

Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct

The University of Oregon

Authors

David Cantor, Westat
Bonnie Fisher, University of Cincinnati
Susan Chibnall, Westat
Carol Bruce, Westat

Reanne Townsend, Westat
Gail Thomas, Westat
Hyunshik Lee, Westat



September 11, 2015

Prepared for:
The University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

Prepared by:
Westat
An Employee-Owned Research Corporation[®]
1600 Research Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850-3129
(301) 251-1500

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Introduction	1
2	Methodology.....	1
	2.1 Instrument Development	1
	2.2 Survey Content.....	2
	2.3 Sample and Incentives	2
	2.4 Survey Procedures	3
	2.5 Response Rates	3
	2.6 Brief Description of the Sampling Procedure for the University of Oregon	4
	2.7 Brief Description of the Weighting Procedure for the University of Oregon	5
3	Survey Results	8
	3.1 Campus Climate around Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct	8
	3.2 Resources Related to Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct	9
	3.3 Frequency and Nature of Victimization by Physical Force or Incapacitation	13
	3.4 Frequency and Nature of Victimization Due to Coercion or Absence of Affirmative Consent.....	13
	3.5 Frequency and Nature of Sexual Harassment, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking.....	22
Appendixes		
1	Instrument Development	22
2	Human Subjects Protections and Safeguards.....	94
3	Results by Individual Status Code	105
4	Non-response Bias Analysis	108
5	Email Invitations and Reminders	117

1. Introduction

This report describes the results of the 2015 *Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct* administered at the University of Oregon. The project was designed to address the concerns related to the incidence and prevalence of sexual assault and sexual misconduct at the University of Oregon. There were three overall goals of the survey. One was to estimate the incidence and prevalence of different forms of nonconsensual sexual contact, harassment, stalking, and intimate partner violence. The second goal was to collect information on student views related to the climate surrounding sexual assault and misconduct. The third goal was to assess student knowledge and evaluation of school resources and procedures when responding to instances of sexual assault and sexual misconduct. Addressing each of these goals will help the University of Oregon create a safer and more accepting campus environment.

The University of Oregon participated as part of a consortium of 27 colleges and universities organized by the American Association for Universities (AAU). The research firm Westat led the design effort, carried out the survey, and conducted the analysis presented in this report. The content and methodology of the survey was developed in consultation with a committee of university representatives from the participating schools.

This report includes a description of the survey design and methodology used to conduct the survey, as well as empirical results. For this report we have included descriptive information for selected tables.

2. Methodology

2.1 Instrument Development

In early November 2014, the AAU Survey Design Team was formed and started on the survey development process. (For a list of Design Team members, see Table A1, Appendix 1.) The team met weekly, sometimes twice a week, to review progress and discuss sections of the questionnaire. Throughout the survey design process, the team received more than 700 comments about the survey for consideration, including those from the Survey Design Team and study coordinators. Disagreements were resolved by consensus. In addition, college students provided feedback on the instrument by participating in: (1) two rounds of cognitive testing conducted at Westat; and (2) pilot administration groups conducted at four participating institutions of higher education (IHEs).

2.2 Survey Content

The survey structure is comprised of ten sections (A-J) and concludes with a final debriefing question about the survey experience. A core set of 63 questions was asked of every respondent, including Background (A), Perceptions of Risk (B), Resources (C), Harassment (D), Stalking (E), Sexual Violence (G), Sexual Misconduct Prevention Training (H), Perceptions of Responses to Reporting (I), and Bystander Behavior (J).

Respondents in a partnered relationship or who had been in a partnered relationship since enrolling at the university were asked questions about Intimate Partner Violence/Domestic Violence (F). Additional questions were administered if respondents reported being victimized. For Harassment, Stalking, and Intimate Partner Violence/Domestic Violence (sections D, E and F), follow-up questions were asked for each type of misconduct. These follow-up questions collected information across all reported incidents for each form of victimization. For example, if someone was a victim of Intimate Partner Violence by two different partners, the follow-up questions asked for information across both partners. For Sexual Violence (section G), follow up questions, including a Detailed Incident Form (DIF), were asked for the items covering sexual assault (G1-G5), coercion (G6, G7) and lack of affirmative consent (G8, G9). (For the complete instrument, with annotations, see Appendix 1.)

The Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct was administered as a web survey. The use of merge fields throughout the instrument allowed for frequent referencing of the respondent's university within questions and framing language, personalizing the survey experience for students. Further, response options for five questions included university-specific responses: school of enrollment (A5), student organizations (A16), living situation (A17), services and resources (C1), and resources related to sexual assault and sexual misconduct (D10, E8, F8, GA16).

Each page of the web survey included links to general and school-specific frequently asked questions (FAQs) and resources. (For FAQs and resources, see Appendix 2.) All web survey pages also included the Help Desk number to assist students who needed either technical assistance or additional resources.

2.3 Sample and Incentives

The University of Oregon identified 21,980 enrolled students to participate in the *Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault & Sexual Misconduct*.

To encourage participation, students were either entered into a drawing or offered a \$5 incentive to complete the survey. A sample of 6,000 students was randomly selected to receive a \$5 Amazon gift card incentive for submitting the survey. All remaining students were entered into a drawing for a \$500 cash prize if they clicked on the survey link embedded in their

invitation or reminder email. Students were not required to complete the survey in order to be entered in the drawing. Students were notified of their eligibility for either the \$5 Amazon gift card or the drawing in the invitation and reminder emails.

2.4 Survey Procedures

The Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct was launched at the University of Oregon on April 17, 2015 and closed three weeks later on May 8, 2015. All enrolled students were offered the opportunity to participate in the survey.

Email invitations to participate in the survey were sent to students' university email addresses through a Westat email account on the first day of data collection, April 17, 2015. Each email included a unique link to the student's online survey and was signed by University of Oregon Vice President for Student Life Robin H. Holmes. Westat sent reminder emails, also signed by Vice President Holmes, on April 24 and May 5 to prompt completion of the survey before the deadline. The University of Oregon Campus Climate Survey was due on May 8. (For email invitations and reminders, see Appendix 5.)

2.5 Response Rates

At the close of data collection, the University of Oregon had an overall response rate of 13.9 percent.

Table 1, Response rates

N = 21,980	Female			Male			Combined		
	n	resp	%	n	resp	%	n	resp	%
Graduates or Professional	1,402	411	29.3	1,520	269	17.7	2,922	680	23.3
Undergraduates	9,089	1,582	17.4	9,969	797	8.0	19,058	2,379	12.5
	10,491	1,993	19.0	11,489	1,066	9.3	21,980	3,059	13.9

A completed survey was defined by two criteria:

- For those with timing information, did it take the respondent at least 5 minutes to fill out the questionnaire?¹
- For everyone, did the respondent answer at least one question in each of the following sections: sexual harassment (D), stalking (E), and sexual assault/other misconduct (G)?

The first criterion is to exclude those students who went through the survey so quickly that they could not possibly read and answer the questions.²

¹ Timing data was not available for anyone who did not get to the end of the survey and hit the 'submit' button.

The second criterion brings in those cases that did not press the ‘submit’ button at the end of the survey, but did provide responses to most of the questionnaire. We used the victimization sections to define a ‘complete’ because of the importance of these items to the survey’s goals.³

The response rate for the incentivized sample – that is, students offered a \$5 gift card upon completion of the survey – was 16.9 percent.

Table 2. Response rates by incentive condition

Incentive condition	n	resp	%
\$5 gift card	6,000	1,012	16.9
Drawing	15,980	2,047	12.8

2.6 Brief Description of the Sampling Procedure for the University of Oregon

A census of 21,980 students was used to conduct the survey. A sample of 6,000 students was selected to receive the \$5 gift card. To select this sample, a systematic sampling procedure was used after sorting the frame by the following variables: Full Time Status, Online Status, Gender, Race/Ethnicity, School, Enrollment Status in Undergraduate/Graduate/Professional/Non-degree Program, Year of Study for Undergraduate Students, and Year in Program for Graduate/Professional Students. The values for these variables are shown in Table 3. The remainder of the students in the frame were able to enter into a drawing to win \$500. The distribution of each sort variable in the frame is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Frame distributions of sampling sort variables

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Full Time Status	Full time	19,291	87.77
	Part time	2,689	12.23
Online Status	Yes	153	0.70
	No	21,827	99.30
Gender	Male	11,489	52.27
	Female	10,491	47.73

² When testing the survey, we asked testers to go through the survey as quickly as possible (e.g., skimming the questions and not reading the introduction or instructions). Based on these findings, five minutes was chosen as a cutoff point, below which the survey was not counted as a complete.

³ This criterion could not be used for Intimate Partner Violence (section F) because of the skip pattern embedded in this section (i.e., student had to have been in a partnered relationship since a student at school).

Table 3. Frame distributions of sampling sort variables (continued)

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Race / Ethnicity	American Indian/Alaska Native	134	0.61
	Asian	1,196	5.44
	Black	424	1.93
	Hispanic	1,865	8.48
	Nonresident Alien	3,053	13.89
	Pacific Islander	89	0.40
	Two or more Races	1,231	5.60
	Unknown	339	1.54
	White	13,649	62.10
School	Architecture and Allied Arts	1,495	6.80
	Arts and Sciences	12,203	55.52
	Business	3,538	16.10
	Education	1,407	6.40
	Graduate School	47	0.21
	Journalism	2,174	9.89
	Law	416	1.89
	Music and Dance	380	1.73
	Unclassified	320	1.46
Enrollment Status	Undergraduate	18,799	85.53
	Graduate	2,518	11.46
	Professional	365	1.66
	Non-degree	298	1.36
Year of Study for Undergraduate Students	Graduate/Professional/Non-degree	3,181	14.47
	Undergraduate Freshman	2,976	13.54
	Undergraduate Sophomore	3,976	18.09
	Undergraduate Junior	4,562	20.76
	Undergraduate Senior	7,285	33.14
Year in Program for Graduate/Professional Students	Undergraduate/Non-degree	19,097	86.88
	Graduate/Professional Year 1	901	4.10
	Graduate/Professional Year 2	1,030	4.69
	Graduate/Professional Year 3	457	2.08
	Graduate/Professional Year 4	198	0.90
	Graduate Year 5	131	0.60
	Graduate Year 6+	166	0.76

2.7 Brief Description of the Weighting Procedure for the University of Oregon

The initial step was to create a base-weight for each respondent. A census was conducted at the University of Oregon and a base weight of one was assigned to each respondent. The base weight was adjusted to reflect non-response. This adjustment consisted of a raking procedure that adjusted the base weight to the demographic data available on the frame (Deming and Stephen, 1940; Deville, Särndal, and Sautory, 1993; Cervantes and Brick, 2008). The variables used in the raking procedure are as shown in the following table:

Table 4. Variables used in the raking procedure

Variable	Description	Variable Value
Incentive Status	This is an indicator variable whether a student was selected into the incentivized program, which offered \$5 Amazon gift card, or not	1: \$5 Amazon gift card 0: Not in incentivized sample
Gender	Two-category gender variable (Male/Female). The frame data only had two categories (male and female), whereas the survey data had 8 categories. To make the frame and the survey data compatible, the survey responses to a non-male/female category were imputed to a male or female category. Transgender male/female cases are coded as ordinary male/female.	1: Male 2: Female
Age Group	Student's age was grouped into four categories, 18-20, 21-23, 24-26, and 27+.	1: 18-20 2: 21-23 3: 24-26 4: 27+
Year in School	This is a combined variable of student affiliation (Undergraduate/Graduate/ Professional) and year of study or year in program. The questionnaire had separate questions on year of study for undergraduates (freshman, sophomore, junior, senior) and graduate/professional students (1 st , 2 nd , ..., 6+).	1: Undergraduate freshman 2: Undergraduate sophomore 3: Undergraduate junior 4: Undergraduate senior 5: Graduate/Professional year 1 & 2 6: Graduate/Professional year 3 & 4 7: Graduate/Professional year 5 & 6+
Race/Ethnicity	This variable has 5 categories, Hispanic, White, Black, Other race, and Nonresident alien. The frame race/ethnicity categories are grouped this way, and the survey race/ethnicity variables were coded to conform to this categorization.	1: Hispanic 2: White 3: Black 4: Other race 5: Nonresident alien

Missing values in the demographic variables in the survey data were imputed using a hot-deck procedure that randomly allocated responses in the same proportion as those answered within each imputation class. On average, 1.16 percent of survey respondents had to be imputed in this way.

The raking procedure adjusts the base weight so that the sum of adjusted weights of the survey respondents for a subgroup is equal to the frame total for that subgroup. Subgroups are defined by each variable used in the raking procedure. Algebraically, this can be expressed as

$$\sum_{k=1}^n I_{gk} w_k = N_g$$

where n is the respondent sample size (3,059), I_{gk} is an indicator variable having 1 if respondent k belongs to subgroup g , 0 otherwise, w_k is the adjusted weight for respondent k , and N_g is the frame count of subgroup g .

For example, the weight total for all female respondent students from the survey is equal to the total female count (10,491) in the frame. The same is true for subgroups defined by each variable listed in the above table.

Due to sparse data when cross-classifying the variables used for raking, extreme weights were encountered. A weight was considered extreme when it is less than 1 or greater than four times of the median weight. To address this problem, weight trimming was used, where any weight less than one is boosted to one and any weight greater than four times of median weight is trimmed so that they were always greater than one and less than four times the median weight. Nine large weights were trimmed by this procedure, and then the raking procedure was run one last time to obtain the final weights that sum to the frame totals.

References

Deming, W.E., and Stephen, F.F. (1940). On a least squares adjustment of a sampled frequency table. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 14, 427-444.

Cervantes, I. F., and Brick, M. (2008). Empirical Evaluation of Raking Ratio Adjustments for Nonresponse. *Proceedings of the Survey Research Methods Section of the American Statistical Association* (CD-ROM).

Deville, J.C., Särndal, E.E., and Sautory, O. (1993). Generalized raking procedure in survey sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 88, 1013-1020.

3. Survey Results

This chapter describes the results of the survey. The analyses were guided by the following research questions:

1. What is the campus climate around sexual assault and sexual misconduct?
2. What do students know about and think of resources related to sexual assault and sexual misconduct?
3. What is the frequency and nature of sexual assault?
4. What is the frequency and nature of misconduct because of coercion and absence of affirmative consent?
5. What is the frequency and nature of sexual harassment, intimate partner violence and stalking?

The discussion and tables are organized by these research questions. There is discussion for the tables related to the attitudinal measures related to campus climate (section 3.1), knowledge of campus resources related to sexual assault and misconduct, the prevalence and incidence of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force, incapacitation (section 3.3), coercion and absence of affirmative consent (section 3.4), harassment, stalking and intimate partner violence (section 3.5). There are tables included in the chapter that are not explicitly discussed, describing the consequences of the victimization experiences, the relationship between the victim and the offender, the location of the incident, information about reporting to an agency/organization.

Most of the discussion and tables are centered on rates by gender and enrollment status. For gender, respondents were asked to identify themselves into one of eight categories.⁴ For this analysis, respondents were classified into one of three groups: 1) female, 2) male, and 3) transgender, genderqueer or nonconforming, questioning or not listed (TGQN).⁵ Collapsing groups into TGQN helps to maintain adequate sample to generate estimates. Enrollment status was divided into two groups: 1) undergraduate and 2) graduate and professional.

Prior surveys have shown that TGQN and females have significantly higher rates of victimization than males. However, very few campus surveys have produced statistically reliable estimates for those that identify as TGQN because they constitute a very small percentage of the campus population. For the AAU survey approximately 1 percent of the students selected a non-male/female category. While

⁴ These eight categories are: male, female, transgender male, transgender female, genderqueer or non-conforming gender, questioning, not listed and 'decline to state'.

⁵ Those who declined to state their gender were randomly allocated using a hot-deck imputation procedure to the male or female categories. Approximately .5 percent of respondents declined to state their gender.

this is a small percentage, the large number of responses to the AAU survey permits estimating rates for this group with adequate statistical precision⁶.

When interpreting the tables, please note the following:

1. An 's' indicates the cell was suppressed for confidentiality reasons.
2. Any non-numeric symbol indicates there was no data for that cell.
3. Comparisons between gender or enrollment status categories are only discussed where those differences were statistically significant at $p < 0.05$. Significance tests were conducted using a t-test assuming independent samples.

3.1 Campus Climate around Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct

Students reported on several topics on the campus climate related to sexual assault and sexual misconduct. They were asked about their expectations regarding the response from the university and peers if they were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct; whether they had ever witnessed an incident and whether they intervened; whether they perceive sexual assault or sexual misconduct as a problem on campus; and the likelihood that they would be victimized.

Response to a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. Students were asked about what might happen if someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at University of Oregon (Table 1.1). Overall, 54.8 percent of all students believe that it is very or extremely likely that the victim would be supported by other students in making a report. Male students are more optimistic than females, with 59.3 percent of male undergraduate students and 57.0 percent of male graduate students indicating that it is very or extremely likely that other students would support the victim in making a report, compared to 52.3 percent of female undergraduate students and 38.5 percent of female graduate students. Overall, fewer TGQN students believe that it is very or extremely likely that a student would be supported by other students after making a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct.

Students were asked about the likelihood that the alleged perpetrator or their associates would retaliate against the victim in response to a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. Overall, 22.9 percent indicated that it is very or extremely likely that retaliation would occur. Male students are less inclined to believe that a report would result in retaliation, with 17.0 percent of male undergraduate students and 20.9 percent of male graduate students indicating that it is very likely or extremely likely that this would occur, compared to 26.9 percent of female undergraduate students and 40.3 percent

⁶ While the rates for TGQN students are generally sufficiently large to generate a reliable statistical estimate, the rates by enrollment status are based on relatively small sample sizes. This makes it difficult to compare across groups. In order to make comparisons with this gender group, the text below makes statements referencing estimates for TGQN students summing across enrollment status (referred to as 'Overall' in the text). This overall estimate is not shown in the tables.

of female graduate students). Overall, a higher percentage of TGQN students believe that there would be retaliation against the victim in the event of a report.

The survey contained several questions about how campus officials would react to a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. Students were asked whether campus officials would take the report seriously. Overall, 53.0 percent said that it is very or extremely likely that the report would be taken seriously by campus officials. Female students are less optimistic than male students in this regard, with 47.7 percent of female undergraduate students and 32.6 percent of female graduate students believing that it is very or extremely likely, compared to 61.8 percent of male undergraduate students and 48.7 percent of male graduate students. Overall, TGQN students were least likely to believe that a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct would be taken seriously.

