

Name (Optional)	Organization Name (Optional)	Please provide any comments or questions about the Task Force on Campus Sexual Misconduct Climate Surveys' Task Force Report below. When making substantive comments, please reference page and/or b...
Leslie Roundtree	Chicago State University	<p>Overall, I believe the survey is too long especially as an annual requirement. Question 13 has an overall negative connotation so unclear of what you are looking for. Question 17 c is an odd question - I know what happens to students that report. Given that information is confidential how would someone know what happened? In 17D is accommodations the right term. This is associated with ADA . The section on sexual consent is awkward. Are we trying to determine students knowledge level or determine if they have been engaged in negative experiences. 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. Also there is a significant amount of details and unclear why that data is needed in a survey. I understand we want to understand student perception but it seems overwhelming and intrusive for an anonymous survey. Overall it needs to be more succinct and possible generate a autoreply if students identify issues to support services..</p>
Dr. Bernard Little	Prairie State College	<p>My comments pertain to the entire assessment and centers on length. 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. While I understand the criticality of the content, I worry that we will not garner the necessary data given the length. This is based on working on several campuses and being unsuccessful with assessment tools any longer than 25-30 questions. I encourage you to reconsider the length for completion purposes.</p>
		<p>Section V regarding Consent - Definition of Consent should be stated before questions are shown to students. This is important for students to have a clear interpretation of the topic they are answering questions about.</p> <p>A solid definition of consent is regarded as an "explicit approval and permission to engage in sexual activity demonstrated by clear actions, words, or writings. Informed consent is freely and voluntarily given, it is mutually understood by all parties involved. If coercion, intimidation, threats, and/or physical force are used, there is no consent." (https://www.uncp.edu/resources/title-ix-clery-compliance/sexual-misconduct/consent-and-coercion-discussed)</p>

Qasim	Richard J. Daley College	<p>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.</p>
Robert Babcock	The School of the Art Institute of Chicago	<p>Hi! Thanks for the opportunity with this...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the idea of a 3rd party help with administering the survey 2. Support the merging of the Illinois and Federal survey, but only having only one 3. For the demographics, suggest using "Latinx" over "Latino/a"; regarding the disability question, suggest using "neurodiverse"; for the question on citizenship, suggest not using a "yes/no" answer and instead ask for citizenship/immigration status: 4. The definitions that are suggested for the sexual misconduct - can we use the definitions that come out with the 2023 regs for consistency? 5. For question 18, suggest adding to the question "I am aware of the function of the following campus and community resources related to sexual misconduct AND/OR I KNOW WHERE TO FIND THEM ON WEBSITE/CAMPUS/ETC.: 6. For question 46, suggest adding the word "romantic" next to the word "acquaintance." 7. For question 47, suggest added to the behaviors experienced: "I have had someone block exit and/or egress, and/or physically restrain/restrict me." 8. Also for question 47 - can we ask if the student has had their finances controlled by a current and/or former partner?
		<p>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.</p> <p>Also very concerned about the length of the survey. The number of questions appears excessive and wonder about the integrity of responses especially at the end of the survey.</p>

Jana Koch	Black Hawk College	<p>IBHE Funding is a recommendation for FY25 what is the status of this recommendation?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Can a FAQ be created that gives participants a reference sheet for defining terms that are used variably across contexts within the survey?</p> <p>Survey states on page 11 it is anonymous realize the information requested is common enough to not reveal the identity but confidential maybe be a better to use and include a statement added that the information will be used only for aggregate purposes.</p> <p>Beginning on page 24 a series of questions that involve "answer only if, etc." begin...this could get confusing for many students. Suggested you revise and condense these questions somewhat.</p>
		What is your current gender?
		Which of the following best describes your living situation?
Sarah Beuning	Illinois Coalition Against Sexual Assault (ICASA)	<p>ICASA thanks the Task Force for its work on the draft survey. ICASA respectfully requests that the Task Force consider adding a pop-up definition of "accommodations" when that term is used in the survey, as it may be unfamiliar to some students. This would apply to question IV(17)(d) on page 17, and to questions XI(83)(e) and (g) on page 39.</p> <p>ICASA suggests the following language: "Accommodations refers to measures taken by [INSTITUTION] to help a student in response to sexual misconduct. Accommodations may be related to academics, safety, housing, or other aspects of campus life. Examples include adjustments to coursework or class schedules, excused absences, approving requests for incompletes, relocating a student to different on-campus housing, roommate changes, and offering accompaniment/escort services when walking on campus."</p> <p>Thank you for considering this request.</p>

