



at the heart of campus safety

CLERY ACT HAZING REQUIREMENTS

ADVANCING YOUR APPROACH

The Stop Campus Hazing Act (SCHA), enacted on December 23, 2024, amended the Clery Act¹ to prioritize the prevention of and transparency about hazing incidents at colleges and universities. This guide provides information on moving forward from the initial implementation and advancing your approach for putting these requirements into practice.

I. Reporting Hazing in the Annual Security Report

By **October 1** of each year, colleges and universities must release their annual security reports (ASRs), which provide information on key campus safety policies and procedures, as well as campus crime statistics for specific incidents reported under the Clery Act. Now, hazing incidents must also be included in an institution's ASR as a Clery Act crime statistic if they meet all the required criteria.

How is hazing defined for Clery Act reporting of annual statistics in the ASR?

As written in the SCHA amendment to the Clery Act, “the term ‘hazing’ for purposes of reporting statistics on hazing incidents ... means any intentional, knowing, or reckless act committed by a person (whether individually or in concert with other persons) against another person or persons regardless of the willingness of such other person or persons to participate, that:

- is committed in the course of an initiation into, an affiliation with, or the maintenance of membership in, a student organization; and
- causes or creates a risk, above the reasonable risk encountered in the course of participation in the institution of higher education or the organization (such as the physical preparation necessary for participation in an athletic team), of physical or psychological injury including—
 - ◊ whipping, beating, striking, electronic shocking, placing of a harmful substance on someone’s body, or similar activity;
 - ◊ causing, coercing, or otherwise inducing sleep deprivation, exposure to the elements, confinement in a small space, extreme calisthenics, or other similar activity;
 - ◊ causing, coercing, or otherwise inducing another person to consume food, liquid, alcohol, drugs, or other substances;
 - ◊ causing, coercing, or otherwise inducing another person to perform sexual acts;
 - ◊ any activity that places another person in reasonable fear of bodily harm through the use of threatening words or conduct;
 - ◊ any activity against another person that includes a criminal violation of local, State, Tribal, or Federal law; and
 - ◊ any activity that induces, causes, or requires another person to perform a duty or task that involves a criminal violation of local, State, Tribal, or Federal law.”
- **A student organization** is defined as “an organization at an institution of higher education (such as a club, society, association, varsity or junior varsity athletic team, club sports team, fraternity, sorority, band, or student government) in which two or more of the members are students enrolled at the institution of higher education, whether or not the organization is established or recognized by the institution”.

When would an incident of hazing be included in the ASR?

Clery Act crime statistics within the ASR represent reports of Clery Act crimes occurring within Clery Act defined geography made to campus security authorities (CSAs)², as defined by the Clery Act, or to local police agencies. CSAs include campus police and security, individuals with a security function on campus, individuals directed to receive reports under the institution's campus security policies, and officials with significant responsibility for student and campus activities.

The ASR crime statistics are reported by type of crime (in this case hazing incidents) and according to specific Clery Act defined geography³:

- On-campus buildings and property;
 - ◊ Including on-campus student housing facilities if such facilities exist at an institution
- Public property; and
- Noncampus buildings and property.

As a result, hazing incidents will be included in the ASR:

- When reported by a CSA or to local police agencies;
- The incident occurred within Clery Act geography; and
- The incident meets the Clery Act definition of hazing.

They must be compiled per each single hazing incident and if the same person or persons commit more than one hazing act and the time and place intervals separating such acts are insignificant, such acts shall be reported as a single hazing incident. For example, if a performing arts group commits multiple acts of hazing over the course of several hours after a single evening of auditions, that will be reflected as one incident of hazing; however, if the same group commits an act of hazing each night for the first week of rehearsals, each of those hazing incidents will be reported as a separate hazing statistic.

Most states have a law pertaining to hazing which might make hazing a crime in your state. The manner in which a state defines hazing may differ from the way it is defined by the Clery Act. When counting and classifying hazing statistics for the ASR it is important to only use the Clery Act definition. Since these definitions may differ there could be instances where a report is received that occurred in Clery Act geography and meets the state's definition of hazing but does not meet the Clery Act definition of hazing. In these instances the report would not be counted in the annual statistics.

