

Central Washington University

**Faculty Senate Task Force to Address Sexual Misconduct
& Gender Discrimination**



Final Report of Recommendations

May 2019

Task Force Members

Wendy Cook, College of Business (CWU Centers – Des Moines)

Cassandra Fallscheer, College of the Sciences

Jill Hoxmeier, College of Education and Professional Studies

Emily Rollie, College of the Arts and Humanities

Allie Sheldon, GEAR UP

Mary Wise, James E. Brooks Library

Zachary Vande Zande, College of the Arts and Humanities

Sydnee Galusha, CWU undergraduate student

Hannah Oliver, CWU undergraduate student

Faculty Senate Task Force to Address Sexual Misconduct & Gender Discrimination

Charges

- 1. Investigate the CWU campus climate, policies, and practices related to sexual violence, sexual harassment, and gender discrimination.**
 - a. Engage in university-wide dialogue, including faculty and students in Ellensburg and at the centers.
 - b. Review and build on the 2016 Campus Climate Violence Prevention Task Force report to the Washington legislature.
 - c. Consider soliciting input and feedback from individuals who have participated in the sexual assault and harassment investigation and resolution process.
 - d. Collect input from other constituents as necessary.

- 2. Research best-practices to prevent, detect, and respond to sexual violence, harassment, and discrimination on university campuses.**
 - a. Investigate faculty role in prevention, detection, and response to sexual violence, harassment, and discrimination at other institutions.
 - b. Identify gaps in CWU policies and practices given best practices.

- 3. Draft recommendations for new policies or practices to:**
 - a. Improve the campus climate related to sexual violence, harassment, and discrimination at CWU.
 - b. Improve CWU practices related to detecting and responding to sexual violence, harassment and discrimination.
 - c. Empower faculty to stand against sexual violence, harassment and discrimination.

**2016 Campus Climate Survey
Quantitative Results for Students & Employees**

In the Fall of 2016, CWU administered an inaugural campus climate study, as mandated by Washington State in 2015. The survey was open for the first weeks of November, and recruitment emails were sent to all students (including online and Centers campus students) at the beginning of the survey period, as well as one week before the closing of the survey, as a reminder. Participation was confidential, and students who participated in the study were compensated with \$10.00 on their CWU Campus Connection card at the end of the data collection period. All procedures were approved by the CWU Human Subjects Research Committee.

Initial findings from the CWU survey, along with other institutions of higher education in Washington, can be found in the [2016 Report to the Legislature Campus Sexual Violence Prevention Task Force](#). Sample size was small (<10%), and high proportion of students failed validity check question (33.4%). Despite this, efforts were made to analyze data specifically in areas to uncover actionable items, i.e. knowledge about campus services and/or participation in training.

Table 1. Undergraduate student demographics*

Demographic	% (n)
Year in School	
First Year	28.42 (208)
Second Year	16.26 (119)
Third Year	23.91 (175)
Fourth year	21.72 (159)
Fifth Year	9.70 (71)
Racial Identity	
American Indian	1.41 (10)
Asian	4.51 (32)
Native Hawaiian or other API	1.97 (14)
Black or African American	1.97 (14)
White	72.90 (564)
Other racial identity	10.58 (75)
Ethnicity	
White, NH	72.90 (530)
Hispanic, regardless of race	27.10 (197)
Gender	
Men	22.68 (161)
Women	77.32 (549)
Other Gender Identity	2.87 (21)
Transfer Status	
Transfer Students	43.44 (318)
Non-transfer Students	56.56 (414)

*totals vary due to missing data; percentages for racial/ethnic identity may be greater than 100% due to ability to indicate Hispanic ethnicity plus a racial identity

Undergraduate students' perception of campus climate and sexual misconduct-related climate

Table 2. Differences in student perceptions of general campus climate, by gender (N = 707)

Student Gender Identity	Mean Scores for Campus Climate \bar{x} (SD)
Women	3.45 (0.68)*
Men	3.58 (0.73)

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$
 Items scored on 5 point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strong Agree*)

Gender was significantly related to climate perceptions ($\beta = -.13, p = 0.0318$); women reported a mean score for general climate of 3.45 (0.68), compared to men's mean scores of 3.58 (0.73). We conducted additional analyses to explore whether student racial identity/ethnicity (0 = Students of Color, 1 = White, NH Students), as well as gender/racial identity (0 = White, NH women, 1 = Women of Color) was related to general campus climate and observed no significant differences between these groups.

Climate Questions Included:

1. School officials (administrators, public safety officers) could do more to protect students from harm.
2. If there were a crisis at my school, my school would handle it well.
3. The school responds too slowly in difficult situations.
4. My school does enough to protect the safety of students.
5. There is a good support system at my school for students going through difficult times.

Items scored on 5 point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strong Agree*). Negative Questions, i.e. #2, was recoded for mean composite score.

Table 3. Differences in student perceptions of sexual misconduct-related climate, by gender (N = 699)

Student Gender Identity	Mean Scores for SM-Related Climate \bar{x} (SD)
Women	3.95 (0.73)
Men	4.09 (0.70)

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$
 Items scored on 5 point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strong Agree*)

Gender was significantly related to sexual assault-related climate perceptions ($\beta = -.15, p = 0.0212$); women reported a mean score for sexual-assault related climate of 3.95 (0.73), compared to men's mean scores of 4.09 (0.70). We conducted additional analyses to explore whether student racial identity/ethnicity (0 = Students of Color, 1 = White, NH Students), as well as gender/racial identity (0 = White, NH women, 1 = Women of Color) was related to sexual assault-related campus climate and observed no significant differences between these groups.

Sexual Misconduct-Related Climate Questions included:

1. CWU would take the report seriously.
2. CWU would maintain the privacy of the person making the report.

3. CWU would do its best to honor the request of the person about how to go forward with the case.
4. CWU would take steps to protect the safety of the person making the report.
5. CWU would support the person making the report.
6. CWU would provide accommodations to support the person (e.g. academic, housing, safety)
7. CWU would take action to address the factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct.
8. CWU would handle the report fairly.
9. CWU would label the person making the report a troublemaker.
10. CWU would have a hard time supporting the person who made the report.
11. CWU would punish the person who made the report.

Items scored on 5 point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strong Agree*). Negative Questions, i.e. #9-#11 was recoded for mean composite score.

Student's Participation In & Attitudes Toward Sexual Misconduct Training

Public institutions of higher education are required to provide education and training for students about the prevention of sexual assault. Based on research showing that most survivors of assault do not report their victimization, understanding students' participation in and attitudes toward that training is vital to address any potential gaps therein. Students were asked to, first, report whether they have received information, programming, or training in four different areas related to prevention and resources, and second, to rate how useful they believed the training on a 5-point scale (1 = not very useful to 5 = very useful).

Table 3 presents proportions of all undergraduate students who report, "I have not received information, programming, or training in this area" are presented in the table. We conducted tests of independence to determine whether students' transfer status (0 = transfer student, 1 = non-transfer student) was related to reporting having no training. For each of the four areas, transfer students were less likely to report having no training. For example, compared to 19.5% ($n = 67$) of non-transfer students, 34.4% ($n = 107$) transfer students reporting not receiving training in "how to report a complaint of sexual assault".

Table 3. Undergraduate students' perception of training and proportion of students without training

Training Topic	Perception of Usefulness \bar{x} (SD)	Students who report no training % (n)	Transfer students who report no training % (n)
Which behaviors are defined as "sexual assault"	3.87 (1.14)	16.78 (161)	26.6 (83)
How to report a complaint of sexual assault	3.50 (1.24)	24.13 (174)	34.4 (107)
The availability of confidential on-campus resources to help victims of sexual assault	3.77 (1.22)	20.94 (151)	30.8 (311)
Prevention of sexual assault	3.78 (1.23)	17.66 (127)	27.4 (85)

Note: Training usefulness was measured on a 5-point scale (1 = not very useful to 5 = very useful).

