UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA National Center for Free Speech and Civic Engagement

2020-2021 Fellows Research
Update: Summer 2024

Tweets, Threats, and Censorship:
Campus Resources to Support Faculty Through Incidents of Targeted Harassment

*by **Nina M. Flores, PhD***
Associate Professor, Equity, Education & Social Justice, California State University Long Beach
Contact: Nina.Flores@csulb.edu

Introduction

Do you know faculty who have experienced targeted harassment by the public? According to *Inside Higher Ed*, "If this hasn't happened to someone on your campus yet, chances are it will." And the consequences have serious implications for free speech and faculty safety: an overall silencing effect, self-censorship, and threats of harm and violence. As high-profile political conflict continues to emerge via social media, a growing form of harassment looms posing a specific threat to university faculty: the targeted harassment of faculty.

Targeted harassment of faculty occurs when groups, organizations, or individuals engage in aggressive viral campaigns that are directed at faculty members. Such efforts might include a flood of contact via email, messaging, and social media, with the potential of escalating to include threats of violence, rape, or death. Harassment may also come in the form of phone calls and messages, letters or mail pieces, and in-person acts of intimidation. Targeted harassment may originate from the faculty member's teaching materials, class lectures, research presentations, area of expertise, social media posts, personal identity markers, presence on professor watchlist sites, public appearances, or as a potential peril of engaging in public scholarship.

Threats to physical, emotional, and online safety have dire implications for both free speech on campus, and for publicly engaged scholars. The resulting "silencing effect" is two-fold: first, the potential self-censorship by the person who is targeted, followed by the potential for self-censorship by others who may witness and want to avoid these attacks. Both impact the ability for faculty to fully engage in academia, the profession, and with the public. Faculty should not have to navigate incidents of targeted harassment alone, and what follows is a series of interactive training sessions designed as a campus resource to better support faculty.

About the Sessions

The urgency for campuses to better support faculty through incidents of targeted harassment is undeniable. Below is a campus resource that consists of sample training sessions created to support campus constituents as they learn about and make plans to address this issue. I design and lead versions of these sessions tailored to the specific needs of colleges and universities across the country. I'm happy to come facilitate these sessions on your campus, and it is my hope that in the meantime I can these materials as you begin having these important conversations with colleagues, in departments, and among leadership teams. Each session outline includes goals, background based in my research, and sample dialogue questions, activities, and facilitator preparation notes.

These sessions are intended as building blocks for creating a training or workshop series that best suits the needs of an individual campus and their faculty. The importance of tailoring a training to meet specific campus needs about this evolving issue is twofold. First, the wide variation of ways in which faculty experience targeted harassment by members of the public, along with the ways campuses respond, suggests that a one-size-fits-all training misses the mark. For instance, incidents of targeted harassment can occur within the context of ongoing campus dynamics or may have a specific regional focus. Likewise, colleges and universities take vastly different approaches to acknowledging, understanding, and responding to the issue. Therefore, it is essential that campuses can draw on the content that meets their needs, while engaging in a format that works best for their community.

Second, identifying the best ways to support faculty through these incidents, as well as to reduce or mitigate the negative implications related to safety, silencing, self-censorship, and more, requires acknowledging the asymmetry of knowledge that exists around this issue. The content included here is meant to scaffold trainings, workshops, and dialogue through which members of the campus community can share experiences, knowledge, strategies, and work toward the co-construction of a path forward that works best for the campus.

Although it would be ideal to approach and address this issue by developing a campus-wide initiative or centering this issue as an administrative priority, we know this isn't the case on many campuses. The research for this project revealed that faculty have very different experiences: some have the support of a senior-level administration team willing to take this issue head on, while others relied on department chairs when top-level support was absent. Still others turned to an informal constellation of colleagues, friends, and family at home when official campus support was absent. This resource is meant to meet campus needs, and to be used at any level. For instance, if top level administrative support is not an option, then it's easy to apply these sessions at the department level during faculty meetings or as a professional development series. If the campus climate feels unsafe for these discussions, then use these ideas with a small group of trusted colleagues.

Lastly, research for this project suggests that participants should include a mix of constituents: university representatives, faculty and staff members, union leaders to provide a mix of institutional knowledge.

