

**EMU Campus Survey on  
Sexual Misconduct Culture**

**Final Report**

## Table of Contents

Abstract	4
Acknowledgments	6
Overview	8

### Part 1: Survey

Summary of Key Findings from the Survey	11
Module 1: Demographics	13
Module 2: Campus Safety	19
Module 3: Coercion	21
Module 4: Stalking and Harassment	24
Module 5: Sexual Violence Victimization	28
Module 6: Sexual Violence Perpetration	33
Module 7: Consent	35
Module 8: Bystander Intervention	39
Module 9: Rape Myths	43
Module 10: Peer Responses	47
Module 11: Institutional Responses to Survivor and Module 12: Perceptions of Institutional Responses; Knowledge of Campus Sexual Misconduct Resources; and Exposure to Sexual Misconduct Information/Education	50

### Part 2: Title IX Report Recommendations

Introduction	58
<b>Section 1: Recommendations Relating to Compliance</b>	
Recommendations relating to the Title IX Office	58
Clearer information around campus about where to report a sexual assault	61
<b>Section 2: Recommendations Relating to Prevention and Education</b>	
Create a work group to develop and create a policy about online harassment, including sexual harassment in the context of classes and the use of social media	63

Required class(es) on sexual violence for all EMU students	64
Required Training on sexual violence every semester for all students	65
Required training on sexual assault and harassment for all faculty and staff, including roles as Mandatory Reporters	70
Create a center, called the Sexual Assault Prevention and Survivor Support Center, to specifically address prevention and support	71
EMU partnership with Safe House	71
Public Safety Oversight Committee	72
Safety on Campus	73
Fraternities	74
Conclusion	75

## **Abstract**

With the approval and support of EMU's Provost's office, the Title IX Office's Research Committee created a survey on Sexual Misconduct Culture. While addressing the many of the same issues as campus climate surveys administered on other campuses nationwide, this survey focuses on EMU students' experiences of sexual misconduct and student perceptions about campus safety and institutional responses. This report should not be confused with the work of the President's Commission on Diversity and Inclusion, which launched a different campus climate survey in Fall of 2019.

The members of the Research Committee working under the Title IX Office developed the sexual misconduct survey, and Wayne State University administered it. The final report from Wayne State University provides the basis for the survey data presented here. Committee members summarized the key data in this report and presented initial findings to initiate a campus discussion about prevention, programs, and policy initiatives that should be developed and implemented by EMU. As a part of this campus discussion, the Title IX Research Committee, with the assistance of the Title IX Education Committee, conducted 15 focus groups with students to review some of the survey data and generate recommendations for the Provost's Office regarding sexual misconduct prevention.

This final report provides an overview, results, and discussion for each module in the survey as well as recommendations for sexual misconduct prevention programs and initiatives. This report serves as the product of the four-year long campus climate assessment conducted by the Title IX Research Committee. It is the goal of the committee that the data and recommendations contained herein be used by EMU to address the serious and timely problem of sexual misconduct in our community by creating robust outreach and education programs, devoting the resources necessary to sustain such programs, so that we can all contribute to a positive change in the current sexual misconduct culture that prevails at our university.

This Final Report was written by the following members of the **Title IX Research Committee**:

Solange Simões, Chair  
Professor of Sociology and Women's and Gender Studies

Caryn Charter  
Director Office of Research Development and Administration

Sonia Chawla  
Research Compliance Officer

Marilyn Corsianos  
Professor of Criminology and Sociology, and Women's and Gender Studies

Kate Mehuron  
Professor of Philosophy, Chair of President's Commission on Women

The survey design and development were conducted in 2017-2019 by all members of the Title IX Research Committee including:

Roger Kernsmith, Professor of Sociology  
Paul Leighton, Professor of Criminology

We would also like to thank Paul Leighton for his contributions to the Final Report

## **Acknowledgements**

### **Provost Rhonda Longworth**

We would like to thank Provost Longworth for her Office's sponsorship of the Survey, and for her strong commitment to the survey's objectives and support of the Committee throughout all stages of survey design, data collection and data analysis.

### **Wayne State University Center for Urban Studies**

We would like to thank the Wayne State University Center for Urban Studies, in particular Charo Hulleza and Robert Mahu, who collected the data. Their work on the project was crucial in protecting student confidentiality, which is of paramount importance given the sensitive nature of the survey.

### **Title IX Education Committee**

We would like to thank the Title IX Education Committee for their feedback about the survey data, their recommendations for outreach and education, and their contribution to facilitating and co-facilitating the focus groups. The focus groups were successful, in a large part, due to the time and effort devoted by members of this committee: Erica Zonder, Becky Janes, Elizabeth Currans, Dyann Logwood, Nicholas Pomante, Amy Merkle, and Simone Dixon.

We would like to thank Amy Finkebine, LGBT Resource Center Coordinator, for her contribution to the focus groups.

### **Student Sub-Committee**

We would like to thank the graduate students who assisted the Committee in the process of survey design, and also played a key role in the design and implementation of the outreach campaign: Katrina Solomon, Jim Pellerin, Richard Cole, Jena Young, Benjamin Dreyer, Sara Rakes, Sara Srygley, and Dareen Othman.

We would also like to thank all the graduate students enrolled in the SOCL 616 Winter 2018, who played an invaluable role in the pretesting of the questionnaire.

Finally, we would like to thank our Graduate Assistants: Zhanar Tuleutayeva and Katie Kiacz for their tireless and competent work on the project, essential in the organization and facilitation of the focus groups.

### **Women's and Gender Studies Department and the Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology**

We would like to thank WGST and SAC for assigning graduate assistants to work with the Committee and the Student Sub-Committee throughout the processes of survey design, outreach campaign and data analysis.

### **EMU Division of Communications**

We would like to thank Darcy Gifford and Geoff Larcom for their important support in the design and implementation of the outreach campaign.

**Campus Stakeholders**

We would like to thank the wide range of EMU stakeholders - offices, organizations and communities - that met with the Committee members providing a comprehensive approach to addressing campus sexual violence and campus sexual culture, and also supported the Committee in the outreach campaign: Office of the Provost, Title IX Office, Division of Communications, Diversity and Community Involvement, Department of Public Safety, President's Commission on Women,, Campus Life, Greek Life, Center for Multicultural Affairs, Office of International Students and Scholars, Military and Veterans Resource Center, Student Government, Athletics, LGBT Resource Center, Women's Resource Center, Vision Volunteer Center, Disability Resource Center, Student Well Being, University Health Services, Counseling and Psychological Services, Office of International Students and Scholars, Residence Life, EMU Faculty Senate, and Student Organizations.

## Overview

In 2018, the Eastern Michigan University Title IX Research Committee (Committee), in collaboration with students, faculty, and administrators, designed an online survey to gather student experiences with and opinions about sexual misconduct culture and safety on campus. A Student subcommittee participated in the design and pretesting of the questionnaire and also in design and implementation of an advertising campaign (including information brochures, banners, flyers, media interviews, e-mail and in-person contact with student organizations across campus). The Committee sought input from stakeholders across campus prior to designing the survey in order to assess the need for information about varying offices and groups across campus and to ensure that the survey was in line with student life on campus<sup>1</sup>. One such stakeholder was the EMU Disability Resource Center (DRC). The Committee discussed including a demographic question about disability with the DRC Director and ultimately decided not to include this question<sup>2</sup>. A presentation of the survey design and objectives was made to the EMU Faculty Senate.

The process of survey design initially drew on campus climate surveys about sexual misconduct conducted in 2014 - 2015 by a number of universities nationwide. Moving beyond the scope of those surveys, the Committee sought to highlight in the survey design other objectives such as a) to take into account the specific context of EMU, with a majority of students living off-campus and b) to include questions to further understand the cultural dimensions of sexual misconduct and better inform prevention initiatives, programs, and policies.

The Committee and students<sup>3</sup> performed extensive pretests with cognitive interviews, culminating in a final survey questionnaire that consisted of twelve sections (modules) and requiring approximately 25-35 minutes to complete. To provide an additional layer of confidentiality, the Committee chose to partner with the Wayne State University Center for Urban Studies (Center) for sampling, contacts with students, and data collection.

During the first weeks of the winter 2019 term, the Committee provided the Center with a list of students enrolled during that term. The Center drew a stratified random sample of 4,000 students

---

<sup>1</sup> The stakeholders included: Office of the Provost, Title IX Office, Division of Communications, Department of Public Safety, Women's Commission, Campus Life, Greek Life, Student Organizations, Center for Multicultural Affairs, Military and Veterans Resource Center, Student Government, Athletics, Housing and Residence Life LGBT Resource Center, Women's Resource Center, Diversity and Community Involvement, Vision Volunteer Center, Disability Resource Center, Student Well Being, University Health Services, Counseling and Psychological Services, Office of International Students and Scholars

<sup>2</sup> The DRC Director explained that the variety of disabilities experienced by students, and the nature of some disabilities being more visible than others, would make disability difficult to ascertain from a survey. There would not be enough data for each type of disability for analysis. In addition, there are conditions that some individuals might identify as disabilities, whereas others with the same condition might not identify as having a disability (e.g., anxiety disorder, visual impairment, etc.). By relying on individuals to self-identify as having a disability instead of using a less subjective measure of disability, any conclusions resulting from such data would be biased.

<sup>3</sup> Graduate students enrolled in the course SOCL 616 Advanced Survey Design, taught by the Committee Chair, conducted pretest cognitive interviews and made presentations of their findings and invaluable insights to the Committee.

from the 16,690 students on this list who were age 18 or older and had email addresses on record. Although the Committee provided direction for the sampling process, the identities of the 4,000 students in the sample were known only to researchers at the Center.

In mid-January, the Center sent a letter signed by Provost Rhonda Longworth to all 4,000 students. This letter informed the students that they had been selected to complete the survey, and reminded them of the purpose and importance of the survey. An informational website, together with campus-wide emails from the university administration, were part of a broader marketing effort to ensure that as many students as possible were aware of the survey.

The survey invitation was sent to all students in the sample on January 23, 2019. The invitation was followed by a total of four email reminders, as well as a telephone reminder from a live caller in mid-February. The language used in the survey invitation, reminder, and phone call was approved by the EMU Institutional Review Board. Students were informed of the voluntary and confidential nature of the survey and were given contact information for relevant university offices in the event that the survey caused distress or if respondents wished to obtain additional information. Potential respondents also had the ability to opt out from being contacted at any time, and 141 students chose to do so. Respondents were able to stop the survey at any time and continue it later if they wished. All email recipients were informed of their eligibility to receive a \$10 gift card as an incentive for taking the survey, and that they would also be eligible for a random drawing for 15 \$100 gift card prizes. The survey closed on March 18, 2019.

Five email addresses in the sample were not valid, and no corresponding email addresses could be identified for these students. 1,494 students answered at least one question on the survey, and 1,297 students reached the end of the survey. Hence, depending on the preferred definition, the response rate ranged from 32.43% (1,297/4,000) to 37.40% (1,494/3,995).

The sample was stratified using EMU institutional data on gender, race/ethnicity, age, online or traditional students, and citizenship (a proxy for international students). Although the proportions of respondents in each of the strata were very close to the EMU student population, the data reveal statistically significant differences between the proportion of respondents and students in the survey population with respect to gender and race/ethnicity. Therefore, weights are applied to the results displayed in this report for Modules 2 through 12. These post-stratification weights apply a slight mathematical adjustment to each survey response based on representativeness of the respondent's gender and race/ethnicity.

In the Winter of 2021, after the Committee received de-identified data from the Center and conducted preliminary descriptive data analysis, the Committee held 15 student focus groups to assist with contextualizing the survey data and to provide recommendations for prevention and education measures. The focus groups consisted of a total of 70 students from various demographic categories and campus communities in order to gather recommendations that are applicable to the diverse student population at EMU. Focus groups were held virtually, and students each received a \$20 gift card for participation. During the focus groups, the facilitators presented a brief summary of the survey data, module by module, for the overall sample of respondents as well as for the sub-sample that corresponded with the demographic characteristics of the focus group participants (e.g., for the focus group with female commuters, data for both the entire sample and for commuter students broken down by gender identity were presented).

After each module, participants were asked if any of the data presented surprised or stuck out to them in any way and for recommendations to the Provost and to Title IX for outreach and prevention efforts.

# Part 1: Survey

## Summary of Key Findings from the Survey

The 2019 Eastern Michigan University Campus Survey on Sexual Misconduct Culture revealed several key findings. These findings are described below.

- *Respondent characteristics.* Most respondents were undergraduate students (80.9%) between the ages of 18 and 23 (66.9%). Over two thirds (67.5%) identified as women and nearly three fourths (72.9%) identified as White or Caucasian. Four fifths of respondents (80.0%) identified as heterosexual, and three fourths (74.9%) of respondents live somewhere off EMU's campus.
- *Campus safety.* In comparison to other public places in which they spend time, over three fourths of respondents reported feeling just as safe or more safe at EMU from sexual harassment (85.7%), dating violence (89.1%), sexual violence (82.7%), or stalking (76.5%).
- *Respondents as victims.* Since they had been students at EMU, and as defined in a number of ways on the survey, over three fifths of respondents (62.5%) reported that they had been victims of some type of sexual coercion, one third (33.0%) had been victims of stalking, over one third (36.4%) had been victims of sexual harassment, and almost one fifth (18.3%) reported that they had been victims of sexual violence. Students were asked to report on experiences that may have occurred either on EMU's campus or any other location.
- *Respondents engaging in behaviors.* Since they had been students at EMU, and as defined in a number of ways on the survey, less than one third of respondents (29.3%) reported that they had engaged in a form of sexual coercion, 12.4% engaged in a behavior that constitutes stalking, and 5.5% reported that that they had engaged in some form of sexual violence.
- *Reporting incidents to EMU.* The vast majority of victims of *sexual violence* (94.0%) reported that they did not contact administrators, instructors, or other officials or staff at EMU about the incident. Many respondents indicated that they did not report the incident to someone at EMU because they felt it was a personal matter (53.1%) and/or do not think the incident was serious enough to report (48.1%). A greater proportion of students who live on campus reported the incident(s) they experienced to at least one EMU resource, compared to students who live off campus.
- *Consent.* Respondents expressed strong agreement with various statements about affirmative consent, although students' confidence in their practice of consent was less pronounced, especially in respect to casual sexual encounters. In casual relationships only

about half the respondents are very sure that they can tell when consent is given (54.3%), and that they know how to stop a sexual encounter if they change their minds (53.9%).

- *Bystander intervention.* Large majorities of respondents felt that it was either very likely or somewhat likely that most of their EMU friends would intervene in certain situations in which sexual misconduct is occurring or may be about to occur.
- *Rape myths.* The vast majority of students disagreed with various myths about men and sexual assault, woman and sexual assault, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and trans people and sexual assault, and other ideas about sexual assault in general.
- *Peer responses.* Three fifths of respondents (60.1%) reported that, if sexual misconduct happened to them, they would share their experience with friends or peers at EMU, and large majorities of those respondents agreed that their EMU friends or peers would respond supportively. One fourth of respondents (25.6%) reported that, since coming to EMU, they had a friend who is an EMU student and a survivor of sexual assault.
- *Perceptions of institutional responses and knowledge of campus resources.* The vast majority of respondents who did not disclose experiencing an incident of sexual misconduct agreed that both from the perspective of a complainant/survivor (94.6%) and from the perspective of an alleged perpetrator (86.3%) they trust in EMU's ability to appropriately handle allegations of sexual misconduct. However, a majority of those respondents did not know where to go to get help on campus or where to report instances of sexual misconduct.
- *Exposure to information/education.* Most respondents reported that since coming to EMU, they had not received written or verbal information from someone at EMU about sexual misconduct or consent, nor had they visited related websites, read certain information from EMU on sexual misconduct or interpersonal violence, or attended related events. In addition, larger proportions of students who lived on campus reported receiving written or verbal information from someone at EMU about sexual misconduct or consent, compared to students who lived off campus. On-campus students expressed greater familiarity with key EMU services related to campus safety, student well-being, and sexual misconduct response, when compared to students who lived off campus. Respondents identified their friends, K-12 sexual education classes, parents, and sexual partners as most influential to their view of sexual consent.

## Module #1: Demographics

### Overview

The EMU Campus Survey on Sexual Misconduct Culture used a probability sampling methodology. This specific sampling type selects a random sample based on stratifying variables with the intention of having the final survey sample be proportionate to the population with respect to specific characteristics. For example, if a population consists of 600 men, 300 women, and 100 non-binary individuals, then this sampling method would randomly select, in a sample of 100 people, 60 men, 30 women, and 10 non-binary individuals. It is important to note that this sampling method does not completely ensure that the final sample will be in exact proportion to the population because people in different subgroups do not respond at the same rates (i.e., self-selection bias). However, when studying topics that may be differentially experienced by different groups within a population, this sampling method further ensures that the survey results will be representative of the population. The EMU Campus Survey on Understanding Sexual Misconduct Culture stratified the sample with respect to available EMU institutional data regarding reported gender, race/ethnicity, age, online or traditional students, and citizenship (a proxy for international students).

