# Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project

## Impact of Attending an At-Risk Gatekeeper Training, LGBTQ on Campus for Faculty and Staff: Comparison of Pre-, Post-, and Follow-Up Training Surveys

December 2014

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Introduction:

As part of the Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project (IYSPP), sponsored by the Illinois Department of Public Health, university faculty and staff across the state were invited to participate in interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper trainings administered by Kognito Interactive. The goals of the training were to increase awareness and empathy for the challenges faced by LGBTQ students, to build the skills of faculty and staff to model respectful behavior, including managing classroom discussion that may include bias comments or attitudes in handling LGBTQ-related issues, and to reduce the number of youth suicides. As such, the trainings focused staff on:

➢ **Responding** when a student makes a biased comment or expresses prejudice;
➢ **Responding** supportively when a student discloses that they identify as LGBTQ;
➢ **Identifying** students showing signs of psychological distress;
➢ **Approaching** psychologically distressed students to communicate concern and gain a better understanding of their behavior; and
➢ **Referring** psychologically distressed students for mental health support services.

After watching a tutorial, staff practiced and honed their strategies through a series of vignettes where their avatar was an educator interacting with students. Staff completed pre-, post-, and 3-month follow-up training surveys in order to measure:

• *Awareness and support of LGBTQ students on campus;*
• *Preparedness to assist psychologically distressed students;*
• *Confidence to assist psychologically distressed students;* and
• *Referrals made to connect psychologically distressed students with mental health services.*

This report includes all staff who participated in the *LGBTQ on Campus for Faculty and Staff* gatekeeper trainings between August 2013 and October 2014, and completed both a pre- and post-training survey. The number of staff, who completed a 3-month follow-up training, was too low to include in this report. Future reports will contain findings from the 3-month training follow-up survey that includes questions about students referred for mental health support services since attending the training.

The Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois serves as the evaluator for the IYSPP grant. CPRD analyzed and summarized all of the data included in this report.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Demographics:

| Number of Respondents | |
|---|---|
| Total Trained | 144 |
| Pre-Training Survey | 134 |
| Post-Training Survey | 98 |
| Matched Pre & Post | 87 |
| 3-Month Follow-Up Survey Only | 10* |

| Respondent Would Recommend Training to Colleagues | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 99% |
| No | 1% |

| Gender | |
|---|---|
| Male | 29% |
| Female | 71% |

| Role in Higher Education | |
|---|---|
| Full-Time Faculty | 25% |
| Adjunct Faculty | 0% |
| Teaching Assistant | 0% |
| Graduate Student Teacher | 2% |
| Administrator | 13% |
| Staff Member | 39% |
| Resident Assistant | 21% |

| Respondent Identifies as LGBTQ | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 10% |
| No | 84% |
| Chose Not to Answer | 6% |

---

*The number of participants that completed the "3-Month Follow-Up Survey" was too low to report for the current reporting period. All data in the ensuing report tables will be omitted. Future reports will include this data once the number of respondents is high enough to report.

## Reports of Awareness and Preparedness:

| Awareness and Support of LGBTQ Students on Campus | Matched N=87 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=10 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I am aware of the need to use gender-neutral language in the classroom. | 3.4 | .66 | 3.4 | .64 | NA | NA |
| I am knowledgeable about the unique challenges facing the LGBTQ student population. | 3.1 | .76 | 3.3 | .62 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to manage a classroom discussion where a student has made an anti-LGBTQ statement. | 2.9 | .68 | 3.2 | .56 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to use respectful and informed language when discussing issues of sexual orientation and gender identity. | 3.2 | .68 | 3.3 | .59 | NA | NA |
| Part of the role of faculty, staff, and administrators is to help create a safe and supportive learning environment for LGBTQ students. | 3.5 | .61 | 3.5 | .59 | NA | NA |
| Part of the role of faculty, staff, and administrators is to connect LGBTQ students experiencing psychological distress to support services such as the counseling center. | 3.6 | .59 | 3.6 | .57 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

| Preparedness to Discuss LGBTQ Issues | Matched N=87 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=10 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Use respectful, informed language when discussing issues of sexual orientation and gender identity. | 4.1 | .87 | 4.2 | .75 | NA | NA |
| Conduct a supportive conversation with a student who discloses that they identify as LGBTQ. | 4.0 | .99 | 4.2 | .76 | NA | NA |
| Manage a classroom discussion where a student made an anti-LGBTQ statement. | 3.3 | 1.03 | 4.0 | .88 | NA | NA |
| Use gender-neutral language in class. | 3.8 | .99 | 4.1 | .85 | NA | NA |
| Explain how the transgender experience on campus differs from the experiences of LGB students. | 3.2 | 1.14 | 4.0 | .90 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 5: 1=Very low, 2=Low, 3= Medium, 4=High, 5=Very high.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Identifying, Approaching, and Referring:

| Identifying and Responding to the Needs of Students | Matched N=87 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=10 | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Recognize when a student's behavior is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.8 | .89 | 4.2 | .80 | NA | NA |
| Recognize when a student's physical appearance is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.8 | .93 | 4.1 | .83 | NA | NA |
| Discuss with a student your concern about the signs of psychological distress they are exhibiting. | 3.8 | .95 | 4.2 | .78 | NA | NA |
| Motivate a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress to seek help. | 3.8 | .94 | 4.3 | .78 | NA | NA |
| Recommend mental health support services to a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 4.1 | .93 | 4.3 | .76 | NA | NA |
| Identifying/Responding Scale Score | 3.8** | .82 | 4.2** | .73 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 5: 1=Very low, 2=Low, 3= Medium, 4=High, 5=Very high.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

| Staff Confidence in Talking with a LGTBQ Student who is Experiencing Psychological Distress or Having Suicidal Thoughts | Matched N=87 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=10 | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I feel confident in my ability to discuss my concerns with this student. | 3.2 | .67 | 3.4 | .57 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to help this student seek help if they are having thoughts of suicide. | 3.3 | .63 | 3.4 | .58 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to connect this student to support services such as the counseling center. | 3.4 | .64 | 3.5 | .57 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

| Impact of the Training on Staff Empathy | Post-Training N=98 | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=10 | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| As a result of this training, staff feels more empathy for the LGBTQ student community. | 3.2 | .60 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Conclusion:

Overall the findings are encouraging. Between August 2013 and October 2014, 144 faculty and staff completed the *LGBTQ on Campus for Faculty and Staff* gatekeeper training and reported greater feelings of empathy for the unique challenges that face the LGBTQ student population. In addition, staff stated an increased preparedness to explain how the transgender experience on campus differs from the experiences of LGB students, as well as how to manage a classroom where a student made an anti-LGBTQ statement.

It is encouraging to note that even before the training staff were already highly prepared to use respectful, informed language when discussing issues of sexual orientation and gender identity, as well as to conduct a supportive conversation with a student who discloses that they identify as LGBTQ. Furthermore, before the training, staff believed that collectively they had a responsibility to help create a safe and supportive learning environment for LGBTQ students, and to connect LGBTQ students experiencing psychological distress to support services.

Staff reports of their readiness and confidence in identifying, approaching, and referring students exhibiting signs of psychological distress, increased after participating in the interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper training in the following ways:

- **Identify:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy and preparedness to recognize when a student's behavior or appearance is a sign of psychological distress.
- **Approach:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to discuss their concerns with a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress.
- **Refer:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to know how and where to refer a student in psychological distress (or a suicidal student) for mental health support services and how to motivate that student to seek help.

# Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project

Impact of Attending an At-Risk Gatekeeper Training, Veterans on Campus for Faculty and Staff: Comparison of Pre-, Post-, and Follow-Up Training Surveys

December 2014

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Introduction:

As part of the Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project (IYSPP), sponsored by the Illinois Department of Public Health, postsecondary schools across the state were invited to participate in *Veterans on Campus for Faculty and Staff,* interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper trainings administered by Kognito Interactive. The goal of the trainings was to teach faculty and staff about the unique value veterans bring to campus, obstacles they may face in their pursuit of a college degree, effective techniques for managing classroom discussions around topics that may be sensitive to veterans, and best practices for connecting student veterans exhibiting signs of psychological distress with support. As such, the trainings focused staff on:

➢ *Identifying* student veterans showing signs of psychological distress;
➢ *Approaching* psychologically distressed student veterans to communicate concern and gain a better understanding of their behavior; and
➢ *Referring* psychologically distressed student veterans for mental health support services.

After watching a tutorial, staff practiced and honed their strategies through a series of vignettes where their avatar was interacting with student veterans and managing a sensitive classroom discussion about military involvement overseas. Staff completed pre-, post-, and 3-month follow-up training surveys in order to measure:

• *Knowledge for helping student veterans;*
• *Preparedness to assist psychologically distressed students;*
• *Confidence to assist psychologically distressed students;* and
• *Referrals made to connect psychologically distressed veteran students with mental health services.*

This report includes all staff who participated in the *Veterans on Campus for Faculty and Staff* gatekeeper trainings between August 2013 and October 2014, and completed both a pre- and post-training survey. The number of staff, who completed a 3-month follow-up training, was too low to include in this report. Future reports will contain findings from the 3-month training follow-up survey that includes questions about students referred for mental health support services since attending the training.

The Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois serves as the evaluator for the IYSPP grant. CPRD analyzed and summarized all of the data included in this report.

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Demographics:

| Number of Respondents | |
|---|---|
| Total Trained | 182 |
| Pre-Training Survey | 167 |
| Post-Training Survey | 105 |
| Matched Pre & Post | 101 |
| 3-Month Follow-Up Survey Only | 13* |

| Gender | |
|---|---|
| Male | 35% |
| Female | 65% |

| Role in Higher Education* | |
|---|---|
| Full-Time Faculty | 20% |
| Part-Time Faculty | 3% |
| Staff Member | 53% |
| RA or Student Leader | 18% |
| Other | 3% |
| Trained as Mental Health Practitioner | 9% |

*Staff may have selected more than one role.

| Respondent Would Recommend Training to Colleagues | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 98% |
| No | 2% |

| Respondent Had Previous Gatekeeper Training | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 33% |
| No | 67% |

---

*The number of participants that completed the "3-Month Follow-Up Survey" was too low to report for the current reporting period. All data in the ensuing report tables will be omitted. Future reports will include this data once the number of respondents is high enough to report.

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Knowledge and Readiness:

| Knowledge for Helping Student Veterans | Matched N=101 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=13 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I am prepared to talk to a student veteran about their military service. | 2.9 | .79 | 3.3 | .58 | NA | NA |
| I am knowledgeable about the common challenges facing the student veteran population. | 2.8 | .79 | 3.2 | .59 | NA | NA |
| I am comfortable talking to a student veteran about their military service. | 3.0 | .73 | 3.3 | .60 | NA | NA |
| I am prepared to refer a student veteran to the appropriate campus offices. | 3.1 | .73 | 3.4 | .61 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

| Identifying and Responding to Student Needs | Matched N=101 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=13 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Recognize when a student veteran's behavior is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.2 | .91 | 3.9 | .83 | NA | NA |
| Recognize when a student veteran's physical appearance is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.2 | .89 | 3.9 | .83 | NA | NA |
| Discuss with a student veteran your concern about signs of psychological distress they are exhibiting. | 3.1 | 1.04 | 3.9 | .84 | NA | NA |
| Motivate a student veteran exhibiting signs of psychological distress to seek help. | 3.3 | .94 | 4.1 | .78 | NA | NA |
| Recommend mental health support services to a student veteran exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.5 | .96 | 4.2 | .80 | NA | NA |
| Identifying/Responding Scale Score | 3.3** | .86 | 4.0** | .77 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 5: 1=Very low, 2=Low, 3= Medium, 4=High, 5=Very high.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Confidence:

| Staff Confidence | Matched N=101 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=13 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I feel confident in my ability to discuss my concerns with a student veteran exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 2.9 | .65 | 3.2 | .52 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to recommend mental health support services to a student veteran exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.0 | .66 | 3.3 | .56 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident that I know where to refer a student veteran for mental health support. | 3.0 | .72 | 3.4 | .63 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in managing classroom discussions around veteran sensitive issues. | 2.5 | .76 | 3.1 | .71 | NA | NA |
| Part of the role of faculty, staff, and administrators is to help create a supportive environment for the student veteran population. | 3.4 | .67 | 3.5 | .58 | NA | NA |
| Part of the role of faculty, staff, and administrators is to connect student veterans experiencing psychological distress with mental health support services. | 3.4 | .65 | 3.5 | .56 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Conclusion:

Overall the findings are encouraging. Between August 2013 and October 2014, 182 faculty and staff completed the *Veterans on Campus for Faculty and Staff* gatekeeper training and reported increased knowledge about the common challenges facing the student veteran population and greater preparedness and confidence in talking with student veterans about their military service and managing classroom discussions around veteran sensitive issues.

Collectively staff believe that they have a responsibility to help create a supportive environment for the student veteran population, as well as to connect student veterans experiencing psychological distress with mental health support services. Staff were already holding themselves accountable to these duties before the training, so there was no change from the pre- to the post-training survey in terms of their confidence to fulfill these responsibilities.

Staff reports of their readiness and confidence in identifying, approaching, and referring students exhibiting signs of psychological distress, also increased after participating in the interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper training in the following ways:

- **Identify:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy and preparedness to recognize when a student's behavior or appearance is a sign of psychological distress.
- **Approach:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to discuss their concerns with a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress.
- **Refer:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to know how and where to refer a student in psychological distress for mental health support services and how to motivate that student to seek help.

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

# Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project

## Impact of Attending an At-Risk Gatekeeper Training to Evaluate LGBTQ on Campus for Students: Comparison of Pre-, Post-, and Follow-Up Training Surveys

December 2014

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Introduction:

As part of the Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project (IYSPP), sponsored by the Illinois Department of Public Health, university and college students across the state were invited to participate in interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper trainings administered by Kognito Interactive. The goals of the trainings were to create a safe and supportive campus community by increasing awareness and empathy for the challenges faced by LGBTQ students, building the skills of students to connect and communicate with respect, and to reduce the number of youth suicides. As such, the trainings focused on:

- ➢ ***Responding*** when someone makes a biased comment or expresses prejudice;
- ➢ ***Responding*** supportively when a peer comes out as LGBTQ;
- ➢ ***Identifying*** a peer showing signs of psychological distress;
- ➢ ***Approaching*** psychologically distressed peers to communicate concern and gain a better understanding of their behavior; and
- ➢ ***Referring*** psychologically distressed peers for mental health support services.

After watching a tutorial, university and college students practiced and honed their strategies through a series of vignettes where their avatar was interacting with peers. Students completed pre-, post-, and 3-month follow-up training surveys in order to measure:

- *Awareness and support of LGBTQ students on campus;*
- *Preparedness to assist psychologically distressed students;*
- *Confidence to assist psychologically distressed students;*
- *Referrals made to connect psychologically distressed students with mental health services;* and
- *Student self-reported behaviors.*

This report includes all students who participated in the *LGBTQ on Campus for Students* gatekeeper trainings between January 2014 and October 31, 2014, and completed both a pre- and post-training survey. The number of students, who completed a 3-month follow-up training, was too low to include in this report. Future reports will contain findings from the 3-month training follow-up survey that includes questions about students referred for mental health support services since attending the training.

The Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois serves as the evaluator for the IYSPP grant. CPRD analyzed and summarized all of the data included in this report.

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Demographics:

| Number of Respondents | |
|---|---|
| Total Trained | 536 |
| Pre-Training Survey | 466 |
| Post-Training Survey | 344 |
| Matched Pre & Post | 319 |
| 3-Month Follow-Up Survey Only | 9* |

| Gender | |
|---|---|
| Male | 32% |
| Female | 67% |
| Transgender | 1% |

| Year in School | |
|---|---|
| Freshman | 10% |
| Sophomore | 30% |
| Junior | 30% |
| Senior | 25% |
| Graduate Student | 5% |

| Respondent is a RA or Student Leader | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 55% |
| No | 45% |

| Respondent Identifies as a LGBTQ Student | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 13% |
| No | 83% |
| Chose Not to Answer | 5% |

| Respondent Was Required to Take Training | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 79% |
| No | 21% |

| Respondent Would Recommend Training to Friends and Peers | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 92% |
| No | 8% |

---

* The number of participants that completed the "3-Month Follow-Up Survey" was too low to report for the current reporting period. All data in the ensuing report tables will be omitted. Future reports will include this data once the number of respondents is high enough to report.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Awareness and Preparedness:

| Awareness and Support of LGBTQ Students on Campus | Matched N=319 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=9 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I feel confident in my ability to manage a discussion where a fellow student has made an anti-LGBTQ statement. | 3.1 | .66 | 3.5 | .53 | NA | NA |
| I am aware of the unique challenges facing the LGBTQ student population. | 3.1 | .72 | 3.5 | .56 | NA | NA |
| Students should support efforts that help create a safe and supportive learning environment for LGBTQ students. | 3.4 | .59 | 3.6 | .53 | NA | NA |
| Students should connect LGBTQ students experiencing psychological distress to support services such as the counseling center. | 3.4 | .58 | 3.6 | .52 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

| Preparedness to Discuss LGBTQ Issues | Matched N=319 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=9 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Use respectful language when discussing issues of sexual orientation and gender identity. | 4.1 | .85 | 4.4 | .69 | NA | NA |
| Conduct a supportive conversation with a fellow student who discloses that they identify as LGBTQ. | 4.0 | .89 | 4.4 | .70 | NA | NA |
| Talk with a fellow student if they make an anti-LGBTQ comment. | 3.8 | .93 | 4.4 | .72 | NA | NA |
| Talk with a fellow student about using terms such as "gay, no-homo, fag, etc." | 3.8 | .95 | 4.4 | .71 | NA | NA |
| Use gender-neutral language when appropriate. | 3.9 | .90 | 4.4 | .70 | NA | NA |
| Explain how the transgender experience on campus differs from the experiences of LGB students. | 3.2 | 1.09 | 4.3 | .82 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 5: 1=Very low, 2=Low, 3= Medium, 4=High, 5=Very high.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Identifying, Approaching, and Referring:

