

University of North Alabama
Key Findings from the Student Campus Climate Survey
2016 – 2017 Full Technical Report

Amber Paulk, Ph.D., Principal Investigator
Andrea Hunt, Ph.D., Co-Principal Investigator
Yaschica Williams, Ph.D., Co-Principal Investigator

Introduction

National statistics indicate that one in five women will be sexually assaulted during their college years (White House Task Force Report, 2014), and that college men also face a significant risk of being sexually victimized (Banyard, Ward, Cohn, Moorhead & Walsh, 2007; Isley, 1998). Amidst growing concern, President Obama convened the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault to establish guidelines to assist colleges and universities in developing effective sexual assault prevention and intervention programming. In April 2014, the Task Force released its first report which recommends a four step process for all colleges and universities: (1) identify the problem by conducting campus climate surveys; (2) prevent sexual assault – and pay special attention to engaging men in this process; (3) effectively respond when a student is sexually assaulted; and (4) increase transparency and improve enforcement.

In accordance with the Task Force’s recommendations, in fall 2014 the University of North Alabama (UNA) administered a Student Campus Climate Survey.¹ The purpose of the survey was to provide UNA with critical information regarding our campus climate, campus resources, and experiences of our students. All students at UNA were sent a notification about the online survey, and a total of 978 surveys were completed. A full technical report and a series of briefs presenting significant findings were released in summer 2015. Based on the findings, the UNA Title IX Education and Prevention Advisory Board developed and implemented a series of recommendations, including mandatory Title IX/Bystander Intervention trainings in every First Year Experience (FYE) course.

Beginning in fall 2015, all freshman and transfer students were required to take a First Year Experience (FYE) course that contained a mandatory Title IX/Bystander Intervention training. In addition to requiring the Title IX/Bystander Intervention training in all FYE courses, the training was also made available on request to all campus entities (e.g., registered student organizations). The Title IX portion of the training included information about Title IX policies and procedures regarding incidents of power-based violence (e.g. what is power-based violence, how to report an incident, confidential resources, procedures for investigating). The Bystander Intervention portion of the training included information about how to engage in active bystander behaviors, specifically behaviors that would prevent power-based violence in risky situations.

¹ The principal investigator for the Student Campus Climate Survey was UNA faculty member, Dr. Amber Paulk from the Department of Sociology and Family Studies. Her co-principal investigators were UNA faculty members Drs. Andrea Hunt and Yaschica Williams, also from the Department of Sociology and Family Studies. The UNA Title IX Education and Prevention Advisory Board reviewed both the 2014 and 2016 surveys and subsequent technical reports. The advisory board includes UNA’s Title IX Coordinator, Ms. Tammy Jacques; UNA faculty, staff, and students; representatives from UNA Student Counseling Services; the UNA Police Department; and local community partners. Both the 2014 and 2016 surveys were approved by UNA’s Human Subjects Review Committee.

In fall 2016, UNA administered a second Student Campus Climate Survey. This report presents key findings from the survey along with recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of prevention and intervention programming for our students.

Funding and Budget

Research indicates increasingly poor response rates for online surveys that do not offer at least the opportunity for incentives in exchange for participation, particularly in the college student population (Porter & Whitcomb, 2003). In order to ensure the broadest possible representation, students were offered the opportunity to receive an incentive for their participation in the survey. At the end of the survey students were presented with the opportunity to enter a drawing for one of the following prizes: 1 \$50 gift card to the UNA Bookstore; 2 \$25 gift cards to Starbucks; and 5 \$10 gift cards for Dining Dollars. The funds for these prizes were provided by UNA's Division of Student Affairs. The principal investigators provided the labor for the development of the survey, creation of recruitment materials, survey administration, data analyses, and a written report of key findings.

Methods

Survey Instrument

The majority of measures in the survey were taken directly from the White House Task Force Report (2014), which is accessible at the following link:
www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/report_0.pdf.

The survey contained measures designed to assess the incidence and prevalence of unwanted sexual experiences, intimate partner violence, and stalking/bullying. It also contained measures that assessed participants' perceptions of the general campus; perceptions of campus leadership, policies, and reporting practices as they relate to sexual assault; rape myth acceptance; and bystander attitudes. Two additional measures were added to the 2016 survey that were not included in the 2014 survey. Based on recommendations from the UNA Title IX Education and Prevention Advisory Board an assessment of non-physical forms of intimate partner violence was added to the 2016 survey (i.e., the New Controlling and Abusive Tactics Scale (CAT 2-C), as well as an assessment of the perceptions of campus climate as it relates to sexual minorities. Students who identified LGBTQ were directed to a series of questions that assessed their perceptions of UNA's climate in regards to sexual minorities.

Due to the sensitive nature of some of the measures, UNA Counseling Services, Shoals Crisis Center, and One Place of the Shoals were listed as resources at the beginning of the survey and again at the end. There was also a trigger warning prior to questions regarding sexual assault and intimate partner violence. Participants were reminded that they had the option to skip any questions they would prefer not to answer and/or exit the survey at that time. A copy of UNA's Student Campus Climate Survey is available for review in **Appendix K**.

Procedure

The survey was developed and administered through Qualtrics, which enabled all data collected to be completely anonymous. As an additional measure to maintain anonymity of respondents, the feature in Qualtrics that collects IP address information was disabled.

In September 2016, all students at UNA were sent a notification about the survey via UNA Portal email that contained an electronic link to the online survey. A link to the survey was also posted on UNA's Homepage, Facebook, and Twitter pages. Notifications were also posted at key

locations on campus. All individuals who clicked on the survey link were provided with more information about the survey and their rights as a participant. In order to participate, individuals had to provide consent before entering the survey. Individuals under the age of 18 also had to provide a completed parental consent form to participate.

The survey was closed in December 2016. The average response time varied between 10 – 30 minutes with over 65% of respondents completing the survey in 20 minutes or less. In accordance with UNA's Human Subjects Review Committee requirements, only the principal investigators have access to the raw data, which are being stored on their password protected computers.

Sample

A total of 1,457 surveys were completed. The mean age of participants was 22 years old ($SD=6.95$). However, since a wide range of ages was reported (16 – 68 years old), the median age of participants (20 years old) may be a more accurate representation of the typical age of participants in our sample. The class standing of participants was as follows: 37% freshman, 18% sophomore, 17% junior, 21% senior, 6% graduate student, and 1% special student. On average, participants reported attending UNA for 3.77 semesters ($SD=3.39$).