The Demographics module contained questions about participants' age, number of years at EMU, degree program (e.g., undergraduate, masters, doctoral, etc.), race/ethnicity, domestic or international status, gender identity, sexual orientation, living situation, and involvement in campus activities. The survey also asked about three specific campus activities: participation in the Greek system, in ROTC, and in student athletics.

### Results

Most respondents (approximately two thirds) were between ages 18 and 23, but a substantial number of respondents (around 15%) were age 30 or older (Table 1.1). While it is important to have education and outreach directed toward more traditional college-aged students, there is a need for programs specific to older students, and the content of these programs will likely have to be different from those developed for younger students. The sample was fairly evenly divided with respect to the number of years attending EMU, with around one fourth of the sample each in the first year, second year, third year, and fourth year or beyond.

*Table 1.1: Respondents by Age Group*

Age Group	Number	Percent
18-23	999	66.9
24-29	274	18.3
30-39	127	8.5
40+	94	6.3
Total	1494	100

A large majority of the sample (four fifths) consists of undergraduate students (Table 1.2). The first year was subdivided into first and second semester because surveys at other institutions and campus police data suggest that first semester students are more likely to experience sexual misconduct.

*Table 1.2: Respondents by Years at EMU*

Term	Number	Percent
First Semester	86	5.8
Second Semester	316	21.3
Second Year	404	27.2
Third Year	304	20.5
Fourth Year or More	376	25.3
Total	1486	100

As shown in Table 1.3, just under three fourths of the participants identified as White. The next most prominent racial/ethnic group was African-American/Black, who made up 16.5% of the sample. Fewer than 10% of the respondents identified as Asian-American or as Hispanic/Latinx, and fewer than 5% of the respondents identified as Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, as Native American or Alaskan Native, as Middle Eastern, or as race/ethnicity not specified. Although with census categories people who are Middle Eastern are categorized as white, we decided to include Middle Eastern as a separate category because there may be cultural stigma around sexual misconduct that differ from the white, predominantly Christian population represented in the White/Caucasian category.

*Table 1.3: Respondents by Race/Ethnicity*

Race/Ethnicity	Survey Percent	University Population Percent
African-American/Black	16.5	18
White/Caucasian	72.9	66
Asian-American	7.2	4.8
Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.1	.2
Native American or Alaskan Native	1.7	1.1
Hispanic or Latinx	7.8	4.5
Middle Eastern	2.8	N/A
Not Listed/Reported	1.2	5.4
Total	110*	100

*\*Total is larger than the sample size (more than 100%) because multiple selections were permitted to account for multi-racial and multi-ethnic identities.*

The totals reported here include individuals who were multi-racial and/or multi-ethnic, as respondents were permitted to indicate all races/ethnicities that apply to them. Fewer than 5% of the respondents were international students.

In subsequent analyses, we combined Middle Eastern, Native American or Alaska Native, Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, race not listed, and Multiracial/Multiethnic into an “another race” category (Table 1.4). This change was undertaken due to low response rates in each of the categories. It is understood that individuals identifying as these races and ethnicities may have different experiences based on their race/ethnicity, however, response rates do not lend sufficient power to analyze these groups individually. Thus, they were combined into a single group. All analyses involving this group should be interpreted accordingly.

*Table 1.4: Revised Race/Ethnicity Categories*

Race/Ethnicity	Survey Percent	University Population Percent
African-American/Black	13.1	18
White/Caucasian	64.3	66
Hispanic or Latinx	3.8	4.5
Asian-American	6.0	4.8
Another Minority/ Multiracial/Multiethnic	12.0	1.3
Not Reported	0.9	5.4
Total	100.1	100

Approximately two thirds of the respondents were women (Table 1.5). Slightly fewer than one third of the respondents were men, and 2.6% of the respondents identified as another gender.

*Table 1.5: Respondents by Gender*

Gender	Survey Percent	University Population Percent
Woman	67.5	61.5
Man	29.8	38.5
Transgender woman	0.1	NA
Transgender man	0.7	NA
Genderqueer/Gender Non-Conforming/ Nonbinary/Genderfluid	1.4	NA
Agender/I do not subscribe to any particular gender identity	0.3	NA
Not Listed	0.1	NA
Total	100	100

The numbers of individuals who responded to non-male/female gender options (i.e., transgender man, transgender woman, genderqueer/gender non-conforming/nonbinary/genderfluid, agender/I do not identify with any particular gender, and not listed) were so small that they prevent a more granular analysis. As such, these individuals were combined, post-hoc, into a third gender category, with the acknowledgement that different gender identities within this category may have different experiences regarding sexual misconduct (Table 1.6).

*Table 1.6: Revised Gender Categories*

Gender	Number	Percent
Woman	1003	67.5
Man	442	29.8
Another Gender	40	2.6
Total	1485	100

Exactly four fifths of the respondents identified as heterosexual. Approximately 10% of the respondents (mostly female) identified as bisexual, and about 10% identified as another sexual orientation. (Table 1.7)

*Table 1.7: Sexual Orientation*

Sexual Orientation	Number	Percent
Heterosexual	1182	80.0
Bisexual	143	9.7
Lesbian	27	1.8
Gay	22	1.5
Asexual	20	1.4
Pansexual	34	2.3
Queer	20	1.4
A sexual orientation not listed here	8	0.5
I do not identify with any particular sexual orientation	22	1.5
Total	1478	100

Similar to the options on the gender question, the numbers of individuals who responded to an option that was neither heterosexual nor bisexual were so small that we combined them, post-hoc, into a third sexual orientation category. (Table 1.8) Again, individuals of different sexual orientations within this third group may experience sexual misconduct differently from each other.

*Table 1.8 Revised Sexual Orientation*

Sexual Orientation	Number	Percent
Heterosexual	1182	80.0
Bisexual	143	9.7
Lesbian, Gay, Asexual, Pansexual, Queer, or a sexual orientation not listed	153	10.4
Total	1478	100

Just under one fourth of the respondents lived on campus in a dorm, residence hall, or on-campus apartment, and fewer than 2% of the respondents lived in a fraternity or sorority house (Table 1.9). The large proportion of subjects (three fourths) lived in non-EMU housing. The survey does not ask for specific details about living situations in non-EMU housing, so it is unknown how many individuals who live in non-EMU housing live with their parents, with their spouse, with other family members, with roommates, or live alone.

*Table 1.9: Respondents by Housing*

Living Situation	Number	Percent
EMU Residence Hall/Dormitory/Apartment	344	23.2
Fraternity House/Sorority House/Athletic House	23	1.6
Non-EMU Apartment or House	1111	74.9
Other	5	0.3
Total	1483	100

Approximately one third of the participants reported that they were not at all involved in campus activities and organizations. Most students were at least somewhat involved in campus activities and organizations, with around 30% reporting high levels of involvement. Regarding the three activities singled out in the survey, only 10% of the respondents were involved in Greek life, fewer than 1% were involved in ROTC, and fewer than 5% were involved in athletics.

## Discussion

***Representativeness of the sample.*** The sample of survey respondents was, for the most part, proportional to institutional data. Within the race/ethnicity category, the survey had a larger heterogeneous Another Minority/Multiracial/Multiethnic than was represented by institutional data, although the survey gave students a wider range of options to report their race/ethnicity as they experience it. Additionally, women were proportionally more represented than men among survey respondents. *To adjust for these imbalances in the data, data were weighted in the final analysis.*

***Generalizability.*** Although the respondents were proportional to the EMU student population, there are some limits to generalizability of the results. The university does not collect data on certain groups that are statistically more likely to experience sexual misconduct (e.g., lesbians, transgender women, transgender men, transgender women, gay men, etc.), so it is unclear how generalizable the results are to the larger student population. Any results that indicate that these groups disproportionately experience sexual misconduct will be closely examined to establish specific or targeted outreach.

For many of the questions that provide multiple response options (e.g., gender identity, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity), the predominant response pattern was that two or three categories were selected by 90-95% of the respondents and the remaining categories selected by fewer than 10 individual respondents. These smaller categories simply had too few respondents to analyze with any accuracy or precision. These categories were combined into one “other” category so that these individuals can still be included in the data analysis. Although some precision was lost

when combining categories, it is preferable to lose some precision rather than exclude individual respondents and lose their voices. However, reducing the precision of the data does affect generalizability for the smaller categories that are combined.

## Module #2: Campus Safety

### Overview

The survey contained questions about campus safety in order to ascertain a baseline level of how safe students feel at EMU relative to how safe they feel in other public places. The question about safety at EMU focused on four domains: sexual harassment, dating violence, sexual violence, and stalking. The question also had four options: students feel safer on campus, students feel equally safe on and off campus, students feel equally *unsafe* on and off campus, and students feel more unsafe on campus. It was important to have two options indicating that students feel the same on and off campus because providing equally safe and equally unsafe options provides additional context for the response.

### Results

Nearly all respondents (94%) feel at least somewhat safe in public places (Table 2.1).

*Table 2.1: Perceptions of Public Safety*

Perception of Safety	Percent
Safe	51.8
Somewhat Safe	42.2
Somewhat Unsafe	5.3
Unsafe	0.7
Total	100

Overall, very few respondents (less than 8%) felt less safe at EMU than in public places with respect to each of the four domains (Table 2.2). However, an additional 8-16%, depending on the domain, reported feeling equally unsafe on and off campus, suggesting that between 10.9% to 23.5% of the respondents felt unsafe on campus in some respect. Feelings of safety were fairly consistent across domains; however, respondents felt the least safe when asked about stalking.

*Table 2.2: Perceptions of Safety at EMU*

Perception of Safety	Sexual Harassment	Dating Violence	Sexual Violence	Stalking
Safer at EMU	19.2%	17.2%	17.9%	13.8%
Same – Just as Safe at EMU	66.5%	71.9%	64.8%	62.7%
Same – Just as Unsafe at EMU	10.4%	8.3%	12.6%	16.0%
Unsafe	3.8%	2.6%	4.8%	7.5%

When broken down by race, there was a difference in feelings of safety in public between African-American/Black students and White students. However, the mean difference of 0.16 on a four-point scale was relatively small, suggesting that the significance may be an artifact of the large sample size. There were no other racial/ethnic differences in feelings of safety in public. When decomposed into racial/ethnic categories, Asian-Americans were statistically more likely

to feel safe than all other racial/ethnic groups with respect to sexual violence. No other significant differences in race/ethnicity were observed within the other three domains.

Men were more likely to feel safe than both women and the aggregated group of non-binary gender identities within each of the four safety domains (Table 2.3).

*Table 2.3: Mean Perceptions of Safety at EMU by Gender Identity*

Safety Domain	Women	Men	Another Identity	Overall Mean
Sexual Harassment	2.90*	3.20	2.76*	3.01
Dating Violence	2.97*	3.17	2.69*	3.04
Sexual Violence	2.83*	3.19	2.56*	2.96
Stalking	2.73*	3.02	2.43*	2.83

*\*Statistically significant at  $p < .05$  from male respondents.*

## **Discussion**

In general, EMU students felt fairly safe on campus with respect to sexual harassment, dating violence, sexual violence, and stalking, and in the broader community. However, 14% of students reported feeling unsafe with respect to sexual harassment, 11% with dating violence, 17% with sexual violence, and 24% with respect to stalking. Clearly, there is a need for outreach and education specifically about stalking behaviors. Further examination of the campus safety data as they relate to the stalking data would illuminate specific areas of concern, potentially informing the design of outreach and education efforts.

Unsurprisingly, men felt safer than women or individuals who identify as another gender. It would be worthwhile to explore the factors that affect gender identity differences in feelings of safety in order to develop appropriate and respectful measures to improve safety on campus. It is possible that interventions specific to gender identity may have to be implemented.

## Module #3: Coercion

### Overview

Coercive behaviors are inappropriate threats and inducements employed to convince someone else to change their mind to engage in sexual acts after reluctance or an initial refusal. The survey asked about both victimization and perpetration of behaviors that had a wide range of seriousness. Respondents were asked to consider all experiences since they have been students at EMU. These situations may have occurred either on EMU's campus or at any other place. The module was not labeled "coercion" so that students receive no indication that these behaviors were inappropriate in order to obtain honest responses.

The list of 24 coercion items included a wide range of behaviors, with different types and levels of coercion. The question presented respondents with a list of behaviors that someone might engage in to convince a partner to change their mind about sexual conduct that they had initially refused to do. The question asked respondents to indicate if they had been on the receiving end of each example of coercion *and* if they had ever perpetrated each type of coercion with a partner to change their partner's mind about previously refused sexual activities. Item responses ranged from 4.2% to 57.5% for victimization and 4.1% to 16.1% for perpetration.

### Results

Over three fifths of respondents (62.5%) reported that, since they had been students at EMU, someone had used at least one of the 24 listed coercive behaviors in order to convince the respondents to change their minds about engaging in unwanted sexual activities, while almost one third (29.3%) reported that they had used at least one of these behaviors on another person for a similar reason.

Full results are presented in Table 3.1. Between 4% and 11% of students reported experiencing the following types of coercion: threats to spread true or made up embarrassing stories (10.8%); threats to hurt or do something bad to someone close (6.8%); threats to withhold, deny, or take away some kind of benefit (promotion, grade, etc.) in classes or jobs (4.2%); persistent belittling to the point of freezing or becoming incapable of saying no (12.6%); being over-served alcohol or drugs or slipped something that the respondent did not know about (10.2%); being physically restrained or held down (9.6%); being punched, hit, smacked, or hurt (7.1%); and things being thrown, being punched, or being pushed (8.1%).

It is noteworthy that for all types of coercion, women were more likely to be victimized than men. However, male respondents also reported experiencing all 24 forms of coercion.

Only respondents who identified as non-heterosexual saw items 23 and 24 in Table 3.1. Almost 10% of those respondents reported that someone had threatened to reveal their sexual orientation as a threat after an initial refusal or reluctance to engage in unwanted sexual activities. Items 23 and 24 were included not only because the individual should be able to make their own decisions about revealing their identity, but also because such information can result in people being isolated, harassed, discriminated against, or physically victimized. Nearly 14% of respondents

reported being told that they were not really a lesbian because they had not had sex with a “real man.”

*Table 3.1 Responses to Coercion Items*

Behavior	Victimization	Perpetration
Said nice things like you/they are attractive, sweet, or sexy	57.5%	16.1%
Said that you/they or that the relationship was special	33.2%	10.7%
Promised that the relationship was never going to end	25.3%	7.5%
Said that you/they were the ‘only one’ for them	28.9%	7.7%
Promised to do something sexual in return for doing something sexual	23.8%	8.5%
Promised to do tasks, chores, or favors	19.4%	9.1%
Promised to give gifts, money, or similar valuables	14.7%	6.0%
Promised to give some kind of benefit (promotion, good grade, special perk) in classes or jobs	5.5%	4.7%
Threatened to spread true or made up embarrassing stories	10.8%	4.8%
Threatened to hurt or do something bad to someone close	6.8%	4.9%
Threatened to withhold, deny, or take away some kind of benefit (promotion, grade, etc.) in classes or jobs	4.2%	5.5%
Said that you/they must not love them or be cheating	17.7%	5.3%
Said that you/they ‘owed’ it	13.8%	4.0%
Said that you/they needed it badly or would be in pain or discomfort if you/they didn’t do what was wanted	13.8%	4.2%
Cried or pouted	24.4%	10.5%
Criticized, said that no one else would want you/them, or that you/them would never do better	15.1%	4.1%
Persistently belittled you/them to the point of freezing or becoming incapable of saying no	12.6%	4.1%
Over-served alcohol or drugs or slipped you/they something that you/they didn’t know about	10.2%	4.6%
Physically restrained or held you/them down	9.6%	5.2%
Punched, hit, smacked, or hurt you/them	7.1%	4.7%
Yelled or screamed at you/them	15.1%	7.4%
Threw, punched, or pushed things	8.2%	5.6%
Threatened to out you/them*	9.7%	4.8%
Telling you/them that you are not really a lesbian because you haven’t had sex with a “real man”*	13.9%	4.5%

\*Asked only of respondents who marked any response option other than heterosexual in Module 1, question 7.

## Discussion

While some of the behaviors in the list may seem harmless, unwelcome bargaining, insults, guilt trips, threats, inducements, and other tactics do not result in truly consensual sex. A “yes” that results from wearing down a person’s resistance is not meaningful consent and not appropriate in a healthy sexual relationship.

Results were broken down by gender and demonstrate that male coercive behavior toward women is more common than the reverse. However, male respondents also reported experiencing coercion. Further analysis is warranted on a number of fronts to fully discuss patterns and interventions. First, additional analysis should clarify the total number of tactics respondents had both experienced and used on an individual basis. Second, analysis should be done to identify how the incidence and types of coercion might vary and be shaped by different life experiences of age groups, various races and ethnicities, and in heterosexual and non-heterosexual contexts. Analysis by other gender is unlikely to reveal meaningful patterns because of the low sample size.

