

RESULTS OF 2015 UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
CAMPUS CLIMATE SURVEY ON
SEXUAL MISCONDUCT



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

I.	Executive Summary	4
II.	Survey Design and Methodology	7
	A. Sample Design	7
	B. Questionnaire Design	7
	C. Field Work Design and Implementation	7
III.	Survey Response Rates	8
IV.	Survey Respondents	9
V.	Survey Responses	10
	A. Campus Climate Regarding Sexual Misconduct, Student Sexual Misconduct Policy and Process to Address Complaints of Sexual Misconduct	10
	B. Education, Prevention, and Likely Reporting to Campus Resources	10
	C. Personal Experiences Regarding Sexual Activity	11
	D. Sexual Misconduct Victimization	12
	E. Specific Incidents: Reporting	17
	F. Specific Incident: Locations, Perpetrators and Impacts	18
	G. Perpetrating Nonconsensual Sexual Experiences	19
VI.	Analysis of Risk Factors	20
Appendix A		22
	A. Sample Design	22
	B. Questionnaire Design	23
	C. Field Work Design and Implementation	23
	D. Post-Survey Adjustment and Weighting	24
	E. Confidentiality	25
	F. Questionnaire Specific Reports of “Don’t Know” Responses	25

INTRODUCTION

The 2015 University of Michigan Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Misconduct reflects the University's commitment to a thorough, transparent, and honest self-examination of the problem of sexual misconduct that affects our students. In January 2015, U-M sent the survey to a representative sample of 3,000 students on the Ann Arbor campus to ask questions about their experiences with sexual misconduct and their views regarding campus climate and related resources. The survey instrument and methodology were designed by a team led by U-M's Survey Research Center, and included representatives from Student Life, the Office of the General Counsel, and SoundRocket (formerly known as Survey Sciences Group), an independent survey research firm headquartered in Ann Arbor, Michigan. The purpose of the survey was to gain a deep understanding of the prevalence and incidence of sexual assault on campus, as well as students' views regarding campus climate and resources, so that U-M can improve its education and prevention efforts, strengthen existing services for survivors, and ultimately, create a safer and more caring community.

This document summarizes the results of the survey, as well as the survey design and methodology used to produce these results. Throughout the upcoming academic year, U-M staff will work with the U-M community to use the survey data to answer additional important questions, including how to more effectively address and prevent sexual misconduct.

WARNING: This report uses explicit language, including anatomical names of body parts and specific behaviors, to discuss data about sexual situations. These situations include sexual misconduct, broadly defined to include nonconsensual (also known as unwanted) kissing and touching; oral vaginal, or anal penetration, and sexual harassment. Reading this report might remind you of experiences that you, friend, or family member have gone through. If you would like to talk to someone confidentially about questions or concerns relating to sexual misconduct, including sexual assault, please contact one of the following resources:

Students

Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC) – <http://sapac.umich.edu>

Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) – <http://caps.umich.edu/counseling>

Faculty and Staff

Faculty and Staff Assistance Program (FASAP) –

http://hr.umich.edu/mhealthy/programs/mental_emotional/counseling-consultation/fasap/contact.html

UMHS Employee Assistance Program (UMHS EAP) –

http://hr.umich.edu/mhealthy/programs/mental_emotional/counseling-consultation/eap/index.html

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sexual misconduct is a long-standing societal problem. Data from the 2002 United States National Survey of Family Growth, which studies families, relationships, sexual experience and reproductive health, indicate that 22.6% of women in the United States aged 18-44 were “ever forced to have sexual intercourse” in their lifetimes.¹ The same study indicates that 7.6% of men aged 18-44 were ever forced to have sexual intercourse.² Data from The Department of Justice’s National Crime Victimization Survey show that females ages 18 to 24 consistently experienced higher rates of rape and sexual assault than females in other age brackets.³ However, the same study also shows that females ages 18-24 not enrolled in a college were 1.2 times more likely to experience rape and sexual assault victimization, compared to college students in the same range.⁴ Although such data provide some evidence that young people enrolled in college are at less risk of sexual assault than those in the same ages who are not enrolled in college, recent studies show that the risk on campuses is substantial.

It is currently estimated that one in five women is sexually assaulted while in college. The “1 in 5” statistic is not from a national survey regarding the prevalence of sexual assault, but is derived from a 2007 study, The Campus Sexual Assault Study, of a sample of undergraduate women at two large public universities, one in the South and one in the Midwest.⁵ The survey found that as many as 20% of undergraduate female students experienced sexual assault, broadly defined in that study to include any form of nonconsensual sexual experience, including unwanted kissing, groping, digital penetration, or oral, vaginal, or anal sex.⁶ The rate of nonconsensual oral, vaginal, or anal penetration was significantly lower than the overall statistic for unwanted sexual experiences.⁷ And the same study indicated that approximately 6.1% of men are assaulted while in college.⁸

Differences in survey design or methodology make precise comparisons across sexual misconduct surveys difficult, if not impossible, but more recent surveys continue to show that the levels of nonconsensual sexual experiences involving college students are high and highest among undergraduate females. For example, the 2014 Community Attitudes on Sexual Assault survey conducted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology shows that 17% of undergraduate females reported attempted or completed nonconsensual touching or kissing, oral sex or sexual penetration by force, physical threat, or incapacitation (compared to 5% of undergraduate males).⁹ Similarly, a Washington Post/Kaiser Family Foundation survey found that 20% of current or recent female college students reported being sexually assaulted while attending school.¹⁰ In that survey, sexual assault was broadly defined to include nonconsensual kissing or touching; oral, vaginal, or anal sex; and digital penetration by force or while incapacitated.

Our collective success in developing strategies to reduce sexual misconduct across the country will only improve based upon reliable available data regarding the prevalence of specific types and circumstances of sexual misconduct. It is against this backdrop that U-M is committed to sharing its data to inform the difficult and necessary discussions we must have to develop and implement the most effective solutions to combat this problem. The U-M climate survey shows:

While approximately 89% of U-M students said that they feel safe from sexual misconduct on the Ann Arbor campus, 11.4% of all students experienced some form of nonconsensual touching and kissing or oral, vaginal, or anal penetration – including 22.5% of undergraduate females and 6.8% of undergraduate males. The survey also found that 9.7% of all female students (graduate and undergraduate) experienced unwanted oral, vaginal, or anal penetration (compared to 1.4% of male students). In most cases, the unwanted sexual penetration occurred primarily after verbal pressure and under the influence of drugs or alcohol. “Verbal pressure” was described in the survey as “continually verbally pressuring you after you said they didn’t want to. This includes telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, showing displeasure, criticizing your sexuality or attractiveness or getting angry but not using physical force.” Fewer than 1% of students reported

nonconsensual penetration due to the use of physical force. “Physical force” was described as “holding you down with their body weight, pinning your arms or having a weapon.”

Most incidents of nonconsensual sexual experiences occurred off or near campus (only 14.5% of undergraduate students and 6.3% of graduate students had nonconsensual sexual experiences on campus). In most cases (56%), students who had an unwanted sexual experience said another U-M student was responsible. Only 5.5% of students reported no prior relationship or did not know the perpetrator.

Among students who said they had a least one unwanted sexual experience at U-M, only 46% told someone else, most often, a friend or a roommate. Just 3.6% of students reported the incident to an official University resource or law enforcement, including the Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center, Counseling and Psychological Services, Office of Institutional Equity, Office of the Dean of Students, Office of Student Conflict Resolution, the Ann Arbor or U-M police department. When asked why they did not report their experience, most students who responded said they did not want to get the person responsible in trouble, or they blamed themselves. A significant number also felt embarrassed or ashamed, did not think U-M would do anything, or did not believe the incident was serious enough to merit a report.

U-M’s data analysis also identified some specific factors that correlate to the risk of experiencing unwanted sexual penetration:

- Females were nearly 8 times more at risk than males.
- Undergraduates were 3 times more at risk than graduate students.
- Lesbian, gay or bisexual students were 2.5 times more at risk than heterosexual students.
- Underrepresented minority students were 2 times more at risk than white students.
- Sorority or fraternity members were 2.5 times more at risk than non-Greek students.
- Club (not varsity) sports members were 2 times more at risk than non-club sports students.

There is no statistically significant difference in risk for undergraduate females or males by class rank, *i.e.*, freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior. In other words, undergraduate freshman women and men were not more likely to be assaulted than undergraduates of any other class rank.

The survey also asked about sexual harassment and nearly 23% of all students reported experiencing some form of sexual harassment; most said they had been stared at in a sexual way, had been the subject of teasing comments of a sexual nature or someone had made a sexual motion towards the student, all in spite of requests to stop.

