



Approved
May 3, 2023

TASK FORCE ON CAMPUS SEXUAL MISCONDUCT CLIMATE SURVEYS

Minutes - February 8, 2023

The fifth meeting of the Task Force on Campus Sexual Misconduct Climate Surveys was called to order at 1:30 p.m. via video conference as permitted by Public Act 101-0640 enacted June 12, 2020. Other IBHE staff members were present at the IBHE office.

The following Task Force members were present: Ginger Ostro (Chair), Brenda Angulo, Madeline Behr, Natalie Bennett, Elizabeth Cook, Allison Decker, Alison Hill, Patricia Hindo, Julia Howland, Senator Cristina Pacione-Zayas, Mindy Schneiderman, Radhika Sharma, Kathryn Statz, Representative Katie Stuart, and Jarrett Williams.

The following Task Force members were absent: Megan Greeson, Representative Norine Hammond, Jaya Kolisetty, Jessica Magliocco, Jasmine Routon, Nabilah Talib, Samir Tanna, and Senator Jil Tracy.

Others present: Melissa Van (IBHE), Ashley Lewis (IBHE), and David Antonacci.

The meeting was recorded, and the recording has been posted on the IBHE website.

A. Call to Order and Approval of Meeting Minutes

- **Call Meeting to Order by Chairperson Ginger Ostro**

New Chairperson Ostro called the meeting order, explained the Open Meetings Act (OMA) protocol, and stated that the meeting would be recorded.

- **Change in Chairperson and Introductions**

Chairperson Ostro explained to the Task Force that former Chairperson Sophia Gehlhausen has resigned from her position at IBHE and will no longer serve on the Task Force. Task Force members then introduced themselves and gave one key goal that each person has for the Task Force.

- **Review and Approval of January 11, 2023 Meeting Minutes**

Chairperson Ostro confirmed that we had a quorum of members. The minutes from the January 11, 2023 Task Force meeting were approved by a roll call vote.

B. Overview of Example Surveys





Chairperson Ostro called upon Ashley Lewis to share her analysis of the example survey instruments (ARC3, AAU, HEDS, and NIU) that she sent to the Task Force. She noted that each of the surveys had wide variations in sections (modules) and items (questions). This shows that the surveys cover the same topic in widely different ways. Ashley also looked at the basic characteristics of the surveys created by New Hampshire and Massachusetts who have a similar mandate to Illinois. New Hampshire has 10 sections in their survey while Massachusetts only has three. New Hampshire also has many more items (questions) than Massachusetts. Ashley has spoken to a group of counterparts in other states that includes New Hampshire and found that New Hampshire, which has already implemented their survey, has been receiving feedback that the survey is too long.

Ashley showed the Task Force a document that she created that analyzes the survey requirements under P.A. 102-0325 and whether each survey meets the requirement. She went through several subsections in the law that no survey fully met. Julia Howland noted that it would be easy to provide a list of resources and information to meet the needs of two of the subsections ((6) and (7)) to every institution with the survey. She indicated that it could be a standalone sheet and not part of the survey itself. Mindy Schneiderman pointed out that several subsections only apply to students who have experienced sexual misconduct and, if not enough students responded, the sections would not provide usable data.

C. Review of Campus Sexual Misconduct Surveys Considering the Task Force's Guiding Principles

Ashley introduced a JamBoard activity that re-examined the Task Force's Guiding Principles considering everything learned since the beginning of the Task Force. The Guiding Principles and questions were:

- Guiding Principle 1: The dual purpose of the Campus Sexual Misconduct Climate Survey is to hold institutions accountable for the impact of their campus climates on student safety, wellness, and retention; and to ensure public access to accurate data on reports of sexual misconduct at institutions of higher education.
 - Question: In what ways did you see the example surveys address student safety, wellness, and retention in Guiding Principle 1.
 - Comments:
 - i. Concern about intrusive questions.
 - ii. Questions on perceptions of retaliation could be asked more specifically around the idea of institutional betrayal.
 - iii. Centering survey design around those impacted while also being sensitive to not re-traumatize.
 - iv. Retention elements not clearly articulated.



