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WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

Yale is committed to maintaining educational, working, and living environments founded on civility and mutual respect in which students, faculty, and staff are connected by strong bonds of intellectual dependence and trust, where they are—and feel—safe, and where they can thrive by taking full advantage of the riches Yale has to offer.
BACKGROUND

- **April 2015**, Yale University students were asked to participate in a survey on sexual misconduct created by the Association of American Universities (AAU). The survey results were made available on the Yale SOM Portal.

- **January 2016**, Yale SOM held a community conversation where Dean Snyder cited on survey findings and began a dialogue about what the results reflect and how we should respond as a community. Many noted that Yale University’s schedule for future surveys—every 3 to 4 years—would not match Yale SOM’s needs.

- **February 2016**, Dean Snyder wrote to the Yale SOM community, sharing the main points from the community conversation—noting that many in the SOM community had expressed an interest in knowing more about what is “behind” the numbers. For example, it was not clear if a respondent reporting sexual harassment experienced it on campus, and / or if incidents involved another member of the Yale or Yale SOM community.

- **Spring 2016**, Dean Snyder sought feedback on provisional next steps. One suggestion which received tremendous support was for the School to design a bi-annual survey / assessment of student experiences with sexual misconduct to guide our continuing efforts to reduce such conduct and measure our progress.

- **Spring 2017**, A team of Yale SOM faculty and staff collaborated with students who are part of Yale SOM’s Title IX Working Group to create this survey, which is intended to get “behind” the numbers, to allow Yale SOM to better understand and thereby address, sexual misconduct experienced by members of our community.
Percentages of respondents—from AAU survey—reporting incidents of sexual harassment, since entering Yale:

- **Sexual remarks, jokes, or stories that are insulting or offensive**: SOM students: 27.4%, All Yale G&P students: 32%, All Yale students: 37.6%.
- **Inappropriate comments regarding body, appearance, or sexual activity**: SOM students: 34.7%, All Yale G&P students: 34.7%, All Yale students: 44%.
- **Crude language or unwanted attempt to talk about sexual matters**: SOM students: 16%, All Yale G&P students: 13.8%, All Yale students: 19.1%.
- **Transmission of offensive sexual remarks, photos, or videos**: SOM students: 8.4%, All Yale G&P students: 5.3%, All Yale students: 7.4%.
- **Continued request to go out or have sex despite refusal**: SOM students: 8.8%, All Yale G&P students: 7.9%, All Yale students: 11.2%.
In addition to this survey, we have acted upon other provisional steps, based on supportive feedback:

- We redesigned our Orientation sessions on sexual misconduct to include a focus on the role of by-standers and peers in dealing with real-time experiences.

- Last spring, student representatives from the MAM and MBA degree programs provided the Dean of Students with (a) examples of effective classroom practices that help establish a professional and inclusive learning environment, and (b) classroom practices that may constitute sexual harassment. This information was shared with the Dean’s Office and has been valuable in subsequent, ongoing discussions among faculty.

- This spring, faculty are being invited to participate in small group conversations about their perceptions and experiences of classroom participation dynamics at SOM. The plan is to better understand faculty perspectives, aspirations and experiences in the classroom so that we can take informed next steps.
SURVEY APPROACH

• YALE SOM SURVEY
  ➢ Faculty expertise in survey design
  ➢ Focused on some types of sexual misconduct
    1) Sexual harassment
    2) Stalking
  ➢ Surveyed students across all degree programs
  ➢ 50% response rate (of 936)
SURVEY APPROACH

• NOMENCLATURE

- **Incident**: a cite by one student of sexual misconduct within a given category
- An individual respondent can cite more than one incident
- The survey further inquires about frequency within a given category
SURVEY APPROACH

• CATEGORY QUESTIONS (1 - 6)

E.g., Since you have been a student at Yale SOM, has someone emailed, texted, tweeted, phoned, or digitally messaged you offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures, or videos in an unwanted manner that...

interfered with your academic or professional performance,

**OR** limited your ability to participate in an academic program,

**OR** created an intimidating, hostile, or offensive social, academic or work environment?

• CONTEXT QUESTIONS (1 - 8)

E.g., At the time of the behavior, how was the person or people who committed the behavior affiliated with Yale?
1) Since you have been a student at Yale SOM, has someone made sexual remarks or told jokes or stories that were insulting or offensive to you and...

2) Since you have been a student at Yale SOM, has someone made inappropriate or offensive comments about your or someone else's body, appearance, gender identity, or sexual activities that...

3) Since you have been a student at Yale SOM, has someone made crude sexual remarks to you or tried to get you to talk about sexual matters in an unwanted manner that...

4) Since you have been a student at Yale SOM, has someone emailed, texted, tweeted, phoned, or digitally messaged you offensive sexual remarks, jokes, stories, pictures, or videos in an unwanted manner that...