The survey also asked more generally about sexual activity among students. Nearly 80% of all students surveyed reported they had engaged in some form of sexual activity, including kissing and fondling, in the past 12 months. Among those students, most sought – and gave – non-verbal consent. More than 15% of students were drinking more than 50% of the time when they engaged in sexual activity in the past 12 months, while nearly 7% of students were drunk more than 50% of the time.

Set forth below is a more detailed discussion of the survey design and methodology, survey response rates, and survey responses, including the results to questions about (1) views of the campus climate relating to sexual misconduct and knowledge of U-M’s Student Sexual Misconduct Policy, (2) participation in campus sexual misconduct prevention and education programming and views of reporting options, (3) personal experiences regarding consensual sexual activity, (4) experiences of sexual misconduct, (5) reporting of sexual misconduct, (6) specific incidents of sexual misconduct: locations, perpetrators, and impacts, and (7) perpetration of sexual misconduct. This report provides data for almost every substantive question in the survey instrument and the order of the survey response data set forth below is consistent with the order in which the questions were asked in

the survey instrument. For more information about U-M's Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Misconduct, including a copy of the survey instrument, please go to <https://publicaffairs.vpcomm.umich.edu/key-issues/faq-on-2015-campus-climate-surveys-regarding-sexual-misconduct/>.

II. SURVEY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

A. SAMPLE DESIGN

Given the large U-M student population, this study used a sample survey approach rather than a census of all students. The survey was sent to a random sample of 3,000 undergraduate and graduate students. U-M chose a randomly selected sample, because it allows researchers to make scientifically based inferences to the population as a whole, and to focus finite research resources on successfully contacting and encouraging the participation of the broadest, most inclusive, most representative group of students.

B. QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The survey instrument and methodology was designed by a team, led by the U-M's Survey Research Center, and included representatives from Student Life; the Office of the General Counsel; and Sound Rocket (formerly known as Survey Sciences Group), an independent survey research organization headquartered in Ann Arbor, Michigan. The team identified the purpose of the survey measurements to include both the prevalence and incidence of sexual assault on campus, as well as perceptions of campus climate. The methodological team drew heavily upon behavioral-specific questions from the Sexual Experiences Survey to measure the prevalence and incidence of sexual assault, because such questions have been researched and validated.¹¹

C. FIELD WORK DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

The field work for this survey followed a classic two-phase responsive design approach, with web-based data collection in the first phase and interviewer assisted web-based interviewing in the second phase. Several tools were used to maximize participation in Phase 1 of the study. These included:

- A message from the U-M President to the entire campus explaining the importance of the issue and the survey.
- Pre-notification letters sent by mail and email before the survey was launched.
- A combination of both a lottery-style incentive and an individual incentive.
- Reminder emails to encourage participation.

A schedule and contact protocol was designed to maximize response. Attention was paid to the contact contents as well as timing. Only nonrespondents to previous contacts were included in follow-up efforts, so that those who had responded were not bothered.^{12 13 14 15}

Due to the expected high costs of telephone and face-to-face contacts employed,^{16 17 18} Phase 2 of the survey chose a random sample of the non-respondents who remained at the close of Phase 1. Professional survey interviewers attempted to contact non-respondents and encourage them to participate in the survey. Because Phase 2 involved telephone and face-to-face contact, Phase 2 sampling was stratified by on campus vs. off campus, and whether a telephone number was available. Very few on campus cases did not have a telephone number, producing three strata: 1) off campus, no telephone number available, 2) off campus, telephone number available, and 3) on campus. The sample rates were 0.333, 0.6, and 0.6 respectively. The inverse of these selection rates was used as a selection weight.

III. SURVEY RESPONSE RATES

Although the overall response rate to this survey was 67% of those invited, this response rate varied across sub-groups within the population invited to participate. Of those living on campus, 75% responded, and of those living off campus, 64% responded. Of the women invited to participate, 71% responded, and of the men invited to participate, 62% responded. Of the undergraduate students invited to participate, 62% responded and of the graduate and professional students invited to participate, 77% responded.

IV. SURVEY RESPONDENTS

The population estimates of U-M students are provided throughout the report based upon responses to the survey. This includes the presentation of characteristics of the students participating in the survey. Each section of the report displays percentages of the student population for each item in the survey and 95% Confidence Limits (CL).

Table A.1 shows characteristics of the students who participated in the survey. As explained in the Appendix, because the estimates for the entire population of U-M students are based on a sample of the students, each statistic reported has some associated sampling variability and the CL describes the size of that sampling variability. In each case the CL describes the range of the statistic such that if 100 samples were drawn from the U-M student population, 95 of those estimates would fall within that range (the CL).

<i>Table A.1: Estimated Percentage of Types of U-M Students in the 2015 Campus Climate Survey (95% Confidence Limits)</i>	
	Percentage of U-M Students (Confidence Limits)
Female	48.5 (45.9, 51.2)
Male	51.5 (48.8, 54.1)
Undergraduate	66.6 (64.2, 69.0)
Graduate/Professional	33.4 (31.01, 35.8)
GSI/GSRA	8.8 (7.6, 10.1)
Heterosexual	92.0 (90.6, 93.4)
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, And Other	8.04 (6.6, 9.4)
Race	
White	64.5 (61.9, 67.0)
Asian	19.0 (16.9, 21.0)
Underrepresented	16.6 (14.5, 18.6)
Residence	
On campus	24.1 (22.0, 26.3)
Fraternity/Sorority	2.8 (1.9, 3.7)
Family	3.9 (2.8, 5.1)
Off campus in Ann Arbor	62.2 (59.7, 64.8)
Off campus out of Ann Arbor	6.3 (4.9, 7.6)
Memberships	
Fraternity/Sorority	16.9 (14.9, 18.8)
Varsity Sports Team	2.8 (1.9, 3.8)
Club Sports Team	5.1 (4.0, 6.3)
Marching Band	1.6 (1.0, 2.3)
ROTC	0.7 (0.3, 1.2)

V. SURVEY RESPONSES

Set forth below are data for almost every substantive question in the survey instrument. The order of the sections that follow are consistent with the order in which the questions were asked in the survey instrument. Responses are generally provided by gender (female, male)¹⁹ and student type (undergraduate, graduate).

A. CAMPUS CLIMATE REGARDING SEXUAL MISCONDUCT, STUDENT SEXUAL MISCONDUCT POLICY AND PROCESS TO ADDRESS COMPLAINTS OF SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

The survey asked students to report their knowledge of U-M policies and their overall feelings of safety at U-M. 85.9% (CL: 84.1, 87.8)²⁰ of U-M students know U-M has a Student Sexual Misconduct Policy and 88.8% (CL: 87.3, 90.4) of U-M students feel relatively safe from sexual misconduct at U-M. More detailed estimates are provided in Table 4A.1.

Table 4A.1: Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students Answering That They Strongly Agree or Agree With Each of the Following Statements

	Female Undergraduates %	Female Graduates %	Male Undergraduates %	Male Graduates %
Know that U-M has a Student Sexual Misconduct Policy	84.7 (81.4, 88.0)	83.4 (79.1, 87.7)	91.2 (88.1, 94.4)	80.7 (76.3, 85.1)
Know where to find/read U-M's Student Sexual Misconduct Policy	31.8 (27.4, 36.2)	36.1 (29.9, 42.3)	48.3 (42.8, 53.8)	45.2 (38.9, 51.5)
Am generally aware of U-M's process to address complaints of sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, stalking, and intimate partner violence	48.0 (43.6, 52.4)	50.7 (44.8, 56.5)	61.7 (56.6, 66.8)	58.5 (52.9, 64.1)
Think that U-M takes complaints of sexual misconduct seriously	74.0 (70.1, 78.0)	80.8 (76.2, 85.3)	86.7 (83.0, 90.3)	90.3 (87.0, 93.7)
Feel relatively safe from sexual misconduct at U-M	75.6 (71.9, 79.4)	89.2 (85.7, 92.7)	96.7 (95.2, 98.3)	98.9 (97.8, 100)

B. TRAINING, EDUCATION, PREVENTION, AND LIKELY REPORTING TO CAMPUS RESOURCES²¹

- 55.2% (CL: 52.5, 57.9) of Michigan students – 63.4% (CL: 58.9, 67.9) of female undergraduate students, 35.6% (CL: 30.1, 41.2) of female graduate students, 66.0% (CL: 60.8, 71.3) of male undergraduate students and 36.3% (CL: 30.9, 41.7) of male graduate students – said that, since they started attending U-M, they have received trainings or attended programs that provided them education on sexual misconduct, such as prevention of sexual assault, availability of confidential resources or information regarding how to report an incident.

Table 4B.1: Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students Reporting That They Have Attended or Participated in the Following Programs. Note: Respondents could report more than one response; these percentages cannot be summed across row categories.

