Journal of Family Violence (2018) 33:629–645
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-018-9986-z

ORIGINAL ARTICLE

Before there Is a Table: Small Wins to Build a Movement against Sexual and Relationship Violence in a University Context

Lauren F. Lichty[1] · Karen Rosenberg[1] · Kyra Laughlin[1]

Published online: 20 August 2018

Abstract

Addressing sexual and relationship violence (SRV) on campuses requires coordinated engagement from all members of the campus-community; however, many campuses do not yet have the infrastructure or institutional commitment to build an all-campus action plan. In such cases, campuses lack the metaphorical table around which collaboration happens. This paper presents tensions and lessons learned so far from a faculty-staff-student partnership to build a movement toward university-wide collaborative practice. Through iterative, collaborative reflection on our context, practice, and intermediate outcomes, we identified recommendations for improving praxis in campus-based, intersectional anti-SRV organizing. Our analysis explores how our individual positionalities both open up and limit our potential to move this work forward. We share our guiding values and frameworks, including intersectional feminist attention to power and oppression; centering survivors and students; strategic collaboration within systems; and integrating self-care and other supportive practices for building a sustainable movement. Our emergent strategy, illustrated through ten lessons/tensions and four case examples, focuses on finding close collaborators with shared SRV analysis; making the best use of resources and spaces we control; identifying meaningful "small wins;" and pursuing opportunities to connect to others through positive collaborations. Efforts to intentionally raise awareness and grow strategic institutional connections build momentum toward institutionally-supported campus-wide evaluation and reimagining of prevention and survivor-support efforts. While feminist collaborative social change is challenging, we celebrate and learn from our "two steps forward" to sustain us through the inevitable steps back. We write to stir a conversation where we help each other interpret and learn across our varied contexts.

Keywords Sexual violence · Relationship violence · Campus · Higher education · Participatory practice · Collaboration · Feminist praxis · Social change

Creating sustainable, institutional change to a university's response to sexual and relationship violence (SRV) requires engagement from top to bottom, left to right. This includes attention to student, staff, and faculty experiences, knowledge, skills, and behaviors; institutional policies and practices; curricular content; support services; and the ever ephemeral "culture" of the institution. Effective work in this arena also requires power-conscious approaches that employ social justice, gender equity, and intersectional analytic frameworks (Crenshaw 1991; Harris and Linder 2017). Building on community-based models of anti-domestic violence organizing (e.g., Allen et al. 2008) and sexual assault response teams (Greeson and Campbell 2013), many campuses have moved to form cross-unit, cross-level participatory committees against SRV. But on campuses with little to no existing coordinated action around SRV, how do you get there?

This paper presents tensions and lessons learned at the end of a 1-year advocacy and organizing effort to build a participatory movement toward large-scale, university-wide collaborative practice. This initiative follows campus-based sexual and relationship violence prevention and response recommendations from the Center for Disease Control (CDC, 2016), American College Health Association (ACHA, 2016), and California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA, 2016). Consistent with these recommendations and the broader literature on effective collaborations to solve complex social issues (e.g., Israel et al. 1998; Minkler and Wallerstein 2011), our organizing approach recognizes that no one unit or stakeholder group has all the necessary expertise, power, or

✉ Lauren F. Lichty
lflichty@uw.edu

[1] University of Washington Bothell, Box 358530, 18115 Campus Way NE, Bothell, WA 98011-8246, USA

responsibility to address SRV. Sustaining participatory collaborations involves establishing group processes that foster trust and mutual respect and ongoing evaluation of group process effectiveness. Members must come together in pursuit of a shared goal using jointly determined strategies. Accountability and willingness to change are critical.

Our approach to participatory practices recognizes the value of each stakeholder while attending to differences in power, positionality, and training that influence how we make sense of and design interventions to address SRV. We draw heavily on intersectional feminist anti-violence movements and apply the social-ecological framework to unpack lived experience in the university context. This framework proffers theoretical insights that view SRV as reflecting unequal power dynamics at the macro level. This work must always flow from an intersectional frame – looking at gender in isolation strengthens the legacy of white supremacy that undergirds US society and harms survivors (Adelman 2004; Crenshaw 1991; Fineman and Mykitiuk 1994; Hill Collins 2002; Richie 2000; Schneider 2000; Sokoloff and Dupont 2005; Sokoloff and Pratt 2005). To address the root causes of SRV, we center voices of survivors, attend to our individual stories and analyses, and understand that institutions that appear neutral or benign often mask their role in perpetuating the conditions necessary for SRV to thrive. Our pursuit of transformative change on campuses leads us to heed the call from Luoluo Hong (2017) for universities to be brave and move from individual-level, ahistorical, power-unconscious approaches to systematically adopt a social justice paradigm.

Other papers describe processes for engaging in systematic examination of university practices once a multi-stakeholder group is convened by campus leadership (e.g., Lichty et al. 2008). This paper describes organizing in the absence of such groups. In particular, we trace our own institutional advocacy efforts, flowing from an organic partnership between a tenure-track faculty member (Lichty), an academic staff and affiliate faculty member (Rosenberg), and an undergraduate student (Laughlin). As we detail later in this paper, a major impetus for our work stemmed from the domestic violence homicide of UWB student Anna Bui by another UWB student (Groover 2016) and our outrage at the University of Washington's weak institutional response. We felt compelled to incite institutional change from a participatory, intersectional social justice frame.

This case is in progress and imperfect. Within our triad we adopt a transformative participatory approach that seeks to upend traditional power and foster individual and collective empowerment (e.g., Cousins and Whitmore 1998). Our broader organizing practice is more practical and limited at this stage. While ideally all relevant stakeholder groups would deeply engage in and maintain joint control over the effort to mobilize the institution to establish a formal coordinating body, we work on an under-resourced, young campus. Most people work beyond a single job description. In addition, not all stakeholders have the power and flexibility to actively join the work without a formal organizational appointment. This challenge to participation may be rooted in issues such as institutional requirements, structural oppression and related experiences with institutional betrayal (Smith and Freyd 2014), and individual, personal life circumstances. Therefore, we describe a process for finding, learning alongside, and/or inviting prospective collaborators to join the "before the beginning" effort, with a respectful appreciation for those who cannot actively engage at this stage. By presenting a case study in progress, we make a claim that intersectional feminist anti-violence scholars and activists need to facilitate conversation in the middle of our struggles for change, not only once the outcomes have been determined and the process deemed ideologically exemplary. We cannot afford to wait until we have the perfect process and outcomes.

Background

Campus as a Site of Sexual and Relationship Violence Prevention and Intervention

Sexual violence, also referred to as sexual assault, sexual misconduct, sexual harassment, or rape, includes any unwanted sexual attention or contact obtained through force, coercion, or other tactic without active, willing, informed consent (CALCASA, 2016). Relationship violence, also called domestic violence or intimate partner violence, refers to a pattern of behaviors one person uses to maintain power and control over another person. This may include psychological, emotional, and/or economic forms of abuse. Physical violence may or may not be present (Sokoloff and Dupont 2005; Sokoloff and Pratt 2005). People who cause harm can mobilize their societal privilege to maintain power and control over their partners. For example, partners of undocumented women can threaten to turn them into Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) if they do not comply with their demands. Both sexual and relationship violence are rooted in cultural norms regarding sexuality, relationship formation, and systemically-maintained power and control (Harris and Linder 2017; INCITE!, 2006).

Recent meta-analyses conservatively estimate that one in five cisgender women on college campuses have experienced sexual assault (Muehlenhard et al. 2017). Estimates for transgender or non-binary people and cis men are less well documented, but research suggests nearly one in four transgender or gender non-conforming people (Cantor et al. 2015) and approximately one in seventeen cis men have experienced sexual assault (Krebs et al. 2016). Relationship violence among college students is similarly high (e.g., Knowledge Networks 2011). While large scale quantitative studies have not adopted intersectional analytic frames, INCITE! (2006)

and Harris and Linder (2017) showcase how the sexual and relationship violence perpetrated against marginalized populations such as women of color, transgender people, queer people, and people with disabilities, are linked to oppression in complex ways that may impact response and recovery. SRV directly impact staff and faculty as well. In any given group on campus, be it a class session or faculty meeting, survivors are in the room.

Sexual and relationship violence "show up" on college campuses in a variety of ways. For example, SRV are present on campus through the impact of new or past incidents on individuals who require academic or workplace accommodations, course curriculum that intentionally engages these issues as topics of study, and through hostile environments created through sexist comments or jokes. The pervasiveness of gender bias in educational contexts in the U.S. led to the creation of Title IX which requires educational institutions to address SRV through prevention education, support for survivors, and adjudication processes (White House Task Force to Prevent Students from Sexual Assault, 2014). However, implementation guidelines offered by the federal government can change at the whim of the current administration, as seen with the recent Department of Education rescinding of the Dear Colleague Letter issued by the Obama-Biden administration (Campus Advocacy and Prevention Professionals Association 2017). Universities must determine for themselves how to comply with Title IX in this shifting landscape. Ideally, institutions will aspire to go beyond compliance with federal mandates to demonstrate a commitment to equity-focused, survivor centered SRV prevention and response.