| Identifying and Responding to the Needs of Fellow Students | Matched N=319 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=9 | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Recognize when a fellow student's behavior is a sign of psychological distress. | 4.0 | .78 | 4.4 | .69 | NA | NA |
| Recognize when a fellow student's physical appearance is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.9 | .82 | 4.4 | .69 | NA | NA |
| Discuss with a fellow student your concern about the signs of psychological distress they are exhibiting. | 3.9 | .82 | 4.4 | .68 | NA | NA |
| Motivate a fellow student exhibiting signs of psychological distress to seek help. | 4.0 | .82 | 4.4 | .68 | NA | NA |
| Recommend mental health support services to a fellow student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 4.1 | .82 | 4.4 | .69 | NA | NA |
| Identifying/Responding Scale Score | 4.0** | .73 | 4.4** | .65 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 5: 1=Very low, 2=Low, 3= Medium, 4=High, 5=Very high.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

| Student Confidence in Talking with a LGTBQ Student who is Experiencing Psychological Distress or Having Suicidal Thoughts | Matched N=319 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=9 | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I feel confident in my ability to discuss my concerns with this student. | 3.2 | .60 | 3.5 | .54 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to help this student seek help if they are having thoughts of suicide. | 3.2 | .62 | 3.5 | .55 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to connect this student to support services such as the counseling center. | 3.3 | .60 | 3.5 | .55 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Student Behaviors and Empathy

| Student Self-Reported Behaviors in the Past Two Months | Pre-Training N=466 | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=9 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Demonstrated respect for LGBTQ students. | 4.7 | .95 | NA | NA |
| Addressed disrespectful behavior or comments toward LGBTQ students. | 3.9 | 1.69 | NA | NA |
| Used gender-neutral language. | 4.2 | 1.14 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges 1 to 5: 1=Never, 2=Rarely, 3=Sometimes, 4=Usually, 5=Always
*Standard Deviation (SD)

| Impact of the Training on Student Empathy | Post-Training N=344 | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=9 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| As a result of this training, student feels more empathy for the LGBTQ student community. | 3.3 | .70 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Conclusion:

Overall the findings are encouraging. Between January 2014 and October 2014, 536 university and college students completed the *LGBTQ on Campus for Students* gatekeeper training and reported a greater awareness and feelings of empathy of the unique challenges that face the LGBTQ population.

In addition students stated increased preparedness to have a supportive conversation with a student who identifies that they are LGTBQ, or conversely, to manage a discussion where a student has made a disparaging LGBTQ remark. (It is encouraging to note that even before the training, students reported that they were almost always respectful of LGTBQ students, and that they usually addressed disrespectful behavior or comments towards LGBTQ students.) Collectively students believed that they have a responsibility to support efforts that create a safe and supportive learning environment for LGTBQ students.

University and college student reports of their readiness and confidence in identifying, approaching, and referring students exhibiting signs of psychological distress, also increased after participating in the interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper training in the following ways:

- **Identify:** Trained students reported higher levels of efficacy and preparedness to recognize when a fellow student's behavior or appearance is a sign of psychological distress.
- **Approach:** Trained students reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to discuss their concerns with a fellow student exhibiting signs of psychological distress.
- **Refer:** Trained students reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to know how and where to refer a fellow student in psychological distress (or a suicidal student) for mental health support services and how to motivate that student to seek help.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

# Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project

Impact of Attending the At-Risk Gatekeeper Training, Veterans on Campus for Students: Comparison of Pre-, Post-, and Follow-Up Training Surveys

December 2014

## Introduction:

As part of the Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project (IYSPP), sponsored by the Illinois Department of Public Health, university and college students across the state were invited to participate in *Veterans on Campus for Students,* an interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper training administered by Kognito Interactive. The goal of the training was to teach student veterans and student leaders how to support fellow student veterans as they face challenges in transitioning to college life, including isolation, cultural disparities, academic difficulties, time management, and mental-health issues such as TBI, depression, and PTSD.  As such, the training focused on:

> ➢ *Identifying* student veterans showing signs of psychological distress;
> ➢ *Approaching* psychologically student distressed veterans to communicate concern and gain a better understanding of their behavior; and
> ➢ *Referring* psychologically distressed student veterans for mental health support services.

After watching a tutorial, university and college students practiced and honed their strategies through a series of vignettes where their avatar was interacting with peers. Students completed pre-, post-, and 3-month follow-up training surveys in order to measure:

- *Knowledge for helping student veterans;*
- *Preparedness to assist psychologically distressed student veterans;*
- *Confidence to assist psychologically distressed student veterans;* and
- *Referrals made to connect psychologically distressed student veterans with mental health services.*

This report includes all students who participated in the *Veterans on Campus for Students* gatekeeper trainings between October 2013 and October 2014, and completed both a pre- and post-training survey. The number of students, who completed a 3-month follow-up training, was too low to include in this report. Future reports will contain findings from the 3-month training follow-up survey that includes questions about students referred for mental health support services since attending the training.

The Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois serves as the evaluator for the IYSPP grant. CPRD analyzed and summarized all of the data included in this report.

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Demographics:

| Number of Respondents | |
|---|---|
| Total Trained | 433 |
| Pre-Training Survey | 352 |
| Post-Training Survey | 299 |
| Matched Pre & Post | 277 |
| 3-Month Follow-Up Survey Only | 11[*] |

| Gender | |
|---|---|
| Male | 34% |
| Female | 66% |

| Year in School | |
|---|---|
| Freshman | 7% |
| Sophomore | 35% |
| Junior | 29% |
| Senior | 24% |
| Graduate Student | 5% |

| Respondent is a RA or Student Leader | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 56% |
| No | 44% |

| Respondent Was Required to Take Training | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 86% |
| No | 14% |

| Respondent Would Recommend Training to Fellow Student Veterans | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 93% |
| No | 7% |

---

[*]The number of participants that completed the "3-Month Follow-Up Survey" was too low to report for the current reporting period. All data in the ensuing report tables will be omitted. Future reports will include this data once the number of respondents is high enough to report.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Knowledge and Readiness:

| Knowledge for Helping Student Veterans | Matched N=277 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=11 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I am knowledgeable about the common challenges facing student veterans when they transition to an academic environment. | 2.7 | .77 | 3.3 | .53 | NA | NA |
| I know where to refer a fellow veteran in psychological distress. | 2.9 | .72 | 3.3 | .52 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

| Identifying and Responding to the Needs of Fellow Students | Matched N=277 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=11 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Recognize when a fellow veteran's behavior is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.3 | .96 | 4.2 | .69 | NA | NA |
| Recognize when a fellow veteran's physical appearance is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.3 | .96 | 4.2 | .72 | NA | NA |
| Discuss with a fellow veteran your concern about the signs of psychological distress they are exhibiting. | 3.3 | .99 | 4.2 | .71 | NA | NA |
| Motivate a fellow veteran exhibiting signs of psychological distress to seek help. | 3.4 | 1.01 | 4.2 | .70 | NA | NA |
| Recommend mental health or other support services to a fellow veteran exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.5 | 1.01 | 4.2 | .71 | NA | NA |
| Identifying/Responding Scale Score | 3.4** | .92 | 4.2** | .66 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 5: 1=Very low, 2=Low, 3= Medium, 4=High, 5=Very high.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Confidence:

| Student Confidence | Matched N=277 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=11 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I feel confident in my ability to discuss my concerns with a fellow veteran exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 2.9 | .67 | 3.3 | .52 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to recommend mental health support services to a fellow veteran exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.0 | .64 | 3.4 | .53 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to help a fellow veteran who is suicidal to seek help. | 3.0 | .63 | 3.4 | .50 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident that I know where to refer a fellow veteran for mental health support services. | 3.0 | .65 | 3.4 | .53 | NA | NA |
| Part of the role of student veterans is to connect fellow veterans experiencing psychological distress with mental health support services. | 3.1 | .62 | 3.4 | .51 | NA | NA |
| Confidence Scale Score | 3.0** | .58 | 3.4** | .48 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

## Conclusion:

Overall the findings are encouraging. Between October 2013 and October 2014, 433 university and college students completed the *Veterans on Campus for Students* gatekeeper training and reported an increased knowledge of the common challenges facing student veterans when they transition to an academic environment. They also reported increased feelings of responsibility to connect fellow student veterans who are exhibiting signs of psychological distress to mental health support services.