Students were asked if campus officials would protect the safety of individuals making the report. Overall, 45.9 percent said that it is very or extremely likely that the individual's safety would be protected. Females are less optimistic, with 41.5 percent of female undergraduate and 24.1 percent of female graduate students saying that it is very or extremely likely that the individual's safety would be protected, compared to 54.3 percent of male undergraduate and 42.9 percent of male graduate students.

Students were asked if they believe that campus officials would conduct a fair investigation in the event of a report. Overall, 37.4 percent indicated that it is very or extremely likely that this would occur. Among undergraduates, females are less optimistic than males, with 35.3 percent of female undergraduate students saying that it is very or extremely likely that there would be a fair investigation, compared to 44.4 percent of male undergraduate students. A similar trend can be found among graduate students, where 17.0 percent of female graduate students say that it is very or extremely likely that there would be a fair investigation, compared to 27.4 percent of male graduate students.

Overall, 36.2 percent of students said it was very or extremely likely that campus officials would take action against the offender. Females are less likely than males to believe that campus officials would take action against the offender, with 31.4 percent of female undergraduate students and 13.4 percent of female graduate students saying that it is very or extremely likely that this would occur, compared to 44.5 percent of male undergraduate students and 34.4 percent of male graduate students.

Lastly, 33.1 percent said it was very or extremely likely that campus officials would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus. Graduate students are less inclined to believe this than undergraduate students, with 14.8 percent of female graduate students and 24.9 percent of male graduate students saying that it is very or extremely likely that this would happen, compared to 40.4 percent of male undergraduates and 29.9 percent of female undergraduate students.

Bystander intervention. Students were asked about different situations related to being a bystander to the occurrence of sexual assault or misconduct, the extent to which they intervened, and the reason for their intervention decision (Table 1.2). Overall, 22.9 percent of the students said they have suspected that a friend may have been sexually assaulted. Female undergraduate students reported this in the highest proportions (27.7%), followed by graduate females and undergraduate males (20.6% and 20.3%, respectively), and male graduate students having the lowest percentage who had suspected that a friend may have been the victim of a sexual assault (11.2%). Overall, TGQN students indicated that they suspected a friend has been sexually assaulted in higher proportions.

Among the bystanders, 65.0 percent took some type of action, with most speaking to a friend or someone else to seek help (54.0%). Female undergraduates were more likely to speak to a friend or someone else to seek help than male undergraduates (58.6% vs. 45.5%).

Overall, 45.0 percent of the students reported they had witnessed a drunken person heading for a sexual encounter. Undergraduates reported this more often, with 48.4 percent of undergraduate females and 46.0 percent of undergraduate males having witnessed this, compared to 37.0 percent of female graduate students and 30.5 percent of male graduate students.

Among the bystanders, a total of 73.4 percent indicated that they did nothing, with 20.6 percent saying they weren't sure what to do and 52.8 percent saying they did nothing for another reason. Approximately 26.6 percent of the students did take some type of action, About 9.4 percent of the students directly intervened to stop the incident, 7.5 percent spoke to someone else to seek help and 9.7 percent did something else. Female undergraduates more often reported that they directly intervened to stop it (11.7% vs. 7.5% male undergraduates), spoke to someone else to seek help (10.3% vs. 5.8% male undergraduates), or did nothing because they weren't sure what to do (23.6% vs. 16.8% male undergraduates).

Asked whether they had witnessed someone acting in a sexually violent or harassing manner, 24.2 percent indicated that they had witnessed such an incident. Female graduate students reported this in the highest proportions (29.4%), followed by 29.1 percent of female undergraduate students and 20.3 percent of male undergraduate students, with male graduate students (15.9%) reporting this least often.

Among the bystanders, a total of 49.5 percent indicated that they did nothing, with 23.3 percent saying they weren't sure what to do and 26.2 percent saying they did nothing for another reason. Overall, 50.5 percent of the bystanders did take some type of action, with 19.1 percent directly intervening to stop the incident, 16.4 percent speaking to someone else to seek help and 15.0 percent doing something else.

Opinions about prevalence and personal risk. Asked how problematic sexual assault or sexual misconduct is at University of Oregon, 37.7 percent reported that it is very much or extremely problematic (Table 1.3). Females were more likely to say this, with 44.2 percent of female undergraduates, 54.5 percent of female graduate students, 28.3 percent of male undergraduates and

39.8 percent of male graduate students reporting this way. Overall, higher proportions of TGQN students believe that sexual assault or sexual misconduct is very or extremely problematic at this university.

A relatively small proportion said that they believe that they are very or extremely likely to experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus (7.0%) or off campus (7.5%). Female undergraduates were more worried than male undergraduates, with 12.5 percent of female undergraduates believing that it is very or extremely likely that they would experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct off campus, for example, vs. 2.5 percent of undergraduate males.

3.2 Resources Related to Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct

This section presents findings regarding the students' awareness of services and resources offered by the university for those affected by sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The students were first asked if they were aware of specific university resources from a list provided by the university. Students were then asked four questions about their knowledge of how the university defines sexual assault and sexual misconduct, how to get help if the student or a friend experienced sexual assault or sexual misconduct, where to make a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct, and what happens when a student reports an incident of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. Students were also asked whether their initial orientation to the university included information about sexual assault and sexual misconduct on campus, and if so, how helpful it was.

Awareness of resources. Table 2.1 presents the extent to which students are aware of specific resources provided by the university for victims of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. The students' awareness of these services ranged from 84.4 percent to 10.9 percent. For most of the services offered, undergraduate students are more aware than graduate students.

Knowledgeable about university sexual assault policies and procedures. Overall, 30.0% of students at University of Oregon are very or extremely knowledgeable about how the university defines sexual assault and sexual misconduct (Table 2.1). Approximately one-third (32.6%) know where to find help at the university if they or a friend are victims of sexual assault or sexual misconduct, and 27.4 percent know where to make a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. A smaller percentage (15.6%) knows what happens when a student makes a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct.

Regarding the university's initial orientation, 54.6 percent indicated that they attended the orientation and it did include information about sexual assault and sexual misconduct. Additionally, 24.1 percent did not remember whether the orientation included this information, and 14.1 percent said that the orientation did not include information about sexual assault and sexual misconduct. Among the students who attended an orientation that included this information, 35.0 percent found the information very or extremely useful.

3.3 Frequency and Nature of Victimization by Physical Force or Incapacitation

Students were asked about victimization due to a wide range of tactics. This section summarizes the prevalence of victimization that was the result of physical force or incapacitation at University of Oregon, as well as the characteristics of the victims, the number of times that students have been a victim of this type of assault and whether the incident was reported to an agency or another individual.

To measure victimization involving physical force and incapacitation, students were asked five questions that covered two types of behaviors:⁷

Penetration:

- When one person puts a penis, finger, or object inside someone else's vagina or anus
- When someone's mouth or tongue makes contact with someone else's genitals

Sexual Touching:

kissing

touching someone's breast, chest, crotch, groin, or buttocks

grabbing, groping or rubbing against the other in a sexual way, even if the touching is over the other's clothes

The estimates include events that were completed, as well as attempts to physically force the person to engage in acts involving penetration.

When a student reported an event, they were asked which academic year it occurred and whether this was part of another assault that had already been reported. If it was part of a previously reported victimization, the respondent was asked which one. Events were only counted once. If both penetration and sexual touching were part of the same incident, the penetration was counted. This hierarchy rule was adopted to conform to the counting rules established by the FBI and in the Clery statistics.

Prevalence. Prevalence is estimated by counting the number of individuals that have been a victim at least once over the time period of interest. Tables 3.1a through 3.1d present the prevalence of nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching due to physical force or incapacitation for undergraduate females, graduate females, undergraduate males, and graduate males. Each table displays the prevalence for the current year and since entering University of Oregon, as well as by the

⁷ See questions G1 – G5 of the questionnaire

different behaviors and tactics. The tactics are further disaggregated by whether physical force, incapacitation or both were involved in the event.

The discussion below primarily concentrates on rates since the student entered University of Oregon. The patterns for the current year parallel these rates, but are lower because of the shorter time frame. First the patterns within each of the four groups are described, with female undergraduates being first. The patterns across groups are then summarized.

Among female undergraduates, 24.2 percent experienced this type of assault since entering University of Oregon and 14.2 percent experienced this type of assault during the current school year (Table 3.1a). Among female undergraduates 10.6 percent were victims of nonconsensual penetration involving force or incapacitation since entering University of Oregon. Breaking this down further, 6.0 percent were victims of penetration with physical force (no incapacitation) 5.5 percent were victims of a sexual assault involving penetration by incapacitation (no physical force), and 1.4 percent were victims of this type of assault by both physical force and incapacitation.

With respect to sexual touching, 19.0 percent of female undergraduates were victims since entering University of Oregon, and 11.1 percent during the current school year. Since entering University of Oregon, 13.2 percent were victims of this type of assault using physical force only, 7.7 percent using incapacitation only and 1.4 percent was victims of nonconsensual sexual touching, with both physical force and incapacitation.

Of the incidents that involved physical force, about half were completed and half were attempted.

Among graduate females, 9.8 percent were victims of sexual assault involving either nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching since entering University of Oregon, and 4.5 percent in the current school year (Table 3.1b). Since entering University of Oregon, 3.9 percent were victims of sexual assault with penetration. With respect to tactics for nonconsensual penetration, 2.7 percent was physical force, and 1.3 percent was by incapacitation only.

Since entering University of Oregon, 7.6 percent of graduate female students were victims of nonconsensual sexual touching due to physical force or incapacitation. Physical force was reported by 6.2 percent of respondents, and 1.5 percent indicated assault by incapacitation only.

Among undergraduate males 8.0 percent were victims of either nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching since entering University of Oregon, and 5.1 percent in the current school year (Table 3.1c). Among male undergraduates, 2.7 percent were victims of assault involving penetration, 1.5 percent by physical force only and 1.2 percent was victims by incapacitation only.

Since entering University of Oregon, 6.2 percent of undergraduate males were victims of nonconsensual sexual touching by force or incapacitation, and 4.1 percent in the current school year. Examining this by tactic, 3.1 percent were by physical force only and 3.1 percent by incapacitation only.

Among male graduate students, 2.0 percent victims of nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching since entering college (Table 3.1d). When examining by behaviors, 1.5 percent were victims of sexual touching.

There are significant differences in the prevalence rates by gender. Females are much more likely to report this type of victimization. Female undergraduates have a rate that is approximately 3 times higher than male undergraduates. Similarly, female graduate students have rates that are 5 times higher than male graduate students. This pattern by gender is also true for each of the types of behaviors.

Undergraduate students report higher rates than graduate students. For females the rate for undergraduates is more than twice as high as for graduate students.

Victim Characteristics. Table 3.2 presents prevalence rates by victim characteristics: sexual orientation, ethnicity, race, disability status, marital status, and year in school. There is a very large difference between the two categories of sexual orientation. Overall non-heterosexuals have a rate of 21.8 percent and heterosexuals 13.7 percent. There are similar differences when comparing rates by gender and across enrollment status.

Students that reported having a disability registered with the university had a prevalence rate that was more than twice as high as those without a disability (25.5% vs. 14.1). This pattern is the same across gender and enrollment status groups.

Graduate and professional students that are married have significantly lower rates than those that are not married for both females and males. The patterns are similar for males, although not as dramatic.

The rates by year in school are disaggregated by time frame (current year vs. since entering University of Oregon). These provide one of the first profiles from survey data on how rates vary by school year. In prior publications, the information by year in school has been based on reports made to the school or the police. Looking at the prevalence rates in the current school year for female undergraduates, the highest rates are for freshman, sophomores, and juniors. The rates then drop significantly in the senior year. For graduate and professional students, the patterns are much less pronounced and do not indicate a consistent decline by year in school.

Patterns for undergraduates since entering University of Oregon exhibit a steady increase by year in school, as would be expected given the increased time period when victimization could have occurred. By senior year, 29.8 percent of female undergraduates reported experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching by force or incapacitation.

The pattern for male undergraduates is not as consistent. Among male seniors, 9.2 percent report being victimized since entering University of Oregon. This is significantly higher than the rate for male freshman (3.9%).

Table 3.3 provides prevalence rates by the same set of characteristics for females disaggregated by whether the incident involved penetration or sexual touching.⁸ The pattern of results does not significantly differ by the two types of behavior.

Number of times assaulted. Tables 3.4a and 3.4b provide estimates of the number of times students have been victims of nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation. This survey is one of the first to estimate rates of multiple victimizations. Table 3.4a provides rates by time period for acts involving penetration for females. Overall, 1.8 percent of females were victimized 2 or more times during the current school year and 4.1 percent reported being victimized 2 or more times since enrolling in college.

Table 3.4b provides the number of times students have been victims of nonconsensual sexual touching due to physical force or incapacitation. Overall, 2.9 percent of students were victims at least twice during the current year and 6.6 percent since enrolling at University of Oregon.

There is significant variation by gender. For example, among undergraduate females, 11.8 percent reported 2 or more incidents of sexual touching since enrolling in college. This compares to 3.1 percent for male undergraduate students, respectively.

Reporting and Reasons for Not Reporting. Students that said they were victimized were asked if he/she reported any of the incidents to several different agencies or organizations. Table 3.9a provides the estimates for females reporting nonconsensual acts of penetration or sexual touching involving physical force and incapacitation. Penetrative acts involving physical force were much more likely to be reported to an agency or organization when compared to penetration by incapacitation. Among penetrative acts, 24.0 percent of the victims reported an incident involving physical force was reported. This compares to 9.4 percent for penetrative acts involving incapacitation. Even fewer reported Sexual Touching incidents, with 6.1 percent of those by force and 6.5 percent by incapacitation.

Several follow-up questions were asked on why the respondent did not report to an agency, as well as whether any of the incidents were reported to someone else. The primary reason why incidents were not reported to an agency or organization was that it was not considered serious enough. For the penetrative acts involving force, 59.5 percent did not think the incident was serious enough to report. This compares to 53.7 percent for victims of penetration due to incapacitation.

A significant percentage of individuals said it was not reported because they did not think anything would be done about it (29.0%) or feared it would not be kept confidential (22.5%). A significant number of victims said she felt embarrassed or ashamed (22.2%). For penetrative act involving incapacitation, a higher proportion of victims reported feeling embarrassed or ashamed (30.0) or did not want the person to get into trouble (28.6%). A smaller proportion felt nothing would be done about it (19.6%) or that a report would not be kept confidential (14.7%).

⁸ Estimates for males are not presented because of the low prevalence rates for this gender.

For victims of nonconsensual sexual touching due to physical force, 66.6 percent felt the incident was not serious enough to report and 22.7 percent did not think anything could be done about it. Similar patterns occur for nonconsensual sexual touching involving incapacitation.

The respondent was asked if they reported the incident to another person. The patterns of this type of reporting were similar across both types of behaviors (penetration, sexual touching) and tactics (force, incapacitation). Between 19.4 to 23.2 percent did not tell anyone else at all and 72.1 to 81.9 percent said they told a friend. Victims of forced penetration were more likely to have told a family member (e.g. 19.2% vs. 12.9% incapacitation) or a faculty member (e.g. 7.9% vs. 4.4% for incapacitation).

Table 3.9b provides the reporting patterns for male victims of nonconsensual Sexual Touching involving physical force or incapacitation. The standard errors for these estimates are considerably higher because of a relatively small proportion of males reporting a victimization. The patterns resemble those displayed for females for this combination of behavior and tactic. For acts involving physical force, none of the victims reported these types of incidents to an agency or organization, and 14.1 percent reported acts involving incapacitation.

NOTE: TABLES 3.5 THROUGH 3.8 ARE NOT DISCUSSED

3.4 Frequency and Nature of Victimization Due to Coercion or Absence of Affirmative Consent

This section summarizes the prevalence of nonconsensual sexual contact that was the result of coercion or the absence of affirmative consent at University of Oregon. This section also provides the characteristics of the victims and the number of times that students have been a victim of this type of contact.

For purposes of the survey, coercion is defined as nonconsensual contact that involve threats of serious non-physical harm or promise of rewards (e.g., threatening to give you bad grades or cause problems for you, promise of good grades or a promotion at work).⁹

The survey also included items asking about nonconsensual contact where there was an absence of affirmative consent (AAC). These items were developed to capture emerging university regulations which make it a violation if both partners in a sexual encounter do not explicitly consent. To develop the questions, policies from AAU and COFHE schools on affirmative consent policies were reviewed.

The question on affirmative consent was introduced with the following definition:

⁹ Section G of the questionnaire had two questions asking about the use of this tactic involving penetration and sexual touching (questions G6 and G7).

Since you have been a student at [University], has someone had contact with you involving penetration or oral sex without your active, ongoing voluntary agreement? Examples include someone:

- initiating sexual activity despite your refusal
- ignoring your cues to stop or slow down
- went ahead without checking in or while you were still deciding
- otherwise failed to obtain your consent

Respondents were asked about AAC that involved penetration and sexual touching.¹⁰

Each time an instance of coercion or AAC was reported by a respondent, follow-up questions were administered that asked about which year it occurred and whether this was part of another incident that already been reported during the survey. If a respondent reported that an instance of coercion was part of a previously reported incident involving physical force or incapacitation, the event was not counted in the coercion prevalence rate. If a respondent reported an instance of AAC was part of a previously reported incident involving physical force, incapacitation or coercion, the event was not counted in the AAC prevalence rate.

Prevalence. Table 4.1 presents the prevalence of nonconsensual contact due to coercion or AAC for the current year and since entering University of Oregon by the different behaviors and tactics. The discussion below primarily concentrates on rates since the student entered University of Oregon. The patterns for the current year parallel these rates, but are lower because of the shorter time frame.

Since entering University of Oregon, nonconsensual contact involving coercion was reported by well less than 1 percent of the students (.5%). Nominally, Females are more likely to report this type of tactic than males, but it is not statistically significant. Similarly, undergraduates are more likely to report this than graduate and professional students, but the difference is not significant. The very low rate makes it difficult to precisely estimate this for these subgroups.

The percent of students reporting AAC as a tactic is much higher than coercion, with 6.9 percent of the students reporting this type of incident since entering University of Oregon. More than half of these incidents involve sexual touching (4.9%) compared to penetration (3.3%). There is significant variation by gender. A much higher percentage of females reported this than males (e.g. 12.5% female undergraduates compared to 2.4% male undergraduates). For females, there is also a difference between undergraduates (12.5%) and graduate students (5.4%).