Seventy-four percent (74%) of the sample identified as female, 24% identified as male, and approximately 2% identified as transgender or other. In terms of race/ethnicity, 76% of participants identified as Caucasian/White, 16% identified as African-American/Black, 5% identified as bi- or multi-racial, 2% identified as Asian, 0.8% identified as American Indian, and 0.2% identified as Pacific Islander. In a separate question, 3% identified as Hispanic/Latino. This racial composition approximates well the racial makeup of the University. More detailed demographic information on the participants in our sample is available for review in **Appendix A**. See **Appendix J** for a breakdown of UNA student demographics that was compiled by the Office of Institutional Research.

Results

I. Title IX/Bystander Intervention Training

In fall 2014, the University of North Alabama (UNA) administered a Student Campus Climate Survey. Based on the findings of the survey, the UNA Title IX Education and Prevention Advisory Board developed and implemented a series of recommendations, including mandatory Title IX/Bystander Intervention trainings in every First Year Experience (FYE) course. Beginning in fall 2015, all freshman and transfer students were required to take a FYE course that contained a mandatory Title IX/Bystander Intervention training. The Title IX portion of the training included information about Title IX policies and procedures regarding incidents of sexual assault (e.g. what is defined as sexual assault, how to report an incident, confidential resources, procedures for investigating). The Bystander Intervention portion of the training included information about how to engage in active bystander behaviors, specifically behaviors that would prevent sexual assault in risky situations. In addition to requiring the Title IX/Bystander Intervention training in all FYE courses, the training was also made available on request to all campus entities (e.g., registered student organizations).

In the 2016 Student Campus Climate Survey, all participants were asked if they had received training from UNA in Title IX policies and procedures. From the sample of 1,457 students, 62% reported they had received the training and 38% reported they had not received the training. The breakdown of participants who indicated they had received the training by class standing was as follows: 47% freshman, 20% sophomore, 13% junior, 15% senior, 4% graduate student, and 1% special student. Participants who indicated they had received the training were asked to rate the usefulness of the training on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not useful and 5 being very useful. The vast majority of students who completed the training (i.e., 86%) reported that they found the training to be “very” to “moderately” useful. See Table 1 for a breakdown of students’ ratings of the usefulness of the Title IX training.

Table 1. *Participants’ Ratings of the Usefulness of the Title IX Training.*

| | very useful | moderately useful | somewhat useful | slightly useful | not useful |
|--|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------|
| How useful would you rate the Title IX training? | 51 | 35 | 10 | 2 | 2 |

A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to test for differences between students who received the Title IX training and students who did not receive the Title IX training. Results indicated that training status was a significant predictor in the overall model [Pillai’s trace = .0.13, $F(2, 1096) = 6.97, p < .001$]. Univariate statistics indicated that students who received the training ($M=1.89; SD=.77$) reported significantly lower rape myth acceptance than students who did not receive the training ($M=2.00; SD=.76$). Also, students who completed the training ($M=4.26; SD=.93$) reported significantly higher bystander attitudes than students who did not receive the training ($M=4.16; SD=1.16$).

II. Unwanted Sexual Experiences

Definition of terms

The survey defined sexual contact as touching of a sexual nature, oral sex, sexual intercourse, anal sex, and sexual penetration with a finger or object. Participants were asked about nonconsensual or unwanted sexual contact they may have experienced since becoming a student at UNA.

The survey defined unwanted sexual experiences as “sexual contact that involved force or threats of force against you. Force could include someone holding you down with his or her body weight, pinning your arms, hitting or kicking you, or using or threatening to use a weapon against you.” Participants were also asked if they had experienced “sexual contact while you were unable to provide consent or stop what was happening because you were passed out, drugged, drunk, incapacitated, or asleep. These situations might include times that you voluntarily consumed alcohol or drugs and times that you were given drugs without your knowledge or consent.”

Incidence of Unwanted Sexual Experiences

Incidence refers to a count of how many unique incidents of a particular act, in this case unwanted sexual experiences, occur during a given period of time (i.e., since becoming a student at UNA). A total of **200 incidents** of unwanted sexual contact were reported from a sample of 1,457 students. According to the National Institute of Justice (2008), incidence rates are calculated by measuring the number of incidents reported per 1,000 students. A total of 200

incidents of unwanted sexual contact were reported from a sample of 1,457 students. If this number is adjusted to reflect a population of 1,000 students, the incidences are adjusted to **137**, for an incidence rate of **14%** [Formula: # of incidences per 1,000 / sample population X 100]. More detailed information regarding the incidence of unwanted sexual experiences in our sample is available for review in **Appendix B**.

Prevalence of Unwanted Sexual Experiences

Prevalence rates are a count of how many unique people experience a particular act, in this case unwanted sexual experiences, during a given period of time (i.e., since becoming a student at UNA). According to the National Institute of Justice (2008), prevalence rates are calculated by dividing the total number of individuals who report an unwanted sexual experience by the sample population and multiplying that number by 100. A total of **112 students** in our sample reported experiencing at least one incident of unwanted sexual contact. Therefore, the prevalence rate of unwanted sexual experiences in our sample was **8%** [Formula: # of individuals reporting / sample population X 100].

Demographic Information about Individuals Reporting Unwanted Sexual Experiences

Of the 112 unique individuals in our sample who reported an unwanted sexual experience, 83% identified as female, 15% as male, 1% identified as a transwoman, and 1% identified as other. The breakdown of participants who reported at least one unwanted sexual experience by class standing was as follows: 28% freshman, 20% sophomore, 16% junior, 33% senior, and 3% graduate student. The majority of victims identified as Caucasian/White (80%) and heterosexual (82%).

Group affiliation was also analyzed to determine if any of the following groups were overrepresented in reporting victimization: athletes; social fraternity and sorority members; band members; ROTC cadets; international students; and early college students. Social fraternity and sorority members were the only group that was overrepresented in reporting victimization. While social fraternity and sorority members accounted for 20% of the overall sample, they accounted for 37% of reported victims. An independent samples *t*-test confirmed the association between greek affiliation and victimization was statistically significant ($p < .001$). More detailed demographic information regarding victims is available for review in **Appendix B**.

Demographic Information about Perpetrators

Eighty-six percent (86%) of perpetrators were identified as male, 10% as female, and 4% of victims were unsure of the gender of their perpetrator. When victims were asked who the unwanted sexual experience involved, 30% identified the perpetrator as an acquaintance, 25% as a non-romantic friend, 18% as a casual or first date, 15% as a stranger, 9% as a romantic partner, 2% as a coworker, and 1% as an employer/supervisor. When asked if the perpetrator was a student at their university, 57% of victims said yes, 32% said no, and 11% said they were unsure. When asked if the perpetrator was affiliated with the university as an employee, faculty, or staff member, 7% of victims said yes, 84% said no, and 9% said they were unsure. More detailed demographic information regarding perpetrators is available for review in **Appendix B**.

