

Executive Summary

Summary of Results

Members of the Association of American Universities (AAU) are working to combat sexual assault and misconduct on their campuses. As an association of research universities, AAU decided in 2014 that the best way to help its members address this issue was to develop and implement a scientific survey to better understand the attitudes and experiences of their students with respect to sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The survey's primary goal was to provide participating institutions of higher education (IHEs) with information to inform their policies to prevent and respond to sexual assault and misconduct. In addition, members hoped that the survey would provide useful information to policymakers as well as make a significant contribution to the body of academic research on this complex issue.

In the fall of 2014, AAU contracted with Westat, a research firm, to work with a university team of researchers and administrators to design and implement the survey, entitled the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct. The survey was administered at the end of the spring 2015 semester on the campuses of 27 IHEs, 26 of which are AAU member universities. This report provides a description of the survey methodology and key results.

The survey was designed to assess the incidence, prevalence and characteristics of incidents of sexual assault and misconduct. It also assessed the overall campus climate with respect to perceptions of risk, knowledge of resources available to victims, and perceived reactions to an incident of sexual assault or misconduct. The report provides selected results for five questions:

- How extensive is nonconsensual sexual contact?
- How extensive is sexual harassment, stalking and intimate partner violence?
- Who are the victims?
- To whom do students report or talk about the incidents?
- What is the campus climate around sexual assault and sexual misconduct?

This study is one of the first to provide an empirical assessment of these questions across a wide range of IHEs. Prior studies of campus sexual assault and misconduct have been implemented for a small number of IHEs or for a national sample of students with relatively small samples for any particular IHE. To date, comparisons across surveys have been problematic because of different methodologies and different definitions. The AAU study is one of the first to implement a uniform methodology across multiple IHEs and to produce statistically reliable estimates for each IHE. It was designed to provide separate estimates for incidents involving two types of sexual contact (penetration and sexual touching) and four tactics (physical force, drugs and alcohol, coercion, absence of affirmative consent), as well as behaviors such as sexual harassment, stalking, and intimate partner violence. Providing this level of detail allows campus administrators to tailor policies by these very different types of sexual assault and misconduct.

Highlights of the results include:

- The percentage of students who report nonconsensual sexual contact varies greatly by the type of sexual contact (penetration or sexual touching) and whether or not it involves physical force, alcohol or drugs, coercion, or absence of affirmative consent.
- The profiles of each IHE are quite different. There is wide variation across IHEs:
 - for most types of sexual assault and misconduct measured on this survey.
 - for various campus climate measures, such as opinions about how problematic it is at the school and how students and university officials might react to an incident.
- The average rates of nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation across all 27 IHEs are as high or slightly higher than those revealed in prior surveys.
- Rates of sexual assault and misconduct are highest among undergraduate females and those identifying as transgender, genderqueer, non-conforming, questioning, and as something not listed on the survey (TGQN).
- The risk of the most serious types of nonconsensual sexual contact, due to physical force or incapacitation, decline from freshman to senior year. This decline is not as evident for other types of nonconsensual sexual contact
- Nonconsensual sexual contact involving drugs and alcohol constitute a significant percentage of the incidents.
- A relatively small percentage (e.g., 28% or less) of even the most serious incidents are reported to an organization or agency (e.g., Title IX office; law enforcement)
- More than 50 percent of the victims of even the most serious incidents (e.g., forced penetration) say they do not report the event because they do not consider it “serious enough.”
- A significant percentage of students say they did not report because they were “...embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult” or “...did not think anything would be done about it.”
- Significantly more than half of the victims of nonconsensual sexual contact who reported the incident to an agency or organization said their experience with the agency or organization was very good or excellent along several criteria.
- When asked what might happen when a student reports an incident of sexual assault or misconduct to a university official, about half say that it is very or extremely likely that the university will conduct a fair investigation. The percentage is lower for those groups that are most likely to report victimization (i.e., females and those identifying as TGQN). Similar percentages are evident for opinions about other types of reactions by

the university (e.g., officials would take the report seriously; protect the safety of the student; take action against the offender).