Program	Female Undergraduates %	Female Graduates %	Male Undergraduates %	Male Graduates %
New Student Orientation	85.6 (82.5, 88.8)	51.5 (45.7, 57.4)	83.9 (79.9, 87.8)	58.7 (53.1, 64.4)
Community Matters Course	31.7 (27.9, 35.5)	8.1 (4.7, 11.6)	30.7 (26.1, 35.2)	4.7 (2.3, 7.2)
Relationship Remix	51.4 (47.0, 55.9)	0.9 (0.0, 1.9)	39.2 (34.3, 44.0)	0.9 (0.0, 1.9)
Change It Up	17.4 (14.5, 20.3)	2.1 (0.2, 3.9)	14.9 (12.0, 17.7)	0.6 (0.0, 1.6)
None of the Above	7.6 (4.9, 10.2)	44.3 (38.4, 50.1)	10.5 (7.0, 14.0)	40.0 (34.3, 45.6)

- 26.3% (CL: 23.9, 28.6) of students – 29.5% (CL: 25.5, 33.5) of female undergraduate students, 20.7% (CL: 16.1, 25.3) of female graduate students, 28.6% (CL: 23.8, 33.4) of male undergraduate students, and 20.6% (CL: 16.2, 25.1) of male graduate students – said they have participated in other activities on campus, other than the programs mentioned above, that provided them with education on sexual misconduct, including informal discussions, lectures, awareness-raising activities or workshops.
- 54.2% (CL: 51.6, 56.9) of students – 57.9% (CL: 53.4, 62.3) of female undergraduate students, 42.9% (CL: 37.2, 48.7) of female graduate students, 61.1% (CL: 55.9, 66.4) of male undergraduate students, and 45.1% (CL: 39.4, 50.7) of male graduate students – reported that they know where to get help on campus if they or someone they know were sexually assaulted.

Table 4B.2: Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Student Answering, “If you or someone you know were sexually assaulted, how likely would you be to report the incident to the following?” Note: Respondents could report more than one response; these percentages cannot be summed across row categories.

	Very Likely %	Somewhat Likely %	Somewhat Unlikely %	Very Unlikely %
Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center	42.9 (40.2, 45.5)	35.8 (33.2, 38.3)	13.3 (11.5, 15.0)	8.1 (6.6, 9.6)
Police Department	65.1 (62.5, 67.6)	24.5 (22.2, 26.9)	7.3 (6.1, 8.6)	3.1 (2.3, 3.9)
U-M Residence Hall or Housing Staff	13.1 (11.3, 14.8)	20.8 (18.6, 22.9)	28.3 (25.8, 30.7)	37.9 (35.3, 40.5)
Office of the Dean of Students	10.7 (9.0, 12.5)	19.5 (17.4, 21.7)	34.7 (32.1, 37.2)	35.1 (32.5, 37.6)
Office for Institutional Equity or Title IX Coordinator	6.3 (4.9, 7.7)	12.8 (11.1, 14.6)	34.2 (31.7, 36.8)	46.6 (44.0, 49.3)
Counseling and Psychological Services	35.1 (32.6, 37.7)	40.5 (37.9, 43.1)	14.0 (12.2, 15.8)	10.4 (8.8, 12.1)

C. PERSONAL EXPERIENCES REGARDING SEXUAL ACTIVITY

- 79.6% (CL: 77.4, 81.7) of students – 81.7% (CL: 78.9, 84.4) of female students and 77.7% (CL: 74.4, 81.0) of male students – have engaged in any form of sexual activity, including kissing and fondling in the past 12 months.

Table 4C.1: Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students Answering, “When you have engaged in any form of sexual activity, including kissing and fondling in the past 12 months...” you did the following. Note: Respondents could report more than one response; percentages cannot be summed across row categories.

	All of the time %	Most of the time %	Some of the time %	Rarely %	Never %
You sought verbal agreement for the activity	45.1 (42.1, 48.1)	22.0 (19.5, 24.4)	15.8 (13.7, 17.9)	12.0 (10.1, 14.0)	5.1 (3.8, 6.3)
You gave verbal agreement for the activity	44.4 (41.4, 47.4)	21.8 (19.4, 24.3)	15.6 (13.6, 17.7)	11.5 (9.6, 13.4)	6.6 (5.1, 8.2)
You sought non-verbal agreement for the activity	68.7 (65.9, 71.5)	12.4 (10.4, 14.4)	7.8 (6.2, 9.3)	3.7 (2.6, 4.8)	7.4 (5.8, 9.0)
You gave non-verbal agreement for the activity	67.8 (65.0, 70.5)	15.3 (13.2, 17.5)	7.6 (6.1, 9.1)	3.1 (2.1, 4.0)	6.3 (4.8, 7.8)

One topic of great concern for university-based programs designed to reduce the prevalence of sexual assault is the use of alcohol, alcohol-related intoxication and the potential for poor communication regarding consent in situations with alcohol consumption. To learn more about the associations between alcohol use and sexual behavior in general, U-M asked a series of questions linking the two. The results are provided in the tables below.

Table 4C.2: Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students Answering, “What percentage of your sexual activities, including kissing and fondling, in the past 12 months occurred when you were drinking, but not drunk or intoxicated?”

	0%	1-33%	34-66%	67-100%
Undergraduate	24.0 (20.6, 27.3)	44.1 (40.3, 47.9)	16.6 (13.6, 19.5)	15.4 (12.5, 18.2)
Graduate	26.2 (22.1, 30.2)	51.1 (46.4, 55.7)	12.6 (9.5, 15.8)	10.1 (7.3, 13.0)
Total	24.7 (22.1, 27.3)	46.5 (43.5, 49.4)	15.2 (13.0, 17.5)	13.6 (11.5, 15.7)

Tables 4C.3: Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students Answering, “What percentage of your sexual activities, including kissing and fondling, in the past 12 months occurred when you were drunk or intoxicated?”

	0%	1-33%	34-66%	67-100%
Undergraduate	34.9 (31.2, 38.6)	47.1 (43.2, 50.9)	10.1 (7.8, 12.4)	8.0 (6.0, 9.9)
Graduate	52.8 (48.2, 57.5)	42.8 (38.2, 47.5)	3.6 (1.7, 5.6)	0.7 (0.1, 1.4)
Total	40.9 (38.0, 43.9)	45.6 (42.6, 48.6)	7.9 (6.3, 9.6)	5.5 (4.2, 6.8)

D. SEXUAL MISCONDUCT VICTIMIZATION

The Michigan survey asked respondents two sets of questions regarding nonconsensual sexual experiences in the past 12 months. The survey questions used the same time metric – within the past 12 months – in order to provide consistent responses for comparison purposes. In doing so, the survey responses captured the current climate regarding sexual misconduct within our campus community and created an appropriate benchmark from which to measure change against future surveys. This standardized reference period is crucial to evaluate the success of programs and policies aimed at reducing sexual assault.

The tables set forth below show the U-M student experiences of nonconsensual sexual behaviors within the past 12 months by various types of experience. Note that ‘*’ indicates no respondents reported “yes” and therefore a population estimate could not be calculated. Please also note that some respondents answered “don’t know” to specific questions regarding specific nonconsensual sexual experiences – the estimates we present here are based on the percentage of the total who answered “yes”. The percentages of respondents who reported “don’t know” are provided in Appendix A for all of the items presented below.

A particularly interesting dimension of the finding is the level of reporting of verbal pressure. This question read in relevant part: “In the past 12 months [did you have any nonconsensual sexual experiences in which someone was]²² ... continually verbally pressuring you after you said you didn’t want to? This includes telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about you, showing displeasure, criticizing your sexuality or attractiveness, or getting angry but not using physical force.”

The first set of questions asked respondents about nonconsensual experiences involving being “fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt)”, having “some of your clothes [removed] without your consent (but [with no] attempt [at]sexual penetration)”. Overall 16.4% (CL:13.9, 18.9) of female students and 4.7% (CL: 2.9, 6.4) of male students reported this experience. More detailed results are reported in Table 4D.1 below.

Table 4D.1: Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students Answering: “In the past 12 months, has anyone fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of your clothes without your consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration by...”. Note: Respondents could report more than one response; these percentages cannot be summed across row categories. For brevity, the precise survey language appears in this table only; it is abbreviated in the tables that follow.