Undergraduate student sexual violence-related victimization experiences

To assess students' victimization of sexual violence while enrolled as a student at CWU, two questions were asked:

1. "Has someone fondled, kissed, or rubbed against the private areas of your body (lips, breast/chest, crotch or butt) or removed some of your clothes without consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration)?" (coded as 'non-penetrative sexual assault')
2. "Since you enrolled as a student at CWU, has someone had oral sex with you or made you have oral sex with them or put their penis, fingers, or other objects into your vagina or butt without your consent?" (coded as 'penetrative sexual assault')

If a student endorsed "yes" for either of the two, follow up questions were asked to understand whether the perpetrator was a CWU-student and whether the incident was reported to CWU staff person or administrator. The following presents proportion of students who reported victimization, by type and gender.

Table 4. Undergraduate students' victimization experiences at CWU

Type of Victimization	Women % (n)	Men % (n)
Non-penetrative sexual assault	23.47 (123)	5.96 (9)
Penetrative sexual assault	9.2 (48)	4.03 (6)

Gender was significantly related to victimization, with a greater proportion of women reporting victimization of non-penetrative sexual assault ($\chi^2 = 22.85, p = 0.041$) and penetrative sexual assault ($\chi^2 = 4.1, p = 0.041$). Approximately 80% of undergraduate students reporting victimization in the study reported that the perpetrator is/was a CWU student; approximately 87% of undergraduate students reporting victimization in the study did not report the incident to a CWU staff person or administrator. No differences were found between students who reported and did not report with respect to knowledge about how to report (from above). Small sample size of participants' reporting to a staff person/administrator precludes ability to tests differences in attitudes, such as perception of campus climate between the two groups.

Students' Readiness to Help Campus Sexual Violence

Researchers have studied students' "Readiness to Help", based on the behavior change model Transtheoretical Model of Change (TTM), to assess awareness of sexual assault, responsibility for its prevention, and action/engagement in prevention initiatives. TTM asserts that individuals move through stages to attain behavioral change; those in later stages, i.e. action as compared to no awareness, are theorized to be more engaged in the behavior change process. As it relates to campus sexual assault, specifically, researchers have found that readiness to help relates to prosocial bystander intervention. A recent paper found that students who participate in prevention programming are more likely to have intervened prosocially as a bystander. Thus, understanding students' readiness to help, and differences thereof, could be an important indicator of students' engagement in campus sexual violence issues. The

following table presents students' mean scores for 'no awareness', 'taking responsibility', and 'taking action'.

Table 5. Students' Readiness to Help campus sexual assault

Readiness to Help Variable	Women \bar{x} (SD)	Men \bar{x} (SD)
No Awareness	1.97 (.56)***	2.19 (.68)
Taking Responsibility	2.48 (.67)***	2.18 (.75)
Action	1.43 (0.68)	1.52 (.67)

Note: Items measured on a 4-point scale (1 = Not at all True to 4 = Very much true)
* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Gender was significantly related to "No Awareness" ($\beta = -.22, p < 0.001$); women reported significantly lower scores, compared to men. Gender was also related to "Taking Responsibility" ($\beta = .31, p < 0.001$); with women reporting higher "Taking Responsibility" scores, compared to men. We observed no differences in students' "Taking Action" based on gender identity.

Additional analyses revealed that, controlling for gender, racial identity/ethnicity was also significantly related to "Taking Responsibility" ($\beta = -.29, p < 0.001$); students of color reported greater "Taking Responsibility" scores ($\bar{x} = 2.63$), compared to White, NH counterparts ($\bar{x} = 2.33$). Controlling for gender, racial identity/ethnicity was also significantly related to "Taking Action" ($\beta = -.020, p < 0.001$); students of color reported greater "Taking Responsibility" scores ($\bar{x} = 1.55$), compared to White, NH counterparts ($\bar{x} = 1.41$).

Items to measure students' Readiness to Help:

No Awareness

- I don't think sexual assault is a big problem at CWU
- I don't think there is much I can do about sexual assault at CWU
- There isn't much need for me to think about sexual assault on campus; that's the job of the rape crisis or wellness center

Taking Responsibility

- Sometimes I think I should learn more about sexual assault, but I haven't done so yet.
- I think I can do something about sexual assault and am planning to find out what I can do about the problem.
- I am planning to learn more about the problem of sexual assault on campus.

Taking Action

- I have recently attended a program about sexual assault.
- I am actively involved in projects to deal with sexual assault.
- I have recently taken part in activities or volunteer my time on projects focused on ending sexual assault on campus.

Students' Sexual Consent Behaviors

With respect to primary prevention of sexual violence, students' sexual consent behaviors were also assessed in the climate study. Gender differences in mean agreement scores were found for three behaviors: deciding ahead of time what sexual activity students' will engage in, communicating consent with body language, and stopping sexual activity with a partner who is intoxicated, with the latter two

meeting lower threshold for statistical significance. These behaviors are theorized to capture protective behaviors against both perpetration and victimization of sexual assault, and should be integrated into primary prevention programming for CWU students.

Table 6. Gender differences in students' sexual consent behaviors

Consent Behavior	Men \bar{x} (SD)	Women \bar{x} (SD)
During a sexual encounter, I typically only GIVE consent once.	4.27 (2.06)	4.16 (2.05)
During a sexual encounter, I typically only ASK for consent once.	3.75 (2.18)	3.65 (2.05)
I tend NOT to decide ahead of time what I will and will not consent to sexually. I wait until I am 'in the moment' to decide.	3.60 (2.17)**	3.06 (2.04)
Sexual consent is NOT something my current (or most recent) partner and I discuss before we start having sex.	3.04 (2.04)	2.87 (2.10)
I communicate sexual consent to my partner using nonverbal signals and body language.	4.22 (2.11)	4.58 (2.01)†
Typically, I ask for consent by making a sexual advance and waiting for a reaction, so I know whether or not to continue.	3.67 (2.06)	3.65 (2.07)
I ask for consent even if I know my partner well.	4.88 (1.98)	4.91 (1.94)
If my partner has consented to similar sexual activity in the past, I don't ask for consent again later.	2.62 (1.70)	2.80 (1.74)
I don't worry about consent when my partner and I are both drunk.	1.73 (1.26)	1.88 (1.52)
If someone invites me to their place, I assume they are giving consent for sex.	1.40 (0.88)	1.29 (0.87)
If my partner is drunk or not able to consent, I stop sexual activity.	5.92 (1.92)	6.20 (1.53)†

† <0.1, *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

2016 Campus Climate Survey
Qualitative Results – Supplemental Findings from CWU Employee Survey

In the Fall of 2016, CWU surveyed employees as part of the first Campus Climate study. Employees were asked a variety of questions related to perception of campus climate, participation in training, perception of training, knowledge of campus resources, and perception of helping students in a sexual misconduct disclosure situation. In total, 389 employees participated. Table 1. Presents demographic information for the sample.

Table 1. Employee Demographics

Demographic Characteristic	% (n)
Employee Status	
Faculty, TT	23.93 (78)
Faculty, NTT	9.2 (30)
Administrative professional	34.66 (113)
Classified	32.21 (105)
Gender Identity	
Women	64.0 (208)
Men	34.77 (113)
Other gender identity	1.23 (4)
Hispanic or Latino/a	
Yes	6.54 (21)
No	93.46 (300)
Racial Identity	
American Indian	1.86 (6)
Asian	2.17 (7)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	0.62 (2)
Black / African American	1.24 (4)
White	86.02 (277)
Other racial identity	8.07 (26)
Length of employment	
Less than 1 year	10.46 (34)
1 to 3 years	20.62 (67)
3 to 5 years	12.92 (42)
More than 5 years	56.00 (182)

*totals vary due to missing data; percentages for racial/ethnic identity may be greater than 100% due to ability to indicate Hispanic ethnicity plus a racial identity

Discussing Sexual Assault Prevention & Student Disclosures

Faculty were asked, “Within the past academic year, how frequently have you discussed sexual assault prevention with your colleagues?” One-third of faculty participants ($n = 36$) reported never; 39.81% ($n = 43$) reported rarely; 22.22 ($n = 24$) reported sometimes; and 4.63% ($n = 5$) reported to have often discussed this topic with colleagues, as compared with 22.94% ($n = 50$) and 13.76% ($n = 30$) of professional/classified employees who reported to have sometimes and often, respectively, spoken with colleagues about sexual assault prevention.

