

# 2017 MSU Campus Climate Survey Executive Summary

## BACKGROUND

The purpose of the study is to address the issue of campus sexual assault at Midwestern State University (MSU), along with other participants in the grant, including other institutions of higher education (IHEs) and partner organizations. As part of a three-year grant from the United States Department of Health and Human Services, this project will measure progression and success through an evaluation approach in order to answer the questions: 1) Are we achieving our objectives? and 2) What is the impact/change occurring? The goal of these questions is to create a consistent, effective response to campus sexual assault.

The campus climate survey instrument, the ARC3, is used to conduct pre and post intervention assessments of student, faculty, and staff at each partnering IHE. The pre-assessment, or baseline measurement, is intended to function as a diagnostic measure. Each module within the existing instrument was statistically scored for this project to produce an overall module score, along with subfactor scores. Such scoring allows for comparable values of what is going well and/or what should be addressed. Baseline results from Year 1 will allow each IHE and the grant Technical Advisory Group to determine a tailored prevention approach that best fits the areas in need of improvement as identified by the module and subfactor scores; post-test scores will reflect whether their efforts are working and offer areas for further improvement. The final post-test score will provide the overall results, indicating the extent to which each IHE was able to influence change through targeted efforts.

## INSTRUMENT

Knowledge and behavioral outcomes for this project are evaluated through the *Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3)*. This survey<sup>1</sup> is the result of ongoing efforts by student and legal affairs professionals, campus advocates, students, campus law enforcement, and sexual assault and harassment researchers, groups of whom met in Atlanta, Georgia, in October 2014 for the Georgia State University Forum on Campus Sexual Assault and in February 2015 in Madison, Wisconsin, for the Madison Summit on Campus Climate and Sexual Misconduct.

The survey is organized into 19 modules that provide campuses with the flexibility in survey length and content they have indicated they need. The modules include:

- 1) Possible outcomes
- 2) Alcohol use
- 3) Peer norms
- 4) Perceptions of campus climate regarding sexual misconduct
- 5) Sexual harassment by faculty/staff
- 6) Sexual harassment by students
- 7) Stalking victimization
- 8) Stalking perpetration
- 9) Dating violence victimization
- 10) Dating violence perpetration

---

<sup>1</sup> Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative. (2015). *ARC3 Campus Climate Survey regarding Sexual Misconduct*. Available from <http://campusclimate.gsu.edu>.

- 11) Sexual violence victimization
- 12) Sexual violence perpetration
- 13) Institutional responses
- 14) Peer responses
- 15) Consent
- 16) Bystander intervention
- 17) Campus safety
- 18) Demographics
- 19) Additional information

The module order is intentional, and is based on collective experience with survey and institutional research. The survey was pretested during the summer of 2015 with over 2,200 students attending one of four universities across the United States.

The full survey was expected to take students an average of 30 minutes to complete; students who report experiencing sexual misconduct only take an additional one minute to complete the full survey, on average.

The development of the survey was guided by the following principles<sup>2</sup>:

- Inclusiveness, mutual respect, and collaboration
- Engaging in an iterative and transparent drafting process
- Ensuring independence and integrity in research
- A commitment to use of the best scientific evidence as the foundation of the survey
- Equal focus on surveying victimization and perpetration
- The adoption of a civil rights approach grounded in Title IX
- Framing efforts with the principles of The Belmont Report
- Justice
- A sensitivity to the unique issues faced by various diverse populations and higher education institutional types

For more information on the ARC3 instrument, please see <http://campusclimate.gsu.edu> or address questions related the survey itself to [campusclimate@gsu.edu](mailto:campusclimate@gsu.edu).

## DATA COLLECTION

The Center for Research, Design, and Analysis (CRDA) at Texas Woman's University oversaw the data collection process. In preparation for data collection, each IHE was asked to determine:

- **IRB approval:** whether it was necessary from their school
- **Module selection:** as part of the grant, modules 2-4 and 11-18 were requested but not required
- **Additional questions** to include in the survey
- **Text changes:** introductory text and survey text changes
- **Methodology selection:** representative sample vs. complete consensus
- **Data collection tool selection:** PsychData was offered as a free and secure option through TWU and provided free for future use

---

<sup>2</sup> Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative. (2015). *ARC3 Campus Climate Survey regarding Sexual Misconduct: Guiding Principles*. Available from <http://campusclimate.gsu.edu>.

- **Marketing and incentivizing:** the use of and types of incentives. Tips from the ARC3 developers were provided.

MSU determined that it would sample the entire campus. Based on this selection, the CRDA recruited participants via email from the entire student body. Participants were informed, in advance, of an upcoming campus survey, and then emailed again with a specific survey link which would track participants without collecting identifying information.

The study was open to participants of all gender, ethnicity, classes, and age groups at MSU. Anonymity was assured and incentives were provided to increase participation.

Data collection opened on March 21, 2017 and closed May 5, 2017. Questions from modules 2-4, 6, 9, and 11-18 were asked in the MSU campus climate survey. The total sample collected was 1,056 and the number of valid responses used was 894.

Data were collected and stored through TWU's secured and IRB-approved PsychData program, with only the CRDA having access to the data for monitoring and analysis purposes. The IHE Representative for MSU was the authorizing agent on the account.

Summary statistics for 53 additional IHEs were used for comparison with the IHEs in this study. Similar methodologies were used to college the ARC at these institutions.

## **DATA PREPARATION**

The CRDA at Texas Woman's University oversaw the data preparation and analysis process.

**Validity Check.** Upon completion of the data collection a validity check was conducted to ensure valid participants were used in the data analyses. Participants who completed the survey in too short a time, incorrectly answered more than half of the attention trap questions, or dropped off before reaching the sexual harassment sections were removed from the data file.

