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“Yes Means Yes:” A New Approach to Sexual Assault Prevention and Positive Sexuality Promotion

DAWN E. LAFRANCE, MEIKA LOE, and SCOTT C. BROWN
Colgate University, Hamilton, NY, USA

“Yes Means Yes” (YMY) is an interdisciplinary, noncredit, five-week, positive sexuality seminar offered at a small liberal arts college as part of a campus-wide initiative to improve students’ relationship skills and behaviors. Most university campuses employ some sort of sexual assault prevention program to help protect students from problematic sexual interactions. This course focuses on helping students decide what they would like from their relationships in a collaborative seminar format, rather than focusing only on what they should avoid. Feedback from the class has been overwhelmingly positive, and it is likely that students at other campuses could benefit from this program.
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“The sexual social scene on many college campuses is dominated by the “hook up” culture. According to Wright, Norton, and Matusek (2010), a “hook up” is a “transitory sexual encounter between two people who are friends, brief acquaintances, or strangers and it may include sexual intercourse or other non-coital sexual activity” (p. 648). The hook-up culture is a heterosexist phenomenon, and in most cases, when students are asked questions about it they are considering behaviors between one man and one woman. About half of college students report engaging in a hook up during the last year (Owen, Rhoades, Stanley, & Fincham, 2010). Students
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engage in uncommitted sexual interactions for a variety of reasons, including physical/sexual gratification (Oswalt, 2010), intending to begin a traditional romantic relationship (Garcia & Reiber, 2008), lack of relationship responsibilities, and sexual exploration (Bisson & Levine, 2009).

Abstinence-only sex education that many students receive in high school does not help them learn how to discuss their sexual development and properly articulate their intentions to others in respectful relationships (Kohler, Manhart, & Lafferty, 2008; Santelli et al., 2006). When they enter college, many students are faced with a heterocentric campus hook-up culture that is confusing and has negative repercussions for students. Approximately one-third of students who hook up do so unintentionally (Garcia & Reiber, 2008). In such a campus culture, individuals may not communicate effectively about their sexual intentions, respect one another’s sexual limits, or use appropriate safety measures during sexual contact (Flack et al., 2007; Glenn & Marquardt, 2001; Grello, Welsh, & Harper, 2006; LaBrie et al., 2005; Paul, McManus, & Hayes, 2000; Stanley, Rhoades, & Markman, 2006; Vail-Smith, Maguire, Brinkley, & Burke, 2010). Many students who have hooked up report a negative reaction to it and poorer psychological well-being (Owen et al., 2010).

Young adults often find it difficult to navigate the sexual scene during the college years. In many studies, male and female college students have reported consenting to unwanted sexual behavior (Davis, George, & Norris, 2004; Impett & Peplau, 2002; O’Sullivan & Allgeier, 1998; Sprecher, Hatfield, Cortese, Potapova, & Levitskaya, 1994). Additionally, students have reported denying their sexual interests when they do desire to engage in sexual activity (i.e., token resistance) (Muehlenhard & Hollabaugh, 1988, 1998; Sprecher et al., 1994). This miscommunication, as well as the use of alcohol and other substances, confuses the ability for one to obtain adequate consent from a sexual partner. “Gray rape” has been used to describe the blurred line between consensual and nonconsensual intercourse that is often evident in a hook-up culture (Jervis, 2008).

The personal sexual conduct of individuals becomes public when their behaviors affect the lives of others in their campus community. Students report sexual assaults, harassment, and rapes frequently on college campuses (DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1993; Fisher, Daigle, Cullen, & Turner, 2003; Gross, Winslett, Roberts, & Gohm, 2006; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Flack and colleagues (2007) found that 78% of the sexual assaults reported in their study happened during a hook up.