Context of Unwanted Sexual Experiences

When asked where the incident occurred, 68% of victims reported that the incident took place off campus while 32% reported that the incident took place on-campus. Victims were asked a series of questions that assessed if the incident involved their or the perpetrators' use of alcohol and/or

drugs, including if they were given drugs without their consent. Of the victims who responded to that series of questions, 87% reported that the incident involved their use of alcohol and 85% reported that the incident involved the perpetrator's use of alcohol. When asked if the incident involved drugs, 20% of victims said the incident involved their voluntary use of recreational drugs, and 20% of victims said the incident involved the perpetrator's use of recreational drugs. Seven percent (7%) of victims believe they were given drugs without their consent and 25% of victims reported that they were unsure if they were given drugs without their consent. More detailed information regarding alcohol and/or drugs used or given during incidents is available for review in **Appendix B**.

Disclosure of Unwanted Sexual Experiences

Participants who reported an unwanted sexual experience were asked a series of follow-up questions. Of the 109 victims who participated in the follow-up questions, 52% said they had told at least one person about the incident, while 48% said they did not tell anyone about the incident. Victims who said they had told at least one person about their unwanted sexual experience were asked to identify who they told about the incident and were allowed to indicate multiple individuals if they had told more than one person. Victims were approximately twice as likely to disclose to a close friend than to any other group listed, including roommates, romantic partners, parents, counselors, faculty, staff, police, or victim support services. If victims indicated they did not tell at least one person about the incident, they were asked to indicate why and were allowed to indicate multiple reasons. The five most common reasons listed by victims who did not disclose were: (1) it was a private matter, (2) wanted to forget it happened, (3) didn't want others to worry about them, (4) didn't think it was that serious, and (5) had other things to focus on (school, work). More detailed demographic information regarding victim disclosure is available for review in **Appendix B**.

Reporting of Unwanted Sexual Experiences

When asked if they were aware of UNA's formal procedures to report the incident, 66% of victims reported yes and 34% said no. Out of 112 individuals reporting an unwanted sexual experience, only 10% of victims (N=11) chose to use UNA's formal procedures to report the incident. These individuals were asked to indicate how much they were helped by UNA's formal procedures on a scale of 1 – 4 (1=didn't help me at all; 4=helped me a lot). The average rating of UNA's formal procedures by those who utilized them was a 2.70 (SD=1.25) with 40% of those who utilized the services reporting that they were helped a lot by them. More detailed information regarding victim reporting is available for review in **Appendix B**.

Comparison of Reported Unwanted Sexual Experiences between 2014 and 2016 Samples

A chi-square test was conducted to determine if there was a difference between the 2014 and 2016 samples in the number of participants who reported an unwanted sexual experience. The results indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two samples. See Table 2 for a comparison of the prevalence rates of reported unwanted sexual experiences between the 2014 and 2016 samples.

Table 2. *Comparison of the Prevalence Rates of Reported Unwanted Sexual Experiences between the 2014 and 2016 Samples.*

| | Prevalence Rate |
|---|-----------------|
| 2014 Reported Unwanted Sexual Experiences | 7% |
| 2016 Reported Unwanted Sexual Experiences | 8% |

In both the 2014 and 2016 survey, participants who reported an unwanted sexual experience were asked a series of follow-up questions, which included questions about their awareness of UNA’s formal reporting procedures to report the incident and whether or not they utilized those services to make a formal report. A chi-square test was conducted to determine if there was difference between the 2014 and 2016 samples in the number of victims who were aware of UNA’s formal procedures to report the incident and whether or not they utilized those services to make a formal report. The dependent variables were participants’ categorical responses (i.e., yes, no) to the questions. The results indicated a statistically significant difference ($p<.001$) in the awareness of UNA’s formal procedures between the samples, with the 2016 sample being significantly more likely to report they were aware of UNA’s formal procedures than the 2014 sample. However, the 2016 sample was no more likely to utilize UNA’s formalized procedures to report than the 2014 sample. See Table 3 for a comparison of the awareness and utilization of UNA’s formal reporting procedures between the 2014 and 2016 samples.

Table 3. *Comparison of the Awareness and Utilization of UNA’s Formal Reporting Procedures between the 2014 and 2016 Samples.*

| | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| Were you aware of UNA's formal procedures to report the incident(s)? | | |
| 2014 | 42 | 58 |
| 2016 | 66 | 34 |
| Did you use UNA's formal procedures to report the incident(s)? | | |
| 2014 | 5 | 95 |
| 2016 | 10 | 90 |

III. Intimate Partner Violence

The 2014 Student Campus Climate Survey only contained questions that assessed physical violence from an intimate partner (i.e., the Safe Dates Physical Violence Victimization Scale). A recommendation from the UNA Title IX Education and Prevention Advisory Board was to include questions in the next round of the survey that would also assess non-physical forms of intimate partner violence. Therefore, the New Controlling and Abusive Tactics Scale (CAT 2-C) was included in the 2016 Student Campus Climate Survey.

The New Controlling and Abusive Tactics Scale (CAT-2) lists 37 controlling and abusive acts (e.g., partner calls you names, attempts to control who you are with, verbally threatens to hurt you) and asks participants to indicate how frequently an intimate partner has perpetrated that act against them during the last year on a scale of 0 – 4 (0 = never; 4 = frequently). The CAT-2 instrument is available for review in **Appendix C**.

Incidence of Controlling and Abusive Tactics

Incidence refers to a count of how many unique incidents of a particular act, in this case controlling and abusive tactics, occur during a given period of time (i.e., during the past year). The most common incidents of controlling and abusive tactics reported in the current sample were being nagged; treated as if one was stupid; deliberately ignored; blamed for all of the problems in the relationship; called or text messaged constantly; ridiculed; and called names (e.g., bitch, loser).

Prevalence of Controlling and Abusive Tactics

Prevalence rates are a count of how many unique people experience a particular act, in this case controlling and abusive tactics, during a given period of time (i.e., during the last year).

According to the National Institute of Justice (2008), prevalence rates are calculated by dividing the total number of individuals who report a crime by the sample population and multiplying that number by 100. A total of **616 individuals** in our sample of 1,457 reported experiencing at least one controlling or abusive tactic from an intimate partner during the last year. Therefore, the prevalence rate of controlling and abusive tactics in our sample was **42%**. Of those who reported experiencing at least one controlling or abusive tactic from an intimate partner during the last year, 40% reported experiencing 1 – 5 acts, 17% reported experiencing 6 – 10 acts, 11% reported experiencing 11 – 15 acts, and 30% reported experiencing 16 or more acts. More detailed information regarding the prevalence of controlling and abusive tactics in our sample is available for review in **Appendix C**.

