdiction over.

And that can also include sexual violence and stalking.

We also have the Violence Against Women Act. About a year or two ago there were a number of reports in the paper about the Violence Against Women Act expiring. It did not expire, it's still there, it's still a Statute. What did expire was a certain part of it had funding, that funding was removed, but

we still have the Violence Against Women Act.

It applies to sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking. And by stalking it doesn't necessarily have to be on the basis of sex, so unlike Title IX, not on the basis of sex, but any form of stalking on campus or off.

And if you have one of those allegations, you have certain very specific procedural steps that you must take.

If you are also using Title IX, then you are already covering all of these VAWA steps.

If it falls outside of Title IX, for example it was off campus, then you have to make sure that you're providing initial information on rights and resources, that you are including all of the specific procedural protections. For those of you who used to have a VAWA brochure and you forgot that you still needed that, I highly encourage you to dust it off or find it and use it to send out any time someone is bringing forward an allegation of dating violence, domestic violence, stalking or sexual assault. And those brochures have information about rights, resources, and different options for resolution.

Also, I know that the current Department of Justice and Department of Education both have been a little more silent about VAWA and Clery Act. They pop up a little bit. There was a little bit of noise from them when the tragedy at Brown University occurred, but there is potentially a five-year lookback. So should this Administration change over in a couple years and should we have a new Administration with a renewed interest in these issues, whether or not you followed all of the procedural protection, gave people all of the rights that are owed to them under VAWA, those issues can come back

even a year or two or three after the current Administration leaves.

So please don't sleep on your VAWA obligations and giving students your VAWA rights.

Okay, and more specifically for those who have forgotten, so there's that written Notice of Rights. They get an Advisor of choice, which is not limited. I see a lot of people saying you may have any person other than a witness. That is not a limitation allowed under VAWA.

You must give them the written outcome, notify parties simultaneously, which doesn't mean in the exact same split second, but reasonably close in time.

Equal access to appeals. No more secret appeals for one party.

If there are changes on appeal, you must notify the parties.

Record-keeping that excludes personally-identifiable information. And we can talk about that if we have time at the end, if folks have questions.

And prevention programming. This is another area where people really have forgotten that the Violence Against Women Act is in place because part of that prevention programming includes how to foster healthy, mutually-respectful relationships, and bystander interventions. If students or employees see situations unfolding that cause them concern. So we're not nationally talking a lot about required VAWA training, but it's not necessarily just folded into your basic training on consent, but it's something much more than that because the need to teach young people especially, but employees and students, but really focusing on the student group, how to have mutually-respectful relationships is a part of VAWA that is still required today.

Okay. We're going to be talking about dating violence, domestic

violence, stalking, and I want to make sure that we all have sort of coming from the same -- on the same page, some level setting here.

So domestic violence: Violence because of sex, committed by a person. So "because of sex" is the Title IX definition. And it also falls into the VAWA definition, but there is also domestic violence happening on your campus that is going to need attention. We're going to talk about that in a few minutes.

If you have a parent and a child, for example, one is working on your campus and there is on-going domestic violence that could be occurring, it might not fall under Title IX, it might fall under VAWA and you would need to deal with it. And many of the lessons that we are going to cover today could apply there. So just things to think about.

Generally the definition of domestic violence that we use is someone who has been in a social relationship, of a romantic or intimate nature with the victim. That's part of Title IX. But also if they have had a child together and that is often in many states. You should know your State's domestic violence definition. A part of the definition, even if they are not in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature at the moment, but if there was at any time a physical relationship resulting in a child, in many states the mere sharing of a domicile catapults into domestic violence. Many states would consider roommates if there was physical violence between the two of them to be domestic violence.

I'm going to generally focus today on the type of domestic violence that comes out of romantic or intimate or sexual relationships more than the familial type of domestic violence because so many of the lessons that we

need to pay attention to in terms of escalating violence come from those relationships that were potentially at one time rooted in a sexual, romantic, or intimate relationship, at least at the start. And those are really the ones I want to focus on. But just as a reminder to you, there are broader definitions in your state potentially. You should know what that is. But those aren't really the ones that I'm going to focus on today.

And then we look at all sorts of factors in deciding whether or not they are in the type of relationship that may, in fact, be falling under your domestic violence definition.

Dating violence, I know a lot of people don't date anymore. People often don't refer to it as that. Using the term "intimate partner violence" for example sometimes can help those who are victims of or survivors identify that they are, in fact, in a relationship that is either dangerous or vectoring in that direction. The general definition: Violence committed by a person, who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature. And it's basically determined whether or not it's dating violence by the comments that our Complainant or survivor makes in identifying whether or not they believe they are in some sort of romantic or intimate nature. If they say they were in such a relationship or it seems like that to you, then using your dating violence policy may be the appropriate one to use.

I'll go on, stalking. Stalking is really terribly misunderstood and often the definitions are poorly applied. I see people referring to stalking quite often as I got an annoying number of text messages from someone, or people use it on the daily, I'm going to stalk that office until the Professor showed up. I'm going to stalk that business until they have a sale. And I really struggle with

this over-use of the term "stalking" because it minimizes something that can actually be horrific and terrifying and lead to, in some cases, extreme violence. And the harm to the person experiencing the stalking is much more than the idea of receiving a few annoying e-mails. It may not be acceptable. It may be distressing, but for these purposes we're talking about someone who engages in a course of conduct that causes a reasonable person to fear for their safety, the safety of others whom they know, it could be their family, their friends, a new partner, or to suffer substantial emotional distress.

And really a course of conduct can be almost anything in which we're talking about two or more. So someone showing up where they shouldn't be showing up. Sending too many messages. Threats. Really engaging in too much conduct to the point where it becomes fearful.

As an aside, I will say many, many of the stalking cases that I've dealt with turn out to be often students, one of whom does not understand boundaries or appropriate human interactions and we sit down and we talk to the person who is accused and help them understand how better to interact and everything ends really well.