	Female Undergraduates Yes (%)	Female Graduates Yes (%)	Male Undergraduates Yes (%)	Male Graduates Yes (%)
Verbally pressuring you after you said you didn’t want to, including telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about you, showing displeasure, criticizing your sexuality or attractiveness, or getting angry but not using physical force	10.2 (7.8, 12.7)	5.5 (2.7, 8.3)	3.2 (1.4, 5.1)	0.7 (0.0, 1.8)
Taking advantage of you while under the influence of drugs or too drunk to stop what was happening	11.1 (8.6, 13.6)	2.9 (0.9, 4.9)	3.2 (1.5, 4.8)	0.4 (0.0, 1.1)
Taking advantage of you while unconscious or asleep or physically incapacitated and could not stop what was happening	2.6 (1.4, 3.9)	1.5 (0.1, 2.8)	1.2 (0.0, 2.3)	*
Threatening to physically harm you or someone close to you	0.4 (0.0, 0.9)	0.4 (0.0, 1.1)	0.7 (0.0, 1.7)	*
Using force, for example holding you down with their body weight, pinning your arms, or having a weapon	3.6 (2.1, 5.0)	1.5 (0.1, 2.8)	0.5 (0.0, 1.1)	*
Yes responses to any of the above	19.5 (16.2, 22.8)	9.0 (5.6, 12.5)	6.7 (4.1, 9.4)	1.1 (0.0, 2.4)

The second set of questions asked if students had experienced nonconsensual sexual penetration orally, vaginally, or anally. In total, 9.7 % (CL: 7.5, 11.8) of female students and 1.4% (CL: 0.5, 2.4) of male students reported this experience. More detailed results are presented below in Table 4D.2 (oral penetration), Table 4D.3 (vaginal penetration) and Table 4D.4 (anal penetration), and are then summarized in Table 4D.2-4.

Table 4D.2: Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students Answering: "In the past 12 months, has anyone had oral sex with you or made you have oral sex with them without your consent by..."

	Female Undergraduates Yes (%)	Female Graduates Yes (%)	Male Undergraduates Yes (%)	Male Graduates Yes (%)
Verbally pressuring	5.5 (3.6, 7.4)	0.4 (0.0, 1.1)	0.9 (0.0, 2.0)	0.4 (0.0, 1.3)
Taking advantage of you while drunk or on drugs	3.6 (2.2, 5.0)	0.8 (0.0, 1.9)	0.9 (0.1, 1.7)	*
Taking advantage of you while unconscious or asleep	0.4 (0.0, 0.9)	0.4 (0.0, 1.1)	0.9 (0.0, 2.1)	*
Threatening physical harm	0.3 (0.0, 0.8)	*	0.3 (0.0, 0.7)	*
Using physical force	1.1 (0.3, 1.8)	0.4 (0.0, 1.1)	0.8 (0.0, 1.9)	*
Yes responses to any of the above	7.7 (5.5, 9.8)	0.8 (0.0, 1.9)	1.7 (0.4, 3.1)	0.4 (0.0, 1.3)

Table 4D.3: Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Female Students Answering: "In the past 12 months, has a man put his penis into your vagina, or has anyone inserted fingers or objects into your vagina without your consent by..." Note: Respondents could report more than one response; these percentages cannot be summed across row categories.

	Female Undergraduates Yes (%)	Female Graduates Yes (%)
Verbally pressuring	4.0 (2.5, 5.5)	1.7 (0.0, 3.7)
Taking advantage of you while drunk or on drugs	4.5 (2.8, 6.2)	1.2 (0.0, 2.4)
Taking advantage of you while unconscious or asleep	1.1 (0.3, 1.9)	0.4 (0.0, 1.0)
Threatening physical harm	0.3 (0.0, 0.8)	*
Using physical force	1.6 (0.6, 2.5)	0.4 (0.0, 1.1)
Yes responses to any of the above	7.2 (5.1, 9.3)	3.3 (0.8, 5.7)

Table 4D.4: Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Students Answering: “In the past 12 months, has a man put his penis into your anus, or has anyone inserted fingers or objects into your anus without your consent by...” Note: Respondents could report more than one response; these percentages cannot be summed across row categories.

	Female Undergraduates Yes (%)	Female Graduates Yes (%)	Male Undergraduates Yes (%)	Male Graduates Yes (%)
Verbally pressuring	1.9 (0.4, 3.4)	0.2 (0.0, 0.5)	0.8 (0.0, 1.9)	*
Taking advantage of you while drunk or on drugs	1.0 (0.2, 1.7)	*	0.4 (0.0, 0.8)	*
Taking advantage of you while unconscious or asleep	0.1 (0.0, 0.2)	0.5 (0.0, 1.5)	0.6 (0.0, 1.6)	*
Threatening physical harm	0.2 (0.0, 0.6)	*	0.8 (0.0, 1.9)	*
Using physical force	0.3 (0.0, 0.8)	*	0.4 (0.0, 0.9)	*
Yes responses to any of the above	2.7 (1.0, 4.3)	0.7 (0.0, 1.7)	1.4 (0.1, 2.6)	*

Table 4D.2-4: Summary of Experience of Nonconsensual Oral, Vaginal or Anal Sex. Note: Respondents could report more than one response; percentages cannot be summed across row categories.

	Female Undergraduates Yes (%)	Female Graduates Yes (%)	Male Undergraduates Yes (%)	Male Graduates Yes (%)
Verbally pressuring	8.0 (5.6, 10.3)	2.3 (0.2, 4.4)	0.9 (0.0, 2.0)	0.4 (0.0, 1.3)
Taking advantage of you while drunk or on drugs	6.7 (4.7, 8.8)	1.5 (0.1, 3.0)	0.9 (0.1, 1.7)	*
Taking advantage of you while unconscious or asleep	1.1 (0.3, 1.9)	1.2 (0.0, 2.7)	0.9 (0.0, 2.1)	*
Threatening physical harm	0.3 (0.0, 0.8)	*	0.8 (0.0, 1.9)	*
Using physical force	1.8 (0.8, 2.8)	0.8 (0.0, 1.8)	1.1 (0.0, 2.3)	*
Yes responses to any of the above	11.9 (9.1, 14.7)	4.3 (1.6, 7.1)	2.0 (0.6, 3.5)	0.4 (0.0, 1.3)

Please note that combining the percentage of students who had reported any of these forms of nonconsensual sexual experiences, that is, fondling, kissing, or touching behaviors (Table 4D.1) along with oral, vaginal or anal penetration (Table 4D.2-4), yields results somewhat less than the sum of the percentages reported in each of the prior tables because some students experience both. In total, 11.4% (CL: 9.7, 13.0) of students indicated having experienced any form of nonconsensual sexual behavior, whether fondling, kissing, touching, or oral, vaginal or anal penetration. As shown below, this 11.4% can be further divided as follows: 22.5% (CL: 19.0, 26.1) of undergraduate female students, 6.8% (CL: 4.2, 9.4) of undergraduate male students, 9.2% (CL: 5.7, 12.7) of graduate female students and 1.1% (CL: 0.0, 2.4) of graduate male students.

Table 4D.1-4: Summary of Experience of Nonconsensual Fondling, Kissing or Touching, and/or Oral, Vaginal or Anal Sex. Note: Respondents could report more than one response; these percentages cannot be summed across row categories.

	Female Undergraduates Yes (%)	Female Graduates Yes (%)	Male Undergraduates Yes (%)	Male Graduates Yes (%)
Verbally pressuring	13.1 (10.2, 16.0)	5.7 (2.8, 8.5)	3.9 (1.8, 6.1)	0.7 (0.0, 1.8)
Taking advantage of you while drunk or on drugs	12.8 (10.0, 15.5)	3.2 (1.1, 5.4)	3.2 (1.5, 4.8)	0.4 (0.0, 1.1)
Taking advantage of you while unconscious or asleep	2.9 (1.6, 4.1)	2.0 (0.3, 3.7)	1.7 (0.1, 3.2)	*
Threatening physical harm	0.4 (0.0, 0.9)	0.4 (0.0, 1.1)	0.9 (0.0, 2.0)	*
Using physical force	3.9 (2.4, 5.4)	1.5 (0.1, 2.8)	1.3 (0.0, 2.6)	*
Yes responses to any of the above	22.5 (19.0, 26.1)	9.2 (5.7, 12.7)	6.8 (4.2, 9.4)	1.1 (0.0, 2.4)

Finally, because of the high rates of any nonconsensual sexual experience among undergraduate females, we also estimated those rates separately for freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors. Although there is some variability in the rates across year, with seniors experiencing the lowest estimated rates, the confidence limits for these estimates all overlap each other, so there are no statistically significant differences in the observed rates by year of undergraduate enrollment. Nor are there statistically significant differences in the rates of any nonconsensual sexual experience by year of enrollment for undergraduate males. In other words, undergraduate freshmen did not report a higher percentage of such assaults than any other class rank.

The final set of questions in this portion of the survey asked respondents about their experiences with various forms of sexual harassment.

- 22.4% (CL: 20.1, 24.6) of Michigan students – 35.1% (CL: 30.9, 39.3) of female undergraduate students, 23.6% (CL: 18.5, 28.6) of female graduate students, 18.1% (CL: 13.9, 22.4) of male undergraduate students and 5.4% (CL: 2.9, 7.9) of male graduate students – said they have experienced any sexual harassment in the past 12 months.

More detailed results are summarized in Table 4D.8.

