



#iSPEAK

**Campus Climate Assessment:
New Jersey Medical School**

Julia Cusano, MSW
Rita C. Seabrook, PhD
MaryGrace DiMaria
Sarah McMahon, PhD, *Principal Investigator*

OCTOBER 2019

VAWC@SSW.RUTGERS.EDU | 848-932-4390

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... 3

I. INTRODUCTION..... 6

II. METHODS..... 7

III. SURVEY SAMPLE..... 8

 SURVEY SAMPLE 8

 REPRESENTATIVENESS OF SURVEY SAMPLE 9

IV. SEXUAL HARASSMENT FINDINGS 10

 SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMMITTED BY FACULTY 10

 TYPE OF FACULTY SEXUAL HARASSMENT..... 11

 THOSE WHO COMMIT ACTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT 13

 LOCATION OF FACULTY SEXUAL HARASSMENT..... 14

 SURVIVOR DISCLOSURE AFTER HARASSMENT COMMITTED BY FACULTY 14

 REASONS STUDENTS DID NOT DISCLOSE SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMMITTED BY FACULTY 15

 BYSTANDER RESPONSE TO FACULTY SEXUAL HARASSMENT 18

 SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMMITTED BY STUDENTS..... 18

 TYPE OF STUDENT SEXUAL HARASSMENT..... 19

 THOSE WHO COMMIT ACTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT..... 21

 LOCATION OF STUDENT SEXUAL HARASSMENT 21

 BYSTANDER RESPONSE TO STUDENT SEXUAL HARASSMENT 22

 SURVIVOR DISCLOSURE SOURCE AFTER HARASSMENT COMMITTED BY STUDENTS... 22

 GENDER HARASSMENT AT RBHS 26

V. UNWANTED SEXUAL CONTACT FINDINGS 27

VI. PERCEPTIONS OF UNIVERSITY & STUDENTS FINDINGS..... 29

 PERCEPTION OF THE UNIVERSITY 29

 PERCEPTION OF THE STUDENTS..... 30

VII. AWARENESS OF CAMPUS RESOURCES/STUDENT EFFICACY FINDINGS 31

 AWARENESS OF CAMPUS RESOURCES..... 31

 KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT TO DO IN CASES OF SEXUAL MISCONDUCT 32

PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SEXUAL MISCONDUCT	33
VIII. ATTITUDES ABOUT SEXUAL MISCONDUCT FINDINGS	34
PERSONAL ENDORSEMENT OF BELIEFS THAT ACCEPT SEXUAL VIOLENCE.....	34
PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR SEXUAL VIOLENCE.....	35
IX. CONCLUSION.....	37
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	39

Tables

Table 1. Participant Demographics	9
Table 2. Nature of Sexual Harassment Perpetrated by Faculty.....	10
Table 3. Types of Sexual Harassment Committed by Faculty.....	12
Table 4. Position of Individual who Committed the Most Significant Incident	13
Table 5. Gender Identity of Individual who Committed the Most Significant Incident	13
Table 6. Location of Most Significant Sexual Harassment Committed by Faculty.....	14
Table 7. To Whom Did Survivors Disclose the Most Significant Incident of Harassment Committed by Faculty.....	14
Table 8. Reasons for Nondisclosure of Most Significant Experience of Harassment Committed by Faculty	16
Table 9. Bystander Behavior during Most Significant Incident of Faculty Sexual Harassment ..	18
Table 12. Student Status of Individual who Committed the Most Significant Incident.....	21
Table 13. Gender Identity of Individual who Committed the Most Significant Incident.....	21
Table 14. Location of Sexual Harassment Committed by Student	21
Table 15. Bystander Behavior During Most Significant Incident of student sexual harassment .	22
Table 16. To Whom Did Survivors Disclose Most Significant Incident of Harassment Committed by Students?.....	22
Table 17. Reasons for Nondisclosure of Sexual Harassment Committed by Students	23
Table 18. Gender Harassment Scale.....	26
Table 19. Rates of Unwanted Sexual Contact Before and Since Coming to RBHS.....	28
Table 20. Students Who Know Anyone Who Experienced Unwanted Sexual Contact.....	28
Table 21. Disclosure of Unwanted Sexual Experiences from a Student Since Coming to RBHS	28
Table 22. Perception of How the University Would Handle a Report of Sexual Misconduct	29
Table 23. Perception of How Peers Might React to Someone Reporting an Incident of Sexual Misconduct	30

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In Spring 2019, the Center on Violence Against Women & Children (VAWC) administered a campus climate survey to students at the New Jersey Medical School (NJMS) at Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) to assess issues of sexual misconduct on campus. The survey was administered as part of a comprehensive campus climate assessment process that also included focus groups and a resource and policy scan. The climate assessment was conducted at two RBHS campuses (the New Jersey Medical School and the School of Public Health) to pilot the tools and process. The campus climate assessment implemented at RBHS contributes to the ongoing campus climate assessment work that began at Rutgers University in 2014.¹

This report provides the findings of the survey for the New Jersey Medical School (NJMS). The survey contained six sections: 1) basic demographics; 2) experiences of sexual harassment; 3) experiences of unwanted sexual contact; 4) perceptions of the university and fellow students; 5) awareness of resources, knowledge of what to do in cases of sexual misconduct and sexual harassment, and participation in sexual misconduct-related education/activities; and, 6) attitudes about sexual misconduct. The survey was based on the *Not Alone* toolkit from The White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault² and the ARC3 Campus Climate Survey Instrument³. Our measure of sexual harassment is in line with the recommendations from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2018 report on the sexual harassment of women⁴.

All students currently enrolled in coursework at NJMS at RBHS during the spring semester of 2019 were invited to participate in the survey. In total, 307 students participated (a 41% response rate). About half of the sample identified as women, which reflects the student body at NJMS.

The following executive summary highlights key findings from the survey for NJMS. A full report, which presents the results of every question asked on the survey, follows. A shorter report on the findings is also available.

Key finding #1: Just under half the participants reported an experience of sexual harassment from faculty and/or students, but very few reported the experience to RBHS.

Participants indicated how often they had experienced several sexual harassment behaviors committed by faculty and students: *sexist gender harassment* (e.g., “treated you differently because of your gender”), *crude gender harassment* (e.g., “repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you”), *unwanted sexual attention* (e.g., “made unwanted attempts to

¹ For more information regarding campus climate assessments, please visit the website of the Rutgers’ Center on Violence Against Women and Children, at <http://vawc.rutgers.edu>.

² White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. (April 2014). *Not Alone: The first report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault*. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/protecting-students-sexual-assault>.

³ ARC3 Campus Climate Survey. Available from: <https://campusclimate.gsu.edu/arc3-campus-climate-survey/>.

⁴ National Academic of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018). *Sexual harassment of women: climate, culture, and consequences in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine*. National Academies Press. Chicago

establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it”), and *sexual coercion* (e.g., “treated you badly for refusing to have sex”).