Unfortunately, there's a small number of cases where that is not the case and we want to make sure we're paying a lot of attention any time someone uses the phrase "stalking" because if they get bad, they can get bad really quickly and if we haven't paying attention it can lead to damaging interactions and significant harm within our campus communities.

Okay. Before we talk about Threat Assessments and Emergency Removals, I just want to go through what might happen on your campus.

So you might get a report of some sort. Hopefully all reports are

coming to one office. It's really important with Title IX compliance, but it's also really important so that you can have a really good picture of everything that is happening on your College campus.

So if some reports of potential dating or domestic violence or stalking are going to Conduct and some to HR and then they are vetting and deciding whether or not to send to your Title IX Office, I encourage you to rethink that system and make sure every report of potential stalking, dating violence, domestic violence, interpersonal violence, sexual assault, all of it gets to one office so they can develop a really clear picture of what's going on, put all of the pieces together in case there's a pattern going on, so we don't have one person with a little bit of information on one side of the campus and someone else with a little bit of information elsewhere. We want everything to get to one office. Your Title IX Office might then decide, okay, this isn't for us and then get it redirected somewhere else. But initially, everything to one place for a whole variety of reasons, including compliance, but also from a Campus Safety perspective.

You're going to reach out, please be thoughtful in the way you are reaching out to someone. I see everything from letters going out saying "hi, I hope you're having a good day", really tone deaf, can be really off-putting. I recognize we are all trying to build rapport, but think about how it might get received.

Also, because we don't really know what's going on, to think about not just saying "we received a report that you are a victim of or that you have experienced", but to reach out and say, "We received some information suggesting that you may have experience". This is important for a couple of

reasons. One, you may have reached out to the wrong person. Or, we may need to give the person space to say, I don't know why they would have reached out to me, I never made a report because if they are experiencing dating violence, domestic violence, someone may be monitoring their e-mails, someone may be paying attention to what is coming into their inbox, and I don't want to cause additional harm through my outreach. So we received a report from a friend, from someone on campus, that you may be experiencing conduct that could be considered as -- I sort of really write around. Again, I don't know who is looking at their e-mails. Should they be able to retrieve their own e-mails? Absolutely. But I want to make sure we are not causing our Complainant to be put in greater harm because my e-mail using my template and I don't consider adjusting it.

Options for resolution. Support measures. If you get a response, you're going to do an intake, I'll talk about that in a moment.

If you don't get a response, we are not stopping there.

And this is, I think, one of the most important points, when we are dealing with dating and domestic violence, stalking, sexual violence, all of these forms of interpersonal harm, you may not get a response. It may be years, it may be months, it may be a week later until the person is ready to respond to you.

I really encourage us to be thinking holistically about is there information I need to gather before I just assume the reason they are not writing back to me is because nothing really happened. So we're going to talk in a few minutes about things you can and should be getting. But really when it's dating and domestic violence and you are not getting a response, to just

assume that means all is well I think can be a significant error in our judgment.

Okay. So if you do have somebody coming in and willing to have an assessment or an intake interview, first of all, so many of us have our most junior person in the office do our intakes. They are newer and we think, well, they are new, they are just starting their career and the intake interview is the start of a process, so I'll have my most junior person do the intake interview. Often that is not your best plan. Really the developing rapport, the thinking ahead about all of the things you need to know, all of the questions that need to get asked, I think these are things that are so important. And I do see a question and I am going to see if I can get to the chat without needing to stop my share.

You know what? I'm going to keep talking and, let's see, is it going to let me? Let's see. Nope, it doesn't want to.

>> JESSICA ST. GERMAINE: Jody, would it be helpful if I read the question?

>> JODY SHIPPER: That would be so helpful.

>> JESSICA ST. GERMAINE: I would be happy to. Somebody said: Excellent point about the perpetrator potentially monitoring the survivor's e-mail or voicemail. Can you offer specific outreach language that conveys the concern and resources being offered without creating more risk?

>> JODY SHIPPER: Thank you so much for that Jessica. I appreciate that. It takes a village to do a webinar.

So I tend to write things like, we have received a report that you may have a concern, or may be aware of someone else with a concern and, you

know, either dating violence or whatever it is, some form of interpersonal violence, if I have the right person, please let me know so that I can set up a time for us to have a conversation. If I have the wrong person, I am so sorry. But, please, would you contact me just to let me know so that I don't continue to reach out to you.

Sometimes that works because I have given them an out. The person might say, oh, I'm just going to call them and tell them to go away. And sometimes that's where I'm able to sort of discover that, oh, we need to do more. I've done all kinds of things like set up, would you like to talk to me in the Benefits Office? I'm going to leave the e-mails for you. I'm going to print them out and put them in an envelope and pick some non-descript Financial Aid Office, the Financial Aid folks don't need to know what it is. And sometimes in order to get access to have a conversation with someone, we need to be really clever and creative and recognize that, yes, we have an office and they are supposed to come in and they are supposed to have an appointment, but that doesn't always work.

So I do want to make sure that I'm giving them an out. Now much of this depends, of course, on how I got the initial report. If the initial report came from our Complainant/survivor themselves and I know they will be comfortable interacting with me, I'm going to feel comfortable responding to them.

One of the questions I always ask within my initial assessments or a phone call or something is "is it okay to e-mail you? Is it safe?" Because I want to make sure that I'm able to communicate with them and not have all of their communications monitored by someone else or controlled because

then I'll never really know what's going on.

So, first things of course in the intake on campus or off campus because I need to know if this is Title IX. Clery reportable? In the dorm on campus? Off.

I'm going to have a discussion about supportive measures. They may not even be aware of what it is they need. I'm going to recognize that and find a way to communicate back with them. And, also, if they are not already connected with campus advocates and/or wellness folks to find ways to connect to them.

Trying to figure out if this is a Title IX matter. If this is something I need to move forward as the Coordinator without the Complainant, they may give the information for the formal complaint, but be unable or unwilling to be the one moving forward so that they have sort of the cover of saying, well, I didn't do it, the Coordinator did it.