Challenges to Participatory Practices on College Campuses

When pursuing collaborative, campus-wide anti-SRV work, there are many potential challenges. Some challenges reflect the nature of college campuses. Other challenges are more pervasive. In a society rooted in white supremacist, cisheteronormative patriarchal power relations, work to support healthy relationships, consent, and accountability meet resistance no matter our institutional location (e.g., Schneider 2000; Incite!, 2006). Furthermore, the overt and covert sexism linked to SRV (e.g., Aosved and Long 2006; Burt 1980; Gartner and Sterzing 2016; Chapleau et al. 2007; Koepke et al. 2014; Abrams et al. 2003) is modified by the racist, classist, colonialist policies and practices that represent the backbone of most US higher education (e.g., Au 2010; Lampman et al. 2009; Patton, 2004a & 2004b; Mirza 2015; Ladson-Billings 1995). Below we describe specific challenging conditions that are particularly salient when organizing around SRV.

Individual Resistance: Why Are we Talking about Sexual and Relationship Violence? Despite over 40 years of feminist activism, SRV remain issues not regularly discussed in public. While 2017 saw a burst of conversation through #MeToo and the work of Tarana Burke (Burke 2018; Garcia 2017), the US has a cultural legacy of treating "family" or "relationship issues" as private, to be handled behind closed doors (Fineman and Mykitiuk 1994; Schechter 1982). This silence extends to nearly all matters of sexuality, and especially sexual violence. Similarly, rape myths and just-world beliefs create a context where people see SRV as an individual-level problem, the result of bad choices by a victim, rather than a product of cultural norms (Burt 1980; Hayes et al. 2013). All members of the campus community are susceptible to these erroneous beliefs. These macrocultural values and norms paired with lack of awareness of the Title IX obligations to address SRV on campuses, may result in faculty, staff, and student resistance or indifference to trainings on and resource allocation to systematically address SRV.

Role Confusion: Whose Job Is this, Anyway? University structures tend to draw lines between academics and all other services provided on campus (e.g., Bourassa and Kruger 2001). Part of the legacy of the dichotomy between "public" and "private" domains is a deep ambivalence on the part of administrators and academics about the role of teaching staff in supporting students who experience SRV (Hayes-Smith et al. 2010). Professors and academic staff focus on pedagogy and research whereas responsibility for student social-emotional-physical well-being is often centralized in the hands of student affairs' staff. While these individuals often have training in how to support student development, this false divide of organizational responsibility can lead people on the academic "side" to ignore how their curricula and pedagogy may impact student well-being (Carello and Butler 2014). Given their recurring contact with students, the prevalence of SRV, and the likelihood of trauma to impact academic performance, professors and academic staff are guaranteed to encounter survivors in need of support. In addition, curricula may include content that can be traumatically triggering for survivors. It may also reinforce (or disrupt) patriarchy and rape culture. Taken together, professors and academic staff play a significant role in campus efforts to address SRV. While some faculty are engaged in this kind of emotional labor (e.g., Tunguz 2016), the challenge is to help all members of the college campus see their role in this work and for the institution to support their development (Durfee and Rosenberg 2009).

Organizational Structure: Who Talks to Whom under What Conditions? Linked to the issue of role confusion is a larger challenge of organizational structure and distribution of power across faculty, staff, and students. Following participatory best practices, if all players have a stake in how SRV are addressed

on campus, then all should be at the table with equitable power to influence the work. Buy-in and transparency increase the likelihood of full participation and effective implementation (Israel et al. 1998; Minkler and Wallerstein 2011). However, in the university context, organizational divides challenge these participatory principles. Units are isolated, with different processes, hierarchies, and perceived domains of practice (e.g., CALASA, 2016; Keeling et al. 2007; Kezar 2005). Faculty may know their curricular programs, other academic units, and the faculty code of conduct, but they do not attend staff meetings or even necessarily know what staff roles exist on campus. Staff who have direct contact with students, on the other hand, likely have a much broader view of the institution. Their work supporting student well-being is seen as interrelated and as such is housed under sweeping units with titles like "Student Affairs" that address everything from counseling to conduct to health and wellness. Support units across campus are often better networked with established communication practices. That said, they do not always know faculty, their research, their curricula, or their expertise. Silos persist.

Power differences among faculty, staff, and students are also evident. Between academic freedom and shared governance, faculty members hold extensive institutional power. Faculty tend to choose what and how they teach, select their required service to the institution, and set their own research agendas. They are on campus when necessary, but rarely on demand. Staff, on the other hand, are typically more constrained by job descriptions, traditional hours, and are often implementing unit mission and values rather than their own. In general, higher education positions students to have the least amount of power on campus, framed primarily as consumers of the institution (Bunce et al. 2017). They pay to attend, are told what they have the option to learn, and are conditioned to be recipients of campus resources/programs rather than potential co-developers. Ultimately, students are framed as recipients of knowledge rather than knowledge producers (Freire 1971). When they rightly rebel against old guard ideals, they are only sometimes taken seriously. Despite some moves to incorporate student voice in educational reform (Cook-Sather 2015), the expression, "wait until they graduate" is considered academic credo by many.

This siloed organizational structure paired with different degrees of power breeds fractured networks, stereotypes, and assumptions about roles and allegiances that challenge collaboration (e.g., Kezar 2014). At its worst, students are seen as idealistic antagonists, staff are seen as towing the party line, and faculty are seen as ego-driven and disconnected from the reality of student and university needs. Pursuing participatory, power-sharing practices in these conditions requires relationship building, attention to process, and emotional labor.

Levels of Analysis and Guiding Frameworks: Why Are we Talking about SRV like this (through an Intersectional, Systems-Oriented, Social Justice Framework)? Those explicitly assigned the responsibility to address SRV on campus are often in positions that respond on a case-by-case basis (e.g., counselors and conduct officers). While an individual-level focus may dramatically impact the life of a single survivor, it will not change the underlying culture and contexts that produce these incidents. Indeed, CALCASA (2016) and the CDC (2016) call on universities to adopt the social-ecological model and examine policies and practices across multiple levels in developing their prevention and response plans. Yet, to create sustainable change, we need university personnel to have the space, time, and institutional commitment to examine the system as a whole while working from a transformative, intersectional social justice model.

This is further complicated by the ways that oppressive power structures are embedded within university contexts. We grapple with the extent to which we view our work within university contexts as using, in Audre Lorde's famous formulation, the "master's tools" to dismantle the "master's house" (Lorde 1984). In other words, if we view the neoliberal universities as a tool to maintain white supremacist, misogynist power structures, are we wasting our time trying to reform them? Or worse, are we unwittingly strengthening them? Would our energies be better spent exclusively collaborating with community-based organizations that function outside of the educational industrial complex? Though we continue to grapple with these questions, we tend toward a Foucaldian analysis of power as inherently unstable and open to resistive ruptures and re-formulations (Foucault 1990). In this frame, the university remains one of many sites where power structures are vulnerable to reconfiguration.

Why a Participatory Approach?

Analysis of traditional approaches to university-based anti-SRV work demonstrate the lack of attention to power, culture, and local context and raise the need for multi-level engagement to create sustainable change (Hong 2017). Furthermore, while campus administrators and other officials hold important views of the institution, theirs cannot be the only perspectives guiding the design and implementation of SRV response. Non-participatory top-down approaches tend to lack grounding in the lived experience with SRV on campus or the historical roots of violence (e.g., Harris and Linder 2017; CALCASA, 2016). It is essential to listen to those implementing anti-SRV campus practices and those impacted by SRV, from multiple positions in the institution and multiple social locations. Furthermore, a well-executed participatory approach can dismantle institutional power dynamics and break down silos to promote meaningful conversation and coordination to address multifaceted issues like SRV.

Therefore, we argue that campuses must undertake participatory practices that align, coordinate, and build in assessment protocols that center marginalized voices and examine the work through a social justice lens (i.e., transformative participatory evaluation, Cousins and Whitmore 1998). In this way, an institutionalized body is not merely serving to promote efficiencies and maximize effectiveness of programming, but to serve as a site of grounding, commitment to, and actualization of a larger transformation related to SRV within higher education.

At the outset of our efforts to create participatory processes for pursuing transformative change on our campus, some of these challenges were already evident. Others emerged over time through missteps and confused interactions. We share our strategies for navigating these challenges and other tensions after providing an overview of our context, emphasizing our institutional history, author social locations and histories related to SRV, and impetus to take action.

Framing The Context

Given the importance of context for informing approaches to collaboration, social change, and social justice, we provide a description of our university context as well as each author. This information intends to ground the reader in the conditions of our practice on a small, public university as well as our positionalities and relationship to the subject matter. Our social and institutional positions can be resources and challenges, and we draw on this complexity as we describe our collaborative organizing practice.

University of Washington Bothell

University of Washington Bothell (UWB) is one of three campuses within the Washington State public university system. UWB is a rapidly growing commuter campus, nearly doubling student enrollment in the last 5 years. As of the 2016–2017 school year, our total student enrollment was 5735 (89% undergraduate and 11% masters-level students). Our campus serves a diverse student body with 49% of students entering in their first year being the first in their family to go to college and 57% identifying as people of color (UWB 2017).