<p>Tim Love, Executive Director and Title IX Coordinator</p>	<p>Loyola University Chicago</p>	<p>Task Force,</p> <p>Thank you for all your efforts to draft and propose the baseline survey. On behalf of Loyola University Chicago, I offer the following feedback, which was informed by robust conversations with invested and relevant staff, faculty, and students. In summary, our feedback is limited to two domains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) the length of the survey, and (2) the required frequency of administration (annually) <p>Starting with the length, we appreciate that the survey uses “skip logic” to limit the length of the survey for students who have not experienced various forms of misconduct. We also appreciate that students are asked whether they are willing to answer additional questions about a negative experience before being presented with the questions themselves (this trauma-informed approach is greatly appreciated). However, even 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).</p> <p>Regarding frequency, we recognize that our critique is outside the scope of the Task Force itself, but we submit it here in the hope it may be included as a recommendation in the Task Force's report and/or considered by the legislators who serve on the Task Force.</p> <p>As noted in the draft report, the Illinois Preventing Sexual Violence in Higher Education Act (at 110 ILCS 155/35(b)) requires that “Each higher education institution shall annually conduct a sexual misconduct climate survey of all students at the institution.” 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.</p>
--	----------------------------------	--

		<p>As we understand it, some technical amendments may be needed to align the language of the PSVHE Act with the actual timeline of delivery for the baseline survey. 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. We appreciate the consideration of this suggestion by Senator Pacione-Zayas, Senator Tracy, Representative Stuart, and Representative Hammond as well.</p> <p>Again, we sincerely appreciate the tremendous amount of work that Task Force members have dedicated to this project, and we commend the Task Force especially for its sensitivity to trauma in developing the questions themselves. Thank you also for taking the time to consider the input we have provided.</p> <p>Very respectfully, Tim Love Executive Director for Equity & Compliance, Title IX Coordinator Office for Equity & Compliance Loyola University Chicago</p>
--	--	--

		<p>For question #8: "Are you in a program in which you take all of your courses online? ____ Yes ____ No ____ Prefer not to respond" - I'm not sure how to account for this, but some students may not be in an exclusively online program, but may elect to take courses online/via Zoom.</p> <p>For question #21, "These next questions ask about behaviors you may have experienced while a student at [INSTITUTION] in the last 12 months. 21. Since you enrolled at [INSTITUTION] in the last 12 months, how often have you been in a situation in which someone..."</p> <p>Do we want to specify that this would only include situations that happen on-campus, or at a campus-related event? (i.e. not at work)</p>
--	--	--

Jessica Shaw	University of Illinois Chicago	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on this report. I have several comments for consideration.</p> <p>Page 11 Introduction: The introduction provides information on who to contact if the respondent would like to report sexual misconduct. However, this statement provides no information on if the contact person listed is a confidential resource. Respondents may not understand what it means to 'report,' nor the implications of making a report. I think it is important to include contact information for an entity that can confidentially provide respondents options for reporting and accessing resources. This comment also applies to the end of the survey where information on reporting to Title IX is provided. Respondents may not understand that such a report carries with it certain implications. Instead of providing contact information for only Title IX reporting in the introduction and at the conclusion of the survey, information should be provided on how to confidentially get information on options so survivors can make informed decisions.</p> <p>Page 11 Introduction: This introduction provides no information on what will be done with the data collected. For respondents to make an informed decision as to if they want to participate, it is important to tell them what will be done with the data they provide and how their privacy and confidentiality will be protected.</p> <p>Page 14, Question 15: While definitions are provided for many of the terms presented in the table, respondents may not readily endorse these items as they rely on these terms instead of behavioral descriptors for each incident. Prior research in this area demonstrates the importance of using behavioral descriptors for these items.</p> <p>Page 26, Question 33: "Why" questions can be harmful in that they suggest to the survivor that they did not do the 'right' thing. Similar to the question on drug/alcohol consumption prior to the incident (question 28), I think it is important to validate the decision made by the survivor before asking what led them to that decision. This question could start by stating that choosing not to tell anyone is a very normal response. Many people choose not to tell. Then ask what led them to choose not to tell. Relatedly, I think it makes sense to also include a question that asks those who chose to tell why they chose to do so. As currently written, the survey suggests that telling is the right path forward for all survivors as the survey only questions those who choose not to tell. By asking the rationale for telling and not telling, the survey better honors survivors' agency in making decisions. This approach also would yield important information on survivors' post-</p>
--------------	--------------------------------	--