- A relatively small percentage of students believe it is very or extremely likely they will experience sexual assault or misconduct. A larger percentage of students believe that sexual assault and misconduct is very or extremely problematic for the IHE.
- A little less than half of the students have witnessed a drunk person heading for a sexual encounter. Among those who reported being a witness, most did not try to intervene.
- About a quarter of the students generally believe they are knowledgeable about the resources available related to sexual assault and misconduct.

As noted above, the study found a wide range of variation across the 27 IHEs in the rates of sexual assault and misconduct, as well as the climate measures. However, the analyses did not find a clear explanation for why there is such wide variation. Some university characteristics, such as size, were correlated with certain outcomes. But the correlation was not particularly strong.

An analysis of the possibility the estimates were affected by non-response bias found that certain types of estimates may be too high because non-victims may have been less likely to participate. This might have contributed to some of the differences observed between schools, although indications are that this was not a large effect.

The wide variation across IHEs puts in stark perspective prior discussions of single-IHE rates as representing a “standard” against which to compare results. For example, many news stories are focused on figures like “1 in 5” in reporting victimization. As the researchers who generated this number have repeatedly said, the 1 in 5 number is for a few IHEs and is not representative of anything outside of this frame. The wide variation of rates across IHEs in the present study emphasizes the significance of this caveat.

The remainder of this executive summary provides a more detailed description of the methodology and selected results.

What Types of Sexual Assault and Misconduct Are Covered on the Survey?

The survey defined sexual assault and misconduct with two types of victimization. One type focused on nonconsensual sexual contact involving two behaviors: sexual penetration and sexual touching. Respondents were asked whether one or more of these contacts occurred as a result of four tactics: (1) physical force or threat of physical force, (2) being incapacitated because of drugs, alcohol or being unconscious, asleep or passed out, (3) coercive threats of non-physical harm or promised rewards, and (4) failure to obtain affirmative consent. The first two tactics generally meet legal definitions of rape (penetration) and sexual battery (sexual touching). The other two tactics are violations of student codes of conduct. The second type of victimization focused on sexual harassment, stalking, and intimate partner violence (IPV). The definitions of these different tactics are provided below when data are presented on their prevalence.

Methodology

The survey was developed by a group of researchers, program administrators, and methodologists from the participating IHEs and the Westat team. The design team started with the survey instrument developed by the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault and adapted the design around the informational needs of the participating IHEs. When asking about sexual assault and sexual misconduct, the questions used descriptions of specific types of behaviors and tactics that constitute sexual assault and misconduct. Words such as “rape” and “assault” were specifically avoided so that respondents would use a set of uniform definitions when reporting on the types of events that were of interest.

Over the 4-month period between November 2014 and February 2015, the survey team met once a week, sometimes twice a week, to make decisions on the content and format of the questions. During this process, more than 700 comments from participating IHEs were reviewed, two rounds of cognitive interviews were conducted, and pilot administrations were conducted at four participating IHEs.

A copy of the questionnaire, with the sources of the questions, can be found in Appendix 5. For each section below, the wording and questionnaire items are provided to the reader. The full report provides a more detailed description of the rationale for the items on the survey.

All but one of the 27 schools launched the Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct over a 3-week period from April 1 to 17. One school launched on May 1. Most schools observed a 3-week field period, with three e-mail requests sent out asking for student participation. For 26 of the 27 schools, all enrolled undergraduates, graduate, and professional students 18 years and older were asked to participate. The sample size was 779,170. To encourage participation, students were offered a variety of incentives. In 18 schools, students were either entered into a drawing or offered a \$5 incentive to complete the survey. Other schools a variation on this basic design. Others offered an incentive to all students, while a few offered no incentive.

The survey had a response rate of 19.3 percent, with a total of 150,072 students participating. Graduate/professional students responded at a higher rate than undergraduates (23.2% for graduate/professional and 17.4% for undergraduates). Females (22.9%) responded at a higher rate than males (15.6%). To generate estimates for the student population, the data were weighted to adjust for this differential non-response. Response rates across the IHEs (Figure E-1) ranged from a low of seven percent to a high of 53 percent.