Just under half of participants (43.3%) reported at least one experience of sexual harassment committed by faculty and/or students; sexist gender harassment was the most common type of harassment experienced by both women and men. Women were more likely than men to experience sexual harassment perpetrated by faculty and/or students (54.6% v. 32.5%). Very few participants who experienced sexual harassment disclosed to a formal resource on campus (e.g., Resident Advisor, Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance [VPVA], Title IX).

Key finding #2: Many students who experienced sexual harassment did not disclose because they did not think it was serious enough to disclose. Some also feared it would affect their careers.

Participants who indicated that they experienced sexual harassment from faculty and/or students but did not disclose the experience to anyone were asked why they did not disclose. The most common reason for not disclosing faculty and student harassment was that the participant did not think it was serious enough to disclose (about 83.6% cited this reason for not reporting faculty harassment and 80.9% for not reporting student harassment). Among participants who experienced sexual harassment from faculty, 23% said they did not disclose because they were afraid it would impact their career or academics and 23% feared retaliation.

Key finding #3: Many participants who experienced sexual harassment reported that at least one other person witnessed the incident, but many did nothing to intervene.

Between 40% to 65% of participants who experienced sexual harassment from faculty and/or students reported that at least one other person witnessed the incident. However, the majority of witnesses did nothing to intervene.

Key finding #4: Unwanted sexual contact since coming to RBHS was relatively uncommon, but many participants reported experiencing unwanted sexual contact prior to attending RBHS.

In addition to sexual harassment, students were asked about their experiences with unwanted sexual contact. Students were asked six questions about whether they had experienced various types of unwanted sexual contact since coming to RBHS using a scale validated by the Bureau of Justice Campus Climate Validation Study.⁵ Participants were also asked whether they had experienced unwanted sexual contact *before* coming to RBHS.

⁵ Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). *Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct*. Retrieved from https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/%40%20Files/Climate%20Survey/AAU_Campus_Climate_Survey_12_14_15.pdf

Unwanted sexual contact since coming to RBHS was relatively uncommon (4.6% of female and 2.7% of male participants). However, many students reported an experience of unwanted sexual contact before coming to RBHS (22.7% of female participants and 7.3% of male participants).

Key finding #5: Participants perceived RBHS's response to reports of sexual misconduct positively.

Students reported relatively high confidence in the institution's ability to handle incidents of sexual misconduct (including sexual harassment and unwanted sexual contact). Despite relatively high confidence, the majority of participants who experienced sexual harassment did not disclose to a formal resource on campus.

Key finding #6: Participants were somewhat aware of resources.

Participants rated their awareness of several resources on campus related to sexual misconduct. A total of 31.6% of students indicated that they were very or extremely aware of Title IX. Fewer students (5.5%) were aware of the Office of Employment Equity, which is where incidents of harassment perpetrated by faculty would be reported.

[The following provides a link to the full report](#) which elaborates on the above key findings.

The report below is divided into the following sections:

- I. Introduction
- II. Methods
- III. Survey Sample
- IV. Sexual Harassment Findings
- V. Unwanted Sexual Contact Findings
- VI. Perceptions of University & Students Findings
- VII. Awareness of Campus Resources/Student Efficacy Findings
- VIII. Attitudes about Sexual Misconduct Findings
- IX. Conclusion

I. INTRODUCTION

The issue of sexual violence against students at institutions of higher education (IHE) has gained growing attention as a major problem. The Association of American Universities (AAU) surveyed students at 27 IHEs and found, on average, 11.7% of students, including 23.1% of female undergraduates, experienced nonconsensual sexual contact by force or incapacitation.⁶ Researchers have also shown that experiences of sexual harassment are common at IHEs. Using data from two large university systems, researchers from the National Academies of Science, Medicine, and Engineering estimate that rates of sexual harassment of students range from 20-50%. Moreover, women, and especially women in the science, engineering, and medicine fields are more likely than men to experience sexual harassment.⁷

The Center on Violence Against Women & Children (VAWC) at the Rutgers School of Social Work worked with the New Brunswick, Newark, and Camden campuses at Rutgers University to administer comprehensive campus climate assessments related to sexual misconduct (see vawc.rutgers.edu for reports from each campus). In Spring 2019, VAWC piloted a survey, called iSPEAK, at two Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) campuses including the New Jersey Medical School (NJMS). The iSPEAK survey was based on the *Not Alone* toolkit from The White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault⁸ and the ARC3 Campus Climate Survey Instrument.⁹ Our measure of sexual harassment is in line with the recommendations from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2018 report on the sexual harassment of women.

This report presents the results of every question asked on the survey. A condensed report, *Key Findings from the iSPEAK Campus Climate Assessment New Jersey Medical School at Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences*, is also available which outlines key findings from the results of the campus climate survey conducted at the New Jersey Medical School.

⁶ Cantor, D., Fisher, B., Chibnall, S., Townsend, R., Lee, H., Bruce, C., & Thomas, G. (2015). *Report on the AAU campus climate survey on sexual assault and sexual misconduct*. Retrieved from https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/%40%20Files/Climate%20Survey/AAU_Campus_Climate_Survey_12_14_15.pdf.

⁷ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018).

⁸ White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault. (April 2014).

⁹ ARC3 Campus Climate Survey. Available from: <https://campusclimate.gsu.edu/arc3-campus-climate-survey/>.

II. METHODS

The survey used in this report was based on validated scales from the *Not Alone* toolkit from The White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault and the ARC3 Campus Climate Survey Instrument. The tool was created using an extensive vetting process by the research team over the course of several years. This process began in 2014, when the White House Task Force and the U.S. Department of Justice's Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) invited the Rutgers School of Social Work's Center on Violence Against Women & Children (VAWC) to pilot a campus climate survey developed by OVW regarding students' experiences, behaviors, and attitudes related to sexual violence. Since 2014, the survey has been modified for use on all Rutgers University campuses as well as at other institutions. Additionally, a dating violence module was added to the 2018 administration at Rutgers University – New Brunswick.

The survey was modified again for use at Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS). This survey was administered at two Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences schools: The New Jersey Medical School (NJMS) and the School of Public Health (SPH). The survey development process mirrored the process of the campus climate assessments conducted at Rutgers–New Brunswick, Camden, and Newark. It included three main components: (1) a resource and policy scan to determine what was available on campus, (2) focus groups with diverse students to understand their perspectives on sexual misconduct, and (3) a campus climate survey for students. Each of these stages is further explained below.

The resource and policy scan was conducted prior to the administration of the survey. The purpose of the resource and policy scan was to systematically document the available resources, programs, policies, and protocols related to sexual misconduct at RBHS. The resource and policy scan was also used to tailor the survey tool to NJMS-specific resources.

Before the survey was administered, 12 students from the New Jersey Medical School (NJMS) and the School of Public Health (SPH) participated in two focus groups. The purpose of the groups was to collect information about students' understanding and perception of sexual violence and harassment in order to inform the campus climate survey design and Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) educational programming.