Faculty were asked, “Within the past academic year, how frequently have you discussed sexual assault prevention with your students?” Just over one-third of faculty participants ($n = 39$) reported never; 31.48% ($n = 34$) reported rarely; 25% ($n = 27$) reported sometimes; and 7.41% ($n = 8$) reported to have often discussed this topic with students.

Of the 104 faculty who responded to the question, “Within the last year, has any student disclosed an experience of sexual misconduct to you? Sexual misconduct includes sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, stalking, and sexual harassment,” 15.4% ($n = 16$) reported to have received a student disclosure and encouraged the student to report the incident to CWU administration. There were no reports of receiving a disclosure and not encouraging the student to report the incident to CWU administration. Tests of independence were conducted to determine whether a relationship existed between frequency of faculty discussing sexual assault prevention with students and reporting to have received a student disclosure of sexual misconduct; 41% of faculty who reported “sometimes/often” discussing this topic reported to receive a disclosure, compared to 9.3% of faculty who reported “never/rarely” ($\chi^2 = 7.631, p = 0.006$).

Perceptions of CWU Response to Sexual Misconduct among Employees

We explored employee perceptions of CWU response to sexual misconduct that occurs between employees. Among all employees, women reported significantly less positive perception of CWU response to employee sexual misconduct ($p = 0.0196$). Faculty reported significantly less positive perception of CWU response to employee misconduct, compared to non-faculty ($p = 0.0012$). The significant relationship between faculty status and reporting less positive perception remained when controlling for gender ($\beta = -0.36, p = 0.001$). Due to small sample sizes of employees of color, analyses could not be conducted to determine whether differences in perceptions in response exist between employees of color and White employees.

Table 2. Differences in employee perceptions of CWU response to employee sexual misconduct

Men \bar{x} (SD)	Women \bar{x} (SD)		Faculty \bar{x} (SD)	Professional/Classified \bar{x} (SD)
3.9 (0.87)	3.65 (0.95)***		3.5 (0.95)***	3.9 (0.90)

Note: Items were scored on 5-point rating scale (1 = Extremely unlikely to 5 = Extremely likely)

Perceptions of CWU Response to Sexual Misconduct among Students

We explored employee perceptions of CWU response to sexual misconduct that occurs between students. Among all employees, there were no differences between women and men in their perception of CWU response to student sexual misconduct. Faculty reported significantly less positive perception of CWU response to student misconduct, compared to non-faculty ($p = 0.0002$).

Table 3. Differences in employee perceptions of CWU response to employee sexual misconduct

Men \bar{x} (SD)	Women \bar{x} (SD)		Faculty \bar{x} (SD)	Professional/Classified \bar{x} (SD)
4.09 (0.76)	3.92 (0.81)		3.75 (0.82)***	4.1 (0.76)

Note: Items were scored on 5-point rating scale (1 = Extremely unlikely to 5 = Extremely likely)

Items for both scales (employee misconduct and student misconduct) included:

- CWU would take the report seriously
- CWU would maintain the privacy of the person making the report.

- CWU would do its best to honor the request of the person about how to go forward with the case.
- CWU would do its best to honor the request of the person about how to go forward with the case
- CWU would take steps to protect the safety of the person making the report
- CWU would support the person making the report
- CWU would provide accommodations to support the person (e.g. academic, housing, safety)
- CWU would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct.
- CWU would handle the report fairly
- CWU would label the person making the report a troublemaker.*
- CWU would have a hard time supporting the person who made the report.*
- CWU would punish the person who made the report.*

*Items reverse coded when calculating mean scores.

Employee Perception of Training

To explore employee participation of training on various topics, and their perception thereof, employees were asked, “While you have been an employee at CWU, how useful did you find the information, programming, and/or training you've received in the following areas related to sexual misconduct, including incidents of sexual assault, harassment, domestic violence, and stalking”. The following table presents proportions of employees who report not receiving information, programming, or training in the four areas and mean scores for perception of usefulness.

Table 4. Training areas and perceptions of usefulness for all employees

	I have not received information, programming, or training in this area % (n)	Perception of Usefulness \bar{x} (SD)
Which behaviors are defined as "sexual misconduct"	11.6 (37)	3.82 (1.12)
How to report a complaint of sexual misconduct	15.4 (49)	3.76 (1.26)
The availability of confidential on-campus resources to help victims of sexual misconduct	17.3 (55)	3.84 (1.23)
Prevention of sexual misconduct	17.7 (56)	3.56 (1.27)

*p<0.01, **p<0.001, ***p<0.001

Items were scored on 5-point rating scale (1 = Not useful to 5 = Very useful)

Tests of independence were conducted to determine whether faculty-status (identifying as a faculty at CWU) was related to reporting having received information, programming, or training. Faculty status was significantly related to reporting receiving no training for “How to report a complaint of sexual misconduct”, with 25% of faculty reporting having received no training in this area, compared to 14.4% of non-faculty ($\chi^2 = 3.98, p = 0.046$).

Table 5. Differences in employees' perception of usefulness of training topic area

	Faculty \bar{x} (SD)	Non-Faculty \bar{x} (SD)
How to define sexual misconduct	3.41 (1.16)***	4.01 (1.04)
How to report sexual misconduct	3.23 (1.34)***	3.97 (1.16)
What resources are available	3.4 (1.32)***	4.04 (1.13)
How to prevent sexual misconduct	3.41 (1.16)***	4.02 (1.04)

* $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.001$, *** $p < 0.001$

Items were scored on 5-point rating scale (1 = Not useful to 5 = Very useful)

ANOVAs were conducted to determine whether mean scores for perception of training usefulness differed between faculty and staff. Faculty mean scores of perception of the usefulness of the training was significantly less than non-faculty mean scores for each of the four topic areas. Among faculty, we observed no differences in reporting no training between tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty.

Faculty knowledge of resources and perception of helping in student disclosure

Employees were asked to rate their agreement with several statements regarding their knowledge of resources and perception of helping in a situation of student disclosure of sexual misconduct. ANOVAs showed significant differences between faculty and non-faculty knowledge of and perceptions toward helping, with faculty mean scores lower than non-faculty scores in several areas. For example, faculty reported significantly less agreement ($\bar{x} = 3.07$, $sd = 1.28$) with the statement, "If I or a colleague experienced sexual misconduct, I know where to go to get help on campus", compared to non-faculty ($\bar{x} = 3.88$, $sd = 1.22$; $p < 0.001$). Faculty reported greater agreement ($\bar{x} = 4.30$, $sd = 0.83$) with the statement, "If a student disclosed they were the victim of sexual misconduct, I would encourage them to report the incident to off-campus police", compared to non-faculty ($\bar{x} = 3.84$, $sd = 1.20$; $p < 0.001$.)

Follow-up analyses showed that, in addition to faculty status, gender was also a significant predictor of "knowing how to report an incident of misconduct", with women reporting less agreement with knowing how to report an incidence of misconduct", compared to men ($R^2 = 0.08$, $F(2,312) = 14.96$, $\beta = -.31$, $p = 0.042$).

