



THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA®

Speak Out Iowa Survey **Full Report and Anti-Violence Plan**

To end sexual misconduct, dating violence, and stalking

Trigger warning: *This document addresses the sensitive topic of sexual violence and may be difficult for some readers. If you or someone you know is in need of any resources or support for sexual harassment, dating violence, stalking, or sexual violence see the Find Help Now page at speakout.uiowa.edu/resources for a comprehensive list of resources.*

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
<i>Speak Out Iowa</i> Survey Key Findings.....	4
<i>Speak Out Iowa</i> Survey Full Data Report.....	13
University of Iowa Anti-Violence Plan.....	51



Fall 2016

The University of Iowa is committed to addressing sexual misconduct, dating violence, and stalking.

There is absolutely no place for these actions on our campus—and we have a committed team working collaboratively to prevent violence, provide support to survivors, and hold offenders accountable.

In fall 2015, the University of Iowa conducted the *Speak Out Iowa* campus climate survey as part of a comprehensive strategy to respond to sexual misconduct, dating violence, and stalking on our campus. Our survey committee chose the ARC3 (Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative) instrument, the most comprehensive survey available, based on a set of eight guiding principles that align with our institutional values of inclusiveness, mutual respect, and collaboration. We would like to thank the students who took the time to complete the survey.

Achieving the goals set forth in President Mason's Six Point Plan was an important step forward, but we are committed to continuing the momentum. Survey data have been used to inform a new two-year campus plan developed by the Anti-Violence Coalition, and we're tailoring our efforts to address specific campus needs rather than using a one-size fits all approach.

Sharing these results is an opportunity to engage the entire campus community in the conversation about this important issue and we're committed to creating a safe and healthy environment for everyone. Improving the campus climate will require sustained community-wide effort.

Please join us as we address these difficult challenges together.

Bruce Harreld
President

Tom Rocklin
Vice President for Student Life

Georgina Dodge
Chief Diversity Officer and Associate Vice President

Monique DiCarlo
*UI Sexual Misconduct Response Coordinator,
Deputy Title IX Coordinator,
and Chair of the Anti-Violence Coalition*





THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA®

Speak Out Iowa Survey KEY FINDINGS

Trigger warning: *This document addresses the sensitive topic of sexual violence and may be difficult for some readers. If you or someone you know is in need of any resources or support for sexual harassment, dating violence, stalking, or sexual violence see the Find Help Now page at speakout.uiowa.edu/resources for a comprehensive list of resources.*

KEY FINDINGS

Table of Contents

Survey Methodology.....	6
<i>Speak Out Iowa</i> Survey Key Findings.....	8
Definitions.....	12

Survey Methodology¹

In fall 2015, the University of Iowa (UI) administered a newly developed campus climate survey, the Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3) survey to all degree-seeking students. The survey selection and administration was overseen by the Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey Subcommittee of the UI Anti-Violence Coalition. The purpose of the survey was to address two objectives:

- Determine UI students' perceptions of the campus climate around sexual misconduct
- Identify rates of sexual misconduct (sexual harassment by faculty/staff, sexual harassment by fellow students, and sexual violence victimization), dating violence, and stalking² that undergraduate and graduate/professional students experienced since enrolling at the UI

The ARC3³ is a free campus climate survey designed specifically for the higher education community. It was developed by a consortium of sexual assault researchers and student affairs professionals who came together to respond to the recommendations of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault.⁴ Six campus stakeholder groups had active roles in providing feedback on the UI ARC3 to tailor it to the UI campus. The survey was marketed as the *Speak Out Iowa* survey.

All degree-seeking, undergraduate, graduate, and professional students ($N=28,797$) at the Iowa City and off-campus centers, including those completing online degrees, were invited to participate in the online *Speak Out Iowa* survey through several email messages sent to their university email address. Prior to the opening of the survey, and throughout data collection, students were made aware of the survey through an extensive campus-wide marketing campaign. Additional outreach strategies were also added in an effort to increase the survey response rate.

Of the 3,785 students who accessed the survey and agreed to participate, 2,683 students completed the survey resulting in a response rate of 9.3%. Survey completers were defined as those students who provided complete data up to and through the sexual violence victimization modules (the last of the victimization modules in the climate survey).

Sample Limitations

There are three key limitations to keep in mind when interpreting the findings of this survey. First, *the response rate is low* (9.3%), although within the range of response rates (7% to 53%) observed on 27 college campuses that administered the briefer American Association of University (AAU) Campus Climate Survey,⁵ that preceded the availability of the ARC3.

Second, *respondents as a group differed from non-respondents* on both sex and race/ethnicity. Specifically, as seen in other campus climate surveys, males and students from underrepresented minority groups were less likely to respond to the survey.

Third, *it is unknown whether respondents were more (or potentially less) likely than non-respondents to have experienced sexual misconduct*. It is possible that students who have experienced sexual misconduct responded to the survey at greater rates than students who have not experienced sexual

¹ See the full *Speak Out Iowa* Report available at <https://speakout.uiowa.edu> for a complete description of the survey methodology, including the recruitment and marketing procedures and data weighting.

² Full definitions of how sexual misconduct, dating violence, and stalking are measured in the survey can be found on page 12

³ <http://campusclimate.gsu.edu/>

⁴ <https://www.notalone.gov/assets/report.pdf>

⁵ Cantor, D., & Fisher, W. B. (2015). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct*. Rockville, MD: Westat.

misconduct, because the survey was more personally relevant to them. If those who have experienced sexual misconduct were more likely to complete the survey, this would produce higher rates of victimization in the sample of respondents, relative to all UI students. Alternatively, it is also possible that students who have experienced sexual misconduct may have responded to the survey at lower rates, because completion of the survey was distressing to them. From the data available in our survey, it is not possible to determine whether students who experienced sexual misconduct were more or less likely to complete the survey. While analyses conducted as part of the AAU Campus Climate Survey Report suggest that those affected by sexual misconduct may have been more likely to respond to other campus climate surveys, other researchers have challenged this conclusion.⁶

The low response rate, and the “known non-response bias” and “unknown non-response bias” raise questions about (a) whether the responding students adequately represent all UI students; and (b) whether the estimates that we present in the tables throughout the report are sufficiently reliable or precise.

As noted above, we know that those who did respond to the survey differed along some important demographic dimensions from students who did not respond, such as sex and race/ethnicity. To adjust for these “known non-response biases,” the data were weighted using a common “raking procedure”.⁷ The variables used in the procedure included gender, age, year in school, and race/ethnicity.

Given that only 9.3% of students responded to the survey, the survey findings should be interpreted with caution. The findings represent the experiences of **those students who completed the survey**, but do not necessarily represent the experiences of all UI students.

Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents – Unweighted Data

Unweighted Sample	Number of respondents	% of respondents	% of all UI Students
<i>Sex at Birth</i>			
Female	1972	73.5%	51.9%
Male	711	26.5%	48.0%
<i>Year in School</i>			
1st year undergraduate	391	14.6%	21.2%
2nd year undergraduate	335	12.5%	15.9%
3rd year undergraduate	489	18.2%	17.9%
4th year (+) undergraduate	682	25.4%	19.9%
Graduate student (Graduate College)	552	20.6%	15.4%
Professional student (law, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy)	234	8.7%	9.3%

⁶ Freyd, J. J. (2015). Examining denial tactics: Were victims overrepresented in the AAU Survey of Sexual Violence on College Campuses? *The Blog, Huffington Post*, September 29, 2015.

⁷ Izrael, D., Hoaglin, D. C., & Battaglia, M. P. (2004). Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual SAS Users Group International Conference, SAS Institute Inc.: *To rake or not to rake is not the question anymore with the enhanced raking macro*. Cary, NC.

Speak Out Iowa Survey Key Findings

Key Finding #1

Since enrolling at the University of Iowa, 21% of the undergraduate female students who completed the survey reported being raped.*

Type of Sexual Violence Victimization	Undergraduate	Graduate/Professional	Total UI Students
<i>Attempted Rape</i>			
Male	7.8%	4.3%	6.8%
Female	20.5%	10.3%	18.4%
<i>Rape</i>			
Male	3.8%	4.1%	3.9%
Female	21.0%	11.3%	19.1%

*A reported rape could have occurred on or off campus and during breaks. These categories are not mutually exclusive. A student could have experienced both an attempted and completed rape.

Key Finding #2

In their first semester at the University of Iowa, 11.4% of first-year undergraduate female students who completed the survey reported being raped.

- Previous research has identified the first semester and first year on campus as a time of increased risk of sexual assault for female undergraduate students.⁸

Key Finding #3

For all types of sexual violence victimization, alcohol is a common factor.

- For students who reported experiencing any sexually violent victimization (unwanted sexual contact, attempted coercion, coercion, attempted rape, or rape), 56.3% said the offender had been using alcohol during the incident, and 64.5% reported they had been using alcohol during the incident.
- The findings on alcohol use by both the offender and victim during sexual violence victimization are consistent with other research which has found alcohol use to be a potent risk factor for sexual assault among college women.⁹

⁸ Carey, K. B., Durney, S. E., Shepardson, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2015). Incapacitated and forcible rape of college women: Prevalence across the first year. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 56*(6), 678-680.; Kimble, M., Neacsu, A. D., Flack, W. F., & Horner, J. (2008). Risk of unwanted sex for college women: Evidence for a red zone. *Journal of American College Health, 57*(3), 331-338.; Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2009). College women's experiences with physically forced, alcohol-or other drug-enabled, and drug-facilitated sexual assault before and since entering college. *Journal of American College Health, 57*(6), 639-649.

⁹ Mohler-Kuo, M., Dowdall, G. W., Koss, M. P., & Wechsler, H. (2004). Correlates of rape while intoxicated in a national sample of college women. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 65*(1), 37-45.; Mouilso, E. R., & Fischer, S. (2012). A prospective study of sexual assault and alcohol use among first-year college women. *Violence and Victims, 27*(1), 78-94.

Key Finding #4

For those students who reported having been raped, 26.4% reported being assaulted on more than one occasion, by more than one offender since enrolling at the University of Iowa.

- Reports of repeat victimization among UI students are consistent with findings from the Sexual Victimization of College Women survey which found that 23% of college women who reported a rape were assaulted on more than one occasion.¹⁰

Key Finding #5

For both sexual harassment committed by faculty/staff and by fellow students, students who completed the survey reported experiencing sexist gender harassment most frequently.

Reports of Sexual Harassment	By Faculty/Staff	By Fellow Students
Sexist Gender Harassment	36.0%	56.9%
Crude Gender Harassment	13.4%	45.6%
Unwanted Sexual Attention	4.2%	23.5%
Sexual Coercion	1.5%	N/A
Sexual Harassment via Electronic Communication	N/A	24.5%

- Graduate students report experiencing more sexist gender harassment by faculty/staff (44.7%) than undergraduate students (33.2%).
- Female students report more sexual harassment (of all types) by fellow students than male undergraduate students.
- Note that not all sexist gender harassment (as measured by the ARC3) constitutes a UI policy violation; however, sexual harassment is a form of sexual violence¹¹ that may create conditions that can be conducive to other forms of sexual violence that may co-exist or escalate in severity.¹²

Key Finding #6

Since enrolling at the University of Iowa, 20.8% of all female students and 11.4% of all male students who completed the survey reported experiencing dating violence.

¹⁰ Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The Sexual Victimization of College Women*. Research Report. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

¹¹ Frieden, T. R. (2014). Six components necessary for effective public health program implementation. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(1), 17-22.

¹² Chamberlain, L. J., Crowley, M., Tope, D., & Hodson, R. (2008). Sexual harassment in organizational context. *Work and Occupations*, 35(3), 262-295.; Sadler, A. G., Booth, B. M., Cook, B. L., & Doebbeling, B. N. (2003). Factors associated with women's risk of rape in the military environment. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 43(3), 262-273.

Key Finding #7

Since enrolling at the University of Iowa, 12.7% of all female students and 5.7% of all male students who completed the survey reported experiencing a pattern of three or more instances of stalking behaviors.

Key Finding #8

For students who experienced sexual violence victimization, dating violence, or stalking, the vast majority said the offender was someone they knew.

Reports of Victimization by Relationship to Offender	Stranger	Non-Stranger*
Sexual violence victimization	20.2%	79.8%
Stalking	16.3%	83.7%
Dating violence	3.0%	97.0%

*Non-stranger included any offender who was known to or acquainted with the victim in any way.

- Prior studies have shown that with regards to sexual violence victimization, the majority of the time the offender is someone known to the victim.¹³

Key Finding #9

For students who experienced sexual harassment, sexual violence, dating violence, or stalking, 42.6% chose to disclose this experience to someone. Those who did disclose were overwhelmingly likely to disclose to an informal support person (i.e., friend, roommate, partner, family member) (95.6%) than a formal support system (i.e., counselor, police, victim advocate, Dean of Students) (22.5%).