		<p>incident needs and desires that can inform service provision. This same comment applies throughout when asking why someone didn't tell.</p> <p>Page 33, Question 59: This matrix does not seem to adequately account for survivors of all genders. While there is an item in the matrix that captures being forced to orally penetrate someone else, there is no item for being forced to anally or vaginally penetrate someone else (with a penis, finger, or object). This is an important item to include to capture the experiences of all survivors.</p> <p>Page 37, Question 72: It is unclear how someone who has withdrawn would have the opportunity to complete this survey. This relates to survey administration, which was not readily described in this report, so this may have already been considered.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>General comments:</p> <p>Overall, I think the survey will be a good source for universities to learn more about where students are at on their campuses. It does, however, take a long time to read through everything and I can only assume how long it will take students to answer each question. I think there are improvement points throughout the report, especially with including the term "Confidential Advisors." As every IL higher ed institution is required to have a Confidential Advisor, it seems counterintuitive that they are not mentioned once. Along those lines, the end of the survey asks questions to determine negative experiences with university systems, but does not ask for positive experiences. I think both should be included to determine what could improve but what is already being done well. 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"</p> <p>Specific Comments:</p> <p>Pg. 27 - 34a. Instead of using "spied," using the term "surveilled"</p> <p>Pg. 33 - 59e. Continue the structure and rhythm of the previous questions, " Someone attempted to... even though they were not successful."</p> <p>Pg. 39 - 82a. Include "advocacy services" in exempli gratia</p> <p>Pg. 41 - 85a - 85c. Clarifying if the "retaliation" mentioned is the formal definition of retaliation/retaliation policy or just the word retaliation used.</p>
Mary Schmidt	Midwestern Career College	<p>Very thorough approach to sexual misconduct. Section V. Consent, #19, questions a-f seemed a little out of sync with the other questions. Not sure if these questions were added to understand how people perceive consent and therefore how that could translate to sexual misconduct in a school. The survey is also so long that I am concerned about surveys being completed.</p>

<p>University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign Sexual Misconduct Survey Committee</p>	<p>University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign</p>	<p>The Sexual Misconduct Survey Committee at the University of Illinois held an ad-hoc meeting on 6/28/2023 to discuss the Task Force’s proposed base survey and related recommendations. Below are comments from the committee.</p> <p>General Comments and Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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. - We support the task force’s recommendation for additional funding for implementing this annual requirement and an opt-in third-party organization. Would the task force be able to provide a projected cost analysis for implementation? - 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. - For questions that ask students to reflect on the last 12 months, members of the committee felt that wording “Since you enrolled at [INSTITUTION] in the last 12 months” was confusing. Suggested wording, “At INSTITUTION” within the past 12 months, how often have you been in a situation in which someone did the following: (If you have been at the university for under 12 months, please consider the time that you have been here.) - 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 GDPR and PIPL? Or to students who are FERPA suppressed? - 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? <p>Specific Questions/Section Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demographics (p. 12)– Thank you for providing more inclusive categories for gender, race/ethnicity, and sexual orientation than federal reporting requirements. Since reporting requirements typically use IPEDS Race/Ethnicity categories which separates out international students, consider adding “Are you an international student?”. - Q18 – This question indicates it would be modifiable by institution. Could you provide more
---	--	---