The overall response rate of 19.3 percent is lower than several other surveys on sexual assault and misconduct. Other surveys that are cited in this report have rates that range from 30 percent to 86 percent. The response rate is only an indirect indicator of data quality.¹ A low response rate does not necessarily mean the survey estimates are biased in a particular direction. The report provides the results of three different assessments of non-response bias. Two of these three analyses provide

¹ Groves, R. M., & Peytcheva, E. (2008). The Impact of Nonresponse Rates on Nonresponse Bias: A Meta-Analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72(2), 167-189.

evidence that non-responders tended to be less likely to report victimization. This implies that the survey estimates related to victimization and selected attitude items may be biased upwards (i.e., somewhat too high).

Data are primarily reported by gender and enrollment status. To measure gender identification, respondents were asked to identify themselves into one of eight categories.² Using responses to this question, students were classified into one of four groups: (1) female, (2) male, (3) transgender, genderqueer or nonconforming, questioning or not listed (TGQN), and (4) decline to state. Groups were collapsed into TGQN to maintain adequate sample size for generating estimates. Enrollment status was divided into two groups: (1) undergraduate and (2) graduate/professional.

Figure E-1. Distribution of response rate for the 27 IHEs participating on the AAU survey



Prior surveys have shown that those identifying as TGQN experience higher risk of sexual assault and sexual misconduct. However, very few campus surveys have produced statistically reliable estimates for those who identify as TGQN because they constitute a very small percentage of the campus population. For the AAU survey, approximately 1.5 percent of the students selected a non-male/non-female category. While this is a small percentage, the large number of responses to the AAU survey permits estimating rates for this group with adequate statistical precision.

² These eight categories are: male, female, transgender male, transgender female, genderqueer or non-conforming gender, questioning, not listed and “decline to state.”

How Extensive is Nonconsensual Sexual Contact?

The four different types of nonconsensual sexual contact included in the AAU survey reflect the different definitions that are used by IHEs, as well as what has been used in previous published studies on campus sexual assault and sexual misconduct. The AAU survey was designed to estimate sexual assault and sexual misconduct using various definitions to allow shaping of IHE policy according to the type of behavior and tactic.

Nonconsensual Sexual Contact by Physical Force, Threats of Physical Force or Incapacitation. Students were asked about nonconsensual sexual contact that was the result of physical force, threats of physical force or incapacitation. This combination of tactics and behaviors generally meets legal definitions of rape (penetration) and sexual battery (sexual touching). The definitions provided to the respondent for the behaviors included (see items G1 through G5 on the survey):

- 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

Physical force was defined on the survey as incidents when someone was:

“... 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.”

Incapacitation was defined on the survey as a student being:

“...unable to consent or stop what was happening because you were passed out, asleep or incapacitated due to drugs or alcohol”


Overall, 11.7 percent of students across the 27 universities reported experiencing nonconsensual penetration or sexual touching by force or incapacitation since enrolling at the IHE. This overall rate masks large differences by gender and enrollment status (Figure E-2). Females and students identifying as TGQN have significantly higher rates of this type of victimization than males and

those declining to provide a gender identity. Undergraduates also have much higher rates than graduate/professional students.

Acts involving penetration by force or incapacitation are considered the most serious types of sexual assault and misconduct. Those identifying as TGQN had the highest rates (12.4% for undergraduates, followed by undergraduate females (10.8%) And TGQN graduate/professional students (8.3%). The rates for males and other graduate/professional students are much lower. For example, 3.9 percent of graduate/professional females were victims of penetration from physical force or incapacitation.

One of the more important risk factors for nonconsensual sexual contact is the use of alcohol and drugs. Among undergraduate females, about as many individuals reported penetration by incapacitation (5.4%) as by physical force (5.7%). For sexual touching, a larger percentage of the undergraduate females reported being physically forced when compared to being incapacitated (12.8% vs. 6.6%). There are small percentages that report that both force and incapacitation occurred (e.g., 1.7% of undergraduate females).