As a developing campus, there are many ways in which we are "in progress." For example, while students create clubs that provide peer support and community (e.g., Latinx Student Union, Black Student Union, Muslim Student Association, Gender Equity Club, Parent Union, Pride Alliance), we do not have a women's center, queer center, daycare, or health center. The campus Diversity Center opened in 2017 after years of student-led advocacy and organizing (Perez et al. 2015; Silva 2018), primarily by students and faculty of color. Note, the Diversity Center was not yet open at the time we began our organizing work. While the folks dedicated to opening the Diversity Center included attention to the needs of sexual and relationship survivors in their list of demands, they were not able to join our mobilizing activities. It is uncertain how participation and engagement in this work may have unfolded differently if these mobilization efforts were not co-occurring.

Title IX coordination is centralized across the tri-campuses. However, each campus is obligated to provide prevention education and support services for student, faculty, and staff survivors. At the time we undertook this organizing work, SRV prevention education and survivor services were underdeveloped. There was no dedicated SRV staff employed at UWB. There was little systematic, required staff training, and no required faculty training, on SRV. Bystander intervention training occurred in a 1-hour segment of new student orientation, student health educators provided occasional SRV-related events, and a handful of professors taught courses that intentionally covered sexuality and relationship topics relevant to SRV. There was no indication that individuals serving in first-responder roles (e.g., student conduct, campus safety) were offered or required to attend in-depth trainings on SRV (e.g., the standard 40-hour community-based agency trainings), particularly intersectional, trauma-informed, survivors-centered SRV trainings. There were also no known resources committed to coordinating or evaluating our limited campus practices related to SRV.

While we did not have a systematic, coordinated institutional response to or financial investment in addressing SRV on our campus, we did have individual people distributed across many units with deeply held commitments to ending SRV. We also had, and continue to have, positions on campus in which people are guaranteed to engage with survivors. These individuals require training and support to develop trauma-informed, survivor-responsive practices. So how do we get from individuals with commitment and awareness of a responsibility to address this issue to a collective movement and coordinated effort to address SRV on our campus?

In what remains of this paper, we describe how we, a student, a staff member, and a faculty member, came together to press for action on our campus. Holding the national and our local context for campus-based SRV in mind, we will share our personal backgrounds, process, and tensions/lessons we are learning from an effort to develop a participatory cross-campus movement to address SRV.

Author Background and Impetus to Act

Author Background: Lichty (Faculty) I am a white, middle class, queer, genderqueer woman. At UWB, I am an assistant professor in a non-departmentalized interdisciplinary school. I aspire to destabilize gender binaries and disrupt rape culture

through university-based sexuality education and social justice pedagogy. I identify as a feminist activist-researcher. My personal activism and professional practice focus on sexual violence and sexual health, first as an undergraduate trained advocate and campus organizer, then as a graduate student in community psychology. I am trained in community-based participatory approaches to research and the use of systematic, rigorous inquiry to document social issues, design interventions, and evaluate their impact. My research has focused on education-based sexual harassment, community response to sexual violence, youth response to rape, and campus-based responses to SRV (e.g., Campbell et al. 2005; Lichty and Campbell 2012; Lichty et al. 2008).

I have personally felt the direct effects of SRV as long as I can remember. Seventeen years ago my post-traumatic stress symptoms almost ended my academic career, and the physical, psychological, and economic effects of past and ongoing interpersonal violence are with me daily. I do not typically discuss my survivor identity when I do this work. This paper marks the first occasion I am "publicly" disclosing this status. Fear, shame, and not wanting to place a spotlight on my story (particularly given some of my privileged identities) are some of the reasons for my silence. However, it is a critical element of how I conceptualize my role as a participant in this work. As a survivor-activist-researcher, my work on campus is grounded in professional commitments and expertise; it is also a personal act of resistance. Identifying with social issues impacts the way we engage in practices to create change. As well understood in feminist practice (e.g., hooks 1994), our personal experiences offer value and complication. I reflect on the distinctness of my own social positioning, interrogate my biases, and intentionally seek collaborations across lines of difference to create a more robust, responsive approach. I also draw on the energy and investment that comes from my personal connection to the topic. I take on labor and commit to extreme hours (while also being a single parent) because I remember what it was like to ask for accommodations, to be terrified of uninformed professors or university staff, and to be triggered by course content and classmate behavior. I have more power now, and I feel responsible to act. I refuse to accept institutional betrayal as a static, perpetual reality. I am committed to see change and believe that change is possible, in individuals and across systems. That said, the nature of my engagement in this work varies over time. When the work described here began, my campus-based anti-SRV activities focused on prevention through the promotion of positive sexuality and relationships via class-based curriculum. I was not connected to others doing anti-SRV work on campus or in the community.

Author Background: Rosenberg (Academic Staff and Affiliate Faculty) I identify as an Ashkenazi Jewish woman and feminist activist/academic. I have worked to create safe and loving communities across multiple contexts and institutions. I worked as a front-line legal advocate in a confidential shelter for 6 years. Experiencing the profound tension between the battered women's movement's insistence that patriarchal institutions foster SRV while looking to these institutions for relief led me to graduate school to more deeply interrogate the relationship between feminist activism and the law. For my Masters, I explored the barriers domestic violence programs face when seeking to engage in transformative social change. For my dissertation, I did a comparative case study of feminist anti-violence organizing in Seattle and Vancouver, BC. I am also the lead writer for the community education tool "In Their Shoes." After the birth of my first child, I decided to leave the anti-violence work because it was taking too heavy an emotional toll. I was thrilled to find an opening to direct the Writing and Communication Center at UWB. Although I continued consulting work with community organizations, I did not continue the research plan I developed in graduate school.

Lichty & Rosenberg's Collaboration History Our collaboration began in the classroom in 2014. While preparing for Rosenberg to guest speak in Lichty's gender-themed Interdisciplinary Inquiry class, we learned of our respective backgrounds in SRV activism and research. After 2 years of co-presenting, we developed and co-taught a first-year 10-credit inquiry and composition course called "Gender under Construction." This course focused on deconstructing gender through an intersectional feminist lens while developing student composition skills. Co-creating this course made space for us to examine our pedagogical practices, develop shared frameworks around gender and social justice, and translate our different disciplinary and practice languages. We considered integrating a unit on SRV into this course, but deemed ourselves not ready to take on this topic with first year students.

Moving toward Action: Lichty and Rosenberg As referenced at the outset of this paper, in 2016, Anna Bui, a UWB student, was murdered by her ex-boyfriend and fellow UWB student. He stalked and intentionally killed her, along with two of her friends, when she refused to continue dating him. By his own admission, this was an act of relationship violence.

Devastated by the news, we watched and waited for our campus response. As emails were released from upper administration, no mention was made of relationship violence. Language like "cruel twists of life" and passive references to our "slain student" were (and remain) prominently featured. This failure to name relationship violence alarmed us.

We privately reached out to members of campus leadership and support services to inquire about the protocol for response and plans for addressing relationship violence head on. We raised concern for existing survivors on campus and the need for intervention on this pressing social issue. A few colleagues

responded echoing our concern and upset, but took no visible action. In all other cases, we were met at first with responses emphasizing concern for those grieving and/or a desire not to prematurely politicize (her) death. When we pressed further about the importance of naming and the need for honest grieving over both the loss of life and the way in which the life was lost, as an act of relationship violence, we were met with silence and blunt refusal to change course.

For Lichty, this lack of naming felt like a personal erasure. It felt like a gag order, like relationship violence survivors could not exist on campus, even when it kills us. Pushing past this institutional betrayal (Smith and Freyd 2014), we committed to being agents of change where our institution was not. This sparked our organizing efforts to build a movement and systematic institutional commitment to address SRV on campus. Our goals were to take immediate action where we could and try to build a movement toward institutional change. We identified our first task of learning more about existing infrastructure and procedures. We also considered immediate actions we could take in contexts we control, like revising our course content to incorporate SRV. A colleague we previously reached out to invited us to an informal anti-SRV discussion. This moment brought together a small group of students, faculty, and staff who were concerned and committed to making change. This is where we met Laughlin.

Author Background and Movement toward Action: Laughlin (Undergraduate Student) I identify as a White, cisgender woman. I've spent my life in emotionally, and at times physically, abusive households - my survivorship is ongoing. Two years ago, at age 21, I was diagnosed with a rare form of ovarian cancer which forced me to leave school to undergo surgery and several rounds of chemotherapy. Three months after my final chemo treatment, I was raped by a coworker (though, like many survivors, I was reluctant to immediately identify the experience as such). A week following the assault, I quit my job and returned to the university to begin onboarding for my new position as a peer health educator. During a student staff training, a local sexual violence agency presented to our team and it was at this time that I recognized the incident a week prior as sexual assault; it would be another 2 weeks before I understood it was rape. As a result of these significant, concurrent traumas, I suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety and have ongoing physical pain. Academically, I have found myself continually going head-to-head with faculty who refuse to hold themselves accountable in creating accessible class spaces for survivors which has thereby transformed my relationship to the classroom and impacted my education. Financially, I remain insecure due to a lack of access to supportive workplaces or funding for my anti-SRV work on campus. Interpersonally, I have retained only a handful of relationships with folks who knew me pre-assault. My family is not aware of the scope of my anti-SRV work or the true reasoning behind my involvement. My trauma has touched every part of my life and is inextricably linked to my daily processes.