Demographic Information about Individuals Reporting Controlling and Abusive Tactics

Of the 616 participants who reported experiencing at least one controlling or abusive tactic from an intimate partner during the last year, 73% identified as female, 26% identified as male, and 1% identified as transman, transwoman, or other. The breakdown by class standing was as follows: 35% freshman, 17% sophomore, 19% junior, 23% senior, 5% graduate student, and 1% special student. The majority of victims identified as Caucasian/White (75%), with 16% identifying as African-American/Black and 6% identifying as bi- or multi-racial. Ninety (90%) of victims identified as heterosexual. More detailed demographic information regarding victims is available in **Appendix C**.

The Safe Dates Physical Violence Victimization Scale lists 16 acts of physical violence (e.g., slapped, pushed, kicked) and asks participants to indicate the number of times during the past year that an intimate partner committed that act of physical violence toward them. Participants were given a scale of 0 – 10+, where 0 indicated they had not experienced that act of physical violence during the past year and a 10+ indicated they had experienced that act of physical violence 10 or more times during the past year. The Safe Dates instrument is available for review in **Appendix C**.

Incidence of Physical Violence

Incidence refers to a count of how many unique incidents of a particular act, in this case physical violence, occur during a given period of time (i.e., during the past year). The most common incidents of physical violence reported in the current sample were being pushed, grabbed, or shoved me; slammed or held against a wall; something thrown at them; being bit; being scratched; and being slapped.

Prevalence of Physical Violence

Prevalence rates are a count of how many unique people experience a particular act, in this case physical violence, during a given period of time (i.e., during the last year). According to the National Institute of Justice (2008), prevalence rates are calculated by dividing the total number of individuals who report a crime by the sample population and multiplying that number by 100. A total of **189 individuals** in our sample of 1,457 reported experiencing at least one act of physical violence during the last year. Therefore, the prevalence rate of physical violence in our sample was **13%**. Of those who reported experiencing at least one act of physical violence from an intimate partner during the last year, 27% reported experiencing 1 act, 12% reported experiencing 2 acts, 17% reported experiencing 3 acts, 6% reported experiencing 4 acts, and 38% reported experiencing 5 or more acts. More detailed information regarding the prevalence of intimate partner violence in our sample is available for review in **Appendix C**.

Demographic Information about Individuals Reporting Physical Violence

Of the 189 participants who reported experiencing at least one act of physical violence during the last year, 64% identified as female, 33% identified as male, and 3% identified as transman or other. The breakdown by class standing was as follows: 34% freshman, 21% sophomore, 19% junior, 22% senior, 3% graduate student, and 1% special student. The majority of victims identified as Caucasian/White (69%), with 22% identifying as African-American and 7% identifying as bi- or multi-racial. The majority of victims (85%) identified as heterosexual. More detailed demographic information regarding victims is available in **Appendix C**.

Disclosure of Intimate Partner Violence

Participants who reported experiencing intimate partner violence (i.e., controlling or abusive tactics and/or physical acts of violence) were asked a series of follow-up questions. Of the 143 victims who participated in the follow-up questions, 43% said they had told at least one person about their experience with intimate partner violence, while 57% said they did not tell anyone about their experience with intimate partner violence. Victims who said they had told at least one person about their experience with intimate partner violence were asked to identify who they told and were allowed to indicate multiple individuals if they had told more than one person. Victims were approximately twice as likely to disclose to a close friend than to any other group listed, including roommates, romantic partners, parents, counselors, faculty, staff, police, or victim support services. If victims indicated they did not tell anyone about their experience with intimate partner violence, they were asked to indicate why and were allowed to indicate multiple reasons. The most common reasons listed by victims who did not disclose were: it was a private matter; ashamed/embarrassed; didn't want others to worry about them; didn't think it was that serious; didn't think others would understand; and didn't have time to deal with it. More detailed demographic information regarding disclosure is available for review in **Appendix C**.

Reporting of Intimate Partner Violence

When asked if they were aware of UNA's formal procedures to report their experience(s) with intimate partner violence, 62% of victims reported yes and 38% said no. Out of 81 individuals who responded to the question, only 9% of victims ($N=7$) chose to use UNA's formal procedures to report the incident. These individuals were asked to indicate how much they were helped by UNA's formal procedures on a scale of 1 – 4 (1=didn't help me at all; 4=helped me a lot). The average rating of UNA's formal procedures by those who utilized them was a 3.25 ($SD=1.04$) with 63% of those who utilized the services reporting that they were helped a lot by them. More detailed information regarding reporting is available for review in **Appendix C**.

Comparison of Reported Physical Violence from an Intimate Partner between 2014 and 2016 Samples

A comparison of controlling and abusive tactics was not possible, because the New Controlling and Abusive Tactics Scale (CAT 2-C) was not included in the 2014 version of the Student Campus Climate Survey. However, the Safe Dates Physical Violence Victimization Scale was included in both the 2014 and 2016 versions of the survey.

A chi-square test was conducted to determine if there was a difference between the 2014 and 2016 samples in the number of participants who reported experiencing physical violence from an intimate partner. The results indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two samples. See Table 4 for a comparison of the prevalence rates of reported physical violence from an intimate partner between the 2014 and 2016 samples.

Table 4. *Comparison of the Prevalence Rates of Reported Physical Violence from an Intimate Partner between the 2014 and 2016 Samples.*

| | Prevalence Rate |
|--|-----------------|
| 2014 Reported Physical Violence from an Intimate Partner | 16% |
| 2016 Reported Physical Violence from an Intimate Partner | 13% |

A comparison of the awareness and utilization of UNA’s formal procedures to report intimate partner violence was not possible, because the 2014 version of the survey did not specifically ask these follow-up questions to victims who reported experiencing intimate partner violence. These follow-up questions were included in the 2016 survey and those results are available in the section titled “Reporting of Intimate Partner Violence.”

IV. Stalking/Bullying

Stalking/bullying was assessed using the **National Violence Against Women (NVAW) Scale**. The U.S. Department of Justice (2008) validated this scale using a large nationally representative sample of 8,000 men and 8,000 women. This scale lists 14 acts of stalking/bullying (e.g., unwanted text messages, following or spying, soliciting information from friends) and asks participants to indicate the number of times during the past year that they have experienced that act. Participants were given a scale of 0 – 5,000+, where 0 indicated they had not experienced that act of stalking/bullying during the past year and 5,000+ indicated they had experienced that act of stalking/bullying 5,000 or more times during the past year. The NVAW instrument is available for review in **Appendix D**.