Table 6. Faculty knowledge of resources and perception of helping in student disclosure

	Faculty \bar{x} (SD)	Non-Faculty \bar{x} (SD)
If a colleague or I experienced sexual misconduct, I know where to go to get help on campus.	3.07 (1.28)***	3.88 (1.22)
I would know where to go to make a report of sexual misconduct.	3.07 (1.31)***	3.86 (1.27)
If a student disclosed they were the victim of sexual misconduct, I would know how to help connect them to CWU resources.	3.36 (1.32)***	3.98 (1.23)
If a student disclosed they were the victim of sexual misconduct, I would encourage them to report the incident to CWU administration.	4.15 (1.02)	4.29 (0.98)
If a student disclosed they were the victim of sexual misconduct, I would encourage them to report the incident to off-campus police.	4.30 (0.83)	3.84 (1.20)***
If a student disclosed they were the victim of sexual misconduct, I am confident I would know how to provide appropriate and non-judgmental support.	4.01 (0.98)	4.02 (1.12)

* $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.001$, *** $p < 0.001$

Items were scored on a 5-point rating system (1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree)

2016 Campus Climate Survey Qualitative Results – Supplemental Findings from CWU Employee Survey

In addition to the quantitative survey items, the 2016 Campus Climate Survey asked several open-ended questions to understand CWU employees' recommendations to address sexual misconduct among students and employees, both on and off campus. The following presents survey items, analysis methods, and results.

Survey Questions

Recommendations to Address & Prevention Sexual Assault among Students

- What recommendations would you make to the leadership of CWU to better address sexual assault among students?
- What recommendations would you make to the leadership of CWU to better address sexual assault that takes place off campus?
- What recommendations would you make to the leadership of CWU to better prevent sexual assault on campus?

Recommendations to Address & Prevention Sexual Assault among Employees

- What recommendations would you make to the leadership of CWU to better address sexual misconduct among employees?
- What recommendations would you make to the leadership of CWU to better prevent sexual misconduct among employees?

Analytical Plan

In the Fall of 2019, as part of the Task Force and Title IX Committee charges, Jill Hoxmeier analyzed the qualitative data using an iterative, inductive process. A codebook was developed from the initial memoing of data; codes were applied to the data, though are not mutually exclusive. That is, several codes could be applied to one participant response to align with the articulated recommendations. Several patterns were observed and the emergent themes are presented below. Due to unobserved differences in recommendations provided for the second and third questions, relating to the prevention of assault on and off campus, responses were combined in the analysis. Thus, the following results generally represent employees' 1) recommendations to *address* and *prevent* misconduct occurring among students, and 2) recommendations to *address* and *prevent* misconduct occurring among employees.

Results: Employee Recommendations to Address & Prevent Sexual Assault among Students

In total, 282 open-ended responses were analyzed, and 478 codes were applied to responses of the first three questions: 1) What recommendations would you make to the leadership of CWU to better address sexual assault among students? 2) What recommendations would you make to the leadership of CWU to better address sexual assault that takes place off campus? And 3) What recommendations would you make to the leadership of CWU to better prevent sexual assault on campus?

Theme 1: Training

Of the 478 codes applied, 184 were in reference to training initiatives; there were 118 articulations of general training; 32 articulations of training specifically for students; 24 articulations of

training specifically for employees; and 10 articulations of training specifically for Centers students/employees.

Sub-theme 1: Training for Students

Under training specifically for students, two patterns emerged – content recommendations and format recommendations. The following provides examples of recommendations in those two areas:

Content

- Primary prevention all students, i.e. consent
- Single-sex training for male students
- Harm reduction for female students, including RAAD/self-defense
- Campus resources / policy

Format

- Fliers and other print-based material
- University 101, workshops
- Online training
- Mandatory

Exemplar quotes are as follows:

- *“Focus on perpetrators--make prevention about telling (primarily) men not to harass or assault (primarily) women. Explain consent, and encourage young men to intervene when they see other young men behaving inappropriately.”*
- *“I think all incoming students should be required to read the letter written by the victim of the former Stanford swimmer about her rape and the aftermath. A follow-up discussion would be a great First Six Weeks event.”*
- *“Encourage student organizations to participate in more prevention-based programs in order to help these groups incorporate prevention into their organization-wide belief systems”*

Sub-Theme 2: Training for Employees

Under training for employees, the same two patterns as for training for students emerged – content recommendations and format recommendations.

Content

- How to respond to and assist students / survivors
- Campus resources / related policy
- Bystander training

Format

- Workshops, seminars, online training

Exemplar quotes are as follows:

- *“More training for those not on main campus. More online classes or discussions to reach students who are not on main campus.”*
- *“Train SAPR [sexual assault prevention response] coordinators in each academic department - of multiple gender identities. Make it part of faculty workload. Put it where the daily contact is.*

- *“This information needs to be provided during orientation and should be given to all employees of the university, so that we can help in any capacity as members of this community.”*

Theme 2: Visibility of Resources

After training, the second most articulated recommendation focused on visibility of resources. These included visibility of information/resources with respect to: 1) reporting processes, 2) Campus Wellness Center Advocates, 3) health services, and 4) Centers campuses.

Due to the nature of the responses (i.e. short phrases), no exemplar quotes are provided. In general, the responses under this theme were “more information about how to report”, for example.

Theme 3: Culture Shift / Policy

The third most commonly articulated recommendation was in regard to both policy (48 articulations) and culture shift (42 articulations). Although these areas may appear to represent different ideas and/or aspects of potential recommendations, the code “culture shift” and the code “policy” often overlapped in their application; that is, these two codes were frequently applied together (18 co-applications of the codes). The recommendations include to take issues seriously, maintain a zero-tolerance policy, and to consistently enforce the policy regardless of “student status”, i.e. student-athlete, etc.

Exemplar quotes are as follows:

- *“You need to better discipline Faculty who have been accused of sexual misconduct with students. Better yet, you need to get rid of Faculty who have these issues. Also, these Faculty should not be able to advise students or be able to be in a situation with a student in a closed-door environment.”*
- *“I have heard many stories about sexual assault happening and reports going nowhere to protect the reputation of the assaulter. This must not happen.”*
- *“Make standard punishments for sexual misconduct more severe and consistent. Revise the appeals process in order to allow both parties to provide info to the committee at different times.”*

Theme 4: Campus / Community Collaboration

The fourth most commonly articulated recommendation was for more campus / community collaboration (21 articulations), which was ostensibly in direct response to the question inquiring suggestions to address sexual assault among students that occur off campus. These suggestions included joint campus/community task forces and strengthening connections between community agencies, i.e. ASPEN and EPD. Due to the brevity of responses, no exemplar quotes are provided.

Theme 5: Structural / Environmental Changes

The fifth most commonly articulated recommendations were with respect to structural / environmental changes (30 articulations). Examples for recommendations include more police patrols, “blue box” lights on campus and/or other lightening, providing students with alternative activities to reduce drinking; and more funding and support for administrative positions and programs aimed at

prevention and intervention in sexual violence. Due to the brevity of responses, no exemplar quotes are provided.

Results: Employee Recommendations to Address & Prevent Sexual Assault among Students

In total, 148 open-ended responses were analyzed, and 244 codes were applied to responses of the second set of two questions: 1) What recommendations would you make to the leadership of CWU to better address sexual misconduct among employees? And 2) What recommendations would you make to the leadership of CWU to better prevent sexual misconduct among employees?

Theme 1: Culture Change

The most commonly articulated recommendation was for a “culture change” (80 articulations), including 39 overlapping with a sub-theme of “policy enforcement” and 26 overlapping with a sub-theme of “transparency”. Similar to recommendations made above to address student sexual assault, responses included “zero tolerance”, “admit there is a problem”, and “dismantling the ‘boys club’ culture”.