I began my senior year 3 weeks after my assault. I double majored in Society, Ethics & Human Behavior and Gender, Women & Sexuality Studies (GWSS) classes. GWSS coursework allowed me to start making sense of the different systems and social norms that allowed SRV to be such a prevalent experience in my life and to recognize that, contrary to what my abusers told me, what my rapist told me, and what I constantly told myself: it wasn't my fault. I began incorporating sexual violence into nearly all of my assignments and projects, several of which included "outting" myself as a rape survivor to my peers and professors. I began to meet with classmates who identified as survivors to discuss our experiences, the lack of resources, and how we could advocate for change. After demonstrating my commitment to SRV, my professor invited me to a planning meeting which is where I met Lichty and Rosenberg – we have been collaborating ever since.

Tensions & Lessons Learned from A Work in Progress

Our Intentions in Organizing

We aim to move beyond individual-level practices or one-off trainings to develop a coordinated, systematic institutional strategy for preventing SRV and supporting survivors. We want to produce sustainable change that is responsive to our campus context. Our goal is to build a truly collaborative, participatory process for working across campus units that includes key stakeholders (i.e., those who design, implement, and are impacted by these practices), promotes collective buy-in, attends to structural power, and is responsive to our campus, faculty, staff, and student cultures. This requires developing shared language and processes, valuing our respective roles on campus, and power sharing, for starters. However, before people can be brought to the table, we have to know who to invite and have a table to sit around. As a campus with no dedicated SRV student space, full-time staff, or infrastructure, it was a challenge to figure out how to start moving the work forward. After a year of our organizing efforts, the Chancellor's office released a statement announcing a new campus commitment to address SRV, including the formation of a cross-campus committee (Yeigh 2017). The committee was formally charged in fall, 2017; Lichty and a member of our Student Affairs unit are the founding co-chairs. This work has been messy, and it is only beginning. Upon reflecting on our experience, there are several lessons learned that we believe anyone trying to initiate a participatory movement for change on their campus may benefit from. Therefore, rather than present a chronological narrative, we frame our

experiences around tensions and lessons learned in this ongoing process of "getting to the table." We close with four illustrative case examples and concluding reflections.

Lesson 1. Find Co-Conspirators, Partners in Organizing

Pursuing anti-violence work in spaces with no movement, passive resistance, or even active objection is hard. Really hard. We do not believe it is possible to sustain this work without finding people to call your co-conspirators. These are the people with whom you can speak candidly, name issues and struggles plainly, question motives, consider frameworks, and, when the frustration level merits it, cry. While individuals working on SRV outside the university can be supports and allies, finding people who know your institution is crucial. In our case, our partnership (among the authors) extends across levels of the institution (faculty, staff, and student), and the makeup of this partnership also serves an important function in the overall strategy of bringing a campus together around a shared issue. Below we detail critical elements of our partnership.

Shared Values, Ideology, and Strategy We share a commitment to intersectional, anti-oppressive, transformative practices. We actively reflect on our unique and shared identities, their connections to structural power, and how that may create advantages and limits to our perceptions, practice, and effectiveness engaging prospective partners. Furthermore, our strategies for pursuing change are rooted in a shared belief in the value of collaboration and participatory practices over antagonism. These shared values, reflective practices, and ideology form the backbone of our partnership. We return to the principles that underlie our partnership to evaluate past efforts and determine next steps.

Holding shared values, ideology, and strategy does not mean we always share language for interpreting events or easily move from idea or value to action. For example, Rosenberg and Lichty trained in different disciplinary fields (Women's Studies and Community Psychology). We also were activists and researchers in the distinct community-based fields of domestic violence and sexual violence. Laughlin is just embarking on her scholarly and organizing practice and is connected to a different generation of activism. These experiences result in differences that have required translation and sometimes produced frustration. However, our moments of translation enhance our reflective practice and mobilization process.

Commitment to Hold Supportive Space In our partnership we attend to the emotion tied to our work. As co-conspirators we hold brave space (Arao and Clemens 2013) for airing feelings and thoughts without concern for political or professional ramifications. We vent, we name, we listen, we empathize. And we say "thank you" for the ways we work and support one another. We also each have distinct professional and personal responsibilities that impact our work. Therefore, we regularly check in on our respective needs, boundaries, and expectations. These honest and sometimes difficult dialogues nurture and sustain our partnership. This is especially important given that we are partnering across lines of power, experience, and development. This kind of supportive partnering requires a willingness to be professionally and interpersonally vulnerable. Having a supportive team in place that understands the nature of the work allows us to sustain our efforts and to keep fighting for those "small to medium wins."

Insight and Access across Levels of the Institution To build toward a cross-unit, cross-campus collaboration, we need to understand the dynamic experiences of people inhabiting different roles, including students. Our partnership bridges faculty, staff, and student silos within our institution and therefore provides important insight and connection to different experiences of the university. While bridging faculty-staff divides is important, we find it most critical to focus on the involvement and dedication of Laughlin, a student leader, in this organizing effort. Anti-SRV prevention and intervention work on campus cannot be done without centering student experience and voice. They are the reason our campuses exist at all, and most campus services target them as recipients. Laughlin not only brings her personal insight and commitment to this issue, she also serves as a liaison to the student body, and especially to student survivors. Student survivors have many reasons to distrust authority figures in higher education; student leaders are critical gatekeepers as well as collaborators. Laughlin has raised issues other students face or referred students directly to us as "safe" allies. Without Laughlin, Rosenberg and Lichty may be read as suspect agents of the institution, and we could lose crucial student insight and involvement.

Leveraging our unique roles, we determine who should initiate meetings, make requests, or even make demands. Amongst ourselves, we talk explicitly about our respective power and what makes us an asset in different spaces and contexts. We analyze unjust hierarchies in the university context while simultaneously seeking to advance our work within the institution. Together, we are better positioned to unpack our organizational structure, consider points of leverage, and see our context more clearly.

Tensions in Close Collaborations Three important tensions are relevant to this lesson. First, when working with survivors, additional attention to support processes is required. Emotional involvement and frustration with slow, bureaucratic processes are amplified when the issue at hand is part of your identity (e.g., for consideration on emotional involvement in sexual violence work, see Campbell 2002).

This is especially important when we are collaborating with people who may have caused harm in the past, and who may have a steeper learning curve related to social justice-informed practices. While they deserve space to make this paradigm shift, we also need to honor that waiting for a paid professional to "get" your lived experience does not feel good.

Second, our close collaboration involved three people read in the world as able-bodied, middle class white women. Given white supremacy and the race, gender, and sexual orientation-based historical exclusivity of anti-violence activism of second wave feminism, this is a significant consideration for how we approach this work. We discuss this at length in Lesson 7.

Third, while we can strive to be mindful of power differentials, lines of power can never be fully erased. Faculty, staff, and administrators hold power over students. Individuals serving in these roles are gatekeepers to students engaging in this work whether that be through serving on committees, doing research, creating clubs, participating in student advisory boards or co-developing SRV programs as peer health educators. The extent to which student voice is incorporated into campus-based institutional change movements is largely dependent on individuals with power inviting student voice and ensuring those voices are heard and valued. Awareness of contingent inclusion and dependence on Lichty and Rosenberg creates tensions that we continuously examine and adjust process around. Communicating across lines of power is difficult, even among those we trust and care for most. Let us say again, this work is messy.

Lesson 2. Be Visible and Keep your Eyes, Ears, and Mind Open

We found each other through a process of being visible and vocal about our commitments to addressing SRV. We demonstrated dedication to doing this work by standing up for these issues and doing so in influential spaces and/or around individuals with power. We were brought together at the first informal gathering because we had each, in our own roles and capacities, communicated our commitment to SRV. Each of us built reputations as "go-to" people and were vocal about our frameworks and values whenever the opportunity presented. Choosing to do so rendered us visible to one another and to other potential collaborators. At the first informal multi-stakeholder meeting where we all first met, as Laughlin describes, "I could immediately tell by the thoughtful language Lichty and Rosenberg used and their consideration for survivors that these were two individuals who I wanted to work with and could have as my mentors." Similarly, Laughlin spoke with such conviction that there was no questioning her passion or commitment to making change. Had any of us been "closeted" allies, there is no way we would have found ourselves at the same meeting, let alone embarked on this broader campaign for change.

On campuses without coordinated SRV practices, there are likely individuals and units doing work to address these issues. These are your best bet for initial collaborators when building a participatory movement. On the staff side of our campus, we found this work occurring in student affairs, particularly within student health and wellness, student conduct and the counseling center, in addition to campus safety. Academic units most likely to house individuals with SRV commitments include (but are not limited to) gender, women, and sexuality studies; sociology; psychology; social work; legal studies; public health; nursing and health studies; and media and communication studies. Subject librarians with ties to social justice are another good option. Note, the mere presence of SRV-related work does not mean it is being done well or in ways consistent with transformative social justice practice (Hong 2017).