Number of times assaulted. Table 4.2 contains estimates for the number of times that students were victimized due to coercion or AAC. As noted above, victimization due to coercion was very rare. Consequently it is difficult to note any significant multiple victimization patterns for this type of tactic. Contact involving AAC is more prevalent and does exhibit significant percentages who are victimized

¹⁰ See questions G8 and G9

more than once. For victims of sexual touching, almost as many individuals were victimized once (2.8%) since entering University of Oregon when compared to being victimized two or more times (2.1%).

Victim Characteristics. Table 4.3 presents prevalence rates for AAC by victim characteristics: sexual orientation, ethnicity, race, disability status, marital status, and year in school.¹¹ The rates for males are very low and disaggregating by these characteristics stretches the sample size. Perhaps as a consequence, there are very few significant differences for males. The discussion below primarily concentrates on females.

For females, there is a very large difference in prevalence rates between the two categories of sexual orientation. For female undergraduates, non-heterosexuals have a rate of 20.4 percent and heterosexuals a rate of 11.6 percent. There is a similar pattern for female graduate and professional students (7.2% vs. 5.0%). There is not a difference for females by ethnicity (Hispanic vs. not Hispanic), but there are selected differences by race. For females, Asians have significantly lower rates when compared to white students (e.g. 6.8% vs. 14.9%).

For all students, not just females, those that reported having a disability registered with the university had a higher prevalence rate than those without a disability (8.7% vs. 6.8%). This pattern is apparent across gender and enrollment status categories.

The rates by year in school are disaggregated by time frame (current year vs. since entering University of Oregon). Unlike the patterns for victimizations involving physical force and incapacitation, there is very little change in the current year risk of AAC victimization by year of undergraduate enrollment. The rates are very similar between freshman and senior year. The pattern is also very similar by year in school for graduate and professional students.

Patterns for undergraduates since entering University of Oregon exhibit a steady increase by year in school, as would be expected given the increased time period when victimization could have occurred. By senior year, 16.2 percent of female undergraduates reported experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching by AAC. This compares to 5.8 percent for freshman.

The prevalence of AAC victimization for these same characteristics for females is presented in Table 4.4 for the two types of behaviors (penetration, sexual touching). Overall, the patterns are very similar across the two behaviors. Significant differences are observed for both behaviors by categories of sexual orientation, race, disability and marital status. The pattern for current year rates by year in school is slightly different by behavior. For penetration, the rate increases from 2.1 percent at freshman year to 3.5 percent at junior year, and then decreases to 2.6 percent at senior year. For sexual touching, the rate increase from 3.6 percent at freshman year to 5.3 percent at sophomore year, and then decreases to 3.6 percent at senior year.

¹¹ Estimates for coercion by victim characteristics were not estimated because of the low prevalence of this type of victimization.

What is the total experience with nonconsensual sexual contact measured by the AAU survey?

To assess the overall risk of nonconsensual sexual contact, prevalence measures were estimated that combine the two behaviors that constitute sexual contact (penetration and sexual touching) and the four tactics discussed above (physical or threat of physical force; incapacitation; coercion; AAC). We provide estimates that combine these behaviors and tactics in several different ways.

We first present rates that include two of the four tactics (i.e. physical force and incapacitation) for the two behaviors (penetration and sexual touching or kissing). To narrow the definition further, estimates are presented for those events that were completed; this excludes attempts at forcible penetration which were not completed.

Some of the estimates provided in prior sections were for all students for the time period since entering University of Oregon. This mixes students who have been at the university for different periods of time and, therefore, are at risk of campus sexual assault or misconduct for different periods of time. To largely standardize for the time period, and get an overall picture of the risk for a student's entire stay on the campus, estimates were also made for seniors since entering University of Oregon. This provides the prevalence for the period while attending University of Oregon, which for many is a four-year period.¹²

According to the survey, 19.2 percent of seniors experienced sexual contact involving penetration or sexual touching involving physical force or incapacitation since entering University of Oregon (Table 4.8). Among senior females 29.2 percent reported this type of victimization. Among senior males, 9.2 percent reported this type of victimization since entering University of Oregon. There were not enough respondents in the TGQN group to generate reliable estimates.

Among senior females, 11.7 percent reported being a victim of nonconsensual penetration involving physical force or incapacitation since first enrolling at University of Oregon.

The above estimates exclude attempted, but not completed, sexual contact. However, attempted acts are also part of the legal definition of rape and sexual assault. They also have been included in a number of different studies on victimization of college students.¹³ The AAU survey measured attempts of forcible penetration. If these are also included, the estimates increase by approximately half a percentage point (e.g., 29.8% for females).

The survey measured two additional tactics—coercion and AAC, which are violations of the student conduct code. If we include these in an overall prevalence measure, the estimate increases to 23.6 percent of seniors who are victims of some type of nonconsensual sexual contact since first

¹² The exception are those that transferred to the college or university after their freshman year.

¹³ Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C.A., and Wisniewski, N. (1987). "The Scope of Rape: Incidence and Prevalence of Sexual Aggression and Victimization in a National Sample of Higher Education Students," *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology* 55: 162–70; Krebs, et al, *Ibid*; Fisher et al, *Ibid*

enrolling at the university or college. Among seniors 35 percent of females and 12.2 percent of males report being a victim of nonconsensual sexual contact at least once.

A second important summary measure is the prevalence during the 2014-2015 academic year. This is the most current measure of risk and might be seen as most relevant when developing policies. The prevalence for the 2014-2015 year for all undergraduates is 8.2 percent for completed acts of nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation (Table 4.9). Females have higher rates than males (12.4% for females vs. 4.4% for males). Among females, 3.8 percent report being victims of completed penetration involving physical force or incapacitation. When adding in attempted, but not completed, acts of penetration using physical force, 5.1 percent report being victims of penetration involving physical force or incapacitation.

Once including all types of nonconsensual sexual contact measured on the survey, 10.7 percent of undergraduates reported being a victim during the 2014 – 2015 academic year. Females when compared to males are most likely to be a victim at least once (16.4% for females vs. 5.5% for males).

How do the estimates compare with surveys of college students on sexual assault and sexual misconduct? To better understand the implications of the above results, it is useful to place them within the context of prior surveys on nonconsensual sexual contact. There are many differences in methodology among the different campus climate surveys, including the composition of the sample, the mode of survey administration, the response rate and, perhaps most importantly, the definitions of nonconsensual activity. Nonetheless, the detailed questions included on the AAU survey allow making selected comparisons.

The College Sexual Assault study (CSA)¹⁴ was conducted with undergraduate students attending two large, public universities. It was a web survey and had a response rate of 42%. While the question wording between the AAU survey and the CSA are not identical, they are similar when asking about penetrative and sexual touching behaviors and tactics, including physical force and incapacitation.¹⁵ The CSA study estimated rates using several different definitions. Perhaps the most widely cited is that 19.8 percent of female college seniors had been victims of completed nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since entering college (“1 in 5”). A 95% confidence interval around this estimate is 17.8 percent to 21.8 percent.¹⁶ The estimate for the AAU survey is 29.2 percent, with a confidence interval of 25.2 percent to 33.2 percent. The estimates for penetration by force and incapacitation are not statistically different (11.7% for University of Oregon and 14.3% for CSA).

NOTE: TABLE 4.5 IS NOT DISCUSSED

¹⁴Krebs, C. and Lindquist, C. (2014) “Setting the Record Straight on ‘1 in 5’”. <http://time.com/3633903/campus-rape-1-in-5-sexual-assault-setting-record-straight/>; see also Krebs, C., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S. and S. Martin (2007) The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study. Report of project awarded by the National Institute of Justice, Award 2004-WG-BX-0010. <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221153.pdf>;

¹⁵The AAU survey was based, in part, on the CSA.

¹⁶ The standard error of the estimate is 1 percent. Data obtained via personal communication from Christopher Krebs.

3.5 Frequency and Nature of Sexual Harassment, Intimate Partner Violence, and Stalking

The survey included measures of three other forms of sexual misconduct: 1) sexual harassment, 2) stalking and 3) intimate partner violence. This section reviews the prevalence, incidence and characteristics associated with each of these behaviors.

Sexual harassment. Harassment was defined as a series of behaviors that interfered with the victim's academic or professional performances, limited the victim's ability to participate in an academic program, or created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment. This definition is in line with campus policies, as well as those of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's definition regarding "hostile environment" and the US Department of Education.¹⁷ The specific behaviors referenced were taken from several different scales measuring harassment¹⁸:

- made sexual remarks or told jokes or stories that were insulting or offensive to you?
- made inappropriate or offensive comments about your or someone else's body, appearance or sexual activities?
- said crude or gross sexual things to you or tried to get you to talk about sexual matters when you didn't want to?
- emailed, texted, tweeted, phoned, or instant messaged offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures or videos to you that you didn't want?
- continued to ask you to go out, get dinner, have drinks or have sex even though you said, "No"?

Table 5.1a presents prevalence rates for victims of sexual harassment and characteristics of both the offenders and the victim. The table provides an overall estimate of prevalence, the specific behavior that occurred, number of times it occurred during the current academic year, the number of offenders involved, the association between the offender and the university, and the relationship between the offender and the victim.

Overall, 50.2 percent of students indicated that they have been the victims of sexual harassment. Female undergraduates report this most often (59.6%), followed by female graduate students and male undergraduates (58.8% and 42.3%, respectively), and lastly by male graduate students (33.3%). Overall, a much larger proportion of TGQN students indicate that they have been sexually harassed while a student at University of Oregon. The most common behavior cited was

¹⁷ For the EEOC definition, see http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/sexual_harassment.cfm. For the Department of Education definition, see http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/ocrshpam.html#_t1a.

¹⁸ For example, see Leskinen, E.A., & Cortina, L.M. (2014) Dimensions of disrespect: Mapping and measuring gender harassment in organizations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38(1), 107-123.

making inappropriate comments about their body, appearance or sexual activity (40.1%); followed by making sexual remarks, or insulting or offensive jokes or stories (31.8%). This pattern by gender and enrollment status is the same for each of the specific types of behaviors.

Students reporting harassment were asked how many times this has occurred in the in the last year. Approximately 82.9 percent of those who said they were subject to harassment said that it had happened in the last academic year. Most of these victims (62.4%) said that it had happened more than once during the last year.

The offender's affiliation to the university was most often described as a student (93.7%). This was more common among female undergraduate students (94.6%) than among female graduate students (85.8). Graduate students more often identified the offender as a faculty member (23.4% of female graduate students and 17.1% of male graduate students vs 6.0% of female undergraduates and 5.2% of male undergraduates). Female graduate students were more likely to identify their offender as another member of the university staff or administration (9.7% of female graduate students. 3.0% of female undergraduates).

The most common response describing the relationship of the offender to the victim is a friend or acquaintance (68.3%), followed by a stranger (49.0%). Female graduate students more frequently identified the relationship of the offender to the victim as teacher or advisor (15.6%), followed by male graduate students (8.7%), female undergraduates (4.2%), and lastly male undergraduates (2.5%). Graduate students were more likely to describe their offender as a co-worker, boss or supervisor (22.6% of female graduate students and 15.4% of male graduate students vs. 5.5% of female undergraduates and 4.5% of male undergraduates).

Female undergraduate students more often identified their relationship to the offender as someone they had dated or had an intimate relationship with (9.2%) compared to both undergraduate males (5.1%) and female graduate students (4.6%). Undergraduates more commonly described the offender as a friend or acquaintance (67.9% of female undergraduates and 73.4% of male undergraduates vs. 59.2% of female graduate students and 57.8% of male graduate students).

Intimate partner violence. Table 5.2a provides similar data for intimate partner violence (IPV). The IPV section was intended to capture violence associated with relationships that would not be captured in the sexual violence section (section G). This section was administered to anyone who said they had been in any partnered relationship since enrolling in college (Question A13):

Partnered relationships include:

- casual relationship or hook-up
- steady or serious relationship
- marriage, civil union, domestic partnership or cohabitation

The question wording for the IPV items (Section F of the questionnaire) is a combination of wording used in the University of New Hampshire 2012 survey as cited in the White House Task Force Report and the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) conducted by the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention.¹⁹ To be classified as a victim, respondents had to say that a partner had done one of the following:

- controlled or tried to control you? Examples could be when someone:
 - kept you from going to classes or pursuing your educational goals
 - did not allow you to see or talk with friends or family
 - made decisions for you such as, where you go or what you wear or eat
 - threatened to “out” you to others
- threatened to physically harm you, someone you love, or themselves?
- used any kind of physical force against you? Examples could be when someone
 - bent your fingers or bit you
 - choked, slapped, punched or kicked you
 - hit you with something other than a fist
 - attacked you with a weapon, or otherwise physically hurt or injured you

IPV was experienced by 10.8 percent of the student population who had been in a partnered relationship. This was reported most often by female undergraduates (13.3 percent), followed by male undergraduates and female graduate students (9.7% and 8.4%, respectively), and lastly by male graduate students (5.0%). The most common behavior was controlling or trying to control the victim (6.3%); followed by threatening to harm the victim, family or themselves (4.8%) and using physical force (4.6%). Close to one-half of victims (46.9%) reported that the incident occurred multiple times since the beginning of the 2014 school year.

Stalking. Stalking was based on definitions and behaviors used in the NISVS, the National Crime Victimization Survey and the National Violence Against Women’s Survey.²⁰ Respondents were asked whether someone:

¹⁹ Modified from Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

²⁰ Black et al, Ibid; Catalano, S. (2012). Stalking victims in the Unites States--revised. (NCJ 224527). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics; Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). Stalking in America: Findings form the National Violence Against Women Survey. (NCJ 172837). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

- made unwanted phone calls, sent emails, voice, text or instant messages, or posted messages, pictures or videos on social networking sites in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- showed up somewhere or waited for you when you did not want that person to be there in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- spied on, watched or followed you either in person or using devices or software in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety

To be considered stalking, the respondent had to additionally say that these behaviors, either singly or in combination, occurred more than once and was done by the same person.

Approximately five percent (4.6%) of students reported that they had been the victims of stalking while attending the University of Oregon (Table 5.3a). Female graduate students reported being victims of stalking most often at 7.5 percent, followed by undergraduate females at 7.4 percent, and male students at 2 percent (1.9% male undergraduates and 1.6% male graduate students). A higher proportion of TGQN students, overall, were victims of stalking. Among the victims, approximately 75 percent (74.5%) reported that an incident occurred within the last year. More than one-half of students (64.0%) reported that within the last year they were stalked multiple times.

Most often, the offender's affiliation to the university was described as a student (60.2%). In describing the relationship of the offender to the victim, students most often indicated that it was a friend or acquaintance (39.9%), followed by a stranger (39.0%), and someone they had dated or were intimate with (19.0%).

Table 5.4 presents the prevalence of sexual harassment, intimate partner violence, and stalking by the characteristics of the victim. For all of these types of sexual misconduct, non-heterosexual students report having been victimized more often than heterosexual youth (67.6% vs. 47.8% for sexual harassment, 19.4% vs. 9.5% for intimate partner violence, and 8.7% vs 4.0% for stalking). There are no significant differences by ethnicity.

NOTE: TABLES 5.1b through 5.3b ARE NOT DISCUSSED

Appendix 1. Instrument Development

A1.1 Survey Design Teams and Questionnaire Development

The survey development process was a collaboration between the Westat and AAU Survey Design Teams. The Westat team was co-chaired by Co-Principal Investigators, Dr. David Cantor, Senior Fellow and Research Professor at the Joint Program for Survey Methodology, and Dr. Bonnie Fisher, Professor, School of Criminal Justice, University of Cincinnati, both of whom are nationally recognized experts in survey methodology and sexual misconduct and sexual assault. The AAU Survey Design team was chaired by Dr. Sandy Martin, Professor and Associate Chair for Research, Department of Maternal and Child Health, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. Dr. Martin is a nationally recognized expert in sexual violence. They were joined by a multi-disciplinary group of university professors and administrators from participating IHEs with relevant expertise in survey design and methodology and issues related to sexual assault on campus. The members of the AAU Survey Design Team are presented in Table A1-1.

To start the survey design process, in October 2014, the Westat team reviewed *Not Alone: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault* which included recommendations on using campus climate surveys to document the problem of sexual assault on college campuses. The team also systematically reviewed decades of research literature on how to measure sexual misconduct and sexual victimization in a student population (e.g., Koss et al., 1987; Koss, et al., 2007; Fisher, 2009; Kilpatrick et al., 2007; Krebs et al., 2009). In addition, the team reviewed procedures and surveys developed and implemented by other IHEs (e.g., Rutgers University, University of Oregon, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Columbia University). Finally, the team drew on other victimization surveys such as National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), NCVS Supplemental Victimization Survey on Stalking (SVS), and the Campus Safety and Security Survey, as well as those that measured specific attitudes and behaviors such as harassment and bystander intervention. The final survey provides the source material that was used for each of the major sections.

In early November 2014, the AAU Survey Design Team was formed and started working with Drs. Cantor and Fisher on the survey development process. The first meeting, conducted via conference call, set the stage for the frequent and ongoing meetings needed to develop the survey. During the initial instrument development phase, from November 2014 to January 2015, the team had weekly conference calls. In February 2015, when final revisions were being made to the survey, the team met every other week. Meetings lasted, on average, two hours. In between formal meetings, team members were in frequent, sometimes daily, contact to provide technical expertise on survey design, review survey drafts and provide feedback, and resolve issues raised during meetings.

During these meetings, the AAU Survey Design Team members discussed at length conceptual and methodological issues underlying the measurement of sexual misconduct, sexual victimization and

campus climate constructs. Team members made final decisions on how to define campus climate (e.g., nature and scope) and the types of victimization that would be covered, question wording, response set wording, and ordering of topics. All decisions were made with the goal of keeping the time to complete the survey to between 15 and 20 minutes.

Survey items and topics were submitted by both the Westat Team and the AAU Survey Design Team and considered as part of the multi-step, iterative process to develop the final instrument. Only a very few persons who were invited to participate were not able to because of their intensive work or clinical schedule Drs. Cantor and Fisher consulted these persons as needed.

The Design Team members provided information on the overall structure and constructs included in the survey, as well as the survey question and responses wording, ordering of questions and sections, and other details. They also served as consultants at their respective universities who provided feedback to the entire group through their university liaisons; thus the survey was informed by a much wider group than the Design Team. In addition, some members of the Design Team assisted by pre-testing aspects of the draft survey with students at their respective universities.

Throughout this process, the team received more than 700 comments about the survey for consideration, including those from the Survey Design Team and IHE study coordinators. Each comment was reviewed individually and a decision was made about how best to handle each one with input from the AAU Survey Design Team. Disagreements were resolved by consensus.