		<p>guidance on the degree it can be modified? For example, are we able to put in our own specific services such as Counseling Center McKinley Health Center, and Confidential Advisors at the Women's Resources Center as items or do we have to keep the general question stems such as University of Illinois's safety, health, wellness services (e.g., Counseling Center, McKinley Health Center, Confidential Advisors at the Women's Resources Center).</p> <p>- Consent (p. 35)- The University of Illinois Student Code of Conduct definition lists additional criteria that might prevent someone from being able to consent, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">o the person is under the legal age to provide consent; oro the person has a disability that prevents such person from having the ability or capacity to give consent. <p>Please consider including these in the definition to be consistent with expectations for student behavior, or allow modification based on institutional policy definitions.</p> <p>- Q19B (p.19)– This question stem uses the language “my current partner” when the others use just “my partner”. We recommend removing “current” for consistency.</p> <p>- Q24, Q36, Q49, Q62 - At Illinois we 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. We recognize this limitation may not</p>
--	--	--

	Every Voice Illinois - 2023 Next Generation Leaders Fellowship Cohort	<p>We are pleased with the digestible length of the survey, the thoughtful definitions, and trauma-aware nature of the questions. The definition pop-ups in each new section are incredibly useful, particularly in sections V and VIII. Many young people do not know that what they experienced was sexual violence or intimate partner violence, and it is clear that the questions and definitions in these sections have this in mind. We are also excited about the various response types throughout the survey (yes/no, disagree/agree, number of times, etc). The change of pace throughout the survey seems to be a promising tool for avoiding respondent survey fatigue. However, we would like to see the addition of a "somewhat" category to yes/no question types (particularly question 62) to allow students to share more nuanced experiences. We worry that a survivor may discount their own experience if they could not confidently say "yes" or "no" to a specific instance of violence.</p> <p>We are thrilled to see this survey come to life and are eager to see the change it will bring to our campuses!</p>
Mike Trame	Parkland College	<p>Feedback # 1: The survey is unduly long in its current form and will inevitably detract from its intended effectiveness.</p> <p>Rationale: Based on institutional experience, community college students will not complete a survey that is almost 200 total questions long (when you count each subsection of a base question individually). This which will minimize its effectiveness in helping us understand our climate and provide effective strategies and supportive remedies. Parkland College's Institutional Research team 's data from our institutional student climate survey indicates that only 10 percent of our students even will begin the survey and of those 10% that begin the survey, we see a significant percentage stopping out between 5-10 minutes. The suggested survey duration given is 15- 20 minutes but based on our analysis, it will take a significantly longer time to complete this survey, especially once all of the information pop-ups are added.</p> <p>We fear that the length of this survey will produce response rates to that are extremely low (as low as 1-2%), especially for the questions in the second half of the survey. A base survey of this length does not allow any meaningful opportunity for institutions to add campus-specific questions to the instrument given that this is a stated goal of the legislation as indicated on page 5 of this document. The vision statement indicates that a "concise" survey was the goal. This survey is clearly not concise.</p>

Mike Trame	Parkland College	<p>Feedback #2: The wording chosen for many questions will not provide an accurate understanding of the issues limiting the efficient creation of supports and resources.</p> <p>Rationale: For many of the questions, it will be impossible for community colleges to understand the geographical context surrounding the data provided by the responses. 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. For example, question #21 should be changed to read: "Since you enrolled at [Institution] in the last 12 months, how often have you been in a situation in which someone on [Institution's] campus or related to [Institution's] campus This geographical understanding of student responses has a number of significances.</p> <p>First, the vision statement on page 7 indicates the survey should provide "easy-to-understand results that inform institutional practices and policies to improve responses to and prevent future incidences of sexual misconduct on campuses." The questions as written do not provide an understanding for community colleges of where the reported experiences are occurring. We would urge significant question editing to make geographical context of the data reported a priority.</p> <p>Second, 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. This means that many of our students spend a relatively small amount of their time physically on our campuses. Our community college district spans parts of 12 counties and 3000 square miles. 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. Our approaches to support our students may be drastically different depending on the geography associated with these experiences.</p> <p>Third, having this clarifying language ensures additional survey reliability and validity across respondents and institutions —students will be answering and interpreting the questions more consistently. Without these language changes, the data provided by 4-year residential students will not be comparable to the data provided by commuter students at community colleges.</p>
------------	------------------	---

