



Comparison of CMU and AAU Findings

Janel Sutkus
Director, Institutional Research and Analysis
88729, jsutkus@cmu.edu

Background

This document is a comparison of two reports prepared by Westat, an independent research company contracted by the AAU to administer this survey.

*Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Misconduct
by Westat (Cantor, et al).*

and
*Report on the AAU Campus Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Misconduct, Carnegie Mellon University
by Westat (Cantor, et al).*

based upon surveys administered during Spring 2019 across the AAU and at CMU.

I created this report to facilitate understanding of each set of results, but have not duplicated content from the Westat reports, such as methodology, design, procedures, and response rates. Please refer to either report for detailed information.

For the purpose of interpretation, the CMU response rate allows generalization to the CMU sub-populations referred to by Westat as men, women, and TR/NB (transgender and non-binary students). Further, Westat's non-response bias analysis found no evidence that responders' sexual assault and misconduct experiences would differ from non-responders' experiences in any of the subgroups (gender X degree level).

Each table in this report shows the number of corresponding data tables in the CMU report and the AAU report. Please see these reports for more detailed results.

Note on Comparisons

For each of the four categories of experiences (nonconsensual sexual contact, intimate partner violence, sexual harassment, and stalking) as well as perceptions of personal risk of sexual assault or other misconduct, I have provided the range and distribution of institutional rates across the AAU participants (shown in red text). Please note that these statistics are not reported consistently across all experiences.

Participating in a multi-university study provides an opportunity for comparison, however; readers are cautioned in how they interpret those comparisons. While CMU's prevalence rates are generally lower than or similar to those reported across participating institutions, these are nonetheless sobering statistics. *It would be inappropriate to presume that these comparisons suggest we are doing well or even good enough.*

Prior CMU Studies

CMU conducted our own [Sexual Assault and Relationship Violence \(SARV\)](#) Studies in Spring 2015 and again in Fall 2017. The full report from each of these studies is available on the Office of Title IX Initiatives website. The SARV studies have proven both informative and beneficial in our on-going efforts. We chose to participate in the AAU project to collaborate with the AAU and member universities in a nationwide effort to combat sexual violence and sexual misconduct through public health research. As AAU President Mary Sue Coleman stated, "The data are not only for our Universities but will also inform policymakers and the American people."¹

¹ AAU Press release: <https://www.aau.edu/newsroom/press-releases/aau-announces-2019-survey-sexual-assault-and-misconduct>

Nonconsensual sexual contact by physical force or inability to consent or stop what was happening

Survey items and definitions

To be counted as having experienced this type of incident, the respondent had to answer 'yes' to one of five different questions about two different types of sexual contact – penetration and sexual touching. The survey defined each of these as:

Penetration:

- *putting a penis, finger, or object inside someone else's vagina or anus*
- *when someone's mouth or tongue makes contact with someone else's genitals*

Sexual touching:

- *kissing*
- *touching someone's breast, chest, crotch, groin, or buttocks*
- *grabbing, groping, or rubbing against the other in a sexual way, even if over the other's clothes*

The prevalence rates in this section refer to sexual contact that occurred because the perpetrator used physical force or the respondent was unable to consent.

Physical force was defined on the survey as *someone holding you down with his or her body weight, pinning your arms, hitting or kicking you, or using or threatening to use a weapon against you.*

The **inability to consent or stop what was happening** was defined with the following introduction:

The next questions ask about incidents when you were unable to consent or stop what was happening because you were passed out, asleep, or incapacitated due to drugs or alcohol. Please include incidents even if you are not sure what happened.

If the student reported both penetration and sexual touching in the same incident, the penetration was counted in the estimates. This hierarchy rule conforms to the counting rules used by schools in disclosing the annual crime statistics required under the Clery Act.

