

Task Force on Campus Sexual Misconduct Climate Surveys

Ninth Convening | July 12, 2023, 1:30-3:00 p.m.

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. Review and Approve June 7, 2023 Meeting Minutes
3. Public Comment Discussion
 1. Base Survey Specific Comments
 2. General Comments
4. Task Force Report Discussion
5. Public Comment
6. Next Steps



Review and Approve Meeting Minutes

June 7, 2023

Task Force Report Public Comment Period

- The Task Force Report's public comment period took place June 20, 2023 to June 30, 2023
- Notification of the public comment period was sent to institutional leadership at 2- and 4-year public and private institutions as well as private business and vocational school (PBVS) staff.
- We received 27 public comments on the report.
 - 8 four-year or graduate-only institutions
 - 5 community colleges
 - 2 advocacy organizations

Public Comments on Task Force Report

- Base-Survey Related Public Comments
 - Clarification on students that the survey applies to (minor, not in U.S., part-time)
 - Clarification on where incident took place
 - Remove or update the phrase “behaved inappropriately” from question introduction
 - Increase question flexibility
- General Public Comments
 - Annual survey administration not feasible
 - Institutions need guidance on reporting and other issues
 - Base survey is too long and other language changes
 - 20 questions not strictly addressing statute requirements (including opt-in questions)
 - Base Survey would still be 70 questions

Example Public Comments

- **Clarification on student populations the survey will apply to:**
 - Is there any guidance from the task force regarding the administration of this survey to students under the age of 18?
 - Is there any guidance from the task force regarding the administration of this survey to students not physically located in the U.S. regarding international privacy laws such as GDPRP and PIPL? Or to students who are FERPA suppressed?
 - Audience modification or question rephrasing should be considered given the high number of minors aged 14-17, as well as the ESL and not yet college ready readers, that are currently included in the intended survey audience at community colleges.
 - Pursuant to the Dual Credit Quality act, we have a significant number of minors in our student body, as young as 14 years of age. Our dual credit population is approaching 20% of our credit students. If the non-credit student populations are included, we add in another significant minor population.
 - Of our FY23 community college credit students, 71.2% are part-time students. 54% of students are enrolled in ≤ 6 credit hrs. We also have a significant amount taking only online and hybrid coursework.

Example Public Comments

- **Clarification on where incident took place:**

- Our students spend a vast majority of their time in communities a significant distance from our physical locations. To effectively provide solutions or resources to students and know what problems we need to address on campus, we need to know where they are experiencing the things they report.
- Questions 21, 34 and 59 do not clarify upfront if the incidents you are asking them to report are on campus. Working in an urban setting students have significant exposure to issues and we need to determine campus vs off campus.
- [W]e have found the terminology “on campus” to be problematic in student surveys. Many students view a section of town as “on campus” even if those facilities are not university owned.
- Our campus is not residential and the responses to the questions as written will not allow us to know if our students are providing information about their experiences on our campus or in their home communities. We believe strongly that there should be a modification of question language to provide a clarity of the geography behind the student responses to indicate whether their experience occurred on campus or in relation to their instruction or college-related interactions.

Example Public Comments

- **Institutions need increased flexibility:**
- Many of the responses are university centric: i.e. question 24, 25, 31 and all corresponding responses either include the word university or reference housing that is not available at most community colleges. Will community colleges be able to modify the responses and/or if using a 3rd party vendor, will they be able to make modifications so as to not confuse students.
- Our campus is not residential and the responses to the questions as written will not allow us to know if our students are providing information about their experiences on our campus or in their home communities.
- The survey's definitions, such as consent, do not align with institutional policies and institutions should have an opportunity to modify the definitions or provide clarification as to how these definitions align with university policies.
- Moody also has concerns about the content of the survey questions as many of them go against our religious beliefs. The questions about a student's sexual orientation, gender identity, and mutability of sex and gender, and having sex outside of biblical marriage do not align with . . . Christian beliefs on biblical human sexuality, the created order of men and women, and God's design for sex and marriage.