The Research

The content of these sessions is informed by the findings of a qualitative research study. The key research questions guiding the study inquired about the experiences of faculty who experienced targeted harassment by the public, the forms of support they received through the duration of the incident, and the implications for silencing or self-censorship.

To meet the criteria for participation, faculty must have experienced harassment by members of the public, and they must have experienced an escalation in that harassment. The researcher contacted potential participants via email when their harassment stories were featured in publications such as *The Chronicle of Higher Education* or *Inside Higher Ed*, or if their stories reached news outlets. Additionally, the researcher used personal networks and snowball sampling to reach out to additional participants. Dozens of potential participants did not meet the criteria for this study for one of two reasons: 1) because the harassment they experienced was by one or two known individuals who routinely engage with them (i.e. not the public at large), 2) the harassment did not escalate, or 3) because the harassment they experienced was not from members of the public, but rather from other people on campus, whether from other faculty members, administrators, staff, or even students. Harassment by individuals on the same campus is not the focus here because there are often on-campus avenues for addressing this behavior; conversely, when faculty are harassed by members of the public there are fewer options.

The final participants were from public and private institutions, and included 12 full and part-time lecturers, as well as tenure-track and tenured professors. They ranged in age from early 30s to those considering retirement. Participants were from fields including political science, law, sociology, psychology, philosophy, Chicano/Latino studies, and interdisciplinary scholars. More than half of the participants had families or partners who they lived with during the time of the harassment.

Participants completed in-depth interviews that lasted between 60 and 90 minutes. The interview protocol explored triggers for harassment, the types of harassment experienced, the stages of handling and processing the incident, official and unofficial sources of support, the post-incident experience of self-censorship or silencing, and lessons learned for future faculty. A second part of the research design involved reviewing existing campus policies about targeted harassment.

A significant finding is that there is no one-size-fits-all approach to understanding this issue, and as such, the sessions that follow do not contain pre-recorded videos or pre-set PowerPoint slides. Instead, each consists of session goals, research-based content as background for the session, sample activities and dialogue questions, along with facilitator preparation notes. Facilitators who are knowledgeable about the issue are key – if you are looking for a partner in this work, please feel free to reach out to me.

Table of Contents

Session 1: Understanding the Issue – What is Targeted Harassment? 5

Session 2: How Faculty are Targeted and the Targeted Harassment Cycle 7

Session 3: Responding in Real Time 9

Session 4: Unofficial and/or Informal Sources of Support 11

Session 5: Official and/or Formal Sources of Support 12

Session 6: Silencing and Self-Censorship Implications 13

Session 7: Campus Asset Mapping Workshop 14

Conclusion: Supporting Faculty, In Their Own Words 16

Session 1: Understanding the Issue – What is Targeted Harassment?

Goals of this session:

- Identify the different types of targeted harassment faculty may encounter
- Identify the drivers of targeted harassment
- Identify ways in which power dynamics are present in targeted harassment

Background:

Faculty members who experience targeted harassment by members of the public report enduring many different types of harassment, whether through social media, email, the mail, phone calls and messages, or other mechanisms. Faculty can be targeted based on their class lectures, video of their research talks, their writing, screenshots of their social media posts, public appearances, and more. Harassment varies based on the faculty member's gender, age, race, region of the country, and perceptions about other identity markers such as immigration status or religion.

Several faculty members expressed concern that department or college staff might be subjected to phone calls and emails, which points to the need for ensuring that staff are included in trainings and have access to campus support resources. In addition to the different types of harassment directed at faculty, what drives targeted harassment is also of concern. Several faculty members identified specific ideological factors as the main drivers behind their harassment. For instance, one person noted that they've been the target of "cancel attempts on the left and the right," each with their own brand of ideological positioning.

Targeted harassment is also experienced differently based on privilege, positionality, and campus power dynamics. For instance, participants shared the ways in which identity markers related to sex, gender, sexual orientation, race, religion, and immigration status were used against them as part of their harassment. In some cases, misperceptions or assumptions about their identities fueled their harassers. Other participants were quick to acknowledge the privileges they held and noted that their positionality as part of a dominant group meant they weren't subjected to the same types of harassment.