All Clery Act crimes that occur within Clery Act geography must be analyzed to determine whether there is a serious or ongoing threat which would require the issuance of a timely warning; therefore the inclusion of hazing as a Clery Act incident in the ASR will also affect timely warning practices. Similarly, note that, as has already been a standard for the Clery Act, the daily crime log should include reports of any state or local crimes made to the campus public safety or police department that occurred within the institution's patrol jurisdiction which includes Clery Act geography. Therefore, if an incident of hazing is a crime in the institution's state and it is reported to campus police or public safety and occurred within the institution's patrol jurisdiction, it should be included in the institution's daily crime log.

Recommended Practices:

- Review list of recognized student organizations. Discuss recognized student organizations as well as unrecognized student organizations known to the institution with an existing Clery Act team or committee.
- Update systems or structures used to collect crime reports from CSAs and local law enforcement (such as reporting forms and platforms) to include incidents of hazing.
- Revise data reconciliation processes to include analysis of hazing incidents.
- Update CSA notification and training materials to include incidents of hazing. Consider providing case studies specific to hazing incidents.
- Update timely warning policies, protocols, and forms to include hazing within institutional timely warning analyses.

²34 CFR 668.46(a). (<https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2014-24284/p-423>)

³34 CFR 668.46(a). (<https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2014-24284/p-427>)

What if hazing occurs in the same incident as another Clery Act crime?

It is likely that institutions will receive reports of hazing that also include additional Clery Act crimes. Institutions will need to analyze these reports to determine which crimes meet Clery Act definitions and appropriately apply the hierarchy rule, which only applies to the criminal offenses category of Clery Act crimes. This means if hazing occurs along with crime(s) from the criminal offenses category the institution will count hazing and the most serious criminal offense. Since the hierarchy rule only applies to that category, if hazing occurs along with any crimes from the categories of hate crimes, VAWA offenses, or arrests and referrals the institution will also count those crimes in addition to the hazing statistic.

What does the presentation of the hazing statistics look like?

Presenting your hazing statistics will look very similar to the presentation of most of your Clery Act crime statistics as these should also be presented in a tabular format.

Your statistics might look something like this:

Crime Classification	Year	On-Campus Housing	On-Campus Total	Public Property	Noncampus
Hazing	2025	0	1	0	0
Hazing	2026	1	1	0	0
Hazing	2027	1	2	0	1

Please note, it won't be until the 2028 annual security report that institutions will have three years' worth of hazing statistics as this table represents, so until then you will only report the years for which you are required to report. It may be helpful to include an explanation as to why there are no statistics for the years prior to 2025.

Remember:

- The definition of hazing in the Clery Act must be used for determining whether incidents reported will be counted as a crime statistic in the ASR.
- The list of behaviors within the Clery Act hazing definition is not exhaustive, meaning, that hazing as defined by the Clery Act is not limited to just the behaviors listed in the definition. Any action that aligns with the definition could be hazing even if not explicitly listed.
- The Clery Act definition of hazing can be but does not have to be used for campus policies adjudicating behavior.

II. Hazing Policy Statements in the Annual Security Report

The ASR must also include a statement of the institution's current policies related to hazing as defined by the institution. **A policy statement is a summary of an existing policy**; therefore, the institution's underlying policy as well as the policy statement in the ASR must address all the required components. The institution's hazing policy definitions may or may not use the Clery Act definition of hazing.

In addition to defining hazing, the policy statement must include:

- How to report incidents of hazing;
- The process used to investigate incidents of hazing; and
- Information on applicable local, State, and Tribal laws on hazing.

It must also include a statement of policy regarding prevention and awareness programs related to hazing that includes a description of research-informed campus-wide prevention programs designed to reach students, staff, and faculty, which includes:

- Information on the institution's hazing policy (as described above)
- Primary prevention strategies intended to stop hazing before it occurs, which may include skill-building for bystander intervention, information about ethical leadership, and the promotion of strategies for building group cohesion without hazing

What information about applicable local, State, and Tribal laws must we include in our policy statement?

While the Clery Act does not specifically state what information you must include about local, State, and Tribal laws, the purpose of doing so is to provide knowledge and education to your community regarding these laws and the legal status of hazing in the applicable jurisdiction. We encourage institutions to provide information that is easy to understand and gives the campus community helpful details about the requirements of the applicable law(s).

We encourage institutions to include information about or descriptions of:

- How the law(s) define hazing
- Any requirements of the law specific to higher education, such as policy requirements or transparency report requirements
- Legal consequences of violating the hazing law(s)
- Where someone could find more information about the law(s)

Remember:

- The Clery Act requires campuses to have information on how to report, investigate, and prevent hazing captured in policy; it does not dictate whether that policy is standalone or not.
- Clarify whether the institutional definition of hazing is exactly aligned with the Clery Act definition or not, and why that definition is the same or is different.