And, listening to what I'm hearing that leads me to think potentially about Emergency Removal and Threat Assessment.

So, for example, is the conduct escalating? Is it physical yet? It could be at the early stages which doesn't mean we dismiss it, but it may not yet have risen to the level of physical violence. There could be some significant control issues, trying to control who you're friends with, who you go out with. And that doesn't mean we dismiss it and say it's not nothing because it's not yet physical because there's going to be a lot we can do there to help, you know, whether it's monitoring or looking for other policies or processes that can help.

But I want to start getting a sense of the nature of their relationship.

This isn't a three-hour intense forensic examination, but how long has this being going on? Do they have access to their e-mails, their phone, have they been cut off from other friends? Those sorts of things so I can start to get a sense of is this something that is feeling like there's some significant possibility of danger involved or not.

And, Jessica or Laura, I see some more questions and some hands raised and I'm wondering if someone can read me.

>> JESSICA ST. GERMAINE: I actually am not able to see any new chats or questions that came in. I don't know if Jennifer or Laura.

>> LAURA SIMS: We have a hand raised, but we can't unmute you. If you have a question, put it in the chat and we will get to it.

I promise I will go through the chat. I'm going to finish my section and then Laura is going to speak and while Laura is speaking, I'm going to look at the chat and figure out what questions I need to answer after Laura has spoken. How about if we do it that way?

>> LAURA SIMS: Yeah. And just to reiterate, folks, be sure to put your questions in the chat or in the Q&A box as well and we'll be able to get those answered for you.

>> JODY SHIPPER: Thank you so much for that.

So we want to be thinking about all of this as we are doing the intake if we are able to do some kind of assessment with our Complainant/survivor.

Sometimes they are not coming in and there could be a whole bunch of reasons they are not coming in.

One, nothing happened, I have an erroneous report. Sometimes that's the case.

Sometimes maybe there's a bad fight, nothing happened, they were mad. Could be.

It could be that there's something really dangerous and it's escalating. We have no idea.

So on the one hand, I don't want to make things worse by moving everything forward and telling my campus community we need a full Court press because this could be very, very dangerous. And I don't want to do nothing. So as a Title IX Coordinator I'm going to sort of activate my network and find out from Conduct, if they know anything going on here. Maybe find out if you have Residential, if they live on campus, are there any reports? Anything they know about? Anything that would simply help me to get a sense of whether or not there's something that's dangerous or potentially vectoring in the dangerous direction that is unfolding.

I'm also mindful, and we're going to talk about this in a moment, that I'm never jumping in to move a complaint forward without having really taken a moment to assess the danger level. And we're going to talk about that in a moment because sometimes that notice letter that goes out is the thing that prompts increased violence. So I'm going to be really thoughtful before I move a case forward.

So this is just all the things I'm thinking about.

I'm also wanting to be, if I am able to do an intake with the Complainant or someone who is close enough to them that I can get information, are we talking emotional harm? Physical? Are there weapons? Are there threats of harm to our Complainant/survivor? Threats of, if you don't stay with me, I'm going to hurt myself.

How long has this been going on?

Is harm accelerating? Is the cycle shortening? I'm sure Laura will talk more about this, but we know dating and domestic violence is often cyclic in nature and it can be very bad and then it can become calmer and more peaceful. Some people call it the honeymoon cycle where they are being wooed back into the relationship. I'm trying to get a sense, I'm not trying to be their therapist, I'm not a clinician, but I'm trying to figure out what is going on so that when I start talking to campus colleagues I have all the right factors at my disposal to have a good conversation as we figure out what we need to do.

Was there a precipitating incident? A piece of bad news for our accused student? They are in academic difficulty and may be are facing an expulsion completely separate and apart from the relationship. Was there a breakup? These are all things we are trying to figure out and think about.

And if our Complainant/survivor has information about access to weapons, whether they exist, these are all things I want to know.

And it's not, by the way, it's not just guns. Knives, I mean, anything can be a weapon. Using a car can be a weapon. But in particular, I do want to know about their interest in or talk about guns, weapons, and all these other pieces. And, again, I'm just trying to get a picture so that I can then sit and think about what to do next.

Sometimes an Emergency Removal is the next step and Title IX, if it's a case that falls within the Title IX 2020 Regulations, then you may remove a student, but it's a high bar. There must be an immediate and physical threat to one or more persons. And arising from conducting defined in the 2020

Regulations. So sexual violence, dating violence, stalking, et cetera. It's not a sanction, it's not a determination of responsibility.

And, you know, then we have some other language in the Regulations in the preamble that can't be based on speculation, can't be based on assumptions.

You must give them a written notice and the right to challenge the determination of an Emergency Removal.

And it exists only really while the process is going on. So at some point if you don't have a Title IX process, an investigation or some other process, you can't leave this in place forever. And at some point either this process ends and they just come back and/or you decide not to move forward and then you don't really have a good way of keeping them off campus. It's really important that you be thinking of who needs to make these decisions based on what. At the end of the day usually it is the Title IX Coordinator who has, at the very least, the authority to say we need to assess. They may or may not be the one who makes the ultimate decision, but it is a tool that you may use.

It can also be limited in that, you know, it's not an on-going method for reducing harm, it's just a removal. It could be a removal from a dorm. It could be a removal from a sports team. It could be a removal from campus in its entirety. And it's just a removal. And it requires an individualized assessment and, again, immediate and identified threat of physical harm to one or more individuals.

It is different from a Threat Assessment process, and I'm going to get to that in a minute.

So if you're doing an Emergency Removal, Title IX-related, a prompt, can't wait a long time, individualized safety and risk analysis. You're going to want to have a system for doing this. Who gets to sit around the table?

You must come to the conclusion that there is an immediate threat requiring an Emergency Removal.

Now if there was a bad thing that happened or a complaint filed or they got a notice letter and then their conduct escalated in response, you can include that when considering whether or not you should have an Emergency Removal.

Whether or not you end up investigating, you can do an Emergency Removal, but if you are not investigating part of the problem becomes at what point do you undo it? Where do you undo it and where do you end it?