Campus or academic ladder power dynamics also play a role in how faculty respond to harassment. For example, lecturers and faculty without tenure expressed different concerns about job security, continuing forward progress toward tenure while navigating and processing the overwhelming experience of targeted harassment, and whether they were at risk of being perceived as a problem because they were untenured. It's worth noting that even some tenured faculty shared these same concerns; however, several of these faculty acknowledged that they felt protected by tenure and were grateful this incident didn't happen while they were still working toward tenure.

Facilitator Preparation:

Facilitators must be familiar with the range of harassment that is possible, along with the ideological drivers of harassment, so that they can answer questions as necessary. As an opening activity, take some time to set community agreements and communication guidelines with the group – these are heavy topics, and it is important to set expectations for how the group should communicate. Next, move into the discussion questions to facilitate a group dialogue. Also, as facilitator you must have a plan in place for if someone divulges their own experience with targeted harassment – how will you support them in that moment, what is your follow up plan, and what resources are available?

Sample Activities:

1) Setting community agreements. Working together as a group, take some time to set community agreements and communication guidelines with each other. How do you want to engage in dialogue and activities around these issues? What are your expectations? How will you handle conflict if it arises within the group? Some examples might include respecting confidentiality, being open to trying on new ideas, using "I" statements, or speaking for yourself instead of using generalizations.
2) Small group dialogue. In small groups take time to consider the following questions:
    a. Have you heard about the issue of targeted harassment before? If so, what was your understanding of the issue?
    b. How would you describe targeted harassment to someone who is unfamiliar with the concept?
    c. Have you or anyone you know experienced targeted harassment by members of the public?
    d. What does learning about these experiences bring up for you?
    e. What stands out to you about the drivers of targeted harassment incidents?
    f. Think about your role on campus, and the power dynamics attached to being staff, faculty, lecturer, or tenured professor. Are there areas in which you hold more power and privilege, and others where you hold less? Do you think your position might affect whether you report targeted harassment or how you deal with the issue?

Session 2: How Faculty Are Targeted and the Targeted Harassment Cycle

Goals of this session:

- Identify the ways in which a faculty member might be targeted
- Learn about the Targeted Harassment Cycle
- Examine variations of the Targeted Harassment Cycle
- Applying the Targeted Harassment Cycle to recent incidents

Background:

Faculty may experience targeted harassment for different reasons, and through a variety of mechanisms. For instance, faculty may find themselves included on professor watchlists, or the subject of articles or posts by "watchdog" groups or organizations that purport to identify alleged bias in higher education. Faculty may also experience recurring harassment following an incident. One participant shared that she is targeted routinely because "people have email alerts set for when my OpEds are released." After an initial OpEd drew attention, readers were able to set an alert for whenever future OpEds by this faculty member were published.

In another example a faculty member experienced what they called "low level incidents" for several years before finally being targeted in a way that drew regional and then national attention. Another participant noted that they believed they were targeted for research, teaching, and talking about race and white supremacy, what they referred to as "trigger words" for some members of the public.

Faculty may also experience harassment through the concept of piling on, meaning that once an incident goes viral, then organizations, high profile individuals (or political influencers), or blogs and other websites draw attention to the individual. This creates potentially exponential results due to the viral nature of the harassment coupled with the efforts of powerful organizations and influential figures online. For instance, one participant said they knew the harassment would continue piling on once Rush Limbaugh started dropping their name on his show and on social media. This example points to the power and influence of a political media figure such as Rush Limbaugh, as well as the way in which harassment shifts based on identity, or in this case even perceptions about one's identity. She went on to share that initially Limbaugh complained about the research, but once he realized she was a woman, his attacks and the harassment she received became explicitly gendered and sexist.

Based on faculty interviews and analyzing incidents of targeted harassment that made the news in recent years, most incidents appear to follow a similar trajectory, which is described below as the Targeted Harassment Cycle. First, faculty described how their harassment incidents unfolded in the following ways.

The first step of the Targeted Harassment Cycle is when incidents begin through *sharing*, a general term for when class materials, research products, writing, social media posts, or footage of a presentation or lecture is captured on video or through a screenshot and disseminated online. However, the sharing alone isn't enough to produce targeted harassment on a large scale. The second step is when an outrage narrative is attached to what the faculty member has said, written, or posted. An *outrage narrative* consists of a politicized message that is used to attract attention from members of the public. This might include clear for and against positions, or language that is meant to trigger the receiver.