Regardless of results by gender, it is clear that education is needed to increase awareness about behaviors that are coercive. Because of the close association between coercion and consent, it may make sense for the two to be addressed together. As will be discussed in the consent module, perhaps by teaching students to confidently practice consent, in part using coercion as a context for non-consensual situations, students will more easily recognize coercive behaviors and cease to practice them.

## Module #4: Stalking and Harassment

### Overview

This module contains questions about 18 different types of stalking behaviors and 12 different types of harassment. With respect to stalking behaviors, respondents were asked if they had experienced each behavior and if they had committed each behavior. Stalking behaviors ranged from fairly mild to severely threatening, including sending emails and texts or calling to the point of distress, taking photos or videos without the respondent's knowledge, threatening to spread information about the respondent, stealing property, hurting or threatening to hurt the respondent or a loved one, changing schedules in order to have more contact with the respondent, and monitoring the respondent's location with their phone or GPS. The questions about harassment asked only if the respondent had experienced each type of harassment and, as a follow up, who had harassed the respondent (e.g., another EMU student, an EMU instructor, a co-worker, a supervisor, etc.). Types of harassment included making unwelcome offensive or sexist remarks, making unwanted attempts to establish an intimate relationship, inappropriate or uncomfortable touching, displaying offensive sexual materials in the respondent's presence, and threatening the respondent with retaliation for not engaging in sexual behavior. At the end of the module, respondents were provided with contact information for the Title IX Coordinator should they wish to report sexual misconduct or avail themselves of other resources.

### Results

#### *Stalking*

The stalking question asked about the student's experience since they started attending EMU, so it includes behavior both on and off campus. One third of the respondents reported that they had experienced at least one of the 18 stalking behaviors (i.e., someone else had committed stalking behaviors against the respondent). The most common form of stalking experienced was receiving unwanted communications (letters, emails, texts, instant messages, etc.) to the point of distress, with just over one fifth of the respondents (22.5%) reporting being stalked in this way. Almost 11% answered yes to whether someone had "hurt or threatened to hurt you or themselves" (Table 4.1).

Substantially fewer respondents reported engaging in stalking behaviors in order to begin or continue a romantic relationship after the recipient indicated that they were not interested. Most commonly, individuals who had stalked other people did so by changing their schedules in order to have more contact with the other person (5.1%) and contacted friends, coworkers, or family about the other person (4.8%; Table 4.1).

Overall, women reported experiencing stalking behaviors more than men (there were too few non-binary individuals who responded to the survey to include in gender analyses). The most common form of stalking for both genders was receiving unwanted communications (letters, emails, texts, instant messages, etc.) to the point of distress.

Table 4.1. *Stalking Victimization and Perpetration*

Action	Reported Victimization	Reported Perpetration
Showed up at home, uninvited	13.1%	2.9%
Sent letters, emails, texts, or instant messages, to the point of distress	22.5%	4.3%
Called and/or left voicemails, to the point of distress	11.0%	2.7%
Drove/walked/biked by work, home, or school, to the point of distress	7.3%	2.3%
Went through trash	1.5%	0.7%
Took photos/video without knowledge or permission	11.3%	2.2%
Spread or threatened to spread information either online or in real life	10.7%	1.0%
Entered living or work space without permission	6.5%	0.8%
Damaged or stole property	4.6%	1.0%
Hurt or threatened to hurt pets	1.3%	0.2%
Hurt or threatened to hurt a friend or family member	3.0%	0.3%
Hurt or threatened to hurt you or themselves	10.8%	2.1%
Pretended to be you either online or in real life	3.7%	0.6%
Contacted friends, coworkers, or family about you	12.5%	4.8%
Changed schedules in order to have more contact with you	10.1%	5.1%
Followed you (on foot, bike, or in a vehicle) with no good reason	5.3%	0.4%
Interacted with you online to the point of distress	10.7%	1.0%
Monitored your location with their phone, GPS, or other means	8.8%	3.8%

### ***Harassment***

Just over one third of respondents (36.4%) reported experiencing at least one form of sexual harassment since becoming students at EMU. More than one in five students were the targets of each of two types of harassment: unwelcome sexist remarks and unwelcome sexual stories, comments, and jokes. Less common, but still prevalent, types of harassment included offensive or embarrassing remarks about the respondent's body, appearance, or sexual activities (16.5%); touching the respondent in a way that made them feel uncomfortable (12.2%), and making unwanted attempts to establish a romantic or sexual relationship (12.0%; Table 4.2).

The most common perpetrators of reported harassment were other EMU students (30.9%). There were 83 respondents who (5.9%) reported being sexually harassed by an EMU instructor and 20 respondents (1.4%) reported being sexually harassed by their supervisor at their EMU job.

Nearly one in six perpetrations were committed by someone not affiliated with EMU (15.6%). Women were more likely to report experiencing sexual harassment than men.

*Table 4.2. Sexual Harassment Victimization*

Action	Yes
Made an unwelcome, offensive sexist remark	23.3%
Shared unwelcome sexual stories, comments, or jokes with you	21.8%
Made offensive or embarrassing remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities	16.5%
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic and/or sexual relationship even after you said no	12.0%
Made unwanted attempts to engage you in social activities (dates, dinners, drinks, etc.) even after you said no	11.0%
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable	12.2%
Made you feel as if you were being bribed with a reward to engage in sexual behavior	3.2%
Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not engaging in sexual behavior	2.8%
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of a sexual nature	9.8%
Made offensive or embarrassing gestures of a sexual nature	9.4%
Displayed offensive sexual or suggestive materials in your presence	5.7%

## Discussion

Based on the results from the survey, stalking and harassment are substantial problems experienced by EMU students. At least one in three students reported experiencing either stalking, harassment, or both. While the victimization that happens on campus must be addressed through intervention programs, stalking and harassment occurring off-campus can still have a major impact on a student's ability to complete classes, a semester, and their degree. Programs and support services for these students should include support and advocacy for victims so that the consequences of these actions, which can exacerbate the effects of previous victimizations, do not become a barrier to education. Support services will have to be sufficiently robust to handle the problem of stalking and harassment, which requires investment from EMU in these services. In addition, given that substantial harassment happens off campus, it is important to ensure that services are available and accessible to students, regardless of where the harassment occurred.

Despite women experiencing stalking and harassment more than men, the number of men who experience stalking and harassment is not trivial. Society typically assumes that women predominantly experience stalking and harassment, but the data demonstrate the importance in developing outreach and support that is tailored to the needs of men as well.

Although relatively small in number, one of the most distressing results is the sexual harassment committed by EMU faculty and staff. Faculty and staff are charged with educating and shepherding students through their time at EMU. Violating this charge by harassing students,

these faculty and staff members are making it more difficult for students to complete their education. While training for faculty and staff is important to combat sexual harassment, it is also imperative to hold faculty and staff accountable for their behavior by implementing structures with real consequences for perpetrators of harassment.

## Module #5: Sexual Violence Victimization

### Overview

Module five asked about experiences with the most serious types of sexual victimization. In contrast to questions about coercion – which purports to change someone’s mind – these behaviors were done without the student’s consent. This module included questions about victimization prior to attending EMU and since being an EMU student. The survey asked about six different tactics that could be used to commit sexual violence. The survey also gathered data about the number of sexual violence incidents and perpetrators, the relationship with the perpetrator, the emotional impact the incident(s) had, and information about reporting. Overall, almost one fifth (18.3%) reported that they had been victims of sexual violence.

### Results

The first part of this module asked about aggressive sexual behaviors done without consent but where the perpetrator did not attempt sexual penetration. Specifically, 15.5% of respondents reported that, since they had enrolled at EMU, someone had fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of their body, or removed some of their clothing without consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration; Table 5.1). Again, the key difference between coercion and sexual violence victimization is that in sexual violence victimization, the perpetrator is fondling, kissing, and/or removing clothing *without consent* whereas coercion involves tactics to change a person’s mind after an initial refusal in an attempt to obtain consent.

The three most common tactics reported by the students responding to this section were taking advantage of you when you were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening (8.1%, N=113); blocking you from leaving (7.2%, N=100); and using force, for example holding you down with their body weight, pinning your arms, or having a weapon (6.2%, N=86).

Of the respondents who had been victimized multiple times, most reported that their experiences with sexual violence were not with the same person (60.4%, N=76). Most respondents who had been victimized multiple times reported that they had been assaulted by two different people (49.3%, N=37), and 4% (N=3) were victimized by more than five different people.

The next series of questions asked about completed and attempted rape. Overall, 7.5% of respondents reported that, since they had enrolled at EMU, someone had oral, anal, or vaginal sex with them without their consent (i.e., a completed rape; Table 5.1). The most commonly reported tactic was taking advantage of the person when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening (6.7%, N=62). Additionally, 10.5% of respondents reported that, since they had enrolled at EMU, someone had tried to have sex oral, anal, or vaginal sex with them without their consent, *but it did not happen* (i.e., an attempted rape; Table 5.1). The most commonly reported tactics were taking advantage of the person when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening (8.3%, N=73) and blocking the person from leaving (8.2%, N=72).

Most (68%, N=48) respondents said their experiences with completed acts of rape were with the same person. In addition, a number of respondents reported multiple – up to five – completed rapes since they enrolled at EMU. Of the respondents who reported that, since they had enrolled

at EMU, someone had tried to have sex with them without their consent (i.e., attempted rape), just over half (51.9%, N=42) reported that all of the experiences were not with the same person.

*Table 5.1. Sexual Victimization Since Enrolling at EMU by Type and Tactic*

Type of victimization	Percent	Most common tactic
Fondled, kissed, rubbed up against private areas of your body, or removed some of your clothes without your consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration)	15.5	Taking advantage of you when you were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening
Oral, anal, or vaginal sex without your consent (completed rape)	7.5	Taking advantage of you when you were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening
Tried to have sex oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you without your consent, but it did not happen (attempted rape)	10.5	Taking advantage of you when you were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening

Those respondents who reported being victimized were also asked about the perpetrator. Responses identified 86.9% of the perpetrators as men.

Students reported that the other person was a stranger in fewer than one fifth of victimization instances (16.5%; Table 5.2). More than half (53.0%) of these respondents reported that the other person was not a student at EMU, and about two thirds (65.6%) reported that none of the situations happened on the EMU campus.

*Table 5.2. Sexual Victimization by Relationship*

Relationship	Percent*
Friend	38.2
Acquaintance or classmate	37.4
Former romantic partner	22.5
Romantic partner	20.8
Casual sexual partner, FWB (friends with benefits), NSA (no strings attached) hookup	20.2
Stranger	16.5
Coworker	8.1
Relative/family	2.8
EMU instructor or another EMU employee (student or non-student)	2.5

*\*Multiple responses were permitted for this question*

Of the survey respondents who reported that they had been victims of sexual violence, about two fifths (41.5%) reported that the other person(s) had been using alcohol or drugs just prior to any of the incidents, whereas 44.9% reported that they (the respondents) had been using alcohol or drugs just prior to any of the incidents.

Survey respondents who reported that they had been victims of sexual violence were also asked the extent to which they experienced eight different feelings during the incidents (Table 5.3). There were no statistically significant differences with respect to respondents' reported races and ethnicities in how they felt during sexual victimization. However, men were significantly less likely than women or respondents of another gender to report feeling scared; like the other person would hurt them if they did not go along; frozen, shut down, or numb; dehumanized; and guilty, like it was their fault, ashamed or dirty.

*Table 5.3. Feelings During Sexual Victimization*

	Extremely	Very	Somewhat	Slightly	Not at all
Scared	28.7%	24.9%	22.2%	12.8%	11.5%
Like my life was in danger	7.3%	8.1%	16.3%	16.8%	51.5%
Like the other person would hurt me if I didn't go along	12.9%	13.7%	20.7%	18.8%	33.8%
Frozen/shut down/ numb	34.2%	21.0%	10.5%	12.9%	21.3%
Dehumanized	30.8%	22.1%	16.2%	12.3%	18.6%
Betrayed	34.9%	18.9%	16.3%	12.9%	16.9%
Guilty/like it was my fault/ashamed/dirty	30.9%	21.6%	18.2%	9.5%	19.8%
Angry	35.2%	21.2%	16.2%	13.7%	13.5%

Of the survey respondents who reported that they had been victims of sexual violence since coming to EMU, 94.0% selected at least one of 12 listed reasons why they did not contact administrators, instructors, or other officials or staff at EMU (Table 5.4).

*Table 5.4. Reasons for Not Reporting Sexual Victimization*

	Yes
It was a personal matter	53.1%
You did not want to get anyone in trouble	28.1%
The person was your friend or significant other	35.0%
You didn't know how to contact them	7.9%
You were concerned they would not keep your situation confidential	22.0%
You were concerned you'd be treated poorly or that no action would be taken	27.6%
You did not think the incident was serious enough to report	48.1%
You did not trust the criminal justice system	20.2%
You did not want any action taken	29.8%
You did not need any assistance	23.7%
You felt that other people might think that what happened was at least partly your fault or that you might get in trouble for some reason	36.5%
You were worried that either the person who did this to you or other people might find out and do something to get back at you	27.5%

Finally, respondents were asked about experiences with sexual victimization before they attended EMU (Table 5.5). Prior victimization, especially when someone does not receive counseling or support, can intensify the subsequent effect of victimization.

*Table 5.5. Victimization Prior to Attending EMU*

	Yes
Did anyone <b>often</b> swear at you, insult you, put you down, humiliate you, or act in a way that made you afraid that you might be physically hurt?	22.5%
Did anyone <b>often</b> push, grab, slap, or throw something at you, or ever hit you so hard that you had marks or were injured?	9.3%
Did anyone ever touch or fondle you, have you touch their body in a sexual way, or try to actually have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with you, when you did not want to?	22.7%

## Discussion

The nature and extent of sexual victimization at EMU is comparable to other universities that have used similar questions on similar surveys. Given that 86% of identified perpetrators were men, the problem is largely one of male violence against women, although discussion, policy, and interventions must balance this framework to be more inclusive of various gender identities to capture the full range of victimization. The most common tactic across the types of victimization was taking advantage of someone who was too drunk or out of it to stop the perpetrator, indicating that the problem is not about nuances of consent. Perpetrators saw someone incapacitated and decided to fondle, rape, or attempt to rape them rather than help them out or take care of them even though victims saw the perpetrators as friends and acquaintances.

Sexual assaults by people known to the victim are more common than assaults by strangers, even though popular belief and mainstream media emphasize the stranger danger. The finding that only about 16% of victimizations were committed by strangers suggests that resources and education should be redirected to reflect this reality. Further, messages and interventions should not be overly moralistic about casual sexual partners, which account for about half the level of victimization as either friends or acquaintance/classmates.

The use of alcohol and/or drugs in sexual assaults is frequent. It is important to recognize that alcohol and/or drugs are used by perpetrators to control their victims, to decrease their victims' ability to think clearly, and to resist or even fight off perpetrators. Women especially are warned about how drinking increases the likelihood of sexual assault. More effort needs to be made targeting men with the message that it is wrong to get a woman drunk and incapacitated in order to take advantage of her, and if they see someone in that state they should help out rather than take advantage.

The results indicate that respondents experience various emotions in reaction to sexual violence victimization. Additional difficulties can arise when a victim has prior experience with sexual assault, as well as uncongenial reactions from friends, peers, and the institution to any disclosure the victim makes. Victim blaming is clearly evident when examining the large number of

respondents who felt ashamed and guilty or felt like their victimization was their fault. Almost three fourths of respondents (72%) felt extremely, very, or somewhat guilty, like it was their fault, ashamed, or dirty.

Although about half of the sexual victimization incidents involved an EMU student as a perpetrator and one-third occurred on campus, 94.0% of respondents selected at least one of 12 listed reasons why they did not contact administrators, instructors, or other officials or staff at EMU. Almost 38% of the students who did not report the incident to anybody at EMU said that it was because they felt that other people might think that what happened was at least partly their fault or that they might get in trouble for some reason, and almost 28% were concerned that they would be treated poorly or that no action would be taken. Another 22% of respondents were concerned that EMU officials would not keep their situation confidential, indicating that EMU has work to do on the perception and reality of its reporting processes. These results suggest that a substantial portion of students do not trust the university and university officials to treat victims/survivors with dignity and respect. Interventions on both sides (students and faculty/staff) are necessary to engender more trust on behalf of the students and knowledge about how best to support them.

## Module #6: Sexual Violence Perpetration

### Overview

Unlike other recent college surveys on sexual misconduct, the current survey attempted to also examine sexual violence perpetration. Sexual violence perpetration has recently become highly stigmatized behavior and is likely underreported more so now than in earlier research. However, consideration and careful scrutiny of both the role and basis of gender in violence perpetration is needed to inform both prevention and intervention efforts.

### Results

A small percentage (5.5%) of students reported that they had engaged in a form of sexual violence perpetration since enrolling at EMU. Specifically, 2.2% of respondents reported that, since enrolling at EMU, they had fondled, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of their partner's body or removed some of their partner's clothes without their partner's consent, but did not attempt sexual penetration using some of the six tactics represented in Table 6.1.

