

Summary of the 2025 Student Human Rights Situation Survey

I. Purpose of the Survey

This report presents the results of the 2025 Human Rights Status Survey conducted among enrolled students at the KDI School of Public Policy and Management. The purpose of the survey is to assess students' levels of human rights and gender sensitivity and to identify the prevalence, types, and underlying factors of human rights violations occurring on campus.

Given the School's unique demographic profile—where international students comprise 41.6% of the total student body—the survey includes a comparative analysis of domestic and international students. While overall human rights awareness is relatively high, the findings reveal ongoing challenges such as cultural friction, limited trust in reporting procedures, and insufficient protective measures. These patterns highlight the need for a stronger and more preventive institutional human rights system.

The findings provide critical evidence to guide the School's human rights policy development. Specifically, they indicate the need to strengthen preventive education, enhance victim-centred protection mechanisms, and improve the accessibility and credibility of reporting channels to address the vulnerabilities identified in the survey.

II. Survey Overview

- **Target:** All 701 master's and doctoral students enrolled at the KDI School of Public Policy and Management (as of October 29, 2025)¹⁾
- **Survey Period:** October 1–30, 2025
- Number of **Respondents:** 286 students(▲16 from the previous year)
- **Response Rate:** 40.8%(286 of 701²⁾) (▲0.8 from the previous year)
- **Method of Survey:** Online survey administered via Google Forms

1) All enrolled students as of October 29th, 2025

2) Excluding those on a leave of absence.

III. Summary of Survey Results

1. Demographic and Cultural Characteristics

The 2025 Human Rights Status Survey was administered online throughout October 2025 and targeted the full population of 701 enrolled master's and doctoral students at the KDI School of Public Policy and Management. A total of 286 students completed the survey, resulting in a response rate of 40.8%. This marks an increase of 16 respondents and a 0.8% rise compared with the previous year, indicating a higher level of engagement and a stronger willingness among students to articulate their perceptions of human rights conditions on campus.

The demographic composition of respondents shows that 60.5% identified as female and 39.5% as male. Age distribution was concentrated among students in their 30s (45.8%) and 20s (36.4%). Master's students accounted for a substantial majority (95.4%), while doctoral students represented 4.5% of the sample.

The cultural and regional composition of respondents highlights the School's distinctly international profile. Korean students constituted 39.1% of participants, followed by students from Southeast Asia (24.1%) and Africa (21.0%). This multicultural representation illustrates the institution's role as a global policy school and reflects the diverse learning environment characteristic of its academic community.

Overall, the results confirm that the KDI School maintains a highly multicultural and internationally integrated academic environment. The distribution of respondents—39.1% from Korea, 24.1% from Southeast Asia, and 21.0% from Africa—aligns with the School's longstanding identity as a globally oriented graduate institution. While the demographic composition remains broadly consistent with the previous year, the increase in the number of respondents (from 270 to 286) demonstrates improved participation and a growing interest in institutional human rights governance. This heightened engagement signals an opportunity for the School to strengthen its human rights policies, expand culturally responsive programming, and tailor support systems to a diverse student population.

2. Human Rights Sensitivity

Levels of human rights and gender sensitivity, as assessed through self-evaluation items, were generally high across the respondent group. On a five-point scale, the average score for human rights sensitivity was 4.35, gender sensitivity 4.24, and interest in international human rights issues 4.18—all falling within the “high” range. Notably, international students recorded significantly higher levels of interest in global human rights issues than domestic students (4.19 vs. 3.66), and their overall human rights and gender sensitivity scores were likewise marginally higher. These results suggest that students from diverse national and cultural backgrounds tend to demonstrate higher awareness of, and stronger engagement with, international human rights and gender-related issues.

The composite indices, however, showed a mild decline from the previous year. The aggregated human rights sensitivity score (36.8 out of 50) and gender sensitivity score (73.98 out of 90) were both slightly lower than in 2024. Response patterns indicate that, while a majority of students strongly endorsed principles such as “the rights of others are as valuable as my own,” many also expressed critical views regarding practices such as spreading personal rumours, corporal punishment, victim-blaming, tolerance of sexual jokes, and treating silence as consent. These trends suggest that although normative awareness of human rights and gender equality is firmly established, actual behaviours and relational dynamics within academic and organisational settings remain more complex and context-dependent.