From here, the next step of the Targeted Harassment Cycle is *escalation*. An incident can escalate immediately or might be a slow build over time. The escalation period itself might be short, for instance lasting the duration of a live television appearance or might last several weeks as a story gains traction, goes viral, and receives more media coverage from different types of outlets. Additionally, there might be several rounds of escalation. For example, one faculty member noted that their experience included what they described as several escalation "peaks" meaning the story went viral several times over the course of a few months. The last step of the cycle is when escalation produces *threats of violence*. Whether via email, social media, mail, or phone, threats of violence may include death threats, rape threats, or the suggestion of other explicitly violent acts, sometimes even aimed at their families.

In a few cases, faculty noted that the *sharing* and sometimes even the *outrage* narrative stages were fueled by a student, or the efforts of a campus organization, which then produced the foundation necessary for escalating harassment by the public.

Facilitator Preparation:

Facilitator selects a few recent news stories about incidents of targeted harassment from a mix of stories from places like *The Chronicle of Higher Education* and *Inside Higher Ed*, as well as local, regional, and national news outlets. Instead of drawing renewed attention to the actual story link, please take time before the workshop to develop anonymized scenarios of each story that you can then share with participants. Again, be sure to have a support plan for if a participant shares a harassment experience.

Sample Activity:

Now that you understand how the Targeted Harassment Cycle works, let's take some time to apply this concept to recent targeted harassment incidents. Take a moment to read through the anonymized stories of targeted harassment. Working with a small group, talk through the incident, and identify and map out each stage of the Targeted Harassment Cycle. How did the incident unfold? What was the trigger moment, meaning the item that was shared that kickstarted the harassment? Can you name the outrage narrative? What type of narrative is fueling the outrage? How did the incident escalate? Were there threats involved? Is there any information about how the campus responded?

Session 3: Responding to Safety Concerns in Real Time

Goals of this session:

- Learn what faculty members experienced as targeted harassment unfolded
- Identify strategies faculty members used as they responded in real time
- Identify the range of personal safety concerns targeted faculty may face
- Brainstorm ways in which your university could better address these safety concerns
- Name specific strategies you would use if you experienced targeted harassment

Background:

Faculty who experienced targeted harassment were asked to recall how they handled the incident, and to walk through the steps or stages of their response. Many people noted the changes in their responses as the incident unfolded and had specific recollections about the complex and wide-ranging emotions during this process. For instance, participants relayed experiencing shock, fear, anger, humiliation, and worry, as well as immediate concerns related to their families, their work, and their professional careers. For many, the most pressing concern was scrambling to remove their personal information online.

Numerous faculty members reported using a service like DeleteMe, which for an annual fee will remove your personal or private information from search engines and data broker sites. Although some faculty expressed that they felt safer knowing that personal information such as their home address was no longer readily available, others wondered whether using these services might also decrease their visibility in general, especially as public scholars. One participant noted that “it’s hard to strike a balance with being a public scholar,” while another shared the tension between meeting campus expectations of being a publicly engaged scholar when support from the university during harassment is absent.

Nearly all faculty members interviewed for this project expressed that at some point they experienced concern for their personal safety, the safety of their families, or the safety of other people on campus (i.e. students, office staff). For some, perceptions about the lack of safety corresponded with the timeline of the incident unfolding; for others, safety concerns remained even after the incident had passed. When asked about how they handled safety concerns, some participants said that they went the police, while others shared the FBI contacted them. Many participants admitted that they were left handling this on their own, with zero support from their campuses.

Faculty also shared strategies they used in response to these concerns, or in an attempt to increase their sense of safety. Strategies included “document, document, document”, enlisting friends and colleagues to take screenshots of evidence online, changing their routes to and from campus, shutting down all online accounts, and even leaving their job and moving to a different state.

Facilitator Preparation: Facilitator must familiarize themselves with targeted harassment experiences and strategies used by individuals and be ready to engage participants in dialogue. Facilitator must also familiarize themselves with the safety concerns noted by faculty and be prepared to answer questions related to campus-specific details. This may mean anticipating what participants will want to know about safety implications and resources on campus. Remind participants about communication guidelines – acknowledge that these are heavy experiences to discuss. And have your support plan ready for if a participant shares an experience with targeted harassment.