The third component, the campus climate survey, was administered in Spring 2019. The survey was approved by the Rutgers University Institutional Review Board and was programmed into Qualtrics by Rutgers Institutional Research (IR). All participants were provided with an informed consent form and the option to participate in the survey. The survey was open from February 6, 2019 through March 7, 2019. Students were invited to participate through an email from Institutional Research, which included a link to the survey and were reminded to take the survey through a range of outreach measures, including direct e-mails, a social media campaign, and posters displayed on campus. All participants received a \$10 electronic Amazon gift card for completing the survey.

The campus climate survey contained six sections: 1) basic demographics; 2) experiences of sexual harassment from faculty and students; 3) experiences of unwanted sexual contact; 4)

perceptions of the university and students; 5) awareness of resources, knowledge of what to do in cases of sexual misconduct, and participation in sexual misconduct-related education/activities; and, 6) attitudes about sexual misconduct. Validated, reliable, and published scales were used throughout the survey. Details about the specific scales are included with findings, below.

III. SURVEY SAMPLE

SURVEY SAMPLE

Demographic information about the sample is presented in Table 1. In total, 307 students from the New Jersey Medical School (NJMS) participated in the survey (a 41% response rate).¹⁰ Gender, race and ethnicity, sexuality, campus, and year in program was measured for the sample.

¹⁰ Although 307 participants took the survey, not all participants answered every question. Therefore, table values will not always add up to 307, particularly in those that include information based on students' gender identity as not all students responded to this question.

REPRESENTATIVENESS OF SURVEY SAMPLE

Half of participants identified as female (50.2%; see Table 1), which largely reflects the student body of NJMS (47.5% female). The sample is diverse in terms of race/ethnicity and is similar to the racial/ethnic background of the NJMS population (see Table 1).

Table 1. Participant Demographics

	All (n=307)	
	N	%
Male	152	49.51
Female	154	50.16
Another	NR	NR
<i>Missing</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Race/Ethnicity		
African American	16	5.21
Asian	128	41.69
Hispanic	37	12.05
White	116	37.79
Other	10	3.26
<i>Missing</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Heterosexual	273	88.93
Non-heterosexual	31	10.10
<i>Missing</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Campus		
Newark	289	94.14
Another	17	5.54
<i>Missing</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>
Year in Program		
First	88	28.66
Second	56	18.24
Third	68	22.15
Fourth	87	28.34
Other	NR	NR
<i>Missing</i>	<i>NR</i>	<i>NR</i>

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

IV. SEXUAL HARASSMENT FINDINGS

Sexual harassment was measured using a modified version of the Sexual Experiences Questionnaire (SEQ DoD), a validated instrument. The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018) report on sexual harassment of women recommends the SEQ DoD because rather than using the term “sexual harassment” in the survey items, which participants may interpret differently, the tool uses behaviorally specific questions, asking about a range of behaviors. This practice has been determined as superior for asking about experiences of sexual misconduct. The survey tool is also recommended because it captures various broad categories of sexual harassment (gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion).¹¹ In the current survey, we used the SEQ DoD to measure harassment experiences committed by both faculty and by students.

The SEQ DoD includes 16 behaviors that capture the following types of sexual harassment: sexist gender harassment, crude gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. Participants indicated whether they had experienced each of the behaviors never (0 times), once (1 time), sometimes (2-5 times, or often (6+ times). Example items include “treated you differently because of your gender” (sexist gender harassment), “repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you” (crude gender harassment), “made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it” (unwanted sexual attention), and “treated you badly for refusing to have sex” (sexual coercion). Participants indicated their experience with these behaviors committed by faculty members and students.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMMITTED BY FACULTY

The rates and types of sexual harassment perpetrated by faculty are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2. Nature of Sexual Harassment Perpetrated by Faculty

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexist Hostility						
Treated you differently because of your gender	17.6	54	26	40	9.3	14
Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials	NR	NR	5.8	9	NR	NR
Made offensive or sexist remarks	23.8	73	26	40	21.9	33
Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender	7.5	23	11	17	NR	NR
Crude Harassment						
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were sexually offensive to you	6.5	20	7.8	12	5.3	8

¹¹ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018).

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters	NR	NR	5.2	8	NR	NR
Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual matters	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Unwanted Sexual Attention						
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said 'No'	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable	NR	NR	6.5	10	NR	NR
Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Sexual Coercion						
Made you feel like you were being bribed with a reward to engage in sexual behavior	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Treated you badly for refusing sex	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

TYPE OF FACULTY SEXUAL HARASSMENT

The report on sexual harassment of women from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine¹² defines sexual harassment as a type of gender discrimination with three categories:

- 1) **Gender harassment.** Gender harassment refers to “a broad range of verbal and nonverbal behaviors not aimed at sexual cooperation but that convey insulting, hostile,

¹² National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018).

and degrading attitudes about” members of one gender¹³ (p. 430). Gender harassment can be further divided into two subcategories:

- a. *Sexist hostility*. Sexist hostility includes behaviors that are demeaning to members of one gender (e.g., jokes or comments about women’s leadership abilities).
 - b. *Crude harassment*. Crude harassment includes using sexually crude terms or making sexually crude jokes about one gender (e.g., referring to a woman as a ‘bitch’ or a man as a ‘pussy’).
- 2) **Unwanted sexual attention**. Unwanted sexual attention refers to sexual advances that are unwelcome (e.g., repeatedly asking someone on a date when they have said ‘no’).
 - 3) **Sexual coercion**. Sexual coercion refers to requirements to engage in sexual activity as a condition of employment or promotion (e.g., receiving a promotion in exchange for sex, or being denied an opportunity for refusing to have sex). Table 3 provides the percentage and number of all students, women students, and male students that reported at least one experience of sexual harassment perpetrated by faculty.

Based on the 16 questions outlined in the table above, experiences of sexual harassment were collapsed into the following categories identified by the National Academies of Sciences¹⁴ Engineering, and Medicine: 1) Gender harassment; 2) Unwanted sexual attention; and 3) Sexual coercion.

Table 3 provides the percentage and number of all students, women students, and men students that reported at least one experience of sexual harassment that faculty committed.

Table 3. Types of Sexual Harassment Committed by Faculty

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Any sexual harassment experience from faculty	30.6	94	36.4	56	25.2	38
Sexist Gender Harassment from Faculty	30.6	94	36.4	56	25.2	38
Crude Gender Harassment from Faculty	10.7	33	14.3	22	7.3	11
Unwanted sexual attention from Faculty	NR	NR	7.8	12	NR	NR
Sexual Coercion from Faculty	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2018).

THOSE WHO COMMIT ACTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Participants who indicated that they experienced an incident of sexual harassment were asked about the position and gender of the faculty or staff member who committed the most significant experience. The position and gender of the individual committing the behavior is displayed in Tables 4 and 5 for all student survivors.