Table A1-1. The AAU Survey Design Team

AAU Survey Design Team Members	
Melanie Boyd	Yale University Assistant Dean of Student Affairs and Director of Office of Gender and Campus Culture
Russell Carey	Brown University Executive Vice President for Planning and Policy
Melissa A. Clark	Brown University Professor of Epidemiology and Obstetrics and Gynecology; Associate Director, Center for Population and Health and Clinical Epidemiology
Nancy Deutsch	University of Virginia Associate Professor
Marne K. Einarson	Cornell University Assistant Director, Office Institutional Research & Planning
Lily Guillot Svensen	Yale University Research Analyst for the Office of Institutional Research; member of Yale’s Title IX Steering Committee
Christi Hurt	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill Director, Carolina Women's Center
Debra Kalmuss	Columbia University Professor, Population and Family Health, Mailman School of Public Health

Table A1-1. The AAU Survey Design Team (continued)

AAU Survey Design Team Members	
David Laibson	Harvard University Robert I. Goldman Professor of Economics
Sandra Martin	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (Chair of Survey Design Team) Department of Maternal and Child Health, Gillings School of Global Public Health
Stephen Minicucci	Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) Director of Research
Christina Morell	University of Virginia Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
Lindsay Orchowski	Brown University Assistant Professor of Psychiatry and Human Behavior (Research)
Jagruti “Jag” Patel	MIT Associate Director of Institutional Research
Nora Cate Schaeffer	University of Wisconsin-Madison Sewell Bascom Professor of Sociology Faculty Director, University of Wisconsin Survey Center
Sarah Schultz Robinson	University of Virginia Institutional Assessment Office
Stephanie S. Spangler	Yale University Deputy Provost for Health Affairs and Academic Integrity Clinical Professor of Obstetrics and Gynecology

A1.2 Student Input

College students provided feedback on the instrument by participating in: (1) two rounds of cognitive testing conducted at Westat; and (2) pilot administration groups conducted at four participating IHEs. Feedback was used to revise the instrument.

Cognitive interviewing at Westat

To cognitively test the survey instrument, Westat conducted two rounds of cognitive interviewing in January and February 2015. Fourteen respondents between the ages of 18 and 29 and currently enrolled in colleges or universities were recruited by posting ads on Craigslist in the Washington DC area. Westat screened each participant by phone to confirm their eligibility and to determine if the person had experienced any unwanted sexual contact while a student.

Two types of problems were revealed in the cognitive interviews. First, the wording of a few questions clearly posed problems as configured. Second, respondents did not fully read instructions and definitions, which led to inconsistent interpretation of questions.

Student feedback from Universities

Pilot studies were conducted at four universities with 91 students in January, 2015. The purpose of these pilot studies was to collect student feedback on the survey instrument. Participants

included a mix of men, women, LGBTQ, undergraduate, graduate and professional students, as well as student leaders and representatives from student governing bodies and organizations (university senate, housing student staff, health services student staff) and on-campus advocacy groups.

Overall, students were generally positive and constructive in the feedback they provided, and were pleased that such a survey was being conducted. There was nearly universal appreciation at being asked to provide feedback.

Feedback ranged from corrected typos and language choice, to suggestions to change the content of questions, to the general and conceptual (for example, not adequately capturing “hook up culture”), and to feedback on measures of sexual assault and coercion. Without suggesting uniformity among schools, respondents generally thought the measures of harassment, IPV, stalking, and sexual assault adequately covered the range of experiences that students might typically encounter. They also felt that questions were worded in an unbiased way. Some respondents were pleased to see questions asking about violations of affirmative consent; in their view, these types of experiences were among the most common sexually-related issues that students have to grapple with. When discussing the content of the questionnaire, participants thought all of the topics were important, particularly questions on personal experiences and prevention training. To improve comprehension, they also suggested providing definitions of sexual assaults. In addition, participants thought it is important to assess student’s attitudes on how ready the campus is for prevention and how campus leadership can be accessible to students; and suggested those attitudinal questions should be followed up with existing campus resources to educate students.

Respondents suggested additional response categories to add to questions about gender identity and sexual identity.

All the comments and suggestions from students’ feedback and cognitive interviews were carefully reviewed and extensively discussed by the Westat Team. The Design Team was informed of the findings and they agreed upon the revisions.

A1.3 Survey Content and Sources

NOTE: TO FOLLOW

A1.4 The Instrument: The Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct

Survey Flow and Logic

The survey has a core set of 63 questions that are asked of every respondent. Additional questions are administered if respondents report being victimized. For Harassment, Stalking and Intimate Partner Violence (Question items D, E and F), approximately 7 follow-up questions are asked for each type of misconduct. These follow-up questions ask for information across all reported incidents for each form of victimization. For example, if someone was a victim of Intimate Partner Violence by two different partners, the follow-up questions ask for information across both partners.

There is more complicated logic for the items covering sexual assault (G1-G5), coercion (G6, G7) and lack of affirmative consent (G8, G9). Across these items, there are two types of follow-up questions. First, there are follow-ups to each 'yes' response to questions G1 – G9 (Attachment 1). The purpose of these follow-ups is to count and date each of the incidents that occurred. This is done by following each 'yes' response to an individual screen item (G1 – G9) with questions that ask for the number of times (Attachment 1: G[X]a²¹) and the school year in which the incident occurred (Attachment 1: G[X]b – G[X]c). To finalize the count, there are additional follow-ups that ask if the incident is part of another incident that was already reported. If it had already been reported, the respondent is asked to indicate which other incident was involved (Attachment 1: G[X]d, G[X]e).

After G1 – G9 were completed, a second type of follow up was used to collect details on the victimization that was reported (Attachment 2). These follow-ups were divided into two groups. One group is for the sexual assault items (G1-G5). If a respondent reported 'yes' to at least one of G1 – G5, a series of approximately 18 items were administered to collect the details (Attachment 2; Items GA). These follow-ups are administered separately for G1-G2 (completed and attempted penetration by physical force), G3 (sexual touching using physical force), G4 (penetration when incapacitated) and G5 (sexual touching when incapacitated). For example, if a respondent reports a penetration by force (G1) and sexual touching by force (G3), these items were administered twice, once for each type.

²¹ "X" goes from 1 to 9. For example, G[1]a is the follow-up to question G1; G[2]a is the follow-up to question G2, etc.

As with the other types of victimization, these follow-up questions ask for a summary across all incidents of each type. For example if the individual was a victim of sexual touching using physical force (G3) on two occasions, the items will ask for a summary across both occasions. Up to 2 forms were administered for those individuals that reported 2 or more types of assaults. If more than two types of assaults were reported, then the top two were selected using the following order: 1) G1-G2 (completed or attempted penetration with force), 2) G4 (penetration when incapacitated), 3) G3 (sexual touching by force), 4) G5 (sexual touching by incapacitation).

The second group of follow-ups were administered for reports of coercion (G6, G7) and lack of affirmative consent (G8, G9; Attachment 2: Section GC). If a respondent reports both coercion and lack of affirmative consent, two forms were administered, one for each type.

SECTION A – BACKGROUND

First, we'd like to ask you a few questions about your background.

A1. How old are you?

[DROP DOWN LIST]

Under 18

18-29, by single year

30+

[IF AGE =Under 18]

“We are sorry but the survey can only be completed by students who are at least 18 years old. Thank you for your interest in our study. We appreciate your time.”

[EXIT SURVEY]

A2. Which of the following best describes your current student affiliation with [University]?

Undergraduate [CONTINUE]

Graduate [GO TO A4]

Professional [GO TO A4]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO A5]

A3. What is your class year in school? Answer on the basis of the number of credits you have earned.

Freshman [GO TO A5]

Sophomore [GO TO A5]

Junior [GO TO A5]

Senior [GO TO A5]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO A5]

A4. What year are you in your program? Answer on the basis of the number of years enrolled in the graduate or professional academic program.

1st year

2nd year

3rd year

4th year

5th year

6th year or higher

A5. In which school at [University] are you enrolled? If you are enrolled in more than one choose the school that you consider your primary affiliation (ex. most credits, college of main advisor).

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

A6. In what year did you first enroll as a student at [University]?

[DROP DOWN LIST]

Prior to 1997

1997 – 2015 by single year

A7. Do you take all of your courses on-line?

Yes

No

A8. Are you Hispanic or Latino?

Yes

No

A9. Select one or more of the following races that best describes you: (Mark all that apply)

American Indian or Alaska Native

Asian

Black or African American

Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander

White

A10. Are you a US citizen or permanent resident?

Yes

No

A11.²² Which best describes your gender identity?

Woman

Man

Transgender woman

Transgender man

Genderqueer or gender non-conforming

Questioning

Not listed

Decline to state

A12.²³ Do you consider yourself to be:

Heterosexual or straight

Gay or lesbian

Bisexual

Asexual

Questioning

Not listed

Decline to state

²² Modified from The University of Oregon Sexual Violence and Institutional Behavior Campus Survey (2014). Retrieved from <http://dynamic.uoregon.edu/jif/campus/UO2014campussurveycontent.pdf>

²³ Badgett, M. V. "Best practices for asking questions about sexual orientation on surveys." *The Williams Institute* (2009)

A13. Since you have been a student at [University], have you been in any partnered relationships? Partnered relationships include:

- casual relationship or hook-up
- steady or serious relationship
- marriage, civil union, domestic partnership or cohabitation

Yes

No

A14. Are you currently ...

Never married

Not married but living with a partner

Married

Divorced or separated

Other

A15. Do you have a disability registered with [University]'s Disability Services or Office on Disabilities?

Yes

No

A16. Since you have been a student at [University], have you been a member of or participated in any of the following? (Mark all that apply):

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

A17. Which of the following best describes your living situation?

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

SECTION B – PERCEPTIONS OF RISK²⁴

“Sexual assault” and “sexual misconduct” refer to a range of behaviors that are nonconsensual or unwanted. These behaviors could include remarks about physical appearance or persistent sexual advances. They also could include threats of force to get someone to engage in sexual behavior such as nonconsensual or unwanted touching, sexual penetration, oral sex, anal sex or attempts to engage in these behaviors . These behaviors could be initiated by someone known or unknown, including someone you are in or have been in a relationship with.

These next questions ask about your perceptions related to the risks of experiencing sexual assault or sexual misconduct.

B1. How problematic is sexual assault or sexual misconduct at [University]

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

B2. How likely do you think it is that you will experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

²⁴ Adapted from Fisher, B. S., & Sloan III, J. J. (2003). Unraveling the fear of victimization among college women: Is the “shadow of sexual assault hypothesis” supported?. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(3), 633-659.

B3. How likely do you think it is that you will experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct during off-campus university sponsored events?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

SECTION C - RESOURCES

The next questions ask about the services and resources offered by the university for those affected by sexual assault and sexual misconduct.

C1.²⁵ Are you aware of the services provided by the following? (Mark all that apply)

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

None of the Above

How knowledgeable are you about each of the following:

C2a. How knowledgeable are you about how sexual assault and sexual misconduct are defined at [University]?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

²⁵ Modified from #ISPEAK: Rutgers Campus Climate Survey. New Brunswick, NJ: Center on Violence Against Women and Children, School of Social Work, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. Received from http://socialwork.rutgers.edu/Libraries/VAWC/new_doc_to_upload_for_ispeak.sflb.ashx

C2b.²⁶ How knowledgeable are you about where to get help at [University] if you or a friend experienced sexual assault or sexual misconduct?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

C2c.²⁷ How knowledgeable are you about where to make a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct at [University]?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

C2d. How knowledgeable are you about what happens when a student reports an incident of sexual assault or sexual misconduct at [University]?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

²⁶ Modified from Rankin & Associates Consulting. (2008). Carleton College Climate Assessment Project: Carleton Final Report. Retrieved from: https://apps.carleton.edu/governance/diversity/campus_climate_survey/results/

²⁷ Ibid.

SECTION D - HARASSMENT²⁸²⁹

These next questions ask about situations in which a student at [University], or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] said or did something that

- interfered with your academic or professional performance,
- limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment

D1. Since you have been a student at [University], has a student, or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] made sexual remarks or told jokes or stories that were insulting or offensive to you?

Yes

Never experienced

These questions ask about situations in which someone said or did something that

- interfered with your academic or professional performance,
- limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment

²⁸ Modified from Leskinen, E.A., & Cortina, L.M. (2014) Dimensions of disrespect: Mapping and measuring gender harassment in organizations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38(1), 107-123.

²⁹ Modified from The University of Oregon Sexual Violence and Institutional Behavior Campus Survey (2014). Retrieved from <http://dynamic.uoregon.edu/jif/campus/UO2014campussurveycontent.pdf>

D2. Since you have been a student at [University], has a student, or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] made inappropriate or offensive comments about your or someone else's body, appearance or sexual activities?

Yes,

Never experienced

These questions ask about situations in which someone said or did something that

- interfered with your academic or professional performance,
- limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment

D3. Since you have been a student at [University], has a student, or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] said crude or gross sexual things to you or tried to get you to talk about sexual matters when you didn't want to?

Yes

Never experienced

These questions ask about situations in which someone said or did something that

- interfered with your academic or professional performance,
- limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment

D4. Since you have been a student at [University], has a student, or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] emailed, texted, tweeted, phoned, or instant messaged offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures or videos to you that you didn't want?

Yes

Never experienced

These questions ask about situations where someone said or did something that

- interfered with your academic or professional performance,
- limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile or offensive social, academic or work environment

D5. Since you have been a student at [University], has a student, or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] continued to ask you to go out, get dinner, have drinks or have sex even though you said, “No”?

Yes

Never experienced

BOX D1

IF YES TO ANY QUESTION D1 – D5, CONTINUE

ELSE GO TO E1

You said that the following happened to you since you’ve been a student at [University]:

- **[IF D1 = YES]** Someone made sexual remarks or jokes that were insulting or offensive
- **[IF D2 = YES]** Someone made inappropriate offensive comments about your or someone else’s body, appearance or sexual activities
- **[IF D3 = YES]** Someone said crude or gross sexual things to you or made unwelcomed attempts to get you to talk about sexual matters
- **[IF D4 = YES]** Someone emailed, texted, tweeted, phoned, or instant messaged offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures or videos to you
- **[IF D5 = YES]** Someone continued to ask you to go out, get dinner, have drinks or have sex even though you said, “No”

D6. How many different people behaved this way?

1 person

2 persons

3 or more persons

D7. How (was the person/were the persons) who behaved (this way/these ways) associated with [University]? (Mark all that apply)

Student

Faculty or instructor

Coach or trainer

Other staff or administrator

Other person affiliated with a university program (ex. internship, study abroad)

The person was not affiliated with [University]

Don't know association with [University]

D8. At the time of (this event/these events), what (was the person's/ were these persons') relationship to you? (Mark all that apply)

At the time, it was someone I was involved or intimate with

Someone I had been involved or was intimate with

Teacher or advisor

Co-worker, boss or supervisor

Friend or acquaintance

Stranger

Other

Don't know

D9. Since the beginning of the fall 2014 term, how many times has someone behaved this way?

0 times

1 time

2 times

3-5 times

6-9 times

10 or more times

D10. Since you have been a student at [University] have you contacted any of the following about (this experience/any of these experiences)? (Mark all that apply)

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

None of the above **[GO TO D13]**

[IF NO PROGRAM MARKED GO TO D13]

BOX D2

IF D10= NONE OF THE ABOVE OR NO PROGRAM MARKED THEN GO TO D13

ELSE ADMINISTER ITEMS D11 AND D12 FOR EACH PROGRAM MARKED IN D10 (UP TO 10)

D11 [A-J]. When did you most recently contact [Program] about (this experience/these experiences)?

Fall of 2014 – present

Fall of 2013 – Summer of 2014

Fall of 2012 – Summer of 2013

Prior to Fall of 2012

D12[A-J]. Thinking about the most recent time you contacted them, how useful was [Program] in helping you deal with (this experience/these experiences)?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

BOX D3

IF MORE PROGRAMS MARKED IN D10 THEN RETURN TO BOX D2

ELSE GO TO D14

D13. [IF NO PROGRAMS CONTACTED] Were any of the following reasons why you did not contact anyone at [University]? (Mark all that apply)

Did not know where to go or who to tell

Felt embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult

I did not think anyone would believe me

I did not think it was serious enough to report

I did not want the person to get into trouble

I feared negative social consequences

I did not think anything would be done

I feared it would not be kept confidential

Incident was not on campus or associated with the school

Incident did not occur while attending school

Other

D14. Did you (also) tell any of the following persons about this? (Mark all that apply)

Friend

Family member

Faculty or instructor

Someone else

I didn't tell anyone (else)

SECTION E – STALKING³⁰³¹³²

The next questions ask about instances where someone behaved in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety.

E1. Since you have been a student at [University], has someone made unwanted phone calls, sent emails, voice, text or instant messages, or posted messages, pictures or videos on social networking sites in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety?

Yes,

No [GO TO E2]

[IF BLANK GO TO E2]

E1a. Did the same person do this to you more than once since you have been a student at [University]?

Yes

No

Don't know

³⁰ Modified from Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

³¹ Modified from Catalano, S. (2012). Stalking victims in the United States--revised. (NCJ 224527). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

³² Modified from Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). Stalking in America: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. (NCJ 172837). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

E2. Since you have been a student at [University], has someone showed up somewhere or waited for you when you did not want that person to be there in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety?

Yes

No [GO TO E3]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO E3]

E2a. Did the same person do this to you more than once since you have been a student at [University]?

Yes

No

Don't Know

E3. Since you have been a student at [University], has someone spied on, watched or followed you, either in person or using devices or software in a way that made you

Yes,

No [GO TO BOX E1]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO BOX E1]

E3a. Did the same person do this to you more than once since you have been a student at [University]?

Yes

No

Don't know

BOX E1

IF REPORTED "SAME PERSON DID THIS MORE THAN ONCE" TO ANY OF THE THREE TACTICS (E1a=yes or E2a=yes or E3a=yes), THEN GO TO E5

IF YES TO TWO OR MORE ITEMS E1-E3, AND NO TO ALL ITEMS E1a & E2a & E3a, THEN GO TO E4

IF 'NO' TO ALL ITEMS E1-E3, OR

IF 'YES' TO EXACTLY 1 ITEM E1-E3 AND 'NO' OR BLANK TO ALL ITEMS E1a & E2a & E3a THEN GO TO BOX F0

You said that the following happened to you since you've been a student at [University]:

- **[IF E1 = YES]** Someone made unwanted phone calls, sent emails, voice, text or instant messages, or posted messages, pictures or videos on social networking sites in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- **[IF E2 = YES]** Someone showed up somewhere or waited for you when you did not want that person to be there in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- **[IF E3 = YES]** Someone spied on, watched or followed you either in person or using devices or software in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety

E4. Did the same person do more than one of these to you since you have been a student at [University]?