Table 4D.8: Estimated Percentage and 95% Confidence Limits of U-M Student Answering Yes To, "In the past 12 months, has anyone ..." Note: Respondents could report more than one response; these percentages cannot be summed across row categories.

Students indicating that they experienced each of the following while at U-M within the past 12 months:	Female Undergraduate %	Female Graduate %	Male Undergraduate %	Male Graduate %
Stared at you in a sexual way or looked at the sexual parts of your body after you asked them to stop	21.3 (17.6, 24.9)	13.7 (9.5, 17.9)	5.1 (2.6, 7.6)	0.6 (0.0, 1.6)
Made teasing comments of a sexual nature about your body or appearance after you asked them to stop	19.4 (15.9, 22.9)	15.5 (11.1, 20.0)	3.7 (1.7, 5.8)	0.7 (0.0, 1.6)
Sent you sexual or obscene materials such as pictures, jokes, or stories in the mail, by text, or over the Internet, after you asked them to stop	5.3 (3.4, 7.3)	3.9 (1.6, 6.2)	2.6 (1.1, 4.1)	1.6 (0.2, 3.0)
Showed you pornographic pictures when you had not agreed to look at them	6.7 (4.5, 9.0)	4.3 (1.9, 6.6)	7.8 (4.9, 10.8)	2.6 (0.8, 4.5)
Made sexual or obscene phone calls to you when you had not agreed to talk to them	1.9 (0.8, 3.0)	0.7 (0.0, 1.6)	1.3 (0.2, 2.4)	*
Watched you while you were undressing, nude, or having sex, without your consent	2.2 (1.0, 3.5)	0.5 (0.0, 1.3)	2.7 (0.9, 4.6)	0.2 (0.0, 0.7)
Taken photos or videotapes of you when you were undressing, nude, or having sex, without your consent	1.0 (0.2, 1.7)	0.8 (0.0, 1.9)	2.4 (0.7, 4.2)	0.2 (0.0, 0.7)
Showed you the private areas of their body (ex. buttocks, penis, or breasts) without your consent	5.5 (3.4, 7.6)	3.9 (1.6, 6.2)	5.9 (3.2, 8.6)	1.1 (0.1, 2.1)
Made sexual motions to you, such as grabbing their crotch, pretending to masturbate, or imitating oral sex without your consent	13.3 (10.3, 16.4)	9.4 (5.9, 13.0)	6.6 (3.6, 9.6)	0.7 (0.0, 1.4)
Masturbated in front of you without your consent	1.2 (0.1, 2.4)	0.3 (0.0, 0.8)	1.0 (0.0, 2.2)	*

E. SPECIFIC INCIDENTS: REPORTING

46.4% (CL: 38.9, 53.9) of students who indicated they had at least one nonconsensual sexual experience at U-M within the past 12 months told someone else about the most recent incident. Only 3.6% (CL: 1.2-6.0) of students who had at least one nonconsensual sexual experience (or 7.9% (CL: 2.7, 13.0) of those who told anyone else about the experience) reported the experience to someone in the Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC), Ann Arbor Police Department, U-M Police Department (UMPD), Office for Institutional Equity, Office of the Dean of Students, Office of Student Conflict Resolution or Counseling and Psychological Services.

- Students who told someone about their experience were most likely to tell a friend (93.9% (CL: 88.6, 99.2)), a roommate (42.5% (CL: 32.8, 52.2)), or a spouse (16.3% (CL: 8.7, 24.0)). Other responses included:
 - Counselor, therapist or social worker: 11.7% (5.3, 18.1)

- Other family member(s): 7.8% (3.1, 12.5)
 - Other U-M Representative: 3.1% (0.0, 6.3)
 - Police Department or Department of Public Safety: 2.6% (0.0, 5.5)
 - Pastor, Priest, Rabbi or other spiritual advisor: 1.4% (0.0, 2.9)
 - Student peer advisor or mentor: 1.2% (0.0, 2.9)
 - Medical doctor or medical professional: 1.0% (0.0, 1.4)
 - Residence Hall Staff: 0.5% (0.0, 3.5)
- For the 3.6% (CL: 1.2, 6.0) of students who reported the experience to an official U-M resource or law enforcement, the U-M resource most often contacted was either Counseling and Psychological Services or SAPAC. Other services were used rarely.
 - 59.7% (CL: 20.6, 98.9) of students who reported the experience to someone in an official U-M capacity or law enforcement received at least one response that made them feel supported.
 - Students who indicated they had experienced at least one nonconsensual sexual behavior were asked about reasons for their decision not to report their experience. Of those responding, the list below notes their rationales, from most- to least- commonly cited:
 - Other: 39.2% (CL: 29.4, 49.0)
 - Did not want to get the person who did it in trouble: 34.0% (CL: 24.0, 44.0)
 - Blamed myself: 29.0% (CL: 19.4, 38.6)
 - Felt embarrassed or ashamed: 27.1% (CL: 18.0, 36.3) Felt embarrassed or ashamed
 - Did not think U-M would do anything: 15.1% (CL: 8.0, 22.2) Did not think U-M would do anything

The “other” category response allowed students to enter the reason for not reporting in their own words. By far the most common of these self-described reasons – accounting for 55% of these answers – was some version of the respondent believing the incident was not severe enough or serious enough to merit a report (not a “big deal”).

F. SPECIFIC INCIDENT: LOCATIONS, PERPETRATORS AND IMPACTS

Students whose survey responses reported sexual misconduct within the past 12 months were asked follow-up questions about a specific incident of such behavior at U-M. Because students may have experienced more than one incident of nonconsensual sexual behavior during that timeframe, they were instructed to respond to this section thinking about “the most recent time.”

56.1% (CL: 48.5, 63.8) of students indicated that another U-M student was responsible for the nonconsensual sexual experience. Almost all female students (98.3% (CL: 96.3, 100)) who reported a nonconsensual sexual experience indicated the perpetrators were males. The male students who reported a nonconsensual sexual behavior indicated the perpetrators were either males 26.3% (CL: 9.4, 43.1) or females 66.8% (CL: 48.0, 85.5). Of those who indicated experiencing a nonconsensual sexual experience, 5.5% (CL: 1.8, 9.3) had no prior relationship with the perpetrator and did not know or were unsure if the person was affiliated with U-M. 17.4% (CL: 11.4, 23.4) of all undergraduate students indicated the perpetrator was a friend. 10.2% (CL: 5.4, 14.9) of all undergraduate students indicated the perpetrator was an acquaintance. 22.5% (CL: 6.2, 38.8) of all graduate students indicated the perpetrator was a friend. 10.7% (CL: 0.0, 22.9) of all graduate students indicated the perpetrator was an acquaintance.²³

Finally, those who had a nonconsensual sexual experience in the past 12 months were asked, “Thinking about the most recent time this happened to you, where did this event take place?” The response options differentiated

between residential buildings and other buildings across the categories “On campus” (defined as “all University owned or managed property in Ann Arbor”), “Near-campus” (defined as “areas within ½ mile of Campus in Ann Arbor”) and “Off campus” (defined as “areas further than ½ mile of Campus”). The results are provided below, separated for undergraduate students and graduate students.

	Undergraduate Students	Graduate Students
On-campus	14.5%	6.3%
Near-Campus	38.4%	22.6%
Off-campus	41.2%	72%

G. PERPETRATING NONCONSENSUAL SEXUAL EXPERIENCES

A series of questions in the survey asked students about their behavior towards others (F1-F4). In their responses, 1.1% (CL: 0.5, 1.6) of students said they had acted without consent, and another 3.3% (CL: 2.2, 4.4) of students indicated that they were unsure if they had behaved in this way. In these responses, the choice of the response “don’t know” is complex. A key reason is that the student respondents were asked to report what they had done and how the person that they did it to may have interpreted their actions – that is, the respondent may very well not know how the other person interpreted the action. Thus, it is not necessarily the case that a response of “don’t know” should be interpreted to mean that the act was nonconsensual. Consequently, these “don’t know” responses are considered as something different than “yes”. Only the proportion of students that said “yes” to questions of perpetrating unwanted sexual behavior were considered affirmative responses. However, this additional 3.3% who indicated they did not know if they had ever acted without consent may reflect actions that others would have considered nonconsensual. The survey also asked respondents to report on their own attempts at perpetrating nonconsensual sexual behaviors. Reports of attempted perpetration were exceptionally rare.

VI. ANALYSIS OF RISK FACTORS

Specific demographic factors and memberships were shown in the survey results to correlate to the risk of nonconsensual sexual penetration (oral, vaginal, anal):

- Females were nearly 8 times more at risk than males.
- Undergraduates were 3 times more at risk than graduate students.
- Lesbian, gay or bisexual students were 2.5 times more at risk than heterosexual students.
- Underrepresented minority students were 2 times more at risk than white students.
- Sorority or fraternity members were 2.5 times more at risk than non-Greek students.
- Club (not varsity) sports members were 2 times more at risk than non-club sports students.