Figure E-2. Percent reporting sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolling in the college



Another factor that might affect risk is the class year. Students who are relatively new to school may experience higher risk because they are not as familiar with situations that may lead to an incident of sexual assault or misconduct. Examination of the rates for the current academic year show this pattern holds for undergraduate females. Among freshmen, 16.9 percent of females reported sexual contact by physical force or incapacitation. This percentage steadily declines by year in school to a low of 11.1 percent for seniors.

Across the 27 IHEs (Figure E-3), the rates range from 13 percent to 30 percent. There are small but statistically significant differences between different types of IHEs. For undergraduates, for example, private universities had a higher rate (25.3%) when compared to public universities (22.8%). This pattern is not uniform for other types of students. For example, graduate/professional students in public universities have higher prevalence compared to private schools. Figure E-4 illustrates this for those identifying as TGQN. For TGQN undergraduates, private IHEs have higher rates, while for graduate/professional students public universities have a higher rate.

Figure E-3. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving force or incapacitation since entering the IHE





Figure E-4. Percent identifying as TGQN* reporting sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation since enrolled in the IHE by type of school and enrollment status



*TGQN = Transgender, Genderqueer or non-conforming, Questioning, Not Listed

Nonconsensual Sexual Contact by Coercion. Coercion is defined as involving threats of serious non-physical harm or promising rewards. This was defined for respondents on the survey as (see questionnaire items G6 and G7):

...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

For the time period since students entered their respective IHEs, nonconsensual contact involving coercion was reported by less than 1 percent of the students. Females and males were about as likely to report this type of tactic (0.4% for females; 0.3% for males). Those identifying as TGQN were the most likely to report this type of tactic (1.6%). There are no significant differences between undergraduates and graduate/professional students.

These rates are lower than reported in other studies. One possible reason is the AAU survey concentrated on threats of punishment or promise of rewards, where other surveys have included tactics such as verbal pressure that may not be considered threats (e.g., pestering or verbal pressure).

Nonconsensual Sexual Contact by Absence of Affirmative Consent. The survey captured emerging student codes of conduct which make it a violation if both partners in a sexual encounter do not explicitly consent. To develop the questions, affirmative consent policies from institutions in AAU and the Consortium on Financing Higher Education (COFHE) were reviewed. To our knowledge, this is one of the first surveys to measure this type of tactic.

The question on absence of affirmative consent (AAC) was introduced with the following definition (see questionnaire items G8 and G9):


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

Females and those identifying as TGQN were the most likely to be victimized by this type of tactic. For example since enrolling at the IHE, 11.4 percent of undergraduate females and 14.8 percent of undergraduates who identify as TGQN were victimized by this tactic compared to 2.4 percent of males.

There is a wide range of rates across the 27 IHEs for this tactic. For undergraduate females, it ranges from a low of 5 percent to a high of 21 percent (Figure E-5). Smaller campuses have higher rates than larger campuses and private IHEs had a higher rate when compared to public IHEs.

Figure E-5. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting nonconsensual sexual contact involving absence of affirmative consent since entering the school for the 27 IHEs



What is the Total Experience with Nonconsensual Sexual Contact? 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).

With a few exceptions, the estimates provided to this point have been for all students for the time period since entering the IHE. 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 made for seniors since entering the IHE. This provides the prevalence for the period while attending a 4-year college or university.

According to the AAU survey, 16.5 percent of seniors experienced sexual contact involving penetration or sexual touching as a result of physical force or incapacitation. Senior females (26.1%) and those identifying as TGQN (29.5%) are, by far, the most likely to experience this type of victimization. Senior males are subject to much smaller risk (6.3%). Senior females and those identifying as TGQN reported being a victim of nonconsensual penetration involving physical force or incapacitation 11.3 percent and 12.6 percent, respectively, since first enrolling at the university or college.

The above estimates exclude attempted, but not completed, sexual contact. However, attempted acts are also part of the legal definition of rape and sexual battery. They also have been included in a number of different studies on victimization of college students (Koss, et al., 1987). The AAU

survey measured attempts of forcible penetration. If these are also included, the estimates increase by approximately one percentage point (e.g., 27.2% for females and 30.8% for TGQN).