University and college student reports of their readiness and confidence in identifying, approaching, and referring fellow student veterans exhibiting signs of psychological distress, increased after participating in the interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper training in the following ways:

- **Identify:** Trained students reported higher levels of efficacy and preparedness to recognize when a fellow student veteran's behavior or appearance is a sign of psychological distress.
- **Approach:** Trained students reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to discuss their concerns with a fellow student veteran exhibiting signs of psychological distress.
- **Refer:** Trained students reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to know how and where to refer a fellow student veteran in psychological distress (or suicidal) for mental health support services and how to motivate that student veteran to seek help.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

# Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project

## Impact of Attending an At-Risk Gatekeeper Training on University and College Students: Comparison of Pre- and Post-Training Surveys

November 2014

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
**UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS**

## Introduction:

As part of the Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project (IYSPP), sponsored by the Illinois Department of Public Health, university and college students across the state were invited to participate in interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper trainings administered by Kognito Interactive. The goal of the trainings was to reduce the number of youth suicides through schools adopting an *At-Risk Program* focused on early awareness and referrals to mental health support services for students showing signs of psychological distress. As such, the trainings focused on:

- ➢ **Identifying** fellow students showing signs of psychological distress;
- ➢ **Approaching** psychologically distressed students to communicate concern and gain a better understanding of their behavior; and
- ➢ **Referring** psychologically distressed students for mental health support services.

After watching a tutorial, university and college students practiced and honed their strategies for *approaching* and *referring* psychologically distressed students through a series of vignettes where their avatar was interacting with a fellow student.

The Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois serves as the evaluator for the IYSPP grant. CPRD in collaboration with Kognito Interactive designed pre-, post-, and 3-month follow-up training surveys in order to measure:

- *Perceived needs for having an At-Risk Program;*
- *Familiarity with their school's existing resources;*
- *Preparedness to assist psychologically distressed students;*
- *Confidence to assist psychologically distressed students;* and
- *Referrals made to connect psychologically distressed students with mental health services.*

This report includes all students who participated in the *At-Risk for College Students* gatekeeper trainings between August 2013 and October 2014, and completed both a pre- and post-training survey. The number of students, who completed a 3-month follow-up training, was too low to include in this report. Future reports will contain findings from the 3-month training follow-up survey that includes questions about students referred for mental health support services since attending the training.

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Demographics:

| Number of Respondents | |
|---|---|
| Total Trained | 1999 |
| Pre-Training Survey | 916 |
| Post-Training Survey | 671 |
| Matched Pre & Post | 626 |
| 3-Month Follow-Up Survey Only | 29* |

| Gender | |
|---|---|
| Male | 32% |
| Female | 68% |

| Year in School | |
|---|---|
| Freshman | 20% |
| Sophomore | 27% |
| Junior | 30% |
| Senior | 18% |
| Graduate Student | 5% |

| Respondent is a RA or Student Leader | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 49% |
| No | 51% |

| Respondent Was Required to Take Training | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 80% |
| No | 20% |

| Respondent Would Recommend Training to Friends and Peers | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 92% |
| No | 8% |

---

*The number of participants that completed the "3-Month Follow-Up Survey" was too low to report for the current reporting period. All data in the ensuing report tables will be omitted. Future reports will include this data once the number of respondents is high enough to report.

## Reports of General Knowledge:

| Perceived Needs and Campus Resources* | Pre-Training N=916 | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=NA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD** | Mean | SD** |
| Mental health and student support service needs are met on our campus. | 3.3 | 1.12 | NA | NA |
| If we address student problems early, we may prevent or reduce problems in the future. | 4.4 | .80 | NA | NA |
| Students on our campus do not have behavioral or mental health issues. | 3.0 | .90 | NA | NA |
| My campus conducts regular trainings for recognizing students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.0 | .94 | NA | NA |
| My campus has a plan or policy for helping students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.7 | .90 | NA | NA |
| Most students on this campus have been trained on recognizing students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 2.6 | 1.01 | NA | NA |
| Community agencies provide services to students in need at or near our campus. | 3.8 | .94 | NA | NA |
| Needs/Resources Scale Score | 3.4 | .51 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges 1 to 5: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree
*Questions for the "Perceived Needs and Campus Resources" scale were asked only on the Pre- and 3-Month Follow-Up Training Surveys.
**Standard Deviation (SD)

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Readiness:

| Identifying and Responding to the Needs of Fellow Student | Matched N=626 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=NA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Recognize when a fellow student's behavior is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.5 | .85 | 4.2 | .66 | NA | NA |
| Recognize when a fellow student's physical appearance is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.5 | .90 | 4.2 | .70 | NA | NA |
| Communicate with a fellow student your concern about the signs of psychological distress they are exhibiting. | 3.4 | .96 | 4.2 | .69 | NA | NA |
| Motivate a fellow student exhibiting signs of psychological distress to seek help. | 3.6 | .92 | 4.2 | .69 | NA | NA |
| Recommend mental health support services to a fellow student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.7 | .96 | 4.3 | .70 | NA | NA |
| Identifying/Responding Scale Score | 3.5** | .75 | 4.2** | .63 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 5: 1=Very low, 2=Low, 3= Medium, 4=High, 5=Very high.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

| Student Confidence | Matched N=626 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=NA | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I feel confident in my ability to discuss my concerns with a fellow student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.0 | .61 | 3.3 | .55 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to recommend mental health support services to a fellow student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.1 | .66 | 3.4 | .55 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to help a suicidal student seek help. | 3.0 | .71 | 3.3 | .59 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident that I know where to refer a fellow student for mental health support. | 3.0 | .72 | 3.4 | .56 | NA | NA |
| I believe students have a responsibility to assist fellow students who are experiencing psychological distress to seek mental health support services. | 3.3 | .61 | 3.4 | .54 | NA | NA |
| Confidence Scale Score | 3.1** | .50 | 3.4** | .48 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Conclusion:

Overall the findings are encouraging. Between August 2013 and October 2014, 1,999 university and college students completed the *At-Risk for College Students* gatekeeper training and reported the belief that if they addressed problems with their fellow students early, they may prevent or reduce problems in the future. As such, the students trained believe they have a responsibility to assist fellow students who are exhibiting signs of psychological distress to mental health support services.

University and college student reports of their readiness and confidence in identifying, approaching, and referring fellow students exhibiting signs of psychological distress, also increased after participating in the interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper training in the following ways:

- **Identify:** Trained students reported higher levels of efficacy and preparedness to recognize when a fellow student's behavior or appearance is a sign of psychological distress.
- **Approach:** Trained students reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to discuss their concerns with a fellow student exhibiting signs of psychological distress.
- **Refer:** Trained students reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to know how and where to refer a fellow student in psychological distress (or a suicidal student) for mental health support services and how to motivate that student to seek help.

# Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project

Impact of Attending an At-Risk Gatekeeper Training on High School Staff:
Comparison of Pre-, Post-, and Follow-Up Training Surveys

October 2014

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Introduction:

As part of the Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project (IYSPP), sponsored by the Illinois Department of Public Health, high schools across the state were invited to participate in interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper trainings administered by Kognito Interactive. The goal of the trainings was to reduce the number of youth suicides through schools adopting an *At-Risk Program* focused on early awareness and referrals to mental health support services for students showing signs of psychological distress. As such, the trainings focused staff on:

> ➢ ***Identifying*** students showing signs of psychological distress;
> ➢ ***Approaching*** psychologically distressed students to communicate concern and gain a better understanding of their behavior; and
> ➢ ***Referring*** psychologically distressed students for mental health support services.

After watching a tutorial, staff practiced and honed their strategies for *approaching* and *referring* psychologically distressed students through a series of developmentally appropriate vignettes where their avatar was a classroom teacher interacting with a student.

The Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois serves as the evaluator for the IYSPP grant. CPRD in collaboration with Kognito Interactive designed pre-, post-, and 3-month follow-up training surveys in order to measure:

- *Awareness and perceived need for having an At-Risk Program;*
- *Familiarity with their school's existing resources;*
- *Preparedness to assist psychologically distressed students;*
- *Confidence to assist psychologically distressed students;* and
- *Referrals made to connect psychologically distressed students with mental health services.*

This report includes all staff who participated in the *At-Risk for High School* gatekeeper trainings between July 2013 and June 2014, and completed both a pre- and post-training survey. This report also contains findings from staff who completed the 3-month training follow-up survey that includes questions about students referred for mental health support services since attending the training.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Demographics:

| Number of Respondents | |
|---|---|
| Total Trained | 840 |
| Pre-Training Survey | 823 |
| Post-Training Survey | 676 |
| Matched Pre & Post | 611 |
| 3-Month Follow-Up Survey Only | 57 |

| Respondent Was Required to Take Training | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 83% |
| No | 15% |
| Don't Know | 2% |

| Gender | |
|---|---|
| Male | 36% |
| Female | 64% |

| Respondent Would Recommend Training to Colleagues | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 93% |
| No | 7% |

| Primary Role at School | |
|---|---|
| Teacher | 67% |
| Mental Health Professional | 17% |
| Administrator | 7% |
| Teacher's Aide | 4% |
| Support Staff | 2% |
| Other | 3% |

| Respondent Had Previous Gatekeeper Training | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 13% |
| No | 87% |

| Daily Contact Time with Students | |
|---|---|
| 0-15 minutes | 4% |
| 15-30 minutes | 8% |
| 30 minutes – 1 hour | 11% |
| 1 – 2 hours | 11% |
| More than 2 hours | 66% |