Table 4. Position of Individual who Committed the Most Significant Incident

	All Survivors (n=94)	
	%	N
Faculty member	41.5	39
Staff member or other administrator	6.4	6
Graduate student instructor	NR	NR
Field/intern instructor or supervisor	11.7	11
Other person affiliated with a university program (ex. Internship, study abroad)	6.4	6
The person was not affiliated with Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences	8.5	8
I don't know their association with Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences	17	16
Other	5.3	5

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

Table 5. Gender Identity of Individual who Committed the Most Significant Incident

	All Survivors (n=94)	
	%	N
Men	87.2	82
Women	7.4	7

LOCATION OF FACULTY SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Participants who reported at least one incident of sexual harassment by faculty/staff associated with RBHS were asked where they the most significant experience of sexual harassment took place. Results are displayed in Table 6.

Table 6. Location of Most Significant Sexual Harassment Committed by Faculty

	All Survivors (n=94)	
	%	N
On-campus	42.6	40
Off-campus at a university-affiliated internship, field placement, or rotation	52.1	49
Other off-campus place	NR	NR

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

SURVIVOR DISCLOSURE AFTER HARASSMENT COMMITTED BY FACULTY

Participants who reported at least one experience of sexual harassment that faculty/staff associated with RBHS committed were asked whether they disclosed the most significant incident of sexual harassment to anyone (see Table 7). Both formal and informal disclosure sources were listed.

Table 7. To Whom Did Survivors Disclose the Most Significant Incident of Harassment Committed by Faculty

	All Survivors (n=94)	
	%	N
Off-campus or Informal Resources		
Anyone	34.0	32
Friend or peer (e.g. roommate, close friend)	33.0	31
Romantic partner (other than the person who did this to you)	21.3	20
Family member (e.g., parent or guardian, other family members)	8.5	8
Resident Advisor (RA) or Residence Life staff	NR	NR
Health care provider	NR	NR

	All Survivors (n=94)	
	%	N
Religious leader	NR	NR
Campus Resources		
Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance (VPVA) staff	NR	NR
Student Wellness Program	NR	NR
Clinician at Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences vis University Behavioral Health	NR	NR
Rutgers Human Resources	NR	NR
Office of Employment Equity	NR	NR
Office of Student Conduct	NR	NR
Rutgers faculty or staff	6.4	6
Field instructor/intern supervisor	NR	NR
Rutgers Title IX Compliance Officer	NR	NR
Rutgers University Police Department	NR	NR
Other person (please specify your relationship to that person)	NR	NR

Note. Participants could select more than one disclosure resource.
 NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

REASONS STUDENTS DID NOT DISCLOSE SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMMITTED BY FACULTY

Respondents who did not disclose their most significant experience of sexual harassment were asked why they did not and were presented with a list of 27 possible reasons (see Table 8). Participants could all that applied.

Table 8. Reasons for Nondisclosure of Most Significant Experience of Harassment Committed by Faculty

	All Survivors Who Did Not Tell Someone (n=47)	
	%	N
Fear of being blamed or not believed		
I felt ashamed/embarrassed	13.1	8
I was afraid of not being believed	NR	NR
I thought I would be blamed for what happened	NR	NR
It would feel like an admission of failure	NR	NR
I didn't think others would understand	13.1	8
I was afraid I or another would be punished for infractions or violations	NR	NR
Concern for Privacy		
It is a private; I wanted to deal with it on my own	27.9	17
I was concerned others would find out	9.8	6
I thought people would try to tell me what to do	8.2	5
I didn't want others to worry about me	13.1	8
Not Serious Enough		
I didn't think others would think it was serious	45.9	28
I didn't think what happened was serious enough to talk about	68.9	42
I had other things I needed to focus on and was concerned about (classes, work)	37.7	23
Nothing Would Be Done		
I didn't think anything would be done	36.1	22
Lack of Reporting Knowledge		
I didn't know reporting procedures on campus	6.6	4
I thought it wasn't a university related issue	9.8	6
Fear of Retaliation		



	All Survivors Who Did Not Tell Someone (n=47)	
	%	N
I was afraid the person who did it would try to get back at me	18	11
I was afraid others would harass me or react negatively toward me	6.6	4
Desire to Forget		
I wanted to forget it happened	13.1	8
Concern for Career/Academics		
I was afraid it would impact my current employment/internship/field placement	16.4	10
I was afraid it would impact my grades or other academic related outcomes	16.4	10
Concern for Community		
I was concerned that members of my religious group would not support me	NR	NR
I was concerned that members of my cultural/ethnic community would not support me	NR	NR
I was afraid it would reflect badly on the LGBT community*	NR	NR
Concern for Individual Who Committed the Behavior		
I didn't want the person to get in trouble	18	11
I was afraid it would impact the future (career) of the person who committed the behavior	NR	NR

Note. Multiple responses could be selected.

*This question was only asked of those who identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, fluid/pansexual, queer, asexual, questioning or unsure, same-gender loving, or another sexual orientation.

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

BYSTANDER RESPONSE TO FACULTY SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Participants were asked whether anyone saw what happened during the most significant experience of sexual harassment and if yes, if they intervened. Table 9 displays the rates of bystander intervention of the sample.

Table 9. Bystander Behavior during Most Significant Incident of Faculty Sexual Harassment

Was there anyone who saw what happened to you?	Yes, and they did nothing		Yes, and they did something		No	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
All survivors (n=93)	63.4	59	NR	NR	34	32

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT COMMITTED BY STUDENTS

Participants were also asked about experiences of sexual harassment committed by students using questions identical to the questions regarding incidents committed by faculty/staff. The SEQ DoD includes 16 behaviors that capture the following types of sexual harassment: sexist gender harassment, crude gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion. Participants indicated whether they had experienced each of the behaviors Never (0 times), once (1 time), sometimes (2-5 times, or often (6+ times). Example items include “treated you differently because of your gender” (sexist gender harassment), “repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you” (crude gender harassment), “made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it” (unwanted sexual attention), and “treated you badly for refusing to have sex” (sexual coercion) (see Table 10).

Table 10. Nature of Sexual Harassment Committed by Students

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Sexist Hostility						
Treated you differently because of your gender	17.6	54	25.3	39	9.9	15
Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials	NR	NR	5.8	9	NR	NR
Made offensive or sexist remarks	20.2	62	27.3	42	13.2	20
Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender	10.4	32	17.5	27	NR	NR
Crude Harassment						
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were sexually offensive to you	5.2	16	6.5	10	NR	NR

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters	NR	NR	5.8	9	NR	NR
Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual matters	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Unwanted Sexual Attention						
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it	NR	NR	5.2	8	NR	NR
Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said 'No'	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable	5.5	17	6.5	10	NR	NR
Sexual Coercion						
Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Made you feel like you were being bribed with a reward to engage in sexual behavior	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Treated you badly for refusing sex	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

TYPE OF STUDENT SEXUAL HARSSMENT

As with questions about incidents committed by faculty/staff, the student questions asked about the following categories:

1) Gender harassment. Gender harassment refers to “a broad range of verbal and nonverbal behaviors not aimed at sexual cooperation but that convey insulting, hostile, and degrading attitudes about” members of one gender¹⁵ (p. 430). Gender harassment can be further divided into two subcategories:

- a. *Sexist hostility.* Sexist hostility includes behaviors that are demeaning to members of one gender (e.g., jokes or comments about women’s leadership abilities).