With the close connection they have with students, educators have a unique opportunity to influence students to make better sexual decisions. Most campus programming aims to prevent sexual assault by focusing on prevention efforts (e.g., buddy system, never leave a drink unattended) (Breitenbecher, 2000; Yeater & O’Donohue, 1999), increasing empathy for sexual assault victims (e.g., Fouhert & Newberry, 2006), or empowering bystanders to help their friends during problematic sexual incidences (Katz, 1994). Since
exploring intimacy and developing sexual identities is developmentally appropriate for college students (Erikson, 1968) and starts years before college, we believe that a comprehensive sexual assault prevention program should also include the examination of sexual identities and desires. College programming “could help young adults identify their expectations about relationships and hooking up, learn how to define their romantic relationships and communicate about expectations, and monitor barriers to making good relationship decisions (e.g., alcohol use)” (Owen et al., 2010, p. 662). Additionally, since physical gratification is a key motivating factor in desire to hook up, sex education must take the topic of pleasure, as well as danger, seriously (Oswalt, 2010).

“Yes Means Yes” (YMY) is an interdisciplinary five-week positive sexuality course offered at our small liberal arts college as part of a campus-wide initiative to improve students’ relationship skills and behaviors. This seminar employs a positive sexuality foundation that advocates for “an understanding of sexuality as a natural and healthy aspect of human life” (ETR Associates, 2007–2009, para. 2) and can be used in conjunction with sexual assault prevention and bystander programs. This course focuses on helping students decide what they would like from their relationships in a collaborative seminar format rather than focusing only on what they should avoid. The goals of this sexual education curriculum include creating healthy sexual beings who are comfortable engaging in safe, consensual and pleasurable sexual activity. A positive sexuality curriculum prioritizes developing sexual agency and making healthy decisions for oneself (DeFur, 2012). In this review of YMY, a campus-wide sexual health initiative, it will become clear how to adopt a similar program on other campuses.

A POSITIVE SEXUALITY SEMINAR

Similar to college students at other institutions, students at our small, liberal arts college in New York have shared with us that they have difficulties navigating their relationships and sexual lives. Many students report discomfort with the hook up culture. Given their ambivalence, we found that students are eager to critically engage with the campus sexual culture, and they found YMY to be a space to do so.

Every semester, for five consecutive weeks, approximately 30 students meet on Wednesday evenings for dinner and 90 minutes of critical discussion facilitated by faculty and staff. As a positive sexuality noncredit class, YMY attempts to better equip students to improve their relationships by addressing issues of healthy communication, positive sexuality, sexual attitudes, and decision-making skills. The five sessions of YMY consist of group activities and discussions. Students who take this class learn positive sexual decision-making skills, how to find campus resource support when necessary, and
ways to engage in safer sexual behaviors. Equipped with this information, they are in the position to work with others to improve the campus climate. Ideally this seminar is used with other programs in a comprehensive plan to build students’ sexual self-efficacy and to teach students to contribute to a safer, healthier sexual campus climate.

Seven YMY seminars have been offered between 2009 and 2012. Generally one seminar is held each semester. The classes fill quickly, and because of high interest two seminars were held simultaneously during one semester. In a typical academic year, approximately 60–70 students participate in YMY. The collaborative facilitation team consists of ten staff members from many departments including the Dean’s Office, Counseling Services, and LGBTQ Initiatives, six faculty members from departments such as Sociology/Anthropology, Education Studies, and Women’s Studies, and two previous YMY students. Students from all four class years enroll in this course. More women than men elect to participate (approximately 85% women). Students who identify as Hispanic/Latino, Black/African-American, Caucasian, and Asian/Asian-American, Multiracial, heterosexual, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgendered, and queer have participated.

**CURRICULUM**

A senior undergraduate’s sociology thesis (Berger, 2009) set the foundation for the YMY seminar. The curriculum is designed for five consecutive sessions, each focused on a short and interesting chapter of the book *Yes Means Yes! Visions of Female Sexual Power and a World Without Rape* (Friedman & Valenti, 2008). These academic essays, covering topics such as “gray rape,” the silencing of women’s desires, and consent in BDSM (Bondage and Discipline, Sadism and Masochism) culture, are used to springboard class discussion about the current sexual climate. A syllabus is distributed with assigned readings and key discussion points for each week (see Appendix A).