- v. Broader questions needed that might find students who leave once they transfer.
 - vi. Liked ARC3 for capturing student retention.
- Guiding Principle 2: The instructions and content of the survey instrument will use intentional, direct, and inclusive language designed to understand students' experiences of sexual misconduct and the impact of those experiences, and students' knowledge of and access to campus resources.
 - Question: Based on your review of the example surveys, is the language in the surveys intentional, direct, and inclusive? Why or why not?
 - Comments:
 - i. Demographic response options should be in alphabetical order.
 - ii. Were the surveys administered online or hard copy? The format/platform could make a difference.
 - iii. Some surveys have too many questions. Will get a bigger response rate if surveys are smaller.
 -
- Guiding Principle 3: The survey will be optional, anonymous, accessible to respondents with different identities and abilities, trauma informed, and to the greatest extent possible, not trauma inducing.
 - Question: After your analysis of the example surveys, are there aspects that make the survey accessible and trauma-informed? Please elaborate.
 - Comments:
 - i. Liked focus on campus being able to allocate resources for victims (counseling).
 - ii. One survey had highly specific questions that drilled down on where and when the incident occurred. This is highly trauma inducing.
 - iii. Some questions had victim blaming framing, ex. "Had you been using alcohol."
 - iv. Questions related to alcohol use not recommended.
 - v. Survey should include who to contact if survey induces trauma.
 - vi. Avoid why questions.
- Guiding Principle 5: The survey will be concise and focused on producing actionable, easy-to-understand results that inform institutional practices and policies to improve responses to and prevent future incidences of sexual misconduct on campuses.
 - Question: Based on your review of the example surveys, are there aspects of the surveys that are concise, clear, and actionable? Please elaborate.
 - Comments:
 - i. Shorter survey produces more results.

- ii. Need a balance-enough information to make the survey actionable but not too much that stops students from completing.
- iii. Appreciated surveys trying to learn whether perpetrators were students or staff but this made the survey very long.
- iv. Need to know who the perpetrators were to focus training for appropriate audience. (I'm guessing they mean staff or student not the name.)

D. Discussion of Massachusetts' Task Force Report

Ashley began the discussion by asking Task Force members what stood out to them about the Massachusetts report. Mindy Schneiderman said she thought Massachusetts's approach was good and made sense to her. Brenda Angulo commented about the feasibility of the incentive recommendations in Massachusetts' report and noted that her institution made it a requirement to complete a survey before being able to register for classes. Mindy Schneiderman said she was told that public universities cannot make taking a survey a requirement to register for classes, but she was not sure how true that is. Ashley said she would try to find out what the rules are regarding this. Elizabeth Cook said she appreciated that Massachusetts took time to analyze the tool that they were basing the survey on and gave alterations to questions as needed to follow Massachusetts law. Kathryn Statz noted that Massachusetts' recommendations said that the survey should be done once every four years and thought that flexibility was notable. She also said the Task Force needed to address the topic of survey fatigue.

Ashley noted that Massachusetts' base survey included a question on whether the student thinks that the sexual misconduct was related to an aspect of their identity (such as black, Hispanic, LGBTQ+ etc.). Madeline Behr said that sexual harm disproportionately affects people in marginalized communities, and she thought questions like that could bring to light the oppression and power dynamics at a play. However, she was concerned that the question as written may be too direct. Mindy Schneiderman said she liked the question and that another survey at NIU asks that question. She said that there is another way to get the information by analyzing the demographics of survey respondents. Ashley asked if the Task Force thought that having a question like that would harm students' perceptions of trust towards their institution. Elizabeth Cooks said she didn't think the question had anything to do with how the student interacted with their institution, but more so with how they interacted with their experience and how it impacted them. Kathryn Statz agreed with Elizabeth but believed that some surveys did not allow students to opt out of the question and that would be something that should be allowed for the Illinois survey. Mindy Schneiderman said that students can skip all questions on NIU survey and that IRB said you must allow students to do that.



Ashley asked if having the ability to skip questions or reply “prefer not to answer” is a way to help make sure the survey is not trauma inducing. Mindy Schneiderman said that yes, but the questions are specific because that is what the institution needs to understand in order to make changes. Resources for help are given to those who may be triggered, and students can stop taking the survey. She doesn’t see how we could get around asking specifics. She did not know of any NIU student filing a complaint about its questions. Madeline Behr said that the level of detail and specificity in the questions is important because it will help universities target prevention programs and get better understanding of where these incidents are occurring. These questions are necessary to make things actionable. Explaining why asking detailed questions and their purpose may help make the survey be more trauma informed. Mindy Schneiderman asked why we couldn’t do that in the instructions or have a blanket statement at the beginning of the survey. Madeline Behr agreed but also said that some questions that may need further explanation. Brenda Angulo felt the questions were too intrusive and would not help the universities or be useful. Natalie Bennett mentioned that during recruitment we might be able to educate people on why the survey is important and we could also get a sense of what questions students may not be willing to answer.

E. Public Comment

- **Call for Public Comment by Chairperson Ostro**

Chairperson Ostro announced at the beginning of the meeting how to sign up to give public comment. Chairperson Ostro called for public comment, but no one signed up.

F. Next Steps

- **Next Steps by Chairperson Ostro**

Chairperson Ostro said we would want to come back to discuss implementation and look particularly at New Hampshire because they have specifics about implementation. We are beginning to see themes coming through in alignment with the Guiding Principles so we can start putting some information on paper that may become recommendations.