Mike Trame	Parkland College	<p>Feedback #3: 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.</p> <p>Rationale: Several community college student audience issues surfaced in our review of this draft. First, 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. We have significant concerns about providing a survey of this nature as written to minor students. We would like to see greater discussion of these issues as they pertain to minor students at Parkland and around the state.</p> <p>Second, there is a concern about the reading and comprehension level that will be needed to complete this survey accurately and to understand the yet-to-be-added informational sections. Not-yet-college-ready community college students may encounter comprehension challenges with these questions. This may skew the data collected. We recommend analyzing the reading comprehension level of the survey.</p> <p>Third, there was minimal community college voice in the initial creation of this survey despite the fact that a majority of the state's public higher education students are enrolled in community colleges. We request the addition of a significant community college practitioner representation to the Task Force and its survey working group during the editing and revision phase of this project.</p>
Mike Trame	Parkland College	<p>Feedback #4: We believe the state should provide language translations for the survey rather than encouraging institutions to provide these translations.</p> <p>Rationale: On page 46 in the implementation section, it calls for institutions to explore translations for the survey on their own. Providing standardized translations will provide more consistent and reliable data at the state level rather than the inconsistency introduced by having different translations at every institution. Creating individual translations at the institutional level is an inefficient use of state resources.</p> <p>Feedback #5: This comment period was too short and at a difficult time of year. Please extend it.</p> <p>Rationale: At community colleges, the teams that address these topics and do the frontline work in this field are very small. Team members have many other duties and responsibilities. The comment period ran for only 10 days, 2 of which were weekend days at the end of the fiscal year and right before a federal holiday when vacations are prevalent. Both the time of year and the</p>

		short duration for the comment period will minimize the quality and the quantity of feedback being provided by the community college sector.
		Recommend that the IBHE budgets funding for any costs associated with administering, promoting or otherwise implementing the surveys.

Emily Babb	Northwestern University	<p>We would like to thank the Task Force on Campus Sexual Misconduct Climate Surveys for its work on this draft Task Force Report and the opportunity to submit a public comment regarding the Report. We acknowledge and appreciate the time and efforts of the task force members in preparing this draft. Below is Part 1 of our comment and a second form submission will include additional feedback.</p> <p>Implementation</p> <p>To begin, we want to share feedback on the implementation of the proposed climate survey instrument. 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. The instrument does not address who will have access to the data or how those individuals will use the data. Some information on this should be added to the introduction of the survey. While the survey introduction states that it will take 15-20 minutes to complete, we believe the timing will be longer. We recommend either the length of the survey be modified to meet the 15-20 minute timeframe or the statement more accurately reflect the time it will take. Further, we noted that the Draft Report survey instrument proposes pop up boxes for definitions. Such functionality may be incompatible with accessible technology, such as screen readers. In addition, when key definitions are in pop up boxes versus the full text of the survey, the survey validity may be questioned as respondents could elect not to view the definitions of conduct about which they are asked to respond. We would recommend removing the pop up boxes from the survey and integrating all definitions into the body of the survey. Finally, we strongly encourage the Task Force to provide the survey in additional languages to ensure the administration of the survey meets the vast and varying student body populations of Illinois colleges and universities.</p> <p>Methodology</p>
------------	-------------------------	---

		<p>Next, we want to share feedback on the methodology of the survey. On Page 8 of the Task Force report, there is a reference to an institutional preparedness survey in which Illinois institutions shared that their top concerns about the survey were frequency, survey fatigue, and low response rates. We would concur with those concerns. An annual survey, particularly with a time frame that does not align with the academic year, does not reflect the manner in which student respondents experience conduct on campus. We recommend a survey administration every 2 -3 years. Further, with regard to demographic questions, we are concerned that small numbers in marginalized demographic areas may either be ignored or combined with larger categories inappropriately. We suggest the Task Force re-examine and reconsider the demographic questions. In addition, while the survey requests the age of the respondent, it does not ask the year in school (only the date of first enrollment) nor ask about whether the individual is an undergraduate, graduate, or professional student. We recommend adding a question regarding year in school and classification (undergraduate, graduate, etc.). Finally, the methodology does not specifically address how the survey responses for institutions will be aggregated to examine potential trends. We recommend that the Task Force develop a process for pooling results of core questions to analyze broader trends beyond the single institutions.</p>
--	--	--