Faculty and staff facilitators usually work in pairs, along with one or two student facilitators who attend all sessions. Facilitators use appropriate self-disclosure, genuinely participate when possible, and keep the conversations focused on university life. A variety of discussion formats (e.g., large group, dyad work, individual journal writing) are utilized to reach students with different learning styles. The session itself takes place in a large comfortable student gathering space, with chairs arranged in a circle so that participants face one another. A buffet dinner is served, and then the 90-minute session begins.

Although each session is important, the way that the first session is conducted sets the stage for the series since group dynamics and norms begin to form early. After an icebreaker introduction, an overview of the seminar is provided. Ground rules (e.g., use first names, speak about your own
experiences, challenge yourself) are discussed and agreed upon during the first session. They are listed and referred back to at the beginning of subsequent sessions. An agree/disagree/unsure exercise is used to help students begin talking about relationships and sexual aspects of their lives. This exercise employs an imaginary line drawn on the floor with the word “Agree” written at one end, “Disagree” at the other end, and “Unsure” in the middle. Participants are asked to place themselves on the imaginary line after a statement is read aloud by a facilitator. A series of statements include “Two intoxicated people can have consensual sex,” “Public displays of affection are okay,” and “Pornography can be a healthy component of a positive sexual relationship.” Facilitators inquire with individuals about why they choose their locations on the line. When facilitators take a nonjudgmental stance open to all opinions, students start to open up quickly. The exercise is always debriefed with questions such as “What did you notice?” “Were there any surprises?” and “Was it easy for you to pick your locations on the line?”

For the time remaining in the first class, students collaborate on a common definition of “hooking up.” Smaller groups share lists of the pros and cons of this type of campus sexual culture. The spring 2010 YMY students, for example, agreed that hooking up is “a casual, noncommittal sexual experience ranging from making out to sexual intercourse [with a potential lack of mutual commitment, affection, attachment, emotion, and there is not necessarily a balance of power].” The follow-up discussion about the pros and cons of hooking up allowed students to consider ways of making future decisions regarding their intimate lives on campus, as well as imagining a healthier sexual culture on campus.

All subsequent classes have at least one short chapter assigned to them that students are expected to read on their own. One of the facilitators’ tasks is to help students examine how the chapter themes are applied to their daily lives at college. Using the chapter themes, facilitators use a variety of exercises to teach students how to use their critical thinking skills to analyze relationships, sexual norms, and campus culture. Fishbowl exercises, small group conversations, worksheets such as the “Want! Will... Won’t Chart” (Brewer, 2011), and partnered “speed dating” discussion exercises are employed. Students grow in their ability to talk about comfort, desire, identity, and intimacy, as well as power and inequality. They begin to articulate what they want from their partner(s) now and in the future and begin thinking about how they will enable these experiences in consensual ways.

Time during the final class is devoted to action planning. Students are asked to think about what an ideal sexual climate would look like for them and how to achieve this. In small groups, students complete a worksheet detailing commitments for the next month and the rest of the semester (personal improvement action steps). Additionally, they report what they will encourage their organizations or groups to do (community change action steps). When these action items are shared aloud with the entire class,
students demonstrate a sense of commitment and interest in both personal and cultural change. Past personal improvement action steps included “encourage more students to think about issues of consent and gender role stereotypes,” “research educational programs at other colleges to fuel our own positive sexual climate,” and “have more confidence in making my own sexual decisions.” Community change action steps have included: “tell my friends about what I’ve done here at Yes Means Yes and ask them to change their approach to sexual relationships,” “encourage people to go to the sexual misconduct information sessions,” and “my group will support events that create a safe, open environment for discussion and communication about sex on campus.” A notable comment from a student that was exactly in line with what the seminar was intended for was “I will say yes when I mean yes.”

EVALUATION OF PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

The YMY seminar started as a pilot program during the 2009–2010 academic year. After collecting positive general feedback about the seminar during the first semester, we decided to undergo a research study during the spring semester to better measure the effectiveness of the program. During spring 2010, we collected data before and after the seminar. Students who expressed interest in taking the class but did not enroll due to conflicts (e.g., scheduling demands) comprised the control group. Our measures included: 1) a 13-item Yes Means Yes Objectives Questionnaire (YMY-OQ, see Appendix B), based on 13 class objectives such as “ability to engage in healthy sexual practices” and “awareness of campus resources,” with each item rated on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree) and 2) the Multidimensional Sexual Self-Concept Questionnaire, which measures everything from sexual anxiety to optimism and motivation (MSSCQ; Snell, 1998).