Prevalence of nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or inability to consent

Nonconsensual sexual contact (penetration or sexual touching) by physical force or inability to consent since enrolling

CMU tables 3.1 through 3.5; AAU tables 5 through 10

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	18.6%	5.8%	4.8%	1.8%	9.3%	
AAU (includes CMU)	25.9%	9.6%	6.8%	2.5%	20.3%	

CMU's rate for nonconsensual sexual contact (penetration or sexual touching) by physical force or inability to consent since enrolling among undergraduate women is 18.6%

Individual institutional rates among undergraduate women range from 14% to 33%:

Five institutions had rates between 14 and 20%

Sixteen institutions had rates between 21 and 25%

Twelve institutions had rates between 26 and 32%

Penetration by physical force or inability to consent since enrolling

CMU tables 3.1 through 3.5; AAU tables 5 through 10

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	10.1%	2.4%	2.1%	1.0%	3.4%	
AAU (includes CMU)	12.7%	4.6%	2.1%	1.0%	10.7%	

Penetration by physical force since enrolling

CMU tables 3.1 through 3.5; AAU tables 5 through 10

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	5.7%	1.2%	0.8%	0.6%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	7.3%	2.5%	1.3%	0.5%	7.2%	

Penetration by inability to consent since enrolling

CMU tables 3.1 through 3.5; AAU tables 5 through 10

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	4.8%	1.2%	0.9%	0.5%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	5.4%	2.1%	1.7%	0.4%	4.6%	

Sexual touching by physical force or inability to consent since enrolling

CMU tables 3.1 through 3.5; AU tables 5 through 10

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	13.8%	4.3%	3.5%	1.2%	9.3%	
AAU (includes CMU)	19.5%	6.9%	5.0%	1.8%	14.8%	

Sexual touching by physical force since enrolling

CMU tables 3.1 through 3.5; AAU tables 5 through 10

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	8.3%	4.3%	1.7%	0.8%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	14.8%	5.2%	3.3%	1.3%	10.4%	

Sexual touching by inability to consent since enrolling

CMU tables 3.1 through 3.5; AAU tables 5 through 10

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	6.3%	0.7%	1.8%	0.4%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	6.4%	2.1%	1.9%	0.5%	5.7%	

Rates for current year compared to since enrollment for undergraduate women

The rates by class year are disaggregated by time frame (current year compared to since entering). The **current year rates** provide a profile of how risk varies by school year. Prior research has found that first-year undergraduate women are at higher risk than upperclass women, particularly in the time between orientation and Thanksgiving (the 'red zone'). These data indicate no statistical difference in prevalence for first-year undergraduate women compared to fourth-year or higher undergraduate women.

CMU table 3.6; AAU table 14

	UG women 1 st year	UG women 2 nd year	UG women 3 rd year	UG women 4 th year
CMU	6.4%	10.9%	7.0%	5.7%
AAU (includes CMU)	16.0%	13.8%	11.5%	11.2%

The measure '**since entering**' provides a cumulative rate in which each year in school equals a longer time period during which an incident could occur. Estimates for women in their fourth year or higher represent the cumulative risk that undergraduate women experience during their college career. There is a statistical difference between undergraduates in their first and fourth or higher year of school, with a cumulative risk of one in four for CMU and one in three for the AAU that penetration or sexual touching by physical force or inability to consent will occur.

CMU table 3.6; AAU table 14

	UG women 1 st year	UG women 2 nd year	UG women 3 rd year	UG women 4 th year
CMU	6.4%	20.1%	23.4%	23.3%
AAU (includes CMU)	16.4%	22.6%	27.1%	32.7%

Characteristics of offenders for nonconsensual sexual contact involving physical force or inability to consent

When asked the affiliation of the offender, all respondents selected CMU student, person not affiliated with CMU, or unsure of the affiliation. None of the other categories received any responses (student teaching assistant, faculty or instructor, research staff, other staff or administrator, coach or trainer, or alumni).

CMU table 3.9; AAU table 18

Indicated the perpetrator was a student at the same institution			
	Penetration	Sexual touching	Penetration or sexual touching
CMU women	76.1%	90.6%	
AAU women (includes CMU)	73.3%	78.3%	
CMU men			56.9%
AAU men (includes CMU)			77.8%

Contacting a program or resource and reasons for not contacting a program or resource

Students contacted a program or resource (not the same as making an official report) for fewer than half of incidents of nonconsensual sexual contact. CMU women are much more likely to contact a program or resource for an incident involving penetration by physical force than for penetration by inability to consent or for sexual touching. CMU men use programs and resources at extremely low rates.