While these are useful starting places, individuals with personal commitments to SRV could be found anywhere on a campus. To find other allies, Rosenberg first reached out to known community-based organizations with connection to the tri-campuses for recommendations of feminist staff working on these issues. We also reviewed institutional websites and all-campus notifications about meetings, presentations, trainings, or other conversations. If SRV could be raised or discussed, we attended. Most importantly, we entered these spaces with an open mind, looking for potential collaborators, insight into current practices, and opportunities for small-scale actions. We listened to and learned from our colleagues. We met with over a dozen people in one-on-one meetings. We initiated conversations, talked about the importance of SRV work and invited others to participate.

To be clear, attending meetings and trainings is added labor. Often we did not know where the meetings would lead. However, on enough occasions attending these gatherings either directly connected us with potential collaborators or provided useful insight into the values of our institution, the language/culture of different units, and increased our overall institutional understanding.

Lesson 3. Work from Spaces you Control

Every person has power. The nature of our power varies depending on our individual identities, social locations, and institutional contexts. Identifying where we hold the most active power to create change allows us to immediately engage in SRV resistance work. A guiding question for this lesson is: Within the bounds of existing structures and roles, what immediate actions can be taken to create change, open conversations with stakeholders, and build new settings for change and collaboration? We used this lesson to design activities in spaces we controlled that raised visibility of SRV and promoted broader awareness to hopefully build support for an institutional commitment to address SRV. Below we outline

opportunities to consider from each of our positions within the university. We illustrate some of these examples in the case example section at the end of this article.

Faculty may consider the power they hold related to teaching, research, and service to the institution. They may also hold power through shared-governance related to broader institutional policies and procedures (e.g., consider the power of the faculty code to create obligations for the institution to provide supportive resources and training). Related to coursework, Lichty chose to infuse SRV-related content into nearly all classes and created opportunities for students to reflect on SRV and consider the need for intervention in order to help them identify as players at the table, part of solutions rather than part of the problem (see case examples for more details). If you're able, assign projects where students examine campus resources and write recommendations for change (note: make sure you provide thoughtful supervision to student projects given concerns regarding rape culture, student readiness to engage this topic with sensitivity and respect, and concern for survivor well-being in classrooms). This increases opportunities to expand the reach of your work and identify additional students who may be interested in co-creating change on campus (e.g., more than a dozen students have conducted student-led SRV projects with Lichty, including queer students, students of color, male or masculine-identified students, and first-generation students – with identities often overlapping- thus expanding the diversity of perspectives informing the campus-based work).

Faculty may also consider shifting their research focus to SRV on campus. To be clear, we do not mean collect data from a sample of intro students in the grand tradition of psychology. We mean ask intentional questions to learn about students experience with SRV on campus. For example, survey, focus group, or interview research on student experiences with SRV in classrooms, clubs, or as campus leaders all help inform practice and generate conversations. As part of our initial work, we applied for funding to conduct an intersectional SRV needs assessment that centers affinity groups students have created on campus and will invite members to review, critique, and imagine a more culturally responsive campus. Other projects include institutional observation via policy reviews, accessibility of outward facing resources, and campus walking tours looking for visible messages around SRV. Some of these small scale research projects fit nicely into student independent studies or capstone coursework. If openings emerge for doing service in diversity and equity or SRV specifically, take them. This is a critical space for raising SRV as a matter related to oppression and equity and resist the traditional university paradigm for SRV work.

Staff power varies depending on position and reporting lines. In our experience, staff power may be drawn from approaches to executing professional obligations (e.g., a feminist empowerment or individual deficits model) as well as expertise on and influence over organizational practices and opportunities for evaluation and redesign. One powerful example of staff power is the provision of training to supervisees. Building units that effectively seek to prevent and respond to SRV may have radiating effects across units and campus. We also recommend examining the borders of job descriptions and strategically serving on, for example, safety task forces, hiring committees, diversity councils, and other venues where multiple units come together. These spaces provide opportunities to build connections and interject anti-SRV-related ideas and values into campus practice.

Student power can be found through club creation and leadership (see case examples for more on this), student government, class projects, feedback on faculty or program evaluations, requesting meetings with campus leadership, and more general agitation on campus. As students, consider your role within classes, in your department (if a student employee), or as part of the larger campus community and then look for opportunities in service of SRV awareness raising, prevention education, intervention, and advocacy for survivors. If something doesn't exist, work to create it. Advocate for student activity fees to fund student-led programming. One tension students may face is not being perceived as credible independent of faculty and staff allies. Being vocal about commitment to this work helps faculty and staff identify prospective collaborators and may open doors for joining change-making efforts.

By taking action in the spaces we control, we can raise awareness of SRV and identify potential collaborators. Such activities also help sustain our energy and commitment to this work – rather than wait for formal, institutionally-empowered entities, we can make changes on our own.

Lesson 4. Identify Targeted, Achievable Outcomes

While working toward a collaborative, participatory practice we inevitably identify low hanging actionable fruit. This may include facilitating revisions to website content, disseminating resource cards, or developing a survivor-centered resource guide. These are opportunities to pursue discrete collaborative projects with key stakeholders which allow us to develop relationships necessary for larger change efforts (see Case Examples at the end of this paper). These actions, while small, nurture us. This is particularly critical for student collaborators. In order for this work to be sustainable from the student perspective, there needs to be meaningful movement...there needs to be "wins", even more so when this labor is invisible, unpaid, and temporary. Students' campus engagement varies from that of staff and faculty because their time is so limited in this environment. When students leave campus, they want to do so knowing that they made an impact; that all of the betrayal, frustration and retraumatization was worth something. It's important that those with institutional power give space

and provide mentorship to students so that they can pursue tangible, meaningful outcomes on SRV-related projects. Though the slow, bureaucratic process for long-term, transformative change cannot, and arguably should not, be sped up, there is always labor that students can take on so long as faculty, staff and administrators work with students to identify what projects feel significant to undertake (ideally with pay).

Lesson 5. Despite Advice to the Contrary, SAY YES (a Lesson for Faculty[1])

One of the more important strategies for gaining the trust and respect of our colleagues was in how we showed up and committed to step outside our traditional roles. This is especially true for Lichty. Tenure-track faculty are expected to do research, teach, and do service for their unit and larger institution. In that order. Best advice is to collect data you can turn around for publication fast, teach repeating courses to reduce course preparation, and do the bare minimum of service. In other words, say no to everything that does not directly meet the tenure or promotion goals. While many of our colleagues choose not to follow these recommendations, it is no wonder the stereotype of faculty is that they are ego-driven and disconnected from the needs of the institution.

When starting a movement for change on campus, faculty may build trust by intentionally ignoring conventional advice to not take on additional labor, within reason, by proving commitment to more than a tenure line (if they are privileged enough to have one). Our strategies: Show up to meetings with interest and respect for the work that has come before. Be humble while also demonstrating expertise, and then offer to do something in service of the group. Ask how to lift up the work of others. Then follow through. For example, invite people to be class guest speakers to promote their services. This demonstrates respect for what that person brings to the campus and hopefully helps more students access those services.

When asked to serve in larger capacities that are directly linked to anti-SRV work on campus, SAY YES. For example, after nearly 6 months of attending meetings and getting to know key players doing Title IX and SRV work on campus, we (all three authors) were invited to serve on the search committee for our first ever dedicated campus-based sexual assault and relationship violence advocate/educator. This service opportunity arose when all of our service obligations to the institution were already met. Participating in this unique moment of institution building allowed us to demonstrate our commitments and expertise related to the topic, support ongoing labor to develop our resources, and personally connect to more people affiliated with SRV work. In meetings where we discussed institutional needs and goals, we learned extensively about our institution, other units, our colleagues, and their experience with SRV. These conversations broadened the scope of understanding on all sides. This also served as a micro-level multi-unit collaboration, organized around clear objectives and activities, a meaningful way to build rapport.

While all of this "saying yes" is in service of building trust and rapport, faculty members interested in keeping their position have to learn how to render the scholarly dimensions of this long, slow process for developing community-based (in this case the university is the community) participatory evaluation and research partnerships legible to colleagues and review committees who are not familiar with this approach. Find creative opportunities to generate output that is consistent with other scholarly products. This in-progress article is part of that effort. In addition, we have presented dimensions of our work at three scholarly conferences including an undergraduate research and practice conference, a scholarship of teaching and learning conference, and a Women's Studies conference.

Tension: We can't Always Say Yes, and Sometimes, We should Say no (See Also, Lesson 9) Unpaid labor by women, especially women of color, is a significant problem within the academy. Disproportionate service expectations paired with unequal pay (that intersect gender and racial lines), particularly when doing work around gender equity, are a persistent and unacceptable reality. This lesson is meant to encourage faculty to think intentionally about our stereotypical perception among staff and others and consider how we can (if we can) resist those assumptions. It also highlights the value of saying yes to added labor that may have a positive effect on efforts to grow a movement. However, structural imbalances of power may significantly impact when a person says yes or no. Boundary-setting also deserves respect and compassion. These are not easy decisions. Ultimately, all of us should be paid to engage in this critical, federally-mandated work. Perhaps someday.