Exemplar quotes:

- “Abolish tenure or enact procedures that provide a safe space for non-tenured faculty to report inappropriate behavior of the tenured track without the annual retribution of reappointment”
- “...it is not part of our new PDP evaluation, but maybe it should be. The goal would be for it to not be an issue for any employees, but there is currently no formal, routine avenue for voicing feedback and opinion about the matter...”
- “You can start by addressing the culture of intimidation that exists among many of the department chairs and the good ol’ boy networks that permeate the chairs, dean’s offices and unions. People think they can get away with something if their buddy winks at the other violations of CWUP, code, and bylaws”

Theme 2: Training

The second most commonly articulated recommendation was for training (61 articulations), including suggestions made for the frequency and/or quality of training, as well as the content of training, including both knowledge increasing in misconduct definitions and skill building to avoid misconduct and to intervene in misconduct.

Exemplar quotes:

- “Education all staff repeatedly on prevention along with examples of what is considered misconduct. Also, share the consequences if convicted of a misconduct along with the long term effects on a person’s life both victim and offender. Make the topic relatable and share realistic examples of how to prevent these actions in the workplace.”
- “Too often trainings are focused on what to do/not to do to another person but misses the fundamental component of the misuse of power, lack of respect for others, etc.”

- Provide training for department chairs on how to provide leadership in this area. Provide a mechanism for employees to report misconduct by colleagues or students that will have guaranteed confidentiality. Systems like ‘Academic Alert System’ have automated forwarding, making it less likely that someone will feel safe reporting misbehavior through this system”

Theme 3: Visibility of Resources

The third most commonly articulated recommendation was with respect to the “visibility of resources” (24 articulations). Examples of responses include: providing information on how to report, the availability of resources and services on campus, as well as visibility of information that defines misconduct. Due to the brevity of responses, no exemplar quotes are provided.

Theme 4: Complainant Support

The fourth most commonly articulated recommendation was with respect to the “complainant support” (14 articulations), referring to the support of faculty who file complaints/reports of experiencing misconduct. Examples of responses include suggestions for individuals making reports to be met with professionalism, confidentiality, and non-judgment.

Exemplar quote:

- “I don’t feel the employee support is nearly as strong as the student support. There is judgement and bias from HR once occurrences involve employees rather than students.”

Conclusions

With respect to the qualitative findings of the 2016 Campus Climate study, we observed salient themes to be in line with suggestions made in the [NASEM](#) report for strengthening campus climate/culture to convey intolerance for misconduct and discrimination. Specifically, CWU employees suggest more training for staff and students to prevent and mitigate the harms associated with misconduct. Additionally, there is a perception that misconduct is tolerated at CWU, and thus, recommendations were made for a culture shift to clarify and underscore CWU upper-administration’s stance on misconduct among staff and students. Finally, transparency also appeared to be a salient theme of the recommendations, which intersect with both training and culture shift.

This information, along with Task Force members’ research into best-practices and discussions with colleagues and students at CWU, informed the recommendations in the pages that follow.

Faculty Leadership Opportunities Recommendations

Recommendation: Include a statement summarizing the CWU position on sexual misconduct, Title IX information, a link to the CWU sexual misconduct/gender discrimination policy website, a statement clarifying mandatory reporting role and contact information for confidential reporting resources in course syllabi.

- Similar to required statements on DAS and plagiarism, for example, faculty have the opportunity to increase awareness of and reinforce the university's message on these issues. The committee could develop standardized language to be included in the syllabus and distribute to faculty across campus.
- Currently, no such statement exists nor is promoting by the university, although some faculty have done so on their own. In speaking with students who have seen such a syllabus and/or in speaking with students about this, we have heard this practice would be well received.
 - Persons/Processes involved: Faculty-initiated statement for the syllabi (member of SMGDTF), then on to EC and Academic Affairs

Recommendation: Include interpersonal violence-related content in course material.

- Given the prevalence of misconduct and other interpersonal violence experienced by students, in addition to the likeliness of students in specific disciplines to interact professionally with these issues (i.e. social work, psychology, public health), faculty should be encouraged to include relevant content in courses. Additionally, where there are no courses in disciplines/programs, faculty should be supported to develop new courses. This recommendation is aimed to provide another opportunity to increase awareness among students and connect academic preparation to public health issues, advocating in their communities, etc.
- Faculty should identify courses where content is already included, compile at the university level, and post publicly for students who may be interested in taking courses.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Training on how to integrate gender-based violence content into courses through Faculty Development and the Wellness Center; Recommendation from SMGDTF to Gen Ed to develop Gen Ed course in consultation with appropriate Pathway Coordinators

Recommendation: Support faculty to develop interpersonal violence-related first year seminars/courses for incoming students.

- Many students arrive on campus with no previous education on interpersonal violence; this recommendation aims to again, increase awareness of interpersonal violence, reinforce university prevention messages, and promote critical thinking about interpersonal violence as a public health issue and students' own role in the prevention and mitigation thereof.
- Currently, the mandated Haven training is insufficient for students to engage in the proposed breadth of content; other opportunities, through the CWU Wellness Center, are shorter, one-time education experiences. Although the first year seminar/course is not intended as a behavioral change initiatives, the breadth of content and duration of the course, provides additional opportunities for students to engage with interpersonal violence-related material, for course credit, which may serve as an incentive for more students to participate.
- University- and College-level support is necessary for the sustained instruction of these courses, including funding to ensure their frequency offering.

- Persons/Processes Involved: Recommendation from SMGDTF to Gen Ed to develop Gen Ed course in consultation with appropriate Pathway Coordinators

Recommendation: Encourage the use of CWU campus community to include preferred gender pronouns in their email signature.

- Increasingly, institutions of higher education are adopting the practice of students, faculty, and staff identification of preferred pronouns in their email signature. Although cisgender members of the CWU community may not understand the practice, or believe it relevant for their own identity and experience, the practice serves as a way to recognize trans and gender non-conforming individuals. The aim is to create safe spaces for these members of our community to share their preferred pronouns, which can otherwise be a difficult task when the climate is unknown to them. More information on the practice, as well as examples for including preferred pronouns be found [here](#).
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Statement from the President and FSEC Chair encouraging new practice

References

Graham, L.M., Mennicke, A., Rizo, C., & Wood, L. (2018). *Journal of Family Violence*. Interpersonal violence prevention and response on college campuses: Opportunities for faculty leadership. doi: 10.1007/s10896-018-9968-1

Addressing Gender Discrimination Recommendations

Recommendation: Ensure diversity initiatives in hiring and promotion are being properly followed/observed.

- Currently, there is variable training for chair/members of search committee for diversity training and/or recognition of individual biases that may influence the search/screening process.
- Allocate appropriate funding for diversity initiatives within the hiring process, i.e. advertise in relevant outlets, enable search committees to bring in candidates that may require extensive travel.
- Increase transparency in search committee procedures, i.e. collecting and reviewing screening tools.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Chairs, College Deans, and HR training on selection bias, diversity in hiring, etc.; Mandated training for chairs of search committee

Recommendation: Align policies and procedures with desired cultural values (this would require a rewrite of the policies surrounding gender discrimination to de-emphasize informal reporting as a "highly desired" method of handling GD, show a clear pathway for reporting, and allow for target-led reporting including anonymous reporting).

- Currently, there is no clear procedure on how to file a report/complaint of gender discrimination, including information on what constitutes "informal" vs. "formal" reporting.
- The current policy states that "Informal reporting is highly desired"; this language is not target-centered and could be perceived as procedures to protect the institution, i.e. to minimize the number of reports filed at CWU.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Title IX/HR/Joel Klucking

Recommendation: Have leadership training that allows deans, administrators, and president's office to make unambiguous, hard stances against gender discrimination.

- [Research](#) underscores the need for reinforcement of intolerance for misconduct and discrimination to come from high level administrative. Training, including content areas that address gender bias/discrimination, should be tailored to upper-level administration to equip individuals with the skills and competencies to identify bias within their units, intervene in cases of discrimination/harassment (including gender/sex-based microaggressions), and support faculty in reporting processes.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Title IX/HR

Recommendation: Employ face-to-face, interactive training at the department level for diversity and gender discrimination training (that includes proper pronoun usage and gender identity training).