CMU table 3.14; AAU table 21

	Penetration by physical force	Penetration by inability to consent	Sexual touching	Penetration	Sexual touching
CMU women	49.7%	19.0%	14.1%		
AAU women (includes CMU)	36.5%	24.5%	12.3%		
CMU men				3.6%	11.2%
AAU men (includes CMU)				17.7%	9.8%

When asked why they did not contact a program or resource, the most common response for both CMU women and men was *I thought I could handle it myself* and *I did not think it was serious enough to contact programs or resources*, regardless of type of nonconsensual sexual contact. No men selected *I did not know where to go or who to tell* for any type of nonconsensual sexual contact, and fewer than 10% of women selected that option as a result of sexual touching.

CMU table 3.14; AAU table 21

Nonconsensual sexual contact by coercion and without active, ongoing voluntary agreement

Survey items and definitions

Coercion

For purposes of the survey, coercion was defined as *threatening serious non-physical harm or promising rewards such that you felt you must comply*. Examples include:

- *threatening to give you bad grades or cause trouble for you at work*
- *promising good grades or a promotion at work*
- *threatening to share damaging information about you with your family, friends, or authority figures*
- *threatening to post damaging information about you online*

If a respondent reported that the incident was part of a previously reported incident involving physical force or inability to consent, the event was not counted as coercion. Rates for coercion are the lowest among the other forms of nonconsensual sexual contact. Since entering CMU, 0.9% of undergraduate women reported they experienced penetration or sexual touching involving coercion. (CMU table 4.1)

Without active, ongoing voluntary agreement

A fourth form of nonconsensual sexual contact measured on the survey were incidents that occurred without active, ongoing voluntary agreement. These items were developed to capture school regulations that make it a violation if both partners in a sexual encounter do not explicitly consent. These were defined as incidents that occur *without your active, ongoing voluntary agreement*. Examples include someone:

- *initiating sexual activity despite your refusal*
- *ignoring your cues to stop or slow down*
- *went ahead without checking in or while you were still deciding*
- *otherwise failed to obtain your consent*

If this type of incident occurred as part of a previously reported incident involving physical force, inability to consent, or coercion, the event was not counted as without active, ongoing voluntary agreement

Penetration or sexual touching without active, ongoing voluntary consent since enrolling

CMU table 4.1; AAU table 25

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	11.7%	4.5%	2.5%	1.1%	20.6%	
AAU (includes CMU)	12.9%	5.9%	3.1%	1.6%	15.9%	

Total experience with nonconsensual sexual contact

To assess the overall risk of nonconsensual sexual contact, rates were estimated that combine the two behaviors that constitute sexual contact (penetration and sexual touching) and the four tactics discussed above (physical force or threat of physical force; inability to consent or stop what was happening; coercion; and without active, ongoing voluntary agreement) in several different ways. These rates were estimated for the period since enrolling in school. The first two sets of estimates include two of the four tactics (i.e., physical force and inability to consent or stop what was happening) for the two behaviors (i.e., penetration and sexual touching). The remaining estimates add in the other types of nonconsensual sexual contact previously discussed above.

Completed penetration using physical force or inability to consent or stop what was happening since enrolling

CMU tables 4.7 and 4.8; AAU tables 34 and 35

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	8.6%	2.2%	1.4%	0.9%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	10.9%	4.0%	2.5%	0.8%	10.9%	6.8%

Completed sexual touching using physical force or inability to consent or stop what was happening since enrolling

CMU tables 4.7 and 4.8; AAU tables 34 and 35

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	13.8%	4.3%	3.5%	1.2%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	19.6%	6.9%	5.0%	1.8%	16.7%	10.4%

Completed or attempted penetration using physical force and completed penetration using inability to consent or stop what was happening, coercion, or without active, ongoing voluntary agreement since enrolling