Emily Babb	Northwestern University	<p>We would like to thank the Task Force on Campus Sexual Misconduct Climate Surveys for its work on this draft Task Force Report and the opportunity to submit a public comment regarding the Report. We acknowledge and appreciate the time and efforts of the task force members in preparing this draft. Below is Part 2 of our comment and a previous form submission includes additional feedback.</p> <p>Survey Instrument</p> <p>Finally, we have reviewed the survey instrument questions and have the following feedback on the survey content. Many institutions have made the practice of placing demographic questions at the end of the survey as they tend to feel more intrusive to respondents, be more sensitive in nature, and can trigger feelings of stereotype threat in respondents. We recommend moving the demographic information to the end of the survey. 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. While the introduction provides a customizable area to provide institutional contact information for reporting, the introduction does not offer any information on support resources and institutions should have an opportunity to add such information to the introduction.</p> <p>Closing</p> <p>The comment period was opened for 10 days during summer break and we encourage the Task Force to consider extending the public comment period, which would invite broader participation from faculty and students who are otherwise unavailable during the summer. In addition, we encourage the task force to invite college and university employees with responsibilities around survey administration and Title IX to listening sessions regarding this proposed climate survey to allow for further discussion.</p>
------------	-------------------------	---

Mark Griffin	Moody Bible Institute	<p>Part 1 of 2</p> <p>To the Task Force on Campus Sexual Misconduct Climate Surveys,</p> <p>My name is Mark Griffin, and I am the Director of Title IX at Moody Bible Institute in Chicago. Please let the following serve as a public comment to the proposed base campus sexual misconduct climate survey that was created under 110 ILCS 155/35. First, thank you to the members of the Task Force for the time, energy, and thought that went into preparing the proposed base survey. For several years, Moody Bible Institute, on its own volition, has conducted campus climate surveys specifically about sexual harassment and sexual violence matters in a way to better understand the Moody community so that we can address areas of need to help our students, faculty, and staff access Moody's programs and activities in a safe, welcoming, and Christ-honoring environment.</p> <p>After reviewing the proposed base climate survey, Moody is raising the following concerns.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The length of the base survey creates a barrier to robust student involvement. There is a minimum of 26 questions and a maximum of 87 depending on how the respondent answers, with an additional 100 sub-questions. The proposed opening statement indicates the survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete. It is our opinion that the length is unreasonable for most students to complete on a voluntary basis. Sample sizes will be greatly reduced due to the lack of interest by most students in completing such a lengthy and time-consuming process. A survey that takes approximately 5-7 minutes is much more reasonable. In addition, survey fatigue among students will limit engagement with this sexual misconduct survey, especially if it remains at the current length. The current length will also practically eliminate the opportunity for schools to add specific questions of their own due to the increased time commitment in filling out the survey. 2. Moody has concerns that many of the questions are not trauma informed. Asking general questions about the number and types of incidents in a high-level format is reasonable. However, the granular nature of some of the questions asking for specific details seems to invite a student to relive the sexual misconduct in an unhelpful manner. Sections VI, VII, VIII, IX of the survey are examples of the unnecessary specificity in and number of questions. We understand that the data point might be informative in addressing a specific situation or type of behavior. However, balancing that benefit with the cost of student well-being shows that the specificity and number
--------------	-----------------------	---

		<p>are not necessary in this base survey. While having counselors available to help students who fill out the survey is a sound recommendation, Moody believes that eliminating most of the activity-specific questions will alleviate this potential for retraumatization.</p> <p>3. Specific language in questions:</p> <p>a. Question 82.b “Believing your report” is complainant sided language that could expose schools to allegations of bias in the conduct processes like Title IX. This question could be made more neutral by “Taking your report seriously.”</p> <p>b. Question 85.a-c uses the word “retaliation” in a factual manner that implies this to always be considered “retaliation.” There are circumstances in which it would not be retaliation. Suggestion to change the word to “responded” to more accurately represent both types of situations.</p> <p>c. Questions 28, 40, 53, and 66 refer to the survey respondent’s alcohol usage, yet did not include anything about using drugs or alcohol without their consent.</p> <p>4. 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 Moody’s Christian beliefs on biblical human sexuality, the created order of men and women, and God’s design for sex and marriage.</p>
--	--	--