- Students who disclosed most frequently reported telling a *close friend other than their roommate* (73%).

Key Finding #10

Overall, students had a favorable perception of how the UI would respond to a student reporting an incident of sexual misconduct.

- Students felt that it was likely or very likely that the institution would:
 - Maintain the privacy of the person making the report (84%)
 - Take the report seriously (76%)
 - Protect the safety of the person making the report (74%)
 - Do its best to honor the request of the person about how to go forward with the case (71%)

¹³ Cantor, D., & Fisher, W. B. (2015). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct*. Rockville, MD: Westat.; Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2008). *The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.; Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The Sexual Victimization of College Women. Research Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

- Students did not feel that it would be likely or very likely that a person making a report would be labeled a troublemaker (16%), blamed for what happened to them (8%), or be punished by the institution (6%).
- Female students perceptions were, however, somewhat less favorable than male students regarding whether the institution would take the report seriously, take steps to protect the safety of the person making the report, would be able to honor the person's request about how to move forward with the case, and be able to provide accommodations or other support to the person.

Key Finding #11

The most frequently reported channels where students said they learned about sexual misconduct information or education on campus were:

- Seeing crime alerts (90%)
- Discussing the topic of sexual misconduct with friends (72%)
- Seeing posters about sexual misconduct (70%)

Key Finding #12

Half (51%) of students agreed or strongly agreed that they would know where to go to get help on campus if they or a friend experienced sexual misconduct, and 41% of students agreed or strongly agreed that they would know where to go to make a report of sexual misconduct.

Definitions of Sexual Misconduct, Dating Violence, and Stalking in the ARC3 Climate Survey

The definitions below are based on how sexual misconduct (sexual harassment and sexual violence victimization), dating violence, and stalking were measured by the *Speak Out Iowa Survey/ARC3*. In some cases, these definitions may not be considered violations of University of Iowa policy or Iowa State Law. All students were asked to respond to these behaviors **since enrolling at the UI**.

Sexual Harassment by faculty/staff and fellow students:

- **Sexist Gender Harassment** – being treated differently because of their sex or perceived gender identity, someone displaying sexist or suggestive materials, someone making offensive sexist remarks, or being put down because of their sex (faculty/staff and fellow students).
- **Crude Gender Harassment** – being told offensive sexual stories or jokes, unwanted attempts to being drawn in to discussions of sexual matters, someone making offensive remarks about their appearance, body, or sexual activities, or making gestures or using body language of a sexual nature that were embarrassing or offensive (faculty/staff and fellow students).
- **Unwanted Sexual Attention** – unwanted attempts to establish a romantic relationship (one item fellow students), continually being asked out for drinks or dinner, touched in a way that made them uncomfortable, or unwanted attempts to kiss, fondle or stroke them (all items faculty/staff).
- **Sexual Coercion** – being bribed with a reward to engage in sexual behavior, feeling threatened with retaliation for not being sexually cooperative, treated badly for refusing to have sex, or someone implied better treatment if they were sexually cooperative (faculty/staff only).
- **Sexual Harassment Via Electronic Communication** – someone sent or posted unwanted sexual comments jokes or pictures by text, email, social media; spread unwelcome rumors by text, email, social media or other electronic means; or called them gay or lesbian in a negative way by text, email, social media or other electronic means (fellow students only).

Sexual Violence Victimization included five types of victimization using coercive tactics, incapacitation, and/or force. *Coercive tactics* involved behaviors such as threats to end the relationship or spread rumors, continual verbal pressure to have sex, or showing displeasure or getting angry but not using physical force. *Incapacitation* involved being taken taking advantage when too drunk to stop what was happening. *Force* involved threats to physically harm them or someone close to them or using physical force such as being held or pinned down. The five types are:

- **Unwanted sexual contact** – fondling, kissing, or rubbing up against a person’s private areas of their body, or removing clothing without the person’s consent (but did not involve attempted sexual penetration) using coercive tactics, incapacitation, or force.
- **Attempted coercion** – attempted oral, anal, or vaginal sex without a person’s consent using coercive tactics.
- **Coercion** – oral, vaginal, or anal sex by coercive tactics.
- **Attempted rape** – attempted oral, anal, or vaginal sex without a person’s consent by incapacitation or force.
- **Rape** – completed oral, anal, or vaginal sex without a person’s consent by incapacitation or force.

Dating Violence included any report of physical and/or psychological abuse behaviors.

Stalking included a pattern of stalking behavior in which a student reported at least one of eight behaviors occurring three or more times.



THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA®

Speak Out Iowa Survey FINAL REPORT

Trigger warning: *This document addresses the sensitive topic of sexual violence and may be difficult for some readers. If you or someone you know is in need of any resources or support for sexual harassment, dating violence, stalking, or sexual violence see the Find Help Now page at speakout.uiowa.edu/resources for a comprehensive list of resources.*

FINAL REPORT

Table of Contents

I. Introduction.....	15
II. Survey Methods.....	15
A. Participant Recruitment and Data Collection.....	15
B. Response Rate and Survey Demographics.....	16
C. Sample Limitations and Weighting Procedures.....	18
III. Students' Perceptions of the Campus Climate on Sexual Misconduct.....	19
A. Perceptions of Campus Safety.....	19
B. Perceptions of How the UI Might Handle a Student Report of Sexual Misconduct.....	20
C. Exposure to Sexual Misconduct Information and Education.....	21
D. Knowledge of Campus Sexual Misconduct Resources.....	23
E. Awareness of the Function of Campus and Community Resources Related to the UI's Sexual Misconduct Response.....	25
IV. Reports of Victimization.....	26
A. Sexual Harassment by Faculty and/or Staff.....	26
B. Sexual Harassment by Fellow Students.....	29
C. Stalking.....	31
D. Dating Violence.....	33
E. Sexual Violence Victimization.....	35
V. Disclosure of Victimization.....	39
VI. Limitations and Next Steps for Future Survey Administration.....	41
Acknowledgments.....	42
References.....	43
Appendix A.....	45
Appendix B.....	46

I. Introduction

Assessing perceptions and reports of sexual misconduct is an important and necessary undertaking to inform the University of Iowa's ongoing efforts to understand the extent of sexual misconduct on campus, improve prevention efforts, and effectively respond when students report sexual misconduct.

In fall 2015, the University of Iowa (UI) administered a newly developed campus climate survey, the Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3) survey to all degree-seeking students. The survey selection and administration was overseen by the Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey Subcommittee of the UI Anti-Violence Coalition. The purpose of the survey was to address two objectives:

- Determine UI students' perceptions of the campus climate around sexual misconduct
- Identify rates of sexual misconduct (sexual harassment by faculty/staff, sexual harassment by fellow students, and sexual violence victimization), dating violence, and stalking that undergraduate and graduate/professional students experienced since enrolling at the UI

The ARC3¹ is a free campus climate survey designed specifically for the higher education community. It was developed by a consortium of sexual assault researchers and student affairs professionals who came together to respond to the recommendations of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault.² Six campus stakeholder groups had active roles in providing feedback on the UI ARC3 to tailor it to the UI campus. The survey was marketed as the *Speak Out Iowa* survey.

This report contains the full description of the survey methodology and the findings related to the above stated objectives.

I. Survey Methods

A. Participant Recruitment and Data Collection

In October 2015, all degree seeking, undergraduate, graduate, and professional students ($N=28,797$) at the Iowa City and off-campus centers, including those completing online degrees, received an invitation to participate in the *Speak Out Iowa* survey through an email message sent to their university email address. The email contained a link to an online survey. Several reminder emails were sent during the course of data collection. Students could also access the survey directly through the *Speak Out Iowa* website.³ After linking to the survey, students were asked to sign in with their university username and password to confirm they were UI students. They were then directed to the anonymous survey, which was not linked to any identifying information.

Prior to the opening of and throughout the data collection period, students were made aware of the survey through an extensive campus-wide marketing campaign described below.

Various emails were sent out including: an initial email from Interim President Jean Robillard before the survey was opened to inform the campus about the survey and upcoming release date; emails from the vice president for student life (to undergraduates) and the deans of professional and graduate colleges (to graduate and professional students); and an email from the University of Iowa Student Government and Graduate and Professional Student Government presidents, as well as multiple reminder emails.

¹ <http://campusclimate.gsu.edu/>

² <https://www.notalone.gov/assets/report.pdf>

³ <https://speakout.uiowa.edu/>

Marketing with print materials included posters and table tents in the residence halls, posters and table tents in the Iowa Memorial Union, posters in high volume campus buildings (i.e., Schaeffer Hall, Iowa Memorial Union), advertisements on the UI campus buses, multiple advertisements in the the Daily Iowan campus newspaper, and postcards placed in student mailboxes in all the residence halls.

The *Speak Out Iowa* website also provided information and answers to frequently asked questions, provided direct access to the survey, and made materials available for departments across campus to spread the word. Other electronic marketing included a Hawk Tools banner, an Iowa Now story, and digital signage on screens across campus. There was limited social media marketing due to UI Institutional Review Board (IRB) restrictions.

Tabling, where flyers and buttons were handed out, occurred at various locations on campus and banners were hung in the Campus Recreational and Wellness Center and Burge Residence Hall. Offices across campus (Center for Diversity & Enrichment, Center for Student Involvement & Leadership, the College of Nursing, etc.) also received a marketing packet before the release of the survey that contained posters, flyers, and buttons, and were asked to post or distribute these materials.

The survey was extended to increase the response rate and additional marketing was conducted to outreach to students. This outreach included an email from newly installed President Bruce Harreld to all students, an email to the UI faculty and staff asking them to share information about the survey with students, posts in departmental listservs and newsletters to students, and an After Class posting. Class announcements were also conducted in larger lecture courses.

The survey began with a consent form approved by the IRB that informed students of the purpose of the survey, the types of questions contained in the survey, and a guarantee of the anonymity of their answers. Students were also told their participation was voluntary and that after they completed the survey they would be directed to a separate webpage to register their name into a lottery drawing to win one of 500 \$10 gift cards to several local restaurants and one of two \$500 Visa gift cards. Students had to agree to participate before proceeding to the survey questions.

B. Response Rate and Survey Demographics

Of the 3,785 students who accessed the survey and agreed to participate, 2,683 students completed the survey. Thus, the overall response rate was 9.3%. Completers were defined as those students who provided complete data up to and through the sexual violence victimization modules (the last of the victimization modules in the climate survey). Table 1 describes key demographic characteristics of the unweighted sample of survey respondents. The majority of respondents were female and white. Most students lived in off-campus housing, and 96% of students completing the survey took most or all of their classes on the Iowa City campus.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Survey Respondents – Unweighted Data

Unweighted Sample	Number of respondents	% of respondents	% of all UI Students
<i>Sex at Birth</i>			
Female	1972	73.5%	51.9%
Male	711	26.5%	48.0%
<i>UI Categories of Race/Ethnicity</i>			
White	2172	81.0%	69.7%
Hispanic	164	6.1%	7.0%
International Student	103	3.8%	13.2%
Asian	77	2.9%	4.1%
Multiracial	82	3.1%	2.4%
African American	56	2.1%	3.3%
Other	29	1.1%	0.2%
<i>Year in School</i>			
1st year undergraduate	391	14.6%	21.2%
2nd year undergraduate	335	12.5%	15.9%
3rd year undergraduate	489	18.2%	17.9%
4th year (+) undergraduate	682	25.4%	19.9%
Graduate student (Graduate College)	552	20.6%	15.4%
Professional student (law, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy)	234	8.7%	9.3%
<i>Type of Housing/Residence</i>			
Off-campus, non-university sponsored housing	1548	57.8%	Not available (n/a)
On-campus residence hall	614	22.9%	(n/a)
With parent, guardian, or other	441	16.5%	(n/a)
Fraternity or sorority house	77	2.9%	(n/a)

C. Sample Limitations and Weighting Procedures

There are three key limitations to keep in mind when interpreting the findings of this survey. First, *the response rate is low* (9.3%), although within the range of response rates (7% to 53%) observed on 27 college campuses that administered the briefer American Association of University (AAU) Campus Climate Survey (Cantor & Fisher, 2015), that preceded the availability of the ARC3.

Second, *respondents as a group differed from non-respondents* on both sex and race/ethnicity. Specifically, males and students from underrepresented minority groups were less likely to respond to the survey.

Third, *it is unknown whether respondents were more (or potentially less) likely than non-respondents to have experienced sexual misconduct*. It is possible that students who have experienced sexual misconduct responded to the survey at greater rates than students who have not experienced sexual misconduct, because the survey was more personally relevant to them. If those who have experienced sexual misconduct were more likely to complete the survey, this would produce higher rates of victimization in the sample of respondents, relative to all UI students. Alternatively, it is also possible that students who have experienced sexual misconduct may have responded to the survey at lower rates, because completion of the survey was distressing to them. From the data available in our survey, it is not possible to determine whether students who experienced sexual misconduct were more or less likely to complete the survey. While analyses conducted as part of the AAU Campus Climate Survey Report suggest that those affected by sexual misconduct may have been more likely to respond to other campus climate surveys, other researchers have challenged this conclusion (Freyd, 2015).