Incidence of Stalking/Bullying

Incidence refers to a count of how many unique incidents of a particular act, in this case stalking/bullying, occur during a given period of time (i.e., during the past year). The most common incidents of stalking/bullying reported in the current sample were receiving unwanted private messages through social media; unwanted text messages; unwanted posts on social media; unwanted phone calls; and having their friends approached for information about them or to seek them out.

Prevalence of Stalking/Bullying

Prevalence rates are a count of how many unique people experience a particular act, in this case stalking/bullying, during a given period of time (i.e., during the last year). According to the National Institute of Justice (2008), prevalence rates are calculated by dividing the total number of individuals who report a crime by the sample population and multiplying that number by 100. A total of **450 individuals** in a sample of 1,457 reported experiencing at least one act of stalking/bullying during the last year. Therefore, the prevalence rate of stalking/bullying in our sample was **31%**. Of those who reported experiencing at least one act of stalking/bullying during the last year, 56% reported experiencing 1 – 3 acts, 24% reported experiencing 4 - 6 acts, and 20% reported experiencing 7 or more acts. More detailed information regarding the prevalence of stalking/bullying in our sample is available for review in **Appendix D**.

Demographic Information about Individuals Reporting Stalking/Bullying

Of the 450 participants who reported experiencing at least one act of stalking/bullying during the last year, 78% identified as female, 20% identified as male, and 2% identified as transman, transwoman, or other. The breakdown by class standing was as follows: 32% freshman, 20% sophomore, 20% junior, 22% senior, 5.5% graduate student, and 0.5% special student. The

majority of victims identified as Caucasian/White (77%), with 13% identifying as African-American/Black and 7% identifying as bi- or multi- racial. The majority of victims (85%) identified as heterosexual. More detailed demographic information regarding victims is available in **Appendix D**.

Disclosure of Stalking/Bullying

Participants who reported experiencing stalking/bullying were asked a series of follow-up questions. Of the 124 victims who participated in the follow-up questions, 58% said they had told at least one person about their experience with stalking/bullying, while 42% said they did not tell anyone about their experience. Victims who said they had told at least one person about their experience with stalking/bullying were asked to identify who they told and were allowed to indicate multiple individuals if they had told more than one person. Victims were approximately twice as likely to disclose to a close friend than to any other group listed, including roommates, romantic partners, parents, counselors, faculty, staff, police, or victim support services. If victims indicated they did not tell anyone about their experience with stalking/bullying, they were asked to indicate why and were allowed to indicate multiple reasons. The most common reasons listed by victims who did not disclose were it was a private matter; didn't think it was that serious; didn't have time to deal with it; and didn't want others to worry about me. More detailed demographic information regarding disclosure is available for review in **Appendix D**.

Reporting of Stalking/Bullying

When asked if they were aware of UNA's formal procedures to report their experience(s) with bullying/stalking, 56% of victims reported yes and 44% said no. Out of 71 individuals who responded to the question, only 10% of victims (N=7) chose to use UNA's formal procedures to report the incident. These individuals were asked to indicate how much they were helped by UNA's formal procedures on a scale of 1 – 4 (1=didn't help me at all; 4=helped me a lot). The average rating of UNA's formal procedures by those who utilized them was a 3.13 (SD=1.24) with 63% of those who utilized the services reporting that they were helped a lot by them. More detailed information regarding reporting is available for review in **Appendix D**.

Comparison of Reported Stalking/Bullying between 2014 and 2016 Samples

A chi-square test was conducted to determine if there was a difference between the 2014 and 2016 samples in the number of participants who reported experiencing stalking/bullying. The results indicated there was not a statistically significant difference between the two samples. See Table 5 for a comparison of the prevalence rates of reported stalking/bullying between the 2014 and 2016 samples.

Table 5. *Comparison of the Prevalence Rates of Reported Stalking/Bullying between the 2014 and 2016 Samples.*

| | Prevalence Rate |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| 2014 Reported Stalking/Bullying | 36 |
| 2016 Reported Stalking/Bullying | 31 |

A comparison of the awareness and utilization of UNA's formal procedures to report stalking/bullying was not possible, because the 2014 version of the survey did not specifically ask these follow-up questions to victims who reported experiencing stalking/bullying. These follow-up questions were included in the 2016 survey and those results are available in the section titled "Reporting of Stalking/Bullying."

V. Perceptions of General Campus Climate

Perceptions of the general campus climate were assessed using two scales: (1) the School Connectedness Scale (McNeely, Nonnemaker, & Blum, 2002), and (2) the Trust in the College Support System Scale (Sulkowski, 2011). Both scales are available for review in **Appendix E**.

The School Connectedness Scale asks students questions that assess their level of agreement with statements indicating that they feel valued and connected to the university, faculty, administration, and their fellow students. In the 2016 survey, an overwhelming majority of survey respondents (84%) “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with statements indicating they felt valued and connected to the university, while 16% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with those statements. A detailed breakdown of participants’ responses is available for review in **Appendix E**.

Trust in the College Support System Scale asks students questions that assess their level of agreement with statements indicating that the university system does enough to protect students’ safety and provides a good support system for students who experience difficulties. In the 2016 survey, 46% of survey respondents “agreed” or “strongly agreed” with statements indicating the university system does enough to protect students’ safety and provides a good support system for students who experience difficulties, while 54% “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with those statements. A detailed breakdown of participants’ responses is available for review in **Appendix E**.

Comparison of Perceptions of General Campus Climate between 2014 and 2016 Samples

An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare scores between the 2014 and 2016 samples on the School Connectedness Scale. There was a significant difference in the mean scores on the School Connected Scale [$t(2030) = -4.01, p < .001$] with 2016 respondents ($M=3.38; SD=.50$) reporting significantly higher scores on the scale than 2014 respondents ($M=3.30; SD=.50$). The effect size was small (Cohen’s $d = .16$) but statistically significant. See Table 6 for a comparison of students’ responses to the School Connectedness Scale between the 2014 and 2016 samples.