Yes **[GO TO E5]**

No **[GO TO F1]**

Don't Know **[GO TO F1]**

You said that the following happened to you since you've been a student at [University]:

- **[IF E1 = YES]** Someone made unwanted phone calls, sent emails, voice, text or instant messages, or posted messages, pictures or videos on social networking sites in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- **[IF E2 = YES]** Someone showed up somewhere or waited for you when you did not want that person to be there in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety
- **[IF E3 = YES]** Someone spied on, watched or followed you either in person or using devices or software in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety

E5. How (is the person/are the persons) who did these things to you associated with [University]? (Mark all that apply)

Student

Faculty or instructor

Coach or trainer

Other staff or administrator

Other person affiliated with a university program (ex. internship, study abroad)

The person was not affiliated with [University]

Don't know association with [University]

E6. At the time of these events, what (was the person's/were the persons') relationship to you? (Mark all that apply)

At the time, it was someone I was involved or intimate with

Someone I had been involved or was intimate with

Teacher or advisor

Co-worker, boss or supervisor

Friend or acquaintance

Stranger

Other

Don't know

E7. Since the beginning of the fall 2014 term, how many times have you had any of these experiences?

0 times

1 time

2 times

3-5 times

6-9 times

10 or more times

E8. Since you have been a student at [UNIVERSITY], have you contacted any of the following about any of these experiences? (Mark all that apply)

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

None of the above [GO TO E11]

[IF NO PROGRAM MARKED GO TO E11]

BOX E2

IF E8= NONE OF THE ABOVE OR NO PROGRAM MARKED THEN GO TO E11

ELSE ADMINISTER ITEMS E9 AND E10 FOR EACH PROGRAM MARKED IN E8 (UP TO 10)

E9[A-J]. When did you most recently contact [Program] about these experiences?

Fall of 2014 – present

Fall of 2013 – Summer of 2014

Fall of 2012 – Summer of 2013

Prior to Fall of 2012

E10[A-J]. Thinking about the most recent time you contacted them, how useful was [Program] in helping you deal with these experiences?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

BOX E3

IF MORE PROGRAMS MARKED THEN RETURN TO BOX E2

ELSE SKIP TO E12

**E11. Were any of the following reasons why you did not contact anyone at [University]?
(Mark all that apply)**

Did not know where to go or who to tell

Felt embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult

I did not think anyone would believe me

I did not think it was serious enough to report

I did not want the person to get into trouble

I feared negative social consequences

I did not think anything would be done

I feared it would not be kept confidential

Incident was not on campus or associated with the school

Incident did not occur while attending school

Other

E12. Did you (also) tell any of the following persons about this? (Mark all that apply)

Friend

Family member

Faculty or instructor

Someone else

I didn't tell anyone (else)

SECTION F – IPV/DV³³

BOX F0

IF A13 = YES (PRIOR RELATIONSHIP) GO TO F1

ELSE SKIP TO G1

Earlier in the survey you indicated that you have been in a partnered relationship at least part of the time since you have been a student at [University]. People treat their partner in many different ways. The next section asks you questions about your relationship with your partner(s). Recall that partnered relationships include:

- casual relationship or hook-up
- steady or serious relationship
- marriage, civil union, domestic partnership or cohabitation

F1. Since you have been a student at [University], has a partner controlled or tried to control you? Examples could be when someone:

- **kept you from going to classes or pursuing your educational goals**
- **did not allow you to see or talk with friends or family**
- **made decisions for you such as, where you go or what you wear or eat**
- **threatened to “out” you to others**

Yes

No

³³ Modified from Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

F2. Since you have been a student at [University], has a partner threatened to physically harm you, someone you love, or themselves?

Yes

No

F3. Since you have been a student at [University], has a partner used any kind of physical force against you? Examples could be when someone

- **bent your fingers or bit you**
- **choked, slapped, punched or kicked you**
- **hit you with something other than a fist**
- **attacked you with a weapon, or otherwise physically hurt or injured you**

Yes

No

BOX F1

IF F1=YES OR F2=YES OR F3=YES, THEN GO TO F4

ELSE GO TO G1

You said that the following happened to you since you've been a student at [University]:

- **[IF F1 = YES]** A partner controlled or tried to control you
- **[IF F2 = YES]** A partner threatened to physically harm you or someone you love
- **[IF F3 = YES]** A partner used physical force against you

F4. How many different partners treated you this way?

1 partner

2 partners

3 or more partners

F5. Were you physically injured as a result of (this incident/any of these incidents)?

Yes

No [GO TO F7]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO F7]

F6. Did you ever seek medical attention as a result of (this incident/any of these incidents)?

Yes

No

F7. Since the beginning of the fall 2014 term, how many times have you (had this experience/had any of these experiences)?

0 times

1 time

2 times

3-5 times

6-9 times

10 or more times

F8. Since you have been a student at [University], have you contacted any of the following about (this experience/any of these experiences)? (Mark all that apply)

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

None of the above [GO TO F11]

[IF NO PROGRAM MARKED GO TO F11]

BOX F2

IF F8= NONE OF THE ABOVE OR NO PROGRAM MARKED THEN GO TO F11

ELSE ADMINISTER ITEMS F9 AND F10 FOR EACH PROGRAM MARKED IN F8 (UP TO 10)

F9[A-J]. When did you most recently contact [Program] about (this experience/these experiences)?

Fall of 2014 – present

Fall of 2013 – Summer of 2014

Fall of 2012 – Summer of 2013

Prior to Fall of 2012

F10[A-J]. Thinking about the most recent time you contacted them, how useful was [Program] in helping you deal with (this experience/these experiences)?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

BOX F3

IF F8= NO PROGRAM MARKED THEN CONTINUE TO F11

ELSE SKIP TO F12

F11. [IF NO PROGRAMS CONTACTED] Were any of the following reasons why you did not contact anyone at [University]? (Mark all that apply)

Did not know where to go or who to tell

Felt embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult

I did not think anyone would believe me

I did not think it was serious enough to report

I did not want the person to get into trouble

I feared negative social consequences

I did not think anything would be done

I feared it would not be kept confidential

Incident was not on campus or associated with the school

Incident did not occur while attending school

Other

F12. Did you (also) tell any of the following persons about this? (Mark all that apply)

Friend

Family member

Faculty or instructor

Someone else

I didn't tell anyone (else)

SECTION G – SV SCREENER³⁴³⁵

This next section asks about nonconsensual or unwanted sexual contact you may have experienced while attending [University]. The person with whom you had the nonconsensual or unwanted contact could have been someone you know, such as someone you are currently or were in a relationship with, a co-worker, a professor, or a family member. Or it could be someone you do not know.

The following questions separately ask about contact that occurred because of physical force, incapacitation due to alcohol or drugs, and other types of pressure.

The first few questions ask about incidents that involved force or threats of force against you. Force could include someone holding you down with his or her body weight, pinning your arms, hitting or kicking you, or using or threatening to use a weapon against you.

G1. Since you have been attending [University], has someone used physical force or threats of physical force to do the following with you:

- **Sexual penetration. When one person puts a penis, fingers, or object inside someone else’s vagina or anus, or**
- **Oral sex. When someone’s mouth or tongue makes contact with someone else’s genitals**

Yes [**GO TO Attachment 1**]

No

³⁴ Modified from Krebs., C.P., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S., & Martin, S.L. (2007). The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study Final Report. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/221153.pdf>

³⁵ Modified from Koss, M. P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., ... & White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31(4), 357-370.

G2. Since you have been attending [University], has someone used physical force or threats of physical force in an unsuccessful attempt to do any of the following with you:

- **Sexual penetration.** When one person puts a penis, finger, or object inside someone else's vagina or anus
- **Oral sex.** When someone's mouth or tongue makes contact with someone else's genitals

Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)

No

G3. Since you have been attending [University], has someone used physical force or threats of physical force to do any of the following with you:

- kissing
- touching someone's breast, chest, crotch, groin or buttocks
- grabbing, groping or rubbing against the other in a sexual way, even if the touching is over the other's clothes

Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)

No

The next questions ask about incidents when you were unable to consent or stop what was happening because you were passed out, asleep, or incapacitated due to drugs or alcohol. Please include incidents even if you are not sure what happened.

G4. Since you have been attending [University], has any of the following happened to you while you were unable to consent or stop what was happening because you were passed out, asleep or incapacitated due to drugs or alcohol:

- **Sexual penetration. When one person puts a penis, finger, or object inside someone else's vagina or anus**
- **Oral sex. When someone's mouth or tongue makes contact with someone else's genitals**

Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)

No

G5. Since you have been attending [University], has any of the following happened to you while you were unable to consent or stop what was happening because you were passed out, asleep or incapacitated due to drugs or alcohol:

- **kissing**
- **touching someone's breast, chest, crotch, groin, or buttocks**
- **grabbing, groping or rubbing against the other in a sexual way, even if the touching is over the other's clothes**

Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)

No

The next questions ask about incidents when someone coerced you by threatening serious non-physical harm or promising rewards.

G6. Since you have been a student at [University], has someone had contact with you involving penetration or oral sex by threatening serious non-physical harm or promising rewards such that you felt you must comply? Examples include:

- Threatening to give you bad grades or cause trouble for you at work
- Promising good grades or a promotion at work
- Threatening to share damaging information about you with your family, friends or authority figures
- Threatening to post damaging information about you online

Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)

No

G7. Since you have been a student at [University], has someone had contact with you involving kissing or other sexual touching by threatening serious non-physical harm or promising rewards such that you felt you must comply? Examples include:

- Threatening to give you bad grades or cause trouble for you at work
- Promise good grades or a promotion at work
- Threatening to share damaging information about you with your family, friends or authority figures
- Threatening to post damaging information about you online

Yes [\[GO TO Attachment 1\]](#)

No

The next questions ask about incidents that occurred without your active, ongoing voluntary agreement.

G8.³⁶ Since you have been a student at [University], has someone had contact with you involving penetration or oral sex without your active, ongoing voluntary agreement?

Examples include someone:

- **initiating sexual activity despite your refusal**
- **ignoring your cues to stop or slow down**
- **went ahead without checking in or while you were still deciding**
- **otherwise failed to obtain your consent**

Yes [[GO TO Attachment 1](#)]

No

G9.³⁷ Since you have been a student at [University], has someone kissed or sexually touched you without your active, ongoing voluntary agreement? Examples include:

- **initiating sexual activity despite your refusal**
- **ignoring your cues to stop or slow down**
- **went ahead without checking in or while you were still deciding**
- **otherwise failed to obtain your consent**

Yes [[GO TO Attachment 1](#)]

No

³⁶ Incorporate affirmative consent as a tactic from the AAU and COFHE schools affirmative consent policies.

³⁷ Ibid.

BOX G1

ONCE THE ENTIRE G SECTION (G1-G9) HAS BEEN ANSWERED THEN DO

IF ANY OF G1-G9 = YES THEN GO TO ATTACHMENT 2

ELSE GO TO BOX H0

SECTION H – SEXUAL MISCONDUCT PREVENTION TRAINING³⁸

BOX H0

ADMINISTER SECTION H ONLY IF A6=2014 or 2015

ELSE SKIP TO I1.

H1. Think back to the orientation when you first came to [University]. Did that orientation include a training or information session about sexual assault or sexual misconduct?

Yes

No [GO TO I1]

I didn't attend orientation [GO TO I1]

I don't remember [GO TO I1]

[IF BLANK THEN [IF BLANK THEN GO TO I1]]

H2. Overall, how useful was this session?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

³⁸ Modified from White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault. (2014). Not Alone: The first report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from sexual assault. Retrieved from <https://www.notalone.gov/assets/ovw-climate-survey.pdf>.

SECTION I – PERCEPTIONS OF RESPONSES TO REPORTING³⁹⁴⁰

The following are statements about what might happen if someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University]. Please use the scale provided to indicate how likely you think each scenario is.

- I1. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that students would support the person making the report?**

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

-
- I2. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that the alleged offender(s) or their associates would retaliate against the person making the report?**

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

³⁹ Modified from White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault. (2014). Not Alone: The first report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from sexual assault. Retrieved from <https://www.notalone.gov/assets/ovw-climate-survey.pdf>.

⁴⁰ Modified from McMahon, S. (2014). #iSPEAK: Rutgers Campus Climate Survey. New Brunswick, NJ: Center on Violence Against Women and Children, School of Social Work, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. Retrieved from http://socialwork.rutgers.edu/Libraries/VAWC/new_doc_to_upload_for_ispeak.sflb.ashx

13. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that campus officials would take the report seriously?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

14. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that campus officials would protect the safety of the person making the report?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

15. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that campus officials would conduct a fair investigation?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

16. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that campus officials would take action against the offender(s)?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

17. If someone were to report a sexual assault or sexual misconduct to an official at [University], how likely is it that campus officials would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual assault or sexual misconduct?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

SECTION J – BYSTANDER BEHAVIOR⁴¹⁴²

The next questions are about situations you may have seen or been in since you have been a student at [University]

J1. Since you have been a student at [University] have you suspected that a friend had been sexually assaulted.

Yes [CONTINUE]

No [GO TO J3]

[IF BLANK GO TO J3]

J2. Thinking about the last time this happened, what did you do?

Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do

Did nothing for another reason

Spoke to my friend or someone else to seek help

Took action in another way

J3. Since you have been a student at [University] have you seen a drunk person heading off for what looked like a sexual encounter?

Yes [CONTINUE]

No [GO TO J5]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO J5]

⁴¹ Modified from Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M. M., Cares, A.C., & Warner, R. (2014). How do we know if it works?: Measuring outcomes in bystander-focused abuse prevention on campuses. *Psychology of Violence, 4*(1), 101-115.

⁴² McMahon, S. (2014). #iSPEAK: Rutgers Campus Climate Survey. New Brunswick, NJ: Center on Violence Against Women and Children, School of Social Work, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey. Retrieved from http://socialwork.rutgers.edu/Libraries/VAWC/new_doc_to_upload_for_ispeak.sflb.ashx

J4. Thinking about the last time this happened, what did you do?

Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do

Did nothing for another reason

Directly intervened to stop it

Spoke to someone else to seek help

Took action in another way

J5. Since you have been a student at [University] have you seen or heard someone was acting in a sexually violent or harassing way?

Yes [CONTINUE]

No [GO TO K1]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO K1]

J6. Thinking about the last time this happened, what did you do?

Did nothing because I wasn't sure what to do

Did nothing for another reason

Directly intervened to stop it

Spoke to someone else to seek help

Took action in another way

SECTION K – DEBRIEFING ITEM

The next question asks for your opinion about this survey.

K1. How difficult were the questions to understand?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

ATTACHMENT 1 – SECTION G1: IMMEDIATE FOLLOWUPS

BOX G1_1

IF G[X]=Yes THEN CONTINUE TO G[X]a

ELSE SKIP TO NEXT ITEM IN SECTION G

G[X]a. Since you have been a student at [University], how many times has this happened?

1. 1 time
2. 2 times
3. 3 times
4. 4 or more times

BOX G1_2

ADMINISTER G1B AND G1C FOR EACH INCIDENT REPORTED IN G1A, UP TO 4 TIMES

IF G1A IS BLANK THEN ADMINISTER G1B AND G1C ONCE

You said that the following occurred (1/2/3/4 or more) time(s):

- **[INCIDENT SUMMARY]**

G[X]b. When did (this/the (second/third/fourth) most recent) incident (of this type) occur?

1. Since the beginning of the fall 2014 term [GO TO NEXT BOX]
2. Prior to the fall 2014 term [GO TO G1c]

[IF BLANK GO TO BOX G1_2]

G[X]c. [IF G1b = 2] In what school year did it occur?

1. Fall 2013 to Summer 2014
2. Fall 2012 to Summer 2013
3. Fall 2011 to Summer 2012
4. Prior to Fall of 2011
5. It occurred before I was a student at [University][GO TO BOX G1_2]

[IF BLANK GO TO BOX G1_2]

BOX G1_3

IF TIME PERIOD REPORTED IN G[X]B AND G[X]C IS THE SAME AS TIME PERIOD REPORTED IN PREVIOUS G ITEM FOLLOW-UP, THEN GO TO G[X]D

ELSE RETURN TO G[X]B FOR NEXT INCIDENT REPORTED IN G[X]A

IF NO MORE INCIDENTS THEN GO TO NEXT G ITEM

G[X]d. Was this part of (the other incident/any of the other incidents) you reported as occurring (during the) (Time period) (school year)?

1. Yes [GO TO G2e]
2. No [GO TO NEXT BOX]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO NEXT BOX]

G[X]e. [IF G[X]d = Yes] Was it part of any of the following incidents you reported earlier?

[LIST PRIOR ANSWERS THAT OCCURRED DURING SAME TIME PERIOD]

1. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G1 TIME PERIOD] Penetration or oral sex involving physical force or threats of physical force
2. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G2 TIME PERIOD] Attempted but not successful penetration or oral sex involving physical force or threats of physical force
3. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G3 TIME PERIOD] Sexual touching involving physical force or threats of physical force
4. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G4 TIME PERIOD] Penetration or oral sex when you were unable to consent or unable to stop what was happening
5. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G5 TIME PERIOD] Sexual touching when you were unable to consent or unable to stop what was happening
6. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G6 TIME PERIOD] Penetration or oral sex when you were coerced by threats of serious non-physical harm or promised rewards
7. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G7 TIME PERIOD] Sexual touching when you were coerced by threats of serious non-physical harm or promised rewards
8. [IF G[X] TIME PERIOD = G8 TIME PERIOD] Penetration or oral sex without your active ongoing consent
9. None of the above

BOX G1_4

IF G[X]A = '4 or more times' AND ALL G[X]C='since fall 2014' THEN CONTINUE TO G[X]F
ELSE RETURN TO G[X]B FOR NEXT INCIDENT REPORTED IN G[X]A
IF NO MORE INCIDENTS THEN GO TO NEXT G ITEM

G2f. You said that this happened other times as well. Did any of these other incidents also occur since the beginning for the fall 2014 term?