When asked about perceived causes of human rights violations, 46.9% of respondents identified “lack of understanding about human rights violations” as the most salient factor. This was followed by “differences in understanding others” (17.1%), “cultural differences” (12.2%), “insufficient punitive measures” (9.4%), and “unequal organisational culture” (8.0%). Domestic students more frequently attributed violations to insufficient understanding and interpersonal differences, whereas international students more strongly emphasised cultural differences and the inadequacy of sanctions. This divergence illustrates how interpretations of human rights issues vary according to students’ sociocultural backgrounds and prior experiences.

✎ In summary, overall human rights sensitivity remained high. The 2025 self-assessment average of 4.35 represents a 0.08-point increase from the previous year. International students again recorded a higher level (4.36) than domestic students (4.16), suggesting relatively heightened sensitivity among international students. Given that human rights sensitivity declined modestly in 2024, the

increase observed in 2025 may reflect expanded access to human rights education and broader participation in such programmes.

3. Gender Sensitivity

Survey responses regarding the perceived causes of violations of sexual autonomy—including sexual harassment and sexual violence—indicate that students view both institutional and sociocultural factors as central drivers. The most frequently cited causes were “insufficient punitive measures” (31.1%) and “lack of understanding of human rights violations” (30.4%). Additional factors identified included “differences in understanding others” (12.2%) and “cultural differences” (11.5%). Domestic students tended to emphasise institutional shortcomings, particularly insufficient sanctions and inadequate understanding, whereas international students highlighted cultural differences alongside limited understanding. These findings suggest that gaps in institutional deterrence, coupled with divergent cultural norms regarding sexual autonomy, may contribute to tensions and actual instances of gender-based violations.

A majority of respondents (80.1%) reported previous experience with human rights education, indicating that most students had received such instruction before entering the School. The most common format was a blended model combining online and offline modalities (49.8%), followed by online-only (31.0%) and offline-only (19.2%). Motivations for participation varied: the most frequently cited was mandatory participation (52.3%), followed by job relevance (34.1%) and general interest in human rights (13.1%). Notably, although more than half participated because the training was required, 68.6% reported that it improved their human rights awareness. When neutral responses are included, more than 90% recognised at least some educational benefit. These results indicate that even compulsory training can produce meaningful learning outcomes when its content and delivery are effectively structured.

☞ The average gender sensitivity score in 2025 was 4.24, representing a modest increase from the previous year. International students recorded higher levels of gender sensitivity (4.24) compared with domestic students (4.13). This suggests that cultural background and differing social norms around gender roles influence levels of gender-related awareness. Given the decline in gender sensitivity observed in 2024, the upward shift in 2025 represents a notable and positive development.

4. Campus Gender and Human Rights Environment

The overall assessment of the campus gender and human rights environment averaged 24.0 out of 30, indicating generally favourable perceptions among students. A majority agreed or strongly agreed that their rights are respected at the KDI School, and many reported having individuals—such as counsellors, peers, or faculty members—with whom they felt comfortable discussing human rights-related concerns. However, approximately 15% of respondents agreed that they had experienced “human rights-related discomfort due to cultural differences,” suggesting that differences in cultural, religious, gender, and political norms continue to generate friction within the School’s multicultural community.

Actual experiences of gender and human rights violations were reported at relatively low rates (0.4–3.5%). Reported incidents included interference with appearance or clothing (3.5%), intrusive personal questions or teasing (3.5%), verbal abuse (2.1%), physical violence or threats (1.0%), intimidation through actions such as throwing objects (1.0%), and stalking or unwanted contact (1.7–2.1%). Although these incidents occurred infrequently, the majority of perpetrators were identified as other students, with a small number involving faculty or staff. A noteworthy proportion of affected students reported taking no action following the incident, citing reasons such as the belief that “reporting would not lead to improvement,” expectations that “the issue would be forgotten over time,” or fears of “damaging relationships.” These patterns suggest that despite the low frequency of violations, trust in the reporting and protection systems remains insufficient.