Sample Activities:

1) Take some time to journal or quick write about the following prompts:
    a. What are you feeling as you're learning about these experiences?
    b. If you or someone you knew experienced targeted harassment, what strategies would you use as the incident unfolded? What is the first thing you would do? Who would you turn to on your campus for support? Why? Who wouldn't you turn to? Why?
2) In small groups, take time to share your responses.
    a. What comes up for you as you're talking about strategies and support?
    b. Who are the people you would approach for support?
    c. Are there similarities in the strategies you'd use? Are there differences? What do you make of these similarities and differences?
3) This activity has three parts:
    a. In pairs take some time to reflect and share your thoughts on the safety concerns you've learned about today. How do you feel learning about these experiences? Have you or anyone you know had similar experiences? What stood out to you? Be prepared to share out with the larger group.
    b. Next, in small groups brainstorm ways in which you believe your campus could address these safety concerns. What existing resources can you think of that could be leveraged to support faculty through these incidents? What resources do you think are needed?
    c. Lastly, we're going to take some time to be prepared and plan ahead. If you experienced targeted harassment, what personal safety strategies would you use? What would be your biggest concern?
    d. Share out as a large group

Session 4: Official and/or Formal Sources of Support

Goals of this session:

- Learn about official and/or formal sources of university support
- Learn about faculty experiences with (or absence of) official and/or formal sources of support
- Brainstorm and name specific official or formal strategies you would like to see on campus

Background:

During targeted harassment two distinct categories of support emerge: 1) official or formal sources of support from the campus, and 2) unofficial or informal sources of support. Here we'll focus on official or formal sources of support. This category includes official university responses, efforts from campus police, and formal support on campus.

Faculty who had positive experiences with official or formal sources of university support referenced engaging with campus police, or identified specific individuals in administration who they perceived as offering tangible support. On the other hand, faculty in equal numbers reported a complete absence of official support from their campus, or negative experiences with campus police and administrators. Several participants who were part of their faculty union expressed the need for more formalized union protections around issues related to academic freedom, censorship, and the overall issue of targeted harassment. As one person said, "I know this may not seem as pressing as salary concerns, but we need to add these issues to our union agenda – we need policy around this!"

Facilitator Preparation:

Facilitator must be familiar with and able to answer participant questions about official or formal support policies, approaches, and resources on campus. If these answers are unavailable, or if there are no formal or official sources of support, then facilitate a dialogue around this absence before moving into brainstorming strategies participants would like to see on campus.

Sample Activities:

1) In small groups, take time to identify and discuss formal or official sources of support available on your campus – or the lack thereof.
    a. What do you think experiences with targeted harassment are like on your campus?
    b. What types of formal or official support do you think are available to faculty (and staff)?
    c. Do you think this support is different depending on your role on campus? How so?
    d. Do you think official or formal support is different depending on privilege, and campus power dynamics?
2) What specific strategies would you like to see in terms of official or formal support?

Session 5: Unofficial and/or Informal Sources of Support

Goals of this session:

- Learn about faculty experiences with unofficial and/or informal sources of support during targeted harassment
- Brainstorm and name specific ways in which you could support a friend or colleague.

Background:

During experiences of targeted harassment, two distinct categories of support emerge: 1) official or formal sources of support from the campus, and 2) unofficial or informal sources of support. Here we'll focus on unofficial or informal sources of support.

Nearly every faculty member reported that they relied on informal or unofficial support as they navigated the experience of targeted harassment. When asked what kinds of unofficial or informal sources of support they relied on, faculty shared about family, local friend networks, select colleagues, online groups, online resources, neighbors, and friends from grad school who may now live far away.

Several participants shared that the silence from their colleagues – who faculty acknowledged may not have known what to say – led to feeling isolated in their departments. As one participant shared, "just send the email that says, 'I don't know what to say', it's better than the nothing I received."

Several participants expressed feeling guilty or concerned that their informal networks of friends and family had to endure this harassment with them. Additionally, some participants noted that they talked with an off-campus counselor or therapist because there were very few on-campus counseling resources available to faculty. In this sense, the absence of a formal or official support program left faculty with no choice but to find support beyond the campus.

Facilitator Preparation:

Facilitator should familiarize themselves with the concerns noted by faculty and be prepared to answer questions, including about related topics such as formal/official campus support.