If all four tactics are included in an overall prevalence measure, the AAU survey estimates that 21.2 percent of seniors were victims since first enrolling at the IHE. One-third (33.1%) of senior females and 39.1 percent of seniors identifying as TGQN report being a victim of nonconsensual sexual contact at least once. Approximately half of these were victims of nonconsensual penetration involving one of the four tactics (physical or threat of physical force; incapacitation; coercion; and AAC).

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. For the 2014-2015 year, 11 percent of undergraduates were victims of nonconsensual sexual contact involving any of the four tactics. Females and those identifying as TGQN, when compared to males, are most likely to be a victim. A large percentage of these victims experienced acts involving penetration (4.4% of all students; 6.9% of females and 9.0% of TGQN).

How do the AAU estimates compare with previous surveys of college students? 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, the definitions of nonconsensual activity, and perhaps most importantly, the wording of the questions. Nonetheless, the detailed questions included on the AAU survey allow selected comparisons.

The College Sexual Assault study (CSA) (Krebs et al., 2007) was conducted with undergraduate students attending two large, public universities in 2005. Like the AAU survey, it was a web survey, though it had a response rate considerably higher than the AAU survey (42% vs. 19%). While the question wording between the two surveys are not identical, they are similar when asking about penetration and sexual touching behaviors and tactics, including physical force and incapacitation.³ The CSA study estimated rates using several different definitions that varied by the time period (current year, since enrolled in college) and whether attempted, but not completed, acts were included. Perhaps the most widely cited figure represents the experience of senior females since entering college. For completed nonconsensual sexual contact involving force or incapacitation, this is 19.8 percent of female college seniors (“1 in 5”). This is lower than the estimate from the AAU survey (26.1%). When comparing the estimates for penetration by force and incapacitation the difference is in the opposite direction, with higher rates for CSA than for AAU (11.3% for AAU and 14.3% for CSA). Consequently the main difference between the two estimates is for sexual touching, which make up the remainder of the “1 in 5” figure.

In both cases, the CSA estimates are within the range of estimates across the 27 campuses included in the AAU survey. For example, the range for nonconsensual sexual contact by force or incapacitation for female college seniors is 15 percent to 34 percent.

³ The AAU survey was based, in part, on the CSA.

The National College Woman’s Sexual Violence Survey (NCWSV) (Fisher, et al., 2000) was a national telephone survey of college students, ages 18-24 years old conducted in 1997. The response rate was considerably higher than both the AAU and the CSA studies (86%). The behaviors included attempted acts as well as completed acts and did not screen for acts involving incapacitation. The most comparable estimate to the AAU survey is completed and attempted forced penetration for the current school year. The NCWSV estimate was 2.8 percent. The rate for the AAU survey, once excluding instances of penetration involving incapacitation, is 2.9 percent.

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) conducted the Community Attitudes on Sexual Assault (CASA)⁴. This was a web survey with a 35 percent response rate which asked students to report about their experiences since entering the university. The question wording was considerably different from the above studies, using both “labeled experiences” specifically referencing rape and sexual assault, as well as behavior-specific descriptions of unwanted sexual contact. The behavior-specific questions include the same range of behaviors as AAU. Once asked about specific behaviors, respondents were then asked if any of the behaviors occurred as a result of several different tactics, including physical force or incapacitation. The estimate from the CASA study for the prevalence of sexual contact by force and incapacitation for undergraduate females was 17 percent. The comparable estimate from AAU is 23.1 percent, which is significantly higher. The rates for female graduate/professional students (5.0%) and male graduate/professional students (1%) are also lower than the comparable AAU estimates (8.8% for female graduate/professionals; 2.2% for male graduate/professionals). The rates for undergraduate males are approximately the same (5.0% vs. 5.4%). As with the comparison to the CSA, the MIT estimate also falls within the range of the AAU IHEs.

Overall, these comparisons illustrate that estimates such as “1 in 5” or “1 in 4” as a global rate, across all IHEs is at least oversimplistic, if not misleading. None of the studies which generate estimates for specific IHEs are nationally representative. The above results show that the rates vary greatly across institutions.