Example Public Comments

- **Update or Remove “behaved inappropriately”:**
 - Finally, there is a phrase, "behaved inappropriately" used repeatedly throughout the survey, specifically when asking follow-up questions to specific types of harm students may have experienced. While the behavior is inappropriate, using this term minimizes the harm that someone could have experienced. A better term could be "caused harm"
 - You indicated that you experienced at least one situation in which someone behaved _inappropriately_." Is there a reason "inappropriate" is used? To label sexual violence as inappropriate behavior may be triggering to survivors. Could the term "harm" or similar language be substituted?

Example Public Comments

- **Annual Survey Administration:**

- Overall, I believe the survey is too long especially as an annual requirement.
- Has the implementation plan been determined? Referenced 4-5 years but community college students enrollment to completion is anywhere between 1-3 years? Conducting a survey annually to collect timely and accurate information would be a lot for a community college and survey fatigue is a concern for all parties involved.
- We find the requirement to administer the survey annually (rather than every 2-3 years) to be problematic for similar reasons as the length critique, above: the extra data provided by an annual survey is not likely to be more useful if it comes at the cost of lower response/completion rates, students will experience survey fatigue, and the content may be triggering for survivors to see year-after-year. Additionally, as part of its work in developing the survey, the Task Force heard presentations by other states (Massachusetts and New Hampshire) who have similar statutory survey requirements, and both presentations suggested that a 2 year cycle is the preferable cadence.... We urge the Task Force to include a recommendation in its report that any such amendments also include an amendment to the "annually" requirement that would serve to reduce the frequency of survey administration to every 2-3 years instead of annually.

Example Public Comments

- **Need for Guidance:**

- Could the task force provide more information about reporting requirements? For example, will there be a template, are certain survey items expected to be combined and reported, recommendations on addressing low cell counts.
- In reviewing the Task Force Draft Report, we would recommend that the Task Force provide further guidance and instruction on the survey implementation. First, the draft report does not address IRB approval, particularly whether the Task Force will assist in obtaining such approval, and whether the Task Force will assist institutions in addressing questions or concerns from individual institution's IRB approval processes. Second, while the Task Force Report discusses implementation, institutions are left with many unanswered questions. The Task Force should offer further guidance on how to maintain confidentiality, processes for maintaining confidentiality while offering incentives, and best practices on protecting anonymity in survey administration.
- Can a FAQ be created that gives participants a reference sheet for defining terms that are used variably across contests within the survey?
- Our institution has seen an increase in survey fraud (e.g., bots, individuals taking surveys multiple times to get incentives, taking surveys to skew data). What recommendations does the task force have to minimize fraud while maintaining anonymity and ensuring wide distribution?

Example Public Comments

- **Length of Survey:**

- With 90 questions and several questions imbedded in questions, I believe the assessment is well beyond the length of something students will dedicate their attention towards.
- The survey is too long. There are many questions and the time given to take the survey is not enough. From experience, long surveys are usually associated with low response rate. Even for those who respond to the survey will leave many unanswered questions which in turns will negatively impact the results of the intended analyses. The target population is the University/College students which is known for low response rate (from my own experience with students population). A pilot study is important if it can be conducted to assess the psychometric properties of the tool.
- [E]ven if a student reports no experiences with any of the kinds of misconduct explored by the survey, the survey is still a minimum of 97 questions long. The consensus among engaged students, faculty, and staff is that this is far too long, will likely result in many incomplete/abandoned surveys (reducing completion rate), and will also likely deter students from completing other climate surveys that are also important to our community (such as surveys about diversity and inclusivity).
- We had anticipated the base instrument to be shorter to allow more space to ask institutional specific questions that could be focused on improvement efforts. Due to the length, we were unlikely to add questions. Any efforts the task force can make to shorten the instrument while still addressing the 13 requirements in the statute is appreciated
- We are pleased with the digestible length of the survey, the thoughtful definitions, and trauma-aware nature of the questions.
- The length of the base survey creates a barrier to robust student involvement.

Proposed Additions to Task Force Report

- Appendix chart showing the questions that meet each statutory requirement
- Survey instructions that explains use of skip logic etc.
- Task Force Member ideas for additions to the Report
 - Send to Ashley by July 21, 2023

Public Comment

Next Steps

- Additional July Task Force Meeting
 - Tuesday, July 25, 2023 from 2-3:30 pm
- Survey Building Working Group Meetings
 - Friday, July 14, 2023 from 3-4 pm
 - Wednesday, July 19, 2023 from 11-12 pm