Violations of learning and labour rights were also infrequent. Four students reported inadequate instruction due to faculty circumstances or restrictions on course enrolment. Seven students reported insufficient academic support resulting from online classes or limited access to academic or career advising. No cases of ghostwriting, coercion related to research funds, or improper gift-giving requests were reported. Labour rights concerns among teaching or research assistants were minimal, with only one case involving excessive monitoring. Nonetheless, concerns regarding course quality, academic advising, and online instruction indicate the need for a more thorough review of academic support systems and faculty–student communication practices.

Results related to expected responses to human rights violations showed that 60.5% of respondents indicated they would report incidents to the Human Rights

Centre, while 19.2% stated they would seek help from others. Only 2.1% reported they would take no action.

Regarding preventive measures deemed most necessary, students identified "education, campaigns, and promotional activities" (46.9%) and "stronger sanctions for perpetrators" (36.0%) as top priorities. Recommended institutional actions included "small-scale, continuous training programmes" (35.0%), "activation of anonymous communication channels" (32.2%), and "strengthening sanctions through policy revision" (29.4%). In terms of incident response, the measures prioritised were "separation of the victim and perpetrator" (30.8%) and "support for victim recovery" (29.0%).

Reports of witnessing human rights violations were provided by 5.9% of respondents, who described incidents such as discrimination, sexual harassment or violence, and power-based bullying. While many witnesses indicated that they assisted the victim, others refrained from intervening due to fears of retaliation, concerns about relationship conflict, or uncertainty about how to respond. These findings underscore the need to strengthen institutional and psychological support systems that encourage and enable active bystander intervention.

☞ Overall, the prevalence of gender and human rights violations on campus remains low (0.4–3.5%), consistent with the previous year. However, the presence of discomfort linked to cultural differences indicates persistent potential for conflict in the context of a diverse and multicultural community.

☞ The campus gender and human rights environment score declined to 26.25 in 2025, representing a 1.23-point decrease from the previous year. Because a similar decline was recorded in 2024, this continued downward trend suggests a gradual weakening of students' perceptions of the human rights environment, despite overall positive evaluations. Potential contributing factors include changes in instructional modalities, shifts in student demographics, and differing levels of utilisation of reporting and counselling systems.

5. About Human Rights Centre

Awareness of the Human Rights Centre was exceptionally high, with 89.9% of respondents indicating familiarity with the centre. The majority reported learning about the centre through human rights education sessions (57.6%) and posters or bulletin boards displayed on campus (23.7%).

Willingness to use the Human Rights Centre in the event of a human rights violation was similarly strong. A total of 84.3% of respondents stated that they

would seek assistance from the centre if needed, demonstrating broad recognition of the institution as an appropriate reporting channel.

Regarding the roles students expect the Human Rights Centre to fulfil, respondents most frequently identified confidentiality (37.9%), fair and impartial investigation (22.5%), victim protection through separation measures (17.9%), and ongoing monitoring and prevention of recurrence (12.9%). These expectations indicate a strong emphasis on both procedural integrity and effective protective measures.

At the same time, several factors were identified as contributing to hesitation in using the centre. These included concerns that “others might find out” (28.4%), limited understanding of the centre’s mandate (18.9%), a belief that individuals could “handle the situation alone” (15.6%), and doubts regarding the centre’s effectiveness (14.5%). These findings indicate that, despite high awareness, informational gaps and trust-related concerns remain.

Students also identified several functions that they believe the centre should strengthen, including the activation of reporting and communication channels (49.3%), provision of emotional and counselling support (45.5%), victim protection measures (45.1%), enhanced gender and human rights education (38.8%), improvements to institutional systems (32.9%), and legal assistance (31.1%). These responses highlight a demand for both preventive and responsive capacities within the institution.

☞ Overall, awareness of—and willingness to engage with—the Human Rights Centre remains notably high. However, student expectations for enhanced anonymity and stronger victim-centred protection have increased. These findings suggest that although the formal response system is widely recognised, additional measures are required to reinforce trust, clarify procedures, and ensure greater procedural reliability.