How Extensive is Sexual Harassment, Stalking and Intimate Partner Violence?

Students were asked about their experiences related to three other forms of sexual assault and sexual misconduct: (1) sexual harassment, (2) stalking and (3) intimate partner violence. These were included on the survey not only because they represent a serious form of victimization but also because they are the subject of federal investigations into civil rights violations across many of the IHEs participating in the survey.

Sexual Harassment. Sexual 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 U.S.

⁴ See two releases provided at <http://web.mit.edu/surveys/health/>

Department of Education. To provide this definition to respondents, each question on harassment was prefaced with the following text (see questionnaire items D1 through D5):

“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”


The specific behaviors referenced were taken from several different scales measuring harassment:

- 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”?

Overall, 47.7 percent of students indicated that they have been the victims of sexual harassment since enrolled at the IHE. Students identifying as TGQN and females are most likely be victims of sexual harassment. For example, 75.2 percent of undergraduate and 69.4 percent of graduate/professional students who identify as TGQN reported being sexually harassed. Well more than half of female undergraduates (61.9%) report being sexually harassed. The most common behavior cited by the students was making inappropriate comments about their body, appearance or sexual behavior (37.7%); followed by making sexual remarks, or insulting or offensive jokes or stories (29.5%).

For undergraduate females, the range of sexual harassment across the IHEs goes from a low of 49 percent to a high of 74 percent (Figure E-6). There are significant differences across several of the IHE characteristics . For enrollment size, the larger schools have the lowest rates of harassment. For example ,among undergraduate females in the largest IHEs 60.3 percent reported being a victim of harassment. This compares to 69.9 percent in the smallest schools. of those attending the largest schools.

Figure E-6. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting sexual harassment since entering the school for the 27 IHEs



The offender’s affiliation to the IHE was most often described as a student (91.6%). This was more common among undergraduate students (94.6% of female undergraduates, 93.8% of male undergraduates, 94.4% for TGQN,) than among graduate/professional students (82.0% female graduate/professional students, 85.7% male graduate/professional students, 82.7% of TGQN). Graduate/professional students more often identified the offender as a faculty member (e.g., 22.4% of female graduate/professional students vs. 5.9% of female undergraduates).

The most common relationship of the offender to the victim is a friend or acquaintance (69.9%), followed by a stranger (43.1%). Graduate/professional students more frequently identified the relationship of the offender to the victim as teacher or advisor (e.g., 15.8% of female graduate/professional students vs. 4.9% of female undergraduates) or a co-worker, boss or supervisor (17.7% of female graduate/professional students vs. 6.0% of female undergraduates).

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). The measure of IPV was intended to capture violence associated with relationships that would not be captured in the questions on nonconsensual sexual contact. These questions were administered to anyone who said they had been in any “partnered relationship” since enrolling in college. This was approximately 75 percent of the student population. A partner relationship included:

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


To be classified as a victim, respondents had to say that a partner had done one of the following (see questions F1 through F3 on the survey):

- 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

Since enrolled in the college, 9.8 percent of the student population who had been in a partnered relationship reported experiencing IPV. This was reported most often by those identifying as TGQN (22.8% undergraduates; 17.8% graduate/professional), followed by female undergraduates (12.8%).

The range of IPV across the campuses goes from a low of 9 percent to a high of 16 percent (Figure E-7). There are some statistically significant, but relatively small, differences in the rate of IPV for characteristics such as the size of the school and public vs. private.

Figure E-7. Distribution of the percent of undergraduate females reporting intimate partner violence since entering the school for the 27 IHEs



Stalking. To measure stalking, students were asked whether someone (see survey items E1 through E4):

- 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 say that these behaviors, either singly or in combination, occurred more than once and were done by the same person.

Overall, 4.2 percent of students reported that they had been the victims of stalking since first enrolling at the college or university. As with almost all the different measures of assault and misconduct, those identifying as TGQN reported the highest rates (12.1% undergraduates; 8.4% graduate/professional). Female undergraduates reported being victims of stalking at the next highest rate (6.7%).