5) Since you have been a student at Yale SOM, has someone continued to ask you to go out, get food, have drinks, have intimate interaction, or engage in sexual activity, even though you declined, in a manner that...
   - interfered with your academic or professional performance, or
   - limited your ability to participate in an academic program, or
   - created an intimidating, hostile, or offensive social, academic or work environment.

6) Since you have been a student at Yale SOM, has someone made unwanted phone calls, sent emails, voice, text or instant messages, or posted messages, pictures or videos on social networking sites in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety? OR Since you have been a student at Yale SOM, has someone showed up somewhere or waited for you when you did not want that person to be there, in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety? OR Since you have been a student at Yale SOM, has someone spied on, watched, or followed you, either in person or using devices or software, in a way that made you afraid for your personal safety?
SURVEY APPROACH > FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS

1) At the time of the behavior, how was the person or people who committed the behavior affiliated with Yale?

2) Since you have been a student at Yale SOM, how many distinct times has someone behaved this way?

3) Where were you when the behavior(s) occurred?

4) In what context did the behavior(s) occur?

5) When was the last time you experienced the behavior(s)?

6) Please share any additional information about your experience(s) with this behavior.

7) Since you have been a student at SOM, have you contacted any of the following about your experience(s) with this behavior?

8) Were any of the following reasons why you did not contact anyone at Yale about your experience(s) with this behavior?
There were 472 total respondents—just over 50% of SOM’s student body, across all degree programs. The bar graph (above) shows the percentage of respondents (n=472) who cited at least one incident (for each category); e.g., 106 distinct respondents (22%) cited at least one incident of “Any” category. The pie graph (corner) breaks total incidents (n = 170) out by category; across all respondents (n = 472), there were 170 distinct category questions with an answer of “Yes.”
The bar graph (above) shows the percentage of respondents (n = 472), by program, who cited at least one incident of “Any” type. The pie graph (corner) breaks total incidents (n = 170) out by program. Note: Respondents who did not identify their program are not included in the bar graph—these account for 8 respondents and 4 incidents.
The bar graph (above) shows the percentage of respondents (n = 472), by gender, who cited at least one incident of “Any” type. The pie graph (corner) breaks total incidents (n = 170) out by gender. Note: Respondents who did not identify their gender are not included in the bar graph—these account for 7 distinct respondents and 0 incidents.
The bar graph (above) shows the percentage of respondents (n = 472), by race/ethnicity, who cited at least one incident of “Any” type. The pie graph (center) breaks total incidents (n = 170) out by race/ethnicity. Note: Respondents who cited multiple races/ethnicities are counted once for each race/ethnicity cited; those who did not identify are not included in the bar graph—these account for 24 distinct respondents and 5 incidents.
The bar graph (above) shows the percentage of respondents (n = 472), by sexuality, who cited at least one incident of “Any” type. The pie graph (corner) breaks total incidents (n = 170) out by sexuality. Note: Respondents who did not identify or are unique in their identity are not included in the bar graph—these account for 16 distinct respondents and 3 incidents.
The bar graph (above) shows the percentage of respondents (n = 472), by citizenship, who cited at least one incident of “Any” type. The pie graph (corner) breaks total incidents (n = 170) out by citizenship. Note: Respondents who did not identify are not included in the bar graph—these account for 11 distinct respondents and 2 incidents.
The bar graph (above) shows the breakdown, by frequency cited, for each incident category. The pie graph (corner) breaks total incidents (n = 170) out by frequency. Note: Incidents where no frequency is cited are not included on the bar graph—these account for 8 distinct incidents (shown in green on pie).
The bar graph (above) shows the breakdown, by affiliation of person identified, for each incident category. The pie graph (corner) breaks total incidents (n = 170) out by affiliation. Note: Incidents where multiple affiliations are identified are counted once for each; incidents where no affiliation is identified or is unique in its affiliation are not included here.
The bar graph (above) shows the breakdown, by location, for each incident category. The pie graph (corner) breaks total incidents (n = 170) out by location. Note: Incidents where multiple locations are identified are counted once for each; incidents where no location is identified are not included here.
The bar graph (above) shows the breakdown, by context, for each incident category. The pie graph (corner) breaks total incidents (n = 170) out by context. Note: Incidents where multiple contexts are identified are counted once for each; incidents where no context is identified are not included here.
The bar graph (above) shows the breakdown for each incident category. The pie graph (corner) breaks total incidents (n = 170) out. Note: Incidents where no option is selected (including “I did not tell anyone”) are not included in the bar graph—these account for 19 distinct incidents.
The bar graph (above) shows the breakdown, by reason, for each incident category. The pie graph (corner) breaks total incidents (n = 170) out by reason (where respondents did not tell anyone about their experience/s). Note: Incidents where multiple reasons are identified are counted once for each; incidents where no reason is identified are not included here.