Lesson 6. Honor Past and Ongoing Labor Related to SRV

As we organize, we must be mindful of the history of a place and current labor. While we aspired to be inclusive as we moved toward the founding of an institutionalized collaborative entity, the process moved too quickly to allow everyone to have a voice. Despite including leaders and some staff of different units, we later heard that some people felt left out of the conversation or that we failed to showcase the existing work at our institution. As a group of practitioners engaging topics so often dismissed or ignored in society, this perception was deeply concerning. To grow and sustain this work, we

[1] Credit to Rosenberg and other staff who shared their hesitation about working with faculty and educated me (Lichty) in this process.

need (and want) to honor past efforts, even as we revise them. No labor should go unrecognized among collaborators. When this was raised to our attention we issued an apology and invitation to have one-on-one discussions about how to do better. Accountability when we make mistakes, no matter how well-intentioned, is essential to building a caring, productive collaborative movement.

Lesson 7. Attend to Identities and Frameworks

We are three intersectional feminist anti-violence practitioners. We utilize our identities and connections to queer, femme, genderqueer, income-unstable, Jewish, disabled, anti-racist and survivor communities to reflect deeply on how we mobilize this work. We are also three white people doing organizing work in a white supremacist society. Therefore, as we pursue practices that attend to the ways structural power animates identities, we are especially intentional in how we attend to the intersection of race and survivor status as well as other less visible oppressed identities (e.g., disability, queerness). This means reading, listening to, and seeking guidance from survivors from multiple marginalized identities, including forming collaborations with liberatory community-based agencies who center the experiences of marginalized survivors such as the NW Network of Bi, Trans, Lesbian and Gay Survivors of Abuse. We also secured funding to pay marginalized people for their labor (e.g., the intersectional needs assessment funding we received is exclusively to pay student participants). We also do not assume the burden of unrecognized, unpaid organizing labor should be placed on multiply marginalized people. Throughout this effort to develop a formalized institutional space, we have included students and colleagues of color in our conversations. Students have engaged with Lichty through their independent studies but declined to join other informal organizing spaces. The few academics and staff of color on our campus are organizing across many spaces, and while they expressed care and support for this work, they did not join the initial mobilizing effort. We respect these decisions. In sum, while commitment to intersectional, social justice approaches guides our methods, our intersecting identities inform how we make sense of these issues and needs, providing meaningful insights and biases. We are aware of the limits of our own perspectives, and that optics and representation matter. These are critical points of tension and awareness in anti-SRV work, particularly when lead organizers hold visibly privileged identities.

Lesson 8. Remember that you Are a Stakeholder, Too

Community-based participatory research best practices instruct us to work from shared expertise (rather than with deference to a PhD) and to serve as facilitators rather than directors. Our training encourages us to listen deeply rather than speak, especially in early stages of rapport building, as we are often outsiders to communities we collaborate with. However, we are not outsiders on our own campus. We have a stake. Therefore, in our practice, we balance a mindfulness of power within the institution and across roles, while also leaving room for our voices, even in these early stages. It took time to feel comfortable pushing back on problematic statements made by colleagues or to suggest we change course in planning meetings. When moving toward institutional action, respectfully sharing insights and professional commitments is essential and appropriate. This is especially important for people, particularly those with less power like students, who are coming to this work having been harmed by the institution. We cannot engage as authentic participants in the collaboration process if we are hiding pain in the room for the benefit of others. We found trying to serve as facilitator of others first (at the expense of our voices) had the reverse effect of deepening distrust and barriers to some connections. Through honest, mediated professional accountability conversations, we found ways to give voice to harm while moving the collaboration forward. These are works in progress.

Lesson 9. Identify your Limits and Prioritize High-Impact Practices

Personal commitment to this work does not account for burnout. Fiery passion to see change can sometimes obscure our vision of our own needs and which activities should be prioritized. Visibility gained through adhering to Lesson 2 can produce more opportunities than are possible to take on. Just because an opportunity presents does not mean we have the capacity, practice-based skills, or socio-emotional supports to take on the project. Also, not all actions are of equal importance or likely impact. We learned to adopt a deliberate self-reflective needs assessment approach by asking: Is this contributing to sustainable changemaking or is this a one-off intervention that may disappear when students graduate, staff take promotions, or faculty leave on sabbatical? If it is the latter and if it does not contribute to nourishing our practice, we focus our energy elsewhere.

Lesson 10. Stay Connected and Support each Other when Things Inevitably Go Sideways

Building a movement related to SRV on a college campus is not a straightforward process. We had meetings go wonderfully, received commitments to act, followed by silence. We had miscommunications and missteps, amongst ourselves and with others. And so we end our lessons where we began, with the importance of staying connected to our closest partners in organizing. When we have pulled all the low hanging fruit we can find and exercised all our individual power in spaces we control, we are there to commiserate and keep each other in the fight.

Case Examples from our Process

To illustrate the lessons, we share four case examples from our work over the last year. One focuses on teaching, one on student leadership, one on multi-unit collaboration for a specific "small win," and finally a snapshot of organizing and creative actions that led to our committee charge. While conditions on campuses vary, we hope these spark possibilities for initiating cross-campus anti-SRV conversation and movement.

Bringing in Students as Experts through Course Content and Learning Activities (Lichty & Rosenberg)

We were scheduled to co-teach our first-year, first-term discovery course the autumn quarter following Anna Bui's murder. Previously, this class consisted of an arc that began with deconstructing the gender binary and moved students to examine gender fluidity. After Anna's murder and the limited institutional response, we decided to adjust the course. To create opportunities to educate students about RV, we retained early units and added a 4-week unit that offered a focused analysis of RV through an intersectional feminist lens. We partnered with community agencies and a university-based advocate to provide background information on RV and campus responses to it.

With this foundation, we emphasized students' expertise on our campus context as we presented potential RV interventions drawn from activists and academic literatures. In groups, they each evaluated one intervention through an intersectional feminist lens and its fit with our campus. Students presented their intervention to the class, made recommendations for how they could be adjusted or modified to better serve our students, and wrote white paper with campus leadership as the target audience. This class-based work enlisted first-year students as experts on the student experience and collaborators on creating campus-based change. Many students came forward as relationship violence survivors, sharing their stories in powerful moments of learning, compassion, and calls for change.

This practice generated student-based insights and created awareness and energy around this issue. We bring these student insights into our campus organizing practices. We also continue to invite interested students to organizing meetings. Some have joined student clubs related to SRV. Others have added minors and majors related to GWSS. Ultimately, we hope that this exposure produces awareness that may lead to a climate of support for and desire to participate in campus-initiatives related to SRV. In addition, we hope we have intervened on campus climate by developing our students' awareness and skills for talking about and responding to RV.

Student Club Creation: Sexual Assault and Violence Education (S.A.V.E)[2]

Students can begin addressing SRV on their campuses by forming an institutionally-recognized club. Student clubs require minimal effort to create, are (mostly) easy to sustain, and typically receive campus funding for programming. As a club, students can design and implement campaigns and events with limited institutional interference. In addition, clubs build a community dedicated to the same cause which can be especially powerful for student survivors of SRV. Since these projects are created by students for students (sometimes by survivors for survivors) they can be more impactful than those devised by the institution.

Laughlin founded a student club called Sexual Assault & Violence Education (S.A.V.E) with Rosenberg and Lichty serving as advisors (say yes!). From its inception, S.A.V.E has been survivor-centered on both the student and faculty/staff sides. Over the past 16 months, S.A.V.E's work has included classroom presentations, workshop development/facilitation, social media/web design, film screenings, hosting guest speakers, creating resource materials (including a first of its kind for-survivors-by-survivors resource guide), and general awareness raising through posters, stickers, brochures, and buttons. One of our most successful campaigns has been the #SurvivorLoveLetters project which was adapted from the Tumblr page, Tani Ikeda, a rape survivor, created in 2015 (Ikeda 2015a). The inspiration for the project came after Ikeda wrote a love letter to herself on the anniversary of her assault (Valentine's Day) and then created a platform for other survivors to do the same (Ikeda 2015b). Since Sexual Assault Awareness Month (April) 2017, S.A.V.E has displayed physical survivor love letters written by students, staff, and faculty along one of the main hallways on campus. Laughlin is currently working with the campus' space management department to make this a permanent installation.

Thus far, S.A.V.E has collaborated with student survivors and allies, our faculty advisors/SRV experts, faculty supporters (particularly the GWSS program), Student Affairs (the Diversity Center, Recreation and Wellness and Student Conduct), the Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences office, student clubs, resident advisors in campus housing, our chancellor, campus librarians, Campus Safety, and a (small) portion of our work has been funded by the institution. By involving all of these units, S.A.V.E is able to expand the reach of its work, engage units that may not immediately identify with

[2] The club name reflects a moment where our different vantage points produced sometimes difficult conversations. In this case, both Rosenberg and Lichty expressed concern about the acronym given legacies of white savior complexes and the problematic idea that people who experience SRV need to be saved by others. These points were taken to the group and the students elected to retain the name but develop a mission statement grounded in survivor empowerment.

anti-SRV efforts, and demonstrate student capacity to participate in campus development. All of these contacts carry forward into our collaborative movement to bring the campus together around SRV.