And part of what you have to think about is if there's a threat, could Respondent actually carry that threat out? So if they are threatening to do something and they couldn't do that that would have to be a reason why you are not engaging in the Emergency Removal.

And you need to have analyzed, preferably in your documentation, were there other supportive measures you could have used instead?

So might you have removed them from the dorm, but not from the campus? Might you have removed from certain classes? Might a no contact order suffice?

And if the facts on which your Emergency Removal process change, you need to rethink whether or not you need to have the Emergency Removal.

So, for example, at the end of evidence review, if you are looking at all the evidence and what you initially thought was the situation just -- the

evidence doesn't show that, you need to at least go through the process of rethinking your Emergency Removal and whether it needs to remain in place or whether our Respondent should come back to campus or to all or some of their activities. And if they are coming back to some and not others, again, you must go through the individualized safety and risk analysis as to why.

It's not disciplinary and it cannot be used as evidence in the investigation or hearing. So the mere fact that someone is placed on Emergency Removal is separate and apart from whether or not they engaged in the conduct.

Jessica, I see you came on. Is there a question?

>> JESSICA ST. GERMAINE: There are a couple questions and I think they would be helpful for you to touch on if you can because they relate closely to what you are speaking about here.

The first one was: Can you share a definition of identified threat?

>> JODY SHIPPER: So I'm going to want someone who can write out really the conduct, the behavior that was seen, not based on stereotypes, so when we see writing that says "all people who engage in sex assault are dangerous" that is not sufficiently specific. I've seen some really offensive ones that have to do with mental health status or suppositions about someone's mental health status that is also not what we want.

What did this person do? What was the behavior? And is there a threat that this will happen again?

So if you've gotten a report that two years ago Pat sexually assaulted somebody and we have no reason to believe it has happened since, that is a violent act, but what suggests to us that there's an immediate threat?

Immediate threat, not someday threat this will happen again? And if you can't tell me what that is, if you can't articulate it, you probably don't have enough to meet the definition of an immediate threat.

Physical harm. So if their mere presence is going to cause disruption, it's going to be distressing, that's not what we're talking about.

>> JESSICA ST. GERMAINE: And one more and I apologize for interrupting.

>> JODY SHIPPER: No, this is so helpful, thank you.

>> JESSICA ST. GERMAINE: And then there won't be any for you to go back to.

Do you need to have an on-going formal investigation or is an informal preliminary investigation sufficient for a removal? Sometimes we may need to act before a formal complaint is received.

>> JODY SHIPPER: Absolutely. If you are acting before a formal complaint is received, you've gotten some initial information, you might be trying to figure all the pieces out, but based on what first came in there's physical violence, there's been use of a weapon, there's potentially been some predatory conduct or drugging of drinks, something that is -- suggests to you that this is going to continue and you're not even sure how you're going to proceed, it's okay, you don't need to be in the process of the full formal Title IX investigation in order to conduct an Emergency Removal.

That said, if you decide it's bad enough for an Emergency Removal, but not bad enough that your Title IX Coordinator is going to sign the formal complaint to move this forward you're going to have some explaining to do. How is it one and not the other?

So always be thinking if you are using your Emergency Removal process and you don't move a case forward for investigation, you can't just leave your Respondent out there hanging forever. This can't be two years, three years, four years and I'm going to tell you in certain states, California, New York, a few others, Massachusetts, I can think of, and I'm sure if I sit here long enough I'll come up with a few others, the Courts are going to say, bring them back. And if you are sitting out there long enough and then you really have a larger problem in that you've lost your ability to put some of the protective measures in place that you wanted to.

So take a moment, document. And the question I always ask is, can you articulate in writing what are the articulable facts that tell you there is an immediate threat of physical harm and it's actually something that might happen.

So "I'm going to blow you all up" may not be an articulable threat. Is that acceptable? No. But Emergency Removal has a high bar to enact.

I'm going to move over a little bit here and talk about Threat Assessment, which is different. And our Threat Assessment processes are not limited to Title IX cases. Many campuses have a Threat Assessment Group, process, Strike Team, other persons have a Students of Concern Group, Employees of Concern Group. Threat Assessment is a really tricky process. It's very important to know how to do. And I'm going to say it now and probably three more times. This is not for people who are guessing at how to do this. This is serious business and if you don't know how to do a Threat Assessment I strongly encourage you to work with one of the really good folks out there. There's some amazing Forensic Psychologists who

have done this work on different campuses, who have been involved at the highest levels, and can help you set up a Threat Assessment process. But a few overarching things to think about.

First of all, when we have a Student Threat Assessment group and a Faculty Threat Assessment group, that's not good because students can harm faculty and faculty can harm students. You need a group that can look at things holistically.

When we are using Threat Assessment, we not only ought to -- but it's a really good idea to do more than just hear from our Complainant or get the report. You might need to talk to some witnesses and interview folks in maybe, you know, Student Housing or Conduct or others. A Threat Assessment Team, I love it when it's a multidisciplinary team involving Law Enforcement, maybe from your community if you have a good relationship, and if you don't, that's a really good relationship to have, Campus Safety, you might want to have a trained Forensic Psychologist with whom you can consult if it looks like things are vectoring in a frightening direction. I think it's really good to have someone from your Wellness Office to help you understand so you are not making determinations based on just an assumption of someone's mental health or their condition or illness. But the goal is to gather information and determine, is there a threat? And sort of what level of threat.

Contrary to public opinion, we don't really have people who just explode and suddenly decide to engage in profound harm out of nowhere. We have people who work their way up. It might happen very quickly, but who work their way up to a decision to engage in harmful behavior. Some of them

can also be moved back down. Some cannot. And it really takes folks who are skilled at knowing how to do this to help decide the differences.

Threat Assessment might result in removal from campus and it might not. It might result in decision to monitor. Once you have removed someone from campus, remember it's harder to have your eyes on them and know what they are doing.