There was no statistically significant difference in risk for undergraduate females or males by class rank, *i.e.*, freshman, sophomore, junior, or senior. In other words, undergraduate freshman women and men were not more likely to be assaulted than undergraduates of any other class rank.

Table 8.1 below summarizes the statistical analyses of the survey data producing these results. Multivariate logistic regression was used to estimate the independent effect of each demographic category on the odds of having an unwanted sexual experience within the prior 12 months. This approach is important because membership in these categories can overlap, but each is an independent risk factor for nonconsensual sexual experiences.

The first model in Table 8.1 estimates the risk of experiencing nonconsensual fondling, kissing or touching.²⁴ The second model in Table 8.1 estimates the risk of experiencing nonconsensual oral, vaginal or anal sex. The effects displayed in the table are odds ratios. Odds ratios are multiplicative, so an odds ratio of 1.0 means no association, an odds ratio of greater than 1.0 means the odds of a nonconsensual experience are increased, and an odds ratio of less than 1.0 means the odds of a nonconsensual experience are reduced. We estimate the statistical significance of each odds ratio with a Wald chi-square statistic, presented in parentheses directly below the odds ratio. Statistically significant effects on the odds of nonconsensual sexual experience are displayed in bold, with the levels of significance identified.

Table 8.1: Estimated Odds Ratios for Nonconsensual Sexual Experiences Within the Past 12 Months at the University of Michigan, 2014-15.

From Multivariate Logistic Regressions: Odds Ratios (Wald Chi-Square)

	Fondling, Kissing or Touching ²⁵	Oral, Vaginal or Anal Sex
Female (compared to male)	4.1*** (40.3)	7.7*** (39.9)
Undergraduate (compared to graduate/professional)	2.6*** (12.0)	3.2** (7.5)
GSI/GSRA (compared to not)	1.2 (0.1)	1.7 (0.5)
Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual And Other (compared to heterosexual)	2.2** (7.6)	2.6** (7.3)
Race²⁶ (compared to white)		
Asian	0.6 (2.7)	0.8 (0.2)
Underrepresented	1.7* (5.1)	2.1* (5.9)
Residence (compared to on campus-housing)		
Fraternity/Sorority	1.2 (0.1)	1.04 (0.01)
Family	1.5 (0.5)	1.8 (1.1)
Off campus in Ann Arbor	0.9 (0.6)	0.7 (2.7)
Off campus out of Ann Arbor	0.7 (0.6)	1.7 (0.8)
Memberships (compared to students who are not members of any of these)		
Fraternity/Sorority	1.8* (6.0)	2.5** (10.0)
Varsity Sports Team	2.0 (2.1)	2.7 (1.9)
Club Sports Team	1.4 (1.4)	1.9+ (3.0)
Marching Band	2.3 (2.0)	1.0 (0.0)
ROTC	1.5 (0.4)	2.3 (1.1)
Model Fit Statistics		
N	1878	1881
-2LL	1101.7	662.8
Likelihood Ratio χ^2	148.7***	129.8***
d.f.	15	15

+ p < .10 * p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001 Two-tailed tests

APPENDIX—MORE DETAILED EXPLANATION OF SURVEY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

U-M leadership engaged leading methodologists from U-M’s Survey Research Center (SRC) and SoundRocket (formerly known as the Survey Sciences Group) to design this survey. The key objective of the study was to measure the level of sexual misconduct on campus as accurately as possible. Because sexual misconduct is believed to be chronically under-reported, and non-participation (survey non-response) could bias U-M’s understanding of the true extent of sexual misconduct, the design of this survey prioritizing maximum participation in the study. This was achieved by taking steps to create the highest possible *response rate* – measured by the percentage of those who were invited to participate who actually did provide answers to the survey questions – using the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) official response rate calculation formulas.

Low response rates do not necessarily imply biased results. Non-response bias results when those who have not participated in the study have opinions or experiences that are systematically different from those who do participate. Even if only a small portion of those invited actually participate, if the participants represent the total population, then bias will not result. However, if a large majority of the target population does not respond, this creates significant risk of non-response bias. Non-response bias could lead to reporting of sexual assault incidence rates that are significantly lower or higher than actually occurs, or skewed levels of awareness of reporting policies or resources available to students on campus. If the study has a response rate of 100% there can be no non-response bias – therefore, increasing the response rate to closer to 100% may reduce the risk of non-response bias. This is a key reason most national surveys for the federal government, for example, prioritize effort to maximize the response rate.

The design selected a scientifically representative sample of the Ann Arbor U-M student population and put substantial effort toward maximizing participation. First, the survey used multiple modes to contact students instead of relying exclusively on email. This included mailing a hard-copy letter for invitation, following up on non-respondents with telephone contact and attempting face-to-face contact with the remaining non-respondents. Second, the survey provided a substantial individual incentive to all students who were invited to participate (\$15/\$30 per person). Third, the team intentionally designed the survey instrument to average less than 15 minutes in length for respondents. Fourth, because participation of Michigan students in surveys is known to decline significantly after spring break and decline even further as the end of the semester approaches, U-M launched the survey in January and completed the data collection before spring break. By systematically applying these tools to a scientifically representative sample of U-M students, this survey produced a high response rate (67%²⁷) and ensured that the majority of those invited actually answered the questions asked.

A. SAMPLE DESIGN

Given the large student population, at U-M, this study used a sample survey approach rather than a census of all students. A randomly selected sample allows researchers to make scientifically based inferences to the population as a whole and helped focus finite research resources on successfully contacting and encouraging the participation of the broadest, most inclusive, most representative group of students. This broad sampling and participation increases confidence that estimates from the survey represent the diverse experiences of the student population. This sampling strategy does, however, introduce sampling error to estimates, which is expressed as “95% confidence limits” around point estimates.

U-M’s Registrar’s Office selected the sample for this study in consultation with sampling experts on the research team. Because of daily fluctuations in enrollment, the U-M student population was defined as the population on January 6, 2015, which was the day before the first day of classes. Further, at that time, key characteristics of the student population were recorded. These population totals were later used to create nonresponse adjustment weights (see section D below) for the respondents after data collection was complete.

To ensure proper representation, the sample was selected from two strata: undergraduate and graduate students. The same sampling rate was used in each stratum, producing a sample of 3,000 students. This sample included 1,005 (33.5%) graduate students. This proportion matches exactly the proportion of graduate students in the U-M population on the date of collection.

B. QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The survey instrument and methodology was designed by a team led by the University's Survey Research Center, and included representatives from Student Life; the Office of the General Counsel; and Sound Rocket (fka the Survey Sciences Group), an independent survey research organization headquartered in Ann Arbor, Michigan. The substantive team identified the most relevant items being used to measure both the prevalence and incidence of sexual assault on campus, as well as perceptions of campus climate. The methodological team drew heavily upon behavioral-specific questions from the Sexual Experiences Survey to measure the prevalence and incidence of sexual assault, because such questions have been researched and validated.²⁸

The substantive and methodological teams worked together to refine survey measures using empirically formed principles for best practices in the design of self-administered surveys, specifically addressing issues of question complexity and the potential sensitivity of question content. The methodological team then applied best practices for the design and layout of questions in web surveys.^{29 30} These design features have demonstrated effectiveness in minimizing response errors in web surveys, as well as minimizing overall respondent burden.³¹

The Survey Sciences Group assumed responsibility for a comprehensive testing strategy.³² More than 100 tests of the logic and usability were conducted before the instrument was finalized. The tests included testing on various browsers/devices, pretesting among students, and review of pretest data for accuracy. The questionnaire was purposely kept extremely brief – estimated at less than 15 minutes to complete – to maximize participation. Testing of the survey length guided several decisions made about the questionnaire during the process.

C. FIELD WORK DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION

The field work for this survey followed a classic two-phase responsive design approach, with web-based data collection in the first phase and interviewer assisted web-based interviewing in the second phase. Several tools were used to maximize participation in Phase 1 of the study. These included:

- A message from the U-M President to the entire campus explaining the importance of the issue and the survey.
- Pre-notification letters sent by mail and email before the survey was launched.
- A combination of both a lottery-style incentive and an individual incentive.
- Reminder emails, to encourage participation.

A schedule and contact protocol was designed to maximize response. Attention was paid to the contact contents as well as timing. Only nonrespondents to previous contacts were included in follow-up efforts, so that those who had responded were not bothered.^{33 34 35 36}

Data Collection Timeline

1/12/2015: Pre-notification letter mailed

1/13/2015: Pre-notification email sent

1/15/2015: Email invitation sent

1/19/2015: Email reminder 1 sent

1/24/2015: Email reminder 2 sent

1/30/2015: Email reminder 3 sent

1/22/2015: Email reminder 4 sent

2/3/2015: Phase 2 sample selected at 6 p.m.