Those wanting to replicate this model should keep several considerations in mind. For one, less institutional regulation/supervision means there is greater responsibility on the club to exercise extreme caution and care when coordinating programs - finding sexual assault and relationship violence experts on your campus is *critical*. Faculty allies offer valuable advice on how to be mindful, effective, and intersectional activists. Finally, survivors should understand that while this campus involvement can be empowering and meaningful, it does not always feel good. There may be moments where you are hurt/re-traumatized by peers, faculty, staff, and administrators. However, by engaging in these difficult dialogues and finding co-conspirators who will hopefully support you when things go sideways, you have the opportunity to work towards creating a safer, braver campus space for yourself and other survivors.

Small, Attainable Interventions: Campus Safety Website Revision

Early in our campus research, we found a problematic campus safety sexual assault webpage. The webpage contained harmful messages commonly seen in public discourse on sexual violence – don't walk alone, don't accept rides, etc. These messages place the responsibility for safety squarely on victims and perpetuate myths related to stranger rape. In addition, the site was labeled an emergency response tips page. In other words, this was a page someone who was just assaulted might be directed to (or find through a google search as it was the first result when you searched our campus webpage for sexual assault) and met with messages about what they should have done differently to avoid their current circumstances. We were alarmed to find this was the primary content on sexual assault for our campus. We considered direct action against campus safety. After all, police and security have a long history of perpetrating a "second rape" against survivors (e.g., Madigan and Gamble 1991).

Despite this impetus to react, we paused. We considered that, long term, this unit is crucial to survivor well-being on campus. We need to work together to move toward survivor-centered, trauma-informed campus safety practice. We also observed that this webpage was one of at least twelve other tip pages. It seemed possible the content was developed without realizing the consequences for survivors. We considered our immediate goals. We wanted the content changed. This could be done through threats of public embarrassment ala Saul Alinsky (1971), or we could take a collaborative approach. We had no existing relationship with campus safety, no knowledge of where the content came from. We took a long view on relationship building and acted assuming good intention. Lichty initiated a meeting at the request of the students, with the belief that a faculty request would be taken most seriously. This reflects the value of partnerships across institutional levels and strategic leveraging of power.

S.A.V.E members led preparations for this meeting. Building on the lesson to use spaces you control, S.A.V.E sought comments on the campus safety content from students via their club webpage. Similarly, Lichty presented the webpage to students in her human sexuality class during their unit on sexual violence. Students were invited to comment on what they found useful, not useful, and what else they would like to see. Students universally objected to the content and requested a list of local resources for support. All student comments were compiled to share with campus safety as needed.

Our meeting consisted of S.A.V.E leadership (Laughlin), Lichty as faculty advisor, and the campus safety leadership. When the conversation moved to the sexual assault content, campus safety immediately offered to change it if we had suggestions. When we provided recommended content, they committed to making the change within the month and suggested a more prominent placement of the sexual assault support link on the webpage. This experience reinforced the importance of slowing down, considering our values, asking questions, approaching with respect, keeping an open mind, and assuming good intentions.

A Snapshot of our Process: From Informal Conversations to a Charged Committee

Meetings to plan Sexual Assault Awareness Month (SAAM) led to conversation about our ongoing practices and opportunities for mutually beneficial resource sharing in service of SAAM. Given our (the authors') commitments to larger institutional change, we asked our colleagues about past work, successes, and challenges. We identified the shared challenges of trying to do anti-SRV work in isolation and the need for more coordination and support across campus. A tenured faculty member with a diversity-related leadership role suggested drafting a proposal to create a campus coordinating committee.

By framing meetings as opportunities and not being constrained by the original focus of the gathering (e.g., to plan SAAM programming), we were able to move our campus into new possibilities. When the suggestion came to draft a proposal, Lichty offered to take up the labor of creating the first draft. This was a clear opportunity to build on previous experience and expertise and demonstrate value to the group. We sought feedback on the proposal from our campus Diversity Council and GWSS faculty as opportunities to elevate the visibility of this effort and seek buy-in from faculty, staff, and students around campus who we hoped would align with

our overall mission. We received no objections but no significant movement toward adoption. Our efforts to initiate the committee stalled as our subsequent efforts to share the proposal in a meeting with the Chancellor were not successful.

During this process, several of us nominated Laughlin for a highly visible award for graduating undergraduate students who overcame obstacles and serve as a campus inspiration. The award is presented, along with a video describing the work of the students, at graduation. Laughlin won. Knowing she was being recognized in large part because of her anti-SRV activism, Laughlin saw receiving this award as an opportunity to raise awareness of SRV across campus, specifically with campus leadership. Laughlin requested a meeting with the Chancellor to share more about her experiences navigating campus as a sexual assault survivor and activist. The meeting was granted, and Laughlin invited members of the organizing group to join. We presented our proposal to see our institution engage in formal strategic design in response to SRV. We shared the yearlong efforts to develop informal relationships, and the collective call for institutionally-supported collaboration. Our Chancellor surprised us by saying he had been waiting for someone to take leadership on this issue, shared his own concerns and commitments around these topics, and asked us to develop a formal proposal to present to his leadership council. We in turn asked him to release a statement of commitment to address SRV. When invited to provide notes to inform the statement, we adopted explicitly anti-oppression, feminist, social justice language. His statement was published in May, 2017 (Yeigh 2017). The multi-unit committee was formally charged (albeit unfunded) in October, 2017.

Concluding Thoughts from A Work in Progress

...no hay camino; se hace camino al andar.
There is no path; The path is made by walking
-Antonio Machado

In this paper we shared ten tensions and lessons learned during our efforts to build a cross-campus collaborative anti-SRV movement. We discussed finding close collaborators with shared SRV-analysis, making best use of resources and spaces we control, strategies for engaging others, identifying meaningful, achievable changes, and pursuing any opportunities to connect to others through positive collaborations.

As we transition into the next phase of our work, we hold close the frameworks that guide our practice: intersectionality and transformative social justice. As white activists part of a movement with ongoing issues with racism, classism, heterosexism, ableism, among others, we have a responsibility to seek diverse representation and ensure our processes support authentic and meaningful participation for all. Our goal is to keep listening, learning, and using our own voices from our respective positions in the university and as people.

For anyone who works in social justice movements, we know the reality of social change is messy: progress and retrenchment, scant resources, and struggles to set strategic agendas. When we feel the task is too great, we may choose not to engage at all. We focus on the concept of the "small win" to keep us in the struggle: to celebrate and learn from our "two steps forward" and to sustain us through the inevitable steps back. We write about our "small wins" because we want to stir a conversation where we help each other interpret and learn from our successes across our varied contexts. We share notes from our journey that we hope will be of use on yours.

Acknowledgements This paper is dedicated to the memory of Anna Bui and every survivor of relationship and sexual violence at UW Bothell. We also want to acknowledge all of our colleagues who worked to raise the visibility of sexual and relationship violence practice on our campus. We cannot name everyone, but we are especially grateful to our collaborators in Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies and Student Affairs.

References

Abrams, D., Viki, G. T., Masser, B., & Bohner, G. (2003). Perceptions of stranger and acquaintance rape: The role of benevolent and hostile sexism in victim blame and rape proclivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(1), 111–125.

Adelman, M. (2004). The battering state: Towards a political economy of domestic violence. *Journal of Poverty, 8*(3), 45–64.

Alinsky, S. (1971). *Rules for radicals: A practical primer for realistic radicals*. New York: Vintage.

Allen, N. E., Watt, K. A., & Hess, J. Z. (2008). A qualitative study of the activities and outcomes of domestic violence coordinating councils. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 41*(1–2), 63–73.

American College Health Association. (2016). *Addressing Sexual and Relationship Violence on College and University Campuses*. Retrieved from https://www.acha.org/documents/resources/guidelines/Addressing_Sexual_Violence.pdf.

Aosved, A., & Long, P. (2006). Co-occurrence of rape myth acceptance, sexism, racism, homophobia, ageism, classism, and religious intolerance. *Sex Roles, 55*(7–8), 481–492.

Arao, B., & Clemens, K. (2013). From safe spaces to brave spaces: A new way to frame dialogue around diversity and social justice. In L. M. Landreman (Ed.), *The art of effective facilitation: Reflections from social justice educators* (pp. 135–150). Sterling: Stylus Publishing.

Au, W. (2010). *Unequal by design: High-stakes testing and the standardization of inequality*. New York: Routledge.

Bourassa, D. M., & Kruger, K. (2001). The national dialogue on academic and student affairs collaboration. *New Directions for Higher Education, 2001*(116), 9–38.

Bunce, L., Baird, A., & Jones, S. E. (2017). The student-as-consumer approach in higher education and its effects on academic performance. *Studies in Higher Education, 42*(11), 1958–1978.

Burke, L. (2018, March 9).The #MeToo shockwave: How the movement has reverberated around the world. The telegraph. Retrieved from https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/world/metoo-shockwave/.

Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(2), 217–230.

California Coalition Against Sexual Assault. (2016). *Sexual Assault Prevention on U.S College Campuses: A National Scan*. Retrieved from http://www.preventconnect.org/2016/05/sexual-assault-prevention-on-u-s-college-campuses-a-national-scan/.

Campbell, R. (2002). *Emotionally involved: The impact of researching rape*. New York: Routledge.