The folks who do, you know, high level Threat Assessment work will say all the time, painful though it is, you are better keeping them within your campus community where you can make sure they are getting fed, that they have eyes on them, that they have access to Mental Health Services then sending them off and we don't know what they're doing.

Someone can sadly commit horrific harm from across the street just because we have banned them from campus. The Threat Assessment process is really designed to help us gather broad information. When I have run these Threat Assessment Teams or put these practices in place, we are pulling everything from their social media postings, we are finding out from local Law Enforcement if we can whether they have just purchased a weapon, whether they purchased ammunition, we are trying to get a full picture.

A decision to refer to Threat Assessment is that's just the first step and you may then be thinking of it along the way as you assess the threat level and what you might do about that.

It's a little bit different from Emergency Removal which is just a determination, we're going to get the right people around the table and decide whether or not our Respondent is going to be removed or not.

Emergency Removal doesn't necessarily include all the other steps

that might be put in place to support our Respondent and to monitor them. It's just a removal.

Now the trick, the real, you know, trick here is how you're going to set up a Threat Assessment and an Emergency Removal process so that you don't have two completely separate processes, but so that you might decide that you're sending everything first for a Threat Assessment and going to also decide as part of that process whether an Emergency Removal is appropriate.

And part of the reason I like doing it that way, and it can happen fast, and you probably have a number of people who serve on both Teams, is that sometimes the act of removing somebody or telling them they're going to be removed becomes the precipitating event that sets off tremendous violence. So before you engage in Emergency Removal, I think it's a really important idea that trained individuals have properly assessed.

I like Threat Assessment Teams that have, you know, a triage team, a strike force, whatever you are going to call them, three or four highly trained people that you can call at a moment's notice and they can start going through their little checklist of what information they need to get in order to engage in an individualized assessment and thinking about whether or not we should also be engaging in an Emergency Removal.

If you are just jumping to Emergency Removal and you don't know whether or not that is going to cause greater harm to either our, you know, victim/survivor or to the community, then I think we're missing an important step in our work because we never want to be the cause of the harm, especially when it's preventable by taking a moment and doing -- going

through a Threat Assessment process.

I also think, for years, many years ago in 2014, 15, 16, I was both the Title IX Coordinator and ran the Investigations Unit and as part of the Investigations Unit I was charged with putting together a Threat Assessment process. At first I thought, this is the weirdest sort of conglomeration of tasks and assignments, but I have to say it was a great way to make sure that I was pulling all the right pieces together and really came to conclude out of those years of doing it that any time you have an allegation of dating violence, domestic violence, stalking that you are -- you, as a Title IX Coordinator, you are taking a moment and at least running by, maybe not your whole Threat Assessment Team, but strike force or someone on the Threat Assessment Team, are we missing facts that suggest that perhaps I should put the sending of that notice letter on hold? Maybe it's not the right thing to do get. And I'm not saying free pass, you won't investigate ever because it could be scary, but do you have all of your ducks in a row?

One of those ducks in a row is safety planning. I'm not going to touch on that. I'm going to have our good friends over at RAINN talk about that because safety planning is not just handing out a no contact directive. It is really difficult to do well and my theme of the day is "know what you are doing and consult with experts" because safety planning should lead to greater safety, not to an empty promise that causes harm.

So a few things to talk about best practices in Threat Assessments as you are thinking about how -- if you don't have a Team together or have you been using them or what is their interaction with Emergency Removal and with Title IX or other interpersonal violence cases is, first, if you haven't been

in a long time, get trained by professionals. I think having an entire Team get trained together so they can learn how to operate together is one of the best gifts you can give your community.

Know when to call someone in to help make difficult decisions. There are especially trained people. Some of them have been, like, FBI profilers and I've worked with some great folks in this field and every once in a while you need to call one of them in. They may need to go in and talk to someone who is on a hold, on a psych hold somewhere, and figure out when they get out are they going to harm someone? And they actually have the skills to do this kind of work.

Have a triage or Strike Team ready just in case.

Remember that if you just have a Student Threat Assessment case you could be missing the mark because, you know, threats can come from many directions, not just from other students, but from outside your community as well.

Moving a case forward without pausing to at least do some form of Threat Assessment can be a cause of greater harm.

And, also, remember that sometimes, I know it's not what we want to do, but keeping connected to the Respondent might be an important piece of enabling better monitoring. Sometimes in some of these cases, it is important. Not always, I'm not saying you never take action, you never separate from them, but to know what you are doing before you just assume that this is our process, we have a complaint that came in, we are moving it forward, we are sending out the notice letter, and you haven't really given the rest of the risk some thought.

And then, you know, this, again, is one of the things I'm a huge believer in weaving some form of Threat Assessment process into handling any time you are moving forward with a relationship violence case. You just don't know if things are going to get worse. It's one of the most agonizing things to have a Complainant who is clearly being harmed come in and say "there's nothing wrong, we're not moving forward. I don't know what possessed my friends to say that". And you know something very bad has happened and it's because we weren't thoughtful with how we handled the notice process.

A few other best practices to keep in mind and then I'm going to turn it over to Laura and then I'll be back to answer questions.

But develop your protocols.

Meet with your Team. If you have a good relationship with Law Enforcement outside of your campus community, I encourage you to lean into that relationship or develop it.

And consulting with experts for safety planning.

And developing individualized contract protocols for each Complainant going through your process because your regular Maxient or e-mail process may not be safe and you may need to get really clever with coming up with something that enables them to be able to participate in your process.

Okay, that's my Part 1 from me. I'm going to end my share and turn this over to Jessica and Laura.

>> JESSICA ST. GERMAINE: Perfect. While Laura pulls up the slide, maybe we can fit in a question or two. Jody, would that be okay

>> JODY SHIPPER: Absolutely.

>> JESSICA ST. GERMAINE: In the Q&A are the three questions

outstanding, I believe.

>> JODY SHIPPER: Let's see, I have a whole bunch in the chat.

>> JESSICA ST. GERMAINE: Would you like me to read them?

Can a hearing panel review evidence of an Emergency Removal when making a determination on whether the allegations occurred? Why or why not?