Table 6. *Comparison of the School Connected Scale between the 2014 and 2016 samples.*

| | % strongly agree / agree | % strongly disagree / disagree | <i>N</i> | <i>mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|----------|-------------|-----------|
| 2014 School Connectedness Scale | 79 | 21 | 957 | 3.30 | .50 |
| 2016 School Connectedness Scale | 84 | 16 | 1403 | 3.38 | .50 |

An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare scores between the 2014 and 2016 samples on the Trust in the College Support System. There was a significant difference in the mean scores on the Trust in the College Support System [$t(2333) = -3.78, p < .001$] with 2016 respondents ($M=2.85; SD=.45$) reporting significantly higher scores on the scale than 2014 respondents ($M=2.78; SD=.47$). The effect size was small (Cohen’s $d = .15$) but statistically significant. See Table 7 for a comparison of students’ responses to the Trust in the College Support System Scale between the 2014 and 2016 samples.

Table 7. Comparison of the Trust in the College Support System Scale between the 2014 and 2016 samples.

| | % strongly agree / agree | % strongly disagree / disagree | <i>N</i> | <i>mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|----------|-------------|-----------|
| 2014 Trust in the College Support System | 39 | 61 | 954 | 2.78 | .47 |
| 2016 Trust in the College Support System | 46 | 54 | 1381 | 2.85 | .45 |

VI. Perceptions of Campus Leadership, Policies, and Reporting Practices

Perceptions of campus leadership, policies, and reporting practices relating to sexual assault were assessed using adapted versions of two scales: (1) the Department of Defense Equal Opportunity Climate Survey, and (2) the Carleton College Campus Climate Survey. Both scales are available for review in **Appendix F**.

The adapted version of the Department of Defense Equal Opportunity Climate Survey assesses students' perceptions of how campus authorities at the university would respond to someone reporting sexual assault. Nearly 80% of survey respondents indicated that they believed our campus authorities would be "very likely" or "moderately likely" to take the report seriously, protect the safety of the person making the report, and take appropriate corrective action, while 21% reported that would be "slightly likely" or "not likely at all."

The adapted version of the Carleton College Campus Climate Survey assesses students' knowledge of resources on campus that address sexual assault and its formal reporting procedures. Over 70% of respondents "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with statements indicating that if they or a friend were assaulted they would know where to get help and that they understand UNA's formal reporting procedures. Twenty percent (20%) of survey respondents reported that they "neither agreed nor disagreed," with those statements. The remaining 8% "disagreed," or "strongly disagreed" with those statements. A detailed breakdown of participants' responses on both scales is available for review in **Appendix F**.

Comparison of Perceptions of Campus Leadership, Policies, and Reporting Practices between 2014 and 2016 Samples

An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare scores between the 2014 and 2016 samples on the Department of Defense Equal Opportunity (DOD-EO) Climate Survey. There was a significant difference in the mean scores on the DOD-EO Climate Survey [$t(2301) = -6.35, p < .001$] with 2016 respondents ($M=3.33; SD=.47$) reporting significantly higher scores on the scale than 2014 respondents ($M=3.20; SD=.50$). The effect size was small (Cohen's $d = .26$) but statistically significant. See Table 8. for a comparison of students' responses to the DOD-EO Climate Survey between the 2014 and 2016 samples.

Table 8. Comparison of the DOD-EO Climate Survey between the 2014 and 2016 samples.

| | % very – moderately likely | % slightly – not all likely | <i>N</i> | <i>mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| 2014 DOD-EO Climate Survey | 70 | 30 | 942 | 3.20 | .50 |
| 2016 DOD-EO Climate Survey | 79 | 21 | 1361 | 3.33 | .47 |

An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare scores between the 2014 and 2016 samples on the Carleton College Campus Climate Survey. There was a significant difference in the mean scores on the Carleton College Campus Climate Survey [$t(1906) = -11.01, p < .001$] with 2016 respondents ($M=4.16; SD=.88$) reporting significantly higher scores on the scale than 2014 respondents ($M=3.73; SD=.98$). The effect size was medium (Cohen's $d = .46$) and statistically significant. See Table 9 for a comparison of students' responses to the Carleton College Campus Climate Survey between the 2014 and 2016 samples.

Table 9. Comparison of the Carleton College Campus Climate Survey between the 2014 and 2016 samples.

| | % strongly agree / agree | % neither agree/ disagree | % strongly disagree / disagree | <i>N</i> | <i>mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| 2014 Carleton College Campus Climate Survey | 51 | 30 | 19 | 957 | 3.73 | .98 |
| 2016 Carleton College Campus Climate Survey | 72 | 20 | 8 | 1394 | 4.16 | .88 |

VII. Rape Myth Acceptance

It is critical to examine rape myth acceptance in any college community, because rape myths blame victims and minimize their experiences, justify the actions of perpetrators, and discourage victims from reporting and seeking help (King & Roberts, 2011). In the current survey, rape myth acceptance was assessed using the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale, which contains five subscales: (1) she asked for it; (2) it wasn't really rape; (3) she lied; (4) he didn't mean to; and (5) he didn't mean to – alcohol. Participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with each item on a scale of 1 – 5 (1=strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree). The Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale is available for review in **Appendix G**.

Table 10 includes a breakdown of the percentages of participants' agreement with statements indicating acceptance of rape myths. A more detailed breakdown of participants' responses on the overall scale and subscales is available for review in **Appendix G**.

Table 10. Percentages of participants' agreement with statements indicating acceptance of rape myths.

| | % strongly disagree / disagree | % neither agree / disagree | % strongly agree / agree |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Rape Myth Acceptance: Total Scale | 85 | 14 | 1 |
| Subscale: She asked for it | 80 | 17 | 3 |
| Subscale: It wasn't really rape | 89 | 9.5 | 1.5 |
| Subscale: She lied | 69 | 25 | 6 |
| Subscale: He didn't mean to | 62 | 28 | 10 |
| Subscale: He didn't mean to – alcohol | 80 | 18 | 2 |

Rape Myth Acceptance by Gender

Independent samples *t*-tests revealed significant differences ($p < .001$) in rape myth acceptance based on gender. Women were significantly less likely to agree with rape myths than men, and this finding was true for the overall scale and for all subscales. See **Appendix G** for the means

and standard deviations for males versus females and results of *t*-tests comparing rape myth acceptance by gender.

Rape Myth Acceptance by Class Standing

A one-way analysis of variance revealed significant differences ($p < .001$) in rape myth acceptance based on class standing. Table 11 includes a breakdown of differences by class standing. A more detailed breakdown of the findings is available for review in **Appendix G**.

Table 11. *Significant differences in rape myth acceptance by class standing.*

| | Tukey post hoc results |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Rape Myth Acceptance: Total Scale | Freshmen > Junior** |
| | Freshmen > Senior*** |
| | Freshmen > Graduate** |
| Subscale: She asked for it | Freshmen > Junior** |
| | Freshmen > Senior*** |
| Subscale: It wasn't really rape | Freshmen > Junior** |
| | Freshmen > Senior** |
| | Freshmen > Graduate** |
| | Sophomore > Graduate* |
| Subscale: He didn't mean to | Freshmen > Senior*** |
| | Freshmen > Graduate*** |
| Subscale: He didn't mean to – alcohol | Freshmen > Junior* |
| | Freshmen > Senior** |
| | Freshmen > Graduate* |

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Comparison of Rape Myth Acceptance between the 2014 and 2016 Samples

An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare scores between the 2014 and 2016 samples on the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale and its subscales. There was a significant difference in the mean scores on the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale [$t(1588) = 3.31, p < .001$] and the following subscales: She asked for it [$t(1709) = 4.12, p < .001$]; It wasn't really rape [$t(1522) = 3.50, p < .001$]; and He didn't mean to [$t(1705) = 2.52, p < .01$].

In both the overall scale and identified subscales, the 2016 sample reported significantly lower acceptance of rape myths than the 2014 sample. The effect sizes were small (Cohen's *d* ranged from .11 - .18) but statistically significant. See Table 12 for a comparison of students' responses to the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale and its subscales in 2014 and 2016.

Table 12. *Comparison of the Illinois Rape Myth Acceptance Scale and its subscales between the 2014 and 2016 samples.*

| | % strongly disagree / disagree | % neither agree / disagree | % strongly agree / agree | <i>N</i> | <i>mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| 2014 RMA: Total Scale | 69 | 25 | 6 | 812 | 2.09 | .88 |
| 2016 RMA: Total Scale | 85 | 14 | 1 | 1195 | 1.96 | .77 |
| 2014 Subscale: She asked for it | 59 | 28 | 13 | 842 | 4.33 | 1.08 |
| 2016 Subscale: She asked for it | 80 | 17 | 3 | 1230 | 4.12 | 1.17 |
| 2014 Subscale: It wasn't really rape | 79 | 15 | 6 | 835 | 1.67 | .97 |
| 2016 Subscale: It wasn't really rape | 89 | 9.5 | 1.5 | 1223 | 1.53 | .77 |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----|----|----|------|------|------|
| 2014 Subscale: He didn't mean to | 52 | 27 | 21 | 844 | 2.42 | 1.21 |
| 2016 Subscale: He didn't mean to | 62 | 28 | 10 | 1219 | 2.29 | 1.11 |

VIII. Bystander Attitudes

Bystander attitudes refer to individuals' perceptions and actions when they are present in risky situations that could lead to sexual assault as well as their beliefs about their responsibility to raise awareness and prevent sexual assault in their community (Banyard, 2008). In the current survey, bystander attitudes were assessed using the Bystander Attitudes Scale, Revised (BAS-R; McMahan, Postmus, & Koenick, 2011), which assesses participants' willingness to engage in active bystander behaviors, specifically behaviors that would prevent sexual assault both for themselves (e.g. "Stop sexual activity when asked to, even if I am already sexually aroused") and others (e.g., "Check in with my friend who looks drunk when they go to a room with someone else at a party"). The scale also assesses how likely participants are to confront a friend if their behavior was sexually inappropriate (e.g., "Confront a friend who is hooking up with someone who was passed out") or report a friend who committed sexual assault. The BAS-R asks participants the likelihood of performing these active bystander behaviors on a Likert scale from 0 – 5 (0 = not likely; 5 = extremely likely). The instrument is available for review in **Appendix H**.

The majority of respondents (76%) indicated that they would be very to extremely likely to engage in active bystander behaviors. Twenty-one (21%) indicated they were moderately to somewhat likely to engage in active bystander behaviors, while 3% indicated that they would unlikely to engage in active bystander behaviors. A more detailed breakdown of participants' responses is available for review in **Appendix H**.

Bystander Attitudes by Gender

Independent samples *t*-tests revealed significant differences ($p < .001$) in bystander attitudes based on gender. Women reported that they were more likely to engage in active bystander behaviors than men. See **Appendix H** for the means and standard deviations for males versus females and results of *t*-tests comparing bystander attitudes by gender.

Bystander Attitudes by Class Standing

A one-way analysis of variance was conducted to compare bystander attitudes by class standing, and no significant differences based on class standing were found. See **Appendix H** for results from a one way analysis for bystander attitudes by class standing.

Comparison of Bystander Attitudes between the 2014 and 2016 Samples

An independent samples *t*-test was conducted to compare scores between the 2014 and 2016 samples on the Bystander Attitudes Scale. There was a significant difference in the mean scores on the Bystander Attitudes Scale [$t(1673) = -4.05, p < .001$] with 2016 respondents ($M=4.22; SD=1.03$) reporting significantly higher scores on the scale than 2014 respondents ($M=4.02; SD=1.11$). The effect size was medium (Cohen's $d = .48$) and statistically significant. See Table 13 for a comparison of students' responses to the Bystander Attitudes Scale between the 2014 and 2016 samples.

Table 13. *Comparison of the Bystander Attitudes Scale between the 2014 and 2016 samples.*

| | very – extremely likely | moderately – somewhat likely | unlikely | <i>N</i> | <i>mean</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|----------|----------|-------------|-----------|
| 2014 Bystander Attitudes Scale | 67 | 27 | 6 | 822 | 4.02 | 1.11 |
| 2016 Bystander Attitudes Scale | 76 | 21 | 3 | 1202 | 4.22 | 1.03 |

IX. Campus Climate for Sexual Minority Students

A recommendation from the UNA Title IX Education and Prevention Advisory Board was to include questions in the 2016 Student Campus Climate that would assess lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and/or questioning (LGBTQ) students’ perceptions of campus climate as it relates to sexual minorities. Students who identified LGBTQ were directed to a series of questions that assessed their perceptions of UNA’s climate in regards to sexual minorities. All questions are available for review in **Appendix I**.

Demographics

A total of 122 respondents completed the questions pertaining to campus climate for sexual minorities. The mean age of respondents was 22 years old (median age=20 years old; *SD*=5.57). The class standing of respondents was as follows: 36% freshman, 12% sophomore, 17% junior, 31% senior, 3% graduate student, and 1% special student. On average, respondents reported attending UNA for 4.10 semesters (*SD*=3.09). Sixty-eight percent (68%) of the sample identified as female (*N*=82), 21% identified as male (*N*=25), 2% as transwoman (*N*=3), 2% as transman (*N*=3), and 7% as other (*N*=9). Forty-six percent (46%) identified as bisexual (*N*=56), 23% as homosexual (*N*=28), 16% as other (*N*=20), 11% as questioning (*N*=13), and 4% as heterosexual (*N*=5).

First, participants were asked to rate their level of comfort/safety on campus (i.e. do you feel safe, at ease etc.) on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being completely uncomfortable/unsafe and 5 being very comfortable/safe. See Table 14 for a breakdown of students’ responses. A more detailed breakdown of the findings is available for review in **Appendix I**.

Table 14. *Sexual Minority Students’ Ratings of their Level of Comfort/Safety on Campus.*

| | % very – mostly comfortable/safe | % somewhat comfortable/safe; somewhat uncomfortable/unsafe | % very – mostly uncomfortable/unsafe |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Level of Comfort/Safety on Campus | 67 | 21 | 12 |

Next, participants were asked to rate how tolerant/accepting the campus is of sexual minorities (i.e. Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Questioning, etc) on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being completely intolerant/accepting and 5 being completely tolerant/accepting. See Table 15 for a breakdown of students’ responses. A more detailed breakdown of the findings is available for review in **Appendix I**.

Table 15. *Sexual Minority Students' Ratings of the Level of Tolerance/Acceptance on Campus.*

| | % completely – mostly tolerant/ accepting | % somewhat tolerant/accepting; somewhat intolerant/ unaccepting | % completely – mostly intolerant/ unaccepting |
|---|---|---|---|
| Level of Tolerance/Acceptance on Campus | 67 | 21 | 12 |

Finally, participants were asked to rate their level of agreement on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 = strongly agree; 5 = strongly disagree) with statements assessing the campus climate for sexual minorities. See Table 16 for a breakdown of students' responses. A more detailed breakdown of the findings is available for review in **Appendix I**.

Table 16. *Participants' Agreement with Statements Regarding the Campus Climate for Sexual Minorities.*

| | % strongly disagree / disagree | % neutral | % strongly agree / agree |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|
| I have experienced harassment on campus because of my sexual and/or gender identity. | 77 | 14 | 9 |
| I have experienced discrimination on campus because of my sexual and/or gender identity. | 79 | 11 | 10 |
| My academic performance has suffered at times because of my sexual and/or gender identity. | 82 | 11 | 7 |
| UNA should be doing more to enhance the educational experiences of sexual minority students. | 32 | 25 | 43 |

X. Summary and Recommendations

A comparison of the 2014 and 2016 samples provides evidence of the positive impact of Title IX programming on UNA's campus, including:

- A 24% increase in the number of victims who were aware of UNA's formal procedures to report sexual assault.
- A statistically significant increase in every measure of general campus climate. In comparison to the 2014 sample, students in the 2016 sample reported:
 - more connection to the university, faculty, administration, and their fellow students
 - more trust in the university system and its processes for protecting students' safety
 - more confidence that if they were to report a sexual assault that campus authorities would take the report seriously, protect the safety of the person making the report, and take appropriate corrective action
 - more knowledge of the resources on campus that address sexual assault and its formal reporting procedures
- A significant decrease in rape myth acceptance.
- A significant increase in bystander attitudes.

Based on these findings, it is strongly recommended that UNA continue its Title IX programming and initiatives on campus. Specifically, UNA should continue (1) the mandatory requirement of providing Title IX/Bystander Intervention education in all First Year Experience (FYE) courses, (2) the mandatory online training program, Haven, in all FYE courses, and (3)

provide several campus-wide education events throughout each academic year that focus on the prevention of power-based violence and increasing awareness of campus resources for victims.

The findings also indicate some potential areas of concern.

- An analysis of group affiliation found that social fraternity and sorority members were overrepresented as victims of sexual assault.
 - It is recommended that this population be specifically targeted for prevention programming.
- The 2016 survey included a measure of non-physical forms of intimate partner violence and over 40% of the sample reported experiencing at least one controlling and abusive tactic from an intimate partner during the last year.
 - It is recommended that the Title IX Education and Prevention Advisory Board review the Title IX/Bystander Intervention presentation that is given in FYE courses to include information about non-physical forms of intimate partner violence. It is also recommended that other campus-wide education events focus on non-physical forms of intimate partner violence.
- The 2016 survey included questions that assessed lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and/or questioning (LGBTQ) students' perceptions of campus climate as it relates to sexual minorities. Findings indicated that the majority of LGBTQ students thought that UNA could be doing more to enhance the educational experiences of sexual minority students.
 - It is recommended that follow-up focus groups be conducted with sexual minority students on campus to develop programming recommendations.
- Some of the quantitative data were difficult to interpret without qualitative feedback.
 - It is recommended that text-boxes that allow for open-ended feedback be provided after certain questions or responses in future rounds of the survey. For example, if students indicate they were dissatisfied with UNA's formal reporting procedures, an open-ended question would allow students to provide recommendations for improvement.
- Finally, there was no significant difference between the 2014 and 2016 samples in the incidence and prevalence of sexual assault, intimate partner violence, and stalking/bullying.
 - It is recommended that UNA continue to focus on increasing the effectiveness of its prevention and intervention programming in order to decrease all forms of power-based violence on campus.

References

- Banyard, V. (2008). Measurement and correlates of prosocial bystander behavior: The case of interpersonal violence. *Violence and Victims, 23*, 83–97.
- Banyard, V., Ward, S., Cohn, E., Moorhead, C., & Walsh, W. (2007). Unwanted sexual contact on campus: A comparison of women's and men's experiences. *Violence and Victims, 22*, 52–70.
- Isley, P. (1998). Sexual assault of men: College-age victims. *NAPSA Journal, 35*, 305–317.
- King, L., & Roberts, J. (2011). Traditional gender role and rape myth acceptance: From the countryside to the big city. *Women & Criminal Justice, 21*, 1-20.
- McMahon (2010). Rape myth beliefs and bystander attitudes. *Journal of American College Health, 59*, 3-11
- McNeely, C., Nonnemaker, J., & Blum, R. (2002). Promoting school connectedness: Evidence from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *The Journal of School Health, 72*, 138–146.
- National Institute of Justice (2008). Measuring frequency. Retrieved from: <http://www.nij.gov/topics/crime/rape-sexual-violence/campus/pages/measuring.aspx>
- Porter, S., & Whitcomb, M. (2003). The impact of lottery incentives on student survey response rates. *Research in Higher Education, 44*, 389-407.
- Sulkowski, M. (2011). An investigation of students' willingness to report threats of violence in campus communities. *Psychology of Violence, 1*, 53 – 65.
- U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs (2000). Extent, nature and consequences of intimate partner violence: Findings for the National Violence Against Women Survey (Report No. NCJ 181867). Retrieved from www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/181867.pdf
- White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault (2014). *Not alone: The first report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault*. Retrieved from: www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/report_0.pdf