Activities:

1) In small groups, take time to discuss your experiences with informal or unofficial support.
    a. What types of informal or unofficial support do you think are available to you?
    b. Do you think this support is different depending on your role at home, or your connection to the area (i.e. are you new to the region? Did you move for work?).
    c. Do you think unofficial or informal support is different depending on privilege, and campus power dynamics?
2) Take some time to brainstorm about informal or unofficial ways you could support friends or colleagues experiencing targeted harassment. Share out with the large group.

Session 6: Silencing and Self-Censorship Implications

Goals of this session:

- Identify the ways in which experiencing targeted harassment impacts how faculty teach, research, and engage publicly, such as through silencing or self-censorship.
- Explore the ways in which fear of potential harassment might shape how faculty teach, research, and engage publicly.

Background:

Many faculty participants shared that the experience of targeted harassment, and the subsequent threats to their safety and the safety of their families, led them to alter their teaching, research, and public engagement. For some people this meant self-editing, self-censoring, second guessing phrasing or terms, and putting an end to public engagement.

One participant noted a key difference between how he perceived silencing versus self-censorship, saying that he experienced both in different ways after experiencing targeted harassment. For him, silencing happened first. Initially, he refused to engage around a specific issue out of fear for his family. Then, he slowly began self-censoring, which he described as adjusting how he spoke about certain topics, choosing his words carefully to avoid any possible way his thoughts could be misconstrued.

Facilitator Preparation: The facilitator will need large sheets of poster paper, or large flip chart sheets that can stick to the wall, along with post-it notes. There should be three posters on the wall: one labeled Issues, one labeled Words, and one labeled Phrases. Participants should be given post-it notes to use for the activity.

Sample Activity:

1) Think about your teaching, research, and/or public engagement. Are there issues, words, or phrases that you avoid using due to the potential for misunderstanding, being misconstrued, or because you've received actual backlash or harassment?
2) Take a moment to think about what these issues, words, or phrases might be in your own teaching, research, or public engagement. Write them down on the post-it notes and add them to the posters.
3) Once everyone has had a chance to add their contributions, take some time to walk around and review the posters.
4) Large group discussion: What have people said? How might this affect effective teaching, research, or engagement? Do you see evidence of silencing? Do you see evidence of self-censorship?

Session 7: Campus Asset Mapping Workshop

Goals of this workshop:

- Identifying campus resources for supporting people through incidents of targeted harassment
- Mapping these campus resources to create a visual of support
- Creating individual asset maps
- Creating an asset "wish list"
- Activating assets

Background:

The activities in this session are designed for use at multiple scales: campus, college, department, committee, or group of individuals. Asset mapping is a tool used across disciplines and professions to identify assets that are available to a community. Examples of assets include, but are not limited to, people, services, connections, resources, talents, skills, certifications, and access to meeting spaces.

Facilitator Preparation:

Facilitators should have stations set up around the room where participants can work in small groups. Each station should include physical copies of a campus map (preferably with buildings labeled) that participants can write or draw on. If possible, an editable version of the map should be projected so that one facilitator can compile all of the assets identified by participants into one digital copy that can be shared. The asset "wish list" will be created as a large group, co-constructed by using white boards and giving each participant a dry erase marker, or by using poster paper. Blank sheets of printer paper can be used to create individual asset maps.

Pre-workshop, facilitators should develop basic role play scenarios that are appropriate or timely based on recent incidents or the climate on your campus. For instance, facilitators might choose participants to read specific scripts (i.e. a part time lecturer who is worried about job security following a targeted harassment incident, or a faculty member who is concerned about their safety). Alternatively, the facilitators may take turns doing the role play and talking participants through the experience. This will be a chance for participants to "try on" what it looks to activate assets, to make asks for resources, or to practice supporting colleagues through these experiences.

Sample Activities:

1) Campus Asset Mapping. First, in small groups participants will brainstorm the assets they see available to them in the campus community during an incident of targeted harassment. Remember, examples of assets include, but are not limited to, people, services, connections, resources, talents, skills, certifications, and access to meeting spaces. Assets can be formal or official sources of support, or can be informal and unofficial networks of support that exist

within the campus. Be creative – what assets might be untapped? Unrecognized? Only used by certain groups on campus? Also, consider the needs of staff members and students. Second, each group will take a copy of the campus map and physically map these assets and their locations onto the campus map. Lastly, one facilitator will compile all the assets the groups come up with and create a final Campus Asset Map.