Campbell, R., Patterson, D., & Lichty, L. F. (2005). The effectiveness of sexual assault nurse examiner (SANE) programs: a review of psychological, medical, legal, and community outcomes. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse: A Review Journal, 6*(4), 313–329.

Campus Advocacy and Prevention Professionals Association (2017). *CAPPA position statement on Title IX implementation for campus sexual assault.* Retrieved from Http://www.nationalcappa.org/position-statements/.

Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., & Townsend, R. (2015, September 21). Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. Retrieved from https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/%40%20Files/Climate%20Survey/AAU_Campus_Climate_Survey_12_14_15.pdf.

Carello, J., & Butler, L. (2014). Potentially perilous pedagogies: teaching trauma is not the same as trauma-informed teaching. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation, 15*(2), 153–168.

Center for Disease Control. (2016). *Sexual Violence on Campus: Strategies for Prevention*. Retrieved from https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/campussvprevention.pdf.

Chapleau, K. M., Oswald, D. L., & Russell, B. L. (2007). How ambivalent sexism toward women and men support rape myth acceptance. *Sex Roles, 57*(1–2), 131–136.

Cook-Sather, A. (2015). Sound, presence, and power: "Student voice" in educational research and reform. *Curriculum Inquiry, 36*(4), 359–390.

Cousins, J., & Whitmore, E. (1998). Framing participatory evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation: A Publication of the American Evaluation Association, 1998*(80), 5–23.

Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review, 43*(6), 1241–1299.

Durfee, A., & Rosenberg, K. (2009). Teaching sensitive issues: Feminist pedagogy and the practice of advocacy based counseling. *Feminist Teacher, 19*(2), 103–120.

Fineman, M., & Mykitiuk, R. (1994). *The public nature of private violence: The discovery of domestic abuse*. New York: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality*. New York: Vintage Books.

Freire, P. (1971). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder & Herder.

Garcia, S. E. (2017, Oct 20). The woman who created #MeToo long before hashtags. The New York times. Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/20/us/me-too-movement-tarana-burke.html.

Gartner, R. E., & Sterzing, P. R. (2016). Gender microaggressions as a gateway to sexual harassment and sexual assault: Expanding the conceptualization of youth sexual violence. *Journal of Women and Social Work, 31*(4), 491–503.

Greeson, M. R., & Campbell, R. (2013). Sexual assault response teams (sarts): An empirical review of their effectiveness and challenges to successful implementation. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 14*(2), 83–95.

Groover, H. (2016). The shooting in Mukilteo is the latest example of what happens when guns meet toxic masculinity. The stranger. http://www.thestranger.com/news/2016/08/03/24443631/the-shooting-in-mukilteo-is-the-latest-example-of-what-happens-when-guns-meet-toxic-masculinity. Accessed 7 Oct 2017.

Harris, J. C., & Linder, C. (2017). *Intersections of identity and sexual violence on campus: Centering Minoritized Students' experiences*. Sterling: Stylus Publishing.

Hayes, R. M., Lorenz, K., & Bell, K. A. (2013). Victim blaming others: Rape myth acceptance and the just world belief. *Feminist Criminology, 8*(3), 202–220.

Hayes-Smith, R., Richards, T., & Branch, K. (2010). 'But I'm not a counsellor': the nature of role strain experienced by female professors when a student discloses sexual assault and intimate partner violence. *Enhancing Learning in the Social Sciences, 2*(3), 1–24.

Hill Collins, P. (2002). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Hong, L. (2017). Digging up the roots, rustling the leaves: A critical consideration of the root causes of sexual violence and why higher education needs more courage. In J. C. Harris & C. Linder (Eds.), *Intersections of identity and sexual violence on campus* (pp. 23–41). Sterling: Stylus Publishing.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

Ikeda, T. (2015a, Feb). *#survivorloveletter*. Retrieved from https://survivorloveletter.tumblr.com.

Ikeda, T. (2015b, April 22). My Survivor Love Letter. Retrieved from: https://www.huffingtonpost.com/tani-ikeda/my-survivor-love-letter_b_7028678.html.

Incite! Women of Color Against Violence (Ed.). (2006). *Color of violence: The incite! Anthology*. Cambridge: South End Press.

Israel, B. A., Schulz, A. J., Parker, E. A., & Becker, A. B. (1998). Review of community-based research: Assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual Review of Public Health, 19*(1), 173–202.

Keeling, R. P., Underhile, R., & Wall, A. F. (2007). Horizontal and vertical structures: The dynamics of organization in higher education. *Liberal Education, 93*(4), 22–31.

Kezar, A. (2005). Redesigning for collaboration within higher education institutions: An exploration into the developmental process. *Research in Higher Education, 46*(7), 831–860.

Kezar, A. (2014). Higher education change and social networks: A review of research. *The Journal of Higher Education, 85*(1), 91–125.

Knowledge Networks. (2011). *2011 College Dating Violence Poll.* Retrieved from http://www.loveisrespect.org/pdf/College_Dating_And_Abuse_Final_Study.pdf

Koepke, S., Eyssel, F., & Bohner, G. (2014). "She deserved it": Effects of sexism norms, type of violence, and Victim's pre-assault behavior on blame attributions toward female victims and approval of the Aggressor's behavior. *Violence Against Women, 20*(4), 446–464.

Krebs, C., Lindquist, C., Berzofsky, M., Shook-Sa, B., & Peterson, K. (2016, January). Campus climate survey validation study final technical report. Retrieved from https://rvap.uiowa.edu/assets/Uploads/Campus-Climate-Survey-2016.pdf.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But That's just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice, 34*(3), 159–165.

Lampman, C., Phelps, A., Bancroft, S., & Beneke, M. (2009). Contrapower harassment in academia: A survey of faculty experience with student incivility, bullying, and sexual attention. *Sex Roles, 60*(5–6), 331–346.

Lichty, L. F. & Campbell, R. (2012). Targets and witnesses: middle school students' sexual harassment experiences. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 32*(3), 414–430.

Lichty, L. F., Campbell, R., & Schuiteman, J. (2008). Developing a university-wide institutional response to sexual assault and relationship violence. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community, 36*(1–2), 5–22.

Lorde, A. (1984). *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Berkley: Crossing Press.

Madigan, L., & Gamble, N. C. (1991). *The second rape: Society's continued betrayal of the victim*. New York: Lexington Books.

Minkler, M., & Wallerstein, N. (Eds.). (2011). *Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcomes*. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.

Mirza, H. (2015). Decolonizing higher education: Black feminism and the intersectionality of race and gender. *Journal of Feminist Scholarship, 7*(8), 1–12.

Muehlenhard, C. L., Peterson, Z. D., Humphreys, T. P., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2017). Evaluating the one-in-five statistic: Women's risk of sexual assault while in college. *The Journal of Sex Research, 54*(4–5), 549–576.

Patton, T. (2004a). Reflections of a black woman professor: Racism and sexism in academia. *Howard Journal of Communications, 15*(3), 185–200.

Patton, T. O. (2004b). In the guise of civility: The complicitous maintenance of inferential forms of sexism and racism in higher education. *Women's Studies in Communication, 27*(1), 60–87.

Perez, A., Basu, A., & Silva, J. M. (2015, October). Direct action toward social change: diversity center initiatives at UWB. Roundtable discussion presented at the 2015 Community Action in the West (CRA-W) 10th Annual Conference, Bothell, WA, October 2015.

Richie, B. E. (2000). A black feminist reflection on the antiviolence movement. *Signs, 25*(4), 1133–1137.

Schechter, S. (1982). *Women and male violence: The visions and struggles of the battered Women's movement*. Boston: South End Press.

Schneider, E. (2000). *Battered women and feminist lawmaking*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Silva, J. M. (2018). "We got you": what raising up the next generation of scholar- activists has taught me. In M. Whitaker & E. Grollman (Eds.), *Counternarratives from women of color in academics: bravery, vulnerability, & resistance*. New York: Routledge.

Smith, C. P., & Freyd, J. J. (2014). Institutional betrayal. *American Psychologist, 69*(6), 575–587.

Sokoloff, N. J., & Dupont, I. (2005). Domestic violence at the intersections of race, class, and gender: Challenges and contributions to understanding violence against marginalized women in diverse communities. *Violence Against Women, 11*(1), 38–64.

Sokoloff, N. J., & Pratt, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Domestic violence at the margins: Readings on race, class, gender, and culture*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Tunguz, S. (2016). In the eye of the beholder: Emotional labor in academia varies with tenure and gender. *Studies in Higher Education, 41*(1), 3–20.

University of Washington Bothell. (2017). Fast facts 2016–2017. https://www.uwb.edu/getattachment/about/facts/fast-facts-2016-2017.pdf. Accessed 7 Oct 2017.

White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. (2014, January). Preventing and Addressing Campus Sexual Misconduct: A Guide for University and College Presidents, Chancellors, and Senior Administrators. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/images/Documents/1.4.17.VAW%20Event.Guide%20for%20College%20Presidents.PDF

Yeigh, W. (2017, May 23). Supporting all survivors. https://www.uwb.edu/chancellor-blog/may-2017/assault. Accessed 9 Oct 2017.