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of General Knowledge:

| At-Risk Program Awareness and School Support* | Pre-Training N=823 | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=57 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD** | Mean | SD** |
| I am familiar with the goals and objectives of the At-Risk Program at our school. | 3.5 | .98 | 3.8 | .75 |
| I support the goals and objectives of the At-Risk Program at our school. | 3.9 | .77 | 4.1 | .67 |
| Many teachers at our school would be comfortable implementing the At-Risk Program. | 3.2 | .87 | 3.2 | .90 |
| Students at our school would be comfortable implementing the At-Risk Program. | 4.0 | .70 | 4.1 | .61 |
| Our school will effectively implement the At-Risk Program. | 3.7 | .72 | 3.5 | .77 |
| There is administrative support for implementing the At-Risk Program at our school. | 3.9 | .78 | 3.8 | .76 |
| Awareness/Support Scale Score | 3.7 | .56 | 3.7 | .50 |

Scale ranges 1 to 5: 1=Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree
*Questions for the "At-Risk Program Awareness and School Support" scale were asked only on the Pre- and 3-Month Follow-Up Training Surveys.
**Standard Deviation (SD)

| Perceived Needs and School Resources* | Pre-Training N=823 | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=57 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD** | Mean | SD** |
| Mental health and student support service needs are met in our school. | 3.1 | 1.05 | 3.2 | 1.18 |
| If we address student problems in the early grades, we may prevent or reduce problems in the future. | 4.1 | .75 | 4.1 | .80 |
| Students at our school do not have behavioral or mental health issues. | 2.7 | 1.00 | 2.4 | 1.02 |
| Staff at my school understand the relationship between socio-emotional learning and academic performance. | 3.6 | .84 | 3.8 | .76 |
| Our school is implementing the Illinois socio-emotional learning standards. | 3.3 | .73 | 3.3 | .76 |
| My school conducts regular trainings for recognizing students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 2.9 | .96 | 3.0 | 1.00 |
| My school has a plan or policy for helping students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.5 | .82 | 3.6 | .97 |
| Most staff at this school have been trained on recognizing students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.1 | .93 | 3.5 | .99 |
| Community agencies provide services to students in need at or near our school. | 3.7 | .75 | 3.8 | .85 |
| I believe that my role at school include counseling students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.6 | 1.02 | 3.6 | 1.04 |
| Needs/Resources  Scale Score | 3.4 | .44 | 3.4 | .52 |

Scale ranges 1 to 5: 1=Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree
*Questions for the "Perceived Needs and School Resources" scale were asked only on the Pre- and 3-Month Follow-Up Training Surveys.
**Standard Deviation (SD)

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Readiness:

| Identifying and Responding to Student Needs | Matched N=611 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=57 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Recognize when a student's behavior is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.5 | .85 | 4.1 | .71 | 3.7 | .79 |
| Recognize when a student's physical appearance is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.5 | .83 | 4.0 | .72 | 3.8 | .83 |
| Communicate with a student your concern about the signs of psychological distress they are exhibiting. | 3.4 | .90 | 4.1 | .72 | 3.7 | .82 |
| Motivate a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress to seek help. | 3.6 | .82 | 4.1 | .72 | 3.7 | .75 |
| Recommend mental health support services to a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.7 | .90 | 4.2 | .71 | 3.9 | .84 |
| Communicate with the parents of a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.4 | 1.04 | 3.9 | .85 | 3.5 | .98 |
| Identifying/Responding Scale Score | 3.5** | .75 | 4.0** | .65 | 3.7 | .70 |

Scale ranges from 1 to 5: 1=Very low, 2=Low, 3= Medium, 4=High, 5=Very high.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

| Staff Confidence | Matched N=611 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=57 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I feel confident in my ability to discuss my concerns with a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.0 | .67 | 3.3 | .55 | 3.0 | .58 |
| I feel confident in my ability to recommend mental health services to a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.0 | .70 | 3.3 | .57 | 3.0 | .67 |
| I feel confident that I know where to refer a student for mental health support. | 3.0 | .69 | 3.3 | .57 | 2.9 | .68 |
| I feel confident in my ability to help a suicidal student seek help. | 2.9 | .70 | 3.3 | .56 | 2.9 | .61 |
| Part of the role of educators is to connect students experiencing psychological distress with mental health support services. | 3.2 | .62 | 3.4 | .56 | 3.2 | .53 |
| Confidence Scale Score | 3.0** | .56 | 3.3** | .50 | 3.0 | .49 |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Training Follow-Up Survey

This section contains findings from the high school staff who completed the *Follow-Up Survey* that is administered three months after the training is completed. Additional questions in the *Follow-Up Survey* focused on how staff utilized knowledge gained from the gatekeeper training to identify, approach, and refer students exhibiting signs of psychological distress.

## Reports of Staff Actions and Referrals

| Actions Resulting from the Training | 3-Month Follow-Up N=57 | |
|---|---|---|
| **As a result of taking the training, there has been an increase in the number of…** | **Mean** | **SD*** |
| …students that I recognized as exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | **2.3** | .55 |
| …students that I approached to discuss my concern about their psychological distress. | **2.3** | .60 |
| …students that I referred for mental health support services. | **2.2** | .61 |
| …conversations I have had with other adults in my school community regarding students I am concerned about. | **2.5** | .60 |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

| Referrals to Mental Health Services | 3-Month Follow-Up N=57 |
|---|---|
| **Number of staff** who referred students to mental health services | **16** |
| **Number of staff** who knew if referred students received services | **6** |
| *Average* **number of students** referred by a staff member | **2.44** |
| **Number of students** referred to mental health services | **39** |
| **Number of students** who received services | **15** |

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Staff Actions and Referrals cont.

| Referrals to Mental Health Support Services* | |
|---|---|
| **Number of staff who referred students to the following services:** | **3-Month Follow-Up N=57** |
| School nurse | 17 |
| Mental health agency | 9 |
| Psychiatric hospital/unit | 3 |
| Emergency room | 2 |
| Substance abuse treatment center | 1 |
| School counselor | 34 |
| Private mental health practice | 3 |
| Mobile crisis unit | 1 |

*Staff may have selected more than one service.

| Effectiveness of Actions | |
|---|---|
| **Staff member's level of satisfaction that their actions taken on behalf of a student were effective:** | **3-Month Follow-Up N=57** |
| Very Dissatisfied | 4% |
| Dissatisfied | 14% |
| Satisfied | 71% |
| Very Satisfied | 11% |

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Conclusion:

Overall the findings are encouraging. Between July 2013 and June 2014, 840 high school staff completed the *At-Risk for High* School gatekeeper training and reported that they support the goals and objectives of the At-Risk Program at their school. They also believe that if they address student problems in earlier grades, they may prevent or reduce problems in the future. Staff reports of their readiness in identifying, approaching, and referring students exhibiting signs of psychological distress, increased after participating in the interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper training in the following ways:

- **Identify:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy and preparedness to recognize when a student's behavior, or appearance, is a sign of psychological distress.
- **Approach:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy and preparedness to discuss their concerns both with a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress and with the student's parents.
- **Refer:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy and preparedness to recommend a student in psychological distress for mental health support services and how to motivate that student to seek help.

Three months after completing the training, only 57 high school staff (7%) completed a Follow-Up Survey and reported the following:

- 16 staff referred students for mental health services;
- 6 staff knew if referred students received mental health services;
- 39 students were referred for mental health services;
- 15 students were known to have received services; and
- 82% of staff were satisfied that the actions they took on behalf of students were effective.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

# Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project

Impact of Attending an At-Risk Gatekeeper Training on Higher Education Faculty and Staff: Comparison of Pre-, Post-, and Follow-Up Training Surveys

October 2014

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Introduction:

As part of the Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project (IYSPP), sponsored by the Illinois Department of Public Health, postsecondary schools across the state were invited to participate in interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper trainings administered by Kognito Interactive. The goal of the trainings was to reduce the number of youth suicides through schools adopting an *At-Risk Program* focused on early awareness and referrals to mental health support services for students showing signs of psychological distress. As such, the trainings focused staff on:

> ➢ *Identifying* students showing signs of psychological distress;
> ➢ *Approaching* psychologically distressed students to communicate concern and gain a better understanding of their behavior; and
> ➢ *Referring* psychologically distressed students for mental health support services.

After watching a tutorial, staff practiced and honed their strategies for *approaching* and *referring* psychologically distressed students through a series of developmentally appropriate vignettes where their avatar was an educator interacting with a student.

The Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois serves as the evaluator for the IYSPP grant. CPRD in collaboration with Kognito Interactive designed pre-, post-, and 3-month follow-up training surveys in order to measure:

- *Awareness and perceived need for having an At-Risk Program;*
- *Familiarity with their school's existing resources;*
- *Preparedness to assist psychologically distressed students;*
- *Confidence to assist psychologically distressed students;* and
- *Referrals made to connect psychologically distressed students with mental health services.*

This report includes all staff who participated in the *At-Risk for Higher Education Faculty and Staff* gatekeeper trainings between August 2013 and June 2014, and completed both a pre- and post-training survey. This report also contains findings from staff who completed the 3-month training follow-up survey that includes questions about students referred for mental health support services since attending the training.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Demographics:

| Number of Respondents | |
|---|---|
| Total Trained | 262 |
| Pre-Training Survey | 281 |
| Post-Training Survey | 187 |
| Matched Pre & Post | 168 |
| 3-Month Follow-Up Survey Only | 45 |

| Gender | |
|---|---|
| Male | 35% |
| Female | 65% |

| Role in Higher Education | |
|---|---|
| Full-Time Faculty | 23% |
| Adjunct Faculty | 3% |
| Teaching Assistant | 0% |
| Graduate Student Teacher | 2% |
| Administrator or Staff Member | 45% |
| Resident Assistant | 18% |
| Other | 10% |

| Daily Contact Time with Students | |
|---|---|
| 0-15 minutes | 8% |
| 15-30 minutes | 8% |
| 30 minutes – 1 hour | 11% |
| 1 – 2 hours | 21% |
| More than 2 hours | 52% |

| Respondent Was Required to Take Training | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 61% |
| No | 36% |
| Don't Know | 3% |

| Respondent Would Recommend Training to Colleagues | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 95% |
| No | 5% |

| Respondent Had Previous Gatekeeper Training | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 14% |
| No | 86% |

## Reports of General Knowledge:

| At-Risk Program Awareness and Campus Support | Pre-Training N=281 | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=45 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I am familiar with the goals and objectives of the At-Risk Program on our campus. | 3.6 | 1.06 | 4.2 | .81 |
| I support the goals and objectives of the At-Risk Program on our campus. | 4.1 | .82 | 4.4 | .65 |
| Many faculty, staff, and administrators on our campus would be comfortable implementing the At-Risk Program. | 3.3 | .92 | 3.2 | .96 |
| Students on our campus will benefit from implementing the At-Risk Program. | 4.1 | .75 | 4.2 | .77 |
| Our campus will effectively implement the At-Risk Program. | 3.8 | .76 | 3.9 | .69 |
| There is administrative support for implementing the At-Risk Program on our campus. | 3.8 | .77 | 4.0 | .78 |
| Awareness/Support Scale Score | 3.8 | .58 | 4.0 | .53 |

Scale ranges 1 to 5: 1=Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree
*Questions for the "At-Risk Program Awareness and Campus Support" scale were asked only on the Pre- and 3-Month Follow-Up Training Surveys.
**Standard Deviation (SD)

| Perceived Needs and Campus Resources | Pre-Training N=281 | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=45 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Mental health and student support service needs are met on our campus. | 3.2 | 1.17 | 3.4 | 1.30 |
| If we address student problems early, we may prevent or reduce problems in the future. | 4.4 | .65 | 4.4 | .72 |
| Students on our campus do not have behavioral or mental health issues. | 2.7 | .93 | 2.7 | .89 |
| My campus conducts regular trainings for recognizing students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.0 | .91 | 3.2 | .96 |
| My campus has a plan or policy for helping students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.8 | .75 | 4.0 | .84 |
| Most faculty, staff, and administrators on this campus have been trained on recognizing students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.0 | .98 | 3.4 | .88 |
| Community agencies provide services to students in need at or near our campus. | 3.7 | .81 | 3.6 | .83 |
| I believe that my role on this campus includes recognizing and referring students exhibiting sign of psychological distress. | 4.2 | .71 | 4.5 | .55 |
| I believe that my role at school include counseling students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.1 | 1.19 | 2.7 | 1.32 |
| Needs/Resources  Scale Score | 3.5 | .42 | 3.5 | .46 |

Scale ranges 1 to 5: 1=Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree
*Questions for the "Perceived Needs and Campus Resources" scale were asked only on the Pre- and 3-Month Follow-Up Training Surveys.
**Standard Deviation (SD

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Readiness:

| Identifying and Responding to Student Needs | Matched N=168 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=45 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Recognize when a student's behavior is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.6 | .88 | 4.1 | .70 | 4.1 | .68 |
| Recognize when a student's physical appearance is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.5 | .96 | 4.0 | .72 | 4.0 | .84 |
| Communicate with a student your concern about the signs of psychological distress they are exhibiting. | 3.4 | .99 | 4.0 | .75 | 4.0 | .83 |
| Motivate a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress to seek help. | 3.6 | .93 | 4.0 | .74 | 4.0 | .84 |
| Recommend mental health support services to a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.8 | .93 | 4.1 | .76 | 4.2 | .74 |
| Identifying/Responding Scale Score | 3.6** | .82 | 4.0** | .68 | 4.1 | .69 |

Scale ranges from 1 to 5: 1=Very low, 2=Low, 3= Medium, 4=High, 5=Very high.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

| Staff Confidence | Matched N=168 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=45 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I feel confident in my ability to discuss my concerns with a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.0 | .73 | 3.3 | .54 | 3.2 | .53 |
| I feel confident in my ability to recommend mental health support services to a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.2 | .70 | 3.3 | .55 | 3.5 | .55 |
| I feel confident that I know where to refer a student for mental health support. | 3.2 | .72 | 3.4 | .58 | 3.6 | .55 |
| I feel confident in my ability to help a suicidal student seek help. | 2.9 | .80 | 3.2 | .58 | 3.2 | .63 |
| Part of the role of faculty, staff, and administrators is to connect students experiencing psychological distress with mental health support services. | 3.3 | .58 | 3.4 | .56 | 3.5 | .51 |
| Confidence Scale Score | 3.1** | .60 | 3.3** | .48 | 3.4 | .42 |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Training Follow-Up Survey

This section contains findings from the higher education faculty and staff who completed the *Follow-Up Survey* that is administered three months after the training is completed. Additional questions in the *Follow-Up Survey* focused on how staff utilized knowledge gained from the gatekeeper training to identify, approach, and refer students exhibiting signs of psychological distress.

## Reports of Staff Actions and Referrals

| Actions Resulting from the Training | 3-Month Follow-Up N=45 | |
|---|---|---|
| **As a result of taking the training, there has been an increase in the number of…** | **Mean** | **SD*** |
| …students that I recognized as exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | **2.4** | .72 |
| …students that I approached to discuss my concern about their psychological distress. | **2.4** | .71 |
| …students that I referred for mental health support services. | **2.4** | .72 |
| …conversations I have had with other faculty, staff, and administrators on my campus regarding students I am concerned about. | **2.6** | .72 |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

| Referrals to Mental Health Services | 3-Month Follow-Up N=45 |
|---|---|
| **Number of staff** who referred students to mental health services | **25** |
| **Number of staff** who knew if referred students received services | **10** |
| *Average* **number of students** referred by a staff member | **2.96** |
| **Number of students** referred to mental health services | **74** |
| **Number of students** who received services | **37** |

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Staff Actions and Referrals cont.

| Referrals to Mental Health Support Services* | |
|---|---|
| **Number of staff who referred students to the following services:** | **3-Month Follow-Up N=45** |
| School nurse | 3 |
| Mental health agency | 2 |
| Psychiatric hospital/unit | 3 |
| Emergency room | 3 |
| Substance abuse treatment center | 2 |
| Campus counseling center | 27 |
| Private mental health practice | 2 |
| Mobile crisis unit | 0 |

*Staff may have selected more than one service.

| Effectiveness of Actions | |
|---|---|
| **Staff member's level of satisfaction that their actions taken on behalf of a student were effective:** | **3-Month Follow-Up N=45** |
| Very Dissatisfied | 0% |
| Dissatisfied | 3% |
| Satisfied | 69% |
| Very Satisfied | 28% |

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Conclusion:

Overall the findings are encouraging. Between August 2013 and June 2014, 262 faculty and staff completed the *At-Risk for Higher Education* gatekeeper training and reported an increased familiarity, and support of, the goals and objectives of the At-Risk Program at their school. Staff continue to believe that if they address student problems early, they may prevent or reduce problems in the future. As such, staff believe their role on campus includes recognizing and referring students exhibiting signs of psychological distress to mental health support services, but they are uncertain if their role should include counseling.

Staff reports of their readiness and confidence in identifying, approaching, and referring students exhibiting signs of psychological distress, also increased after participating in the interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper training in the following ways:
* **Identify:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy and preparedness to recognize when a student's behavior or appearance is a sign of psychological distress.
* **Approach:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to discuss their concerns with a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress.
* **Refer:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to know how and where to refer a student in psychological distress (or a suicidal student) for mental health support services and how to motivate that student to seek help.