CMU tables 4.7 and 4.8; AAU tables 34 and 35

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	13.0%	4.6%	2.5%	1.6%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	16.2%	6.6%	3.8%	1.4%	18.7%	12.2%

Completed sexual touching using physical force, inability to consent or stop what was happening, coercion, or without active, ongoing voluntary agreement since enrolling

CMU tables 4.7 and 4.8; AAU tables 34 and 35

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	18.1%	7.0%	5.1%	1.6%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	24.5%	9.6%	6.7%	2.8%	23.8%	15.4%

Any type of nonconsensual sexual contact since enrolling (comparison not available)

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	23.5%	9.3%	6.3%	2.7%	25.6%	

To standardize for the time period and get an overall picture of the cumulative rate for a student’s career, estimates are provided for undergraduate students in their fourth year or higher.

Completed nonconsensual contact by force or inability to consent

CMU table 4.9; AAU table 33

	UG women 4 th year	UG men 4 th year
CMU	22.7%	5.0%
AAU (includes CMU)	31.5%	8.4%

Completed or attempted penetration using physical force and completed penetration using inability to consent or stop what was happening, coercion, or without active, ongoing voluntary agreement

CMU table 4.9; AAU table 33

	UG women 4 th year	UG men 4 th year
CMU	29.6%	8.1%
AAU (includes CMU)	39.4%	11.7%

Frequency and nature of sexual harassment

Survey items and definitions

Harassment is defined as a series of behaviors that:

- interfered with the victim’s academic or professional performance,
- limited the victim’s ability to participate in an academic program, or
- created an intimidating, hostile, or offensive social, academic, or work environment.

This definition is consistent with many campus policies. It is also consistent with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the U.S. Department of Education’s definitions of “hostile environment.”

The specific behaviors referenced on the survey were taken from several different scales measuring harassment. The respondent was asked if *a student, or someone employed by or otherwise associated with [University] did the following:*

- *made sexual remarks or told jokes or stories that were insulting or offensive to you?*
- *made inappropriate or offensive comments about your or someone else’s body, appearance, or sexual activities?*
- *said crude or gross sexual things to you or tried to get you to talk about sexual matters when you did not want to?*
- *used social or on-line media to send offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures, or videos to you or about you that you did not want?*
- *continued to ask you to go out, get dinner, have drinks, or have sex even though you said, “No?”*

Respondents who answered ‘yes’ to one or more of these items were then asked whether these behaviors led to any of the following consequences:

- *interfered with your academic or professional performance*
- *limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or*
- *created an intimidating, hostile, or offensive social, academic, or work environment*

Prevalence of sexual harassment

Experienced at least one type of harassing behavior

CMU table 5.1; AAU table 36

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	54.6%	23.0%	37.9%	17.1%	58.3%	
AAU (includes CMU)	59.2%	36.6%	36.2%	23.0%	65.1%	53.4%

Heard sexual remarks or sexual jokes that were offensive to them

CMU table 5.1; AAU table 36

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	37.1%	15.1%	20.0%	8.2%	45.7%	
AAU (includes CMU)	42.0%	26.1%	18.3%	13.0%	49.4%	39.2%

Heard inappropriate or offensive comments about theirs or someone else’s body, appearance, or sexual activities

CMU table 5.1; AAU table 36

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	44.2%	15.7%	31.9%	12.8%	43.1%	
AAU (includes CMU)	42.0%	26.1%	18.3%	13.0%	56.1%	43.3%

Had crude or gross sexual comments made to them or someone tried to get them to talk about sexual matters when they didn’t want to

CMU table 5.1; AAU table 36

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	20.9%	7.9%	11.9%	4.4%	23.6%	
AAU (includes CMU)	25.2%	12.0%	12.5%	7.6%	30.4%	20.6%

Harassment was defined as having one of these experiences and reporting that the behavior interfered with their academic or professional performance, limited their ability to participate in an academic program, or created an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment.