2) Creating individual asset maps. This activity applies the concept of Asset Mapping to an individual scale. Each participant will get time to create their own individual map of assets available to them, whether from their personal, academic, or professional lives. Using blank paper, map out the assets you have access to, the people or places you turn to for support, care, and guidance. On a personal level this might include family, religious spaces, therapists, or personal skills that support self-care regimens. At a professional level this might include colleagues on campus, people from professional organizations, or mentors. Your individual asset maps are meant as a preparation resource, in hopes that you'll never need to use them.
3) Creating an asset "wish list". For this activity the large group will brainstorm assets they believe should be available to faculty, students, and staff during incidents of targeted harassment. Remember, be creative! Either a facilitator or a participant can write the asset list wish on a white board or a flip chart so that all participants can see and discuss them simultaneously. After the list is complete, take a moment to reflect and plan: What would it take to make the items on this wish list a reality? How do we get there?
4) Activating Assets. For this activity participants will have a chance to engage in role play to "try on" what it looks to activate assets, to make asks for resources, or to practice supporting colleagues through these experiences. Facilitators will walk participants through several scenarios, and after each scene the group will consider the following questions:
    - How would you respond to a colleague who is having this experience?
    - How might the scenario be different if that colleague was untenured? Or a lecturer? Or a staff member?
    - How might your response change if your colleague was experiencing racialized harassment? Gender-based harassment? Harassment for their actual or perceived sexual orientation? Immigration status? Religion?
    - How might you use the Campus Asset Map as a resource to support this colleague?
    - How could you draw on your personal asset map to support this colleague?

Conclusion: Supporting Faculty, In Their Own Words

Research about the targeted harassment of faculty is ongoing, and future studies are needed to help further our understanding, develop more effective strategies at institutional and individual levels, and to better inform policy making. For instance, in this study reviewing existing campus policies and procedures about the issue of targeted harassment provided few concrete answers, but instead raised important and necessary questions about what such policies should include, who the policy is meant to serve, whether the policy exists to support faculty or as a protective measure for the campus, and whether policies are followed during incidents of targeted harassment. A future study could include interviews with faculty members who work for campuses with these policies in place *and* who experienced targeted harassment. Such a study could reveal more about whether the campus followed the policy during an incident, whether the policy was effective as designed, and importantly whether the faculty member felt supported through the policy.

One thing we do know: faculty need better support when experiencing targeted harassment, and in the aftermath. As a closing question during their interviews, faculty were asked about what they needed during that time, the types of support they wished they had, and what advice they might offer other faculty who are facing similar situations. Here they are in their own words.

- "It is so, so simple for universities to make these experiences easier for faculty. We shouldn't have to endure this on our own."
- "We need a more systematic messaging strategy – no one should have to message away their own harassment, or rely on vague university language."
- "Please, please start addressing this issue during the new faculty orientation. I can guarantee you this issue is not going away."
- "Remember that this affects students, too. They need support because sometimes we're experiencing joint harassment where both faculty and students are targeted."
- "Our academic affairs VPs need to be on it. Right now no one seems to know what to do."
- "Every campus needs to address the Academic Freedom issues. Safety is front and center as it should be, but Academic Freedom is everything."
- "Campuses need to make public statements immediately in support of faculty, Academic Freedom, the exchange of ideas, etc. Stop throwing faculty under the bus."
- "Remember to tell yourself 'it's not about me.' When I look back at some of the tweets and messages over the years, this is about something much bigger than me. This is anti-intellectualism and hate watching and being a placeholder for other issues."
- "Document everything! Document, document, document. Take screenshots. Enlist friends to be on the lookout. You never know what will be important, and you never know what someone might delete. Screenshot."

- "Take a look at your social media set-up now, before an incident. What's private, what isn't? Clean up your friends list. I was scrambling as things were unfolding and it was an added stress."
- "I was so overwhelmed, I needed emotional support, even for small logistics."
- "You know what I could have used? An email review service. Someone who would just glance through the inbox and delete or file away the nasty messages."
- "DeleteMe is a lifesaver."
- **"I can tell you exactly what I needed: Support, and lots of it."**