The low response rate, and the “known non-response bias” and “unknown non-response bias” raise questions about (a) whether the responding students adequately represent all UI students; and (b) whether the estimates that we present in the tables throughout the report are sufficiently reliable or precise.

To address this potential non-response bias, we used a raking procedure (Izrael, Hoaglin, & Battaglia, 2004) that adjusted the base weight for each respondent to the demographic information available for the sample population. The variables used in the adjustment procedure included gender, age, year in school, and race/ethnicity.

As a test of the effectiveness of the weighting procedure, key variables (alcohol use, perceptions of safety on campus, well-being) in the sample were compared to external criterion data from the National College Health Assessment (NCHA) of UI undergraduate students. The weighted results from this survey were similar to the results for the same questions on the NCHA. Thus, the findings reported below are based on the weighted sample in an effort to provide a better representation of the entire student body. Nonetheless, it is important to remember that inaccuracies and biases almost certainly remain, as no correction or weighting procedure can eliminate them entirely from survey data. Thus, given that only 9.3% of students responded to the survey, the survey findings should be interpreted with caution. The findings represent the experiences of **those students who completed the survey**, but do not necessarily represent the experiences of all UI students.

Results are presented by sex at birth (male/female) and year in school (undergraduate and graduate/professional). Gender differences could not be examined because the percentage of respondents who identified as transgender or other gender was small (1.8%), such that we were unable to obtain precise estimates of these students’ responses as a group to the survey. Therefore, sex at birth was used to compare responses between males and females. Accordingly, graduate and professional students were also combined when comparing responses across year in school because of the relatively low rate of professional students who responded. Comparisons by race/ethnicity could not be conducted because the number of minority student respondents was also small.

III. Students' Perceptions of the Campus Climate on Sexual Misconduct

To assess their perceptions of the campus climate on sexual misconduct, students were asked questions about their:

- Perceptions of safety on the UI campus during the day and night
- Perceptions of how the UI might handle a student report of sexual misconduct
- Exposure to sexual misconduct information and education
- Knowledge of UI campus sexual misconduct resources
- Awareness of the function of the UI campus and community resources specifically related to the UI's response to sexual misconduct

A. Perceptions of Campus Safety

Students were asked how safe they felt on campus using a 4-point scale that ranged from *not at all safe* to *very safe*. Tables 2 and 3 summarize students' perceptions of how safe they felt on campus for students who responded to the survey. Overall, 99% of students report feeling somewhat to very safe on the UI campus during the daytime. However, male and female students feel considerably less safe on the UI campus at night, overall, and only 6.5% of female students report feeling very safe at night. Perceptions of safety on campus were similar for graduate/professional and undergraduate students.

Table 2: Perceptions of Campus Safety by Sex

	Male	Female	Total*
<i>I feel somewhat safe on campus in the daytime</i>	9.4%	21.4%	15.6%
<i>I feel very safe on campus in the daytime</i>	89.8%	77.2%	83.3%
<i>I feel somewhat safe on campus in the nighttime</i>	50.6%	48.1%	49.3%
<i>I feel very safe on campus in the nighttime</i>	40.1%	6.5%	22.6%

Table 3: Perceptions of Campus Safety by Undergraduate/Graduate

	Undergraduate	Graduate/ Professional	Total*
<i>I feel somewhat safe on campus in the daytime</i>	16.2%	14.0%	15.6%
<i>I feel very safe on campus in the daytime</i>	82.7%	85.1%	83.3%
<i>I feel somewhat safe on campus in the nighttime</i>	48.0%	53.1%	49.3%
<i>I feel very safe on campus in the nighttime</i>	20.3%	29.8%	22.6%

* The "total" columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

B. Perceptions of How the UI Might Handle a Student Report of Sexual Misconduct

Students were asked to respond to statements describing how they thought the UI might handle a student reporting having experienced an incident of sexual misconduct. Statements were rated on a 5-point scale ranging from *very unlikely* to *very likely*. Tables 4 and 5 summarize students' perceptions of how likely or very likely the UI would be to handle a report of sexual misconduct, separately by sex and by year in school. Overall, students were more certain about institutional responses that indicate the UI would take the report seriously, maintain privacy, honor a person's request about how to go forward with the case, protect the safety of the person making the report, and support the person making the report. They did not feel the UI would punish or blame the person making the report.

Students appeared less certain about what the UI would do about the report. Only half of the students felt the UI would provide accommodations to support the person reporting and take action to address the factors that led to the sexual assault. In addition, only half of the students felt the UI would only share private information when absolutely necessary.

Female students were less certain about the UI's response to a report of sexual misconduct than male students on several items. In most instances, graduate and professional students also reported less certainty than undergraduate students.

Table 4: Perceptions of How the UI Might Handle a Student Reporting Sexual Misconduct by Sex

The following statements describe how the University of Iowa might handle it if a student reported experiencing an incident of sexual misconduct. Using the scale provided, please indicate the likelihood of each statement.	Male Likely/ Very Likely	Female Likely/ Very Likely	Total*
<i>The institution would maintain the privacy of the person making the report.</i>	86.1%	82.8%	84.4%
<i>The institution would take the report seriously.</i>	83.1%	70.1%	76.3%
<i>The institution would take steps to protect the safety of the person making the report.</i>	82.1%	66.1%	73.7%
<i>The institution would do its best to honor the request of the person about how to go forward with the case.</i>	76.3%	66.7%	71.2%
<i>The institution would support the person making the report.</i>	79.4%	62.7%	70.6%
<i>The institution would handle the report fairly.</i>	69.5%	64.7%	67.0%
<i>The institution would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct.</i>	63.7%	52.2%	57.7%
<i>The institution would only share private information about the person making the report when absolutely necessary.</i>	56.2%	55.7%	55.9%
<i>The institution would provide accommodations to support the person (e.g. academic, housing, safety).</i>	60.0%	47.9%	53.7%
<i>The institution would label the person making the report a troublemaker.</i>	16.4%	14.9%	15.6%
<i>The institution would have a hard time supporting the person who made the report.</i>	12.4%	18.1%	15.3%
<i>The institution would blame the person for what happened to them.</i>	5.7%	10.7%	8.3%
<i>The institution would punish the person who made the report.</i>	6.1%	5.7%	5.9%

* The "total" columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Table 5: Perceptions of How the UI Might Handle a Student Reporting Sexual Misconduct by Undergraduate/Graduate

The following statements describe how the University of Iowa might handle it if a student reported experiencing an incident of sexual misconduct. Using the scale provided, please indicate the likelihood of each statement.	Undergraduate Likely/ Very Likely	Graduate/ Professional Likely/ Very Likely	Total*
<i>The institution would maintain the privacy of the person making the report.</i>	85.5%	81.1%	84.4%
<i>The institution would take the report seriously.</i>	76.1%	76.9%	76.3%
<i>The institution would take steps to protect the safety of the person making the report.</i>	74.0%	73.0%	73.7%
<i>The institution would do its best to honor the request of the person about how to go forward with the case.</i>	71.7%	70.0%	71.2%
<i>The institution would support the person making the report.</i>	71.9%	66.9%	70.6%
<i>The institution would handle the report fairly.</i>	68.7%	61.8%	67.0%
<i>The institution would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct.</i>	59.6%	51.8%	57.7%
<i>The institution would only share private information about the person making the report when absolutely necessary.</i>	53.4%	63.7%	55.9%
<i>The institution would provide accommodations to support the person (e.g. academic, housing, safety).</i>	55.0%	49.6%	53.7%
<i>The institution would label the person making the report a troublemaker.</i>	15.4%	16.3%	15.6%
<i>The institution would have a hard time supporting the person who made the report.</i>	14.7%	17.5%	15.3%
<i>The institution would blame the person for what happened to them.</i>	8.2%	8.7%	8.3%
<i>The institution would punish the person who made the report.</i>	5.7%	6.5%	5.9%

C. Exposure to Sexual Misconduct Information and Education

Tables 6 and 7 summarize students’ exposure to information or education about sexual misconduct since enrolling at the UI by sex and year in school. Students were asked to respond yes or no to each question. The most frequently reported sexual misconduct information or education exposures were to crime alerts/timely warnings of incidents of sexual misconduct (90%) and to informational posters on campus (71%). Students also indicated that they were discussing sexual misconduct with their friends or peers (72%). Only half of the students reported completing an online educational program on sexual misconduct even though this training is required of all undergraduate students. There were no appreciable differences between males and females on their exposure to sexual misconduct information. Graduate and professional students were less likely to report discussing sexual misconduct in a class or with friends, or having seen posters about sexual misconduct on campus, but more likely to recall completing an online education program and visiting a UI website on sexual misconduct than undergraduate students.

* The “total” columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Table 6: Reports of Exposure to Sexual Misconduct Information and Education by Sex

Since you came to the University of Iowa, which of the following have you done?	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Seen crime alerts about sexual misconduct</i>	89.0%	89.9%	89.5%
<i>Discussed the topic of sexual misconduct with friends</i>	68.6%	74.7%	71.8%
<i>Seen posters about sexual misconduct (e.g. raising awareness, preventing rape, defining sexual misconduct)</i>	71.1%	69.9%	70.5%
<i>Read a report about sexual violence rates at the University of Iowa</i>	60.4%	56.5%	58.3%
<i>Seen or heard about sexual misconduct in a student publication or media outlet</i>	53.4%	52.1%	52.7%
<i>Completed an online education program (e.g. Every Choice, Not Anymore)</i>	53.0%	48.3%	50.6%
<i>Discussed sexual misconduct/rape in class</i>	44.3%	44.9%	44.6%
<i>Seen or heard campus administrators or staff address sexual misconduct</i>	43.9%	36.0%	39.8%
<i>Discussed sexual misconduct with a family member</i>	31.5%	43.3%	37.6%
<i>Attended an event or program about what you can do as a bystander to stop sexual misconduct</i>	29.8%	31.1%	30.5%
<i>Visited a University of Iowa website with information on sexual misconduct</i>	15.7%	14.2%	14.9%
<i>Attended a rally or other campus event about sexual misconduct or sexual assault</i>	9.0%	12.3%	10.7%
<i>Volunteered or interned at an organization that addresses sexual misconduct</i>	5.7%	8.8%	7.4%
<i>Taken a class to learn more about sexual misconduct</i>	6.4%	6.2%	6.3%

Table 7: Reports of Exposure to Sexual Misconduct Information and Education by Undergraduate/Graduate

Since you came to the University of Iowa, which of the following have you done?	Undergraduate	Graduate/ Professional	Total*
<i>Seen crime alerts about sexual misconduct</i>	89.1%	90.6%	89.5%
<i>Discussed the topic of sexual misconduct with friends</i>	74.1%	64.6%	71.8%
<i>Seen posters about sexual misconduct (e.g. raising awareness, preventing rape, defining sexual misconduct)</i>	73.4%	61.4%	70.4%
<i>Read a report about sexual violence rates at the University of Iowa</i>	59.1%	55.8%	58.3%
<i>Seen or heard about sexual misconduct in a student publication or media outlet</i>	52.8%	52.3%	52.7%
<i>Completed an online education program (e.g., Every Choice, Not Anymore)</i>	46.8%	62.3%	50.6%
<i>Discussed sexual misconduct/rape in class</i>	48.2%	33.5%	44.6%

* The "total" columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Since you came to the University of Iowa, which of the following have you done?	Undergraduate	Graduate/Professional	Total*
<i>Seen or heard campus administrators or staff address sexual misconduct</i>	39.8%	39.9%	39.8%
<i>Discussed sexual misconduct with a family member</i>	39.6%	31.7%	37.6%
<i>Attended an event or program about what you can do as a bystander to stop sexual misconduct</i>	32.5%	24.0%	30.5%
<i>Visited a University of Iowa website with information on sexual misconduct</i>	13.1%	20.5%	14.9%
<i>Attended a rally or other campus event about sexual misconduct or sexual assault</i>	11.3%	9.0%	10.7%
<i>Volunteered or interned at an organization that addresses sexual misconduct</i>	7.7%	6.4%	7.4%
<i>Taken a class to learn more about sexual misconduct</i>	6.0%	7.4%	6.3%

D. Knowledge of Campus Sexual Misconduct Resources

Students were asked about their knowledge of UI campus sexual misconduct resources on a 5-point scale from *strongly disagree* to *strongly agree* (Tables 8 and 9). They were also asked if they received any information on sexual misconduct (e.g., brochures, emails, videos, presentations, trainings, workshops) in a *yes/no* format since they enrolled in the UI (Tables 10 and 11).