>> JODY SHIPPER: They should not. It is not evidence. And, in fact, doing that could potentially result in a successful appeal as it's returned for another hearing because it's not punitive and it is based only on the preliminary information that came in.

And, in fact, in the preamble to the 2020 Regulations, it talks about the fact that would, in fact, be a reversible error to include.

>> JESSICA ST. GERMAINE: There is someone asking for recommendations on speakers that I'll leave to you in the Q&A.

And the last one that I see --

>> JODY SHIPPER: Oh, I'll handle that when I'm not speaking and I'll come back with a few questions. Thank you.

>> JESSICA ST. GERMAINE: Perfect. Over to you, Laura.

>> LAURA SIMS: Thank you so much. I think that sets up the conversation about the need really for expert consultation when it comes to safety planning. And certainly as RAINN Consulting Group, we will explain who we are, but we do focus on the part that isn't covered in Title IX and other policies is, how do people connect with us? How do we help our Staff and faculty feel more confident in being able to address some of these situations and feel confident about their response?

So we were slightly introduced before, but just to make sure everyone has an idea of who RAINN is. So RAINN is the leading authority on sexual violence in the U.S., so we were the first organization to stand up, the first and only centralized Hotline for the issue of sexual violence, where survivors can call in and get support, as well as their loved ones and folks that are also supporting survivors in different capacities can use the Hotline.

That is available by telephone, chat, text, we are branching out with the New World into thing like Signal and WhatsApp, so lots of places to meet survivors where they are. And that is free and confidential and 24/7.

But Jessica and I are here as part of RAINN and RAINN Consulting Group where we consult about best practices and protocols, a lot of consulting around the trauma-centered response, as well as providing Hotline services specifically for organizations. So getting a tailored service set up by providing a third-party mechanism, for recording for example.

We're going to talk a little bit about safety planning for this last part of the presentation because it is a really important part of working with survivors when something has happened. And honestly, also working with perpetrators and witness and safety planning around different things they might be experiencing.

You know, Jody was talking a lot about Threat Assessment and, obviously, we are looking at risks that the perpetrator may pose to the community or to the survivor or to other individuals in the community, and so we can use safety planning a lot of different ways to also help address some of those concerns about what might happen or how might someone be reacting or responding? And how do we take care of the people in our

community?

And so we'll provide a brief overview of safety planning here. And if you want more information, you know, I'm putting our contact information on the last slide and we're happy to provide more information and more support.

But safety planning really is a collaborative process and one of the goals of safety planning is really to protect survivor agency. So it's aimed at empowering survivors and others that we're safety planning with, to that matter, to empower them, to make sure that they feel as though they still have a sense of control in the process of what's going on. You know, it's easy to feel when you make a report that you lose control rather quickly of your own experience, your own story, and safety planning can really help make sure that the survivor remains a collaborative partner in what's going on.

And it also is aimed at reducing the risk of further harm. So it often focuses on things such as physical safety, psychological safety, we're also looking at things like is someone feeling safe emotionally, as well, what does their technology safety look like? Especially knowing a lot more incidents are involving technology these days, that's an important one to keep in mind.

It also involves keeping in mind the practical or logistical concerns a survivor might have. If I participate in this process, you know, when we talk about dating and domestic violence, for example, one of the largest concerns we see is it might involve children or even pets. You know, if I go to a shelter, for example, and I'm getting away from the perpetrator, but I have a cat I really care about, what is going to happen to my cat? Especially if the person is violent, are they going to harm my cat? This may seem like a small or non-consequential concern to some people, but for a survivor it may mean

the difference between going to a shelter and not going to a shelter and being stuck in that situation.

So we're also looking at emotional and/or psychological responses when safety planning. That's to say how this person's experience of trauma impacts their ability to cope and take care of themselves.

So to be able to effectively safety plan, it's important that we prepare our organizations around our policies, our protocols, our resources. And I've seen a lot of great questions come through here about how to really use the information that Jody has shared to be able to understand how do we shape our policies and our protocols around and even beyond Title IX? And some of those recommendations.

And so this often involves having clear policies and protocols that are often reviewed and updated at regular intervals. This is a growing issue, it's changing and evolving. AI has been giving people a lot of trouble, creating fake, but non-consensual images, there's technological stalking that happens nowadays, so policies might need to be updated to reflect that form of harm, for example. Maybe we address what we think about traditional forms of harm, such as physical violence, sexual violence, but maybe we need to incorporate how technology adds to or exasperates that. We are looking at changes in organizational needs, structure, or staffing. And any new resources we might want to add to our repertoire.

So refining our policies creates a solid base to reduce survivor barriers and it provides our Staff with clear guidance on how to address situations.

We also want to sensor access on what we do. This needs to be addressed proactively. For example, we have someone here doing captions in

this webinar. That's a great example of making sure we are examining accessibility in everything we do. And we have diverse campuses, making sure we know who our translators are that we often rely upon. Making sure we have Interpreters available, we know where to go to source those Interpreters.

And how do we find information about reporting? If it's hard to find, we're going to see less reports. If I go to Google and put sexual conduct or Title IX and nothing shows up, I may not know where to look to find that information to make a report. Again, this means taking the barriers that survivors might experience into account.

And then responding to survivors' needs by assembling those resources in advance. When someone comes and makes a report to us and we are trying to safety plan with them or we're trying to figure out how to proceed with a report, you know, we don't want to be scrambling, "oh, I think we have some resources at this office, but I'll have to ask them". And then, "oh, I heard this person in this office is dealing with that". Like, that's a very difficult experience for a survivor to feel like they are being tossed around or they just don't know what their options and resources are.

Usually partnering with a local sexual assault Service Provider can be a really helpful way to go about this because then you have a partner who already knows what the different resources are in the area. They are local, they are already doing this work constantly, and a lot of organizations set up memorandums of understanding with those types of organizations so that they can really rely on those advocates for response, potentially for advocates to come over and help safety plan if we don't have the capacity or

training to do that internally. So that can be a really easy way. Easy as far as this issue goes, to be able to get some of those resources at hand.