A 2 × 2 Experimental Design was employed with pretest and posttest data for the experimental and the control groups. Students in the control group were sent questionnaires by campus mail during the same weeks as the first and last sessions of YMY to ensure that the same amount of time lapsed. The hypotheses of this study were that experimental group students would improve more than control group students in their perceived abilities to: engage in intellectual discourse about their social involvement, critically analyze their sexual attitudes, engage in healthy sexual practices, seek campus resources, consider ways to create sexual climate change, positively explore their sexual identities, and correct misperceptions about rape myths. Analyses of variances (ANOVAs) were used to identify significant changes between the experimental and the control groups as well as between the pretest and posttest data collection periods. Using this method allowed for
Improvement in students’ positive sexual identity exploration was studied by using the MSSCQ pretest and posttest scores. In order to measure the intended outcomes of the class, six subscales were combined into a cluster subscale, we named “Positive Sexual Self Understanding,” including sexual self-efficacy, sexual consciousness, sexual satisfaction, sexual self-schemata, sexual esteem, and sexual self-monitoring. The experimental group improved significantly more that the control group in regards to their “Positive Sexual Self Understanding” (see Table 1). Thus, the students who participated in YMY believed they developed a more positive sexual self-understanding at the end of the session than their control group peers.

The YMY-OQ was used to study students’ ability to engage in intellectual discourse about their social involvement, critically analyze their sexual attitudes, engage in healthy sexual practices, seek campus resources, and consider ways to create sexual climate change. Although there were no significant differences between the control and experimental group YMY-OQ scores at pretest, there was a significant difference between the control group YMY-OQ scores and the experimental group scores at posttest. This indicates that the students who participated in YMY showed more improvement in the measured areas—YMY positive sexuality objectives—compared with controls (see Table 2). Thus, combining the results gathered from the MSSCQ and the YMY-OQ, it can be assumed that the YMY class was effective in reaching its originally outlined objectives.

**TABLE 1** MSSCQ results, Subscale Cluster: Positive Sexual Self-Understanding 2×2 ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N = 22)</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (N = 16)</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Analysis: Interaction between Experimental Pretest/Posttest and Control Pretest/Posttest: F (1, 36) = 4.49, p < 0.05

**TABLE 2** YMY-OQ Results 2×2 ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group(s)</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental (N = 22)</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control (N = 16)</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Analyses:
- No significant difference between Experimental Pretest and Control Pretest
- Interaction between Experimental Pretest/Post-test and Control Pretest/Post-test: F (1, 36) = 4.76, p = .036.
In sum, the results of this evaluation study were positive and provided us with a solid rationale for continued offerings of YMY. We found that our objectives were largely being met. Perhaps most importantly, participants’ reported a more positive sexual self-understanding, willingness to engage in intellectual discourse about their social involvement, ability to critically analyze their sexual attitudes, interest in healthy sexual practices, knowledge of campus resources, commitment to sexual climate change, and ability to discuss and define sexual assault and rape.