Experienced harassment

CMU table 5.1; AAU table 36

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	26.2%	11.8%	10.2%	6.6%	39.1%	
AAU (includes CMU)	31.3%	19.9%	10.1%	7.6%	46.3%	37.2%

CMU’s rate of harassment among all students is 13.8%

Individual institutional rates for harassment among all students range from 11% to 25%:

- Eleven institutions have rates between 11 and 17%
- Fifteen institutions have rates between 18 and 20%
- Seven institutions have rates between 21 and 25%

Contacting a program or resource and reasons for not contacting a program or resource

Contacting a program or resource (not the same as making an official report)

CMU table 5.2; AAU table 43

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	18.0%	12.2%	12.6%	13.1%	22.5%	
AAU (includes CMU)	14.1%		8.3%		21.0%	

Similar to responses for nonconsensual sexual contact, when asked why they did not contact a program or resource, the most common response for both women and men was *I thought I could handle it myself and I did not think it was serious enough to contact programs or resources.* (Table 5.2)

Characteristics of offenders for sexually harassing behaviors

Student indicated at least one offender was a student at the same institution

CMU table 5.4; AAU table 36

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	93.9%	86.0%	95.2%	77.2%	88.6%	
AAU (includes CMU)	93.1%	75.8%	92.6%	78.8%	98.6%	78.4%

Student indicated at least one offender was faculty or an instructor

CMU table 5.4; AAU table 36

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	6.4%	11.5%	2.7%	15.0%	17.9%	
AAU (includes CMU)	5.5%	24.0%	4.3%	18.2%	13.5%	33.3%

Student indicated at least one offender was a student teaching assistant

CMU table 5.4; AAU table 36

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	3.7%	12.6%	2.5%	11.0%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	2.8%	5.9%	2.0%	6.6%	6.0%	12.7%

Frequency and nature of intimate partner violence

Survey items and definitions

Intimate partner violence (IPV) refers to non-sexual violence among intimate partners. The section of the survey used to measure IPV was administered to students who said they had been in a partnered relationship since entering CMU. Partnered relationship was defined as including:

- marriage or civil union
- domestic partnership or cohabitation
- steady or serious relationship
- other ongoing relationship involving physical or sexual contact

The section of the survey on IPV included a series of items asking about different forms of non-sexual violence.

To be classified as having experienced **IPV**, respondents indicated that a partner had done one of the following:

- *controlled or tried to control you. Examples could be when someone:*
 - kept you from going to classes or pursuing your educational goals*
 - did not allow you to see or talk with friends or family*
 - made decisions for you, such as where you go or what you wear or eat*
 - threatened to “out” you to others*
- *threatened to physically harm you, someone you love, or him or herself*
- *used any kind of physical force against you or otherwise physically hurt or injured you.*
 - Examples could be when someone:*
 - bent your fingers or bit you*
 - choked, slapped, punched, or kicked you*
 - hit you with something other than a fist*
 - attacked you with a weapon*

Prevalence of intimate partner violence

Experienced at least one type of intimate partner violence, among students who indicated they had been in a partnered relationship,

CMU table 5.5; AAU table 38

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	12.0%	5.8%	10.3%	6.2%	18.8%	
AAU (includes CMU)	14.1%	7.0%	10.1%	5.9%	21.5%	11.8%

CMU's rate of intimate partner violence among all students is 8.9%

Individual institutional rates for intimate partner violence among all students range from 6% to 14%:

- Eight institutions have rates between 6 and 7%
- Fourteen institutions have rates between 8 and 10%
- Eleven institutions have rates between 11 and 14%

Experienced a partner trying to control them

CMU table 5.5; AAU table 38

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	8.4%	3.5%	5.6%	4.4%	7.0%	
AAU (includes CMU)	10.0%	4.7%	6.6%	3.8%	15.3%	8.1%

Experienced physical force or were otherwise hurt or injured

CMU table 5.5; AAU table 38

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	3.5%	1.9%	4.4%	1.3%	10.9%	
AAU (includes CMU)	4.3%	2.4%	3.6%	2.0%	7.0%	5.7%

Contacting a program or resource and reasons for not contacting a program or resource

Contacting a program or resource (not the same as making an official report)