Yes

No

ATTACHMENT 2 – SECTIONS GA & GC: SUMMARY DETAILED INCIDENT FORMS⁴³⁴⁴

Section GA – Detailed Incident Form (DIF) for G1-G5

BOX GA0

IF ALL ITEMS G1 – G5 = ‘NO’ THEN SKIP TO BOX GC0

ELSE CONTINUE TO BOX GA1

BOX GA1

Section GA administered UP TO 2 TIMES based on incidents reported in items G1-G5

The FIRST DIF will reference the MOST SERIOUS TYPE of incident reported

The SECOND DIF will reference the SECOND MOST SERIOUS TYPE of incident reported

The following are the 4 INCIDENT TYPES reported in G1-G5, (listed from most serious to least serious):

GA Type 1: G1 and/or G2 (Forcible rape and/or Attempted forcible rape)

GA Type 2: G4 (Rape by incapacitation)

GA Type 3: G3 (Forcible sexual touching)

GA Type 4: G5 (Sexual touching by incapacitation)

You said that the following happened to you since you have been a student at [University]:

- **[SUMMARY OF REFERENCE INCIDENT(S)]**

⁴³ Modified from Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

⁴⁴ Modified from the 2012-2013 National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS).

The next questions ask about what happened (when/during any of the times) this happened to you since you have been a student at [University].

GA1. (In total, across all of these incidents) (How/how) many people did this to you?

1 person [GO TO GA2a]

2 persons [SKIP TO GA2b]

3 or more persons [SKIP TO GA2b]

[IF BLANK SKIP TO GA2b]

GA2a. [IF 1 PERSON] Was the person that did this to you ...

Male

Female

Other gender identity

Don't know

[FOR ANY RESPONSE OR IF BLANK SKIP TO GA3]

GA2b. [IF >1 PERSON] Were any of the people that did this to you...

Male	Yes	No	Don't Know
Female	Yes	No	Don't Know
Other gender identity	Yes	No	Don't Know

GA2c. What type of nonconsensual or unwanted behavior occurred during (this incident/any of these incidents)? (Mark all that apply)

Penis, fingers or objects inside someone's vagina or anus

Mouth or tongue makes contact with another's genitals

Kissed

Touched breast, chest, crotch, groin or buttocks

Grabbed, groped or rubbed in a sexual way

Other

GA3. How (is the person/ are the persons) who did this to you associated with [University]? (Mark all that apply)

Student

Faculty or instructor

Coach or trainer

Other staff or administrator

Other person affiliated with a university program (ex. internship, study abroad)

The person was not affiliated with [University]

Don't know association with [University]

GA4. At the time of (this event/ these events), what (was the person's /were these

At the time, it was someone I was involved or intimate with

Someone I had been involved or was intimate with

Teacher or advisor

Co-worker, boss or supervisor

Friend or acquaintance

Stranger

Other

Don't know

GA5. Just prior to (the incident/any of these incidents), (was/were) (the person/any of the persons) who did this to you drinking alcohol?

Yes

No

Don't know

GA6. Just prior to (the incident/any of these incidents), (was/were) (the person/any of the persons) who did this to you using drugs?

Yes

No

Don't know

GA7. Just prior to (the incident/any of these incidents) were you drinking alcohol? Keep in mind that you are in no way responsible for what occurred, even if you had been drinking.

Yes

No

GA8. Just prior to (the incident/any of these incidents) did you voluntarily take any drugs? Keep in mind that you are in no way responsible for what occurred, even if you had been on drugs.

Yes

No

GA9. Just prior to (the incident/any of these incidents), had you been given alcohol or another drug without your knowledge or consent?

Yes, I am certain

I suspect, but I am not certain

No

Don't know

BOX GA2

IF GA7='YES' or GA8='YES' or GA9 = 'YES' or 'I SUSPECT', THEN CONTINUE TO GA10.

OTHERWISE SKIP TO BOX GA3

GA10. Were you passed out for all or parts of (this incident/any of these incidents)?

Yes

No

Not sure

BOX GA3

IF MORE THAN ONE INCIDENT IN G[X]A OR IF DK NUMBER OF TIMES
THEN SKIP TO GA11b

OTHERWISE CONTINUE TO GA11a

GA11a. [IF G[X]A=1 TIME] Did this incident occur during an academic break or recess?

Yes

No

GA11b. [IF G[X]A>1 TIME] How many of these incidents occurred during an academic break or recess?

None

Some

All

GA12. Did (this incident/any of these incidents) occur on campus or on university affiliated off-campus property?

Yes [CONTINUE TO GA13a]

No [SKIP TO GA13b]

[IF BLANK THEN SKIP TO GA13b]

GA13a. [IF GA12=Yes] Where did (this incident/these incidents) occur? (Mark all that apply)

University residence hall/dorm

Fraternity or Sorority house

Other space used by a single-sex student social organization

Other residential housing

Non-residential building

Other property (ex. outdoors)

[FOR ANY RESPONSE OR IF BLANK SKIP TO GA14]

GA13b. [IF GA12=No] Where did this (incident/these incidents) occur? (Mark all that apply)

Private residence

Fraternity or Sorority house

Other space used by a single-sex student social organization

Restaurant, bar or club

Other social venue

Outdoor or recreational space

Some other place

GA14. Did any of the following happen to you from (this experience/any of these experiences)? (Mark all that apply)

Physically injured, [CONTINUE TO GA14a]

Contracted a sexually transmitted disease [SKIP TO GA15]

Became pregnant [SKIP TO GA15]

None of the above [SKIP TO GA15]

[IF BLANK THEN SKIP TO GA15]

GA14a. What sort of injury or injuries did you sustain (Mark all that apply)

Bruises, black-eye, cuts, scratches or swelling

Chipped or knocked out teeth

Broken bones

Internal injury from the sexual contact (ex., vaginal or anal tearing)

Other injuries

GA15. Did you experience any of the following as a result of (the incident/any of the incidents)? (Mark all that apply)

Difficulty concentrating on studies, assignments or exams

Fearfulness or being concerned about safety

Loss of interest in daily activities, or feelings of helplessness and hopelessness

Nightmares or trouble sleeping

Feeling numb or detached

Headaches or stomach aches

Eating problems or disorders

Increased drug or alcohol use

None of the above

GA16. Have you ever contacted any of the following about (this experience/these experiences)? (Mark all that apply)

[UNIVERSITY SPECIFIC LIST]

None of the above [\[GO TO GA17\]](#)

[\[IF NO PROGRAMS MARKED GO TO GA17\]](#)

BOX GA4

IF NO PROGRAM MARKED, GO TO GA17

ELSE ASK GA16a-GA16f FOR THE FIRST 4 PROGRAMS SELECTED IN GA16

GA16a. When did you most recently contact [Program] about this experience?

Fall of 2014 – present [CONTINUE TO GA16b]

Fall of 2013 – Summer of 2014 [SKIP TO BOX GA4B]

Fall of 2012 – Summer of 2013 [SKIP TO BOX GA4B]

Prior to Fall 2012 [SKIP TO BOX GA4B]

[IF BLANK THEN CONTINUE TO GA16b]

GA16b. How useful was [Program] in helping you?

Not at all

A little

Somewhat

Very

Extremely

GA16c. At any time did you feel pressure from [Program] on whether or not to proceed with further reporting or adjudication?

Yes

No [SKIP TO GA16e]

[IF BLANK THEN SKIP TO GA16e]

GA16d. [IF GA16C=Yes] What type of pressure?

To proceed with further reporting or adjudication

To not proceed with further reporting or adjudication

How would you rate [Program] on the following criteria?

GA16e. Respecting you

Excellent

Very good

Good

Fair

Poor

GA16f. Helping you understand your options going forward

Excellent

Very good

Good

Fair

Poor

BOX GA5

IF GA16 = NO PROGRAMS MARKED, THEN CONTINUE

IF MORE PROGRAMS MARKED THEN RETURN TO BOX GA4

ELSE SKIP TO GA18

GA17. [IF NO PROGRAMS CONTACTED] Were any of the following reasons why you did not contact anyone at [University]? (Mark all that apply)

Did not know where to go or who to tell

Felt embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult

I did not think anyone would believe me

I did not think it was serious enough to report

I did not want the person to get into trouble

I feared negative social consequences

I did not think anything would be done

I feared it would not be kept confidential

Incident was not on campus or associated with the school

Incident did not occur while attending school

Other

GA18. Which of the following persons, if any, did you (also) tell about this? (Mark all that apply)

Friend

Family member

Faculty or instructor

Someone else

I didn't tell anyone (else)

BOX GA6

IF THIS IS THE FIRST DIF FOR SECTION GA AND THERE IS ANOTHER INCIDENT THEN RETURN TO BOX GA1

ELSE GO TO BOX GC0

Section GC – Detailed Incident Form (DIF) for G6-G9

BOX GC0

IF ALL ITEMS G6 – G9 = 'NO' THEN SKIP TO BOX H1

ELSE CONTINUE TO BOX GC1

BOX GC1

Section GC is administered UP TO 2 TIMES based on incidents reported in items G6-G9

The FIRST DIF will reference the MOST SERIOUS TYPE of incident reported

The SECOND DIF will reference the SECOND MOST SERIOUS TYPE of incident reported

The following are the 2 INCIDENT TYPES reported in G6-G9, (listed from most serious to least serious):

GC Type 1: G6 and/or G7 (Sex and/or Sexual touching by Coercion)

GC Type 2: G8 and/or G9 (Sex and/or Sexual touching without Affirmative Consent)

You said that the following happened to you since you have been a student at [University]

- [SUMMARY OF REFERENCE INCIDENT(S)]

The next questions ask about what happened (when/during any of the times) this happened to you since you have been a student at [University].

GC1. (In total, across all of these incidents) (H/h)ow many people did this to you?

1 person [GO TO GC2a]

2 persons [GO TO GC2b]

3 or more persons [GO TO GC2b]

[IF BLANK THEN GO TO GC2b]

GC2a. [IF 1 PERSON] Was the person that did this to you ...

Male

Female

Other gender identity

Don't know

[FOR ANY RESPONSE OR IF BLANK THEN SKIP TO GC2c]

GC2b. [If >1 PERSON] Were any of the people that did this to you...

Male	Yes	No	Don't Know
Female	Yes	No	Don't Know
Other gender identity	Yes	No	Don't Know

GC2c. What type of nonconsensual or unwanted behavior occurred during (this incident/any of these incidents)? (Mark all that apply)

Penis, fingers or objects inside someone's vagina or anus

Mouth or tongue makes contact with another's genitals

Kissed

Touched breast/chest, crotch/groin or buttocks,

Grabbed, groped or rubbed in a sexual way

Other

GC3. How (is the person/ are the persons) who did this to you associated with [University]? (Mark all that apply)

Student

Faculty or instructor

Coach or trainer

Other staff or administrator

Other person affiliated with a university program (ex., internship, study abroad)

The person was not affiliated with [University]

Don't know association with [University]

GC4. At the time of (this event/ these events), what (was the person's/were these persons') relationship to you? (Mark all that apply)

At the time, it was someone I was involved or intimate with

Someone I had been involved or was intimate with

Teacher or advisor

Co-worker, boss, or supervisor

Friend or acquaintance

Stranger

Other

Don't know

BOX GC2

IF REFERENCE INCIDENT FOR THIS DIF IS G8 OR G9, THEN GO TO G5

IF THIS IS THE FIRST DIF FOR SECTION GC AND THERE IS ANOTHER INCIDENT THEN RETURN TO BOX GC1

ELSE GO TO BOX H0

GC5. Did the person(s) do any of the following during (this incident/any of these incidents)? (Mark all that apply)

Initiated sexual activity without checking in with you first or while you were still deciding

Initiated sexual activity despite your refusal

During consensual activity, ignored your verbal cues to stop or slow down

During consensual activity, ignored your nonverbal cues to stop or slow down

Otherwise failed to obtain your active ongoing voluntary agreement

None of the above

Appendix 2. Human Subjects Protections and Safeguards

A2.1 IRB Review Options and Process Overview

In January 2015, Westat submitted its Institutional Review Board (IRB) package (including the instrument and study protocols) to both the Westat IRB, for a full review, and the 27 participating IHEs, who used the materials to develop their own IRB packages. At this time, the study was given conditional approval by the Westat IRB. Full approval was obtained in February 2015. In March 2015, Westat tested and programmed the instrument for April 1, 2015, the first launch date⁴⁵.

Among participating IHEs, five universities elected to rely on Westat's IRB as the IRB of record, 11 universities chose to use their own IRB, and four universities used both IRBs (their own and Westat's). Seven universities determined their involvement in the study did not constitute human subjects research and, consequently, elected not to seek IRB approval or review. For these schools Westat was the only IRB involved in the study process and students were fully covered by Westat's IRB protections.

The University of Oregon elected to rely on both IRBs for review and continuing oversight of its human subjects research.

A2.2 Respondent Emotional Protections

Given the sensitive nature of the survey topic, there was some risk of emotional distress for survey participants, as well as concerns about confidentiality and data security. Consequently, a number of human subject protections and security protocols were considered and put in place for survey participants.

A2.3 NIH Certificate of Confidentiality

The AAU survey is protected by a Federal Certificate of Confidentiality (CoC) CC-AA-15-45. This certificate, issued by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse & Alcoholism, National Institutes of Health (NIH), allows "researchers to refuse to disclose identifiable research

⁴⁵ To accommodate differences in IHEs' academic calendars, IHEs chose the field period (generally three weeks) during which they wanted their survey to be open, with the earliest available launch date of April 1.

information in response to legal demands,”⁴⁶ such as court orders and subpoenas, for identifying information or identifying characteristics of a research participant. This is an important legal tool and we are very pleased to have secured this protection for our study participants.

Following a multi-month application and review process, the certificate was issued April 8, 2015 and is retroactive to the start of data collection.

A2.4 Informed Consent

The first safeguard against participant distress was the process of informed consent. Functioning as a gateway to the survey, the consent form provided details about the survey, set expectations for the types of questions to be asked, and allowed students to make an informed decision whether participation was right for them. Students who felt they would become distressed taking such a survey could choose not to participate (and could not enter the survey), and students who consented to participate were prepared for the sensitive topics. The consent form emphasized that respondents could skip any question they did not want to answer, and that they could stop the interview at any time they felt uncomfortable or simply wished to stop. In addition, all consent forms concluded with contact information for a responsible IRB and research representative.

A2.5 Distress Protocols

Prior studies on sexual misconduct show that most individuals do not find participation in such research to be harmful and, in many cases, consider their participation beneficial (Wager, 2012; Yeater, Miller, Rinehart, and Nason, 2012). However, data collection for the AAU survey included several safeguards to minimize risk related to emotional distress.

A2.6 Campus-specific Resources

Campus-specific resource lists with contact information on national, campus, and community-specific resources were offered to all students and accessible both in- and outside the survey. Examples of such resources include counseling and medical centers and 24-hour crisis phone lines. A link to these resources was available on each survey screen starting with the initial landing page. In addition, all respondents were offered the resource list again at the conclusion of the survey.


⁴⁶ From What is a Certificate of Confidentiality? NIH Certificates of Confidentiality (CoC) Kiosk <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/coc/index.htm>

Although we anticipated that most participants would access these resources through the web survey, we also developed a protocol for Help Desk staff to use if they received distress calls or questions about sexual assault resources.

A2.7 Help Desk

To further encourage participants to complete the survey and minimize distress, Help Desk staff were available by phone and email throughout data collection to answer technical questions about the survey and how to complete it, and to provide resource lists to respondents who call and need additional support or referrals for services. Help Desk contact information was provided in all email communication and was available on all screens of the online survey, as well as on the survey landing page. Help Desk staff were trained in both project and customer service procedures, including distress protocols. While Help Desk staff did not provide counseling or other crisis intervention services, staff were prepared to offer respondents the same resource information included in the online survey for their specific campus. In the event that a caller expressed elevated distress or a threat to themselves or others, the staff were trained to directly connect these students with counseling services from the resource list. Data collection closed without the need to initiate the distress protocol.

In all cases, Help Desk staff were trained to be sensitive to callers and respond to them politely and thoughtfully, regardless of the circumstances of their call.



The screenshot displays the top section of a survey page. On the left, there is a logo for 'Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault & Sexual Misconduct'. On the right, there are three links: 'FAQs', 'Support Resources', and 'Help Desk: (855) 497-4787'. Below these links is a horizontal blue bar. The main content area contains the following text:

B2. How likely do you think it is that you will experience sexual assault or sexual misconduct on campus?

- Not at all
- A little
- Somewhat
- Very
- Extremely

As shown in this screenshot above, each page of the survey included links to general and school-specific frequently asked questions (FAQs) and resources. It also included the Help Desk number for easy access to those students who needed it for either technical assistance or additional resources.

A2.8 Data Security and Protecting Confidentiality

All survey data was collected via a secure web site hosted at Westat. The respondent's email address was encrypted and stored in the SqlServer database. Upon final submission of the survey, the respondent's email address and PIN number (used to create the unique survey link) was automatically deleted from the database, removing any linkage between the survey responses and the respondent. For any respondents who completed some of the survey but did not formally submit it, these variables were deleted manually at the end of the data collection period.

Roster file data was not included in the questionnaire data file so that if someone were to somehow obtain the survey data, they could not associate any data with a particular individual.

All necessary steps to mask the identity of survey respondents have been taken for the data analysis and reporting. The analysis included only quantitative components. Results are tabular, as well as more formal statistical models. Results were reviewed to ensure an acceptable risk of disclosure, including suppression of demographic characteristics and other potentially identifying information in situations in which cell sizes are small.

All data pertaining to this project has been stored in a secure manner in a physical and electronic form that can only be accessed by study personnel. All electronic data has been stored on network server directories. Access to the network project directory has been controlled through the use of directory and file access rights based upon user account ID and the associated user group definition. Paper data is stored in locked files cabinets.

Datasets will be provided to AAU and to participating universities. These project partners will own their respective datasets and the reports summarizing findings that will also be delivered by Westat. The individual data-sets have been reviewed for potential disclosure risks. Where appropriate, variables were altered (e.g., categories collapsed) to identify potential risks before delivering the final files.

Three years after completion of the study, all data and files related to this study will be permanently destroyed.

References

Wager, N. M. (2012). Respondents' experiences of completing a retrospective, web-based sexual trauma survey: Does a history of victimization equate with a risk for harm? *Violence and Victims, 27*(6), 991-1004.

Yeater, E., Miller, G., Rinehart, J. & Nason, E. (2012). Trauma and sex surveys meet minimal risk standards: Implications for institutional review boards. *Psychological Science*, 23(7), 780-787.

Informed Consent

The University of Oregon is asking all students to answer a climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The survey is sponsored by the University of Oregon in collaboration with the Association of American Universities (AAU). The results will be used to guide policies to encourage a healthy, safe and nondiscriminatory environment at the University of Oregon.