¹⁵ Ibid.

b. *Crude harassment.* Crude harassment includes using sexually crude terms or making sexually crude jokes about one gender (e.g., referring to a woman as a ‘bitch’ or a man as a ‘pussy’).

2) Unwanted sexual attention. Unwanted sexual attention refers to sexual advances that are unwelcome (e.g., repeatedly asking someone on a date when they have said ‘no’).

3) Sexual coercion. Sexual coercion refers to requirements to engage in sexual activity as a condition of employment or promotion (e.g., receiving a promotion in exchange for sex, or being denied an opportunity for refusing to have sex).

Table 11 provides the percentage and number of all students that reported at least one experience of sexual harassment committed by students and is also broken down by gender.

Table 11. Types of Sexual Harassment Committed by Students

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Any sexual harassment experience from students	27.4	84	37	57	17.9	27
Sexist Gender Harassment from students	25.7	79	35.1	54	16.6	25
Crude Gender Harassment from students	8.5	26	10.4	16	6.6	10
Unwanted sexual attention from students	8.5	26	12.3	19	NR	NR
Sexual Coercion from students	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

THOSE WHO COMMIT ACTS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Participants were asked about the student status and gender identity of the peer who committed the most significant experience of sexual harassment. Results are indicated in Table 12 and Table 13.

Table 10. Student Status of Individual who Committed the Most Significant Incident

	All Survivors (n=84)	
	%	N
No	NR	NR
Yes	94	79
I don't know	NR	NR

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

Table 11. Gender Identity of Individual who Committed the Most Significant Incident

	All Survivors (n=84)	
	%	N
Female	11.9	10
Male	83.3	70

LOCATION OF STUDENT SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Participants indicated where the most significant experience of sexual harassment a student committed took place. Results are displayed in Table 14.

Table 12. Location of Sexual Harassment Committed by Student

	All Survivors (n=84)	
	%	N
On-campus	64.3	54
Off-campus at a university affiliated internship, field placement, or rotation	NR	NR
Off-campus at university-affiliated housing	8.3	7
Other off-campus place	17.9	15

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

BYSTANDER RESPONSE TO STUDENT SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Participants were asked whether anyone saw what happened during the most significant experience of sexual harassment by a fellow student and if yes, if they did anything. Table 15 displays the rates of bystander intervention of all of the sample and by gender.

Table 13. Bystander Behavior During Most Significant Incident of student sexual harassment

	Yes, and they did nothing		Yes, and they did something		No	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
All survivors (n=84)	34.5	29	6.0	5	58.3	49

SURVIVOR DISCLOSURE SOURCE AFTER HARASSMENT COMMITTED BY STUDENTS

Participants who reported at least one experience of harassment committed by students were asked whether they disclosed the most significant experience of sexual harassment to anyone (see Table 16). Both formal and informal disclosure sources were listed.

Table 14. To Whom Did Survivors Disclose Most Significant Incident of Harassment Committed by Students?

	All Survivors (n=84)	
	%	N
Off campus or Informal Resources		
Anyone	42.9	36
Friend or peer (e.g. roommate, close friend)	41.7	35
Romantic partner (other than the person who did this to you)	23.8	20
Family member (e.g., parent or guardian, other family members)	NR	NR
Resident Advisor (RA) or Residence Life Staff	NR	NR
Health Care Provider	NR	NR
Religious Leader	NR	NR
Campus Resources		
Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance (VPVA) staff	NR	NR

	All Survivors (n=84)	
	%	N
Student Wellness Program	NR	NR
Rutgers Human Resources	NR	NR
Office of Employment Equity	NR	NR
Office of Student Conduct	NR	NR
Rutgers faculty or staff	NR	NR
Field Instructor/intern Supervisor	NR	NR
Rutgers Title IX Compliance Officer	NR	NR
Rutgers University Police Department	NR	NR
Therapist	6.0	5
Other person (please specify your relationship to that person)	NR	NR

Note. Participants could select more than one disclosure resource. *Numbers in this table regarding disclosure sources were calculated differently than was done for the 2014 Campus Climate report.
 NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

REASONS STUDENTS DID NOT DISCLOSE INCIDENTS COMMITTED BY STUDENTS

Respondents who did not tell anyone about what happened to them were asked why they did not disclose and were presented with a list of 27 possible reasons (See Table 17). Participants could choose multiple reasons.

Table 15. Reasons for Nondisclosure of Sexual Harassment Committed by Students

	All Survivors Who Did Not Tell Someone (n=61)	
	%	N
Fear of being blamed or not believed		
I felt ashamed/embarrassed	6.4	3
I was afraid of not being believed	NR	NR
I thought I would be blamed for what happened	8.5	4
It would feel like an admission of failure	NR	NR
I didn't think others would understand	12.8	6



	All Survivors Who Did Not Tell Someone (n=61)	
	%	N
I was afraid I or another would be punished for infractions or violations	NR	NR
Concern for Privacy		
It is a private; I wanted to deal with it on my own	44.7	21
I was concerned others would find out	NR	NR
I thought people would try to tell me what to do	10.6	5
I didn't want others to worry about me	14.9	7
Not Serious Enough		
I didn't think others would think it was serious	48.9	23
I didn't think what happened was serious enough to talk about	76.6	36
I had other things I needed to focus on and was concerned about (classes, work)	34	16
Nothing Would Be Done		
I didn't think anything would be done	21.3	10
Lack of Reporting Knowledge		
I didn't know reporting procedures on campus	NR	NR
I thought it wasn't a university related issue	14.9	7
Fear of Retaliation		
I was afraid the person who did it would try to get back at me	NR	NR
I was afraid others would harass me or react negatively toward me	6.4	3
Desire to Forget		
I wanted to forget it happened	17	8
Concern for Career/Academics		
I was afraid it would impact my current employment/internship/field placement	NR	NR
I was afraid it would impact my grades or other academic related outcomes	NR	NR



	All Survivors Who Did Not Tell Someone (n=61)	
	%	N
Concern for Community		
I was concerned that members of my religious group would not support me	NR	NR
I was concerned that members of my cultural/ethnic community would not support me	NR	NR
I was afraid it would reflect badly on the LGBT community*	NR	NR
Concern for Individual Who Committed the Behavior		
I didn't want the person to get in trouble	21.3	10
I was afraid it would impact the future (career) of the person who committed the behavior	NR	NR

Note. Multiple responses could be selected.