Overall, only half of the students said they knew where to get help on campus for sexual misconduct and less than half knew where to go to make a report of sexual misconduct. One third reported that they knew what happened when a student made a report of sexual misconduct. Compared to male students, fewer female students said they knew where to go to make a report or understood what happened when a report was made.

Table 8: Reported Knowledge of Campus Sexual Misconduct Resources by Sex

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.	Male Agree/Strongly Agree	Female Agree/Strongly Agree	Total*
<i>If a friend or I experienced sexual misconduct, I know where to go to get help on campus.</i>	52.0%	50.5%	51.3%
<i>I would know where to go to make a report of sexual misconduct.</i>	47.3%	35.7%	41.3%
<i>I understand what happens when a student reports a claim of sexual misconduct at the University of Iowa.</i>	37.0%	28.4%	32.5%

Table 9: Reported Knowledge of Campus Sexual Misconduct Resources by Undergrad/Graduate

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.	Undergraduate Agree/Strongly Agree	Graduate/Professional Agree/Strongly Agree	Total*
<i>If a friend or I experienced sexual misconduct, I know where to go to get help on campus.</i>	51.0%	51.9%	51.3%
<i>I would know where to go to make a report of sexual misconduct.</i>	40.0%	45.2%	41.3%

* The "total" columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.	Undergraduate Agree/Strongly Agree	Graduate/Professional Agree/Strongly Agree	Total*
<i>I understand what happens when a student reports a claim of sexual misconduct at the University of Iowa.</i>	32.3%	33.1%	32.5%

When asked about information they received on sexual misconduct, overall, more than half of students reported receiving information about how to prevent sexual misconduct (69%) and definitions of the types of sexual misconduct (67%) (Table 10). More male than female students reported receiving information on the Code of Student Life (63% versus 49%) and how to report an incident of sexual misconduct (52% versus 38%). Less than half of students knew how to report (45%) or where to go to get help for an incident of sexual misconduct (48%). Few students reported receiving information about measures to address safety or the impact of trauma (25%). There were no remarkable differences between undergraduate and graduate students on reports of information received on sexual misconduct (Table 11).

Table 10: Reports of Information Received on Sexual Misconduct since Enrolling at the UI by Sex

Since you came to the University of Iowa, have you received any information (e.g., brochures, emails, videos, presentations, trainings, workshops) at the university about the following?	Male	Female	Total*
<i>How to help prevent sexual misconduct</i>	71.9%	65.6%	68.6%
<i>The definitions of types of sexual misconduct</i>	71.7%	63.6%	67.4%
<i>Code of Student Life</i>	63.0%	48.8%	55.6%
<i>Where to go to get help if someone you know experiences sexual misconduct</i>	52.3%	43.8%	47.9%
<i>How to report an incident of sexual misconduct</i>	52.0%	38.0%	44.7%
<i>Measures to address safety or the impact of trauma (e.g., No Contact Directive, Academic/Housing accommodations)</i>	27.3%	23.2%	25.2%

Table 11: Reports of Information Received on Sexual Misconduct since Enrolling at the UI by Undergraduate/Graduate

Since you came to the University of Iowa, have you received any information (e.g., brochures, emails, videos, presentations, trainings, workshops) at the university about the following?	Undergraduate	Graduate/Professional	Total*
<i>How to help prevent sexual misconduct</i>	70.8%	61.7%	68.6%
<i>The definitions of types of sexual misconduct</i>	66.7%	69.7%	67.4%
<i>Code of Student Life</i>	57.1%	50.7%	55.6%
<i>Where to go to get help if someone you know experiences sexual misconduct</i>	46.7%	51.4%	47.9%
<i>How to report an incident of sexual misconduct</i>	43.2%	49.4%	44.7%
<i>Measures to address safety or the impact of trauma (e.g., No Contact Directive, Academic/Housing accommodations)</i>	25.7%	23.6%	25.2%

* The “total” columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

E. Awareness of the Function of the Campus and Community Resources Related to the UI’s Sexual Misconduct Response

Finally, students were asked how aware they were, on a 5-point scale ranging from *not at all aware* to *extremely aware*, of the function of various campus and community resources related to their response to sexual misconduct. Tables 12 and 13 reflect the percentage of students who said they were *at least somewhat aware* of the resources.

Although the questions asked were specific to the function of the resource for addressing sexual misconduct, some responses may reflect students’ general awareness of the resource on campus. For example, students were most aware of the Department of Public Safety, University Counseling Service, and the Dean of Students, but they may have come in contact with these resources for other reasons.

Female students were less aware of some of the resources (Dean of Students, Ombudsperson, Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity) but were more aware of the Women’s Resource and Action Center (WRAC) than male students.

Graduate and professional students were much more aware of the Office of the Ombudsperson and less aware of WRAC than undergraduate students

Table 12: Awareness of the Function of Campus and Community Resources Related to the UI’s Sexual Misconduct Response by Sex

Please use the following scale to indicate how aware you are of the function of the campus and community resources specifically related to sexual misconduct response at the University of Iowa.	Male At least somewhat aware	Female At least somewhat aware	Total*
<i>Department of Public Safety/University Police</i>	82.0%	77.9%	79.9%
<i>University Counseling Service</i>	77.0%	79.5%	78.3%
<i>Office of the Dean of Students</i>	72.0%	61.7%	66.6%
<i>Women’s Resource and Action Center (WRAC)</i>	55.6%	69.3%	62.7%
<i>Rape Victim Advocacy Program (RVAP)</i>	47.8%	54.3%	51.2%
<i>Office of Equal Opportunity & Diversity (EOD)</i>	48.2%	38.9%	43.3%
<i>Domestic Violence Intervention Program (DVIP)</i>	41.2%	43.1%	42.2%
<i>Office of the Ombudsperson</i>	42.9%	30.6%	36.5%
<i>Office of the Sexual Misconduct Response Coordinator</i>	38.3%	34.5%	36.3%

Table 13: Awareness of the Function of Campus and Community Resources Related to the UI’s Sexual Misconduct Response by Undergraduate/Graduate

Please use the following scale to indicate how aware you are of the function of the campus and community resources specifically related to sexual misconduct response at the University of Iowa.	Undergraduate At least somewhat aware	Graduate/ Professional At least somewhat aware	Total*
<i>Department of Public Safety/University Police</i>	80.6%	77.7%	79.9%
<i>University Counseling Service</i>	77.8%	80.0%	78.3%
<i>Office of the Dean of Students</i>	67.2%	64.9%	66.6%

* The “total” columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Please use the following scale to indicate how aware you are of the function of the campus and community resources specifically related to sexual misconduct response at the University of Iowa.	Undergraduate At least somewhat aware	Graduate/ Professional At least somewhat aware	Total*
<i>Women’s Resource and Action Center (WRAC)</i>	67.2%	49.1%	62.7%
<i>Rape Victim Advocacy Program (RVAP)</i>	52.5%	47.4%	51.2%
<i>Office of Equal Opportunity & Diversity (EOD)</i>	42.5%	45.8%	43.3%
<i>Domestic Violence Intervention Program (DVIP)</i>	41.2%	45.3%	42.2%
<i>Office of the Ombudsperson</i>	29.2%	59.0%	36.5%
<i>Office of the Sexual Misconduct Response Coordinator</i>	35.8%	37.9%	36.3%

IV. Reports of Victimization

The types of victimization measured in the *Speak Out Iowa* survey included student reports of 1) sexual harassment by faculty and/or staff, 2) sexual harassment by fellow students, 3) stalking, 4) dating violence, and 5) sexual violence victimization (unwanted sexual touch, attempted or complete sexual coercion, and attempted rape and completed rape).

Students were asked to respond to all the victimization types experienced that had occurred “since enrolling at the University of Iowa.” Comparisons were made by sex and year in school (all undergraduate years and graduate/professional students).

A. Sexual Harassment by Faculty and/or Staff

Sexual harassment by a faculty member, instructor, teaching assistant, practicum/clinic/field instructor, or staff member was measured with the 16-item Department of Defense Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ-DoD) (Fitzgerald, Magley, Drasgow, & Waldo, 1999), plus one additional item recommended by UI campus stakeholders (see Appendix B for the full instrument), that asked students to rate the frequency with which each item had occurred as *never, once or twice, sometimes, often, or many times*. Any answer other than *never* for each type of sexual harassment was treated as an affirmative response. Four types of sexual harassment are measured in the scale:

- **Sexist Gender Harassment** – included being treated differently because of their sex or perceived gender identity, someone displaying sexist or suggestive materials; someone making offensive sexist remarks, or being put down because of their sex.
- **Crude Gender Harassment** – being told offensive sexual stories or jokes; unwanted attempts to being drawn in to discussions of sexual matters; someone making offensive remarks about their appearance, body, or sexual activities; or making gestures or using body language of a sexual nature that were embarrassing or offensive.
- **Unwanted Sexual Attention** – unwanted attempts to establish a romantic relationship, continually being asked out for drinks or dinner, touched in a way that made them uncomfortable, or unwanted attempts to kiss, fondle or stroke them.
- **Sexual Coercion** – felt they were being bribed with a reward to engage in sexual behavior, someone made them feel threatened with retaliation for not being sexually cooperative, were treated badly for refusing to have sex, or someone implied better treatment if they were sexually cooperative.

* The “total” columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

For students who completed the survey, Tables 14 and 15 summarize their reported rates of sexual harassment by faculty/staff, compared by sex and year. Students reported more *sexist gender harassment* by faculty/staff than other types of harassment, and 3rd and 4th year and graduate and professional students experienced this behavior more frequently than other students.

Table 14: Reports of Sexual Harassment by Faculty/Staff by Sex

	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Sexist Gender Harassment</i>	32.2%	39.5%	36.0%
<i>Crude Gender Harassment</i>	10.2%	16.3%	13.4%
<i>Unwanted Sexual Attention</i>	3.2%	5.1%	4.2%
<i>Sexual Coercion</i>	0.9%	1.9%	1.5%

Table 15: Reports of Sexual Harassment by Faculty/Staff by Year in School

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year (+)	Total Undergrad.	Total Grad./ Professional	Total*
<i>Sexist Gender Harassment</i>	15.2%	33.2%	43.9%	43.8%	33.2%	44.7%	36.0%
<i>Crude Gender Harassment</i>	7.9%	12.3%	15.5%	17.3%	13.1%	14.3%	13.4%
<i>Unwanted Sexual Attention</i>	2.9%	3.2%	4.7%	4.3%	3.7%	5.7%	4.2%
<i>Sexual Coercion</i>	1.7%	0.9%	1.0%	2.0%	1.4%	1.5%	1.5%

When examining individual items on the faculty/staff sexual harassment scale (Table 16), the most frequently reported behaviors were *being treated differently because of their sex* (25%), *someone making offensive sexist remarks* (23%), *someone displaying sexist or suggestive materials* (14%), and *being put down because of their sex* (12%). When examining the frequency of these behaviors, the majority of students reported being exposed to them one or two times as opposed to many times.

Table 16: Individual Items from the Faculty/Staff Sexual Harassment Scale

Since you enrolled at the University of Iowa, have you been in a situation in which a faculty member, instructor, teaching assistant, practicum/clinic/field instructor, or staff member has done any of the following:	Total*
<i>Treated you “differently” because of your sex?</i>	24.7%
<i>Made offensive sexist remarks?</i>	23.2%
<i>Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials?</i>	13.5%
<i>Put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex?</i>	11.5%
<i>Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?</i>	8.7%
<i>Treated you “differently” because of your perceived gender identity?</i>	8.5%
<i>Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?</i>	5.5%

* The “total” columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Since you enrolled at the University of Iowa, have you been in a situation in which a faculty member, instructor, teaching assistant, practicum/clinic/field instructor, or staff member has done any of the following:	Total*
<i>Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters?</i>	5.0%
<i>Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you?</i>	4.2%
<i>Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?</i>	3.3%
<i>Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?</i>	2.4%
<i>Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said “No”?</i>	1.8%
<i>Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you?</i>	1.5%
<i>Implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative?</i>	1.1%
<i>Made you feel like you were being bribed with a reward to engage in sexual behavior?</i>	1.0%
<i>Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative?</i>	0.9%
<i>Treated you badly for refusing to have sex?</i>	0.9%

For those students who reported an experience of sexual harassment by faculty/staff, the characteristics of this harassment victimization are outlined in Table 17. Students were asked to answer these questions in reference to the *one situation* that had the greatest effect on them. More female students reported that the individual who committed the behavior was a man (90%). When asked about the classification of the individual who committed the behavior, 54% of students reported it was a faculty member. The majority of the incidents happened in a university building or at a university sponsored event (75%).

