

# House Bill 19 Teen Dating Violence Prevention: A Policy Brief

## Integrated Abstract Summaries

#331478 Post-Program Evaluation of Know Abuse: A Teen Dating Violence Prevention Program

#317162 Tina Croucher Act for Teen Dating Violence Prevention: A state level assessment of policy implementation

### Background

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) formally defines intimate partner violence (IPV) as “physical, sexual, or psychological harm by a current or former partner or spouse (Intimate Partner Violence 2015). With an average of 1 in 3 females experiencing dating violence, there is a need for preventive action (CDC, 2010). The state of Ohio passed House Bill 19 (HB19), the Tina Croucher Act, in December of 2009 and implementation began in 2010. The act was an effort to quell the rise of dating violence through prevention education. Because this is an unfunded mandate that is not rigidly enforced, the challenge lies in ensuring compliance or thorough fulfillment of its guidelines.

### HB19 Mandates

- Education: all public schools must incorporate dating violence prevention into health education curriculums for grades 7-12
- Policy: ten policy requirements were supposed to be incorporated into the Anti-Harassment policy of school handbooks

The State Legislation and Department of Education enact mandates on school districts that are charged with the regulation and enforcement of policy requirements through a top-down approach. Schools need a continuum of services to increase protective factors and reduce risk factors and use youth as positive role models for their peers (Ohio Department of Education, 2006). The Tina Croucher Act was designed to:

- Increase instruction in dating violence prevention
- Focus on recognition of abuse warning signs
- Develop skills to talk through issues and report abuse

### Policy Results

Tina’s Law was the first acknowledgement of the importance of incorporating dating violence prevention education into the health education curriculum of schools.

The primary outcomes from the analysis included:

- How school districts address the policy mandate;
- Degree of policy compliance;
- Which barriers limited schools’ compliance;
- Which factors increased likelihood of compliance;
- Policy recommendations

Figure 1. School sample of house bill 19 policy compliance

House Bill 19 Requirements	School Districts & Private Schools									Protocols	
	A	B	C*	D	E	F	G*	H	I	Met	Not Met
State what is prohibited	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	9	0
Definition of terms	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	6	3
Reporting procedures	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8	1
Assigned school designee	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	9	0
Parent notification	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8	1
Documentation	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8	1
Responding and investigating	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8	1
Retaliation protection strategies	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8	1
Disciplinary procedure	✓	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	8	1
District semiannually report	✗	✓	✗	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗	✓	6	3
<b>Protocols Met</b>	8	10	2	10	10	10	9	9	10		
<b>Protocols Not Met</b>	2	0	8	0	0	0	1	1	0		
<b>Grade</b>	B	A	F	A	A	A	A-	A-	A		
<b>Median Family Income</b>											
Less than 60K				✓	✓						
60-75K		✓						✓			
75-90K	✓										
Over 90K						✓			✓		

# House Bill 19 Teen Dating Violence Prevention: A Policy Brief

## Integrated Abstract Summaries

#331478 Post-Program Evaluation of Know Abuse: A Teen Dating Violence Prevention Program

#317162 Tina Croucher Act for Teen Dating Violence Prevention: A state level assessment of policy implementation

After reviewing the sample population, it was found:

- Having a Teen Dating Violence Prevention (TDVP) Program was associated with sufficient staffing, parental support, and a leader of implementation;
- Student awareness of staff members designated to handle TDVP matters depended upon sufficient teaching staff and funding;
- Student awareness of staff members designated to handle TDVP matters depended upon the influence of other schools' prevention efforts, Board of Education, and local politicians.

### Stakeholders

Data from surveys and in-person interviews confirmed that verbal and emotional abuse were the most commonly identified types of abuse in dating relationships.

- School-wide initiatives were implemented based on the following:
  - School-level interests of administrators and perceived needs;
  - Community-level influences (i.e. others schools, local administrators, local politicians);
  - Student engagement;
  - Parental support;
  - Available staffing trained on the subject matter;
  - Available funding

### Key Conclusions

- Mandated policy requirements are effective in changing written policy
- 85 percent of the public schools used a school board policy servicer
- Organizations should provide prevention resources/staff training in basic abuse counseling
- Partnerships that can impact school culture around dating violence prevention need to be developed and implemented annually

### Recommendations

The policy recommendations include:

- Compliancy checks on HB19
- Providing funding and grants to aid the growth of dating violence prevention education
- Develop a shared language regarding policy enforcement among schools
- Alleviate anti-harassment policy inconsistencies and their implementation through collection of more data on TDVP programming and outcomes examining the structure, process and consequences
- Conduct an evaluation of the impact of HB19

For more information and reference citations please contact the researchers: Katarina Gardner (kkg13@case.edu), Vidya Gogineni (vxg84@case.edu), or Mendel Singer (mendel@case.edu). Case Western Reserve University 10900 Euclid Ave Cleveland, OH 44106.