And maintaining a Library or Toolkit or some kind of resource you can give to survivors or send to survivors. We're going to talk about the importance of that in just a moment.

One of the things we often encourage for anyone partaking in safety planning, whether it's advocates, Counselors, is understanding this requires a harm reduction approach. We want to -- of course, leveraging what we know from any kind of threats or emergency assessments we have done so far preliminary.

Harm reduction really focuses on interventions aimed at reducing negative effects associated with behaviors, while also acknowledging the reality of the context of a survivor situation.

So this is something that is often -- a harm reduction approach often applies to substance abuse. So for example, not forcing someone to completely cold turkey off of a substance to get housing. But also acknowledging, one, that can be dangerous to go cold turkey from a substance, but we are noticing that it's often a process and this person needs things immediately to feel safe and take care of themselves.

Harm reduction encourages working with survivors and making sure we are doing that without judgment, without trying to push them towards a certain path, or even pushing them to report perhaps. A lot of organizations make sure their policy is folks know that you don't have to submit a report to get access to resources and that's a form of harm reduction as well. Making sure we have things available when people need them and there aren't, you

know, specific pre-conditions that required to be able to access support.

You know, we see that in the restricted/not restricted reporting pathways and that's a really helpful way to think about that.

And it relies on meeting survivors where they are at and acknowledging the impact of sexual violence on exploring these different coping and survivor strategies when we are safety planning. Or even when we are talking to someone about here are your options and what we can do to help you.

Our brain operates differently when we are in crisis and it can make it more difficult to engage in safety planning. It's important to know about trauma. Sexual violence is a trauma and it often kick starts off fight, flight, and freeze response. Freeze is the most common response to sexual misconduct, but this can impact a survivor's sense of self, how they responded to an incident. More specifically, you know, if they did freeze up, what did they begin to start thinking about themselves? Oh, I should have fought back. People are going to blame me for not fighting back or not saying something sooner. So it can really impact how we think about ourselves, how we responded in that situation, even though that response was uncontrollable. It was really something that was regulated by this fight, flight, or freeze system, which happens in our nervous system. And it's often very quick. We often, you know, don't get a choice sometimes on how we're responding to these traumatic situations. But it can also impact someone's sense of safety far beyond when the incident has passed.

Their ability to regulate their emotions. We often see, for example, survivors may really have a hard time with regulating things like anxiety or

depressive feelings, or they may have a really hard time when they see something that reminds them of what happened, being able to center themselves after that.

It can impact someone's ability to pay attention or what they pay attention to.

Their decision-making.

Their social engagement, so basically how are they able to maintain and be in relationships with others, whether that's friends, family, peers. You know, you might have someone who used to be really talkative in class and used to raise their hand a lot and contribute and suddenly they can't anymore. They don't feel safe doing that anymore.

It can also impact things like creativity. That comes into the safety planning aspect because these are all things that make it either easier or more difficult to engage in safety planning because it is a creative process. What can I do to keep myself safe? Well, I have no idea.

So it's helpful to work with a survivor with this in mind to try and de-escalate them if they are in acute crisis prior to trying to engage in safety planning.

This can look like a different things. It can look like allowing the survivor space and time to share their experiences.

Identifying and acknowledging their feelings and making sure they do feel emotionally safe with us.

Validating their situation, validating they may have questions or concerns, even about our process. A survivor may feel uncomfortable with the idea of engaging in an investigation. It's a difficult thing to do.

How are we validating and addressing those concerns?

Using our own presence, perhaps, to help calm the survivor. Speaking slowly, making sure we are paying attention to our body language.

And allowing silence for reflection and decision-making. Making sure the survivor feels like they can take it at their own pace.

Something else we can do if the survivor seems particularly upset and if we have a little bit of training in this, is engaging in breathing or grounding exercises.

And being mindful that this process can be overwhelming and asking one question at a time until they are able to participate more fully.

So safety planning is a process that is iterative and on-going. We don't just safety plan once and we're done. We want to make sure we are checking back in. When the survivor wants to reach out again, we want them to know they can and they feel comfortable doing so.

So you can think about it as a process that includes where we are identifying the situation. What do we need to be mindful of as far as specific risks for the situation for the survivor?

Any barriers that might get in the way of support?

And what is this person actually looking for? Maybe they don't need a ton of support, but they're like, you know, I really just need to know that I can attend my classes still. Right? Like, that's their main concern. I really need to know this isn't going to affect my ability to graduate, or that I'm not going to be forced to take a leave of absence if I don't feel like I need one. And maybe that's their biggest concern. You're like, okay, that's really helpful to know. I have other resources for support for you and I want to make sure you

know what else is available, but let's focus on that main concern. You know, we don't want to miss that when the survivor is telling us about what they are worried about.

From there, we can brainstorm with them. Understand, again, pulling from our policies and our resources, what we know is available in our community, what might help this person?

And once we have kind of built a plan together, then we are reinforcing it. Again, we want to make sure that the survivor is on the same page, we are not forcing a safety plan on to them that doesn't feel like it's going to fit their needs. And we are encouraging them to reach out if they need more help.

The first step was definitely identify and that's an important one because survivors do face a lot of different barriers when it comes to planning effectively around their situation.

And we can think of this as kind of three different areas. So, again, kinds of looking at similar things as before, but looking at access. You know, many survivors already may have limited access to resources or support. Maybe they are already isolated. Maybe they have already been struggling a lot physically, maybe chronic illness or mental health. You know, the access might already be limited. And in a way we can really help those folks if we do have access to a lot of resources because we can give them things they don't already have access to.

Many survivors may experience different kinds of power imbalances that create additional challenges. So an example of this can even be, you know, many survivors -- or many College students like to go out, like to party, like to drink and that can create a little bit of a power imbalance when it

comes to knowing that they have broken a rule perhaps, maybe they were some place they weren't supposed to be, again, maybe they were drinking under age, or maybe the person that assaulted them is a Professor, if we are talking about a student, and so that creates different challenges that someone might experience when it comes to either reporting something or accessing support.