Table 17: Characteristics of the Faculty/Staff Sexual Harassment Incident by Sex

Gender of the person who committed the behavior	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Man</i>	54.3%	90.2%	75.3%
<i>Woman</i>	38.3%	7.6%	20.3%
<i>Could not identify the person’s gender</i>	6.1%	1.8%	3.6%
<i>Other gender not listed</i>	1.4%	0.4%	0.8%
Classification of the person who committed the behavior	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Faculty member</i>	54.2%	54.1%	54.1%
<i>Graduate student instructor/teaching assistant</i>	19.5%	16.8%	17.9%
<i>Other</i>	16.6%	17.4%	17.0%
<i>Staff member</i>	9.0%	10.4%	9.8%
<i>Practicum, Clinic, or Field instructor</i>	0.7%	1.3%	1.1%

* The “total” columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

B. Sexual Harassment by Fellow Students

Sexual harassment by fellow students was measured with nine items from the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Fitzgerald et al., 1988; Fitzgerald, Gelfand, & Drasgow, 1995) and 3 items from the AAUW Knowledge Networks Survey (Nukulkij, 2011), and one additional item recommended by UI campus stakeholders (see Appendix B for the full instrument), that asked students to rate the frequency with which each item had occurred as *never*, *once or twice*, *sometimes*, *often*, or *many times*. Four types of sexual harassment are measured in the scale. Any answer other than *never* for each type of sexual harassment was treated as an affirmative response:

- **Sexist Gender Harassment** – same as faculty/staff sexual harassment (see page 14).
- **Crude Gender Harassment** – same as faculty/staff sexual harassment (see page 14).
- **Unwanted Sexual Attention** – one item asking about unwanted attempts to establish a romantic relationship.
- **Sexual Harassment via Electronic Communication** – someone sent or posted unwanted sexual comments jokes or pictures by text, email, Facebook, etc.; someone spread unwelcome rumors about them by text, email, Facebook or other unwanted electronic means; or someone called them gay or lesbian in a negative way by text, email, Facebook or other unwanted electronic means.

For students who completed the survey, Tables 18 and 19 summarize their reported rates of sexual harassment by fellow students, compared by sex and year. Female students reported more harassment by fellow students than males did. Reports of sexist gender harassment by students were the highest reported type of harassment across all student years, and rates were higher for upper class undergraduate students than for 1st and 2nd year undergraduate students. Undergraduate students also reported more crude gender harassment and unwanted sexual attention by fellow students compared to graduate/professional students.

Table 18: Reports of Sexual Harassment by Fellow Students by Sex

	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Sexist Gender Harassment</i>	44.2%	68.4%	56.9%
<i>Crude Gender Harassment</i>	34.3%	55.9%	45.6%
<i>Unwanted Sexual Attention</i>	13.4%	32.8%	23.5%
<i>Sexual Harassment via Electronic Communication</i>	22.6%	26.2%	24.5%

Table 19: Reports of Sexual Harassment by Fellow Students by Year in School

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year (+)	Total Undergrad.	Total Grad./ Professional	Total*
<i>Sexist Gender Harassment</i>	46.0%	59.8%	65.6%	65.6%	58.6%	51.5%	56.9%
<i>Crude Gender Harassment</i>	39.2%	48.5%	54.5%	55.6%	49.1%	35.0%	45.6%
<i>Unwanted Sexual Attention</i>	21.4%	23.9%	28.9%	33.5%	26.8%	13.4%	23.5%
<i>Sexual Harassment via Electronic Communication</i>	13.1%	21.7%	33.5%	37.0%	25.9%	20.2%	24.5%

* The “total” columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

When examining individual items on the student sexual harassment scale (Table 20), students reported more frequency across a greater number of individual behaviors than for harassment by faculty/staff. They also reported multiple occurrences of these behaviors by fellow students. The most frequently reported behaviors were *someone making offensive sexist remarks (48%), being treated differently because of their sex (40%), repeatedly being told sexual stories or jokes (34%), and being put down because of their sex (30%).*

Table 20: Individual Items from the Sexual Harassment Experiences Scale by Fellow Students

Since you enrolled at the University of Iowa, have you been in a situation in which a student has done any of the following:	Total*
<i>Made offensive sexist remarks?</i>	47.9%
<i>Treated you “differently” because of your sex?</i>	40.4%
<i>Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?</i>	33.7%
<i>Put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex?</i>	29.6%
<i>Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials?</i>	28.7%
<i>Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?</i>	28.0%
<i>Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters?</i>	25.5%
<i>Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you?</i>	23.6%
<i>Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?</i>	23.5%
<i>Sent or posted unwelcome sexual comments, rumors, jokes or pictures by text, email, Facebook or other electronic means?</i>	17.3%
<i>Treated you “differently” because of your perceived gender identity?</i>	15.1%
<i>Spread unwelcome sexual rumors about you by text, email, Facebook or other electronic means?</i>	9.5%
<i>Called you gay, lesbian, or trans in a negative way by text, email, Facebook or other electronic means?</i>	9.0%

Characteristics of student sexual harassment victimization are outlined in Table 21. Students were asked to answer these questions in reference to the *one situation* that had the greatest effect on them. When asked about the gender of the individual who committed the behavior, 82% of students reported it was a man. Students reported more sexual harassment by undergraduate students (72%) and the majority of incidents were reported to have happened off-campus (60%).

Table 21: Characteristics of Fellow Student Sexual Harassment Incident by Sex

Gender of the person who committed the behavior	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Man</i>	54.3%	90.2%	75.3%
<i>Woman</i>	38.3%	7.6%	20.3%

* The “total” columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Gender of the person who committed the behavior	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Could not identify the person's gender</i>	6.1%	1.8%	3.6%
<i>Other gender not listed</i>	1.4%	0.4%	0.8%
Classification of the person who committed the behavior	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Faculty member</i>	54.2%	54.1%	54.1%
<i>Graduate student instructor/teaching assistant</i>	19.5%	16.8%	17.9%
<i>Other</i>	16.6%	17.4%	17.0%
<i>Staff member</i>	9.0%	10.4%	9.8%
<i>Practicum, Clinic, or Field instructor</i>	0.7%	1.3%	1.1%

C. Stalking

Stalking was measured with 8 items from the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011) (see Appendix B for the full instrument) that asked students to rate the frequency with which each item had occurred as *none*, *1-2 times*, *3-5 times*, *5-8 times*, or *more than 8 times*. Tables 22 and 23 summarize students' reported rates of stalking, compared by sex and year in school. Since the legal definition of stalking typically involves a pattern of behavior, students were considered to have been stalked if they indicated they had experienced at least one of the 8 items 3-5 times or more.

Overall, 9.4% of students who completed the survey reported experiencing a pattern of stalking behavior. Female students and undergraduate students experienced stalking more frequently than male or graduate students.

Table 22: Reports of Stalking by Sex

	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Pattern of stalking experienced</i>	5.7%	12.7%	9.4%

Table 23: Reports of Stalking by Year in School

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year (+)	Total Undergrad.	Total Grad./ Professional	Total*
<i>Pattern of stalking experienced</i>	5.7%	7.2%	13.5%	14.4%	10.1%	7.1%	9.4%

When examining individual items on the stalking scale that were experienced 3 or more times (Table 24), the most frequently reported individual experiences were *left you unwanted messages including text or voice messages* (16%), *sent you unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through social media apps* (13%), *approached you or showed up in places, such as your home, workplace, or school when you didn't want them to be there* (10%), and *made unwanted phone calls to you including hang up calls* (9%).

* The "total" columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Table 24: Individual Stalking Items Experienced Three or More Times

	Total*
<i>Left you unwanted messages (including text or voice messages)?</i>	4.9%
<i>Sent you unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through social media apps?</i>	4.8%
<i>Made unwanted phone calls to you (including hang up calls)?</i>	3.3%
<i>Approached you or showed up in places, such as your home, workplace, or school when you didn't want them to be there?</i>	2.8%
<i>Watched or followed you from a distance, or spied on you with a listening device, camera, or GPS [global positioning system]?</i>	1.7%
<i>Left you cards, letters, flowers, or presents when they knew you didn't want them to?</i>	0.5%
<i>Left strange or potentially threatening items for you to find?</i>	0.2%
<i>Sneaked into your home or car and did things to scare you by letting you know they had been there?</i>	0.2%

Characteristics of the stalking victimization are outlined in Table 25. Students were asked to answer these questions in reference to the *one situation* that had the greatest effect on them. More female students reported that the individual who committed the behavior was a man (91%) than male students. Students indicated that the person who committed the behavior was not a stranger (84%) and that the individual was an undergraduate student at the UI (74%). The majority of the incidents happened off-campus (66%).

Table 25: Characteristics of the Stalking Incident by Sex

Gender of the person who committed the behavior	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Man</i>	51.2%	90.8%	79.3%
<i>Woman</i>	46.9%	7.2%	18.7%
<i>Could not identify the person's gender</i>	1.9%	0.6%	1.0%
<i>Other gender not listed</i>	0.0%	1.5%	1.0%
Classification of the person who committed the behavior	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Casual acquaintance</i>	14.2%	29.8%	25.3%
<i>Ex-romantic or sexual partner</i>	21.4%	22.6%	22.3%
<i>Friend</i>	35.5%	14.7%	20.6%
<i>Stranger</i>	10.2%	10.4%	16.3%
<i>Other</i>	7.4%	7.5%	7.5%
<i>Coworker</i>	4.9%	2.7%	3.3%
<i>Current romantic or sexual partner</i>	2.9%	1.1%	1.6%

* The "total" columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Classification of the person who committed the behavior	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Teaching Assistant</i>	0.0%	1.3%	1.0%
<i>Employer/supervisor</i>	1.8%	0.5%	0.9%
<i>University staff</i>	1.7%	0.0%	0.5%
<i>University professor/instructor</i>	0.0%	0.7%	0.5%
<i>Ex-spouse</i>	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%
	Male	Female	Total*
<i>The other person was a student at the University of Iowa</i>	76.2%	72.6%	73.6%

D. Dating Violence

Dating violence was measured with 6 items from the Partner Victimization Scale (Hamby, 2014) and the Women’s Experience with Battering Scale (Smith, Earp, & DeVellis, 1995) (see Appendix B for the full instrument). These items assessed both physical and psychological dating violence experienced by students. Students rated the frequency with which each item had occurred, excluding horseplay or joking around, as *never, once or twice, sometimes, often, or many times*. An affirmative response to one or more items was an indication of dating violence.

Tables 26 and 27 summarize students’ reported rates of dating violence, compared by sex and year in school. For students who completed the survey, female students experienced more dating violence than male students, and undergraduate students experienced dating violence more frequently than graduate/professional students.

Table 26: Reports of Dating Violence by Sex

	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Any experience of dating violence</i>	5.7%	12.7%	9.4%

Table 27: Reports of Dating Violence by Year in School

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year (+)	Total Undergrad.	Total Grad./ Professional	Total*
<i>Any experience of dating violence</i>	5.7%	7.2%	13.5%	14.4%	10.1%	7.1%	9.4%

When examining individual items on the dating violence scale (Table 28), the most frequently reported individual experiences were *the person can scare me without laying a hand on me* (10%), *the person pushed, grabbed, or shook me* (10%), *the person threatened to hurt me and I thought I might really get hurt* (6%), and *the person hit me* (5%).

* The “total” columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Table 28: Individual Dating Violence Items

Not including horseplay or joking around, the person:	Total*
<i>Can scare me without laying a hand on me.</i>	10.2%
<i>Pushed, grabbed, or shook me.</i>	9.8%
<i>Threatened to hurt me and I thought I might really get hurt.</i>	5.6%
<i>Hit me.</i>	5.4%
<i>Stole or destroyed my property.</i>	4.0%
<i>Beat me up.</i>	1.3%

Characteristics of dating violence victimization are outlined in Table 29. Students were asked to answer these questions in reference to the *one situation* that had the greatest effect on them. More female students reported that the individual who committed the behavior was a man (95%), and more male students reported that the individual who committed the behavior was a woman (80%). Students indicated that the person who committed the behavior was a current or ex romantic partner or spouse (81%) and that the incident happened off-campus (85%). More than half of the individuals who committed the behavior were students at the UI (55%).

Table 29: Characteristics of the Dating Violence Incident by Sex

Gender of the person who committed the behavior	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Man</i>	20.3%	95.0%	70.1%
<i>Woman</i>	79.7%	4.9%	29.8%
<i>Could not identify the person's gender</i>	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Other gender not listed</i>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Classification of the person who committed the behavior	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Ex-romantic or sexual partner</i>	59.8%	54.0%	55.9%
<i>Current romantic or sexual partner</i>	18.8%	22.0%	20.9%
<i>Friend</i>	7.5%	10.8%	9.7%
<i>Casual acquaintance</i>	3.8%	4.7%	4.4%
<i>Spouse</i>	6.2%	1.5%	3.0%
<i>Stranger</i>	1.4%	3.8%	3.0%
<i>Other</i>	1.8%	0.7%	1.1%
<i>University staff</i>	0.0%	0.2%	0.1%
<i>Ex-spouse</i>	0.0%	1.1%	0.7%
<i>Coworker</i>	0.8%	0.5%	0.6%

* The "total" columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Classification of the person who committed the behavior	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Family member</i>	0.0%	0.6%	0.4%
<i>Employer/supervisor</i>	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
<i>University professor/instructor</i>	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Teaching Assistant</i>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

E. Sexual Violence Victimization

Sexual violence victimization was measured using the Sexual Experiences Survey Short Form Victimization (SES-SFV) (Koss et al., 2007) (see Appendix B for the full instrument). The SES-SFV is considered the ‘gold standard’ of sexual victimization measures (Senn et al., 2013) for its behavioral specificity and updated wording for assessing consent, alcohol-related incidents, unwanted acts, and coercive tactics (Koss et al., 2007).