*Table 6.1. Sexual Violence Perpetration: Did Not Attempt Sexual Penetration*

Tactic	Percent	Number
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises they knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said you didn't want to	1.1	12
Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after they said they didn't want to	1.1	13
Blocking them from leaving	1.7	19
Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them	0.2	8
Using force, for example holding them down with your body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon	1.2	13
Taking advantage of them when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening	1.4	16

Of the students who reported that they had committed more than one of the actions in Table 6.1, just over half (55.0%) reported that experiences were not all with the same person. Of these respondents, three fifths (60.0%) reported that the experiences were with two people, and two fifths (40.0%) reported that the experiences were with three people.

A very small percentage of respondents (0.8%) reported that, since they had enrolled at EMU, they had oral, anal, or vaginal sex with someone without that person's consent (i.e., committed rape), and 4.2% of respondents reported that, since they enrolled at EMU, they had tried to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex with someone without their consent, but it did not happen (i.e., attempted rape). The most commonly reported tactic among these respondents who tried to have sex with someone without their consent was showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or

attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after their partner refused consent (4.2%; Table 6.2).

*Table 6.2. Sexual Violence Perpetration*

Tactic	Had sex		Tried to have sex but it did not happen	
	Percent	Number	Percent	Number
Telling lies, threatening to end the relationship, threatening to spread rumors about them, making promises they knew were untrue, or continually verbally pressuring them after they said they did not want to	0.5	6	3.7	52
Showing displeasure, criticizing their sexuality or attractiveness, getting angry but not using physical force, after they said they did not want to	0.3	4	4.2	58
Blocking them from leaving	0.5	7	3.7	51
Threatening to physically harm them or someone close to them	0.2	3	3.5	53
Using force, for example holding them down with your body weight, pinning their arms, or having a weapon	0.5	6	3.8	52
Taking advantage of them when they were too drunk or out of it to stop what was happening	0.6	8	3.5	48

## Discussion

The number of respondents reporting sexual violence perpetration overall was very low in contrast with respondents reporting sexual victimization. This result is not surprising primarily for a number of reasons. First, society historically has overwhelmingly blamed victims for their own violent victimizations, and perpetrators have rarely been held accountable. Typically, perpetrators fail to recognize their conduct as wrong and/or illegal. Second, the results may reflect the effects of the *#MeToo* movement that exploded in the fall of 2017 with wide, mainstream attention given to sexual violence. For the first time, society has witnessed the downfall of some high profile sexual violence perpetrators who are also powerful individuals, and progress in some states and industries has been made. The *#MeToo* movement has led to an increased stigma particularly for male-perpetrated sexual violence, which is likely underreported in our survey. It is also important to keep in mind that respondents might not be willing to disclose perpetration of sexual violence on a survey.

## Module #7 Consent

### Overview

Developing and agreeing on clear definitions of consent to educate the campus communities have been at the center of campaigns and initiatives to prevent sexual misconduct on university campuses. In this process, and in the last decade, the notion of consent has evolved from “no means no” to “yes means yes,” or what has been called *affirmative consent*. People cannot say no if they are unconscious, and threats and coercion can silence individuals. However, it is also clear that the simple absence of a “no” in sexual situations does not equal a “yes,” or mean that the person consents. Affirmative consent requires not only a “yes” at the beginning of a sexual encounter, but rather consent that is ongoing as a sexual encounter progresses.

The EMU survey sought to explore to what extent respondents understood and agreed with current definitions of consent. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with 13 statements that addressed various situations and nuances of the concept of affirmative consent. Moreover, given that there might be differences between agreement with the current definition of affirmative consent and the ability and/or comfort in giving or asking for consent, the survey introduced new questions to learn about any important differences between respondents’ understanding of the idea of consent and how they perceive their own ability and comfort in practicing consent.

Results show that while agreement with the current notion of affirmative consent is widespread, respondents are less confident about their ability and comfort about asking for or giving consent, especially in casual relationships. Differences by gender and racial identities are also noteworthy.

### Results

The first battery of items probed respondents’ understanding of the concept of affirmative consent (Table 7.1). Nearly all respondents strongly or somewhat agreed with two main ideas about consent: 1) consent must be ongoing and clear in a sexual encounter (99.2% strongly or somewhat agreed) and 2) even when a person initiates sex, they can later change their mind and withdraw consent at any time (97.4% strongly or somewhat agreed). The vast majority – 80 to 90% – of respondents also demonstrated strong agreement with affirmative consent in additional situations.

However, it is noteworthy that respondents are *not* in total agreement with the definition of affirmative consent. For example, nearly 20% of respondents at some level endorsed the statement that if a person does not say no then they have given consent to sex. Respondents on surveys tend to affirm positions that are socially desirable, so these survey responses likely reflect a conservative estimate of the respondents’ mindset. Indeed, nearly one in five indicated some level of agreement with the statement, “If a person is nonresistant, still, or silent, they have given consent” (12.8 % somewhat disagree and 5% strongly agree or somewhat agree).

Table 7.1. Consent

Statement	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Consent must be ongoing and clear in a sexual encounter	94.7%	4.5%	0.7%	0.1%
Even when a person initiates sex, they can later change their mind and withdraw consent at any time	91.3%	6.1%	1.7%	0.9%
If a person is nonresistant, still, or silent, they have given consent	2.4%	2.6%	12.8%	82.2%
Consent for sex one time is consent for future sex	1.6%	1.7%	6.2%	90.5%
If a person doesn't say no, they have given consent to sex	0.8%	3.5%	15.1%	80.7%
If a person has been drinking, they are probably trying to loosen up before sex, so you do not need to be as concerned about consent	0.8%	1.0%	7.0%	91.2%
If someone is sending mixed signals/flirting or is not clear about consent, their partner can continue until there is a clear "no"	1.9%	12.7%	20.7%	64.7%
If someone invites you to their place, they are giving consent for sex	0.3%	1.4%	6.3%	91.9%
It is not necessary to get consent before sexual activity if you are in a relationship with that person	3.0%	5.5%	13.3%	78.2%
If someone sends a nude or sexually explicit picture, it means they consent to sex at a future time	0.4%	4.2%	10.0%	85.5%
If someone talks in general about enjoying a certain type of sexual activity, you can assume they have given you consent to do that	0.5%	2.7%	7.7%	89.1%
If someone is verbally resistant but physically aroused, they are giving consent	0.5%	0.8%	7.8%	91.0%
If someone does not say "yes" but is sexually enthusiastic, they are giving consent	2.8%	16.4%	23.8%	57.0%

Not surprisingly, on average, female respondents were significantly more likely to strongly agree with statements indicating affirmative consent than male respondents, except for one statement ("It is not necessary to get consent before sexual activity if you are in a relationship with that person"), for which there were no statistically significant differences by gender identity.

Two additional questions and a series of items probed respondents' perceptions on their *practice of affirmative consent* in both *casual* and *committed relationships*. When asked about consent in a casual relationship, about half of the respondents were very sure that they can tell when

consent is given (54.3%), that they know how to stop a sexual encounter if they change their mind (53.9%), and that they feel comfortable stopping a sexual encounter if they change their mind (47.8%). Over two thirds of the respondents endorsed that they are very sure they can tell when consent is *not* given (70.2%), that they know how to ask for consent (68.9%), and that they know how to tell the other person that they are not consenting (66.8%).

Several differences among respondent groups are also apparent. For example, compared to White and multiracial/multiethnic/other minority respondents, Black or African American respondents expressed, on average, greater confidence that they know how to ask for consent and feel comfortable stopping a sexual encounter if they change their mind in a casual sexual encounter.

Male respondents, on average, expressed significantly less confidence that they know how to ask for consent when compared to female respondents or respondents who identified as another gender. However, male respondents, on average, expressed significantly more confidence that they know how to stop a sexual encounter if they change their mind, can stop a sexual encounter if they change their mind, and feel comfortable stopping a sexual encounter if they change their mind in a casual sexual encounter, compared to female respondents and respondents who identified as another gender.

When asked about consent in a committed relationship, respondents were overall very confident in their practice of consent. About three in four respondents were very sure that when it comes to sex in a committed relationship they can tell when consent is given (76.9%), that they can tell when consent is *not* given (79.3%), and that they know how to ask for consent. However, fewer respondents indicated that they are very sure that they can stop sex if they change their mind (71.9%), that they know how to stop a sexual encounter if they change their mind (70.3%), and that they feel comfortable stopping a sexual encounter if they change their mind (66.7%) when it comes to sex in a committed relationship.

Again, several differences by gender identity among respondents are evident. For example, female respondents expressed significantly more confidence that they can tell when consent is given, that they can tell when consent is *not* given, and that they know how to ask for consent when it comes to sex in a committed relationship, compared to male respondents.

## Discussion

These findings show that it is relevant to distinguish, first, between respondents' knowledge and practice of consent and, second, between the practice of consent in casual versus committed relationships. Among the findings that are worth further exploration and that may require educational interventions are that about 20% of respondents are *not* in total agreement with the provided definitions of affirmative consent, and, importantly, over one third of respondents *do not fully* understand affirmative consent in a number of situations. Navigating consent within a sexual encounter, in particular being able to refuse different sex acts or to end an encounter, is another important area to focus future efforts.

As the primary objective is prevention of sexual misconduct, it is important not to collapse the "very sure" and "somewhat sure" responses. In practicing consent, any uncertainty or insecurity (or as indicated in the response options, "somewhat sure," "somewhat unsure," or "very unsure")

can lead to situations in which there are misunderstandings about consent. In any sexual situation, if partners are not in total agreement about consent (i.e., both “very sure” about how to practice consent), then true affirmative consent is impossible to obtain. The results strongly underscore the need for educational interventions focusing on the practice of consent.

Interestingly, over 90% of respondents *strongly disagreed* with the statement that if a person is drinking, they are trying to loosen up, and consent is less of a concern. This statement has the *second largest* number of respondents in disagreement. Yet, the results from Module 5, about sexual violence victimization, demonstrate that the most common tactic used in commission of sexual violence is taking advantage of a person who is too drunk or out of it to stop the encounter. The implication, as discussed in Module 5, is that most people who initiate sex or attempt to have sex with another person who is drunk *are very likely to know that the sex is not consensual*. That is, the common claim made by perpetrators of rape, that they misunderstood or received mixed signals or thought that they had consent, is very likely not true.

## Module #8: Bystander Intervention

### Overview

This section of the questionnaire asked students about a wide range of behaviors in situations in which they might have acted to prevent or to stop sexual misconduct committed against other EMU students who were their peers, acquaintances, or friends. It also asked students about the likelihood that most of their EMU friends would also intervene to prevent sexual misconduct. At the end of this module, students were asked how much trust they have in the police appropriately handling allegations of sexual misconduct in two cases: 1) thinking from the perspective of a complainant/survivor and 2) thinking from the perspective of an alleged perpetrator.

### Results

When asked how often, if ever, students engaged in 15 listed actions to address sexual misconduct situations that they observed at EMU, a majority of respondents indicated that they found all but three of the actions not applicable to them (Table 8.1). Of these three actions, students engaged in only two a majority of the time: 1) speaking up against sexist jokes (58.9%) and 2) asking someone who looked upset at a party if they were okay or needed help (51.0%). The third action, talking to the friends of a drunk person to make sure that the drunk person was not left behind at a party, bar, or other social event, was endorsed by a minority of participants (47.0%), as only 50.7% of students found that situation applicable to them, and a small percentage of students who had been in that situation never intervened.

For eight of the 15 actions, respondents who identified as neither a woman or a man reported, on average, that they intervened significantly more frequently than female or male respondents. Overall, the majority of respondents believed that it was either very likely or somewhat likely that most of their EMU friends would intervene in the situations described in the survey (Table 8.2). Specifically, the vast majority of respondents believed that it was very likely or somewhat likely that their friends would speak up or help in some way if they saw a stranger looking uncomfortable and being touched, grabbed, or pinched in a sexual way (92.6%) and would ask a friend if they were being mistreated if it was suspected that they might be in an abusive relationship (91.9%).

Male respondents were significantly less likely to believe that most of their EMU friends would say or do something to get them to stop leading someone who is obviously drunk away to have sex with them. They were also significantly less likely to believe that most of their EMU friends would come up with a plan for checking in with one another throughout the evening compared to female respondents or respondents who identified as neither female nor male.

Table 8.1. Bystander Intervention

Action	Always	Most of the Time	Sometimes	Never	N/A
Spoke up against sexist jokes	9.7 %	22.0%	27.2%	13.3%	27.8%
Intervened with a person who was being physically abusive to someone else	13.9%	10.1%	5.3%	7.1%	63.6%
Asked someone who looked very upset at a party if they were okay or needed help	21.5%	17.7%	11.8%	4.6%	44.4%
Tried to distract someone who was trying to take a drunk person to another room or trying to get them to do something sexual	12.7%	18.8%	5.6%	6.1%	66.8%
Walked someone who had had too much to drink home from a party, bar, or other social event	22.6%	11.8%	9.3%	5.5%	50.9%
Talked to the friends of a drunk person to make sure they did not leave the drunk person behind at a party, bar, or other social event	26.8%	13.0%	7.2%	3.6%	49.3%
Spoke up against unwelcome sexual comments to women in locker room or restroom situations	12.7%	8.5%	7.8%	6.6%	64.4%
Spoke up against unwelcome sexual comments to transgender or gender non-conforming people in locker room or restroom situations	13.8	8.9%	6.2%	7.0%	64.2%
Spoke up against unwelcome sexual comments to people in laboratory or library situations	10.4%	7.5%	5.6%	7.2%	68.2%
Tried to cool down a potential sexual misconduct situation	8.3%	7.4%	6.4%	7.2%	70.9%
Intervened in a sexual/physical assault	10.1%	5.8%	6.4%	7.4%	70.3%
Spoke up against unwelcome sexual comments to people in the classroom	11.8%	9.3%	8.1%	8.6%	62.2%
Helped someone in an abusive relationship to get counseling or other help	19.7%	10.3%	7.9%	5.2%	56.8%
Spoke up against leering or harassing comments while walking across campus	10.2%	7.1%	8.4%	10.5%	63.9%
Used a cell phone to help someone get transportation to safety	20.1%	9.7%	8.3%	4.6%	57.4%

Table 8.2. Likelihood of Intervention by EMU Friends

Situation	Very Likely	Somewhat Likely	Somewhat Unlikely	Very Unlikely
If you were sending sexual pictures, web pages, or messages to someone who didn't ask for them, how likely are most of your friends to say something to try to get you to stop?	59.6%	25.9%	9.5%	5.0%
If people they don't know very well are making unwanted sexual comments, jokes, or gestures, how likely are most of your friends to say something to try to get them to stop?	52.0%	34.8%	9.5%	3.7%
If your friends saw you leading someone who is obviously drunk away to have sex with you, how likely are most of them to say or do something to get you to stop?	65.5%	24.4%	7.6%	2.5%
If your friends suspected that you might be in an abusive relationship, how likely are most of them to ask you if you were being mistreated?	67.2%	24.7%	5.6%	2.4%
If someone told your friends that they had sex with someone who was passed out, how likely are most of your friends to report the incident to a campus administrator or the police?	48.6%	34.0%	12.0%	5.4%
If your friends see someone they don't know who looks uncomfortable and is being touched, grabbed, or pinched in a sexual way, how likely are most of them to speak up or help in some other way?	60.3%	32.3%	6.0%	1.4%
When your friends go out with you, how likely are most of them to come up with a plan for checking in with one another throughout the evening?	60.3%	24.7%	9.4%	5.6%

Two thirds of survey respondents (67%) either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that, thinking from the perspective of a complainant or survivor, they trust that the police would appropriately handle allegations of sexual misconduct. Similarly, two thirds of respondents (67%) strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that, thinking from the perspective of an alleged perpetrator, they trust that the police would appropriately handle allegations of sexual misconduct. Black or African American respondents were less likely to trust the police to appropriately handle allegations of sexual misconduct from the perspective of either a complainant/survivor or an

alleged perpetrator Respondents who identified as neither male nor female expressed significantly lower levels of trust in the police than either female or male respondents.

## **Discussion**

The majority of respondents who found themselves witnessing sexual misconduct situations reported that they intervened by not leaving a drunk person behind at a party, bar, or other social event, asking someone who looked upset at a party if they were okay or needed help, or speaking up against sexist jokes. It is important to note that when students reported that a situation did not apply to them, they had not experienced, encountered, or witnessed that situation. Given the ubiquity of sexual misconduct, both as reported by survey respondents and underscored during the focus groups, it is also possible that students do not recognize when sexual misconduct is occurring around them. Therefore, it is important to educate students on red flags or behaviors that could indicate a situation in which they can (and should) intervene to stop sexual misconduct. Conversely, it is also relevant to highlight that the respondents who did encounter sexual misconduct situations experienced a wide range of situations in which they could have intervened, some rather frequently (e.g., 82.8% of respondents found themselves in situations where sexist jokes were being shared). Bystander intervention initiatives should take into account the most commonly encountered situations, teaching students context-specific interventions.