This survey includes sections that ask about your knowledge and beliefs about social situations, perceptions related to sexual misconduct at the University of Oregon and your knowledge of resources available at the University of Oregon. This survey also asks about your personal experience with sexual misconduct, such as harassment, sexual assault and other forms of violence. Some of the language used in this survey is explicit and some people may find it uncomfortable, but it is important that we ask the questions in this way so that you are clear what we mean. Information on how to get help, if you need it, appears on the top of each page and at the end of the survey.

This survey should take most students approximately 20 minutes to complete. It may take up to 30 minutes for some individuals. You do NOT have to participate in this survey, and if you do choose to participate, you may skip any question you are not comfortable answering and may exit the survey at any time. There will be no consequences to you personally or your student status if you choose not to complete the survey.

[CONDITION 1 ONLY] To thank you for your participation, every student who completes the survey will be offered a \$5 gift card to Amazon.com.

We will protect the confidentiality of your answers [to the extent the law allows⁴⁷]. When you complete the survey the link with your name, email and IP address will be broken so that no one will be able to connect these with your survey answers. The results will be presented in summary form so no individual can be identified. However, if we learn about child abuse or you threaten to harm yourself or others, we are obligated to report it to the authorities.

We have obtained a Certificate of Confidentiality (CoC) issued by the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The CoC is issued to protect the investigators on this study from being forced to tell anyone about your participation in this study, even under a subpoena.

Even when a CoC is in place, you and your family members must still continue to actively protect your own privacy. If you voluntarily give your written consent for an insurer, employer,

⁴⁷ Pre-NIH Certificate of Confidentiality language, removed once the Federal certificate was in place.

or lawyer to receive information about your participation in the research, then we may not use the CoC to withhold this information⁴⁸.

If you have any questions about this study please call the Help Desk at 1-855-497-4787.

If you have questions about your rights and welfare as a research participant, please call the Westat Human Subjects Protections office at 1-888-920-7631. Please leave a message with your full name, the name of the research study that you are calling about (the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct), and a phone number beginning with the area code. Someone will return your call as soon as possible.

⁴⁸ NIH Certificate of Confidentiality CC-AA-15-45 was issued on April 8, 2015. Changes to the consent were made as soon as operationally possible.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

Why me and what is this about?

We are asking all students at University of Oregon to answer a climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The results will be used to guide policies to encourage a healthy, safe, and nondiscriminatory environment on campus. Our goal is to make University of Oregon as safe as possible by developing programs and services that prevent sexual assault and misconduct, as well as respond to these events when they do occur. This survey is an important tool for us to assess current programs and to shape future policies.

Who is administering the survey?

The survey is sponsored by University of Oregon in collaboration with the Association of American Universities (AAU). Westat, a private research organization, is administering the survey and will be assisting in the analysis of the data.

What will University of Oregon do with the results?

The results will be used to better understand the climate at University of Oregon the extent of sexual assault and misconduct among students, and the use of programs and services currently being offered. This information will be used to make recommendations for changes to the policies and procedures related to preventing and handling sexual assault and misconduct at University of Oregon.

Why are you asking about these sensitive topics?

Our goal is to foster a safe and supportive environment where students can flourish, both academically and personally. To understand the climate at University of Oregon, we need to ask direct questions about topics that some may find sensitive. It is only by directly collecting this information from you that we will be able to prevent negative experiences and effectively respond when they do happen.

What will I be asked to do?

You are invited to participate in a web survey. This survey includes sections that ask about your knowledge and beliefs about social situations, perceptions related to sexual misconduct at your college, and your knowledge of resources available at your college. This survey also asks about your personal experience with sexual misconduct, such as harassment, sexual assault, and other forms of violence.

Why is the language on the survey so explicit?

Some of the language used in this survey is explicit and some people may find it uncomfortable, but it is important that we ask the questions in this way so that you are clear what we mean. Information on how to get help, if you need it, appears on the bottom of each page and at the end of the survey.

Isn't this survey only for women?

No, this survey is for everyone, regardless of gender identity or experiences. The survey will be used to shape policies that affect everyone on campus, so it is very important that you provide your experiences and viewpoint.

I've never experienced sexual assault or sexual misconduct, so why should I take part?

If only victims of sexual assault and sexual misconduct participate in the survey, we will have a very lopsided view of your campus. To get a complete picture of your college, we need to hear from as many students as possible. Please tell a friend!

How long will the survey take?

This survey should take most people approximately 20 minutes to complete. It may take up to 30 minutes for some individuals.

Am I required to participate?

You do NOT have to participate in this survey, and if you do participate, you may skip any question you are not comfortable answering and may exit the survey at any time. Most people will find the questions interesting.

Will my answers be confidential?

When you complete the survey, the link with your name, email, and IP address will be broken so that no one will be able to connect these with your survey answers. The results will be presented in summary form so no individual can be identified. However, if we learn about child abuse or about a threat of harm to yourself or others, we are obligated to report it to the authorities.

What should I do if I become upset answering these questions?

On each page of the online survey, there is a link to on- and off-campus resources that you can contact if you become upset. In addition to local resources, there is information for several national services that provide information and counselors 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. We

have included a variety of resources so you can choose to contact the one(s) you think would be most helpful to you.

I still have questions.

If you have any questions about this study, you can call the study Help Desk at 1-855-497-4787.

If you have questions about your rights and welfare as a research participant, please call the Westat Human Subjects Protections office at 1-888-920-7631. Please leave a message with your full name, the name of the research study that you are calling about (the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct), and a phone number beginning with the area code. Someone will return your call as soon as possible.

University of Oregon

Student Resource Information

On-Campus Services

University of Oregon 24-hour Crisis Line: 541-346-SAFE (7233)
<http://safe.uoregon.edu/>

University of Oregon Counseling Center541-346-3227

Off-Campus Services

Sexual Assault Support Service541-343-7277 (SASS)

Womenspace Crisis Line:541-485-6513 or 1-800-281-2800

National Resources

These services are available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Callers can connect free of charge to the phone hotlines and will be directed to local agencies in their area. Individuals can also connect with trained hotline staff online through a secure chat messaging system.

Phone Hotlines

National Sexual Assault Phone Hotline (RAINN).....1-800-656-HOPE(4673)

National Suicide Prevention Lifeline.....1-800-273-TALK(8255)
(Press 2 for Spanish)

New York City Anti-Violence Project Hotline (LGBTQ community)..... 212-714-1141
(hotline will assist LGBTQ community nationwide- not limited to New York City)

Websites and Online Hotlines

Crisis Text Line.....text 741741

National Sexual Assault Online Hotline (RAINN): <http://www.rainn.org/get-help/national-sexual-assault-online-hotline>

Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network (RAINN) Website: <http://www.rainn.org/>

Appendix 3. Results by Individual Status Code

A3.1 Definition of Completed Survey

We define a completed survey with two criteria for all but one university: (1) the respondent answered at least one of the question in each of the following victimization sections: sexual harassment (Section D), stalking (Section E), and sexual assault/other misconduct (Section G); and (2) the respondent took at least 5 minutes to fill out the questionnaire.

When calculating response rates, we take the following response status into consideration,

- **Status 1:** Respondents who did not click on the link to access the Web survey
- **Status 2:** Respondents who clicked on the link to access the Web survey, but did not start the survey
- **Status 3:** Respondents who started the survey, but did not complete the victimization sections, and did not submit the survey
- **Status 4:** Respondents who completed and submitted the survey in less than five minutes
- **Status 5:** Respondents who submitted the survey, completed the survey in five or more minutes or started/submitted the survey on different days, but did not complete the victimization sections
- **Status 6:** Respondents who started the survey, completed the victimization sections, but did not submit the survey
- **Status 7:** Respondents who started the survey, completed the victimization sections, and submitted the survey

Based on the definition on completed survey, cases of Status 6 and 7 are considered as completed, whereas cases of Status 1 to 5 are considered as not completed. Therefore, the response rate is calculated as,

$$\text{Response Rate} = \frac{n_1 + n_2}{N}$$

Where N is the total number of students that received the survey invitation (For those schools that conducted a census, N represents the total number of registered undergraduate and graduate students; For those few school that did not conduct a census, N represents the total number of registered undergraduate and graduate students that were sampled); n_1 represents the number of students who started the survey, completed the victimization

sections, but did not submitted the survey; n_2 represents the number of students who started the survey, completed the victimization sections, and submitted the survey.

Table A3.1. Frequency of survey response status for the University of Oregon

	Status Description	n	%
1	Did not click on link	17,826	81.1%
2	Clicked on link, but did not start	622	2.8%
3	Started, did not submit, did not have enough responses	462	2.1%
4	Submitted, completed in <5 minutes	10	.1%
5	Submitted, completed \geq 5 minutes or could not measure duration, did not did not have enough responses	1	.0%
6	Started, not submitted, completed minimum responses	268	1.2%
7	Started, submitted, completed minimum responses	2,791	12.7%
	Total	21,980	100.0%

A3.2 Drop-out Rates

Students who consented to participate, then entered the survey but did not complete the victimization sections were not counted as a complete for the survey. Similarly, those that took less than 5 minutes to complete the survey were dropped.

About 13.4% of the individuals that started the survey did not complete using the rules described above ($(473 / 3,532) = 13.4\%$). Much of the dropout occurred after the background and harassment sections. Once starting section G (sexual assault), very few respondents were dropped from the analysis dataset. Of those that did not complete, 59% did not answer the first question in the Harassment section and 98% did not answer the first question in the first sexual violence question.

Table A3.2. Survey drop-out rate for the University of Oregon: Percent Non-Missing Responses for Initial Item in Each Section for Respondents That Started the Survey^{1,2}

Section	Not Complete	Complete	Total
Section A – Background	97%	100%	100%
Section B – Perceptions of Risk	70%	99%	95%
Section C – Resources	54%	100%	94%
Section D – Harassment	41%	100%	92%
Section E - Stalking	18%	100%	89%
Section G – SV Screener	2%	100%	87%
Section I – Perceptions of Responses to Reporting	2%	94%	82%
Section J – Bystander Intervention	2%	92%	80%
Section K - Debriefing	2%	91%	79%
Submitted	2%	91%	79%
Total Started	473	3,059	3,532

1. Initial questions used by section are: A2, B1, C2a, D1, E1, G1, I1, J1, K1. Sections F and H are not included because not all respondents were routed to these sections.

2. See text for definition of a completed survey.

Appendix 4. Non-response Bias Analysis

Nonresponse issues are common in surveys, and the bias caused by nonresponse (or nonresponse bias) needs to be addressed, especially when the nonresponse rate is high. As described in the weighting section, we adjusted base weights to reduce the effects of nonresponse on the estimates. However, such adjustments may not completely eliminate the nonresponse bias. Nonresponse bias will be nonexistent if all sampled units have the same probability of response (response propensity). If the response propensities are not equal, nonresponse bias may still be nonexistent if the survey variables are uncorrelated with response propensities. For example, if those that do not respond have the same rates of victimization as those that do respond, then the estimates of victimization will be unbiased.

As shown by the response rates at the beginning of this report, the response propensity depends on student characteristics. Moreover, it appears that the survey variables are correlated with the victimization and other outcomes. For example, the response rate of females is higher than that of males, and there also is a strong correlation between gender and victimization. We can correct this source of bias by adjusting the survey weights for the gender of the respondent. This is one of the primary purposes of the raking procedure described at the beginning of this report. However, there is still the potential that the estimates are subject to nonresponse bias that is not removed by the weighting. For example, if female victims are more likely to participate than other females, then there is potential for nonresponse bias.

To evaluate the possibility of remaining nonresponse bias, we conducted several different analyses. The first analysis evaluated the effectiveness of the weighting methodology. The more effective the weighting methods, the less likely there will be bias due to nonresponse. The second analysis directly assessed the nonresponse bias by examining variation of key outcomes by several measures of response propensity.

A4.1 Evaluation of the Weighting Methodology

We conducted two different analyses to evaluate the weighting methods:

- Correlation analysis: This analysis examines the correlation between some selected key survey variables and auxiliary variables used in nonresponse weighting adjustments. A high correlation implies that the auxiliary variables used in weighting could remove nonresponse bias if the response propensity is also correlated with the auxiliary variables. The correlation is calculated using the SAS GLM (General Linear Model) procedure with a survey variable as the dependent variable and auxiliary variable(s) as independent variable(s). The measure used to evaluate the correlation is the positive square root of the R-square of the GLM model.

- Comparison of the weighting method with an alternative weighting method: Another weighting method was developed and compared with the actual method employed for the survey. We compared key variable estimates through t-tests.

We used the following 11 key outcome variables for the analysis:

Table A4-1. Eleven key variables used in the nonresponse bias analysis

Variable Number	Variable Name	Variable Description
1	Penetration by Physical Force or Incapacitation	Indicates whether respondent experienced any rape incident since entering college
2	Sexual Touching by Physical Force or Incapacitation	Indicates whether respondent experienced any sexual battery incident since entering college
3	Penetration or Sexual Touching by Coercion	Indicates whether respondent experienced any incident of sex or sexual touching by coercion since entering college
4	Penetration or Sexual Touching by Absence of Affirmative Consent	Indicates whether respondent experienced any incident of sex or sexual touching without affirmative consent since entering college
5	Sexual Harassment	Indicates whether respondent experienced any incident of sexual harassment since entering college
6	Stalking	Indicates whether respondent experienced any incident of stalking since entering college
7	Intimate Partner Violence	Indicates whether respondent experienced any incident of intimate partner violence since entering college
8	Resources	Indicates whether respondent is 'very' or 'extremely' knowledgeable about campus resources for sexual assault and misconduct
9	Reporting Perception	Indicates whether respondent feels it is 'very' or 'extremely' likely that university officials will do all of the following in response to a report of sexual misconduct or assault: take the report seriously, conduct a fair investigation, and take action to address causes of the issue
10	Bystander Intervention	Indicates whether respondent took some sort of action when they suspected a friend had been sexually assaulted
11	Perception of Problem	Indicates whether sexual assault or misconduct is seen as very or extremely problematic at the university

Discussion of Analysis Results

Correlation analysis

Correlations are shown in Table X2. The row “(estimate)” provides the point estimates of the key variables. The row “All” presents the correlation of each key variable with all auxiliary variables used as independent variables in the GLM model.

Table A4-2. Correlations of the auxiliary variables and the key survey variables

Auxiliary Variable ¹	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
(Estimate)	0.060	0.114	0.005	0.069	0.502	0.046	0.108	0.326	0.236	0.650	0.376
Incentive Status	0.024	0.039	0.003	0.004	0.033	0.013	0.003	0.004	0.034	0.003	0.006
Gender	0.159	0.192	0.018	0.189	0.183	0.133	0.064	0.039	0.101	0.084	0.158
Age Group	0.061	0.070	0.009	0.042	0.089	0.008	0.021	0.086	0.032	0.037	0.034
Year in School	0.005	0.003	0.022	0.023	0.061	0.045	0.001	0.052	0.103	0.039	0.134
Race/ Ethnicity	0.073	0.083	0.032	0.075	0.193	0.032	0.055	0.157	0.036	0.106	0.194
All	0.184	0.223	0.044	0.208	0.308	0.155	0.086	0.177	0.161	0.181	0.282

¹ Refer to the weighting section for the definitions of the auxiliary variables.

In general, as a single auxiliary variable, Incentive Status, Age Group, and Year in School have a low correlation with all key variables, whereas Gender and Race/Ethnicity have higher correlations. Gender has considerably higher correlations for several key variables (Penetration by Physical Force or Incapacitation; Sexual Touching by Physical Force or Incapacitation; Penetration or Sexual Touching by Absence of Affirmative Consent; Sexual Harassment; Stalking; Reporting Perception; and Perception of Problem). All auxiliary variables collectively have non-negligible correlations with all key variables, except Penetration or Sexual Touching by Coercion. Among the 11 key survey variables, Penetration or Sexual Touching by Coercion has lowest correlations with all auxiliary variables, followed by Intimate Partner Violence and Stalking.

We know that the auxiliary variables are correlated with the response propensity. The correlation analysis also shows that the auxiliary variables are correlated with the outcome variables. Therefore, it appears that those auxiliary variables were effective in reducing, or perhaps eliminating, nonresponse bias.

Comparison of the weighting method with an alternative weighting method

We developed alternative weights by using a two-step procedure, where the first step adjusted for nonresponse using the response propensity method and the second step calibrated the nonresponse adjusted weights to the population totals through raking. The major outcome measures were compared using this alternative weighting method and the method used in the analysis discussed in this report. Two hundred and seventy five comparisons were

made at the population and subgroup level (see below for details) but there were no statistically significant differences between the estimates using the two weighing methods. This implies that the one-step raking procedure is as effective in removing nonresponse bias as the more complex two-step weighting method that uses the same auxiliary information.

A4.2 Testing for Nonresponse Bias

We conducted two different analyses to test whether bias due to nonresponse exists for the above 11 key measures (see Table A4-1). These include:

- Comparison of early and late responders: We compared key estimates between early and late responders. Early and late responders are identified by respondents' survey submission time. Early responders are those who responded before the first reminder email out of two reminders; and the other respondents are the late responders.
- Comparison by the incentive status: The incentivized sample has a higher response rate than the other group. We compared the key variable estimates of the incentivized sample with those of the other group.

Discussion of Analysis Results

Comparison of early and late responders

One standard method of assessing nonresponse bias is to assume that the respondents that required the most effort to convince to complete the survey are similar to the nonrespondents. For purposes of this analysis we defined 'effort' as the number of contacts made before the respondent completed the survey. Those who responded early (e.g., before the first email reminder) required less effort to gain cooperation than those who responded later after multiple e-mails. This analysis assumes that those who responded later have more in common with the nonrespondents than those who responded early. If this assumption is true, then a difference in the outcome measures between the early and late responders would be an indication of nonresponse bias.

While this is a standard method to evaluate nonresponse bias, the assumption that those requiring more effort to gain cooperation resemble the nonrespondents does not always hold.⁴⁹

In our analysis, early responders are defined as those who responded before the first reminder email, and late responders are those who responded after the first reminder email was sent. About 9 percent of respondents were missing the survey submission time and could

⁴⁹ Lin, I-F., and Schaeffer, N.C. (1995). Using survey participants to estimate the impact of nonparticipation. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 59 (2), 236–58; Olson, K. (2006). Survey participation, nonresponse bias, measurement error bias and total bias. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 70 (5), 737-758.

not be included in this analysis.⁵⁰ The late responders account for 52 percent of the respondents with nonmissing survey submission time.