The SES-SFV has 25 questions measuring five types of sexual violence victimization:

- Someone fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of my body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of my clothes without my consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration)
- Someone had oral sex with me or made me have oral sex with them without my consent
- Someone put their penis, fingers, or other objects into my vagina without my consent
- Someone put their penis, fingers, or other objects into my butt without my consent
- Even though it didn’t happen, someone TRIED to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with me without my consent

For each type of sexual violence victimization, students indicated the frequency (*0 times, 1 time, 2 times, or 3+ times*) with which someone used any of the following types of tactics:

- **Coercion** involved someone telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises they knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they didn’t want to OR showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after they said they didn’t want to.
- **Force** involved someone threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them OR using force, for example holding them down with their body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon.
- **Incapacitation** involved someone taking advantage of them when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening.

Students were asked to report experiences that occurred on or off campus, when school was in session or when on a break. They were also instructed to indicate all experiences they may have had; for example if someone took advantage of them when they had been drinking and threatened to physically harm them they would indicate both. Any answer other than zero for any tactic was treated as an affirmative response. The SES-SFV is scored to identify the frequency of the following types of sexual violence victimization:

- **Unwanted sexual contact** – fondling, kissing, or rubbing up against a person’s private areas of their body, or removing clothing without the person’s consent (but did not involve attempted sexual penetration) using coercive tactics, incapacitation, or force.

* The “total” columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

- **Attempted coercion** – attempted oral, anal, or vaginal sex without a person’s consent using coercive tactics.
- **Coercion** – oral, vaginal, or anal sex by coercive tactics.
- **Attempted rape** – attempted oral, anal, or vaginal sex without a person’s consent by incapacitation or force.
- **Rape** – completed oral, anal, or vaginal sex without a person’s consent by incapacitation or force.

Table 30 outlines the reported rates for each category of sexual violence victimization by sex and year in school for those students who completed the survey. Note that students may have experienced more than one type of sexual violence victimization; thus a student might be represented in more than one category.

Across all types of sexual violence victimization, 37% of female students and 15.9% of male students reported some type of sexual violence victimization since enrolling at the UI.

For students who completed the survey, reports of types of sexual violence victimization by year in school are higher for undergraduate compared to graduate/professional students across all categories. Reports of all types of sexual violence victimization are also higher for upper class undergraduate students than for 1st and 2nd year undergraduate students, as expected given the greater number of years of exposure to the risk of victimization.

Rates of sexual violence victimization are notably high among first-year students. In their first semester at the UI, 11.4% of first-year undergraduate female students who completed the survey reported being raped. Previous research has identified the first semester and first year on campus as a time of increased risk of sexual assault for female undergraduate students (Carey, Durney, Shepardson, & Carey, 2015; Kimble, Neacsiu, Flack, & Horner, 2008; Krebs, Lindquist, Warner, Fisher, & Martin, 2009).

Table 30: Sexual Violence Victimization by Year in School and Sex

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year (+)	Total Undergrad.	Total Grad./ Professional	Total*
<i>Unwanted Sexual Contact</i>							
Male	9.9%	11.8%	13.6%	19.3%	13.9%	9.1%	12.5%
Female	24.3%	30.2%	44.8%	46.2%	35.2%	23.4%	32.9%
<i>Attempted Coercion</i>							
Male	3.2%	3.2%	5.3%	4.0%	4.0%	2.2%	3.5%
Female	5.4%	12.7%	20.0%	22.3%	14.2%	9.2%	13.2%
<i>Coercion</i>							
Male	1.1%	3.2%	1.3%	2.6%	2.0%	1.5%	1.9%
Female	5.2%	9.2%	15.4%	19.1%	11.6%	5.7%	10.4%

* The “total” columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

	1st year	2nd year	3rd year	4th year (+)	Total Undergrad.	Total Grad./ Professional	Total*
<i>Attempted Rape</i>							
Male	6.6%	9.5%	8.4%	7.0%	7.8%	4.3%	6.8%
Female	13.9%	17.5%	22.1%	30.6%	20.5%	10.3%	18.4%
<i>Rape</i>							
Male	2.2%	3.2%	3.5%	5.9%	3.8%	4.1%	3.9%
Female	11.4%	19.7%	26.8%	30.0%	21.0%	11.3%	19.1%

For those students who reported having been raped, 26.4% reported being assaulted on more than one occasion, by more than one offender since enrolling at the UI. Reports of repeat victimization among UI students are consistent with findings from the Sexual Victimization of College Women survey which found that 23% of college women who reported a rape were assaulted on more than one occasion (Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000).

Characteristics of sexual violence victimization are outlined in the tables below. Students were asked to answer these questions in reference to the *one situation* that had the greatest effect on them. More female students reported that the individual who committed the behavior was a man (98%) and the majority of students indicated that the person who committed the behavior was someone who was known to them/non-stranger (80%) (Table 31). The individual who committed the behavior was most often a student at the UI (63%) and the majority of the incidents happened off-campus (84%).

Table 31: Characteristics of Sexual Violence Victimization Incident by Sex

The other person was a:	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Man</i>	39.9%	98.3%	82.1%
<i>Woman</i>	58.3%	1.4%	17.2%
<i>Could not identify the person's gender</i>	1.2%	0.3%	0.5%
<i>Other gender not listed</i>	0.6%	0.0%	0.2%
The other person was a:	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Non-stranger</i>	81.2%	79.3%	79.8%
<i>Stranger</i>	18.8%	20.7%	20.2%
What best describes your relationship to the other person?	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Friend</i>	31.3%	22.2%	24.7%
<i>Casual acquaintance</i>	18.4%	25.8%	23.8%
<i>Ex-romantic or sexual partner</i>	18.6%	18.4%	18.5%
<i>Stranger</i>	18.8%	20.7%	20.2%

* The "total" columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

What best describes your relationship to the other person?	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Current romantic or sexual partner</i>	3.8%	8.7%	7.3%
<i>Other</i>	3.1%	0.9%	1.5%
<i>Coworker</i>	1.1%	1.3%	1.3%
<i>Employer/Supervisor</i>	3.1%	0.2%	1.0%
<i>University staff</i>	1.9%	0.2%	0.7%
<i>Family member</i>	0.0%	0.6%	0.4%
<i>Spouse</i>	0.0%	0.5%	0.4%
<i>Ex-spouse</i>	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%
<i>Teaching Assistant</i>	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%
<i>University professor/instructor</i>	0.0%	0.1%	0.1%

Students were also asked if the individual who committed the behavior or they had been using alcohol or other drugs prior to the incident (Table 32). The majority of both male and female students indicated that the individual who committed the behavior had been using alcohol (56.3%) and that they had been using alcohol (64.5%) prior to the incident.

The findings on alcohol use by both the offender and victim during sexual violence victimization are consistent with other research which has found alcohol use to be a potent risk factor for sexual assault among college women (Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, Koss, & Wechsler, 2004; Mouilso & Fischer, 2012).

Table 32: Alcohol Use During the Sexual Violence Victimization Incident by Sex

Had the other person been using alcohol or drugs just prior to the incident?	Male	Female	Total*
<i>They had been using alcohol</i>	56.1%	56.4%	56.3%
<i>They had <u>not</u> been using either alcohol or drugs</i>	14.1%	18.6%	17.3%
<i>I don't know</i>	22.8%	14.4%	16.7%
<i>They had been using both alcohol and drugs</i>	7.1%	9.2%	8.6%
<i>They had been using drugs</i>	0.0%	1.4%	1.0%
Had you been using alcohol or drugs just prior to the incident? Remember the only person responsible for sexual misconduct is the perpetrator.	Male	Female	Total*
<i>I had been using alcohol</i>	62.7%	65.2%	64.5%
<i>I had <u>not</u> been using either alcohol or drugs</i>	32.5%	29.9%	30.6%
<i>I had been using both alcohol and drugs</i>	4.9%	3.8%	4.1%
<i>I had been using drugs</i>	0.0%	1.0%	0.7%

* The "total" columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

V. Disclosure of Victimization

Students who reported any sexual misconduct were asked whether they had told anyone about the incident before this questionnaire. The question was worded as follows:

You reported that you experienced at least one type of sexual misconduct. This could have included things like someone making offensive sexist remarks to you, someone sending you unwanted text messages or spreading rumors about you online, having a partner who pushed or grabbed you, or someone having or attempting to have sexual contact with you without your consent. We would like to know if you told anyone about the incident(s) before your participation with this questionnaire?

A limitation of the ARC3 is we cannot associate the type of sexual misconduct experienced with the report of disclosure. A student could have experienced both sexual harassment by fellow students and an attempted rape, but we are unable to determine if they told someone about both incidents.

For students who experienced sexual harassment, stalking, dating violence, or sexual violence victimization, 42.6% chose to disclose this experience to someone. Female students were somewhat more likely (48%) to tell someone than male students (35%) (Table 33), but there were no remarkable differences between undergraduate and graduate/professional students (43% versus 40%) (Table 34).

Table 33: Disclosure of Sexual Misconduct Incident by Sex

	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Did you tell anyone about the incident before this questionnaire?</i>	35.1%	48.2%	42.6%

Table 34: Disclosure of Sexual Misconduct Incident by Undergraduate/Graduate

	Undergraduate	Graduate/ Professional	Total*
<i>Did you tell anyone about the incident before this questionnaire?</i>	43.3%	40.1%	42.6%

Those students who indicated that they told someone were asked how soon after the incident they told someone and who they told. Most students (68%) disclosed the incident to someone within 24 hours (see Tables 35 and 36)

Table 35: Time to Disclosure by Sex

How long after the incident did you first tell someone what happened?	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Within the first 24 hours</i>	67.5%	66.3%	66.7%
<i>Within one week</i>	17.9%	15.6%	16.4%
<i>Within one month</i>	6.5%	6.9%	6.8%
<i>Within one year</i>	4.1%	8.4%	6.9%
<i>More than a year</i>	3.9%	2.8%	3.2%

* The "total" columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Table 36: Time to Disclosure by Undergraduate/Graduate

How long after the incident did you first tell someone what happened?	Undergraduate	Graduate/ Professional	Total*
<i>Within the first 24 hours</i>	66.8%	66.1%	66.7%
<i>Within one week</i>	17.0%	14.3%	16.4%
<i>Within one month</i>	5.6%	11.1%	6.8%
<i>Within one year</i>	7.4%	5.2%	6.9%
<i>More than a year</i>	3.2%	3.4%	3.2%

Those students who did disclose were overwhelmingly likely to disclose to an informal support person (i.e., friend, roommate, partner, family member), but far fewer students reported disclosing to a formal support system (i.e., counselor, police, victim advocate, Dean of Students) (see Tables 37 and 38).

Table 37: Type of System Disclosed to by Sex

	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Told an informal support person</i>	93.5%	96.7%	95.6%
<i>Told a formal support system</i>	20.4%	23.6%	22.5%

Table 38: Type of System Disclosed to by Undergraduate/Graduate

	Undergraduate	Graduate/ Professional	Total*
<i>Told an informal support person</i>	96.3%	92.8%	95.6%
<i>Told a formal support system</i>	20.7%	29.4%	22.5%

Students who disclosed most frequently reported disclosing to a *close friend other than a roommate* (73%) or a *roommate* (46%) (see Table 39). There were no appreciable differences between male and female students or undergraduate and graduate students with regards to the time to disclosure or who they disclosed to.