Most often, the offender's affiliation to the university was described as a student (63.9%), particularly among undergraduate students. A fairly large percentage (28.9%) did not know the person's association with the university.

In describing the relationship of the offender to the victim, students most often indicated that it was a friend or acquaintance (40.4%), followed by a stranger (28.7%), and someone they had dated or were intimate with (24.3%). Undergraduates were particularly likely to indicate that the offender was a friend or acquaintance.

The range across the 27 universities for stalking goes from 5 to 8 percent. University characteristics such as size or public/private are not strongly related to the percentage of students that report stalking.

Who Are the Victims?

In addition to collecting data on gender and enrollment status, students were asked about a number of other personal characteristics that might be related to rates of sexual assault and sexual misconduct. Generally speaking, the same groups had the highest rates of victimization across all types of sexual assault and misconduct. Non-heterosexual students report having been victimized more often than heterosexual students. For example, 60.4 percent of gays and lesbians report being sexually harassed compared to 45.9 percent of heterosexuals. Those who said they had a disability had higher rates of victimization. For example, 31.6% of female undergraduates with a disability reported nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or incapacitation. This compares 18.4 percent of the undergraduate females without a disability. With respect to race, for most forms of victimization, Asians are less likely to report being a victim. For example, 37.9 percent of Asians reported being sexually harassed when compared to 51.3 percent for whites. There are not consistent differences among the other race groups. For graduate and professional students, married students are less likely to report all types of victimization. For example, 2.1 percent of married graduate/professional females reported AAC since entering the IHE compared to 6.3 percent who have never been married.

To Whom Do Students Talk About the Incident?

One important policy concern is whether victims of sexual assault and misconduct report it to either the appropriate university agency or another organization, such as law enforcement. To understand how often this happens, those students reporting a victimization were presented with a list of agencies that were tailored to specific campus resources. This list ranged from agencies concerned with prosecuting offenders (e.g., the Title IX office; campus or local police) to those concerned with assisting the victim with the consequences of the incident (e.g., health care providers; victim services). Students were asked if they reported the victimization to any of these places (hereafter referred to as "agencies"). These questions were asked for those students reporting sexual contact involving physical force and incapacitation for each behavior (penetration, sexual touching). It was also asked of those reporting sexual harassment, IPV, and stalking.


Overall, the rates of reporting were quite low. The highest was for stalking (28.0%) and physically forced penetration (25.5%). The rates are lowest for sexual touching involving both physical force (7%) and incapacitation (5. %).

As with the rates of victimization, there was a wide range of reporting across the different IHEs. For example, the proportion that reported penetration by physical force to an agency across the 27 IHEs varied from a low of 17 percent to a high of 46 percent (Figure E-8).

When asked why the incident was not reported, the dominant reason was it was not considered serious enough. Even for penetration involving physical force, over half (58.6%) of students gave this reason. This reason is highest for harassment (78.6%) and sexual touching due to physical force or incapacitation (75.6%, 74.1%, respectively).

Fully one-third (35.9%) of victims of forced penetration did not report the event because they were “...embarrassed, ashamed or that it would be too emotionally difficult.” Almost as many said they “...did not think anything would be done about it”.

Figure E-8. Distribution of the percent of students reporting a nonconsensual penetration by physical force to an agency since entering the college for the 27 IHEs



Most students (between 50% and 85%) reported telling someone else about the incident, although the percentages differ by the type of incident.

Those who reported to an agency during the current school year were asked to evaluate their experience. For those victims who reported at least one incident to an agency, 29.6 percent said it was somewhat useful, 37.7 percent said it was very useful and 33.1 percent said it was extremely

useful. In contrast, 14.8 percent and 19 percent said it was not at all or a little useful. Students were asked if at any time they felt pressure from the program on whether or not to proceed with further reporting or adjudication. The vast majority of students said they were not pressured.

The students were asked to rate the program on a scale that went from “excellent” to “poor”. When asked to rate the program on showing respect to the student, 61.5 percent said excellent and 28.0% said very good. A smaller percentage said either fair (10.4%) or poor (6.4%). When asked to rate how well the agency helped to understand the victim’s options, 46.2% said excellent and 32.6% said very good. Among those not as satisfied, 15.7% said fair and 11.9% said poor.