We compared weighted estimates of the 11 key survey variables at the total population and subgroup levels. The subgroups are defined by the categories of the auxiliary variables used in weighting (see Table A4-2). There are altogether 20 categories of subgroups (2 Incentive Statuses, 2 genders, 4 Age-groups, 7 categories of Year in School, and 5 categories of Race/Ethnicity). Comparisons are also made at finer subgroups defined by crossing the gender and school enrollment (four subgroups: male undergraduate, male graduate/professional, female undergraduate, and female graduate/professional). There were 275 comparisons overall, which corresponds to the sum of 11 population-level comparisons, 220 (= 11 key variables × 20 categories) subgroup-level comparisons, and 44 (= 11 key variables × 4 finer subgroups) finer subgroup-level comparisons.

Subgroup-level comparisons for the same auxiliary variable were treated as multiple comparisons using Bonferroni corrected alpha values. For example, one t-test was performed to compare the estimate of Penetration by Force or Incapacitation for males for early vs. late responders. Another t-test was carried out for females in the same way. These two comparisons were made using the Bonferroni-corrected alpha-value of 0.025 (= 0.05/2). Population-level comparisons were made individually with a 0.05 alpha-value.

Four (36%) out of 11 population-level comparisons are individually significant – they are Penetration by Physical Force or Incapacitation; Penetration or Sexual Touching by Absence of Affirmative Consent; Sexual Harassment; and Risk Perceptions. One issue with these comparisons is they do not fully control for differences that are adjusted in the survey weights (e.g., gender and enrollment status). While this analysis uses the weights, it does not control within early and late responder groups. For example, there may be more males who responded later, and comparing the early and late responder groups does not control for this difference. It is more instructive to examine the subgroup differences, which are specific to some of the characteristics that were used in the weighting. Seven (3%) out of 220 subgroup comparisons are significant, and one (2%) out of 44 finer subgroup comparisons is significant.

It is useful to concentrate on the subgroup estimates, as they are used throughout the report and they disaggregate by important variables used in the weighting. Table A4-3 provides the differences for each of these outcomes for the early vs. late responders for the four primary subgroups defined by gender and enrollment status. For example, for male undergraduate students the rate for Bystander Intervention for late responders is 51.63 percent and for early responders is 69.70 percent. This difference is statistically significant at the 5 percent significance level for multiple comparisons with a P-value of 0.89 percent, which is less than the Bonferroni alpha value of 1.25 percent (= 5%/4).

⁵⁰ A time was not obtained for those that stopped completing the survey before they completed.

Table A4-3. Comparison of early and later responders by gender and school enrollment for 11 key variables (estimates in percent)

Outcome ¹	Gender	Enrollment Status ²	Late Responders	StdErr ³	Early Responders	StdErr ³	Difference	P-value ⁴
1	M	UnderGr	2.25	0.80	1.97	0.70	0.28	80.54
1	M	Grad/Prof	0.00	0.00	1.02	0.64	-1.02	11.47
1	F	UnderGr	8.01	0.91	11.12	1.09	-3.11	3.31
1	F	Grad/Prof	3.06	1.01	4.12	1.28	-1.06	51.87
2	M	UnderGr	5.03	1.18	6.07	1.12	-1.04	55.27
2	M	Grad/Prof	1.53	1.01	1.62	1.07	-0.09	95.40
2	F	UnderGr	16.72	1.44	15.91	1.39	0.81	69.29
2	F	Grad/Prof	7.08	2.04	7.17	1.92	-0.09	97.71
3	M	UnderGr	0.42	0.39	0.32	0.30	0.10	85.41
3	M	Grad/Prof	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
3	F	UnderGr	0.59	0.24	0.42	0.23	0.17	62.25
3	F	Grad/Prof	0.39	0.37	0.00	0.00	0.39	29.25
4	M	UnderGr	1.27	0.54	3.43	0.99	-2.16	6.79
4	M	Grad/Prof	1.19	0.76	2.17	1.50	-0.98	55.87
4	F	UnderGr	10.42	1.09	11.94	1.05	-1.52	28.30
4	F	Grad/Prof	4.99	1.32	6.72	1.64	-1.73	39.49
5	M	UnderGr	40.75	2.31	43.48	2.59	-2.73	44.14
5	M	Grad/Prof	35.38	4.78	32.79	4.26	2.59	68.53
5	F	UnderGr	56.54	1.72	60.55	1.82	-4.01	10.72
5	F	Grad/Prof	56.19	2.73	60.31	3.71	-4.12	36.64
6	M	UnderGr	1.64	0.70	1.86	0.89	-0.22	85.48
6	M	Grad/Prof	2.84	1.69	0.49	0.46	2.35	19.10
6	F	UnderGr	7.83	1.10	6.15	0.87	1.68	27.41
6	F	Grad/Prof	6.89	1.76	8.83	2.02	-1.94	45.40
7	M	UnderGr	8.89	1.57	11.12	2.02	-2.23	38.93
7	M	Grad/Prof	3.20	1.49	7.41	2.86	-4.21	22.03
7	F	UnderGr	13.21	1.31	11.82	1.26	1.39	41.47
7	F	Grad/Prof	8.48	1.83	9.93	2.42	-1.45	64.05
8	M	UnderGr	31.32	2.49	35.72	2.38	-4.40	19.72
8	M	Grad/Prof	18.26	3.55	25.37	3.50	-7.11	15.74
8	F	UnderGr	33.97	1.87	36.05	1.70	-2.08	44.31
8	F	Grad/Prof	30.65	3.92	30.38	3.47	0.27	96.03
9	M	UnderGr	29.80	2.01	29.86	2.94	-0.06	98.65
9	M	Grad/Prof	16.70	3.15	17.24	3.26	-0.54	90.94
9	F	UnderGr	21.80	1.30	19.27	1.43	2.53	19.23
9	F	Grad/Prof	13.10	2.76	4.81	1.77	8.29	1.74
10	M	UnderGr	51.63	4.72	69.70	5.00	-18.07	0.89*
10	M	Grad/Prof	83.13	9.57	78.75	11.11	4.38	75.93
10	F	UnderGr	73.62	3.22	63.64	3.70	9.98	4.45
10	F	Grad/Prof	72.44	8.74	68.64	5.44	3.80	73.94
11	M	UnderGr	27.45	1.89	31.49	2.88	-4.04	24.04
11	M	Grad/Prof	40.28	4.42	43.31	4.72	-3.03	61.19
11	F	UnderGr	41.54	1.92	46.49	1.66	-4.95	3.64
11	F	Grad/Prof	50.29	3.61	62.16	3.38	-11.87	3.58

¹ See Table A4-1 for definitions of outcomes

² UnderGr = Undergraduate; Grad/Prof = Graduate or Professional Student

³ StdErr = Standard Error for the proportion

⁴ A significant result (P-value < 1.25%) is asterisked (*).

As noted above, only 2% of the differences in Table A4-3 are statistically significant. These results indicate there is weak or no evidence of non-response bias, since the number of significant differences is about what was expected by chance (5 percent).

Comparison by the incentive status

One limitation the analysis of early/late responders is reliance on the assumption that late responders resemble the nonrespondents. As noted above, this assumption does not always hold and can vary by the outcome that is being examined. An alternative approach to examining nonresponse bias is to compare outcomes by the different incentive groups. The incentivized sample, which received a \$5 gift card for participating in the survey, was randomly selected, but responded at a higher rate (16.9% vs. 12.8%) – those not selected in the incentivized sample were entered into a cash lottery to win \$500. If there is nonresponse bias, then there should be a difference in the outcomes between the incentivized and non-incentivized (cash lottery) groups. For example, the incentive of \$5 gift card may have been more successful at convincing non-victims to participate. That is, the non-victims may have needed additional motivation to participate beyond the appeals made in the e-mails and advance publicity. If this is true, then the incentivized group should have a lower victimization rate than the non-incentivized group. Alternatively, the incentive of \$5 gift card may have been more successful at motivating victims who normally would not participate because of not being willing to share their personal experiences. If this is true, then the incentivized group should have a higher victimization rate than the non-incentivized group. If response propensity is not related to being a victim, then there should not be any difference between the incentivized and non-incentivized groups.

The total number of comparisons is 198, which is less than before because we cannot make subgroup-level comparisons defined by the Incentive Status. Significance tests were performed similarly as above. Overall weighted estimates of three key variables (Sexual Touching by Physical Force or Incapacitation, Sexual Harassment, and Reporting Perception) are significantly different between the two incentive groups. Only four comparisons (2%) out of 198 subgroup comparisons are significant, and only one (2%) out of 44 finer subgroup comparisons is significant (see Table A4-4). This is slightly less than would be expected by chance (around 5%). However, many of these differences are concentrated in certain outcomes.

Focusing on the subgroups estimates, Table A4-4 provides the differences for each of these outcomes for the four primary subgroups defined by gender and enrollment status. For example, for male graduate/professional students the rate for Bystander Intervention for the incentive group is 100.00 percent and for the non-incentive group is 74.05 percent. This difference is statistically significant at the 5 percent significance level for multiple comparisons with a P-value of 0.52 percent, which is less than the Bonferroni alpha value of 1.25 percent (= 5%/4).

Table A4-4. Comparison of incentivized and non-incentivized groups by gender and school enrollment for 11 key variables (estimates in percent)

Outcome ¹	Gender	Enrollment Status ²	Incentive	StdErr ³	Non-Incentive	StdErr ³	Difference	P-value ⁴
1	M	UnderGr	0.92	0.58	3.38	0.81	-2.46	1.54
1	M	Grad/Prof	1.79	1.11	0.00	0.00	1.79	11.29
1	F	UnderGr	10.21	1.26	10.79	0.99	-0.58	72.27
1	F	Grad/Prof	3.50	1.57	4.52	1.12	-1.02	59.81
2	M	UnderGr	5.26	1.04	6.67	0.98	-1.41	32.73
2	M	Grad/Prof	0.00	0.00	1.99	0.93	-1.99	3.55
2	F	UnderGr	15.95	1.71	20.16	1.48	-4.21	6.72
2	F	Grad/Prof	5.09	1.57	9.00	1.59	-3.91	8.59
3	M	UnderGr	0.00	0.00	0.63	0.36	-0.63	8.34
3	M	Grad/Prof	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
3	F	UnderGr	1.05	0.34	0.55	0.22	0.50	23.07
3	F	Grad/Prof	0.68	0.63	0.26	0.25	0.42	52.88
4	M	UnderGr	2.35	0.68	2.44	0.68	-0.09	92.12
4	M	Grad/Prof	2.24	1.41	1.33	0.92	0.91	58.81
4	F	UnderGr	12.91	1.29	12.51	1.04	0.40	81.16
4	F	Grad/Prof	6.04	2.08	5.81	1.19	0.23	92.63
5	M	UnderGr	37.00	2.41	44.86	2.15	-7.86	1.93
5	M	Grad/Prof	44.25	5.71	30.39	3.52	13.86	4.32
5	F	UnderGr	58.26	1.48	60.34	1.51	-2.08	32.64
5	F	Grad/Prof	54.27	3.39	61.43	2.86	-7.16	10.95
6	M	UnderGr	0.89	0.59	2.43	0.70	-1.54	10.41
6	M	Grad/Prof	2.13	1.40	1.43	1.04	0.70	68.89
6	F	UnderGr	7.56	0.98	7.45	0.84	0.11	93.36
6	F	Grad/Prof	7.63	2.04	8.10	1.67	-0.47	86.07
7	M	UnderGr	11.29	1.98	9.10	1.42	2.19	37.20
7	M	Grad/Prof	7.51	2.58	4.02	1.69	3.49	26.84
7	F	UnderGr	10.72	1.80	14.28	1.09	-3.56	9.77
7	F	Grad/Prof	9.70	2.46	9.47	1.93	0.23	94.10
8	M	UnderGr	31.72	2.74	32.87	2.07	-1.15	74.16
8	M	Grad/Prof	30.78	5.28	17.87	2.69	12.91	3.27
8	F	UnderGr	33.91	2.00	35.42	1.38	-1.51	52.84
8	F	Grad/Prof	26.10	3.86	32.18	2.89	-6.08	21.69
9	M	UnderGr	26.01	1.95	31.03	1.93	-5.02	7.16
9	M	Grad/Prof	17.96	4.16	16.40	2.52	1.56	75.23
9	F	UnderGr	18.25	1.26	21.24	1.25	-2.99	9.50
9	F	Grad/Prof	11.57	3.46	7.96	1.74	3.61	35.41
10	M	UnderGr	57.14	6.19	59.13	4.00	-1.99	78.94
10	M	Grad/Prof	100.00	0.00	74.05	8.95	25.95	0.52*
10	F	UnderGr	68.70	4.17	68.31	3.03	0.39	93.90
10	F	Grad/Prof	64.49	8.59	72.26	5.42	-7.77	44.69
11	M	UnderGr	27.08	3.42	29.17	1.72	-2.09	59.01
11	M	Grad/Prof	51.45	6.68	35.99	3.90	15.46	4.89
11	F	UnderGr	43.39	2.36	44.86	1.54	-1.47	59.96
11	F	Grad/Prof	51.61	3.72	56.75	2.49	-5.14	26.03

¹ See Table A4-1 for definitions of outcomes

² UnderGr = Undergraduate; Grad/Prof = Graduate or Professional Student

³ StdErr = Standard Error for the proportion

⁴ A significant result (P-value < 1.25%) is asterisked (*).

As noted above, 2% of the differences in Table A4-4 are statistically significant. These results indicate there is weak or no evidence of non-response bias, since the number of significant differences is about what was expected by chance (5 percent).

Appendix 5. Email Invitations and Reminders

Survey Invitation and Reminder Messages

1st Contact: Email Invitation

Condition 1: \$5 Amazon gift card

From: Campus Climate Survey

Subject: Invitation to take part in a Campus Climate Survey

From: Vice President for Student Life Robin H. Holmes

To: University of Oregon Student

I'm writing to ask you to respond to a climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The results will be used to guide policies to encourage a healthy, safe and nondiscriminatory environment at the University of Oregon. It is important to hear from you, even if you believe these issues do not directly affect you.

I know your time is valuable, but I hope you can find a few minutes to respond before the survey closes on Friday, May 8, 2015. As a small token of appreciation, **you will receive a \$5 Amazon gift card** once you complete the survey.

Share your perspective by clicking on the link below:

<https://group1.campusclimatesurvey2015.org/Home.aspx?uPin=xL1GOXTLcm14SO2>

Your individual responses will be treated as confidential. Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and will not affect any aspect of your experience at the University of Oregon. However, your response is important to getting an accurate picture of the experiences and opinions of all students.

Westat, a social science research firm, is administering the survey for us. If you have any questions about the survey or have difficulty accessing it, please send an e-mail to CampusClimateHelp@westat.com or call 1 (855) 497-4787.

Thank you,

Robin H. Holmes

Vice President for Student Life

Survey Invitation and Reminder Messages

2nd and 3rd Contact: Email Reminder

Condition 1: \$5 Amazon gift card

From: Campus Climate Survey

Subject: Reminder to complete the Campus Climate Survey

From: Vice President for Student Life Robin H. Holmes

To: University of Oregon Student

I recently sent you an individualized link to participate in a climate survey. If you have filled out the survey, thank you! This message has gone to all students on campus because no identifying information is linked with the survey and we are unable to identify whether you have completed the survey.

If you have not had a chance to take the survey yet, please do so as soon as possible by clicking on the link below. Your participation in this confidential survey is voluntary, but the more people who participate, the better the information we will have to promote a healthier campus.

The closing date for the survey is Friday, May 8, 2015, so it is important to hear from you as soon as possible. As a small token of appreciation, you will receive a **\$5 Amazon gift card when you complete the survey.**

<https://group1.campusclimatesurvey2015.org/Home.aspx?uPin=xL1GOXTLcm14SO2>

Westat, a social science research firm, is administering the survey for us. If you have any questions about the survey or have difficulty accessing it, please send an e-mail to CampusClimateHelp@westat.com or call 1 (855) 497-4787.

Thank you,

Robin H. Holmes

Vice President for Student Life

Survey Invitation and Reminder Messages

1st Contact: Email Invitation

Condition 2: \$500 Drawing

From: Campus Climate Survey

Subject: Invitation to take part in a Campus Climate Survey

From: Vice President for Student Life Robin H. Holmes

To: University of Oregon Student

I'm writing to ask you to respond to a climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The results will be used to guide policies to encourage a healthy, safe and nondiscriminatory environment at the University of Oregon. It is important to hear from you, even if you believe these issues do not directly affect you.

I know your time is valuable, but I hope you can find a few minutes to respond before the survey closes on Friday, May 8, 2015. **By going to the website at the link below, you will be entered into a lottery to win \$500** . We hope you will decide to complete the survey, but you are eligible for the lottery whether or not you complete the survey:

<https://group1.campusclimatesurvey2015.org/Home.aspx?uPin=xL1GOXTLcm14SO2>

Your individual responses will be treated as confidential. Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and will not affect any aspect of your experience at the University of Oregon. However, your response is important to getting an accurate picture of the experiences and opinions of all students.

Westat, a social science research firm, is administering the survey for us. If you have any questions about the survey or have difficulty accessing it, please send an e-mail to CampusClimateHelp@westat.com or call 1 (855) 497-4787.

Thank you,

Robin H. Holmes

Vice President for Student Life

Survey Invitation and Reminder Messages

2nd and 3rd Contact: Email Reminder

Condition 2: Drawing

From: Campus Climate Survey

Subject: Reminder to complete the Campus Climate Survey

From: Vice President for Student Life Robin H. Holmes

To: University of Oregon Student

I recently sent you an individualized link to participate in a climate survey. If you have filled out the survey, thank you! This message has gone to all students on campus because no identifying information is linked with the survey and we are unable to identify whether you have completed the survey.

If you have not had a chance to take the survey yet, please do so as soon as possible by clicking on the link below. Your participation in this confidential survey is voluntary, but the more people who participate, the better the information we will have to promote a healthier campus.

The closing date for the survey is Friday, May 8, 2015, so it is important to hear from you as soon as possible. As a small token of our appreciation, **by going to the website at the link below, you will be entered into a lottery to win \$500** . You are eligible for the lottery whether or not you complete the survey.

<https://group1.campusclimatesurvey2015.org/Home.aspx?uPin=xL1GOXTLcm14SO2>

Westat, a social science research firm, is administering the survey for us. If you have any questions about the survey or have difficulty accessing it, please send an e-mail to CampusClimateHelp@westat.com or call 1 (855) 497-4787.

Thank you,

Robin H. Holmes

Vice President for Student Life