Table 39: Person Disclosed to by Sex

Who did you tell? (check all that apply)	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Close friend other than roommate</i>	68.3%	76.0%	73.3%
<i>Roommate</i>	40.3%	49.0%	45.9%
<i>Romantic Partner</i>	29.7%	30.1%	29.9%
<i>Parent or guardian</i>	18.4%	19.5%	19.1%
<i>Other family member</i>	10.9%	10.0%	10.3%

* The “total” columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

Who did you tell? (check all that apply)	Male	Female	Total*
<i>Institution faculty or staff</i>	6.1%	6.3%	6.2%
<i>Off-campus counselor/therapist</i>	5.1%	5.9%	5.6%
<i>On-campus counselor/therapist</i>	3.5%	6.4%	5.4%
<i>Other</i>	2.3%	2.0%	2.1%
<i>Local police</i>	2.7%	3.3%	3.1%
<i>Resident Advisor or Hall Coordinator</i>	1.6%	3.8%	3.0%
<i>Office of the Sexual Misconduct Response Coordinator</i>	0.8%	3.8%	2.8%
<i>Rape crisis advocate</i>	0.0%	4.0%	2.6%
<i>Doctor/nurse</i>	0.8%	3.1%	2.3%
<i>Religious leader</i>	2.3%	0.9%	1.4%
<i>Office of the Dean of Students</i>	0.8%	1.7%	1.4%
<i>Crisis hotline</i>	1.6%	0.9%	1.1%
<i>Campus police department</i>	0.5%	1.1%	0.9%
<i>Domestic violence advocate</i>	0.0%	0.6%	0.4%

VI. Limitations and Next Steps for Future Survey Administration

The results of this study need to be interpreted within the context of several limitations. First, as discussed previously, the low response rate raises the real possibility that the results may be biased.

At a minimum, we are unable to say that the survey results, particularly with regards to the rates of sexual misconduct, stalking, and dating violence are representative of and generalizable to the entire UI student body.

Second, despite the fact that the instruments used to measure sexual misconduct are well-established, validated, and in some instances considered a gold standard measure, there are always limitations to self-report measures. For example, post-traumatic memory or recollection may have resulted in respondents under-reporting these experiences.

Finally, there were instances where the wording of items and the applicability of the follow-up questions could be improved. With regards to item wording, for example, students were asked whether they had completed an online sexual misconduct educational program. Despite this program being a required part of new undergraduate student orientation, only 47% of undergraduates responded affirmatively to this question. Students may not have recalled this program because it is embedded in a larger, overall orientation program. We also learned that the name of the program had changed in the past few years.

With regards to the applicability of some of the follow-up questions, the ARC3 does not associate the disclosure of any victimization to the specific type of victimization experienced. Sixty-three percent of students who experienced any sexual misconduct, stalking, or dating violence reported experiencing more than one type of victimization. However, students' reasons for disclosing, or not, might vary

* The "total" columns in the tables throughout the document represent the total percentage for all survey respondents.

depending on the type of victimization experienced. It would be useful information to inform UI interventions if we could explore students decisions to report based on the type of victimization.

The administration of the *Speak Out Iowa* survey in fall 2015 demonstrates the ongoing commitment by the UI to better understand students' perceptions of campus climate and rates of sexual misconduct on campus. This 2015 survey provided baseline data and piloted the use of the ARC3 as a comprehensive instrument for assessing sexual misconduct.

The length of the survey very likely was a significant factor in the low response rate. The ARC3 takes approximately 30 minutes to complete. Anecdotal feedback from students indicated that this was too long. The ARC3 contains modules asking about students' overall alcohol use, academic engagement, mental health, peer norms and perpetrator behaviors, which are not presented in this report. Future administrations of the survey may need to be confined to the campus climate and sexual misconduct victimization questions.

Future administrations of the survey to assess the UI campus climate on sexual misconduct need to address the above mentioned limitations, particularly steps to increase both the response rate and the representativeness of the sample. Additional recruitment methods and incentive strategies are also needed to increase the overall response rate as well as the participation of racial/ethnic and sexual minorities, professional students, and international students.

Acknowledgments

The selection of the climate survey (ARC3), the development of the survey recruitment plan, and the survey administration were conducted by the Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey Subcommittee of the Anti-Violence Coalition. Subcommittee members included:

Carolyn Copps Hartley, PhD, associate professor, School of Social Work, chair of the Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey Subcommittee

Anne G. Sadler, PhD, R.N., associate professor, Carver College of Medicine Department of Psychiatry; and research investigator at the Iowa City VA Health Care System Comprehensive Access & Delivery Research and Evaluation Center

Teresa Treat, PhD, professor, Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences (Fall 2015 only due to sabbatical)

Josh Abdo, student, undergraduate student member of the President's Student Advisory Committee on Sexual Misconduct

Carter Bell, 2016 UI graduate, member of the President's Student Advisory Committee on Sexual Misconduct

This report was prepared by:

Carolyn Copps Hartley

Anne G. Sadler

Teri Schnelle, MA, coordinator for Student Life assessment and initiatives, Division of Student Life

Statistical consultation was provided by:

James Torner, PhD, Department of Epidemiology, College of Public Health; Departments of Neurosurgery and Surgery, Carver College of Medicine

Linda Rubenstein, PhD, statistician, Department of Epidemiology, College of Public Health

Special thanks to:

Kevin Swartout, PhD, assistant professor of Psychology, Georgia State University, contact person for the ARC3, for his consultation throughout our process.

Various campus stakeholder groups for their input before the survey administration and their feedback on the survey results and campus-wide action plan.

The University of Iowa students who shared their experiences by participating in the survey.

References

- Cantor, D., & Fisher, W. B. (2015). *Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct*. Rockville, MD: Westat.
- Carey, K. B., Durney, S. E., Shepardson, R. L., & Carey, M. P. (2015). Incapacitated and forcible rape of college women: Prevalence across the first year. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 56*(6), 678-680.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2011). *National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2011 Victimization Questions*. Retrieved from http://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/24726/cdc_24726_DS1.pdf
- Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The Sexual Victimization of College Women. Research Report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 17*(4), 425-445.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ-DoD). *Military Psychology, 3*, 243-264.
- Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., . . . Weitzman, L. M. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32*, 152-175.
- Freyd, J. J. (2015). Examining denial tactics: Were victims overrepresented in the AAU Survey of Sexual Violence on College Campuses? *The Blog, Huffington Post*, September 29, 2015.
- Hamby, S. (2014). Self-report measures that do not produce parity in intimate partner violence: A multi-study investigation. *Psychology of Violence, 15*, 149-158.
- Izrael, D., Hoaglin, D. C., & Battaglia, M. P. (2004). Proceedings of the Twenty-Ninth Annual SAS Users Group International Conference, SAS Institute Inc.: *To rake or not to rake is not the question anymore with the enhanced raking macro*. Cary, NC.
- Kimble, M., Neacsiu, A. D., Flack, W. F., & Horner, J. (2008). Risk of unwanted sex for college women: Evidence for a red zone. *Journal of American College Health, 57*(3), 331-338.

- Koss, M. P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., . . . White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve the assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, 357-370.
- Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2009). College women's experiences with physically forced, alcohol-or other drug-enabled, and drug-facilitated sexual assault before and since entering college. *Journal of American College Health*, 57(6), 639-649.
- Mohler-Kuo, M., Dowdall, G. W., Koss, M. P., & Wechsler, H. (2004). Correlates of rape while intoxicated in a national sample of college women. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 65(1), 37-45.
- Mouilso, E. R., & Fischer, S. (2012). A prospective study of sexual assault and alcohol use among first-year college women. *Violence and Victims*, 27(1), 78-94.
- Nukulkij, P. (2011). *AAUW Knowledge Networks: Harassment at School Survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.aauw.org/files/2013/02/crossing-the-line-harassment-at-school-survey-methodology.pdf>
- Senn, C. Y., Eliasziw, M., Barata, P. C., Thurston, W. E., Newby-Clark, I. R., Radtke, H. L., & Hobden, K. L. (2013). Sexual assault resistance education for university women: Study protocol for a randomized controlled trial (SARE trial). *BMC Women's Health*, 13(1), 1-13.
- Smith, P. H., Earp, J. A., & DeVellis, R. (1995). Measuring battering: Development of the Women's Experience with Battering (WEB) Scale. *Women's Health: Research on Gender, Behavior, and Policy*, 1(4), 273-288.

Appendix A

CHARGE: Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey Subcommittee of the Anti-Violence Coalition

Sponsorship

This survey is a project of the University of Iowa Anti-Violence Coalition, in support of the coalition's efforts and in response to a request from university administration, represented by Vice President for Student Life Tom Rocklin.

Background

The University of Iowa has in place a comprehensive plan to combat sexual violence. In order to monitor progress under the plan and to inform revisions to the plan, this project will develop and implement a process for collecting information from students about (1) their experiences with sexual violence and (2) their knowledge about relevant resources available to them.

Charge

The subcommittee will:

- 1) Select an appropriate survey instrument from among those available in a time frame consistent with the project schedule.
- 2) Modify the selected instrument to make it suitable for the University of Iowa context and test the language of the survey with University of Iowa students.
- 3) Develop a plan to administer the survey in a way that has the best chance of resulting in a sample of respondents' representative of the University of Iowa student body.
- 4) Develop, before the survey results are received, a plan for analyzing the responses and disseminating the results.
- 5) Direct the administration of the survey.
- 6) Evaluate the process used in this project and recommend a process and schedule for future administrations of the survey.

Appendix B

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY FACULTY/STAFF

Since you enrolled at the University of Iowa, have you been in a situation in which a faculty member, instructor, teaching assistant, practicum/clinic/field instructor, or staff member has done any of the following:

Never	Once or Twice	Sometimes	Often	Many Times
-------	------------------	-----------	-------	---------------

- | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1) Treated you “differently” because of your sex? | | | | |
| 1a) Treated you “differently” because of your perceived gender identity? | | | | |
| 2) Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials? | | | | |
| 3) Made offensive sexist remarks? | | | | |
| 4) Put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex? | | | | |
| 5) Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you? | | | | |
| 6) Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters? | | | | |
| 7) Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities? | | | | |
| 8) Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you? | | | | |
| 9) Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it? | | | | |
| 10) Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said “No”? | | | | |
| 11) Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable? | | | | |
| 12) Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you? | | | | |
| 13) Made you feel like you were being bribed with a reward to engage in sexual behavior? | | | | |
| 14) Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative? | | | | |
| 15) Treated you badly for refusing to have sex? | | | | |
| 16) Implied better treatment if you were sexually cooperative? | | | | |

Item 1a was added based on the recommendation of UI campus stakeholders.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ-DoD). *Military Psychology, 3*, 243-264.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT BY STUDENTS

Since you enrolled at the University of Iowa, have you been in a situation in which a student has done any of the following:

Never Once or
Twice Sometimes Often Many
Times

- 1) Treated you “differently” because of your sex?

- 1a) Treated you “differently” because of your perceived gender identity?

- 2) Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials?

- 3) Made offensive sexist remarks?

- 4) Put you down or was condescending to you because of your sex?

- 5) Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you?

- 6) Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters?

- 7) Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?

- 8) Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you?

- 9) Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?

- 10) Sent or posted unwelcome sexual comments, jokes or pictures by text, email, Facebook or other electronic means?

- 11) Spread unwelcome sexual rumors about you by text, email, Facebook or other electronic means?

- 12) Called you gay, lesbian, or trans in a negative way by text, email, Facebook or other electronic means?

Item 1a was added based on the recommendation of UI campus stakeholders.

Items from the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (Fitzgerald et al., 1988, 1995) and the AAUW Knowledge Networks Survey (Nukulij, 2011).

Fitzgerald, L. F., Gelfand, M. J., & Drasgow, F. (1995). Measuring sexual harassment: Theoretical and psychometric advances. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17(4), 425-445.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., . . . Weitzman, L. M. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152-175.

Nukulij, P. (2011). *AAUW Knowledge Networks: Harassment at School Survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.aauw.org/files/2013/02/crossing-the-line-harassment-at-school-survey-methodology.pdf>

STALKING VICTIMIZATION

How many times have one or more people done the following things to you since you enrolled at the University of Iowa:

None 1-2 3-5 6-8 More than 8

- 1) Watched or followed you from a distance, or spied on you with a listening device, camera, or GPS [global positioning system]?
- 2) Approached you or showed up in places, such as your home, workplace, or school when you didn't want them to be there?
- 3) Left strange or potentially threatening items for you to find?
- 4) Sneaked into your home or car and did things to scare you by letting you know they had been there?
- 5) Left you unwanted messages (including text or voice messages)?
- 6) Made unwanted phone calls to you (including hang up calls)?
- 7) Sent you unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through social media apps?
- 8) Left you cards, letters, flowers, or presents when they knew you didn't want them to?

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2011). *National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2011 Victimization Questions*. Retrieved from http://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/24726/cdc_24726_DS1.pdf

DATING VIOLENCE VICTIMIZATION

Answer the next questions about any hook-up, boyfriend, girlfriend, husband, or wife you have had, including exes, regardless of the length of the relationship, since you enrolled at [INSTITUTION].

None Once or Twice Sometimes Often Many Times

- 1) Not including horseplay or joking around, the person threatened to hurt me and I thought I might really get hurt.
- 2) Not including horseplay or joking around, the person pushed, grabbed, or shook me.
- 3) Not including horseplay or joking around, the person hit me.
- 4) Not including horseplay or joking around, the person beat me up.
- 5) Not including horseplay or joking around, the person stole or destroyed my property.
- 6) Not including horseplay or joking around, the person can scare me without laying a hand on me.

Hamby, S. (2014). Self-report measures that do not produce parity in intimate partner violence: A multi-study investigation. *Psychology of Violence, 15*, 149–158.