Campus Climate Around Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct

The survey included a wide variety of measures of the climate with respect to sexual assault and sexual misconduct. This section of the report describes the results for four of these measures.


Response to a report of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. Students were asked a series of questions about what would happen if an instance of sexual assault or sexual misconduct was reported. Overall, about half of the students generally said it was very or extremely likely that a positive result would happen as a result of reporting:

- 55.2 percent believe that it is very or extremely likely that the victim would be supported by other students in making a report.
- 63.3 percent believe it very or extremely likely that the report would be taken seriously by campus officials.
- 56.5 percent said it is very or extremely likely that the individual’s safety would be protected.
- 49.2 percent believe it is very or extremely likely that a fair investigation would occur.
- 44.3 percent of students thought it was very or extremely likely that campus officials would take action against the offender.
- 38.9 percent believe it is 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.

For each of these items, those groups that have the highest rates of victimization (i.e., TGQN and females) are the least likely to provide a positive response.

There is wide variation across the IHEs participating in the survey on student perceptions about what is likely to happen when a victim reports an instance of sexual assault or sexual misconduct. For example, the percentage of students who think it is very or extremely likely the university will take a report of sexual assault or misconduct seriously varies from a low of 46 percent to a high of 77 percent (Figure E-9).

Figure E-9. Distribution of the percent of students who perceive it is very or extremely likely the university will take a report of sexual assault or misconduct seriously for the 27 IHEs



The range is larger for opinions on whether an official at the school would conduct a fair investigation (Figure E-10).


Bystander intervention. Students were asked whether they have been a bystander to the occurrence of sexual assault or misconduct, and if so, the extent to which they intervened and the reason for their intervention decision.

Overall, 17.8 percent of respondents have suspected that a friend may have been sexually assaulted. Among those who reported they suspected a friend had been sexually assaulted, 66.4 percent took some type of action, with most speaking to the friend or someone else to seek help (57.1%).

Overall, 44.4 percent of respondents reported they have witnessed a drunk person heading for a sexual encounter. Among those who reported being a witness, 77.0 percent indicated that they did nothing, with 23.5 percent saying they weren't sure what to do and 53.5 percent saying they did nothing for another reason.

Overall, 19.6 percent of respondents indicated that they had witnessed someone acting in a sexually violent or harassing manner. Among those who witnessed this, 54.5 percent indicated that they did nothing, with 24.5 percent saying they weren't sure what to do and 30.0 percent saying they did nothing for another reason.

Figure E-10. Distribution of the percent of students who perceive it is very or extremely likely the university will conduct a fair investigation for the 27 IHEs in the AAU survey since entering college




Opinions about prevalence and personal risk. When asked how problematic sexual assault or sexual misconduct is at the IHE, 20.2 percent reported it is very or extremely problematic. In contrast, a relatively small percentage of students thought it was either very or extremely likely that they would experience sexual assault on campus or at a university affiliated event off campus (5.0% on campus; 5.3% campus affiliated event off campus).

There is quite a bit of variation in how problematic students view sexual assault and misconduct to be across the participating universities (Figure E-11). This ranges from a low of 2 percent to a high of 39 percent. Many (14) of the schools are at 20 percent or below.

Knowledge about university sexual assault policies and procedures. Students were asked a series of questions related to their knowledge of policies related to sexual assault and sexual misconduct:

- 24 percent of students reported they are very or extremely knowledgeable about how the university defines sexual assault and sexual misconduct
- 29.5 percent said they were very or extremely knowledgeable about where to get help if they or a friend are victims of sexual assault or misconduct.
- 25.8 percent said they were very or extremely knowledgeable about where to make a report if a student or friend experienced a sexual assault or sexual misconduct.

Figure E-11. Distribution of the percent of students who perceive that sexual assault and sexual misconduct is very or extremely problematic on campus for the 27 IHEs



The distribution across the 27 schools of student knowledge on where to get help at the school if the respondent or a friend experienced sexual assault or sexual misconduct ranges from a low of 17 percent to a high of 44 percent.