And then survivors may also be at risk of additional violence from individuals or systems. So if we have someone who is part of our response process who believes very heavily in false reporting, for example, that can put survivors at risk because it puts them at risk of not being believed, of being shamed, of being invalidated through a process. That's just one example.

But also, the big thing going on in our country right now is Immigration Services, so if someone is undocumented and a survivor, there's going to be some -- I apologize, I don't realize we were at our stopping time. I thought we were going a little further. I apologize for that.

We have a few more slides, so I apologize for that, folks.

But, yeah, looking at what other risk factors might arise in that situation.

I'm going to skip the agency thing.

But an important question to think about perhaps on your own: What does it mean to protect survivor agency during safety planning and centering our approach around agency?

But once we have identified barriers, you know, we can explore things like coping strategies and support networks, resources and referrals, we can even rely on certain specific processes, such as schedule mapping. That's

one that comes up a lot, understanding, you know, how do we help someone feel safe on campus?

And we want to look at immediate physical safety, technology safety, housing, school and workplace safety if that applies, emotional safety, safe transportation.

And forms and structured assessments can be important safety planning tools. It can help both the survivor and the person safety planning with them remember to plan for common safety risks.

It encourages collaboration and participation with the survivor, and it provides the survivor with a customized plan, if they choose to have one, and it doesn't create the additional risk.

We want to make sure we don't let these folks interfere with empathy. I imagine a lot of folks have had education around active listening, but really paying attention to what the other person might be feeling, their expressions, body language, recognizing different feeling words, how the survivor describes their experience, avoid minimizing their feelings or experience itself.

When we are talking to them about what happened, we are considering what questions are necessary to ask, where we need to understand and clarify something, verse proposing for personal curiosity.

And we might want to ask the survivor what they think first. Safety planning is the most effective when it is the survivor who is engaged and coming up with the ideas rather than us telling them, you should do this, you should do that.

And finally, to leave you all with some considerations for safety planning. It's an on-going process with the goal of enable agency and

survivor empowerment.

There are limitations. There are only so much we can do for someone until they are ready or something changes in the situation.

And even the best plans can be difficult for survivors to follow through because they may be dealing with repercussions of trauma.

Survivors may come back several times and it's important that we are there for us.

Apologies for running over. Here is our contact information.

>> JENNIFER LAKE: I'm okay with staying on a few more questions. We have one in the Q&A and one in the chat we didn't get to, so if you open for staying a few more minutes, we can do it.

>> JODY SHIPPER: And I apologize for misjudging the time and going on.

I tried to respond to a few in the Q&A, but the question is: I recognize that Emergency Removal and Threat Assessments are individualized, but are there any recognized guideposts with respect to conduct that would require removal?

I don't mean to be flippant at all, but it's a little bit of I know it when I see it. Certainly use of weapons, threats of physical harm that could be carried out. So generic angry person is like "I just -- you wait and see", but they have been saying this for two years, there's no escalating behavior. Certainly the use of weapons, the use of predatory mechanisms which can include drugging somebody, it could include credible threats of harm, escalating physical violence, and in some cases escalating emotional controlling behaviors where they are limiting our Complainant/survivor's

ability to participate and we need to see if we can create some level that so the Complainant/survivor is going to continue with their education.

If the removal is going to do nothing, maybe we are removing from classes, but they live off campus, but at least our Complainant can walk campus.

I need you to be able to articulate, what was the act? What did you think would happen? And why did you think that would happen? Because if it's speculative, while people who send these kinds of messages, I've once read they are the type who do these other things, that's not good enough. I need you to articulate the behaviors that you believe may occur and why this is going to happen without relying on sort of speculation of -- alone -- speculation alone of the types of things that one might do.

It looks like there's one here about safety planning.

>> LAURA SIMS: Yeah, I just saw it. Yeah, a question about, know are there things are we should be careful about when talking about safety planning with the Title IX Coordinator?

We recommend that safety planning helps with someone else. Usually it's best practice to separate out who is taking the report versus who is adjudicating and reviewing that information, that way we are trying to remove biases throughout the process. It might be the same for the Title IX Coordinator role. Someone may not feel as safe or comfortable safety planning with the person they just had to give the report to or who might be asking for questions and engaging in that process a different way.

So if we have advocates, mental health professionals on campus, really bringing those folks in and leveraging their strengths in that process.

>> JODY SHIPPER: If you are the Title IX Coordinator, someone who has been a Title IX Coordinator, I don't ever want you in a position where you have promised something, like safety, because they will feel betrayed by you and you can't promise.

But being able to find a way to say "can I connect you with", "from what I'm hearing, I think you would benefit from, can I walk you over?" So you doing that warm handoff, getting them the assistance they need.

But if you are ever in the position of saying we need to keep you safe, we need to make sure, anything along those lines, you might inadvertently be making a promise you can't keep, first of all.

And I'm not so much worried about just the idea of bias, but the lack of skills. If it's not something you -- if it's not a muscle you use all the time to engage really in the broad scope of safety planning, if we're dealing with dating and domestic violence, call and get help, call RAINN, they are fantastic folks.

>> JENNIFER LAKE: All right, well, I think we are at our time. And Laura and Jody, thank you so much for doing this today. The audience was very engaged. We had a lot of great questions. I'm seeing tons of "thank yous" popping up in the chat.

If you need anything else after this webinar, remember I'm going to be e-mailing you from the Center the recording link and the transcript and the PowerPoint and another resource from RAINN.

So thank you all. I'm going to let you enjoy your afternoon and we hope to see you down the road at another Center event or Conference.

Take care, everyone! Have a great day!

>> LAURA SIMS: Thank you all.

>> JODY SHIPPER: Thank you.

[Training concluded]

CART Disclaimer: This rough edit transcript, which may contain missing, misspelled or paraphrased words, is only provided for your immediate review and is not certified as verbatim and is not to be cited in any way.