The vast majority of respondents showed trust in their peers in most sexual misconduct situations. Most felt that it was very likely or somewhat likely that their friends would speak up or help in some way if they saw a stranger looking uncomfortable and being touched, grabbed, or pinched in a sexual way and would ask if a friend was being mistreated if they suspected that their friend might be in an abusive relationship.

A majority of survey respondents trust that the police would appropriately handle allegations of sexual misconduct from the perspective of a complainant/survivor and from the perspective of an alleged perpetrator. However, there were important racial and gender identity differences expressed by respondents. Perhaps police outreach and increased police oversight, including transparency both on the part of the police and the citizen-oversight groups, are necessary to engender trust among marginalized populations who may be more at risk for both sexual misconduct and differential treatment by the police.

## Module #9: Rape Myths

### Overview

An important aspect of sexual misconduct culture is the acceptance of various rape myths. The survey did not directly state that the statements were rape myths, rather it provided the respondent with a series of statements and asked for their level of agreement or disagreement. These statements generally suggest a victim consented when they did not, blame the victim for the rape, and minimize the harm of rape. Asking about acceptance of myths is important because it can reveal attitudes about consent, perpetration, perceptions of situations that might require intervention, and understandings of fairness for outcomes of formal processes, and informal understandings that follow accusations of rape. While most surveys ask only about myths surrounding the rape of women, EMU's survey also asked about beliefs surrounding male and LGBT persons victims of rape.

### Results

The vast majority of respondents disagreed with 13 ideas that people might have about men and sexual assault, with over 90% of respondents either strongly disagreeing or somewhat disagreeing with nine of the 13 listed statements (Table 9.1). However, the belief that men are innately programmed to rape and that they cannot control sexual desires because of innate differences or biology remains a common perception. A minority (16.2%) of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that when men are raped, it is usually because the rapist cannot control their sexual desires, and 23% either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed with the statement when men rape, it is usually because they cannot control their sexual desires.

Several differences among racial and ethnic groups were revealed, although there were few consistent patterns. For example, White respondents were significantly less likely than Asian or Black/African American respondents to agree that any healthy man can successfully resist a rapist if he really wants to. Patterns are more consistent when considering respondents' gender identities. For example, female respondents were significantly less likely than male respondents to agree with each of the 13 statements. Similarly, respondents who identified as neither female nor male were significantly less likely than male respondents to agree with ten of the 13 statements

Table 9.1. Male Rape Myths

Statement	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Men cannot be raped	1.4%	2.0%	7.5%	89.1%
Any healthy man can successfully resist a rapist if he really wants to	3.8%	8.1%	19.6%	68.5%
If a man had an erection while being raped, it probably means that he started to enjoy it	1.1%	2.1%	8.6%	88.3%
Even if a man did not give consent, he should be glad he had sex	0.6%	1.3%	4.4%	93.7%
Most men who are raped are somewhat to blame for not escaping or fighting off the rapist	2.6%	2.5%	5.4%	89.6%
Male rape is usually committed by homosexuals	3.0%	7.3%	19.3%	70.4%
When men are raped, it is usually because the rapist cannot control their sexual desires	6.6%	15.6%	15.8%	62%
A man who has been raped has lost his manhood	1.1%	4.7%	7.9%	86.4%
Most men who are raped by a woman are somewhat to blame for not being more careful	1.3%	3.9%	7.8%	87%
If a man is drunk, he might rape a man unintentionally	1%	6.4%	15.2%	77.4%
I would have a hard time believing a man who told me that he was raped by a woman	2.1%	7.9%	15.9%	74.1%
When men rape, it is usually because they cannot control their sexual desires	6.4%	16.6%	15%	62%
It shouldn't be considered rape if a man is drunk and didn't realize what he was doing	0.9%	2%	7.4%	89.7

The vast majority of respondents disagreed with 16 misconceptions that people might have about women and sexual assault, with over 90% of respondents either strongly disagreeing or somewhat disagreeing with 12 of the 16 listed statements (Table 9.2). However, fewer respondents either strongly disagreed or somewhat disagreed with the statements that women who are caught cheating on their boyfriends sometimes say it was rape (79.9%) and if a woman initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a man assumes she wants to have sex (79.1%).

Male respondents were significantly more likely to endorse rape myths about women, showing more agreement with 15 of the 16 statements, when compared to female respondents or respondents who identified as neither female nor male.

Table 9.2. Female Rape Myths

Statement	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
If a woman is raped while she is drunk, she is at least somewhat responsible for letting things get out of hand	0.7%	6.0%	9.0%	84.3%
When women go to parties wearing revealing clothes, they are asking for trouble	0.6%	6.8%	10.1%	82.5%
If a woman goes to a room alone with a guy at a party, it is her own fault if she is raped	0.3%	2.9%	8.0%	88.8%
If a woman is sexually provocative or promiscuous, it is her fault if she is raped	0.5%	3.5%	8.9%	7.0%
When women get raped, it's often because the way they said "no" was unclear	0.3%	3.9%	11.7%	84.1%
If a woman initiates kissing or hooking up, she should not be surprised if a man assumes she wants to have sex	3.5%	17.4%	19.5%	59.6%
If a woman doesn't physically resist sex—even if protesting verbally—it can't be considered rape	1.7%	1.9%	6.5%	89.9%
If a woman doesn't physically fight back, you can't really say it was rape	0.5%	0.7%	4.9%	93.8%
A rape probably didn't happen if a woman doesn't have any bruises or marks	0.4%	0.6%	3.6%	95.4%
If a woman doesn't clearly say "no," she can't claim rape	0.8%	5.6%	11.3%	82.3%
A lot of times women who say they were raped agreed to have sex and then regretted it	2.1%	9.8%	23.8%	64.3%
Rape accusations are often used as a way of getting back at guys	2.8%	12.8%	23.3%	61.0%
A lot of times, women who say they were raped often led the man on and then had regrets	1.5%	7.1%	19.1%	72.3%
Women who are caught cheating on their boyfriends sometimes say it was rape	2.8%	17.3%	22.6%	57.3%
Women secretly want to be raped	0.3%	0.6%	3.8%	95.3%
A woman cannot rape another woman	0.7%	1.0%	4.7%	93.5%

Large majorities of respondents disagreed with six misconceptions that some people might have about lesbian, gay, bisexual, and trans people and sexual assault and about sexual assault in general (Table 9.3). Over 95% of respondents either strongly disagreed or somewhat disagreed

with five of the six statements, and 94.3% of respondents either strongly disagreed or somewhat disagreed with the statement that if both people are drunk, then rape cannot occur.

*Table 9.3. Rape Myths About Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender People and Other Ideas About Sexual Assault in General.*

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
One cannot be a legitimate rape victim if they are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or trans	0.5%	0.4%	3.7%	95.5%
Gay men and bisexual people cannot be legitimate rape victims because they are naturally promiscuous	0.2%	0.5%	3.7%	95.6%
Sex within a marriage/serious relationship cannot be rape	0.5%	3.1%	9.4%	87.0%
If the accused “rapist” doesn’t have a weapon, you really can’t call it rape	0.2%	0.3%	3.2%	96.2%
One cannot be a legitimate rape victim if they post sexual images of themselves on social media	0.3%	0.4%	6.5%	93.8%
If both people are drunk, it can’t be rape	0.6%	5.1%	18.9%	75.4%

No significant differences among racial and ethnic groups were revealed. However, male respondents were more likely to agree with six statements than female respondents. Respondents who identified as neither female nor male expressed significantly stronger disagreement with four of the five statements when compared to female and male respondents.

## Discussion

The vast majority of respondents either strongly disagreed or somewhat disagreed with several of the common rape myths about men. It seems that education efforts to dispel rape myths are possibly making a difference. However, the belief that men are innately programmed to rape and that they cannot control sexual desires remains a common misperception. For example, almost one in four of our respondents agreed with the statement that when men rape, it is usually because they cannot control their sexual desires. Endorsement of traditional beliefs and assumptions about men and masculinity is hypothesized to be driving these ideas.

With regard to ideas about women and sexual assault, once again respondents strongly disagreed or somewhat disagreed with several of the common rape myths. However, the belief that women cry rape as a form of revenge, or when caught cheating on a boyfriend, remains common. These misconceptions highlight the importance of continuing to critically reflect on traditional beliefs about gender and how these beliefs shape our understanding of sexual behaviors as well as sexual assault. Continuing to challenge dominant rape myths as they relate to gender, and cultural narratives that blame victims of sexual assault and/or exonerate perpetrators are crucial to ending sexual misconduct culture.

## Module # 10: Peer Responses

### Overview

The purpose of this module was to learn whether respondents would share a sexual misconduct experience with friends or peers at EMU, and if they did share, how they thought their EMU friends and peers would respond to them.

### Results

Three questions were posed to respondents in this module. The first question asked if the student would hypothetically share their experiences of sexual misconduct with their friends or peers at EMU. Three fifths of respondents (60.1%) reported that, if sexual misconduct happened to them, they would share their experiences with friends or peers at EMU. The majority of the respondents agreed that their EMU friends or peers would respond supportively. Additionally, one fourth of respondents (25.6%) reported that, since coming to EMU, they had a friend who is an EMU student and a survivor of sexual assault.

*Table 10.1. Perceptions of Peer Responses*

Action	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Reassure you that you did not deserve it	80.8%	16.8%	1.1%	1.2%
Treat you differently after you told them, in a way that made you uncomfortable	5%	16.8%	32.4%	45.8%
Comfort you by telling you it would be alright or by holding you	55.8%	32.3%	9.1%	2.7%
Tell you that you could have done more to prevent this experience from occurring	4.4%	10.7%	26.1%	58.7%
Assist you in getting help, provide information, and/or discuss options	71%	21%	46%	1.9%
Avoid talking to you or spending time with you/withdrawing from the friendship	2.1%	6.3%	22.3%	69.3%
Express disbelief or denial of your experience	3.5%	10.5%	25.3%	60.7%
Want to confront or get even with the person who committed the sexual misconduct	25.7%	41.4%	18.8%	14.1%
Advise that you need to see a therapist	45.3%	40.6%	10.4%	3.7%

The second question provided respondents with a list of nine possible ways that their friends or peers could respond to a disclosure of sexual misconduct. As can be seen in Table 10.1, the majority of respondents either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that their peers would engage in supportive actions, such as reassuring the victim that they did not deserve to be assaulted (97.6%) and assisting the victim in getting help, providing information, and/or discussing options (92%). Large numbers strongly disagreed or somewhat disagreed that peers would engage in

non-supportive actions, such as avoiding talking to or spending time with the victim or withdrawing from the friendship (91.6%) and expressing disbelief or denial of the victim's experience (86%).

Male respondents were significantly less likely than female respondents to agree that their friends or peers would have supportive reactions, such as "reassure you that you did not deserve it," "comfort you by telling you it would be alright or by holding you," "assist you in getting help, provide information, and/or discuss options," and "advise that you need to see a therapist." Male respondents were statistically significantly more likely to agree that friends/peers would "tell you that you could have done more to prevent this experience from occurring", when compared to female respondents or respondents who did not identify as female or male.

The third question asked students about the possible reactions from their friends if they experienced sexual misconduct *and reported the case of sexual misconduct to EMU* (Table 10.2). From the respondents who reported they would share their experiences with friends or peers *and report to EMU*, a large majority either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that their friends or peers would think that they are courageous (84.5%) and admire or respect them (77.2%). A large majority either strongly disagreed or somewhat disagreed that if they shared their experiences of sexual misconduct, their friends or peers would accuse them of creating drama (92%) and have a hard time supporting them (90.3%).

*Table 10.2. Perceptions of Peer Responses to Reports of Sexual Misconduct to EMU*

Statement	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Most of your EMU friends/peers would say you are creating drama	0.8%	7.1%	22.2%	69.8%
Most of your EMU friends/peers would have a hard time supporting you	1.2%	8.5%	23.4%	66.9%
The alleged offender(s) or their EMU friends would try to retaliate against you	10.1%	31.5%	27.8%	30.7%
Most of your EMU friends/peers would admire or respect you	28.3%	48.9%	16.8%	6.1%
Most of your EMU friends/peers would think you are courageous	36.8%	47.7%	10.9%	4.6%
Most of your EMU friends/peers would probably tell you that it won't make any difference	4.2%	18.3%	4.3%%	43.2%

Female respondents were significantly more likely than male respondents to agree that most of their EMU friends or peers would think that they are courageous, and significantly less likely than male respondents to agree that that most of their EMU friends/peers would have a hard time supporting them. Respondents who identified as neither female nor male were more likely than male respondents to agree that the alleged offender(s) or their EMU friends would try to retaliate against the victim.

## **Discussion**

The majority of respondents anticipated supportive reactions from their EMU friends and peers if they chose to share their experiences of sexual misconduct. Questions emerge when the responses are differentiated by gender. Male respondents were more likely than all other respondents to agree that friends or peers would tell them that they could have done more to prevent this experience from occurring. When asked to imagine friend/peer reactions to reporting sexual misconduct to EMU, female respondents expressed more agreement than male respondents that most of their EMU friends or peers would think that they are courageous and less agreement than male respondents that most of their EMU friends or peers would have a hard time supporting them. These examples highlight gender differences in the expectations of friend and peer responses. Men anticipate more critical reactions and women anticipate more supportive reactions. Consequently, it is important to create and encourage safe spaces, particularly for male victims of sexual misconduct, to be able to share experiences in a supportive environment.

Respondents who identified as neither female nor male were more likely than male respondents to believe that the alleged offender(s) or their EMU friends would try to retaliate against them should they report sexual misconduct to EMU. The idea that nonbinary respondents are more likely to fear retaliation may reflect the lack of acceptance and high levels of violence in society (in both behavior and rhetoric) against nonbinary people. It is imperative that programs implemented as a result of this project address how nonbinary people are treated in society and establish cultural change toward inclusion.

## **Module #11: Institutional Response to Survivor and Module #12: Perceptions of Institutional Responses; Knowledge of Campus Sexual Misconduct Resources; and Exposure to Sexual Misconduct Information/Education**

### **Overview**

Modules 11 and 12 are combined in this section of the report. Both modules focus on institutional responses, albeit from two different perspectives: one of a sexual misconduct survivor (Module 11) and one of a person who has not experienced sexual misconduct (Module 12). It is important to note that no respondent completed both Module 11 and the first two parts of Module 12 (all respondents completed the third part of Module 12: Exposure to Sexual Misconduct Information/Education). Branching logic was used in the survey to direct survivors to Module 11 (they then only saw the third part of Module 12) and to direct respondents who did not experience sexual misconduct straight to Module 12 (they did not see Module 11).

Paramount to EMU is providing effective institutional responses when members of the campus community experience sexual misconduct, as well as providing the campus community with knowledge about available campus resources and educational programming and materials pertaining to sexual misconduct. Effective institutional responses include both responses to actual reports of sexual misconduct and students' perceptions about the University's ability to effectively respond to and support students experiencing sexual misconduct. Instances of sexual misconduct can have a profound impact on the lives of our students. EMU works to ensure that students have resources, counseling, and accommodations necessary to recover from experiences of sexual misconduct. Creating a culture in which students are comfortable reporting requires clear and transparent processes that are understood and trusted. This was assessed within Module 11: Institutional Response to Survivors and the first part of Module 12: Perceptions of Institutional Responses.

Module 11 was designed to assess effectiveness of the institution in responding to and supporting students who, themselves, had reported disclosing at least one experience with coercion, stalking, harassment, or sexual violence since coming to EMU, as well as the effectiveness of the institution in responding to and supporting friends of those who had experienced sexual misconduct since coming to EMU. Furthermore, when respondents indicated that they had a friend who is an EMU student and a survivor of sexual assault, they were also asked whether or not their needs for support and resources were met by EMU and if they felt safe remaining at EMU.

Four items were used to assess the institution's response to and support of students who had disclosed at least one experience with coercion, stalking, harassment, or sexual violence earlier in the survey. Students who disclosed at least one experience with coercion, stalking, harassment, or sexual violence earlier in the survey were first asked if they reported what happened to them to EMU. They were provided a list of campus resources that included, among others, the Title IX Office, EMU Department of Public Safety/EMU Police, Snow/University Health Services, Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) or other EMU counseling,

EMU instructor, Resident Advisor or Residence Life staff, or another non-student/student EMU employee. They were then asked to assess the effectiveness of the response of the campus resource. Two additional items were presented to students who disclosed at least one experience with coercion, stalking, harassment, or sexual violence earlier in the survey to assess the ability of faculty and staff to effectively respond to and support students who had experienced sexual misconduct and to assess the environment created by EMU faculty or staff.

Students' perceptions about EMU's ability to respond effectively were assessed in the first part in Module 12. Students who had not experienced incidents of sexual misconduct were asked to respond to a series of statements designed to assess their perception of how EMU might respond and how much trust students had in EMU's ability to respond appropriately. First, respondents were provided with a series of statements describing the ways in which EMU faculty or staff might handle a student report of an incident of sexual misconduct and asked to agree or disagree with each of these statements. The second item asked students how much trust they have in EMU faculty or staff appropriately handling allegations of sexual misconduct from the perspective of the complainant/survivor and of the alleged perpetrator.