- Current training does not address gender identity sufficiently with respect to encouraging actual behavior change. Based on the evidence suggesting that discrimination and misconduct occur in institutions where it is perceived to be tolerated, face-to-face, interactive training can reinforce institutional messaging of intolerance. Active training can provide faculty opportunities to discuss "case studies", i.e. situations that have occurred on campus (anonymized), clarify definitions of inappropriate behavior/misconduct/discrimination through visual representation (acted out), and build skills for effective prosocial intervention for faculty bystanders.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Title IX/HR

Recommendation: Eliminate (or de-emphasize) SEOIs as a means of evaluation for promotion and tenure in favor of self review, peer review, real-time student feedback, or targeted questioning.

- Currently, faculty tenure and promotion processes rely on SEOIs to quantify teaching effectiveness despite [evidence](#) and [critique](#) suggesting their bias. Thus, reliance on measures shown to benefit white, male faculty are inherently in violation of Title IX. Couple with low response rates at CWU for SEOIs, using this measure as part of the tenure and promotion process introduces bias and potential discrimination. This recommendation is not about eliminating SEOIs altogether; rather, SEOIs should be just for faculty/instructors to use in teaching reflection, not for tenure and promotion review.
- Suggestions for alternatives include greater emphasis on self-review, peer-review, and real-time student feedback, including both online non-numeric feedback submissions, as well as facilitated focus groups with students about instructor teaching effectiveness.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: College Deans, Personal Committee, CBA, and FS Evaluation & Assessment Committee

Recommendation: Encourage and implement college-level or departmental language surrounding gender pronouns in official communication and syllabi.

- Currently, there is no standardized effort and/or mechanism to better understand students' proper pronouns, which can increase perception of an inhospitable climate for non-cisgender students. As noted above in recommendations for faculty leadership opportunities, More information on the practice, as well as examples for including preferred pronouns be found [here](#).
 - Persons/Processes Involved: President's Office, FS Executive Committee, Diversity & Equity Center

Recommendation: Access to gender neutral bathrooms in every building on campus

- Currently, not all buildings have gender-neutral bathrooms.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Facilities

Recommendation: Access to gender inclusive housing.

- Self-identify gender on housing application
- Option for gender inclusive housing
- Non-gendered room assignment
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Housing

Recommendation: Creating gender/sexuality center on campus.

- Currently, Diversity & Equity Center is too broad to convey value of gender/sexuality diversity on campus
 - Persons/Processes Involved: WGSS currently developing proposal for the project; administrative/academic support necessary to initiate and sustain

References

Boring, A., Ottoboni, K., Stark, P.B. (2016). Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness. Science Open Research. doi: 10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AETBZC.v1

Graham, L.M., Mennicke, A., Rizo, C., & Wood, L. (2018). *Journal of Family Violence*. Interpersonal violence prevention and response on college campuses: Opportunities for faculty leadership. doi: 10.1007/s10896-018-9968-1

Sexual harassment of women: Climate, culture, and consequences in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine. Johnson, P.A., Widnall, S.E., & Benya, F.F., eds. The National Academies Press: Washington D.C.

Sexual Misconduct & Gender Discrimination among Graduate Students Background and Recommendations

Graduate students are a vulnerable student population with regard to victimization of gender and sexual harassment, although compared to undergraduate students, incidents of victimization are lower. Graduate students occupy different positions at the university compared to undergraduate students. The graduate student experience is often hierarchical including relationships with power differentials, which can increase vulnerability to gender and sexual harassment by faculty mentors/advisors. In addition, many graduate students work as teaching assistants and instructors, placing them in the position to be victims or perpetrators of discrimination and assault in the classroom. Yet, much of institutional programming and services is often oriented toward the undergraduate population; recent [research](#) suggests graduate students may not be aware of the services available to them or if they are aware, they may not think these services are relevant to their experience. The [2015 AAU Campus Climate](#) study found that relative to their undergraduate female and graduate male counterparts, graduate women frequently reported less favorable attitudes and/or beliefs about institutional response. They also found that graduates students were less likely to receive information on these topics from orientation events, less likely to believe the institution would protect the safety of an individual making a report, and less likely to believe the institution would take action against offenders.

To explore the status of some of these issues among our own graduate students, we analyzed relevant CWU 2016 Campus Climate study data to understand victimization among graduate students, as well as other indicators of climate, including perceptions of institutional response and knowledge of campus resources. The findings, as well as related recommendations are as follows.

2016 Campus Climate Study: Graduate Student Data

Graduate Student Sample

- 70 students (5.6% of sample)
- 43 students (4.62% of sample after we removed participants who failed validity check)

Gender

- 16 males (22.9%) / 13 males (31%) after we removed participants who failed validity check
- 54 females (77.1%) / 30 females (69%) after we removed participants who failed validity check

Table 1. Differences in Student CWU Climate Perceptions, by Student Status

Student Status	\bar{x} (SD)
Undergraduate Students	3.47 (0.7)
Graduate Students	3.23 (0.62)*

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Graduate students reported significantly less positive perceptions of CWU campus climate ($\bar{x} = 3.47$), compared to undergraduate students ($\bar{x} = 3.23$, $p = 0.023$). Despite the small sample of graduate students, we tested whether there were differences in perception of CWU Climate by student status, i.e. between undergraduate and graduate women and observed none. A major limitation of this data is the small sample, which likely precludes detection of a difference in mean scores.

Climate Questions Included:

1. School officials (administrators, public safety officers) could do more to protect students from harm.
2. If there were a crisis at my school, my school would handle it well.
3. The school responds too slowly in difficult situations.
4. My school does enough to protect the safety of students.
5. There is a good support system at my school for students going through difficult times.

Items scored on 5 point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strong Agree*). Negative Questions, i.e. #2, was recoded for mean composite score.

Table 2. Differences in Students’ CWU Sexual Misconduct-Related Climate Perceptions, by Student Status

Student Status	\bar{x} (SD)
Undergraduate Students	3.96 (0.74)
Graduate Students	3.86 (0.73)

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

We found no significant differences in students’ perception of sexual misconduct-related climate perceptions, by student status. Again, despite the small sample size of graduate students, we tested for differences in perception of sexual misconduct related-climate. We observed no significant differences in women’s perception of sexual misconduct-related climate, by student status, i.e. between undergraduate and graduate women. Similarly, major limitation of this data is the small sample, which likely precludes detection of a difference in mean scores.

Sexual Misconduct-Related Climate Questions included:

1. CWU would take the report seriously.
2. CWU would maintain the privacy of the person making the report.
3. CWU would do its best to honor the request of the person about how to go forward with the case.
4. CWU would take steps to protect the safety of the person making the report.
5. CWU would support the person making the report.
6. CWU would provide accommodations to support the person (e.g. academic, housing, safety)
7. CWU would take action to address the factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct.
8. CWU would handle the report fairly.
9. CWU would label the person making the report a troublemaker.
10. CWU would have a hard time supporting the person who made the report.
11. CWU would punish the person who made the report.

Items scored on 5 point scale (1 = *Strongly Disagree* to 5 = *Strong Agree*). Negative Questions, i.e. #9, was recoded for mean composite score.

Table 3. Differences in Undergraduate and Graduate Students Reported Receiving No Training

Type of Training	Undergraduates % (n)	Graduates % (n)
Which behaviors are defined as “sexual assault”	16.9 (122)	50.0 (21)***
How to report a complaint of sexual assault	24.3 (175)	45.2 (19)**
The availability of confidential on-campus resources to help victims of sexual assault	21.1 (152)	40.4 (17)**
Prevention of sexual assault	17.8 (128)	47.6 (20)***

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

Student status significantly related to reporting no training received in all four areas; graduate students were significantly more likely to report having received no training compared to undergraduate students. For both groups, the proportion of students reporting no training was highest for “how to report a complaint of sexual assault.”