Three months after completing the training, only 45 higher education faculty and staff (17%) completed a 3-Month Follow Survey and reported the following:
* 25 staff referred students for mental health services;
* 10 staff knew if referred student received mental health services;
* 74 students were referred for mental health services;
* 37 students were known to have received services; and
* 97% of staff were satisfied that the actions they took on behalf of students were effective.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

# Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project

## Impact of Attending an At-Risk Gatekeeper Training on Middle School Staff: Comparison of Pre-, Post-, and Follow-Up Training Surveys

October 2014

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Introduction:

As part of the Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project (IYSPP), sponsored by the Illinois Department of Public Health, middle schools across the state were invited to participate in interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper trainings administered by Kognito Interactive. The goal of the trainings was to reduce the number of youth suicides through schools adopting an *At-Risk Program* focused on early awareness and referrals to mental health support services for students showing signs of psychological distress. As such, the trainings focused staff on:

- ➢ *Identifying* students showing signs of psychological distress;
- ➢ *Approaching* psychologically distressed students to communicate concern and gain a better understanding of their behavior; and
- ➢ *Referring* psychologically distressed students for mental health support services.

After watching a tutorial, staff practiced and honed their strategies for *approaching* and *referring* psychologically distressed students through a series of developmentally appropriate vignettes where their avatar was a classroom teacher interacting with a student.

The Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois serves as the evaluator for the IYSPP grant. CPRD in collaboration with Kognito Interactive designed pre-, post-, and 3-month follow-up training surveys in order to measure:

- *Awareness and perceived need for having an At-Risk Program;*
- *Familiarity with their school's existing resources;*
- *Preparedness to assist psychologically distressed students;*
- *Confidence to assist psychologically distressed students;* and
- *Referrals made to connect psychologically distressed students with mental health services.*

This report includes all staff who participated in the *At-Risk for Middle School* gatekeeper training between June 2013 and June 2014, and completed both a pre- and post-training survey. This report also contains findings from staff who completed the 3-month training follow-up survey that includes questions about students referred for mental health support services since attending the training.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Demographics:

| Number of Respondents | |
|---|---|
| Total Trained | 1261 |
| Pre-Training Survey | 1227 |
| Post-Training Survey | 1067 |
| Matched Pre & Post | 954 |
| 3-Month Follow-Up Survey Only | 115 |

| Gender | |
|---|---|
| Male | 16% |
| Female | 84% |

| Primary Role at School | |
|---|---|
| Teacher | 63% |
| Mental Health Professional | 18% |
| Administrator | 5% |
| Teacher's Aide | 4% |
| Support Staff | 2% |
| Other | 8% |

| Daily Contact Time with Students | |
|---|---|
| 0-15 minutes | 4% |
| 15-30 minutes | 8% |
| 30 minutes – 1 hour | 10% |
| 1 – 2 hours | 9% |
| More than 2 hours | 69% |

| Respondent Was Required to Take Training | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 78% |
| No | 20% |
| Don't Know | 2% |

| Respondent Would Recommend Training to Colleagues | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 97% |
| No | 3% |

| Respondent Had Previous Gatekeeper Training | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 12% |
| No | 88% |

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of General Knowledge:

| At-Risk Program Awareness and School Support* | Pre-Training N=1227 | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=115 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD** | Mean | SD** |
| I am familiar with the goals and objectives of the At-Risk Program at our school. | 3.3 | 1.00 | 4.0 | .76 |
| I support the goals and objectives of the At-Risk Program at our school. | 3.8 | .81 | 4.1 | .80 |
| Teachers at our school would be comfortable implementing the At-Risk Program. | 3.1 | .83 | 3.3 | .96 |
| Students at our school would be comfortable implementing the At-Risk Program. | 3.9 | .74 | 4.2 | .65 |
| Our school will effectively implement the At-Risk Program. | 3.6 | .71 | 3.6 | .68 |
| There is administrative support for implementing the At-Risk Program at our school. | 3.8 | .78 | 3.8 | .79 |
| Awareness/Support Scale Score | 3.6 | .56 | 3.8 | .53 |

Scale ranges 1 to 5: 1=Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree
*Questions for the "At-Risk Program Awareness and School Support" scale were asked only on the Pre- and 3-Month Follow-Up Training Surveys.
**Standard Deviation (SD)

| Perceived Needs and School Resources* | Pre-Training N=1227 | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=115 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD** | Mean | SD** |
| Mental health and student support service needs are met in our school. | 3.1 | 1.07 | 3.3 | 1.17 |
| If we address student problems in the early grades, we may prevent or reduce problems in the future. | 4.2 | .69 | 4.3 | .68 |
| Students at our school do not have behavioral or mental health issues. | 2.8 | 1.01 | 2.6 | 1.11 |
| Staff at my school understand the relationship between socio-emotional learning and academic performance. | 3.7 | .79 | 3.9 | .71 |
| Our school is implementing the Illinois socio-emotional learning standards. | 3.4 | .77 | 3.5 | .84 |
| My school conducts regular trainings for recognizing students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 2.8 | .94 | 2.9 | .96 |
| My school has a plan or policy for helping students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.5 | .86 | 3.6 | .81 |
| Most staff at this school have been trained on recognizing students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.0 | .93 | 3.4 | .92 |
| Community agencies provide services to students in need at or near our school. | 3.7 | .76 | 3.9 | .75 |
| I believe that my role at school include counseling students exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.6 | .98 | 3.7 | .96 |
| Needs/Resources  Scale Score | 3.4 | .45 | 3.5 | .46 |

Scale ranges 1 to 5: 1=Strongly disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neither agree nor disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree
*Questions for the "Perceived Needs and School Resources" scale were asked only on the Pre- and 3-Month Follow-Up Training Surveys.
**Standard Deviation (SD)

## Reports of Readiness:

| Identifying and Responding to Student Needs | Matched N=954 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=115 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Recognize when a student's behavior is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.4 | .81 | 4.1 | .68 | 3.9 | .77 |
| Recognize when a student's physical appearance is a sign of psychological distress. | 3.5 | .79 | 4.0 | .69 | 3.9 | .80 |
| Communicate with a student your concern about the signs of psychological distress they are exhibiting. | 3.3 | .88 | 4.1 | .68 | 3.8 | .82 |
| Motivate a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress to seek help. | 3.4 | .86 | 4.1 | .68 | 3.8 | .83 |
| Recommend mental health support services to a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.6 | .94 | 4.2 | .69 | 4.0 | .82 |
| Communicate with the parents of a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 3.2 | 1.01 | 3.9 | .82 | 3.7 | .93 |
| Identifying/Responding Scale Score | 3.4** | .75 | 4.1** | .63 | 3.8 | .73 |

Scale ranges from 1 to 5: 1=Very low, 2=Low, 3= Medium, 4=High, 5=Very high.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

| Staff Confidence | Matched N=954 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=115 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I feel confident in my ability to discuss my concerns with a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 2.9 | .63 | 3.3 | .53 | 3.2 | .53 |
| I feel confident in my ability to recommend mental health services to a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | 2.9 | .69 | 3.4 | .56 | 3.2 | .60 |
| I feel confident that I know where to refer a student for mental health support. | 2.9 | .70 | 3.3 | .55 | 3.1 | .64 |
| I feel confident in my ability to help a suicidal student seek help. | 2.8 | .70 | 3.3 | .57 | 3.1 | .59 |
| Part of the role of educators is to connect students experiencing psychological distress with mental health support services. | 3.2 | .57 | 3.4 | .57 | 3.3 | .51 |
| Confidence Scale Score | 2.9** | .52 | 3.3** | .50 | 3.2 | .46 |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)
**Statistically significant change (p<.001) from pre to post.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Training Follow-Up Survey

This section contains findings from the middle school staff who completed the *Follow-Up Survey* that is administered three months after the training is completed. Additional questions in the *Follow-Up Survey* focused on how staff utilized knowledge gained from the gatekeeper training to identify, approach, and refer students exhibiting signs of psychological distress.

## Reports of Staff Actions and Referrals

| Actions Resulting from the Training | 3-Month Follow-Up N=115 | |
|---|---|---|
| **As a result of taking the training, there has been an increase in the number of…** | **Mean** | **SD\*** |
| …students that I recognized as exhibiting signs of psychological distress. | **2.3** | .57 |
| …students that I approached to discuss my concern about their psychological distress. | **2.3** | .55 |
| …students that I referred for mental health support services. | **2.3** | .57 |
| …conversations I have had with other adults in my school community regarding students I am concerned about. | **2.6** | .65 |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

| Referrals to Mental Health Services | 3-Month Follow-Up N=115 |
|---|---|
| **Number of staff** who referred students to mental health services | **41** |
| **Number of staff** who knew if referred students received services | **22** |
| *Average* **number of students** referred by a staff member | **2.9** |
| **Number of students** referred to mental health services | **119** |
| **Number of students** who received services | **57** |

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Staff Actions and Referrals cont.

| Referrals to Mental Health Support Services* | |
|---|---|
| **Number of staff who referred students to the following services:** | **3-Month Follow-Up N=115** |
| School nurse | 25 |
| Mental health agency | 23 |
| Psychiatric hospital/unit | 7 |
| Emergency room | 4 |
| Substance abuse treatment center | 6 |
| School counselor | 65 |
| Private mental health practice | 11 |
| Mobile crisis unit | 5 |

*Staff may have selected more than one service.

| Effectiveness of Actions | |
|---|---|
| **Staff member's level of satisfaction that their actions taken on behalf of a student were effective:** | **3-Month Follow-Up N=115** |
| Very Dissatisfied | 2% |
| Dissatisfied | 5% |
| Satisfied | 85% |
| Very Satisfied | 8% |

## Conclusion:

Overall the findings are encouraging. Between June 2013 and June 2014, 1,261 middle school staff completed the *At-Risk for Middle School* gatekeeper training and reported an increased familiarity, and support of, the goals and objectives of the At-Risk Program at their school. Staff now strongly believe that if they address student problems in earlier grades, they may prevent or reduce problems in the future. As such, staff now report that they believe their role at the school includes counseling students exhibiting signs of psychological distress.