Mark Griffin	Moody Bible Institute	<p>Part 2 of 2</p> <p>We recognize that some of these questions are notated with “modifiable by institution,” however, many are not so denoted (Questions 3, 26, 38, 51, 64, 83(j)). For example, we object to Section V. There are other ways to ask about a student’s knowledge of the definition of consent without assuming the presence of sexual activity in a mainly pre-marriage population. Moreover, a great majority of the community population in religious school would find the specific questions graphic, objectionable, and harmful. Moody does not believe that the state should compel speech that goes against Moody’s religious beliefs. Doing so would implicate the First Amendment protection of speech and religion.</p> <p>Moody suggests that the Task Force creates a base survey that complies with the statutory elements in 110 ILCS 155/35(f) that is significantly shorter in length than the proposed survey. This will allow institutions to add questions that will aid it in addressing school-specific concerns. A shorter base survey will also promote more student engagement and create less of a risk of retraumatization. Finally, Moody asks the Task Force to create a base survey that recognizes the many religious schools in Illinois by allowing for more questions to be modifiable by the institution or eliminated altogether. This will protect the freedom of speech and the free exercise of religion of these schools while still fulfilling the intent of the statute.</p> <p>Thank you for reviewing this public comment. I would be happy to engage with the Task Force on these issues further.</p> <p>God bless you,</p> <p>Mark Griffin, J.D. Director of Title IX Moody Bible Institute</p>
--------------	-----------------------	---

Kelly Maginot	University of Illinois Chicago	<p>Thank you for the time and labor you have put into creating this survey, which will provide invaluable data to institutions on how to better serve survivors and prevent future harm. I especially appreciate the section on how harm can affect survivors' experiences of belonging, sense of safety, and academic performance on campus. (Ideally, I would like to see the survey go to students who are away from the institution as well, to catch a more robust sample of those affected.) Would it be useful to include a pop-up definition of "accommodations?"</p> <p>I also appreciate the section on institutional responses to reporting, which may yield evidence of both institutional betrayal and institutional courage. One question here (pages 39-41): what is the benefit of using yes/no responses rather than a larger range? People may struggle to answer this if they have gotten support within one arena of the institution but felt unsupported by another.</p> <p>Following Question #88 (pg. 42), I would appreciate an assessment of these materials. If students are receiving trainings, materials, information, etc., how much are they learning from these? How effective are the tools that they are given? I am sure most students will mark "yes" to some of these points because of mandated online trainings required for registration, but in practice many students argue that the trainings are ineffective or trivial.</p> <p>I also appreciate the implementation and recruitment suggestions at the end of the report, especially (1) the last bullet point under "Student Recruitment/Outreach" and (2) the Diversity-Specific Recommendations (pages 47-48). In regard to "Making clear to students the value of completing the survey and what impact their participation will have to their campus," will this be added to the introduction to the survey (page 1)?</p> <p>After the subsections on forms of gender-based violence, the heading explains "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? Additionally, the introduction to the section on Sexual Violence (p. 33) explains "The following questions concern sexual experiences that you may have had that were unwanted. They are detailed and ask about specific types of touching. We know that these are personal questions, so we did not ask your name or other identifying information. Your information is completely anonymous. We hope that this helps you to feel comfortable answering each question, but you do not have to." While this note is appreciated, I wonder why a similar note wasn't written attached to Dating/Domestic</p>
---------------	--------------------------------	--

		<p>Violence, Stalking, or Sexual Harassment, all of which can be equally harmful to survivors.</p> <p>I appreciate bullet points j & k on page 40 ("Did the institution play a role by ... Responding differently to your experience/s based on your racial or ethnic background, based on your sexual orientation or gender identity?") Could an additional bullet point be added for disability status? Also, will the survey go to only undergraduate students? If not, could student status (part/full time, graduate, professional, undergraduate, international) be added to the Demographics section?</p> <p>Finally, I wonder if a couple bullet points could be added within the sexual harassment section addressing intersections, for example between racism, sexism, parenting status, and ableism. Point #5 on p. 46 speaks to this - given that defining and recognizing sexual harassment, especially as it intersects with other forms of oppression, can be difficult, I would want participants to be able to speak clearly to the harms they experience and show through this survey that we as institutions know they are interconnected.</p> <p>Thank you again for the opportunity to comment and for this work! I look forward to seeing the process move fwd.</p>
--	--	--