Table 4. Differences in Victimization among Undergraduate and Graduate Women*

Type of Victimization	Undergraduates % (n)	Graduates % (n)
Non-penetrative sexual assault	23.47 (123)	10.3 (3)
Penetrative sexual assault	9.2 (48)	0 (0)

*small sample precludes tests of independence

Consistent with the AAU Climate study report, graduate women were less likely to report victimization, compared to their undergraduate women counterparts. Due to the small sample of victimization among graduate students, we could not conduct tests of independence to determine the relationship between student status and victimization.

Recommendations

Recommendation: Include graduate students as members of any long-term committee/task force initiatives.

- Currently, graduate students are not included as members of the Task Force or Title IX Committee.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Dean of Grad Studies, Grad Council, Department Chairs or faculty program directors of graduate programs

Recommendation: Increase participation in campus climate-type survey initiatives among graduate students.

- Future Committee and/or Task Force charged with implementing campus climate studies should include a graduate student to help assist with the inclusion of relevant survey measures, conduct outreach to graduate students for participation, and disseminate findings.

- A specific dissemination plan for graduate students should be included as part of the planning for future climate studies.
- Specifically name graduate students on materials advertising events where it would be appropriate for all students to attend and/or create events specifically for graduate students.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Dean of Grad Studies, Graduate Council, Department/committee responsible for climate survey

Recommendation: Provide sexual misconduct and gender discrimination informational/educational materials, including a statement of the CWU policy, information on reporting both for on campus and non-campus resources and procedures, and contact information for campus resources to all graduate students.

- Consult with current CWU graduate students on the appropriateness/relevance of language used in the material and disseminate broadly during orientation events
- Orient graduate program director/coordinators, specifically, to the resources available on campus as to facilitate greater communication between directors/coordinators and their students.
- Include CWU's policy for reporting harassment or assault and where to find help in syllabi. Require all departments discuss this with their first-year graduate students during department orientation or during an introductory class.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: HR, ASL Deans

Recommendation: Develop online training program specifically for graduate students.

- Currently, CWU does not provide online training – as mandated for undergraduate students – for graduate students; given the demographic and experiential differences between undergraduate and graduate students, the undergraduate training is not adequate nor appropriate for graduate students.
- Training should clarify definitions, policies, and procedures related to sexual misconduct and gender discrimination, and provide contact information for CWU Victim Advocate.
- Provide additional training for graduate students who will work as GAs, TAs or instructors. Currently the only training required is FERPA training. Graduate students attending these trainings should be compensated for their time by counting the hour(s) in training towards their 200 total required work hours for the quarter. This would encourage attendance and emphasize the university's commitment to these issues.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: HR, Grad Council

Recommendation: Mandate training for graduate faculty to clarify sexual misconduct and gender discrimination policies, expectations for advising, and incidence/prevalence of misconduct and discrimination among graduate students.

- Currently, no such training exists for graduate faculty.
- Training on mentor-mentee relationships and how to dismantle the power imbalance as been shown to reduce instances of harassment (NASSEM, pp. 135)
 - Persons/Processes Involved: HR, Grad Council

Recommendation: Consider alternative models for graduate student advising to dismantle potential power imbalance of graduate faculty/student advising relationships, research mentor/supervisor relationship, and other relationships where graduate students are reliant on faculty.

- Using egalitarian leadership reduces instances of harassment because subordinates are treated more as equals, creating a culture of “looking out for one another,” valuing all perspectives including those of the lowest-ranking individuals
- Consider developing mentoring networks or committee-based advising where a students’ funding, support, and guidance comes from multiple sources, reducing the concentration on one individual. This model can foster informal reporting of harassment
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Grad Studies, Deans, Department chair, Grad Council, GSA

References

Bulmer, S.M., Irfan, S., Barton, B., Vancour, M., & Breny, J. (2010). Comparison of health status and health behaviors between female graduate and undergraduate college students. *The Health Educator*, 42(2), 67-76.

McMahon, S. O’Connor, J., & Seabrook, R. (2018). Not just an undergraduate issue: Campus climate and sexual violence among graduate students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. Advanced Online Publication. doi: 10.1177/0886260518787205

McMahon, S., Stepleton, K., Cusano, J., O’Connor, J., Gandhi, K., & McGinty, F. (2018). Beyond sexual assault surveys: A model for comprehensive campus climate assessment. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 55(1), 78-09

Sexual harassment of women: Climate, culture, and consequences in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine. Johnson, P.A., Widnall, S.E., & Benya, F.F., eds. The National Academies Press: Washington D.C.

Sexual Misconduct & Gender Discrimination Related Campus Climate Surveys Recommendation for Future Initiatives

Recommendations: A president-supported standing committee focused on the prevention and mitigation of interpersonal violence, including sexual misconduct and gender discrimination, with representation of faculty and students.

- In addition to coordinating other initiatives, such a committee is necessary to implement future campus climate studies. Members may include Dean of Student Wellness, Violence Prevention Coordinator, Title IX officer, faculty members, statistician, ASCWU student liaison and/or other students, and other individuals who are committed to translating findings into actionable items.
- Encourage faculty representation to provide guidance in research methods, sampling strategies, data analysis, and to ensure ethical standards of research, i.e. dissemination.
- Support, specifically work load allocation, for principal investigator overseeing survey, i.e. if PI is faculty member, then appropriate WL should be provided in addition to WL allocated for serving on the committee, in years in which campus climate survey is conducted for coordinating recruitment efforts, compiling survey measures, implementing study, analyzing data, and disseminating findings.
- Consider allocation of a graduate assistant to assist with the study efforts, including HSRC application and protocol, recruitment, implementation, analysis, and dissemination.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: CWU President initiates standing committee (recommended); ad hoc committee formed in climate study years (current)

Recommendations: Implement a campus climate study on a 4-year cycle.

- Given the resources required to implement climate studies, a 4 year cycle lends itself to appropriate distribution of personnel time, funding for implementation, analyzing and disseminating data, implementation of recommended actions based on data, among other activities associated with climate surveys. The most recent, and only, campus climate survey was conducted in the Fall of 2016.
- Consider the timing of implementation in the context of other survey initiatives; review all survey initiatives to understand scope, purpose, measures and potential redundancies, and consider combining efforts where appropriate.
- Consider integration of Community-Based Participatory Research principles to generate buy-in and work toward appropriate branding/marketing for the climate study, i.e. heighten 'culture of research participation' among CWU students.
 - Increase participation among key populations, i.e. students/employees of color, queer students/faculty, etc.
 - Increase participation among online/distance students through outreach among CWU CWU, consider different measures to capture their experience with these issues, and disseminate findings appropriately.
- Use of evidence-based measures, i.e. ARC3, iSpeak, etc., for victimization experiences in particular; consult recent literature for valid measures when investigating variables not included in previous studies. For consistency, it is recommended that the measures used in the key findings in this report should be used in subsequent study to assess potential change, i.e. student knowledge of resources, participation in training, general and sexual-misconduct related climate variables, victimization, etc.
- Use of evidence-based recruitment strategies, i.e. Dillman Method, to increase response rate
 - Consider paper/pen survey method over online/Qualtrics

- Include 'validity check' measures to ensure completion; no incentives provided for participants who fail validity check (372 out of 1,114 students failed validity check in 2016 survey)
- Include qualitative methods and incentivize accordingly, i.e. focus groups, to enhance understanding of climate with explicit plan for dissemination of findings.
- Develop a dissemination plan that is made explicit to potential participants before data collection; adhere to timely dissemination of findings in various outlets including, campus presentations and discussion forums, CWU Observer articles, Pulse articles, CWU We Care site, brief report of key findings to all campus members via email, etc.
 - Current mention of 2016 Campus Climate report is housed on the [CWU We Care site](#). A link to key findings from the survey could help increase campus community perceptions of transparency, and ultimately, help increase participation rate for future studies.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: CWU President initiates standing committee (recommended); ad hoc committee formed in climate study years (current)

References

Graham, L.M., Mennicke, A., Rizo, C., & Wood, L. (2018). *Journal of Family Violence*. Interpersonal violence prevention and response on college campuses: Opportunities for faculty leadership. doi: 10.1007/s10896-018-9968-1

McMahon, S., Stepleton, K., Cusano, J., O'Connor, J., Gandhi, K., & McGinty, F. (2018). Beyond sexual assault surveys: A model for comprehensive campus climate assessment. *Journal of Student Affairs Research and Practice*, 55(1), 78-09

Sexual harassment of women: Climate, culture, and consequences in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine. Johnson, P.A., Widnall, S.E., & Benya, F.F., eds. The National Academies Press: Washington D.C.