6. Overall Interpretation and Implications

Students at the KDI School of Public Policy and Management generally demonstrate high levels of human rights and gender sensitivity, and most view the School’s human rights environment positively. However, in a student body marked by substantial cultural diversity, differences in cultural norms and varying understandings of “difference” continue to pose potential sources of human rights-related tension. Several reported incidents—ranging

from discrimination and invasion of privacy to verbal or physical intimidation and stalking—highlight the need for sustained attention to both interpersonal dynamics and institutional systems that shape the campus human rights environment.

Importantly, even when violations occur, some students choose not to report them. Reasons include scepticism about whether reporting will lead to meaningful change, concerns about damaging relationships, and fear of retaliation. Although awareness of the Human Rights Centre and willingness to use its services remain high, these findings point to lingering concerns regarding confidentiality, procedural fairness, and the overall effectiveness of institutional responses.

Taken together, these results provide a critical foundation for developing targeted strategies to enhance the centre's role as a trusted institutional partner. Strengthening preventive education, expanding counselling and emotional support, improving administrative procedures, and reinforcing reporting and protection mechanisms will be essential for cultivating a safer and more inclusive campus environment.

Category	Overall	Domestic Students	International Students	Change from 2024
Cultural Background & Other Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Korea 39.1%, Southeast Asia 24.1%, Africa 21.0% → highly multicultural composition - 95.4% master's students - Higher proportion of female respondents 	- About 39% of all respondents	- High proportion from Southeast Asia & Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Similar multicultural composition - Number of respondents increased (2024: 270 → 2025: 286)
Human Rights Sensitivity	- 4.35/5 (High)	Low (4.16)	High (4.36)	- Slight increase (+0.08)
Gender Sensitivity	- 4.24/5 (High)	Low (4.13)	High (4.24)	- Slight increase (+0.07)
Experience of Human Rights Violations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low overall: approx. 0.4%–3.5% - Most common: interference with appearance/hair & teasing (3.5%) 	Low	Low- Some reference to cultural discomfort	- Similar to 2024- Human rights environment score ↓ by 1.23 points
Assessment of Human Rights Environment	- Generally positive	Positive- High intention to report incidents	Positive	- Score decreased- Awareness of the Human Rights Centre and demand for education remained high

1. Implications of the Findings (Prepared by an External Expert)

1.1. In-Depth Comparative Analysis of Domestic and International Students

The survey results reveal clear and consistent differences between domestic and international students across several key dimensions of human rights awareness. International students reported higher levels of human rights and gender sensitivity, as well as considerably greater interest in global human rights issues. Their average human rights sensitivity score (4.36) exceeded that of domestic students (4.16), and interest in international human rights discourse was markedly stronger within the international student group. These patterns likely reflect the combined influence of diverse social norms, prior exposure to human rights education, and heightened awareness developed through participation in an international academic

environment.

Domestic students, by contrast, tended to explain human rights violations as arising from personal misunderstandings or differences in expressing familiarity. Their awareness that behaviours such as asking personal questions or commenting on someone's appearance may constitute human rights violations was comparatively low. This finding aligns with the survey results, indicating that privacy-related violations were more frequently reported among domestic students. The divergence between culturally framed interpretations—for example, viewing personal questions as a “natural means of forming rapport”—and human rights-based interpretations, such as viewing such behaviour as an “intrusion into personal boundaries,” helps explain these perceptual differences.

Although international students generally evaluated the campus human rights environment positively, they also reported higher levels of discomfort related to cultural differences. This indicates ongoing risks associated with language barriers, divergent social norms, and differing religious or cultural expectations. In addition, limited access to information about reporting procedures and uncertainty about the effectiveness of protection mechanisms may heighten international students' vulnerability when incidents occur.

Both domestic and international students identified insufficient post-report protection and inadequate procedural guidance as major reasons for avoiding the reporting system. However, their underlying concerns differed: international students expressed higher expectations for institutional protection and due process, whereas domestic students cited worries about damaging interpersonal relationships and the social pressure to maintain harmony within the community.

These comparative findings underscore the need for group-specific policy interventions. For domestic students, strengthening gender and cultural diversity education—including explicit training on interpersonal boundary-setting—is essential. For international students, priorities include clearer guidance on reporting procedures, improved access to information about rights, and enhanced multilingual support. Across both groups, case-based preventive education and victim-centred measures—such as prompt separation protocols and accompaniment services—are critical for building institutional trust.