*This question was only asked of those who identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, fluid/pansexual, queer, asexual, questioning or unsure, same-gender loving, or another sexual orientation.

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

GENDER HARASSMENT AT RBHS

Because gender harassment is the most common type of sexual harassment, we included three additional questions to capture experiences of sexist gender harassment at RBHS. Respondents rated their agreement with three statements to measure sexist gender harassment at RBHS. Participants were given a scale with five options including strongly disagree (1), disagree (2), neutral (3), agree (4), strongly agree (5). A mean score across the three items was calculated such that higher scores indicate more experiences with gender harassment at RBHS (see Table 18).

Table 16. Gender Harassment Scale

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Since Enrolling at Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS), I have been denied academic opportunities because of my gender.	1.35	.66	1.38	.57	1.32	.75
At Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS), I have not received the same support from my professors because of my gender.	1.4	.71	1.49	.76	1.31	.65
At Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS), I have witnessed people of genders other than my own receive preferential treatment in the classroom.	1.75	1.07	1.86	1.06	1.64	1.07

V. UNWANTED SEXUAL CONTACT FINDINGS

To assess victimization, a series of questions were asked about whether students experienced various types of unwanted sexual contact at RBHS. Students who reported a completed sexual assault were asked a series of follow-up questions on the nature of the sexual violence they had experienced and what happened afterward, including any disclosure of the incident to others and use and perceived helpfulness of campus resources. In addition, students were asked how many of their peers had disclosed an experience of sexual violence to them and how they perceived their ability to help such peers. *As a reminder, the information presented in this section may be especially sensitive and difficult for some readers.*

To better understand the relationship between the campus climate and sexual violence, it is necessary to gather information about the scope and nature of unwanted sexual experiences among students. For this section of the *iSpeak* survey, the research team drew many of the items and scales from the 2014 *Not Alone* toolkit.¹⁶ The team modified the items after consulting the available literature, with additional input from several RBHS stakeholders. Before asking participants about their experiences with victimization, the *iSpeak* survey provided students with the definition of unwanted sexual contact as stated in the Rutgers University Student Policy Prohibiting Sexual Harassment, Sexual Violence, Relationship Violence, Stalking and Related Misconduct.¹⁷ The definition provided was broken down into two types of unwanted sexual contact: (1) unwanted penetrative contact and (2) unwanted touching of a sexual nature.

Following the definitions of unwanted sexual contact as stated in the Rutgers University Student Policy Prohibiting Sexual Harassment, Sexual Violence, Relationship Violence, Stalking and Related Misconduct - students were asked six questions about whether they had experienced various types of unwanted sexual contact since coming to RBHS using a scale validated by the Bureau of Justice Campus Climate Validation Study.¹⁸ This included:

- Four questions about unwanted sexual contact that involved force or threat of violence, explained as “This could include someone holding you down with his or her body weight, pinning your arms, hitting or kicking you, or threatening to use a weapon against you.”
- Two questions about unwanted sexual contact while being unable to provide consent or to stop what was happening because “you were passed out, drugged, incapacitated or asleep.” One question asks about experiences of this type that participants are certain occurred, and the second question asks about experiences of this type that participants are uncertain occurred.

If a student endorsed any of the six items referring to a completed or attempted sexual assault since coming to RBHS, the student was asked a follow-up question to indicate whether the incident involved unwanted sexual touching of a sexual nature, unwanted penetrative contact, or other.

¹⁶ The White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault (2014). *Not Alone Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/protecting-students-sexual-assault>

¹⁷ Definition adapted from Rutgers University. (2015). Student Policy Prohibiting Sexual Harassment, Sexual Violence, Relationship Violence, Stalking and Related Misconduct.

¹⁸ Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Berzofsky, M., Shook-Sa, B., & Peterson, K. (2016). *Campus Climate Survey validation study: Final technical report*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

It is important to note that because rates of unwanted sexual contact on campus were low, all six types of unwanted sexual contact were combined into one overall experience variable.

Participants were also asked whether they had experienced unwanted sexual contact before and since coming to RBHS (see Table 19).

Table 17. Rates of Unwanted Sexual Contact Before and Since Coming to RBHS

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Did you ever experience unwanted sexual contact before coming to RBHS?	30	46	22.7	35	7.3	11
At least one incident of completed sexual violence since coming to RBHS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
At least one incident of attempted sexual violence since coming to RBHS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
At least one incident of incapacitated sexual violence since coming to RBHS	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

KNOWING SOMEONE WHO EXPERIENCED UNWANTED SEXUAL CONTACT

All survey participants were asked whether they know anyone who has ever been forced or coerced by another person to do something sexually that they did not want to do (see Table 20). Participants were also asked whether any other students have ever disclosed an experience of unwanted sexual contact to them since coming to RBHS (see Table 21).

Table 18. Students Who Know Anyone Who Experienced Unwanted Sexual Contact

	All Students (n=307)	
	%	N
Yes	41.1	116
No	58.9	166

Table 19. Disclosure of Unwanted Sexual Experiences from a Student Since Coming to RBHS

	All Students (n=307)	
	%	N
Yes	21.7	61
No	78.3	220

VI. PERCEPTIONS OF UNIVERSITY & STUDENTS FINDINGS

PERCEPTION OF THE UNIVERSITY

The survey contained a scale to assess university responsiveness, which was included in the *Not Alone* toolkit from The White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault.¹⁹ Students were asked how they believe the university would handle a report of sexual misconduct. Participants rated their agreement with seven statements on a 1 to 5 scale, with higher scores indicating more positive perceptions of the university’s response. Example statements include, “RBHS would take the report seriously” and “RBHS would support the person making the report.” Results are displayed in Table 22.

Table 20. Perception of How the University Would Handle a Report of Sexual Misconduct

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) would take the report seriously	4.11	0.85	3.97	.8	4.26	.88
Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) would maintain the privacy of the person making the report	4.09	0.93	4.04	.87	4.14	.98
Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) would protect the safety of the person making the report	4.06	0.91	3.94	.84	4.18	.96
If requested by the victim, Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) would forward the report to criminal investigators (for example, the police)	4.05	0.89	3.92	.89	4.19	.88
Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) would support the person making the report	3.98	0.90	3.85	.87	4.11	.92
Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) would take action to address factors that may have led to the unwanted sexual contact	3.75	1.04	3.63	.99	3.87	1.07
Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) would handle the report fairly	3.87	0.87	3.76	.83	3.99	.9

¹⁹ The White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault (2014). *Not Alone Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/protecting-students-sexual-assault>

PERCEPTION OF THE STUDENTS

The survey contained a scale to assess peer responsiveness, which was included in the *Not Alone* toolkit from The White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault.²⁰ Table 23 shows participants’ perception of their peer’s response if someone was to report sexual misconduct. Participants rated their agreement with three statements on a 1 to 5 scale (Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree). Scores were calculated such that higher scores indicate more positive perceptions of fellow students. Example statements include, “Students would label the person making the report a trouble maker” and “the alleged offenders or their friends would try to get back at the person making the report.” Average scores for all participants, as well as women students and men students are displayed in Table 23.