Critical to promoting a safe environment is ensuring that students know what can be done if they experience sexual misconduct. To assess students' knowledge of university resources and supports related to sexual misconduct and how these resources and supports can be accessed, Module 12 asked if respondents knew where to get help on campus if they or a friend were to experience sexual misconduct; if they knew where to report sexual misconduct; and if they understood what happens after reporting sexual misconduct at EMU.

It is important, too, that students have access to effective educational materials and programming to support their healthy development and wellbeing and the safety of the university community. Therefore, in the third part of Module 12, all students, regardless of experiencing sexual misconduct, were shown items designed to ascertain exposure to campus sexual misconduct educational information and programming, as well as to assess the channels through which this information is conveyed.

These items included asking students if they had any type of sex education, about the influence various sources had on their view of sexual consent before coming to EMU, if students received written or verbal information about definitions of the types sexual misconduct and consent, and if they were familiar with EMU's Policy on Sexual Misconduct and Interpersonal Violence. Questions also asked where students saw and heard information about sexual misconduct, including discussions about consent, bystander behavior, and sexual misconduct, or if students had seen or heard head campus administrators or staff address sexual misconduct. The survey asked whether or not students had accessed resources through EMU websites such as Speakup! Active Bystander Training, Title IX Office, and EMU I Choose Campaign, or had participated in on-campus training and events about sexual violence and its prevention. Finally, students were asked how aware they were of the function of campus resources as they related to campus safety, student well-being and sexual misconduct.

## Results

### Module 11: Institutional Response to Survivor

Just over one fourth of the respondents (25.6%) reported that they had a friend who is an EMU student and a survivor of sexual assault. A majority of this group (70.5%) felt safe to remain at EMU. Multiethnic/multiracial/other minority students felt significantly safer to remain at EMU compared to Black or African American respondents. Male respondents also felt significantly safer to remain on campus when compared to female respondents or respondents who identified as neither female nor male. Likewise, respondents who identified as neither female nor male were significantly less likely to feel safe remaining on campus when compared to female and male respondents.

A vast majority of students (88.8%) who disclosed earlier in the survey that they had experiences with coercion, stalking, harassment, or sexual violence did not report the incident to any campus office/resource. Of the respondents who did report sexual misconduct to the university (11.2% of the sample) CAPS or other EMU counseling (22.6%) was the most often used resource followed by an unspecified "Other" category (18.8%), the Title IX Office (14.6%), EMU Department of Public Safety/EMU Police (10.7%), and other EMU employee (non-student and student; 10.3%), EMU instructor (8.4%) and Resident Advisor or Residence Life Staff (5.4%). The remaining campus resources listed in the survey each received less than 5% of sexual misconduct reports. In addition, students who live on campus are more likely to report sexual misconduct to EMU than students who live off campus.

Of those resources utilized by more than 5% of the respondents, the Resident Advisor or Residence Life staff received the highest proportion of very effective or somewhat effective ratings (84.9%), while other EMU employees (non-student and student) received the lowest proportion of very effective or somewhat effective ratings (47.3%; Table 11.1). CAPS, the Title IX Office, and EMU Instructors were also viewed as providing effective responses. A majority of students who reported disclosing to EMU Department of Public Safety/EMU Police viewed the response as very effective (31.9) or somewhat effective (31.1%); however, nearly 40% of students viewed the response by EMU DPS/EMU Police as either somewhat ineffective (10.4%) or very ineffective (26.5%). There were no significant differences among respondent race/ethnicity or gender identity.

Part of the institution's response is the effectiveness of individual faculty and staff and the environment they create. Students who disclosed in the survey that they had experienced sexual misconduct were asked how EMU faculty and staff reacted to their report. More than 85% of the respondents indicated that the statement was not applicable to them, which corresponds with the rate at which respondents who experienced sexual misconduct did (or did not) report their experiences to EMU. For those students who did find the statement applicable to them, a little more than half felt that, in all cases, EMU faculty or staff believed them (55.9%) and/or allowed them to have a say in how their report was handled (51.4%). Again, for students who felt that the statements were relevant, nearly 60% or more felt that in none of the cases, EMU faculty or staff punished them in some way for reporting (71.15%), suggested that sexual misconduct might affect the reputation of EMU students, faculty, and staff (60.78%), treated them as if they were somehow responsible (58.48%), or covered up the report of sexual misconduct" (58.42%).

*Table 11.1. Effectiveness of Response in Cases Where Incidents Were Reported*

Resource	Very Effective	Somewhat Effective	Somewhat Ineffective	Very Ineffective	N
CAPS (Counseling and Psychological Services) or other EMU counseling	51.4%	27.6%	12.8%	8.1%	57
Other	36.7%	37.0%	12.1%	14.2%	40
Title IX Office	43.0%	35.0%	10.3%	11.6%	37
EMU Department of Public Safety/EMU Police	31.9%	31.1%	10.4%	26.5%	26
Other EMU employee (non-student and student)	10.2%	37.1%	19.4%	33.3%	24
EMU instructor	34.9%	42.4%	14.3%	8.4%	21
Resident Advisor or Residence Life staff	41.4%	43.4%	7.1%	8.1%	13
Snow/University Health Services	69.7%	0.0%	15.2%	15.2%	6
Office of the Ombuds	38.9%	22.1%	19.5%	19.5%	5
Women's Resource Center	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4
Office of Wellness and Community Responsibility	29.8%	29.8%	0.0%	40.5%	3
EMU religious leaders	76.0%	24.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3
LGBTQ Center	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	1
Office of Diversity	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0

### **Module 12: A. Perceptions of Institutional Responses**

Responses amongst students who did not report an incident of sexual misconduct in the survey demonstrated general trust in EMU's ability to effectively respond to reported claims of sexual misconduct. Students who did not report sexual misconduct earlier in the survey were asked how they felt that EMU would hypothetically handle a student report of sexual misconduct. The vast majority of students felt that EMU would take the report of sexual misconduct seriously (98.1%) and maintain the privacy of the person making the report (97.1%). Male respondents were significantly more likely to believe that EMU would make the report of sexual misconduct

seriously and maintain the privacy of the person making the report when compared to female respondents. There were no statistically significant differences by race and ethnicity.

The vast majority of respondents who did not disclose experiencing sexual misconduct either strongly agreed or somewhat agreed that they would trust EMU to appropriately handle allegations of sexual misconduct from both the perspective of a complainant or survivor (94.6%) and from the perspective of an alleged perpetrator (86.3%) There were no significant differences by race and ethnicity and no statistically significant differences by gender or sexual orientation.

When asked how likely EMU faculty or staff would appropriately handle a student report of sexual misconduct, 98.1% of respondents reported that EMU faculty or staff would take the report seriously, and 97.1% reported that EMU faculty or staff would maintain the privacy of the person making the report. There were no significant differences by race and ethnicity and no significant differences by gender or sexual orientation.

### **Module 12: B. Knowledge of Campus Sexual Misconduct Resources**

A majority of respondents who completed Module 12B did not know where to get help on campus (60.3%) or where to report sexual misconduct (60.4%). In addition, more than 40% of the respondents did not understand the process for handling claims of sexual misconduct.

### **Module 12: C. Exposure to Sexual Misconduct Information/Education**

Adequately informing students of available university resources and providing effective educational information and programming is key to promoting a safe campus. A little over half of the respondents (51.9%) reported that, since coming to EMU, they have received written or verbal information from someone at EMU about at least one of seven listed topics in Table 12.1. This leaves nearly fifty percent of the students (48.1%) who have not received any information. It is also important to note that fewer than half of the respondents received information about each of the topics listed.

The number of students who received information about sexual misconduct differed according to students' reported living situation. For example, about two thirds of respondents who lived on campus (66.4%) reported that, since coming to EMU, they have received written or verbal information from someone at EMU about at least one of the seven listed topics. For respondents who lived off campus, this percentage drops to 47.5%.

Respondents were more likely to have discussed topics of consent (71.5%), bystander behavior (60.0%), or sexual misconduct (70.1%) with other people outside of EMU, than with other EMU students. In contrast, more respondents discussed consent (49.4%), bystander behavior (41.6%), or sexual misconduct (48.5%) with other EMU students than in class. Nearly one third (32.3%) of the respondents had taken a class where sexual misconduct was discussed with only one fourth, or so, seeing or hearing administrators or staff addressing sexual misconduct (27.5%) or seeing or hearing about sexual misconduct in student publication or media outlet (25.3%).

*Table 12.1. Receipt of Verbal or Written Information Since Coming to EMU*

Topic	Yes	No (option not selected)
The definition of consent	42.6%	57.4%
EMU's Policy on Sexual Misconduct and Interpersonal Violence	40.6%	59.4%
How to report an incident of sexual misconduct	40.5%	59.5%
Where to go to get help if someone you know experiences sexual misconduct	39.4%	60.6%
The definitions of types of sexual misconduct	38.9%	61.1%
Title IX protections against sexual misconduct	36.9%	63.1%
How to help prevent sexual misconduct	30.5%	69.5%

The vast majority of respondents reported that they had not visited any of three listed EMU websites since they came to EMU (Table 12.2). The largest proportion of respondents who did visit one of the three websites reported that they had visited the website for the Title IX Office (11.4%).

*Table 12.2. EMU Websites Visited Since Coming to EMU*

Website	Yes	No (option not selected)
EMU website of the Speakup! Active Bystander Training.	3.9%	96.1%
EMU website for the Title IX Office.	11.4%	88.6%
EMU website for EMU I Choose Campaign.	1.9%	98.1%

Similarly, the vast majority of respondents reported that they had not read any of the three listed EMU publications regarding sexual misconduct or interpersonal violence since coming to EMU (Table 12.3). The largest proportion of respondents who read one of the three publications read EMU's Policy on Sexual Misconduct and Interpersonal Violence (18.8%).

Likewise, the vast majority of respondents reported that they had not attended any of eight listed EMU events since coming to EMU (Table 12.4). The largest proportion of respondents who did attend one of the eight events attended a Yes Means Yes New Student Orientation (14.4%).

*Table 12.3. EMU Information Read Since Coming to EMU*

Information Source	Yes	No (option not selected)
EMU's Policy on Sexual Misconduct and Interpersonal Violence	18.8%	81.2%
EMU Sexual Assault Survivor Handbook	5.9%	94.1%
I Choose Sexual Misconduct & Interpersonal Violence resource wallet card	5.1%	94.9%

Both non-binary and non-heterosexual students were more aware of available resources such as Title IX and CAPS, and non-heterosexual students were more likely to report sexual misconduct to both CAPS and the Title IX Office. Additionally, non-binary and non-heterosexual students were more likely to be exposed to information at EMU (in class, reading resources, hearing about resources) and to discuss, in class, consent and sexual misconduct with other EMU students.

*Table 12.4. Programs/Activities Attended Since Coming to EMU*

Activity	Yes	No (option not selected)
A Yes Means Yes New Student Orientation	14.4%	85.6%
A training/education session led by RA (Resident Advisor) about sexual violence and prevention	7.9%	90.8%
An event about sexual violence and prevention at a sorority/fraternity	5.2%	94.8%
A rally or other campus event about sexual misconduct or sexual assault	5.1%	94.9%
A Yes Means Yes Training Program	4.6%	95.4%
A Vagina Monologues performance	4.2%	95.8%
A Speakup! Active Bystander Training	4.2%	95.8%
A Take Back the Night event	1.4%	98.6%

## **Discussion (Modules 11 and 12)**

The results for Modules 11 and 12 provide a framework for current awareness of campus resources, their use, and their efficacy. However, the picture is not entirely positive. A large number of students are not disclosing their experiences of sexual misconduct to EMU. In addition, there is a disparity in reporting between students who live on campus compared to students who live off campus, highlighting the need for more resources geared toward off-campus students to both facilitate reporting to EMU and to encourage seeking resources in off-campus students' own communities. A partial (but not complete) explanation is that students do not know how to report sexual misconduct, to whom to report sexual misconduct, or about the process after reporting sexual misconduct. Although the university provides ample outreach and education, students are not availing themselves of these resources. It is incumbent upon the university to meet students where they are and provide outreach and education that is timely, relevant, and accessible. Ideally, students should not have to seek out resources on their own; the outreach and education should be pervasive enough that they are impossible to miss.

A majority of students reported feeling safe on campus after a friend disclosed experiencing sexual misconduct, but a substantial portion (29.5%) of students do not feel safe. When focus group participants were asked about how to make students feel safer on campus, they offered a variety of suggestions, which will be discussed in the following section of this report. Key suggestions included better campus lighting and a heightened presence of SEEUS, expanding SEEUS to areas immediately adjacent to campus.

For those students who did access university resources after experiencing sexual misconduct, their ratings of the efficacy of these offices varied widely. Students talk to other students, and if the word around campus is that a given office (or offices) are ineffective, then students will continue not to report sexual misconduct to EMU.

## Part 2: Title IX Report Recommendations

### Introduction

This section of the report focuses on both general and specific recommendations for the Title IX office and the university based on the survey results. Some of these recommendations are borne out of the data from the EMU Campus Survey on Sexual Misconduct Culture, suggested by members of the Title IX Research Committee and the Title IX Education Committee. However, many come from students who participated in focus groups during which students were presented with selected survey data and asked to recommend actions that the university could take to address surprising or concerning survey results. Focus groups were held with 15 different constituencies across campus in order to elicit feedback from as many demographic groups and campus communities as possible. The recommendations below consist of common themes that coincide across the different focus groups, as many focus groups proposed similar, if not the same, recommendations. Recommendations are grouped into two sections: one for compliance and a second for prevention and education. Within each section, recommendations are organized both by the group, constituency, or office to which they pertain and thematically. There is agreement among many of the focus group participants that the recommendations both are necessary and will be effective. As one student said, “Almost every person I know from EMU knows someone or is someone that’s experienced sexual misconduct.” In the survey, one fourth of respondents (25.6%) reported that, since coming to EMU, they had a friend who is an EMU student and a survivor of sexual assault. The goal of these recommendations, if implemented, is to ensure that future students are unable to make that same comment.

**The Title IX Research Committee proposes that the Faculty Senate establish an ad hoc committee, chaired by faculty and including faculty, administrators, staff, and students, to implement the recommendations contained herein. The ad hoc committee can also suggest logistics for programming that will be developed.**

### Section 1: Recommendations Relating to Compliance

#### Recommendations Relating to the Title IX Office

**Recommendation #1: Expand education about the role of the Title IX office and the reporting process.**

The survey showed that a large majority of students did not know how to get help on campus, how or to whom to make a report, or did not understand the reporting process. Off-campus students are even more disadvantaged in their knowledge of campus resources and reporting process. Across the focus groups, participants agreed that the role and function of the Title IX office are not commonly known to students across campus. They recommended that the university should expand education about the reporting process as well as the scope of the Title IX office. More people would consider reporting to Title IX if they understood the process and if information was more clearly communicated and readily available. Currently, students find reporting frightening because they are unfamiliar with what it entails. Instead most students

report to CAPS, which is not surprising because CAPS provides therapy, and students have a better understanding of what therapy entails.

Students have a number of questions about the reporting process and the role of Title IX that they believe should be included in educational content. Questions about the reporting process include the following:

- Does the student talk to one person or multiple people?
- Is there follow up?
- Can the complainant be anonymous?
- What does it mean to and what will happen if a person reports anonymously?
- Will the allegation be reported to police?
- What happens at the DPS level?
- If reported to police, does a criminal investigation automatically begin?
- What does it mean for the complainant if there is a criminal investigation?
- Would the complainant have to testify in court?
- Are there different steps for reporting anonymously versus those who identify themselves?
- If the victim/survivor who reports to Title IX does not want to be identified, will the Title IX office still report it to DPS?
- What supports or options are given to survivors? If anonymous, does the Title IX office just record the allegation and the process ends there?
- Would DPS begin an investigation without the victim's identity?
- Would other police departments get involved? For instance, if the sexual assault took place in Ypsilanti, would YPD be notified? Would they begin their own investigation? Would the victim be interviewed now by both EMU DPS as well as YPD?
- If the perpetrator confesses, what does this mean for the victim who did not want to be identified or doesn't want to go to trial?
- Students don't know that they can report without identifying a perpetrator. This should be made clear.
- Students should know that they can report to Title IX without police involvement so that the students can get the help they may need immediately. It should also be explained to students that they can come back six months later, or a few years later, when they are more emotionally ready to proceed with a criminal investigation. By reporting to Title IX immediately, they will have access to resources and their experience will be recorded in case they later decide to press charges.
- How are Title IX processes explained to students?
- Who is responsible for following up with the survivor?
- Students were unaware that there is an online anonymous reporting portal for sexual misconduct. The existence of the online portal should be included in education about the reporting process, as well as the process for investigating allegations made through the

online portal. In addition, the online portal should be more prominently displayed on the main EMU website.