2/6/2015: Phase 2 data collection began

2/6/2015 to 2/26/2015: Interviewer-prompted reminder emails sent to active sample cases

2/27/2015: Data collection ended

Due to the expected high costs of telephone and face-to-face contacts employed,^{37 38 39} Phase 2 of the survey chose a random sample of the non-respondents who remained at the close of Phase 1. Professional survey interviewers attempted to contact non-respondents to encourage them to participate in the survey. Because Phase 2 involved telephone and face-to-face contact, Phase 2 sampling was stratified by on-campus vs. off campus, and whether or not a telephone number was available. Very few on campus cases did not have a telephone number, producing three strata: 1) off campus, no telephone number available, 2) off campus, telephone number available, and 3) on campus. The sample rates were 0.333, 0.6, and 0.6 respectively. The inverse of these selection rates was used as a selection weight.

Professional interviewers contacted non-respondents by phone to encourage their participation and sent follow-up email when requested by potential respondents. Professional interviewers also visited non-respondents' places of residence with handheld tablet computers preset to access the web survey to offer that option for completing the survey. For students living in University housing, professional interviewers delivered written reminder letters to housing staff who delivered these reminder to non-respondents – the letters provided interviewer contact information for any potential respondents who preferred interviewer assistance. In all interviewer efforts, an emphasis was placed on confidentiality and on the independent contractor status of the interviewers assuring students that the university would not have access to individual identities.

D. POST-SURVEY ADJUSTMENT AND WEIGHTING

Statistical weighting was performed to ensure that the data based on this sample of students correctly represent the entire population of students. The original sample design was an equal probability sample of students. The two-phase sampling introduced differential weights for some students. Students sampled for the second phase of recruitment receive an adjustment weight, equal to the inverse of the rate at which they were selected. These weights allowed this second-phase sample to represent the sample members who were not selected for the second phase.

After data collection was complete, information on the sampling frame and from population counts provided by the Registrar's Office was used to develop additional weighting adjustment factors. These weighting factors, called non-response and post-stratification adjustments, were used to match the respondent characteristics to those of the full sample and student population respectively. For example, because on campus vs. off campus status was available for the full sample, and students in these two groups responded at different rates, the inverse of the response rate for each group (*i.e.* those living on campus and those living off campus) was used as an adjustment factor.

After this adjustment was applied to the selection weights of the respondents, the characteristics of the respondents were weighted to match those of the population. This technique, known as post stratification, reduces sampling error and may reduce any bias related to the factors used in the post stratification. In this case we used graduate/undergraduate status, gender, academic level, term of entry and race/ethnicity. The weighted

distributions from the respondents were matched to the population distribution of these characteristics. For example, if estimates for graduates and undergraduates differed, and these groups also differed in their response rates, then post stratification would correct this bias.

Under the assumptions described earlier about the non-response and post-stratification factors, the weighting adjustments allowed analysts to make inferences regarding the entire student population. These estimates have an associated sampling error. This error is expressed as “95% confidence limits,” which indicate that over repeated sampling, an estimate within this interval would occur 95 out of 100 times.

E. CONFIDENTIALITY

To ensure success of this survey, given the potentially sensitive nature of the questions, part of the design for this study was to limit direct access between University of Michigan employees and students who were being surveyed. Key to this effort was the use of the independent contractor (SoundRocket) for data collection efforts, which provided a firewall between respondents’ identity and their survey responses. Consistent with standard practices for cross-sectional data collections like this, SoundRocket was required to use encryption technologies (including SSL for all web-based interfaces) and to adhere to strict guidelines to maintain data security and confidentiality. SoundRocket has been collecting sensitive data from college student populations for over 10 years. Communications, staff training, processes, and quality inspections all included an eye towards minimizing risk of disclosure. SoundRocket agreed to be held to the same standards prescribed by the U-M IRB to protect respondents before, during, and after this study.

During the course of this study, once the registrar list was provided to SoundRocket, no University of Michigan employee ever came into contact with any identifying information on any survey respondent in a way that would allow them to link survey response to individual identity. All staff, including interviewers, were SoundRocket employees and/or contractors. This fact was openly discussed during contacts with respondents so that they were assured that their responses would not be linked back to them.

After the study was completed, SoundRocket destroyed all identifiable data (electronic and paper) that was received during the course of the effort.

F. QUESTIONNAIRE SPECIFIC REPORTS OF “DON’T KNOW” RESPONSES

Because some answers to questions regarding sexual assault may be difficult for respondents to provide, the meaning of “Don’t Know” responses is potentially complex. This important issue is understudied in methodological research on sexual assault. Set forth below are the percentages of “Don’t Know” responses corresponding to each question in the survey instrument. Please use the survey instrument available at <https://publicaffairs.vpcomm.umich.edu/key-issues/faq-on-2015-campus-climate-surveys-regarding-sexual-misconduct/> to see the survey questions.

“Don’t Know” Responses Regarding Sexual Assault

Obs	Question	“Don't Know” (%)	95% Lower Confidence Limit (%)	95% Upper Confidence Limit (%)
1	D1A	1.30	0.70	1.90
2	D1B	2.03	1.18	2.88
3	D1C	1.09	0.50	1.69
4	D1D	0.48	0.10	0.86
5	D1E	0.78	0.26	1.30
6	D2A	0.42	0.06	0.78
7	D2B	0.75	0.23	1.27
8	D2C	0.35	0.00	0.69
9	D2D	0.42	0.00	0.88
10	D2E	0.29	0.00	0.61
11	D3A	0.14	0.00	0.33
12	D3B	0.69	0.17	1.22
13	D3C	0.37	0.00	0.76
14	D3D	*	*	*
15	D3E	0.07	0.00	0.21
16	D3_1A	*	*	*
17	D3_1B	*	*	*
18	D3_1C	*	*	*
19	D3_1D	*	*	*
20	D3_1E	*	*	*
21	D4A	0.15	0.00	0.39
22	D4B	0.28	0.00	0.57
23	D4C	0.14	0.00	0.38
24	D4D	0.12	0.00	0.35
25	D4E	0.21	0.00	0.48
26	D5A	0.46	0.05	0.86
27	D5B	0.66	0.16	1.16
28	D5C	0.28	0.00	0.57

Obs	Question	“Don't Know” (%)	95% Lower Confidence Limit (%)	95% Upper Confidence Limit (%)
29	D5D	0.18	0.00	0.45
30	D5E	0.22	0.00	0.49
31	D6A	0.24	0.00	0.52
32	D6B	0.05	0.00	0.15
33	D6C	0.14	0.00	0.35
34	D6D	*	*	*
35	D6E	0.20	0.00	0.43
36	D6_1A	*	*	*
37	D6_1B	*	*	*
38	D6_1C	*	*	*
39	D6_1D	*	*	*
40	D6_1E	*	*	*
41	D7A	0.20	0.00	0.46
42	D7B	0.21	0.00	0.48
43	D7C	0.14	0.00	0.38
44	D7D	0.12	0.00	0.35
45	D7E	0.35	0.00	0.77
46	D8A	4.75	3.63	5.88
47	D8B	2.11	1.26	2.96
48	D8C	0.31	0.00	0.63
49	D8D	0.37	0.03	0.71
50	D8E	0.38	0.00	0.80
51	D8F	1.57	0.88	2.27
52	D8G	1.86	1.12	2.60
53	D8H	0.61	0.13	1.10
54	D8I	0.52	0.16	0.88
55	D8J	0.57	0.06	1.07
56	F1A	0.36	0.03	0.69
57	F1B	0.41	0.08	0.73

Obs	Question	“Don't Know” (%)	95% Lower Confidence Limit (%)	95% Upper Confidence Limit (%)
58	F1C	0.18	0.00	0.45
59	F1D	0.12	0.00	0.35
60	F1E	0.14	0.00	0.38
61	F2A	0.16	0.00	0.40
62	F2B	0.27	0.00	0.57
63	F2C	0.12	0.00	0.35
64	F2D	0.18	0.00	0.45
65	F2E	0.12	0.00	0.35
66	F3A	0.29	0.00	0.69
67	F3B	0.19	0.00	0.45
68	F3C	0.14	0.00	0.38
69	F3D	0.12	0.00	0.35
70	F3E	0.12	0.00	0.35
71	F4A	0.12	0.00	0.35
72	F4B	0.12	0.00	0.35
73	F4C	0.12	0.00	0.35
74	F4D	0.12	0.00	0.35
75	F4E	0.12	0.00	0.35
76	F5A	0.26	0.00	0.60
77	F5B	0.12	0.00	0.35
78	F5C	0.12	0.00	0.35
79	F5D	0.12	0.00	0.35
80	F5E	0.12	0.00	0.35
81	F6A	0.17	0.00	0.42
82	F6B	0.19	0.00	0.45
83	F6C	0.24	0.00	0.52
84	F6D	0.17	0.00	0.42
85	F6E	0.17	0.00	0.42
86	F7A	0.12	0.00	0.35