Recommended Practices:

- Develop or revise hazing policies on campus and a process to review them on at least an annual basis.
- Ensure that you have *at least* one clear method for reporting hazing—multiple are recommended.
- Ensure the policy includes a definition of hazing, how to report, and the process used to investigate incidents of hazing.
- Include information on applicable local, State, and Tribal laws on hazing. Distinguish between definitions that are a violation of policy versus those used in legal proceedings.
- Incorporate hazing prevention information into existing policy or develop a separate hazing prevention policy.
- Ensure the policy includes education on the institution's hazing policy or policies as well as primary prevention strategies.
- Identify what programs will be used for primary prevention of hazing.
- Establish a programming schedule for students, staff, and faculty.

III. Hazing Prevention & Awareness Programs

As described above, the Clery Act requires institutions to include in their ASR a statement of policy describing their hazing prevention and awareness programs and the required components. This means that institutions **must have an institutional policy in place that outlines their hazing prevention programs and must also offer those programs to their community**. It is important to remember that there must be a policy regarding these programs; it is not enough to simply facilitate these programs.

An institution's hazing prevention and awareness initiatives must include campus-wide programs that are designed to reach students, staff and faculty. Institutions are not required to make participation in these programs mandatory or to track attendance, but may choose to do so. However, it is important that programs are available for any students, staff, and faculty who have interest in attending. If an online program or training is offered, it should be made available to all students and employees. If in-person programs or training opportunities are offered, institutions should ensure that there are a sufficient number of programs and space capacity that would allow for these to truly be a campus-wide program. For example, if only one program is offered and it is held in a space that has a capacity for 50 people, it is not likely that all students, staff, and faculty could attend that program.

What does it mean to be research-informed?

Hazing prevention and awareness programs should be informed by research. This means that programs should use information from the best available research or evidence. Research-informed programs allow for more than just anecdotal evidence to guide the practices of these prevention programs. Institutions should also plan to evaluate their programs for effectiveness and use their own data to further inform future improvements and changes to their programming efforts.

Program types with the most research and evidence for effectiveness include workshops and training that focus on bystander intervention, ethical leadership skillbuilding, and building healthy groups and teams. Social norms campaigns have also shown effectiveness.

Research related to hazing is growing, but still limited, which can make program planning challenging. Even so, institutions can implement research-informed programs that cover primary prevention strategies to meet Clery Act requirements. Campuses are also encouraged to supplement these efforts with ongoing prevention and awareness initiatives tailored to their community, such as events, tabling and resource sharing, and social media or poster campaigns, to reinforce education about the risks of hazing throughout the year.

For more information about what it means for a program to be research-informed, read [this informative blog post from StopHazing](#).

Recommended Practices:

- Ensure there is an institutional policy in place to guide hazing prevention and awareness programming efforts
- Identify campus partners to be involved in planning and facilitating hazing prevention and awareness programs
- Create a programming plan to schedule what programs will occur when and for which audiences
- Ensure programs are in place to reach students, faculty, and staff
- Identify any specific populations to offer specific programming to, such as athletics, fraternity and sorority life, student organization leaders, student organization advisors, etc.
- Review current programming efforts for what could be redesigned and tailored to be a hazing prevention program, such as current bystander intervention programs

“We Don’t Haze” Documentary & Supplemental Resources

We Don’t Haze is a short film, developed in partnership by Clery Center and StopHazing, in which families and victims testify to the true impact that hazing can have on campus communities. The film promotes bystander intervention and takes a deeper look at the causes and consequences of hazing, and helps to identify hazing behaviors and offer alternatives that promote a safer team-building experience.

This documentary is available at no cost and includes a companion guide to help plan and facilitate hazing prevention programs utilizing this film. This program has been tested and proved to be effective, so it meets the research-informed standard required by the law. You can find more information about this resource and how to access the film and companion guide on the Clery Center website at clerycenter.org/hazing.

What topics must the prevention and awareness programs cover?

The law requires institutions to educate on:

- Institutional hazing policies including:
 - ◊ How the institution defines hazing and how to report it
 - ◊ The process used to investigate incidents of hazing
 - ◊ Applicable local, State, and Tribal laws regarding hazing
- Primary prevention strategies intended to stop hazing before it occurs which may include:
 - ◊ skill-building for bystander intervention,
 - ◊ information about ethical leadership, and
 - ◊ the promotion of strategies for building group cohesion without hazing.