Staff reports of their readiness and confidence in identifying, approaching, and referring students exhibiting signs of psychological distress, also increased after participating in the interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper training in the following ways:

- **Identify:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy and preparedness to recognize when a student's behavior, or appearance, is a sign of psychological distress.
- **Approach:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to discuss their concerns both with a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress and with the student's parents.
- **Refer:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to know how, and where, to refer a student in psychological distress (or a suicidal student) for mental health support services and how to motivate that student to seek help.

Three months after completing the training, only 115 middle school staff (9%) completed a Follow-Up Survey and reported the following:

- 41 staff referred students for mental health services;
- 22 staff knew if the referred student received mental health services;
- 119 students were referred for mental health services;
- 57 students were known to have received services; and
- 93% of staff were satisfied that the actions they took on behalf of students were effective.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

# Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project

Impact of Attending an At-Risk Gatekeeper Training, Step In, Speak Up!
Comparison of Pre-, Post-, and Follow-Up Training Surveys

December 2014

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Introduction:

As part of the Illinois Youth Suicide Prevention Project (IYSPP), sponsored by the Illinois Department of Public Health, K-12 faculty and staff across the state were invited to participate in interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper trainings administered by Kognito Interactive. The goals of the training were to increase the understanding of challenges faced by LGBTQ youth, to practice techniques for creating a safer and more supportive environment (i.e., curtailing instances of harassment and use of homophobic language, and connecting with a student who has been the target of harassment), and to reduce the number of youth suicides. As such, the trainings focused staff on:

➢ **Responding** when a student makes a biased comment or expresses prejudice;
➢ **Intervening** when a LGBTQ student discloses that they are being teased, harassed, or bullied;
➢ **Approaching** psychologically distressed students to communicate concern and gain a better understanding of their behavior; and
➢ **Referring** psychologically distressed students for mental health support services.

After watching a tutorial, staff practiced and honed their strategies through a series of vignettes where their avatar was an educator interacting with students. Staff completed pre-, post-, and 3-month follow-up training surveys in order to measure:

- *Awareness and support of LGBTQ students and LGBTQ issues in school;*
- *Preparedness to assist psychologically distressed students;*
- *Confidence to assist psychologically distressed students;* and
- *Referrals made to connect psychologically distressed students with mental health services.*

This report includes all staff who participated in the *Step In, Speak UP!* gatekeeper training between July 2013 and October 2014, and completed both a pre- and post-training survey. The number of staff, who completed a 3-month follow-up training, was too low to include in this report. Future reports will contain findings from the 3-month training follow-up survey that includes questions about students referred for mental health support services since attending the training.

The Center for Prevention Research and Development (CPRD) at the University of Illinois serves as the evaluator for the IYSPP grant. CPRD analyzed and summarized all of the data included in this report

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Demographics:

| Number of Respondents | |
|---|---|
| Total Trained | 155 |
| Pre-Training Survey | 155 |
| Post-Training Survey | 124 |
| Matched Pre & Post | 112 |
| 3-Month Follow-Up Survey Only | 10* |

| Professional Role | |
|---|---|
| Middle or High School Teacher | 46% |
| University or College Faculty | 1% |
| Staff | 13% |
| Administrator | 4% |
| Other | 36% |

| Respondent Would Recommend Training to Colleagues | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 97% |
| No | 3% |

| Respondent Had Previous LGBTQ Anti-Harassment or Anti-Bullying Training | |
|---|---|
| Yes | 35% |
| No | 65% |

---

* The number of participants that completed the "3-Month Follow-Up Survey" was too low to report for the current reporting period. All data in the ensuing report tables will be omitted. Future reports will include this data once the number of respondents is high enough to report.

**CPRD**
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Awareness and Preparedness:

| Awareness and Support of LGBTQ Students on Campus | Matched N=112 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=10 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I am aware of the need to use gender-neutral language in the classroom. | 3.2 | .56 | 3.7 | .48 | NA | NA |
| I am knowledgeable about the common challenges facing the LGBTQ student population. | 3.0 | .66 | 3.6 | .51 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to manage discriminatory remarks in the classroom. | 3.3 | .53 | 3.6 | .50 | NA | NA |
| Part of the role of faculty, staff, and administrators is to help create a safe and supportive learning environment for LGBTQ students. | 3.6 | .49 | 3.7 | .48 | NA | NA |
| Part of the role of faculty, staff, and administrators is to connect LGBTQ students experiencing teasing, harassment, and bullying to support services or supportive staff. | 3.6 | .51 | 3.7 | .45 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

| Preparedness to Discuss LGBTQ Issues | Matched N=112 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=10 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Manage a student in your classroom who has used "fag," "gay," "'mo" or other derogatory language. | 3.7 | .95 | 4.4 | .61 | NA | NA |
| Discuss with a student your concern about their being teased, harassed, or bullied. | 3.9 | .80 | 4.5 | .60 | NA | NA |
| Connect a student who is being teased, harassed, or bullied to support services. | 4.2 | .77 | 4.5 | .60 | NA | NA |
| Use gender-neutral language in class. | 3.9 | .76 | 4.4 | .67 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 5: 1=Very low, 2=Low, 3= Medium, 4=High, 5=Very high.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Reports of Identifying, Approaching, and Referring:

| Likeliness to Address LGBTQ Issues | Matched N=112 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=10 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| Stop a class every time a student uses discriminatory language, such as "fag," "gay," "'mo," and others, to address the issue. | 3.3 | .66 | 3.6 | .49 | NA | NA |
| Discuss your concerns with a LGBTQ student who has been teased, harassed, or bullied. | 3.3 | .64 | 3.6 | .55 | NA | NA |
| Connect a student who is being teased, harassed, or bullied to support services. | 3.6 | .55 | 3.7 | .46 | NA | NA |
| After class, check to see if a teased, harassed, or bullied student is OK. | 3.6 | .49 | 3.7 | .49 | NA | NA |
| After class, talk with a student who has used discriminatory language. | 3.4 | .58 | 3.7 | .47 | NA | NA |
| Intervene if a LGBTQ student tells you that they are being teased, harassed, or bullied. | 3.5 | .54 | 3.7 | .45 | NA | NA |
| Communicate to your class that discriminatory language is not allowed. | 3.6 | .51 | 3.8 | .43 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 5: 1=Very unlikely, 2=Unlikely, 3=Likely, 4=Very likely.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

| Staff Confidence in Talking with a LGTBQ Student who is Being Teased, Harassed, or Bullied | Matched N=112 | | | | 3-Month Follow-Up N=10 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-Training | | Post-Training | | | |
| | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* | Mean | SD* |
| I feel confident in my ability to discuss my concerns with this student. | 3.3 | .56 | 3.6 | .50 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to help this student seek help if they are having thoughts of suicide. | 3.3 | .61 | 3.5 | .57 | NA | NA |
| I feel confident in my ability to connect this student to support services or a supportive staff member. | 3.5 | .56 | 3.7 | .46 | NA | NA |

Scale ranges from 1 to 4: 1=Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3= Agree, 4=Strongly agree.
*Standard Deviation (SD)

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

## Conclusion:

Overall the findings are encouraging. Between July 2013 and October 2014, 155 faculty and staff completed the *Step In, Speak Up!* gatekeeper training and reported an overall increased awareness and support of LGBTQ students, preparedness and likeliness to address LGBTQ issues, and confidence in talking with a LGBTQ student who is being teased, harassed, or bullied.

It is encouraging to note that even before the training, staff believed that collectively they had a responsibility to help create a safe and supportive learning environment for LGBTQ students, and to connect LGBTQ students experiencing teasing, harassment, and bullying to support services or supportive staff. Furthermore, before the training, staff were confident of the likelihood that they would: communicate to their class that discriminatory language is not allowed, check on a student after class who was being teased, harassed, or bullied to see if they were okay, and to connect them to support services if necessary.

Staff reports of their readiness and confidence in approaching and referring students exhibiting signs of psychological distress, also increased after participating in the interactive, avatar-based gatekeeper training in the following ways:

- **Approach:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to discuss their concerns with a student exhibiting signs of psychological distress.
- **Refer:** Staff reported higher levels of efficacy, preparedness, and confidence to refer a student in psychological distress (or a suicidal student) for mental health support services.

CPRD
INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS