



WILLIAM & MARY

CHARTERED 1693

2017 Sexual Misconduct Climate Study Executive Summary

Survey Summary:

The Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey was made institutional specific with minimal modification to the Association of American Universities (AAU) sexual assault and sexual misconduct survey. The surveys asks individuals to respond to questions about perceptions, orientation, bystander behavior, harassment, stalking, interpersonal/domestic violence, physical sexual violence, non-physical sexual violence, and response to sexual misconduct incidents.

Methods:

Between March 21 and April 2, 2017 and email invitation was sent to all (8,792) enrolled undergraduate and graduate students. 2,672 students responded to the survey and 1,899 students complete the survey for a university-wide response rate of 30.4% and a completion rate of 21.6%. We are 95% confident the true results are within +/- 2% of the survey results.

Findings:

56.6% (n=1356) of students said sexual misconduct was somewhat, very, or extremely problematic. 69.4% (n=1524) were the victim of at least one act of sexual misconduct. 71.3% (n=) of respondents indicated they were somewhat, very, or extremely knowledgeable about how sexual misconduct is defined at William & Mary.

Responded at least one incident of sexual misconduct happened since enrolling at William & Mary:

	All Students	Women	Men	Non-Binary
Harassment	64.9%	71% (n=1029)	44% (n=369)	67% (n=26)
Stalking	12.4%	14% (n=225)	4% (n=33)	Too few to report
Interpersonal/ Domestic Violence	20.4%	14% (n=228)	10% (n=81)	Too few to report
Physical Sexual Violence	20.9%	22% (n=365)	6% (n=52)	Too few to report
Non-physical Violence	19.9%	20% (n=331)	7% (n=57)	28% (n=11)

Women experienced all forms of sexual misconduct at a statistically significant higher rate ($p < .05$) than men. While non-binary students responded to questions, there were not enough in the sample to test for statistical significance. The same was true of student athletes, first generation, and international students. There were no statistically significant differences in occurrence rates of students of color and White students. Non-heterosexual/non-straight students experienced statistically significant higher rates of harassment, stalking, physical sexual violence, and non-physical sexual violence. ($p < .05$) There were no statistically significant differences in occurrence rates for interpersonal/domestic violence. However, without accurately knowing the orientation of all students on campus, it was unclear if the sample was representative of campus and thus generalizable.

Fraternity and Sorority Life (FSL) members made up a sizeable proportion of the sexual misconduct victims. While FSL members only made up 43% of the respondents, they made up 55% (n=789) of the harassment, 59% (n=154) of the stalking, 57% (n=23.8%) of interpersonal/domestic violence, 67.3% (n=286%) of physical sexual violence, and 66% (n=265) of non-physical sexual violence victims.

In looking as aspects of prevention and bystander behavior, 79.7% (n=310) of physical sexual violence perpetrators and 80.9% (n=313) of victims drank alcohol. 38.6% (n=732) suspected their friend had been sexually assaulted, 11.4% (n=215) of students suspected a friend had sexually assaulted an individual, 33.6% (n=631) saw or heard someone was acting in a sexually violent or harassing way, and 57.7% (n=1082) have seen a drunk person heading off for what looked like a sexual encounter. Even though individuals suspected or saw something, between 38-60% of individuals did nothing because they were unsure what to do or for another reason.

FSL members reported a statistically significant higher rate ($p < 0.0$) of suspecting a friend was a victim of sexual assault or a perpetrator, seeing or hearing someone was acting in a sexually violent way, and a drunk person heading off for what looked like a sexual encounter. While there was no statistical difference in their response suspecting a friend was a perpetrator, victim, or having seen or heard someone was acting in a sexually violent way, there was a statistical difference in their response to seeing a drunk person heading off for what looked like a sexual encounter. 44% of FSL members did something compared to only 32% of unaffiliated students ($p < 0.0$).

We asked students their opinions regarding student body and campus officials' response to sexual misconduct incidents. The following were the questions asked:

	Very or Extremely likely	
	%	n
The student body would support the person making the report	66%	1227
The alleged offender(s) or their associates would retaliate against the person making the report	24%	436
Campus officials would take the report seriously	61%	1136
Campus officials would protect the safety of the person making the report	61%	1126
Campus officials would conduct a fair investigation	48%	888
Campus officials would take action against the offender(s)	40%	730
Campus officials would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct	34%	633

FSL members and victims of sexual misconduct, on average, reported a higher likelihood of retaliation by associates of perpetrator ($p < 0.5$) and a lower likelihood campus officials will take the report seriously, protect the person making the report, conduct a fair investigation, take action against the offender and address the factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct. ($p < 0.0$). In addition, sexual misconduct victims also reported on average, a lower likelihood the student body would support the person making the report and a victim's wishes to report but not investigate being honored ($p < 0.0$).

Limitations: The survey was fairly representative of the student body, though there were a few demographics that were over reported, underreported, or unknown for the entire student body. While the survey asked the sexual orientations of respondents, we do not have enough respondents identified as non-heterosexual to determine statistical differences of their experiences. This is also true for student athletes, gender non-binary, non-citizen/permanent residents, first-generation, and transfer student respondents. Sexual orientation, gender identity, and are all demographics that are unknown for the campus. Students living on campus and FSL members responded at a higher percentage than their overall campus percentages.

Next Steps: The focus of the 2017-18 academic year has been sharing the results with key stakeholders across campus and utilizing the results to inform our practices. This survey administration gave us better data to begin looking for areas to improve not only in our prevention efforts, but also or response to incidents of sexual misconduct and our victim support efforts. Though a combination of self-reflection, data analysis, and best practice review, we can continue to make updates/improvements and begin to measure their effect over time on upcoming survey administrations.

With a new bystander intervention programing kicking off this spring, further exploration of bystander behavior, the role of alcohol and the circumstances surrounding sexual misconduct should be explored. With an increased focus on incorporating survey statistics into trainings for all students and faculty, and increased communication around the reporting and investigation process of sexual misconduct, a deeper exploration of student opinions on response efforts and the reasons behind them would be beneficial.