Ongoing Evaluation

Since collecting data on our initial research sample, we continue to measure the effectiveness of the YMY seminar with each new group of participants. To ensure that it continues to benefit the students who participate, we use of the YMY-OQ at the beginning and end of the seminar, solicit qualitative responses from students and facilitators, and ask for feedback with a weekly mini-evaluation, in order to make on-board adjustments as the seminar proceeds. In agreement with past results, recent evaluations support the continued offering of this course. During the 2011–2012 year, 87 participants’ postseminar YMY-OQ scores were higher than pretest scores, and posttest scores on 10 out of 13 YMY-OQ items were 4.5 or higher on a 5-point Likert scale. Additionally, we asked students to answer the question, “What did you like most about the class?” Answers included: “I love how comfortable I’ve become at asserting myself, my wants, desires, and to sticking to my guns;” “Collaborating and listening to people about what they want in relationships... Brainstorming realistic ways for us to change [institution name]’s culture;” and, “The take-aways, finding myself applying them to daily life.” The most repeated criticism we received was students’ interest in recruiting more male participants and focusing more on lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) issues. As a follow-up, we contacted students four months after the ending of their YMY class and asked them to complete this sentence: “Since I took YMY _____.” Answers centered on four key themes: community (“a sense of community bonded through nontraditional means, which had previously not existed on campus”), power/inequality (“I have been empowered to bring up issues like rape, sexual harassment, and power hierarches at [institution name] with male and female friends, my sister, and even my parents”), interpersonal relationships (“gotten to know myself better, taken charge of my sexuality, and realized what I want in a relationship”), and relationship to body (“I have a newfound confidence and level of comfort in my sexuality”).

Strengths and Weaknesses of YMY

The YMY program has made a huge impact on our campus. Students, faculty, staff, and administrators all refer to this as part of a larger movement to raise
critical sexual awareness on campus. (See Discussion and Future Directions for more on effects of this movement.) Feedback from students has been overwhelmingly positive; however, there have been some challenges. Students have noted an interest in seeing more men participating, more LGBTQ issues covered, and the possibility of taking the issues discussed to another level of depth.

It is a strength and a weakness that the majority of the participants in YMY have been female. Some women feel more comfortable opening up in the presence of other women. Participants in the hook-up culture are both men and women and therefore, a wider ripple effect on campus is likely to occur when everybody is engaged in the conversation. Also, men who elect to participate in YMY may feel that they have to speak for the entire male population. We started offering a “male only” YMY mini-session to fraternities last year as one way to reach out to men on our campus.

The second area of improvement is ensuring that the class is inclusive to all sexualities and covers LGBTQ issues in more detail. Most discussions of the hook-up culture tend to be heterocentric. Our facilitators work to be more inclusive, discussing many types of relationships in YMY discussions, and assigning a wide range of critical sexuality readings. Perhaps surprisingly, even if they identify as heterosexual, students want to be able to confront their own biases and move beyond a heterocentric model, and we continue to work at facilitating discussions with this in mind.

Many students have requested longer than 90-minute sessions to allow for more in-depth discussions. We have considered a “YMY 1.2” for participants who would like to continue their learning. We envision offering this seminar for all students who have previously participated in YMY. Additionally, offering general for-credit courses on critical sexualities would alleviate some of the pressure on YMY.

DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The YMY seminar is an alternative program for sexual assault prevention and positive sexuality promotion that should be offered in partnership with other sexual assault prevention efforts on campus. Since the YMY seminar has clear benefits for participants, expanding the seminar to reach a broader audience is desirable. Following up on the barriers listed above, for YMY to be most effective, male students need to participate in higher numbers, as do students across a diversity of backgrounds. Focus groups may help us to learn how to broaden our YMY demographic.

We would like to develop plans to track long-term effectiveness of the program. To date, YMY-OQ evaluations have been collected at the end of each seminar. We believe that many students who “graduate” from YMY
continue to work on positive sexuality initiatives and create change in their social circles. Students have discussed hosting “reunion” events and utilizing social media to continue YMY community-building beyond the seminar. However, this behavior change has not been systematically tracked. A staff or faculty advisor could continue to help students translate their positive sexuality thoughts into actions and inspire community change with an evaluation element to track their progress.

On our campus, we have started a number of extensions of YMY to attempt to involve others in the broader positive sexuality initiative. Students living in a positive sexuality theme house now have regular discussions and host events focused on positive sexuality. Collaborative programming with student organizations and academic departments, such as Women’s Studies and Educational Studies, send a clear, consistent message on campus about what constitutes appropriate and inappropriate community behaviors. This past year, a violence prevention seminar followed YMY for three additional Wednesday evenings with some of the same participants and the Women’s Studies Department led an effort among faculty, students, staff, and administrators to create a short “zero tolerance” video focused on sexual assault on campus.