Table 21. Perception of How Peers Might React to Someone Reporting an Incident of Sexual Misconduct

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Students would label the person making the report a trouble maker	2.33	0.95	3.65	.88	3.69	1.02
Students would have a hard time supporting the person who made the report	2.14	0.86	3.81	.75	3.91	.95
The alleged offender(s) or their friends would try to get back at the person making the report	2.59	1.02	3.34	.97	3.47	1.08

²⁰ The White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault (2014). *Not Alone Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov/ovw/protecting-students-sexual-assault>

VII. AWARENESS OF CAMPUS RESOURCES/STUDENT EFFICACY FINDINGS

AWARENESS OF CAMPUS RESOURCES

Participants were asked to rate their awareness of several resources on campus related to sexual misconduct. For each resource, participants were asked to indicate whether they were not at all aware (1), slightly aware (2), moderately aware (3), very aware (4), or extremely aware (5). Higher scores indicate greater average awareness of resources. Table 24 presents the mean (average) scores for participants across all resources. The table contains results for all participants, as well as women students and men students.

Table 24. Awareness of Campus Resources

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Office of Student Affairs	3.30	1.19	3.21	1.19	3.4	1.19
Office of RBHS Title IX	3.04	1.15	2.98	1.13	3.09	1.17
Student Wellness Program	3.16	1.18	3.14	1.18	3.17	1.18
The Office of Employment Equity	1.94	1.02	1.66	.87	2.23	1.09
Rutgers Health Services	3.22	1.22	3.18	1.2	3.25	1.25
Rutgers University Police Department (RUPD)	3.39	1.14	3.3	1.08	3.48	1.19
Student Legal Services	1.81	1.05	1.55	.81	2.08	1.18

KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT TO DO IN CASES OF SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

Participants were asked to rate their agreement with four statements regarding knowledge of what to do if they or a friend experienced sexual misconduct on a 1 to 5 scale. Sample statements include, “If a friend or I experienced unwanted sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, I know where to get help on Rutgers' campus.” Table 25 presents the mean (average) scores for participants. The table contains results for all participants, as well as women students and men students. Higher scores indicate greater efficacy/knowledge of what to do if they or a friend experienced sexual misconduct.

Table 25. Perceived Efficacy/Knowledge about what to do in Cases of Sexual Misconduct

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
If a friend or I experienced unwanted sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, I know where to get help on Rutgers' campus	3.41	1.06	3.33	1.07	3.49	1.04
If a friend or I experienced sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, I know where to get help off Rutgers' campus	3.33	1.06	3.22	1.07	3.44	1.03
I am aware of and understand Rutgers' procedures for dealing with reported incidents of sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment	3.30	1.06	3.13	1.03	3.46	1.07
At Rutgers, I know what services are available for people who experience sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment	3.20	1.10	3.06	1.09	3.34	1.1
At Rutgers, students who are accused of perpetrating sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, are treated fairly	3.26	0.77	3.29	.59	3.44	.79
At Rutgers, when it is determined that sexual misconduct has happened, the perpetrator gets punished appropriately	3.30	1.19	3.15	.67	3.36	.84

PARTICIPATION IN ACTIVITIES RELATED TO SEXUAL MISCONDUCT

Students were asked whether they participated in three activities related to sexual misconduct on campus. The percentages of students who had participated in the events is displayed in Table 26. The table contains results for all participants, as well as women students and men students.

Table 26. Participation in Sexual Misconduct Related Prevention Education/Activities

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	%	N	%	N	%	N
Attended a VPVA sponsored event (e.g., Clothesline Project, Take Back the Night, Vagina Monologues)	6.2	19	NR	NR	7.9	12
Took an online course/module (e.g., Not Anymore) regarding sexual or dating violence	27.4	84	20.1	31	35.1	53
Attended an orientation program where the definition of sexual harassment, sexual assault, gender bias, and/or dating violence was discussed	67.1	206	65.6	101	69.5	105

NR: Not reported; cell size smaller than 5.

VIII. ATTITUDES ABOUT SEXUAL MISCONDUCT FINDINGS

PERSONAL ENDORSEMENT OF BELIEFS THAT ACCEPT SEXUAL VIOLENCE

Students rated their agreement scale with seven statements in order to gauge their personal endorsement of beliefs that accept sexual violence on a 1 to 5 utilizing a scale adapted from the Personal Acceptance of Sexual Violence scale from Krebs et al. (2016).²¹ Mean scores across all seven statements are presented in Table 27. Higher scores indicate greater rape myth acceptance.

Table 27. Acceptance of Sexual Violence

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
People get too offended by sexual comments, jokes, or gestures	2.48	0.97	2.22	.76	2.74	1.08
It doesn't really hurt anyone to post sexual comments or photos of people without their consent through e-mail, text, or social media	1.25	0.50	1.18	.39	1.33	.59
A person who is sexually assaulted while they are drunk is at least somewhat responsible for putting themselves in that position	1.52	0.79	1.39	.69	1.66	.87
If one of my friends told me that someone had unwanted sexual contact with them, I would encourage them to report the incident to campus or local police	4.19	0.89	4.19	.92	4.19	.87
It is not necessary to get consent before sexual activity if you are in a relationship with that person	1.35	0.60	1.27	.58	1.43	.61
Accusations of sexual assault are often used by one person as a way to get back at the other person	1.97	0.96	1.67	.85	2.27	.97
A lot of times, what people say is rape is actually consensual sex that they regretted afterwards	1.66	0.81	1.43	.64	1.9	.9

²¹ 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, US Department of Justice.

PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR SEXUAL VIOLENCE

The Readiness to Help scale²² evaluated the extent to which students think that sexual violence is a problem at RBHS and their level of intention to do something about it on a 1 to 5 scale. Mean scores across all statements are presented in Table 28.

Table 28. Readiness to Help

	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
I don't think sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, is a problem at RBHS (reverse coded) ²³	2.89	0.89	3.22	.81	2.99	.96
I don't think there is much I can do about sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment at RBHS (reverse coded)	2.56	0.88	3.50	.85	3.38	.91
There isn't much need for me to think about sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment at RBHS (reverse coded)	2.64	0.96	3.45	.95	3.26	.96
Doing something about sexual violence, including sexual misconduct, is solely the job of university officials (reverse coded)	1.86	0.72	4.12	.72	4.17	.72
Sometimes I think I should learn more about sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment	3.19	0.93	3.26	.94	3.12	.91
I have not yet done anything to learn more about sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment (reverse coded)	2.74	1.05	3.20	1.05	3.13	1.04
I think I can do something about sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment	3.52	0.77	3.52	.75	3.53	.8
I am planning to learn more about the problem of sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment on campus	3.01	0.89	3.52	.83	2.91	.93
I have recently attended a program about sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment	2.33	1.05	2.28	1.03	2.38	1.08

²² Adapted from Banyard, V.L., Moynihan, M.M., Cares, A.C., & Warner, R. (2014). How do we know it works? Measuring outcomes in bystander-focused abuse prevention on campus. *Psychology of Violence*, 4(1), 101-115.