Smith, P. H., Earp, J. A., & DeVellis, R. (1995). Measuring battering: development of the Women's Experience with Battering (WEB) Scale. *Women's Health: Research on Gender, Behavior, and Policy, 1(4)*, 273-288.

SEXUAL VIOLENCE VICTIMIZATION

The following questions concern sexual experiences that you may have had that were unwanted. We know that these are personal questions, so we did not ask your name or other identifying information.

Your information is completely anonymous. We hope that this helps you to feel comfortable answering each question honestly. Fill in the bubble showing the number of times each experience has happened to you. If several experiences occurred on the same occasion, for example, someone took advantage of you when you were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening and threatened to physically harm you, you should indicate all experiences.

We want to know about your experiences since you enrolled at the University of Iowa. These experiences could occur on or off campus, when school is in session or when you are on a break.

1) Someone fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of my body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of my clothes without my consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration) by:

0 times 1 time 2 times 3+ times

Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.

Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.

Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening

Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.

Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

2) Someone had oral sex with me or made me have oral sex with them without my consent by:

0 times 1 time 2 times 3+ times

Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.

Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.

Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening

Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.

Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

3) Someone put their penis, fingers, or other objects into my vagina without my consent by:

0 times 1 time 2 times 3+ times

Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.

Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.

Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening

Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.

Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

4) Someone put their penis, fingers, or other objects into my butt without my consent by:

0 times 1 time 2 times 3+ times

Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.

Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.

Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening

Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.

Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

5) Even though it didn't happen, someone TRIED to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with me without my consent by:

0 times 1 time 2 times 3+ times

Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about me, making promises I knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring me after I said I didn't want to.

Showing displeasure, criticizing my sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after I said I didn't want to.

Taking advantage of me when I was too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening

Threatening to physically harm me or someone close to me.

Using force, for example holding me down with their body weight, pinning my arms, or having a weapon.

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

Koss, M. P., & Gidycz, C. A. (1985). The sexual experiences survey: Reliability and validity. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53*, 442-423.

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization among a national sample of students in higher education. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55*, 162-170.

Koss, M. P., & Oros, C. J. (1982). The Sexual Experience Survey: An empirical instrument investigating sexual aggression and victimization. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50*, 455-457



THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA®

University of Iowa Anti-Violence Plan

To end sexual misconduct, dating violence, and stalking

Trigger warning: *This document addresses the sensitive topic of sexual violence and may be difficult for some readers. If you or someone you know is in need of any resources or support for sexual harassment, dating violence, stalking, or sexual violence see the Find Help Now page at speakout.uiowa.edu/resources for a comprehensive list of resources.*

The University of Iowa Anti-Violence Plan for Sexual Misconduct, Dating Violence, and Stalking

The University of Iowa has a committed team working collaboratively to prevent sexual misconduct, dating violence, and stalking; provide support to survivors; and hold offenders accountable.

The UI strives to maintain a safe and respectful environment, which requires campus-wide support and continuous effort. Through collaborative efforts, including the Six Point Plan to Combat Sexual Assault, we have made measurable progress, but there is more work to be done.

The UI Anti-Violence Coalition (AVC), made up of campus stakeholders and community partners, worked together to identify additional action items focusing on prevention and education, intervention, and policy. This new two-year plan is influenced by results from the *Speak Out Iowa* campus climate survey (noted by numbers), evidence-informed efforts and practices (noted by letters), as well as input by members of the AVC and campus constituents.

It's on all of us to continue this important work.

Prevention and Education

Goal: To expand existing programs, create new education opportunities for the campus community, and use comprehensive evaluation to maximize the effectiveness of all programming. This work is guided by the [UI Comprehensive Education Model](#).

- 1) Implement a refresher course on sexual misconduct in the first semester for incoming undergraduate students as a follow-up to the required Success at Iowa course taken before coming to campus (2)
- 2) Develop a new module for orientation programs for incoming graduate and professional students to increase awareness of resources and reporting options, as well as prevention education (5, 12)(B, C)
- 3) Expand faculty/staff sexual harassment prevention education by:
 - a. Including employees with appointments below 50% and undergraduate students in formal peer leadership roles (e.g., tutors) (5)(C)
 - b. Including more primary prevention strategies, as well as explaining the importance of creating an environment where sexist and crude gender harassment is not used, even if it does not violate university policy (5)(C)
- 4) Explore options and models for partnering with feeder high schools given evidence that prevention is more likely to be effective with students, developmentally, before college (2)(C)
- 5) Continue to engage and share prevention resources and strategies with community partners to help prevent incidents of sexual misconduct off campus (3)(C)
- 6) Work with Fraternity and Sorority Life staff and student leaders to implement procedures that create protective environments (e.g., improving safety and monitoring at events and creating social incentives for behavior) (2)(C)

Numbers indicate key findings from the Speak Out Iowa survey (speakout.uiowa.edu) starting on page 5. Letters indicate sources found on page 56.

- 7) Continue to develop and implement targeted education for and about specific populations identified at high risk (e.g., international students, LGBT community, etc.) (H)
- 8) Increase messaging to parents about policies, procedures, resources, and how to respond to a disclosure (D)
- 9) Develop and implement men's programming that promotes healthy masculinity across campus, specifically engaging groups where students who identify as men come together (C)
- 10) Raise awareness about dating violence and stalking, including where to get help and how to report victimization, (6,7)(B, H) by:
 - Implementing a communications campaign (11)
 - Making sure existing programs have resource information on stalking and dating violence readily accessible
- 11) Implement [Enhanced Assess, Acknowledge, Act \(EAAA\)](#) sexual assault resistance education program (1)(C), including content on:
 - a. The role of alcohol (3)
 - b. Verbal and physical defense (1, 8)
 - c. Perpetrator behavior and patterns (8)
- 12) Ensure programs reinforce that sexual assault by an acquaintance is most common while also raising awareness of measures to reduce the risk of victimization by a stranger (8)
- 13) Ensure alcohol harm reduction efforts include: (3)(C, I)
 - a. Recommendations for parents/guardians on talking with their student about alcohol (e.g., A Parent Handbook for Talking with College Students About Alcohol)
 - b. Environmental prevention strategies (e.g., alcohol control measures/local ordinances)
 - c. Late-night entertainment alternatives
- 14) Identify and assess ways to centralize the evaluation of all student prevention education programs through coordination in the Office of the Vice President for Student Life (B, E)
- 15) Build a team of peer educators to expand capacity for prevention education, including increasing student preparedness to respond to disclosures of victimization (1, 9, 11)
- 16) Maximize attendance of bystander intervention training during *On Iowa!* by offering it earlier in the orientation schedule, and track attendance so students not in attendance can be identified for future programming (2)(C)
- 17) Partner with UISG to promote It's On Us messaging campaign to expand its impact and ensure the content is aligned and linked to other prevention activities (1, 2)(C)
- 18) Create a web resource connecting groups and individuals looking for education with the appropriate resources and opportunities (2)(C)

Numbers indicate key findings from the Speak Out Iowa survey (speakout.uiowa.edu) starting on page 5. Letters indicate sources found on page 56.

- 19) Implement a strategy for continuous improvement by establishing learning benchmarks for all students in their first, second, third, and fourth years, and assessing outcomes (e.g., know when each student should receive what content and develop specific skills, recognizing that there's an optimal progression in knowledge/skills development) (F, H)
- 20) Implement biannual climate survey of students regarding their experiences with sexual misconduct, dating violence, and stalking (I)

Intervention

Goal: To integrate inclusive, trauma-informed, person-centered interventions for all those impacted by sexual misconduct, dating violence, and stalking, in a fair and equitable manner.

- 1) Enhance education about resources on campus and in the community for students to ensure they know where to get help and where to make a report by: (12)(B)
 - a. Providing a safety booklet in every residence hall room that highlights resources available on campus (2)
 - b. Updating crime alerts to include hyperlinks/images (11)
 - c. Increasing reminders about where to get help and where to report by exploring new communication methods to reach students and implementing messaging campaigns (9, 12)(B)
- 2) Provide training on responding effectively to disclosures to promote help-seeking behavior by:
 - a. Increasing education programs for students/campus community on how to respond to a disclosure by a friend/peer (9)
 - b. Ensuring responsible employees or Academic Administrative Officers (AAOs) can recognize and respond to a disclosure of sexual misconduct, dating violence, or stalking (5, 6 & 7)(B)
- 3) Collaborate with directors of graduate studies programs and professional school deans to cultivate a respectful and safe environment within their department or college (5)(E)
- 4) Advance investigative expertise for campus law enforcement and judicial administrators to increase accountability of persons committing sexual assault, dating violence, dating violence, and stalking: (4)(H)
 - a. Develop a sustainable education program for new officers and judicial administrators
 - b. Provide annual ongoing training to all officers and judicial administrators, ensuring training content is culturally inclusive and addresses needs of the LGBT community
- 5) Strengthen resources for survivors:
 - a. Raise awareness about the impact of adverse childhood experiences (ACE) to promote linkage with resources for reducing the risk of future trauma (4)(C)
 - b. Expand the capacity of RVAP to provide long-term therapeutic care and support group services (1, 2) (C)
 - c. Increase survivors' access to immediate support through RVAP advocacy and mobile messaging (I)

- 6) Expand resources for people accused of sexual misconduct by:
 - a. Creating student judicial process guidance for those accused (G)
 - b. Increasing training for senior human resources representatives and associate deans on how to have effective conversations that motivate behavioral change when facilitating an informal sexual harassment resolution (5)
- 7) Expand resources for people found responsible for a policy violation to prevent reoccurrence and ensure fairness:
 - a. Ensure an alcohol or drug assessment is required as a sanction when the person found responsible was using alcohol or drugs during an incident of sexual misconduct, dating violence, or stalking (3)
 - b. Implement a research-informed educational program for students who are found responsible for sexual misconduct, dating violence, or stalking (H)
- 8) Engage with community partners to ensure coordinated responses by establishing a memorandum of understanding with local law enforcement agencies to complement the county guidelines for investigating sex crimes (J)

Policy

Goal: To review and revise policies on a consistent basis to ensure they are clear, fair, and effective at holding offenders accountable and keeping the campus community safe.

- 1) Streamline and align existing civil rights policies and procedures while exploring the feasibility of merging them into one policy (A)
- 2) Identify and utilize a variety of mechanisms to collect campus feedback to inform policy review and revision
- 3) Identify and engage with local, state, and national policy leaders, as well as professional associations (e.g., elected officials, Office of Civil Rights, Association of Title IX Administrators, and National Association of College and University Attorneys) to confirm legal requirements are met, best practices are implemented, and the university contributes to societal change
- 4) Develop explicit campus policy education programs and tools to increase knowledge about how policies are applied by:
 - a. Broadening publication of aggregate response and investigation outcomes data, including sanctions imposed, related to sexual misconduct, dating violence, and stalking to increase transparency (10)
 - b. Continuing to build on students' favorable perception of how the UI would respond to a student reporting an incident of sexual misconduct, by increasing knowledge on how sexual misconduct policies and procedures are applied (10)(B)

Sources

- A ATIXA: Association of Title IX Administrators (n.d.). The ATIXA one policy, one process model policy: Why choose the-one policy/one-process model. Retrieved from <https://atixa.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/Why-Choose-the-One-Policy-One-Process-Model.pdf>
- B ATIXA: Association of Title IX Administrators (2016). *The ATIXA Title IX and VAWA section 304 training checklist*. Retrieved from <https://atixa.org/resources/training-checklist/>
- C Centers for Disease Control. (2016). *STOP SV: A technical package to prevent sexual violence*. Atlanta, GA. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/sv-prevention-technical-package.pdf>
- D The University of Iowa Academic Support and Retention (n.d.). Excelling@Iowa data showing that 20% of students talk to their parents and families every 3 waking hours. Shared at meeting 9/2016.
- E Nation, M., Crusto, C., Wandersman, B., Kumpfer, K. L., Seybolt, D., Morrissey-Kane, E., & Davino, K. (2003). What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs. *American Psychologist*, 58(6/7), 449-456.
- F Nation, M., Keener, D., Wandersman, A., & DuBois, D. (2005). *Applying the principles of prevention: What do prevention practitioners need to know about what works?* Retrieved from <http://www.odvn.org/training/Documents/doc-principles-prevention.pdf>
- G Office of Civil Rights. (April 4, 2011). *Dear colleague letter on sexual violence*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/letters/colleague-201104.pdf>
- H U.S. Department of Justice Office on Violence Against Women 2014 Grant to Resource Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, and Stalking on Campus
- I The White House (2014). *The first report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.notalone.gov/assets/report.pdf>
- J The White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (n.d.). *Building partnerships among law enforcement agencies, colleges and universities: Developing a memorandum of understanding to prevent and respond effectively to sexual assaults at colleges in universities*. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/white_house_task_force_law_enforcement_mou.pdf