**Sample Weighting.** Weighting is the process of adjusting data to reflect differences in the number of population units that each respondent represents. For example, if a student population is 50% male but respondents are only 33% male, then male respondents are given more weight and female respondents are given less weight in the data so that the results more accurately reflect the student population. In practical terms, a weight is a number in a data file assigned to each respondent, and is used as a multiplier to adjust the number of cases used in a calculation.

Weighting procedures were carried out to correct for any disparity between the sample characteristics and MSU campus characteristics. Specifically, the MSU sample was weighted by the following characteristics: age group, race, gender, and class standing.

**Module Scoring.** To aid in benchmark reporting and where to focus priorities, overall module scores were examined for Likert-type scaled items within each module. Factor and reliability analyses were conducted on Likert-type scale items within each module to determine if the items grouped together statistically and how they were conceptually related in the survey. Strong factor loadings ( $> .300$ ) and reliability scores ( $> .600$ ) were found. Thus, subscale scores within each module and overall module scores were created as the average of the items within the subscale or overall module score. Module 2: Alcohol Use was purposely not included in this analysis due to the question types.

## **SAMPLE OVERVIEW**

The total sample used was 894. Of these respondents, 37.6% were 18-20 years of age, 37.3% were 21-25 years of age, and 25.1% were 26 years of age or older. When responding to the question about their **race or ethnicity**, 15.7% considered themselves Black/African, 62.7% White/Caucasian, 3.9%

Asian/Asian American, 20% Hispanic/Latino, and 1.2% a race/ethnicity not listed. When asked about their **gender identity**, 59% are female, 41% are male. When asked about their **sexual orientation**, 85.2% report being heterosexual/straight, 3.7% gay, 7.6% bisexual, 1% lesbian, and 2.4% other. Roughly 8.9% of respondents are **international** students. When asked about their living situation, 36.1% **live on campus**. Respondents' **class standing** includes 37.4% lower classmen, 50.5% upper classmen, and 11.9% graduate/professional.

## HIGHLIGHTED MSU FINDINGS

Key findings from this baseline report include:

- Overall, students at MSU report high perceptions of consent, and moderate perceptions of campus safety, satisfaction with the institution's response to campus sexual violence, positive perception of campus climate towards sexual misconduct, and confidence in their ability to intervene.
- The MSU body reports fairly low incidences of sexual harassment by students and dating violence victimization.
- Approximately 17% of those on MSU's campus have been a victim of sexual violence; just over 1% admit to being perpetrators of sexual violence. More than twice as many women (21.5%) than men (9.3%) experience sexual violence.
- Although more confident in institutional support, respondents seemingly do not feel confident in their peers' empathetic response to any misconduct that may occur.

The data suggests that the campus body feels a general sense of support from the institution, but more attention needs to be given to educating individuals on their personal responses to misconduct. MSU should continue to strengthen its support network in order to continually increase the confidence in its response to the physical and emotional safety of its campus body.

## COMPARISON INSTITUTION SAMPLE OVERVIEW

Approximately one-third of the IHEs were Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) and another third were four-year private schools. More than half of the 63 IHEs had enrollment sizes of 1,000-4,999. More than 25% of the IHEs were located in small to midsize cities and another 25% were located in towns. Forty percent of the IHEs were from great lakes and plains states, while nearly 40% were from southeast states (19.4%) and southwest states (19.4%). More than 25% of the IHEs were NCAA II (30.6%) and another 25% were NAIA (27.4%). Nearly half of the IHEs have football teams (46.8%) and 37.1% have fraternities and/or sororities.

	n	%
<b>Type</b>		
2 Year	8	12.9
4yr Private	21	33.9
4yr Public	11	17.7
CCCU	22	35.5
<b>Size</b>		
Under 1000	7	11.3
1,000-4,999	38	61.3
5,000-9,999	10	16.1
More than 10,000	7	11.3
<b>Urbanization</b>		
City -- Large	7	11.3
City -- Small/Mid	19	30.6
Rural/Remote	7	11.3
Suburb	13	21.0
Town	16	25.8
<b>Region</b>		
Far West	8	12.9
Great Lakes/Plains	25	40.3
Mid-east	5	8.1
Southeast	12	19.4
Southwest	12	19.4
<b>Athletic Level</b>		
NAIA	17	27.4
NCAA I	3	4.8
NCAA II	19	30.6
NCAA III	13	21
NJCAA	1	1.6
NONE/UNK	9	14.5
<b>Football</b>		
No Football	33	53.2

Yes Football	29	46.8
<hr/>		
Greek		
No Greek	31	50.0
UNK Greek	8	12.9
Yes Greek	23	37.1

## HIGHLIGHTED FINDINGS

Key findings from this comparison report include:

- Students at MSU report slightly higher levels of **alcohol use** when compared to the collective universities in this sample, but slightly less alcohol use compared to the nine universities in the HHS grant.
- Higher levels for **bystander intervention** are also reported by students at MSU as compared to those universities part of this grant, as well as the collective sample.
- Similar to the other schools, MSU reports low levels of reported **peer norms, sexual harassment by students, dating violence victimization, sexual violence victimization, sexual violence perpetration, and anticipated peer responses**.
- Students are seemingly on par with all university students in this sample with regard to their understanding of **consent** and general feeling of **campus safety**.
- The MSU student body reports a greater number of **institutional responses** than the universities outside of this grant, but is much lower than the collective nine universities that are part of this grant (note: the large collective institutional responses by the nine universities that are part of this grant was driven by one IHE with extremely high scores).