Research has shown the recommended primary prevention strategies named in the law are effective, but they are not required and institutions may choose to utilize other prevention strategies.

Institutions may already conduct programming related to these topics that could easily be tailored for a hazing prevention program. For example, institutions should be educating on bystander intervention in the context of preventing the crimes of dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking. The principles and strategies of bystander intervention are the same regardless of what the crime or harmful behavior is, so campuses could take their current bystander intervention programming and tailor the context of it to be suitable for student organizations and hazing.

Our institution found a third-party hazing prevention program that we’d like to use. Does it meet the requirements?

While Clery Center is not familiar with every program available and cannot determine whether a specific program meets statutory requirements, the following questions are recommended to help institutions assess whether a program aligns with both compliance obligations and institutional needs:

- Is the program informed by research? If so, what research?
- What prevention strategies does the program cover? What methods are used to educate on these strategies?
- Who is the intended audience for this program? Can it be used to educate students, staff, and faculty?
- Do we have the ability to customize the program with information about our policies?

With the answers to these questions an institution can determine if the program meets the requirements and will help the institution comply with the law. If it only meets some of the requirements, the institution could still use it while also supplementing with other programming that also meets the requirements. Each institution will need to determine what will work best for their campus community.

Remember:

- There are few existing prevention programs that are considered “research-informed” for hazing specifically; therefore, your institution’s evaluation of program effectiveness will contribute to determining what approaches best meet the criteria for research-informed hazing prevention.
- Preventionists interested in developing prevention programs specifically for hazing should use the Clery Act as leverage for applying for grants that would support such work.

IV. Campus Hazing Transparency Report

Each institution must develop a Campus Hazing Transparency Report summarizing findings concerning any established or recognized student organization found to be in violation of an institution's standards of conduct relating to hazing as defined by the institution in their hazing policies.

The Campus Hazing Transparency Report must include each incident involving a student organization for which a finding of responsibility is issued relating to a hazing violation, including:

- The name of such student organization;
- A general description of the violation that resulted in a finding of responsibility, including:
 - ◊ whether the violation involved the abuse or illegal use of alcohol or drugs,
 - ◊ the findings of the institution, and
 - ◊ any sanctions placed on the student organization by the institution, as applicable; and
- The dates on which:
 - ◊ The incident was alleged to have occurred
 - ◊ The investigation into the incident was initiated
 - ◊ The investigation ended with a finding that a hazing violation occurred, and
 - ◊ The institution provided notice to the student organization that the incident resulted in a hazing violation.
- The Campus Hazing Transparency Report cannot include personally identifiable information.

The first Campus Hazing Transparency Report was required to be published by December 23, 2025, and must include data from July 1, 2025 through the date of release. The report must now be updated **biannually (at least two times a year)**, covering the period from the date of the most recent publication through the date on which the update is submitted. For example, if Clery University publishes its first Transparency Report on December 1, 2025 and commits to publishing it every six months to meet its biannual publication requirement, then the December 1 report would include findings of responsibility for hazing incidents by recognized student organizations determined between July 1, 2025 and December 1, 2025. When the May 1, 2026 report is published, it will include findings from December 1, 2025-date of the updated report (which could be as late as April 30, 2026).

Some institutions are in states that require additional hazing reporting under state law. The Clery Act states that the Campus Hazing Transparency Report may include any additional information determined by the institution to be necessary or reported as required by State law. This means you could include additional information you think your community would find valuable, as long as you're also addressing the minimum requirements.

Recommended Practices:

- Identify the department responsible for publishing the Campus Hazing Transparency Report. Provide training or other education on the requirements.
- Determine whether the institution's records management system used for student and employee conduct has the ability to document the required information.
- Determine a process for sharing required information under the Campus Hazing Transparency Report.
 - ◊ Can the existing records management system export the required information?
 - ◊ If not, create a template for logging the required information.
 - ◊ Establish procedures for updating the Campus Hazing Transparency Report at least twice annually. Consider whether it is easier/possible to update the report every time there is an addition (every time there is a finding of responsibility for hazing).
- If the institution already publishes a transparency report required by state law, determine if the current report meets the Campus Hazing Transparency Report requirements or if it can be modified to meet the requirements.

The information for the Transparency Report must be maintained for a period of five calendar years from the date of publication of the most recent update; however, since the Clery Act requires institutions to retain their records supporting information in the ASR for seven years, we recommend retaining all data related to Clery Act reporting for seven calendar years.