Overall, the relatively high levels of sensitivity and awareness among international students represent an important resource for strengthening the Human Rights Centre's educational impact, while raising awareness among domestic students is central to improving the broader human rights climate on campus. Therefore, the 2025 prevention

plan should incorporate tailored strategies that reflect group-specific needs and perception gaps in order to build a more effective and inclusive human rights protection system.

Analysis Category	Domestic Students	International Students	Key Differences & Interpretation
Human Rights Sensitivity (Avg.)	4.16	4.36	International students show higher human rights sensitivity.
Gender Sensitivity (Avg.)	4.13	4.24	Gender sensitivity is also higher among international students.
Interest in Global Human Rights Issues	3.5	4.33	International students demonstrate significantly higher interest in global human rights issues.
Campus Human Rights Environment Score (out of 30)	23.64	24.28	International students perceive the campus human rights environment more positively.
Past Experience of Human Rights Violations	34.60%	45.60%	International students report more frequent experiences of human rights violations.
Perceived Main Causes of Human Rights Violations	- Lack of understanding (14.1%) - Differences in understanding others (10.7%) - Cultural differences (9.9%) - Insufficient sanctions (6.7%)	- Lack of understanding (26.9%) - Cultural differences (10.7%) - Insufficient sanctions (7.0%)	International students emphasise cultural differences and insufficient sanctions more strongly than domestic students.
Experience of Cultural Discomfort	Lower	Higher	International students report more discomfort due to cultural differences.
Recognition of Gender-Based Violence Risks	Lower	Higher	International students more strongly recognize risks related to gender-based violence and sexual autonomy.
Reasons for Not Reporting Violations	Concerns about relationship damage and community pressure	Lack of clarity about procedures; concerns about being misunderstood; uncertainty regarding protection	Domestic students hesitate due to relational concerns, whereas international students cite procedural and institutional uncertainty.
Education Preferences	Focus on boundary setting	Need for more guidance on rights, reporting procedures, and cultural diversity	Domestic students need boundary and interpersonal education; international students require system-related information.
Support Needs	Requests for strengthened prevention education	Requests for multilingual guidance and tailored support	Different support structures required for each group; tailored strategies needed.

1.2. Improvement Measures Based on Individual Cases

Although the individual human rights violation cases reported in the 2025 survey were relatively infrequent, several types of incidents—including invasion of privacy, discriminatory remarks or behaviour, creation of an intimidating atmosphere, stalking, and unwanted contact—indicate the potential for significant psychological distress and social withdrawal among affected students. Particularly concerning were cases in which victims chose not to pursue formal reporting channels due to beliefs that “nothing would improve even if reported,” or fears that “relationships might worsen.” Such patterns underscore the urgent need to reinforce post-report protection mechanisms and enhance institutional trust in the response system.

Based on the analysis of individual cases, the following targeted measures are required to ensure effective and victim-centred protection:

1.3. Summary of Findings and Predicted Risk Factors

The 2025 survey results indicate that students at the KDI School of Public Policy and Management generally maintain high levels of human rights and gender sensitivity. International students, in particular, reported higher sensitivity than their domestic peers, reflecting the characteristics of a highly international learning environment. These findings suggest that diverse cultural perspectives contribute positively to the campus human rights climate.

Despite these strengths, the overall campus human rights environment score decreased to 26.25 out of 30, marking a 1.23-point decline from the previous year. Reports of discomfort related to cultural differences further indicate that potential sources of tension persist within the multicultural academic community. This pattern suggests that, although the actual frequency of human rights violations remains low, students’ trust in the institution’s protection and support mechanisms is not yet fully established.

In addition, several respondents expressed concerns about insufficient post-report protective measures, citing ineffective implementation of separation protocols and limited protective actions for victims. Similar issues were raised in the previous year’s expert consultations, indicating recurring shortcomings in the Human Rights Centre’s case-handling processes and underscoring the need for sustained improvement to restore institutional credibility and ensure student safety.