- There should also be a text hotline to report to Title IX in addition to the internet portal
- International students pointed out that they feel more vulnerable in reporting to Title IX. Given their visa status and foreign status they do not know what kind of support (including legal) they would be able to get from Title IX, and are concerned about how reporting could impact their student visas. There was a recommendation to have the Office for International Students and Scholars play a role or facilitate international students reporting to Title IX.

Also, students want clearer and more information about other responsibilities of the Title IX office. For example, they want to know the resources and support that the Title IX office provides to students who experience sexual misconduct. Suggestions for education about the role of Title IX include the following:

- There should be a clear and clearly stated view and vision for what the Title IX office is. If the role and responsibilities of the Title IX office are clearly defined, then this is not evident to students (and likely faculty and staff).
- The Title IX office should have procedures that address the potential appearance of bias or conflict with having an advocate for survivors also conduct investigations. Students suggested increasing the Title IX staff and perhaps having a separate office that exclusively provides support to students who experience sexual misconduct.
- Some believe that if something happens off campus, there is no reason to report it to EMU. Title IX education should explain why reporting to EMU is important (e.g., accommodation requests, etc.)
- Students are unclear as to what the Title IX mandate is. This information should be included in education programs.

### **Recommendation #2: Title IX should have procedures in place to address the specific needs of graduate students who experience sexual misconduct**

Concerns were raised by graduate students about the reporting of sexual misconduct, particularly when the perpetrator is a faculty member or staff member. Graduate programs are typically small, and everyone knows each other. Victims feel particularly vulnerable to report. There were fears about the consequences when others in the program would learn about the report. Combined with uncertainty about the role of Title IX and the reporting process, graduate students feel that reporting may be too risky. For example, if a graduate student has to switch advisors due to sexual misconduct, it could set back or derail their progress in their program. Additionally, there could be retaliation against the student in the form of other faculty members not wanting to advise a student who made an allegation against a faculty colleague.

Another issue that was raised is that many graduate programs do not always consider student well-being. Graduate students in the focus groups wonder why such a large number of students who are victimized do not report their victimization to the relevant offices. One student does not believe that the university is effective, mentioning that if the university were effective, there would be a climate where more students felt safe reporting sexual misconduct.

**Recommendation #3: Provide appropriate resources to the Title IX office.**

The budget and staffing for Title IX should be increased so that the recommendations can be appropriately implemented. Providing required resources will demonstrate that the university cares about preventing sexual misconduct. There was also a suggestion to reconvene the Title IX research and education committees to prioritize efforts once resources have been committed by the Provost and President.

Another point students raised is that LGBTQ+ individuals and individuals from racial or ethnic minorities may feel more comfortable reporting to other people with their same demographic characteristics, that their experiences would be better understood and treated more seriously by people like them. This recommendation includes increasing the diversity represented in Title IX staff in order to promote inclusion.

**Recommendation #4: Review and discuss changing the requirement that all faculty and staff are mandatory reporters.**

In the survey, the most commonly endorsed reason for not reporting was that students feel that sexual misconduct is a private matter. Some students may be deterred from reporting their victimization to EMU faculty and staff because they know that faculty and staff are mandatory reporters. Students express that in confiding in trusted faculty and staff who are mandatory reporters, students may lose their privacy and their ability to hold on to their stories.

The recommendation is to have a larger discussion with regard to changing the status of faculty and staff as mandatory reporters. More information is needed regarding the law to ascertain the university's discretion in deciding who is and is not a mandatory reporter as well as whether changing this requirement would encourage students to confide in trusted faculty and staff. If this change is adopted, then faculty and staff should instead receive professional development that includes information about how to support students who disclose sexual victimization, how to assist students in accessing resources that are available, and how to encourage reporting to Title IX.

**Clearer information around campus about where to report a sexual assault**

**Recommendation #1: EMU should create a central source of information for types of misconduct**

EMU lacks a central source for information that it can use in publicizing where to get help, and many students do not know what Title IX is. It is recommended that a series of top-level pages like [emich.edu/rape](http://emich.edu/rape), [emich.edu/harassment](http://emich.edu/harassment) and [emich.edu/stalking](http://emich.edu/stalking) be created. Each page should be constructed with a view to the needs of a student who has experienced sexual misconduct and of a friend who is trying to be supportive. The websites should be in plain language instead of in legalistic terms.

Because a survivor may not prioritize filing a report in the wake of their attack, priority on the webpage for rape should be given to rape crisis hotlines, such as what is available through Safe House. Ideally the website would provide the hotline numbers for the counties where the largest number of students live (because they can connect commuter students to community resources), a way to look up a local hotline number, and the number for a national hotline (e.g., RAINN).

The webpage should also list EMU resources, in a reader-friendly way that briefly identifies the services offered, any requirements for accessing services, and expectations for reporting, privacy, and confidentiality. Each EMU resource — Title IX, DPS, CAPS — should be linked on the landing page. Recommendations also included the development of infographics or decision trees to diagram intake procedures and possible outcomes.

**Recommendation #2: EMU should implement an advertising campaign across campus to increase awareness of where and how to report sexual misconduct.**

Students express the need for increased visibility about sexual assault and the role of the Title IX office across campus. They feel that there should be a more robust outreach or advertising presence of Title IX resources and contact information around campus. Specific recommendations include the following:

- More needs to be done to publicize that the Title IX office offers services for students who experience victimization regardless of whether it happened on campus or off campus. Many students assume that Title IX is only for on-campus cases.
- Students suggest increasing the visibility of the Title IX services to facilitate contacting Title IX. Recommendations include:
  - Educational displays and infographics across campus (in dorms, lounges, student center, bathrooms, hallways) detailing a step-by-step process (e.g., a flowchart that would list where to go for help, who to call, etc.). These displays should be similar to the suicide hotline posters that are readily available across campus to ensure that students remember seeing the number or office and therefore know where to go or who to call for help when needed.
    - Outreach should be everywhere (impossible to avoid) and persistent so that reporting sexual assaults is ingrained in people’s heads, and they go into immediate action. A student compared this concept to the use of “stop, drop, and roll” for fire safety.
  - Using the EMU Engage app.
  - Having a more ubiquitous presence on EMU websites other than the Title IX website.
  - Having information about Title IX included in syllabi.
  - Having a link available in Canvas, on the main page and not in each course shell, for students to click on to access information about Title IX and resources about sexual misconduct.
  - The billboards on campus should be used to advertise Title IX and other support services.
  - Distributing flyers where people congregate.
- Use plain language in explaining Title IX services and processes in all outreach and education. The email students receive about Title IX is very bureaucratic and legalistic. Students skim through them and may not read them with any depth because they are very difficult to understand. The complexity of the language may deter students from reporting.

- Outreach should focus on off-campus students as well as on-campus students (over 70% of EMU students live off campus). Survey results showed that a majority of students did not know how to get help on campus and that commuters were even less likely to know about university resources for students. Students noted that more should be done to inform and serve off-campus students, and more resources should be made available to on campus students as well.
- There should be a program, perhaps during orientation or within students' first month at EMU, during which students are taken to Title IX (and other support) offices across campus so they see what these offices look like, where they are, and who is there to help. Students should also be instructed to put the offices' phone numbers in their cell phones.
- Students suggest making considerable changes to the Title IX website to make it more user-friendly. These suggestions include adding navigation bars with information about support services and a step-by-step process of what to do if a person experiences sexual misconduct.
- There was a suggestion to use social media to reach out to students about the resources that are available and about events.

## **Section 2: Recommendations Relating to Prevention and Education**

There must be more of a focus on changing the culture. Currently, much emphasis is placed on what the victim can do (e.g., where to report, how to report, etc.). Sexual violence and harassment are the problem; therefore, there needs to be more emphasis on prevention of sexual misconduct. There should be a focus on teaching people not to engage in sexual misconduct, including debunking false beliefs (i.e., rape myths) about sexual behavior and misconduct, instead of solely focusing on teaching people how not to be victimized.

Education and training should also emphasize ways to change the culture by exploring various aspects of current society and campus cultural contexts that a) lead students to not recognize many coercive behaviors (as a victim or as a perpetrator); and b) make the practice of consent difficult.

**Create a work group to develop and create a policy about online harassment, including sexual harassment, in the context of classes and the use of social media.**

**Recommendation: The university should create a committee consisting of faculty, staff, administration, students, and a member of the Board of Regents to establish a university policy addressing online harassment.**

Although the survey included questions about harassment that occurred over email and texting, students in the focus groups noted that the survey did not include questions or examples regarding sexual harassment that occurs over social media. In addition, with classes being predominantly online during the past year, there is evidence of online harassment through social media and other websites. Currently, there are no means at EMU for providing consequences when social media is used to harass faculty, staff, and other members of the campus community.

## Required class(es) on sexual violence for all EMU students

### Recommendation #1: EMU should require classes on sexual misconduct for all students.

There is strong support for either a single required class or a series of required classes about sexual violence. Sexual violence classes are viewed as a necessary part of the curriculum and undergraduate experience. There is a clear distinction made between training in sexual misconduct that would be offered at different points throughout the year versus continuous education (via classes) that is needed to re-socialize and educate students in order to change the culture around sexual misconduct.

Students suggest the following types of classes:

- Sexual violence
- Gendered violence
- Sexuality psychology class
  - This class would include both understanding how to read body language and how to interpret messages that appear conflicting.
- Human sexuality classes
  - These classes would focus not only on anatomy and physiology but also on the social and sociological aspects of sexuality.
- Hegemonic masculinity or toxic masculinity
- Coercive behaviors
- Critical media studies to combat messages in popular culture
- Stereotypes that sexualize and fetishize minorities (native-born and international students) and LGBTQ+ populations

There are a number of ways that students advise that the university incorporate required classes on sexual misconduct into the curriculum. Students suggest that classes be structured in the following ways:

- These classes should be UNIV classes. Students would be required to take a class on sexual misconduct as they do for other areas such as campus life, mental health, etc.
- Required classes on sexual misconduct should also generate LBC credit, and there could even be a sexual misconduct category within LBC that students would need to complete a certain number of credits within.
- The university should offer upper-level Gen Ed classes on sexual violence or consider creating a Gen Ed category dedicated to sexual culture and misconduct.

Information about sexual misconduct should be available in the syllabi and in Canvas course shells.

- Students mention that every syllabus should have information about Title IX. Specifically, students want a list of resources that are available and for faculty to discuss this information in class. There was another proposition, especially for first year classes, to invite guest speakers who can provide information and resources about sexual misconduct in first year classes.

- In addition, students suggest that there should be a video about sexual misconduct and associated resources in Canvas and that this video is required viewing in order to access course materials. Students also want a separate course shell in Canvas that everyone can access, that would include information about Title IX, contact numbers and email addresses, and information about sexual misconduct, as well as the link to the anonymous reporting portal.

**Recommendation #2: Students should undergo regular tests of knowledge of sexual misconduct.**

In addition to requiring classes about sexual misconduct, students also believe that it is important to regularly test knowledge about sexual violence and harassment. Students suggest that this testing is required for graduation. For example, at MSU, students must pass an online test about sexual misconduct and cultural competence in order to graduate. Another recommendation is that testing could be required either every year or every semester and be administered online, similar to MSU. The test would include questions in different areas, such as coercion, understanding consent, practicing consent, rape myths, etc. Students would receive credit for passing these tests.

**Required training on sexual violence every semester for all students**

**Recommendation: Regular training on sexual misconduct should be required.**

Students strongly support regular required training on sexual misconduct, ideally completing a training module or program every semester while attending EMU. These trainings are different from required classes because they are brief in duration, either held in an in-person workshop format or an online or video module, and contain self-assessments for students throughout. In addition, they are not a part of the curriculum, and students are not graded. The purpose of these training sessions is also different from classes; these would be more focused on specific topics and would serve as a knowledge booster. Students believe that training must be mandatory or otherwise incentivized. Suggestions for incentives include:

- Withholding students' transcripts;
- Requiring module completion for graduation;
- Providing course credit; and
- Monetary incentives, such as tuition discounts.

Students also would like the university to specifically focus on targeting sophomores during the 2021-2022 academic year because they did not have exposure to campus and training during the pandemic year. Similarly, students point out the need to make training accessible and applicable to transfer students and off-campus students as well. Multiple modalities are suggested for these training sessions. The different methods and timing of delivering training include the following:

- Training should consist of brief online modules or videos. Some students also suggest in-person training sessions and peer-led sessions.
  - Modules should have weekly discussion posts or a group research project about the Title IX policies in order to force interaction from students.
  - Video modules are suggested specifically with regard to training about consent.

- Consent modules should have questions to answer as students go along with the model, ideally using scenario-based questions to allow students to think about what they would do in certain situations and develop a heuristic for when they are in a sexual situation.
    - Students should see scenarios instead of just reading about consent.
      - Because it is difficult to measure engagement with online modules, it is suggested that online training use modules strategically to introduce what Title IX does, how victims can get help, what the step-by-step process is, how to file a complaint, the role of the public safety oversight committee, etc.
- Having each topic or module consist of a multi-step process. For example, in a consent module, students can learn how to give consent, how to ask for consent, what consent looks like, and how to interpret body language (e.g., a person says “yes” but their body language is not enthusiastic or is inconsistent with the “yes”).
- Offerings should be available at various times throughout the year because some students felt that orientation or first three was not a good time to cover such important information.
- One idea is to create a bridge program that would explain how to adjust to life at the university, including students’ rights and responsibilities as well as the norms at EMU, with a focus on sexual misconduct. This program could be tied in as a requirement to be able to register for classes or could be a one-credit seminar.
  - The program could be a requirement to be able to register or a 1 credit seminar.
  - This program could incorporate content specific to graduate students, commuters, LGBTQ students, students of color, etc.
  - There is a suggestion that the bridge program could include a culminating project, a community action project, or practice oriented work, which would provide a clearinghouse of ideas to make campus safer on a continuous basis.
- The Signature Learning Arc group is interested in adding a requirement for Title IX education. It is possible that regular training could be incorporated into the Signature Learning Arc program.
- A number of students mentioned a performing arts troupe that does a skit about consent during the first four. Perhaps this troupe could be brought in for regular events on campus and they can be given support for recording skits along with creating discussion guides. The Office of International Students and Scholars also holds a play for international students during orientation that is about consent. It is suggested that this play should be made more widely available to other students.
- Programs at orientation should be required. Self-selection may be a problem in that the people who need the education most do not receive it.
- Students suggest having workshops on consent with peers interacting and then discussing the interactions to develop a shared understanding of consent. These workshops should be mixed gender groupings instead of segregated by gender.
- There should be peer-facilitated workshops for men (students, faculty, and staff) focused on issues relating to the ideology of masculinity, aggression, and violence.

The idea is that the training would be standalone modules that are combined into a robust and regular education program over the students' time at EMU. As such, each module would consist of a different topic; a number of ideas for topics to be covered were discussed during the focus groups. Suggestions for content include:

- **General topics** to be included in training:
  - Resources that are available, how to access these resources, and general sexual misconduct prevention training.
  - Material about rape, coercion, consent, etc. Training should include case-studies involving all forms of sexual misconduct.
  - Training should involve actual survivors and their stories, raising awareness through the survivors' lived experiences. Focusing on timely examples will enable students to relate to the situation instead of feeling disconnected from outdated examples and situations. Examples should also include experiences that might not seem serious to the victim/survivor or an observer but can have an impact on education and for which the university can provide support. In addition, these lived experiences may help students build empathy for survivors of sexual misconduct, perhaps facilitating prevention.
  - RAs experience students reporting sexual misconduct every few weeks and provide students with information about the Title IX office. It is suggested that everyone should have the same or similar Title IX or sexual misconduct training as the RAs or other student staff members. Given how common sexual misconduct is, everyone should have this training. Although the training is long and tedious, it is important for the campus community to know how to help a survivor.
  - Training should include content about decision making. The prefrontal cortex, which is involved in decision making, is not yet fully developed in 18-23-year-olds. Students may need training or help with decision making in sexual situations. One example provided by a student is that the idea that "you came out with me, why don't you want to kiss me" is not playful, but rather is coercive and makes women feel uncomfortable.
    - Just because behaviors may seem inconsequential to the perpetrator, that does not mean that those same behaviors are not coercive or traumatizing to the victim.
  - Male victimization should be brought up as an issue as well, and a culture of awareness around male victims should be encouraged.
  - Apply a "see something, say something" education approach to combat all forms of sexual misconduct.
- Topics specific to the **culture** of sexual misconduct:
  - Training must also focus on prevention, including addressing toxic masculinity within society and teaching people not to rape or commit other forms of sexual misconduct.
  - Education and training should explore various aspects of current society and campus cultural contexts that a) lead students to not recognize many coercive

behaviors (as a victim or as a perpetrator); and b) make the practice of consent difficult.