CMU table 5.6; AAU table 43

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	27.4%	23.0%	23.1%	18.3%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	21.3%		14.8%		29.6%	

Similar to responses for nonconsensual sexual contact and sexual harassment, when asked why they did not contact a program or resources, the most common response for both women and men was *I thought I could handle it myself and I did not think it was serious enough to contact programs or resources.*

CMU table 5.6; AAU table 43

Frequency and nature of stalking

Survey items and definitions

To be considered stalking, the behavior had to occur more than once and be committed by the same person or persons. In addition, these behaviors had to make the victim either afraid for their personal safety or cause substantial emotional distress.

To measure **stalking behavior**, respondents were first asked whether someone:

- *made unwanted phone calls; sent emails, voice, text, or instant messages to you; or posted unwanted messages, pictures, or videos on social media to or about you or elsewhere online*
- *showed up somewhere uninvited or waited for you when you did not want that person to be there*
- *spied on, watched, or followed you in person, or monitored your activities or tracked your location using devices or software on your phone or computer*

Respondents who reported that one or more of these behaviors occurred were then asked if one person had done any of these things on more than one occasion. Those who said 'yes' were then asked if these behaviors made them afraid for their personal safety or caused them substantial emotional distress.

Prevalence of experiencing stalking

Experienced at least one type of stalking behavior since enrolling

CMU table 5.9; AAU table 40

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	18.6%	12.5%	13.5%	5.3%	5.1%	
AAU (includes CMU)	24.7%	12.9%	13.1%	6.0%	27.7%	18.4%

Experienced at least one of these behaviors committed by someone more than once which resulted in making them afraid for their safety and/or caused substantial emotional distress

CMU table 5.9; AAU table 40

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	8.8%	4.7%	3.4%	1.7%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	10.0%	5.9%	3.1%	1.8%	15.2%	8.5%

CMU's rate of experiencing among all students is 4.4%

The overall AAU rate for experiencing stalking is 5.8% (range of individual institutional rates are not provided)

Contacting a program or resource and reasons for not contacting a program or resource

Contacted a program or resource (not the same as making an official report)

CMU table 5.10; AAU table 43

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	34.8%	33.6%	44.0%	49.5%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	28.3%		29.2%		32.9%	

Similar to responses for nonconsensual sexual contact, sexual harassment, and intimate partner violence, when asked why they did not contact a program or resources, the most common response for both women and men was *I thought I could handle it myself and I did not think it was serious enough to contact programs or resources.*

CMU table 5.10; AAU table 43

Characteristics of offenders for stalking

Student indicated at least one offender was a student at the same institution

CMU table 5.12; AAU table 40

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	87.1%	45.4%	80.8%	27.4%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	74.5%	53.8%	76.6%	54.0%	71.5%	48.2%

Student indicated at least one offender was a person not associated with their institution

CMU table 5.12; AAU table 40

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	19.2%	37.5%	23.2%	44.6%	suppressed	
AAU (includes CMU)	23.3%	32.3%	20.2%	26.5%	30.9%	40.4%

**Perceptions of campus response to sexual assault and other misconduct,
personal risk, and community connection and support**

Perceived response to a report of sexual assault or other misconduct

Believe it is very or extremely likely that campus officials would take a report of sexual assault or misconduct seriously

CMU table 1.1; AAU table 55

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	58.6%	70.5%	78.4%	84.7%	46.1%	
AAU (includes CMU)	53.5%	60.2%	74.8%	76.7%	43.7%	48.6%

Believe that it is very or extremely likely that the campus officials would conduct a fair investigation of a report of sexual assault or misconduct

CMU table 1.1; AAU table 55

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	46.0%	63.3%	61.1%	75.0%	29.8%	
AAU (includes CMU)	40.5%	47.0%	57.0%	60.4%	27.5%	30.0%

Perceptions of personal risk of sexual assault or other misconduct

Believe sexual assault or other sexual misconduct is very or extremely problematic at their university