Additionally, shorter YMY versions, or “mini-YMY” curricula, have been developed that are one to two sessions in length, geared at specific audiences to begin the dialogue of positive sexuality with various student organizations and help them consider how their actions affect others and the community. Last year, all new members of sororities, two full sorority organizations, three fraternities, and the leaders of the Outdoor Education program participated in mini-YMY workshops. We are offering a train-the-trainer program to prepare upperclass students to facilitate mini-YMY sessions with groups of first-year students. Through these initial workshops, we hope that dialogue will continue and first-year students will feel empowered to make better sexual decisions as they are introduced to the college social scene. Additionally, YMY is being incorporated into a comprehensive first-year program that includes education/training for orientation leaders, orientation programs that send consistent messaging (e.g., Dorian Solot and Marshall Miller’s Sex Discussed Here program), and invitations to events held by the positive sexuality theme house on campus.

Improving today’s university sexual culture is an enormous task. Administrators and faculty should offer positive sexuality programs that students find interesting and engaging. Information needs to be delivered in ways that students will hear it, analyze it, and employ it. “Yes Means Yes,” used as an alternative sexual assault prevention program, provides a space to facilitate conversations within interactive workshops that tap into students’ sexual interests allowing them to consider how to make healthy sexual decisions.
NOTES

1. The Spring 2010 pilot study participants were 22 college students who completed the YMY course and were included in the experimental group. There were more women (17) than men (5) and the group consisted of students who identified as Hispanic/Latino/a (4), Multiracial (2), Caucasian (15) and Other (1). The control group consisted of 12 women and 4 men who identified as Caucasian (13), Hispanic/Latino/a (2) and Multiracial (1). We acknowledge bias in the control group when it comes to interest in positive sexuality. However, despite similar proclivities between the experimental and control groups, we can still point to important differences in outcomes.

2. The total score of the YMY-OQ is the average of all 13 answers and can range from 1 to 5. Good internal consistency was demonstrated by calculating the Cronbach’s alpha coefficient ($\alpha = .78$) for the experimental and a control group combined during the pilot study.

3. The MSSCQ is a 100-item self-report questionnaire that measures 20 areas of sexuality: sexual anxiety, sexual self-efficacy, sexual-consciousness, motivation to avoid risky sex, chance/luck sexual control, sexual preoccupation, sexual assertiveness, sexual optimism, sexual problem self-blame, sexual monitoring, sexual motivation, sexual problem management, sexual esteem, sexual satisfaction, power-other sexual control, sexual self-schemata, fear of sex, sexual problem prevention, sexual depression, and internal sexual control. Single subscales or groups of subscales have been used by several researchers (e.g., Meyer et al., 2005). Good internal consistency for all 20 subscales was determined by Snell (1995, as cited in Snell, 1998).

4. The MSSCQ is a 100-item self-report questionnaire that measures 20 areas of sexuality: sexual anxiety, sexual self-efficacy, sexual-consciousness, motivation to avoid risky sex, chance/luck sexual control, sexual preoccupation, sexual assertiveness, sexual optimism, sexual problem self-blame, sexual monitoring, sexual motivation, sexual problem management, sexual esteem, sexual satisfaction, power-other sexual control, sexual self-schemata, fear of sex, sexual problem prevention, sexual depression, and internal sexual control. Single subscales or groups of subscales have been used by several researchers (e.g., Meyer et al., 2005). Good internal consistency for all 20 subscales was determined by Snell (1995, as cited in Snell, 1998).

5. At the end of each session, the student facilitator uses a mini-evaluation to ask for an overall rating of the class, the best thing about the day’s workshop, how the session could be improved, what students learned about themselves that day, and comments/concerns. This frequent feedback allows us to ensure that the objectives for each week are being met and the planning for the next week matches group expectations.
6. The 10 YMY-OQ items with mean post-test scores of higher than 4.5 were: I feel equipped with enough knowledge to engage in intellectual discourse about intimate relationships, I understand the “hook up culture” and can articulate my opinions about it, I understand what consent means and I am able to provide examples of verbal and non-verbal means of giving consent, I believe that positive, healthy relationships come in many forms and I can give examples of these, I can define rape and sexual assault, I know who is available at [the university] to support me if I am sexually assaulted, or I can refer a friend to a support person on campus if s/he is sexually assaulted, I know how to talk with my friends about sexual climate, rape, and sexual identity, I can name three obstacles that stand in the way of a healthy sexual climate at [the university], I have considered realistic ways of transforming the culture towards a more positive sexual climate, and I feel supported in making changes that would be positive for the sexual climate at this university.
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**APPENDIX A: YES MEANS YES SYLLABUS**