Obs	Question	“Don't Know” (%)	95% Lower Confidence Limit (%)	95% Upper Confidence Limit (%)
87	F7B	0.12	0.00	0.35
88	F7C	0.12	0.00	0.35
89	F7D	0.12	0.00	0.35
90	F7E	0.12	0.00	0.35
91	F8A	0.69	0.18	1.19
92	F8B	0.29	0.00	0.59
93	F8C	0.22	0.00	0.50
94	F8D	0.39	0.00	0.82
95	F8E	0.12	0.00	0.35
96	F8F	0.14	0.00	0.38
97	F8G	0.17	0.00	0.42
98	F8H	0.17	0.00	0.42
99	F8I	0.14	0.00	0.38
100	F8J	0.14	0.00	0.38

ENDNOTES

¹ See Table 37: Chandra A., Martinez, G.M., Mosher, W.D., Abma, J.C., & Jones, J. (2005). *Fertility, Family Planning, and Reproductive Health of U.S. Women: Data from the 2002 National Survey of Family Growth*. National Center for Health Statistics. Vital Health Stat 23(25).

² See Table 17: Martinez, G.M., Chandra, A., Abma, J.C., Jones, J., & Mosher, W.D. (2006). *Fertility, Contraception, and Fatherhood: Data on Men and Women from Cycle 6 (2002 of the National Survey of Family Growth)*. National Center for Health Statistics. Vital Health Stat 23(26).

³ Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2014). *Rape and Sexual Assault Among College-Age Females, 1995-2013*. (NCJ 248471).

⁴ Id.

⁵ Krebs, C.P., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S., & Martin, S.L. (2007). The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.; Krebs, C.P., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S., & Martin, S.L. (2009).

⁶ Id.

⁷ Id.

⁸ Krebs, C.P., Lindquist, C.H., Warner, T.D., Fisher, B.S., & Martin, S.L. (2007). The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study.

⁹ MIT Health & Wellness Surveys: 2014 Community Attitudes on Sexual Assault, <http://web.mit.edu/surveys/health/MIT-CASA-Survey-Summary>, Table 2.2.

¹⁰ Anderson, N. & Clement, S. (2015, June 12). College Sexual Assault: 1 in 5 college women say they were violated. *The Washington Post*.

¹¹ Koss, M.P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., Ullman, S., West, C., & White, J. (2006). The Sexual Experience Short Form Victimization (SES-SFV). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona; Koss, M.P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, C., Ullman, S., West, C., & White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, 357-370. The survey instrument design team consulted a host of other materials including: *Estimating the incidence of rape and sexual assault*. Panel on Measuring Rape and Sexual Assault in Bureau of Justice Statistics Household Surveys, C. Kruttschnitt, W.D. Kalsbeek, and C.C. House, Editors. Committee on National Statistics, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council; Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; MIT's "Community Attitudes on Sexual Assault"; The University of New Hampshire's "Unwanted Sexual Experiences Survey," Banyard, V., Cohn, E., Edwards, K., Moynihan, M.M., Walsh, W. & Ward, S. (2012).

¹² Kaplowitz, M. D., Lupi, F., Couper, M. P., & Thorp, L. (2011). The effect of invitation design on web survey response rates. *Social Science Computer Review*, doi: 10.1177/0894439311419084.

¹³ Heerwegh, D. (2005). Effects of personal salutations in e-mail invitations to participate in a web survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 69(4), 588-598.

¹⁴ Crawford, S., McCabe, S., Couper, M., & Boyd, C. (2002, August). From mail to web: improving response rates and data collection efficiencies. In *International Conference on Improving Surveys* (pp. 25-28).

¹⁵ Fan, W., & Yan, Z. (2010). Factors affecting response rates of the web survey: A systematic review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(2), 132-139.

¹⁶ Braunsberger, K., Wybenga, H., & Gates, R. (2007). A comparison of reliability between telephone and web-based surveys. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(7), 758-764.

¹⁷ Fricker, S., Galesic, M., Tourangeau, R., & Yan, T. (2005). An experimental comparison of web and telephone surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 69(3), 370-392.

¹⁸ Millar, M.M., & Dillman, D.A. (2011). Improving response to web and mixed-mode surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, doi: 10.1093/poq/nfr003.

¹⁹ So few respondents identified themselves as transgender that they are not differentiated in the analysis. No one reporting themselves as transgender reported any experience of sexual assault.

²⁰ These are the confidence limits described above – 95% of samples of the U-M student population will estimate the percent that know U-M has a Student Sexual Misconduct Policy between these two limits. Our sample estimates the percentage as 85.9%.

²¹ Data presented in this report are based on student responses to survey questions, not to any other form of University record of their experiences. This is particularly true with respect to U-M's training, education, and prevention programs relating to sexual misconduct.

²² For precise wording of specific questions please see the questionnaire.

²³ Respondents could report more than one response, therefore, percentages cannot be summed.

²⁴ Unwanted experiences were defined to include being “fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of your body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or [having] some of your clothes [removed] without your consent (but [with no] attempt[ed] sexual penetration).”

²⁵ Anyone fondling, kissing or rubbing up against the private areas of the respondent's body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or anyone removing some of the respondent's clothes without their consent (but without attempting sexual penetration).

²⁶ Whites are the reference category. Underrepresented groups include African Americans, Hispanic Americans, American Indians and Mixed Race.

²⁷ This response rate conforms to the AAPOR Response Rate 4. This rate includes partial interviews and interviews in the denominator. See the “AAPOR Standard Definitions” for a complete definition of how this response rate is calculated.

²⁸ Koss, M.P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, M., Ullman, S., West, C., & White, J. (2006). The Sexual Experience Short Form Victimization (SES-SFV). Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona; Koss, M.P., Abbey, A., Campbell, R., Cook, S., Norris, J., Testa, C., Ullman, S., West, C., & White, J. (2007). Revising the SES: A collaborative process to improve assessment of sexual aggression and victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 31, 357-370. The survey instrument design team consulted a host of other materials including: *Estimating the incidence of rape and sexual assault*. Panel on Measuring Rape and Sexual Assault in Bureau of Justice Statistics Household Surveys, C. Kruttschnitt, W.D. Kalsbeek, and C.C. House, Editors. Committee on National Statistics, Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council; Black, M.C., Basile, K.C., Breiding, M.J., Smith, S.G., Walters, M.L., Merrick, M.T., Chen, J., & Stevens, M.R. (2011). The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 Summary Report. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; MIT's “Community Attitudes on Sexual Assault”; The University of New Hampshire's “Unwanted Sexual Experiences Survey,” Banyard, V., Cohn, E., Edwards, K., Moynihan, M.M., Walsh, W. & Ward, S. (2012).

²⁹ Crawford, S., McCabe, S. E., & Pope, D. (2005). Applying web-based survey design standards. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 29(1-2), 43-66.

³⁰ Couper, M. P. (2008). *Designing effective web surveys* (Vol. 75). New York: Cambridge University Press.

³¹ Crawford, S. D., Couper, M. P., & Lamias, M. J. (2001). Web surveys perceptions of burden. *Social Science Computer Review*, 19(2), 146-162.

³² Baker, R. P., Crawford, S., & Swinehart, J. (2004). Development and testing of web questionnaires. *Methods for Testing and Evaluating Survey Questionnaires*, 361-384.

³³ Kaplowitz, M. D., Lupi, F., Couper, M. P., & Thorp, L. (2011). The effect of invitation design on web survey response rates. *Social Science Computer Review*, doi: 10.1177/0894439311419084.

³⁴ Heerwegh, D. (2005). Effects of personal salutations in e-mail invitations to participate in a web survey. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 69(4), 588-598.

³⁵ Crawford, S., McCabe, S., Couper, M., & Boyd, C. (2002, August). From mail to web: improving response rates and data collection efficiencies. In *International Conference on Improving Surveys* (pp. 25-28).

³⁶ Fan, W., & Yan, Z. (2010). Factors affecting response rates of the web survey: A systematic review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26(2), 132-139.

³⁷ Braunsberger, K., Wybenga, H., & Gates, R. (2007). A comparison of reliability between telephone and web-based surveys. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(7), 758-764.

³⁸ Fricker, S., Galesic, M., Tourangeau, R., & Yan, T. (2005). An experimental comparison of web and telephone surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 69(3), 370-392.

³⁹ Millar, M.M., & Dillman, D.A. (2011). Improving response to web and mixed-mode surveys. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, doi: 10.1093/poq/nfr003.