CMU table 1.3; AAU table 48

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	15.7%	5.7%	10.9%	5.0%	20.7%	
AAU (includes CMU)	36.0%	20.6%	20.2%	14.3%	44.8%	38.6%

Overall, 9.4% of CMU students believe sexual assault or other sexual misconduct is very or extremely problematic at their university

Individual institutional rates for the same level of belief range from 8% to 41%:

Nine institutions are between 8 and 18%

Eighteen institutions are between 19 and 30%

Six institutions are rates between 31 and 41%

Think it is very or extremely likely they will experience sexual assault or other misconduct in the future while enrolled

CMU table 1.3; AAU table 48

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	7.2%	1.4%	1.6%	0.5%	11.0%	
AAU (includes CMU)	14.4%	4.7%	2.2%	1.0%	18.4%	9.5%

Perceptions of community connection and support

Feel very or extremely connected to the campus community

CMU table 1.4; AAU table 50

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	33.2%	15.9%	32.7%	20.5%	15.6%	
AAU (includes CMU)	39.1%	15.1%	35.3%	18.0%	21.6%	10.5%

Feel very or extremely comfortable seeking advice from faculty or staff, even about something personal

CMU table 1.4; AAU table 50

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	24.7%	26.0%	26.7%	31.1%	26.8%	
AAU (includes CMU)	23.5%	29.7%	29.5%	33.9%	20.5%	22.8%

Believe students are very or extremely concerned about each other's well-being

CMU table 1.4; AAU table 50

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	39.3%	35.4%	42.7%	37.5%	36.8%	
AAU (includes CMU)	34.7%	35.5%	35.2%	35.8%	27.4%	29.4%

Believe faculty and staff are very or extremely concerned about each other's well-being

CMU table 1.4; AAU table 50

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	29.8%	40.7%	41.0%	43.4%	34.4%	
AAU (includes CMU)	34.3%	39.1%	38.0%	41.0%	29.7%	32.5%

Believe school officials are very or extremely concerned about each other's well-being

CMU table 1.4; AAU table 50

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	19.5%	29.1%	29.9%	40.5%	11.7%	
AAU (includes CMU)	24.0%	25.1%	28.2%	31.7%	10.7%	14.8%

Bystander observations and responses

Noticed someone acting in a sexual way they believed was making others feel uncomfortable or offended

CMU table 1.2; AAU table 47

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	33.2%	9.4%	23.5%	9.8%	44.7%	
AAU (includes CMU)	36.5%	19.9%	23.9%	13.9%	47.3%	32.4%

Overall, 64.9% of CMU students took some type of action

36.1% directly intervened or engaged the person doing the behavior

37.8% of all AAU students directly intervened

Witnessed a pattern of sexual comments or behaviors that made them concerned a student was experiencing sexual harassment

CMU table 1.2; AAU table 47

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	9.6%	3.6%	3.3%	2.9%	14.6%	
AAU (includes CMU)	9.4%	5.8%	6.1%	3.7%	15.6%	11.2%

Overall, 82.7% of CMU students took some type of action

28.6% directly intervened or engaged the person doing the behavior

approximately 30% of all AAU students directly intervened (exact value not available)

Witnessed someone behaving in a controlling or abusive way towards a dating or sexual partner

CMU table 1.2; AAU table 47

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	20.6%	6.8%	13.0%	3.0%	20.1%	
AAU (includes CMU)	20.0%	7.3%	12.3%	4.4%	26.9%	12.6

Overall, 74.7% of CMU students took some type of action

21.5% directly intervened or engaged the person doing the behavior

approximately 25% of all AAU students directly intervened (exact value not available)

Witnessed a situation that they believed could have led to a sexual assault

CMU table 1.2; AAU table 47

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	17.1%	2.5%	15.9%	3.6%	10.3%	
AAU (includes CMU)	22.9%	8.2%	15.6%	5.6%	21.4%	15.6%

Overall, 73.4% of CMU students took some type of action

42.1% directly intervened or engaged the person doing the behavior

45.1% of all AAU students directly intervened

Resources related to sexual assault and other misconduct

Awareness of services and resources

Are you aware of the following services and resources for victims of sexual assault and misconduct?