**Session 1:** Introduction & Chapter 1, “Offensive Feminism: The Conservative Gender Norms That Perpetuate Rape Culture, and How Feminists Can Fight Back” by Jill Filipovic (13–27)

- Welcome and Introductions, Overview of Program, Ground rules, Logistics
- Thermometer exercise – issues of sexuality/attraction/etc.
- Definition of hook-up culture – positive/negatives exercise

**Session 2:** Chapter 15, “An Immodest Proposal” by Heather Corinna (179–192) key terms: sexual agency, pleasure

- Do “first time” sexual encounters shape those to follow? How so?
Do parents have responsibilities as facilitators of the “first time”?

Do you think that men and women equally experience sexual desire?

How do you see sexual agency in your environment? Who has it? What power comes along with sexual agency?

**Session 3:** Chapter 13, “An Old Enemy in a New Outfit: How Date Rape Became Gray Rape and Why It Matters” by Lisa Jervis (163–177); Chapter 9, “The Fantasy of Acceptable “Non-Consent”: Why the Female Sexual Submissive Scares Us (and Why She Shouldn’t)” (117–125) key terms: gray rape, BDSM

In what ways does acknowledging and taking control of one’s desires relate to gray rape?

Does college culture perpetuate “gray rape”? If yes, in what ways?

Is it possible for females to be as sexually autonomous as men?

What is consent and how do you express it?

What assumptions and accommodations can be made about various forms of sexuality?

**Session 4:** Chapter 3, “Beyond Yes or No: Consent as a Sexual Process” by Rachel Kramer Bussel (43–51) key terms: consent, responsibility

What assumptions do we have going into a sexual encounter? How do we navigate these?

What specific responsibilities do men have during sexual encounters? Women?

Do these responsibilities change in homosexual sexual encounters?

What is the goal of sex? Why do we have sex?

In what ways can consent help us achieve these goals?

**Session 5:** Chapter 27, “In Defense of Going Wild” by Jaclyn Friedman key terms: power, entitlement, healthy sexual climate

What does rape mean on a college campus? This campus?

In what ways does college culture positively impact sexual experiences? Negatively?

Are there hierarchies on campus that perpetuate ideas of entitlement and power?

What obstacles stand in the way of healthy sexual climate on campus?

What can be done to promote a healthy sexual climate?
Wrap Up

- Each participant revisits goals/assumptions, compares the program with his/her goals/assumptions, offers one suggestion for transforming the [university] culture
- Action plan: implementable and with identification of allies

APPENDIX B: YES MEANS YES QUESTIONNAIRE (YMY-Q)

1. I feel comfortable talking in a group about sexual topics.
2. I feel equipped with enough knowledge to engage in intellectual discourse about intimate relationships.
3. I understand the “hook up culture” and can articulate my opinions about it.
4. I understand what consent means and I am able to provide examples of verbal and nonverbal means of giving consent.
5. I behave in ways that are consistent with my values regarding relationships.
6. I believe that positive, healthy relationships come in many forms and I can give examples of these.
7. I can define rape and sexual assault.
8. I know who is available at this university to support me if I am sexually assaulted, or I can refer a friend to a support person on campus if s/he is sexually assaulted.
9. I have considered how sexual assault affects the LGBTQ community on campus.
10. I know how to talk with my friends about sexual climate, rape, and sexual identity.
11. I can name three obstacles that stand in the way of a healthy sexual climate at this university.
12. I have considered realistic ways of transforming the culture towards a more positive sexual climate.
13. I feel supported in making changes that would be positive for the sexual climate at this university.