Sexual Misconduct & Gender Related Policy and Practices Recommendations for Faculty, Staff, & Students

Policies and practices related to sexual misconduct and gender discrimination should be proactive and represent more than what is known as merely “symbolic compliance”. That is, initiatives that serve only to comply with federal regulations and/or other external demands may not manifest in meaningful behavioral change, particularly in cases where institutional support, including funding, is inadequate to implement evidence-based strategies. We should not expect reactive policies and practices – those that respond to, rather than prevent, incidents – to facilitate a campus culture intolerant of misconduct and discrimination. Title IX, Title VII, and Washington state law should be considered the minimal standard of compliance; proactive prevention initiatives, clear policy/procedure language, and transparency of the handling of incidents work toward conveying a stronger stance against misconduct, which is necessary for its prevention.

Recommendation: University-wide policy statement against sexual misconduct, including gender harassment and discrimination, for all campus community members that is clear, accessible, widely communicated, posted publicly, and supported by CWU administrators at the highest level.

- There is currently different policies for students and staff/faculty. Many institutions are moving toward a single policy, although procedures may differ, to clarify the university’s expectations for conduct for all campus community members. Policies and procedures should be accessible to the campus community, including supportive messages in non-legal language disseminated broadly across campus.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: President, ASCWU, Faculty Senate, UFC, and/or Staff Unions

Recommendation: Clarification of roles and responsibilities for administrative personnel involved in the reporting, investigation, and/or resolution process, in addition to those employees identified as “confidential” persons.

- The 2016 CWU Campus Climate found limited knowledge among both students and employees with respect to the Title IX coordinator’s role, where to report an incident of misconduct, and/or where to get help. We recommend explicit documentation – and dissemination, housed online – explaining the roles and responsibilities of individuals who are involved in cases of sexual misconduct and/or gender discrimination, including both mandatory reporting/responsible employee roles and those who maintain confidential status. This information should be provided at student and employee orientations and be accessible easily online. Currently, this information is dispersed between different web pages; the CWU “We Care” website could be enhanced to house all relevant materials.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Human Resources; Student Success

Recommendation: Online, confidential reporting systems (i.e. [CALLISTO](#)) for employees and students should be widely publicized, with additional information including the target-centric intent to allow victims/survivors to control the disclosure process by documenting incidents, the handling of such reports, and the implications for reporting parties to remain anonymous (i.e. inability to follow up, thus challenging their investigation).

- Currently, CWU hosts an [online, confidential reporting system](#), with description of challenges in investigating anonymous reports; this system is for employees only. Students may also benefit from anonymous/confidential reporting system, with appropriate contact information for confidential employees, i.e. violence victim advocate. The publicity for CWU’s system – its focus

on “violations of university policy, concerns about fiscal compliance, and questionable fiscal conduct” may not convey a message that this system can be used for incidents of sexual misconduct/discrimination.

- CALLISTO offers 1) building time-stamped records of an incident, 2) formal reporting of the incident electronically to campus authorities using the records, and 3) a matching system for targets to search whether another complaint has been made on the same perpetrator. These features have demonstrated increase in victim/survivor formal reporting, quicker reporting, and are supported by students and field experts.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Internal Audit; Title IX; CWU police; HR; Student Success

Recommendation: Best-practice for investigating complaints specify a completion timeline of 60 business days, with a decision/disciplinary action within 40 days after the completion of the investigation.

- Timely investigation and resolution can help increase perception of responsiveness, as well as low tolerance, which can shift cultures that are perceived to tolerate misconduct, including discrimination/harassment.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Human Resources / Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities, UFC

Recommendation: Semi-annual reporting and dissemination of anonymized complaints, including role of the complainant and respondent (i.e. student, staff, faculty) and results, including investigation timelines.

- Modeled after [Yale University’s Report of Complaints of Sexual Misconduct](#), we recommend a report informing the campus community about complaints and their resolution, which aims to enhance university accountability and increase transparency, which were noted as recommendations in the 2016 CWU Campus Climate Survey.
- No empirical support for such initiatives exists; we recommend items to assess perception of this initiative in future campus climate studies.
 - Persons/Processes Involved : Human Resources / Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities’ CWU Police

Recommendation: Enhanced training for faculty and staff that includes prevention strategies, contextualizes misconduct and discrimination within collegiality/civility, and provides tangible strategies to combat harassment and discriminatory language used among colleagues and students.

- Initial orientation events, at the initial time of employment, are important to set the tone of the university’s stance on misconduct/discrimination; faculty, staff, and students should be oriented to institutional policy, expectations for conduct, available resources for support (prevention and post-incident support), roles and responsibilities of Title IX and other institution personnel working in these areas, and reporting locations.
- Training should be conducted in-person (rather than online) and every year of employment, including among part-time/adjunct faculty, with proportions of completion/participation reported at the academic department level.
- Current “Responsible Employee” language holds all CWU employees as mandatory reporters; training on mandatory reporting is currently limited to the Treating People with Dignity and Respect program, completed once every three years. This is inadequate to foster knowledge on reportable offenses, skill-acquisition in explaining mandatory reporting responsibilities to students, and sustainable culture shift among employees to take responsibility for reporting,

particularly when employees are required to report misconduct allegations against their peers.

- Although “bystander engagement” training has shown initial promise for students, there exists little evidence to understand the potential benefit for institutional leaders, as well faculty and staff at all levels. That said, two models exist to provide a framework for promoting prosocial response to problematic situations, which can help shift campus climate and support behavioral change among faculty and staff to confront such behaviors. [Confronting Prejudiced Responses \(CPR\)](#) and Behavior Modeling Training (BMT) are models that aim to help potential bystanders overcome barriers for effective intervention and provide an opportunity to practice intervention (confrontation) skills.
- Training should include relevant scenarios that appeal to a diverse audience, including harassment between individuals of the same sex/gender identity, misconduct between faculty and students, and female perpetrators.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Human Resources & Violence Prevention Coordinator/Advocate; Inclusivity & Diversity Committee; ASL Deans

Recommendation: Specific training for department chairs and college deans.

- Potential training initiatives include the [EEOC’s Leading for Respect \(for supervisors\) and Respect in the Workplace \(for all employees\)](#), which allow for institutions to customize training to provide CWU-specific policies and procedures for the handling of complaints.
- [NASEM](#) recommends specific training for those in leadership positions, who will have opportunities to address misconduct and discrimination occurring among subordinates; training that equips those in leadership positions with the skills to foster a climate intolerant of misconduct and discrimination and effectively address these incidents when they occur, which can help shift the campus culture toward more proactive and target centric.
 - Persons/Processes Involved: Directive from the President; implemented by Human Resources / Office of Student Rights & Responsibilities; Information to department chairs directly from college deans

References

Sexual harassment of women: Climate, culture, and consequences in academic sciences, engineering, and medicine. Johnson, P.A., Widnall, S.E., & Benya, F.F., eds. The National Academies Press: Washington D.C.

U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2017) EEOC Launches New Training Program on Respectful Workplaces. Retrieved from <https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/newsroom/release/10-4-17.cfm>