The bill notes that institutions may want to educate the community on the purposes of, and differences between, the ASR and the Campus Hazing Transparency Report. Although the bill does not require institutions to make an update to the Transparency Report if there are no findings of a hazing violation since its most recent publication, it is helpful to still include language such as *"There were no findings of responsibility for hazing violations between xx/xx/yyyy and xx/xx/yyyy"* so the campus community is aware the institution is complying with the requirements but does not have any new information to share.

What definition do we use?

Some institutions might be working with several different definitions of hazing: the Clery Act definition, the institution's definition, and possibly a definition in state law. **The Clery Act definition must be used for counting and classifying hazing statistics for the annual security report (ASR) and for disclosure to the Department of Education.** No other definition(s) should be used for counting hazing statistics. An institution may choose to adopt the Clery Act definition for its **policy**, though it is not required. In some cases, state law may dictate how an institution defines hazing. An **institutional policy definition** is what will be used to determine findings of violation in a disciplinary proceeding that will appear in the Campus Hazing Transparency Report.

What is required by the Clery Act is that an institution clearly define hazing in its policies. That definition must appear in in an institution's:

- hazing policy,
- ASR policy statement on hazing,
- website where the Campus Hazing Transparency report is published, and
- hazing prevention programs.

Clergy Act Requirement	Hazing Definition(s)	Why
Clery Act crime statistics reporting in the annual security report (ASR)	Clery Act definition of hazing	Consistent definitions across institutions of higher education
ASR policy statement and prevention education about institutional policy and applicable laws	Institutional hazing definition & any applicable local, State, or Tribal laws related to hazing	To educate community members about the legal status of hazing in the jurisdiction vs. campus policy
Campus Hazing Transparency Report	Institutional hazing definition	Policy definition for which the institution uses to investigate and adjudicate hazing

What might your Campus Hazing Transparency Report look like?

The law establishes what information your Transparency Report contains, but doesn't prescribe a particular format that must be used. Institutions must determine what format and design will work best for their community. Institutions should consider if they are already using a database for managing conduct cases which would allow for the generation of a report that meets the requirements of the Campus Hazing Transparency Report and can be published to the institution's website.

The Campus Hazing Transparency Report might look like this:

Summer & Fall 2025

Organization	Incident Date	Investigation Started	Description	Findings & Sanction	Date of Finding	Date of Notice to Organization
Chess Club	8/22/2025 & 8/23/2025	9/2/2025	New members were forced to do calisthenics for losing practice matches.	In Violation of the Hazing Policy Sanctions: Hazing prevention workshop; probation	9/22/2025	9/22/2025
Drama Club	8/31/2025	9/4/2025	New members were forced to drink large amounts of alcohol until all alcohol was finished. Included abuse and illegal use of alcohol.	In Violation of the Hazing Policy Sanctions: Hazing prevention workshop, social probation, probation	9/25/2025	9/25/2025

V. Notification of and Education on the Clery Act's Hazing Requirements

On each institution's public website, there must be a statement notifying the public of the annual availability of their hazing statistics, including a link to the institution's ASR, information about the institution's policies relating to hazing and applicable local, State, and Tribal laws on hazing, and the information required for the Campus Hazing Transparency Report.

Where should hazing information live on the public website?

This is ultimately up to each institution. The law requires that this information be located in a prominent location on the public website, but does not provide further guidance as to what a prominent location might mean. Institutions should consider publishing their Campus Hazing Transparency Report on a standalone webpage dedicated to hazing, which can present all the required information in a clear, accessible format without competing content. A dedicated webpage also better accommodates the volume of required information and the likely HTML format of the report itself. Institutions should also consider including a link to their hazing reporting form on this page, if one exists.

Recommended Practices:

- Link to the hazing webpage from various, relevant places on the institution's website such as the homepage and the pages for student organization/student leadership, student conduct, athletics, and any page(s) designed to provide information for specific parties such as students, families, etc.
- Include information and context about the differences between the Campus Hazing Transparency Report and the annual security report (ASR) on the hazing webpage as well. These two reports contain different types of data and campus community members will benefit from an intentional explanation about the distinctions between the reports themselves and the information they contain. Include information about reporting hazing as well as how to support reporting parties. Provide a link to reporting forms in addition to stating how hazing can be reported. Clarify what should be reported (such as level of detail), what happens with a report, and any expectations about what communications they may or may not receive. Also explain if there are any limitations to working with anonymous reports.
- Provide information about support and resources that are available on campus that a victim or third-party reporter might find helpful such as counseling and psychological services, student health, academic support services, etc.