²³ "Reverse coded" refers to when the numerical scoring scale for a particular survey item runs in the opposite direction so the item is reverse coded in order to match the scoring scale of the other items.



	All Students (n=307)		Women Students (n=154)		Men Students (n=151)	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
I am actively involved in projects to deal with sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, at Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS)	1.97	0.94	2.03	.98	1.91	.89
I have recently taken part in activities or volunteered my time on projects focused on ending sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, on campus	2.01	.093	2.07	.96	1.96	.9
I have been or am currently involved in ongoing efforts to end sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment, on campus	2.01	0.91	2.04	.93	1.97	.9

IX. CONCLUSION

Research presented in the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine report on sexual harassment suggests that 20 to 50% of students experience sexual harassment.²⁴ Rates of sexual harassment at NJMS fall within this range; just over 40% of students at NJMS report harassment. Consistent with previous research, gender harassment (i.e., demeaning or derogatory remarks about members of one gender) was the most common type of harassment experienced.

Very few participants who experienced sexual harassment reported the experience to a formal resource; if participants did disclose they were most likely to tell a friend or peer. There are several reasons why students who experienced harassment did not report. The most common reason reported by participants was that they did not feel the experience was serious enough to report. This finding is consistent with other research that demonstrates that minimizing or normalizing sexual harassment experiences is a common coping mechanism for dealing with sexual harassment.²⁵

Another reason for not reporting was that participants were not familiar with the resources available to them on campus. At RBHS, incidents of sexual harassment perpetrated by faculty can be reported to the Office of Employment Equity, yet nearly half of participants were unaware of this office. Additionally, about one-third of participants who experienced harassment from faculty said they did not disclose because they did not think anything would be done. If students are unaware of resources for reporting sexual harassment they may be more likely to assume that the school will not do anything in response to a report. Therefore, increasing students' awareness of resources may increase their perception that the university would respond to a report and their willingness to actually report.

Rates of unwanted sexual contact (including sexual assault) were quite low at NJMS. The low rates may be because NJMS serves graduate students, who are less likely than undergraduates to experience sexual violence.²⁶ The rates of unwanted sexual contact before coming to RBHS (e.g., as an undergraduate) are consistent with national averages: 22.7% of women and 7.3% of men report an experience of unwanted sexual contact before coming to RBHS.

Participants felt relatively positive about how RBHS would respond to a report of sexual misconduct; in general, they thought RBHS would handle the report fairly for both the accuser and the accused. This finding is important because perceived tolerance for sexual misconduct predicts the occurrence of sexual misconduct in an organization.²⁷ Additionally, survivors who

²⁴ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018).

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Cantor et al., (2015); McMahon, S., O'Connor, J., & Seabrook, R. (2018). Not just an undergraduate issue: Campus climate and sexual violence among graduate students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 0886260518787205. doi:10.1177/0886260518787205.

²⁷ National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2018). *Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

distrust their institutions are more likely to experience anxiety and other trauma-related symptoms in the wake of sexual misconduct.²⁸

Participants felt relatively positive about how their peers would respond to a report of sexual misconduct. Peer support of survivors is important because survivors are more likely to disclose experiences of sexual misconduct to their peers than to any other resource.²⁹ Receiving a negative reaction from one's peers after disclosing an experience of sexual violence is associated with negative mental health outcomes such as depression, PTSD, paranoia, hostility, and substance abuse.³⁰

Finally, while many participants reported that another individual witnessed the incident of harassment occur, very few witnesses intervened. Based on these findings, bystander intervention programs may be important to increase prosocial helping behaviors on campus, as well as improve students' perceptions of peer norms.

For a report complete with data based on the results of the *iSPEAK* campus climate survey conducted at SPH, please see the following report: *Key Findings from the iSPEAK Campus Climate Assessment New Jersey Medical School at Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences*.

²⁸ Smith, C. P., & Freyd, J. J. (2013). dangerous safe havens: Institutional betrayal exacerbates sexual trauma. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 26*(1), 119-124. doi:10.1002/jts.21778.

²⁹ Orchowski, L. M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2012). To whom do college women confide following sexual assault? A prospective study of predictors of sexual assault disclosure and social reactions. *Violence Against Women, 18*(3), 264-288.

³⁰ Hakimi, D., Bryant-Davis, T., Ullman, S. E., & Gobin, R. L. (2018). Relationship between negative social reactions to sexual assault disclosure and mental health outcomes of Black and White female survivors. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy, 10*(3), 270-275. doi:10.1037/tra0000245; Orchowski, L. M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2015). Psychological consequences associated with positive and negative responses to disclosure of sexual assault among college women: A prospective study. *Violence Against Women, 21*(7), 803-823. doi:10.1177/1077801215584068; Ullman, S. E., & Peter-Hagene, L. (2014). Social reactions to sexual assault disclosure, coping, perceived control, and PTSD symptoms in sexual assault victims. *Journal of Community Psychology, 42*(4), 495-508. doi:10.1002/jcop.21624.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research team thanks the many members of the Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences community who contributed to the campus climate assessment project. This report and the project as a whole are the result of the enthusiastic support and participation of administrators, faculty, staff, and students across Rutgers. This report is dedicated to all those who are survivors of sexual and dating violence. We hope our efforts can help contribute to creating campus communities that are free of all forms of violence.

We would especially like to thank the following members of the Rutgers community who provided support to the project:

Brian L. Strom, M.D., M.P.H, Chancellor, Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences

James Hill, Ph.D., Associate Dean at the Office of Student Affairs, New Jersey Medical School

Michael Vega, MSW, Director of Student Support Services, School of Public Health

Susan Hamilton, MA. Ed., Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic & Student Affairs and Title IV Coordinator, Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences

Matthew Marino, Education and Prevention Coordinator for Title IX, Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences

Victoria Porterfield, Ph.D., **Ben Kinsella**, Ph.D., **Haifa Matos**, Ph.D., and **La Reina Bates**, Ph.D., Office of Institutional Research and Academic Planning

Cathryn Potter, Ph.D., Dean, School of Social Work, Rutgers University

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY MEMBERS AND ORGANIZATIONS

The Arts and Sciences Institutional Review Board – New Brunswick

The Center on Violence Against Women and Children, School of Social Work, Rutgers University

RESEARCH SUPPORT

Rebecca Glinn, **Abigail DeSilva**, and all of the students and staff who provided assistance