CMU table 2.1; AAU comparison not available

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	TR and NB
Office of Title IX Initiatives	82.2%	37.8%	81.2%	37.4%	82.1%
Counseling and Psychological Services (CaPS)	96.9%	69.0%	91.1%	63.4%	93.0%
University Health Services (UHS)	91.6%	82.8%	90.2%	82.5%	87.5%
UHS Health Promotions Team	8.0%	6.8%	11.7%	10.9%	16.9%
University Police Department	88.0%	71.9%	89.5%	74.3%	85.7%
Center for Student Diversity and Inclusion	65.2%	48.4%	68.4%	42.8%	63.9%
Office of Community Standards and Integrity	22.0%	7.9%	32.5%	11.0%	18.6%
Housefellows	71.0%	4.8%	71.9%	4.4%	60.9%
Center for Victims (non-CMU resource)	6.3%	1.6%	7.9%	4.1%	9.9%
Pittsburgh Action Against Rape (non-CMU resource)	18.8%	7.1%	17.6%	8.7%	18.3%
Women's Center and Shelter of Greater Pittsburgh (non-CMU resource)	25.5%	11.6%	13.6%	7.7%	25.8%
Local hospitals (non-CMU resource)	56.6%	41.0%	60.4%	40.9%	59.0%
None of the above	0.7%	6.9%	2.4%	9.8%	suppressed

Knowledge of CMU's sexual assault policies and procedures

Are very or extremely knowledgeable about how their institution defines sexual assault and other misconduct

CMU table 2.2; AAU table 49

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	28.1%	17.2%	38.2%	22.9%	29.8%	
AAU (includes CMU)	37.2%	31.8%	40.8%	35.5%	42.9%	41.1%

Are very or extremely knowledgeable about where to find help if they or a friend are victims of sexual assault or other misconduct

CMU table 2.2; AAU table 49

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	37.2%	18.1%	41.4%	24.8%	31.8%	
AAU (includes CMU)	39.3%	31.9%	39.4%	33.1%	44.0%	41.0%

Are very or extremely knowledgeable about where to make a report of sexual assault or other misconduct

CMU table 2.2; AAU table 49

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	32.7%	15.6%	39.4%	24.6%	19.7%	
AAU (includes CMU)	29.6%	27.6%	35.2%	32.3%	34.8%	34.9%

Are very or extremely knowledgeable about what happens when a student makes a report of sexual assault or other misconduct

CMU table 2.2; AAU table 49

	UG women	GR women	UG men	GR men	UG TR/NB	GR TR/NB
CMU	20.7%	10.7%	20.7%	13.3%	21.2%	
AAU (includes CMU)	16.1%	16.3%	18.8%	19.6%	21.2%	21.9%

Contacting a program or resource for any sexual assault or misconduct

**Had any measured experience and contacted a program or resource
(not the same as making an official report)**

CMU table 6.1; AAU table 44

CMU named resource	AAU resource category	CMU	AAU (includes CMU)
Office of Title IX Initiatives	Title IX	33.3%	20.6%
Counseling and Psychological Services (CaPS)	Counseling	55.8%	46.8%
University Health Services (UHS)	Health center	19.7%	23.6%
University Police Department	Campus police	15.8%	11.2%
Center for Student Diversity and Inclusion		8.1%	
Office of Community Standards and Integrity		5.8%	
Housefellows	Residence life	18.3%	8.8%
Academic Advisor		15.7%	
Faculty Member		22.9%	
Pittsburgh Bureau of Police	Local police	2.8%	9.4%
	Student affairs		11.6%
	Victim services		17.9%

Perception of program or resource usefulness and pressure on whether to report or file a complaint

34.0% of CMU students reported the program was very or extremely helpful to them

40.7% of AAU students reported the same

CMU table 6.2; AAU table 45

	Did not feel pressure to report or file complaint	Felt pressure to report or file a complaint	Felt pressure to NOT report or file a complaint
CMU	84.0%	9.1%	6.9%
AAU (includes CMU)	84.6%	9.5%	6.0%