Individual Case	Recommended Improvement Measures
<p>1) Asking about private life or personal questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inquiries about personal background/religion • Uncomfortable comments or questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen orientation and small-group training on <i>boundary setting</i>. • Provide domestic students with education focusing on “friendly behaviour vs. boundary violations” using real cases. • For both domestic and international students, enhance training on unacceptable questions, cultural norms, and privacy rights. • Develop case-based programmes addressing private-life invasion and low awareness of cultural boundaries.
<p>2) Discriminatory remarks or exclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unilateral grouping or exclusion of certain students • Discriminatory jokes or verbal expressions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce mandatory diversity and cultural sensitivity modules for all students. • Strengthen faculty-led education on discrimination prevention. • Provide international students with targeted guidance addressing cross-cultural conflicts. • Use real examples to highlight microaggressions and discriminatory behaviours.
<p>3) Creating intimidating or hostile atmosphere</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verbal aggression, shouting, or public humiliation • Threatening gestures or behaviour 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduce immediate separation procedures for relevant cases. • Reinforce monitoring and intervention protocols within dormitory and classroom settings. • Build a rapid-response system that includes counsellor involvement and behavioural guidelines. • Increase awareness of what constitutes verbal/psychological intimidation.
<p>4) Stalking or unwanted contact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistent messaging or physical following • Repeated unwanted interactions causing distress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link students directly to external counselling and legal advisors. • Provide psychological support for victim anxiety, with access to specialized trauma counsellors. • Increase education on digital safety, communication boundaries, and legal protections. • Strengthen sanctions for repeated unwanted contact and improve monitoring.
<p>5) Fear of retaliation or belief that “reporting will not help”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Reporting won’t change anything.” • “I’m worried it will worsen relationships.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mandate protection measures (e.g., separation within 24 hours; first action within 14 days). • Strengthen communication so that victims are informed of procedures, rights, timelines, and protections. • Improve confidentiality and anonymity protocols to reduce fear of exposure. • Identify causes of low trust in the Human Rights Centre and implement targeted improvements.

C. Summary of Findings and Predicted Risk Factors

The 2025 survey results indicate that students at the KDI School of Public Policy and Management generally maintain high levels of human rights and gender sensitivity, with international students demonstrating higher sensitivity compared with domestic students. This pattern reflects the School's distinctly international composition and suggests that diverse cultural backgrounds contribute positively to the overall human rights climate on campus.

However, the overall human rights environment score declined to 26.25 out of 30, representing a 1.23-point decrease from the previous year. Reports of discomfort related to cultural differences further suggest that latent sources of tension persist within the School's multicultural learning environment. These findings indicate that, despite the relatively low frequency of human rights violations, trust in the institution's protection and support mechanisms has not yet been fully established among community members.

Moreover, several respondents raised concerns about insufficient protection for victims following the reporting of incidents. Specific issues included ineffective implementation of separation measures and limited provision of protective actions. Similar concerns were noted in expert consultations the previous year, pointing to recurring challenges in the Human Rights Centre's case-handling processes and underscoring the need for stronger institutional trust and more robust victim-centred procedures.

Risk Type	Likelihood	Impact	Overall Vulnerability	Priority Response
Insufficient victim protection	High	Very High	Very High	Immediate protective measures; strengthen control and monitoring
Low utilisation of reporting/counseling systems	High	Medium	High	Improve accessibility and communication channels
Cultural conflicts	Medium	High	High	Expand diversity education; establish mediation mechanisms
External reporting to outside institutions	Medium	High	Medium	Strengthen institutional trust; improve procedural clarity
Administrative delays	Medium	Medium	Medium	Streamline administrative processes
Incidents involving international students	Medium	High	High	Expand multilingual support and tailored assistance
Limitations in preventive education	High	Medium	High	Strengthen education content and delivery strategies

C. Recommendations for Establishing the 2025 Human Rights Violation Prevention Plan

Based on the 2025 survey findings, the current operational practices of the Human Rights Centre, and the School’s existing educational framework, the KDI School of Public Policy and Management should formulate a strategic plan that shifts toward a more prevention-oriented human rights protection system. Although the School currently implements a range of initiatives—including mandatory online training, in-person orientation sessions, sexual violence prevention education for international students, small-scale human rights education programmes, submission of human rights pledges, and card-news/QR-based reporting guidance—several challenges persist. These include declining perceptions of the campus human rights environment, reluctance among students to report violations, and notable differences in awareness and expectations between domestic and international students.