VI. Utilizing the Clery Compliance Team

The Clery Act is a wide-reaching law that impacts many functional areas of higher education. While responsibility for Clery Act compliance often rests with a single individual—typically within campus safety or the police department—many compliance obligations are carried out by partners across multiple campus departments. As a result, while having a designated coordinator is beneficial, a team-based approach to Clery Act compliance is considered best practice. For institutions without an established Clery compliance team, the new hazing-related requirements present an opportunity to build one. Institutions with an existing team should take this opportunity to evaluate team membership and responsibilities to ensure the appropriate partners are engaged and prepared to address the Clery Act’s hazing requirements.

Who Should Be Involved?

Since Clery Act compliance involves many functional areas across campus, an institution will benefit from recruiting representatives from a variety of departments and offices. If building a new team, it should be led by the Clery Coordinator or the individual responsible for Clery Act implementation. Then consider those most directly involved with compliance efforts, such as campus police or security, Title IX, Dean of Students and/or student conduct, housing, violence prevention and/or victim advocacy, human resources, et al.

Whether forming a new team or evaluating an existing one, the addition of hazing-related requirements provides an opportunity to ensure representation from areas central to hazing prevention and response, like fraternity and sorority life, student activities or involvement, athletics, recreation/club sports, ROTC, student conduct, and other relevant units.

How can the Clery compliance team assist with hazing prevention and response?

Hazing prevention and response should be a campus-wide effort, and utilizing the Clery compliance team can make those efforts more productive. Research has shown that hazing happens in many student groups including athletics, fraternities and sororities, performing arts groups, student clubs, club sports and intramurals, and more. Yet prevention programs often focus narrowly on Greek Life and are often only offered to students. Effective prevention efforts should engage all students, faculty, and staff, ensuring the entire campus community can recognize the signs of hazing, understand the dangers it poses, and respond appropriately.

The Clery compliance team can plan and facilitate programs, assess effectiveness, and review response efforts to ensure that the appropriate measures are being taken to address hazing:

- **Review:** As a team, review existing programs that could be tailored to hazing prevention.
- **Envision and Create:** Adapt these programs using research-informed approaches.
- **Identify:** Determine team members or campus partners who are best suited to facilitating these programs. Remember, prevention programming should be a shared responsibility, not the work of one person or office.
- **Present:** Offer hazing prevention programs to the entire campus community.
- **Evaluate:** Collect feedback and review evaluations from attendees and program facilitators to refine the programs for the future.

The Clery compliance team may also be helpful for reviewing reports and response efforts. Because the Clery Act definition of hazing is new, classifying reports as hazing for the annual statistics may be challenging. For complex cases, it may be helpful to have the team meet to discuss the details of the report and if it meets the Clery Act definition of hazing. Consider if it is helpful to convene a small working group—members of which may vary depending on the incident in question—to keep them informed, discuss response to hazing reports, and determine next steps.

VII. Timelines

Below are the initial timelines of the Clery Act's hazing requirements based on the Stop Campus Hazing Act's date of enactment of December 23, 2024:

January 1, 2025	Institutions began collecting statistics on hazing incidents
June 23, 2025	Hazing policies (including prevention policies) were due to be in place
July 1, 2025	Institutions began collecting information about hazing incidents that violated campus policy/violations
December 23, 2025	The Campus Hazing Transparency Report first published on the institution's website and must be updated at least two times each year
October 1, 2026	First ASR with hazing data

The implementation of the Clery Act's hazing requirements marks a significant step forward in addressing the persistent issue of hazing within higher education institutions. By mandating the collection and reporting of hazing incidents, as well as the creation of clear, transparent policies, this law ensures that colleges and universities are taking proactive measures to protect students and promote safe, respectful campus environments.

As institutions work to integrate these requirements into their operations, it is essential to foster collaboration across departments to ensure that the provisions of the Clery Act, as amended by SCHA, are effectively enacted. Transparency and accountability are critical to preventing hazing, and by adhering to these guidelines, colleges and universities can create a culture of respect and inclusion while fulfilling their legal obligations.

By taking the steps outlined in this guide, institutions will not only comply with the law but also contribute to a larger, shared effort to eradicate hazing and ensure that all students are treated with dignity and respect. The commitment to prevention, reporting, and accountability is vital for safeguarding the well-being of students and for building campuses where safety and integrity are prioritized.