- Students do not always feel important and valued at the university. One of the more frequently endorsed reasons why students do not report sexual misconduct is that they do not see the assault as being serious. Training should mention that even if a victim does not see their assault as serious, the university does.
- Training should address potential cultural factors in rape myths and cultural stigma against reporting sexual misconduct, such as shaming and victim blaming.
- Topics specific to **misogyny** module:
  - This training should address the social reality that women disproportionately have been and continue to be the victims of sexual violence and that men disproportionately are the perpetrators.
  - This training should address how misogyny is condoned and promoted in our society.
  - Focus should be given to promoting women's empowerment and the different ways to challenge patriarchy and demand accountability on the part of institutions.
- Topics specific to a **consent** module:
  - How to withdraw consent during sexual activity. However, students must explicitly be taught how to say no after sex has started and how to be empowered during a sexual encounter to say no. In addition, this training should include practice with saying no in different situations. Women or feminine presenting persons are not always taken seriously when they change their minds, and withdrawal of consent could be interpreted as playing hard to get.
  - Training on consent should stipulate that one-time consent is not consent for the future.
    - A student mentioned that training could include how to establish a safeword at the beginning of sexual encounters so that if one person changes their mind during an encounter or things get too far, they can use the safeword to indicate that they want to stop.
    - A student also mentioned setting ground rules ahead of time for each encounter (e.g., "I'm good to do X and Y tonight but not Z").
  - The survey results demonstrate that students have a strong understanding of situations that are and are not consensual. However, students are substantially less confident in their ability to practice consent. Education and training on consent should focus more on how to practice consent than on just the understanding consent. A good understanding of what consent means does not necessarily translate into confidence, comfort or ability to ask for consent or know when consent is given or not.
  - However, as the survey shows that about 20% of respondents are *not* in total agreement with the provided definitions of affirmative consent, and that over one third of respondents *do not fully* understand affirmative consent in a number of

situations, training sessions should further explore definitions and understanding of affirmative consent.

- Education and training on the practice of consent conducted by peers and by groups of students was considered to be more effective. Substance use and how it affects consent should be included.
- Topics specific to a **bystander intervention** module:
  - Information should be included that shows what to look for or how to identify sexual misconduct in certain situations.
  - Potential red flags and how to spot them.
  - There should be a focus on agency.
  - Training should include the message that bystander intervention helps people.
  - It should focus both on individuals and creating a larger community that offers support.
- Topics specific to **sexual harassment**:
  - There should be training on how to respond to harassment or a harasser. Harassment must not be normalized at EMU.
- Topics related to a **stalking** module:
  - Students pointed out that some types of “stalking” are not included in the survey and should be included in educational content. Examples include stalking a social media profile or stalking a person at work to determine their work habits.
  - Some students expressed concern that the availability of students’ email addresses through campus directory and Canvas classes could facilitate virtual stalking or unwanted contact. How to respond to this concern should be considered in the light of the survey findings showing that the most common form of stalking experienced was receiving unwanted communications (letters, emails, texts, instant messages, etc.) to the point of distress, with just over one fifth of the respondents (22.5%) reporting being stalked in this way.
- Topics specific to a **coercion** module:
  - People might be more likely to associate coercion with physical restraint or over-serving alcohol/drugs instead of manipulative behavior. It is important to stress the different types of coercion, especially ones that are less clear because of gender socialization and media.
  - Include situations (beyond buying dinner) where one person may try to convince another that sex is ‘owed,’ use guilt trips and gaslight the victim/survivor after the incident.
  - Overwhelmingly, students in the focus groups believe that their peers may not see the coercive situations that were mentioned in the survey as being coercive.
- Topics specific to a module about **sexual violence and racial and ethnic minorities**:
  - This training should address stereotypes of and fetishizing minorities, including misconceptions and assumptions about Black and Brown bodies (e.g., being dehumanized, objectified, hypersexualized, and called exotic).

- This training should include a discussion of the prototype of attractiveness as portrayed in the media.
- Another topic to be addressed is the use of feigned interest or misplaced and inappropriate curiosity in a person's cultural background as an opening or as coercion and its intersection with privilege.
- One myth that can be debunked during this training is that racial and ethnic minorities are sometimes seen as easier targets because of the perception that they have less power (e.g., if she reports, people will not believe her or the police will not investigate) and that they are less likely to fight back.
- Training should also explore the **experiences of LGBTQ+ students**. Examples of topics to be included are:
  - Fetishization of trans people as a reason for violent victimization by non-transgender and non-binary people.
  - Transgender people may be targeted because of their marginalized status (i.e., they have less power or are easy targets).
  - People may try to take advantage of LGBTQ individuals, subjecting them to coercive behaviors (e.g., "I'll prove to you that you'll like this").  
Acknowledge and educate about the trauma that may be in the lived histories of LGBTQ+ people and how this trauma might affect their susceptibility to and experiences with sexual misconduct.
- Topics specific for **international students**:
  - For international students, rape myths, lack of reporting, and not wanting to discuss sexual misconduct in general may be a part of their cultural upbringing.
  - Training could be developed specifically for international students that includes different cultural expectations in the United States.
  - International students pointed out that training should address their foreign status and visas. For example, they need to know what kind of support (including legal) they would be able to get from Title IX, and how reporting could impact their student visas.
  - International students also reported that education and other prevention initiatives directly supported by the Office for International Students and Scholars would likely be more effective given that they often develop close and trusting relationships with OISS.

### **Required training on sexual assault and harassment for all faculty and staff, including roles as Mandatory Reporters**

**Recommendation: Faculty and staff should undergo regular, mandatory training about sexual misconduct.**

Students point out that faculty knowledge of sexual misconduct varies vastly among faculty members. Some faculty have limited understanding of the Title IX Office, their roles as

mandatory reporters, and sexual misconduct overall. There must be a focus on faculty engagement in these areas.

In addition, students do not always perceive faculty as safe. Both female graduate students and commuter women express considerable concern about sexual harassment perpetrated by instructors. They believe that instructor misconduct is vastly underreported and that students are unlikely to report misconduct because the student takes classes with the instructor, the student does not want to switch classes (or it may be impossible for the student to switch classes), or the student is fearful of retaliation. It is also unclear to whom students should report misconduct because students may not understand the relationship between faculty and Department Heads or School Directors. Finally, the idea of faculty and staff being mandatory reporters is very frightening to students. They are afraid to tell their stories because they believe that the police will automatically be involved.

Graduate students also observed that they tend to have closer one-to-one work relationships with graduate instructors, especially with program and thesis or dissertation advisors. They recommended special sexual misconduct education initiatives for faculty and graduate students that would take into account the more frequent, face-to-face, one-to-one nature of the work relationship among graduate students/instructors/advisors.

### **Create a center, called the Sexual Assault Prevention and Survivor Support Center, to specifically address prevention and support**

**Recommendation: Create a separate center that exclusively supports victims of sexual misconduct.**

Students do not commonly know what Title IX means, nor do they understand that Title IX has a very broad scope, in addition to addressing sexual misconduct. There is support for the creation of a separate, collaborative center that would be responsible for sexual misconduct complaints and to rename the center to reflect its focus (the Sexual Assault Prevention and Survivor Support Center). Creation of an appropriately named, standalone center dedicated exclusively to sexual misconduct survivors would ensure clarity for students. The name would be clear, and the purpose of the center would be unmistakable to students. Students suggest that having a separate, collaborative center focused on survivor support would help increase reporting of sexual misconduct. The creation of a separate, collaborative sexual assault prevention and support center would also then enable the Title IX office to focus on all others areas required of Title IX.

### **EMU partnership with Safe House**

**Recommendation: There should be a Safe House presence on campus.**

EMU should enter a contract with Safe House to create a permanent presence on campus. This presence would ensure that survivors receive the necessary legal, emotional, and psychological support that they need. Work by advocates for survivors of sexual victimization proceeds on an empowerment philosophy: the misconduct has elements that have taken away a woman's autonomy and respect, so supporting her entails providing her information and an environment in which she can make decisions and regain control of her life. As much as EMU might want to encourage reports to understand what is going on and as a step to accountability, survivors need a source of support that they can intuitively trust to provide the support they want. Safe House

would do this work, and take care of the whole victim/survivor in ways that go beyond psychological counseling. Students may feel more comfortable with the confidentiality of Safe House compared to a university-affiliated office.

The needs of victims/survivors are complex, and Safe House training covers a wide variety of issues and is constantly updated. For example, a person being stalked could get assistance with cell phone apps that are leaking information, ideas for dealing with the stalker, and information about Personal Protection Orders. Students experiencing intimate partner violence from a non-EMU student may not see Title IX as the place to get help, but Safe House can help them with safety plans and other strategies. In cases in which a criminal investigation has commenced, Safe House is uniquely qualified to help prepare survivors for the trial process, connecting students with long-term support services in the community. They can also provide support for students who are wrongfully accused as we often see in cases where women are accused of domestic violence against male intimates. In addition, it would divorce the support process from the university, enhancing student trust in the process (during the focus groups, students noted the appearance of a conflict of interest in having the university both manage the investigation process and provide necessary support, including legal support, to students).

## **Public Safety Oversight Committee**

**Recommendation: EMU should adopt the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Public Safety Oversight Committee's Final Report regarding the EMU Public Safety Oversight Committee.**

The university must move forward on the final report by the Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Public Safety Oversight Committee. There are several recommendations in the report about the importance of increasing police accountability and transparency and how to make the complaint process more accessible and widely publicized. Also contained in the report is a suggestion to expand the mandate of the EMU Public Safety Oversight Committee beyond exclusively investigating complaints made against the EMU Police Department, giving the EMU Public Safety Oversight Committee the authority to conduct oversight evaluations on police conduct and policies. Currently, the Faculty Senate is waiting for President Smith's written response to the final report in order for the ad hoc committee to move forward and meet with various stakeholders. The ad hoc committee is eager to begin the necessary conversations and work on prioritizing their recommendations. In the interim there must be more visibility across campus about the EMU Public Safety Oversight Committee, what it does, and how students, faculty, and staff can register a complaint.

## **EMU Department of Public Safety**

**Recommendation #1: The Title IX office and the Department of Public Safety should increase awareness of the role of the Department of Public Safety in sexual misconduct investigations.**

In the focus groups, students were not surprised by the survey results showing a high level of trust in police because students do not understand the grey area in sexual misconduct investigations and police discretionary powers. Survey responses demonstrate a lack of understanding of the role of the Department of Public Safety, which was underscored in the focus groups. One suggestion from the focus groups is that students should receive a tour of the

Department of Public Safety in their first year at EMU to demystify the department. Students want clear information about DPS and their role in sexual misconduct investigations.

Information that students need includes the following:

- An understanding of the criminal legal process and police discretion in the investigation. What is the officer's discretion to commence and end an investigation?
- The Department of Public Safety must make information public, as required by law, when a person makes a sexual misconduct complaint.
- What happens if a survivor reports anonymously to the Department of Public Safety? What are the steps to the investigation?
- Is there one officer who is responsible for communicating with the survivor? How is contact and communication maintained during an investigation, and how often do contact and communication occur?
- What kind of training is offered to Department of Public Safety officers in the area of sexual violence? How often do officers receive Clery Act training?
- Students report that they have been told by officers that there is not enough evidence to prosecute even after the student has had a rape kit done and when there are witnesses. The decision of the Department of Public Safety to investigate (and the county to prosecute) should be transparent, with criteria being clear to the EMU community. There should be clear instruction on what is necessary to prosecute and what the steps are in the criminal legal system.
- How are sexual assaults categorized and filed by the Department of Public Safety? The lawsuit claims that the EMU Department of Public Safety did not classify the allegations as sexual assaults.
- Who is responsible for the internal crime statistics? Is there oversight internally?
- Are outside police agencies immediately contacted if an assault occurs off campus? For example, if an assault occurs in Ypsilanti, is the Ypsilanti Police Department contacted as well? Who is ultimately responsible for the investigation?

**Recommendation #2: Pair sexual misconduct survivors with an advocate from Safe House during police investigations.**

One suggestion during the focus groups is to match sexual misconduct survivors who wish to proceed with a criminal investigation with an advocate from Safe House during the investigation. The Safe House advocate would be able to assist the survivor and coach them through the legal process, explaining in plain language what the survivor can expect and preparing the survivor for the additional trauma of a criminal investigation.

## **Safety on Campus**

**Recommendation #1: EMU should increase safety precautions on campus, particularly at night.**

Survey results demonstrate that there is a substantial portion of students who do not feel safe on campus. In addition, students express concern that if they witness sexual misconduct while they are intoxicated, potential punishment from the university for being intoxicated could deter

students from reporting. The university should consider offering amnesty to intoxicated students who report witnessing sexual misconduct.

During the focus groups, several suggestions were made related to campus safety and having safer spaces on campus. These recommendations include the following:

- More lighting is needed on campus.
- There should be signs reminding students about surveillance cameras throughout campus as a deterrent.
- SEEUS was brought up frequently during the focus groups as a useful service. They should be more readily available so that students are not afraid of walking across campus at night to get to their cars. SEEUS should also be expanded and better publicized.
- One problem identified is that SEEUS is limited to campus. Students strongly suggest that a program similar to SEEUS to walk students to other campus-related activities that are just off campus (e.g., various training clinics) be established.
- Education is needed about using technology to help with safety. For example, content can include how various apps track locations and how to disable tracking for stalking prevention (e.g., snap maps).
- EMU should offer regular self-defense classes to teach people how to free themselves if they are physically restrained, how to disable an attacker, and how to react when a person attempts to physically restrain a person.
- EMU should also offer psychological self-defense classes, in which students would learn ways to respond to potentially threatening situations in the hope of countering the tendency to freeze in traumatic situations.

**Recommendation #2: EMU should create safe spaces on campus to discuss misconduct.**

EMU should establish spaces on campus where peer-led discussions about different types of victimizations can take place, where students can support each other and not worry about faculty or staff and mandatory reporting requirements. To enable these safe spaces, EMU should offer peer-to-peer training for students who facilitate the support groups, perhaps having facilitators be students who have experienced victimization and been appropriately trained.

## **Fraternities**

**Recommendation: EMU should have strict requirements for the Greek system regarding sexual misconduct.**

Students identify certain fraternities as breeding grounds for rape and other sexual assaults given the ways they support and promote toxic masculinity and a party culture that condones aggression and violence often against women. The survey results broken down by members of fraternities and members of sororities differed. It is hypothesized that fraternities may be underreporting perpetration of sexual misconduct, either out of a lack of understanding about sexual misconduct or as a deliberate attempt to conceal illegal behavior. The authors find that the sorority data may be a more accurate representation of Greek Life than the data reported by fraternity members. Suggestions to curtail sexual misconduct and hegemonic male culture include:

- Eliminate fraternities where serious or continuing complaints of sexual assault complaints are generated.
- Conduct semi-annual investigations into the operations of fraternities to identify abuses.
- Members of fraternities and sororities must be required to complete online testing every semester about sexual misconduct, coercive behaviors, and how to practice consent, including obtaining and providing consent.
- Send the message that survivors will be believed, and *believe survivors*. Students report that there is a conception, especially in Greek Life, that men will back up other men when accused of sexual assault, and that women who report will be blamed.
- EMU must be more proactive in educating itself about what happens at fraternities and why sexual violence is exceedingly prevalent at fraternities. This must be prioritized.

## Conclusion

The recommendations presented here represent data gathered from nearly 1500 student surveys and 70 students via focus groups. In addition, the authors met with 23 different stakeholder groups across campus and with the Title IX Education Committee for their input and recommendations. The Title IX Research Committee also used its expertise in related areas and knowledge of the university to suggest some of the educational interventions presented here. In short, there is considerable experience and expertise, from many facets of the university, contributing to this final chapter of this report. The recommendations are based within an intersectional framework that respects and acknowledges diversity and the social realities of specific groups of students. Suggestions ranged across many areas and constituencies at EMU. The recommendations are both broad and inclusive; the goal of soliciting input from such a wide variety of people was to turn away from a one-size-fits-all (but, in reality, fits none) program and generate a proposal that is accessible and relevant to the entire EMU community. Our survey found that a large number of students experience different forms of sexual victimization while they are students at EMU; Almost 1 in 5 experience sexual violence; more than 3 in 5 experience coercive behaviors used to pressure them into sexual conduct, and approximately 1 in 3 experience sexual harassment. These rates are both alarming and disturbing and have no place at EMU.

At this particular moment, eleven women who were students at EMU have filed a lawsuit against the university alleging a series of sexual assaults by former students, including law enforcement. Although this report is independent of and preceded the current lawsuit, the lawsuit underscores the urgency of implementing education and prevention programs. EMU must further commit to holding both the Title IX Office and EMU Department of Public Safety accountable to how they respond to sexual misconduct complaints, how they treat survivors, and to ensuring transparency. EMU is presented with a unique and timely opportunity to make both the campus and the student experience safer, an opportunity that should begin with full implementation of the recommendations presented in this report. Sexual misconduct and sexual violence are serious problems, and EMU must be willing to commit fully to promoting prevention efforts and educating the campus community about the continuum of behaviors such as attempted or completed rape, coercion, consent, stalking, and sexual harassment in order to make meaningful change to the current sexual misconduct culture.