In response to these findings, the following recommendations are proposed for the development of the 2025 Human Rights Violation Prevention Plan.

1) Strengthening Gender Sensitivity and Cultural Diversity Education for Domestic Students

Survey findings indicate that international students exhibit higher levels of human rights and gender sensitivity and report greater discomfort related to cultural differences. Accordingly, more targeted and enhanced education for domestic students is needed. Recommended actions include:

- Training on distinguishing between expressions of familiarity and behaviours that constitute human rights violations
- Education prohibiting intrusive personal questions and comments on appearance
- Role-play and case-based learning modules to foster experiential understanding
- Mandatory training for faculty members, teaching assistants, and administrative staff

☞ As member behaviour emerged as a major risk factor, expanding targeted education for domestic students is expected to substantially improve preventive outcomes.

2) Strengthening Post-Report Protection Measures and Standardising Procedures

Some respondents reported that filing a report resulted in “no meaningful change” or “insufficient protection,” which contributed to reluctance to use the system. To address these issues, the prevention plan should incorporate:

- Mandatory implementation of separation measures immediately after a report
- Introduction of a victim-accompaniment support system
- Establishment of referral networks with external professional and legal services
- Provision of step-by-step guidance throughout the reporting, investigation, action, and follow-up stages
- Clear processing timelines (e.g., first action within 14 days)

☞ The effectiveness of protection measures is fundamental to strengthening institutional trust.

3) Enhancing Multilingual Support and Accessibility for International Students

International students may be more vulnerable due to limited understanding of reporting systems and language barriers. Additional support beyond existing annual training and informational materials should include:

- Expanded multilingual guidance for reporting and counselling
- Conversion of the Report page and QR-based reporting platform into multiple languages
- Regular mechanisms for collecting feedback from international students
- Programmes addressing conflict prevention based on cultural and social norms
 - ☞ These measures are essential for improving perceived safety and ensuring equitable access for international students.

4) Developing and Institutionalising Case-Based Preventive Education Content

Current small-scale education sessions (four times per year) are beneficial but can be strengthened further. Recommendations include:

- Developing educational content based on actual cases identified through survey results
- Providing role-play and scenario-based experiential learning opportunities
- Implementing programmes that enable participants to examine issues from the victim's perspective
- Establishing an annual operational plan for continuous and institutionalised training
 - ☞ Case-based experiential training has demonstrated strong effectiveness in promoting meaningful shifts in awareness and behaviour.

5) Strategies to Promote Use of Reporting and Counselling Systems

Despite available QR guidance and the Report page, utilisation remains low. Strategies to strengthen engagement include:

- Operating a 24-hour online anonymous counselling channel
- Improving case manager assignment procedures and communication of outcomes
- Simplifying reporting processes and enhancing accessibility
- Strengthening promotion via orientation, LMS notifications, email, social media, and on-campus postings
 - ☞ Enhancing user experience directly contributes to increased reporting and earlier intervention.

6) Improving Administrative Systems to Enhance Trust in the Human Rights Centre

Survey findings confirm that low trust in case-handling procedures is a major driver of declining evaluations of the human rights environment. Necessary

improvements include:

- Clarifying operational procedures and updating manuals
- Designating responsible personnel and disseminating relevant information
- Providing clear information at each stage of the case-handling process
- Establishing systematic evaluation and monitoring mechanisms

7) Operating a Prevention Plan Based on Evaluation Indicators

A performance-based operational approach is recommended for the 2025 plan.

Key indicators include:

- Participation rate in human rights education
- Educational effectiveness as measured through pre- and post-assessments
- Utilisation rates of reporting and counselling systems
- Implementation rates of protective measures
- Satisfaction levels among international students
- Changes in perceived human rights environment scores

8) Consolidated Recommendations

The 2025 prevention plan should be guided by the following strategic directions:

- Strengthening targeted sensitivity training for domestic students
- Standardising and ensuring the timely implementation of victim-centred protective measures
- Expanding accessibility and multilingual support for international students
- Developing and institutionalising case-based preventive education modules
- Enhancing trust in and utilisation of reporting and counselling systems
- Improving administrative procedures and ensuring greater transparency
- Employing performance indicator-based management and continuous evaluation

☞ Collectively, these strategies are expected to strengthen the credibility of the Human Rights Centre, enhance campus safety, and provide a robust foundation for future human rights policy development within the institution.

Recommendation	Core Implementation Tasks	Main Activities	Performance Indicators	Responsible Unit
1) Strengthening gender sensitivity and cultural diversity education for domestic students	Operating continuous human rights education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monthly case-based small-group sessions • Orientation education enhancement • Diversity education programme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation rate 80%+ • Satisfaction score 4.5/5 • Increased 신고/상담-related awareness 	Human Rights Centre / Education Team
2) Enhancing post-report victim protection and standardising procedures	Establishing a protection protocol	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introducing immediate separation procedures • Operating accompaniment support services • Developing a step-by-step reporting & follow-up guide 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% implementation of separation & protective measures • Processing time reduction 	Human Rights Centre
3) Strengthening multilingual support and accessibility for international students	Improving multilingual reporting & support system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multilingual reporting/counselling guide • Converting QR reporting page to multilingual format • Regular feedback collection from international students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased usage by international students • Satisfaction improvement 	International Relations Office / Human Rights Centre
4) Developing and institutionalising case-based preventive education	Producing educational content based on real cases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing case-based modules • Introducing experience-based role-play/scenario training • Annual education cycle planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased participation • Improved education evaluation scores 	Human Rights Centre
5) Increasing utilisation of reporting and counselling systems	Expanding counselling and reporting channels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operating 24-hour anonymous online counselling • Strengthening promotion via OT, LMS, emails, SNS, and posters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased 신고.상담 usage rate • Increased accessibility score 	Counselling Office / Human Rights Centre
6) Improving administrative procedures to enhance trust in the Human Rights Centre	Standardising processing procedures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Updating manuals • Providing process guidance at each stage • Establishing transparent administrative processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved trust level • Increased satisfaction with case handling 	Human Rights Centre
7) Introducing a performance-indicator-based management system	Strengthening monitoring & evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring participation, reporting trends, and educational outcomes • Annual evaluation of human rights environment scores 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased reporting & participation • Improved human rights environment score 	Human Rights Centre

1.1. Implications

The findings of this survey yield several key implications for the formulation of future institutional plans.

First, the quality of human rights education must be strengthened. The survey identified a decline in perceived improvement relative to the level of educational exposure, indicating diminishing marginal effects of current training. The proposed expansion of small-group training programmes and blended online–offline modalities is therefore likely to enhance learning outcomes and reinforce knowledge retention.

Second, a more robust victim-centred response system is required. The emphasis in future planning on active protection measures and anti-retaliation mechanisms is expected to play a crucial role in addressing persistent gaps in post-report support and ensuring that victims feel adequately protected throughout the process.

Third, counselling and communication channels require improvement. Respondents expressed a clear need for greater accessibility to counselling services, and the strengthened online counselling guidance and enhanced communication mechanisms outlined in the future plan align well with these expectations and are likely to increase students' willingness to seek support.

Fourth, administrative procedures and operational manuals must be improved to strengthen trust in the Human Rights Centre's response system. Greater clarity in reporting procedures and the establishment of a prompt and transparent case-handling structure will facilitate effective implementation of the procedural revisions proposed for future plans.

Taken together, the survey findings provide the following strategic direction for the Human Rights Centre's future initiatives:

- Strengthening human rights education and diversifying programme offerings
- Establishing a comprehensive, victim-centred response system
- Enhancing communication and counselling support mechanisms
- Systematising administrative procedures and improving institutional reliability

These strategies are expected to enhance perceptions of the human rights environment and foster deeper intercultural understanding within the campus community.

Ultimately, the survey underscores the need for the Human Rights Centre to move beyond functioning solely as a "case-handling body" and to serve as a collaborative institutional partner that actively contributes to fostering a safe,

inclusive, and rights-respecting campus culture.