



Report on Campus Climate and Sexual Violence at Maryland Colleges and Universities Volume 1

November 2016

MSAR #10622

Lawrence J. Hogan, Jr.
Governor

Boyd K. Rutherford
Lt. Governor

Maryland Higher Education Commission

Anwer Hasan, Chairman

Sandra L. Jimenez, Vice-Chair

Vivian S. Boyd

Joseph DeMattos, Jr.

John Holaday

Russell V. Kelley

Peri J. Kelsey, Student Commissioner

Ian MacFarlane

Donna M. Mitchell

Joel Packer

Rizwan A. Siddiqi

John W. Yaeger

James D. Fielder, Jr., Ph.D.
Secretary

Report on Campus Climate and Sexual Violence at Maryland Colleges and Universities

Volume 1

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction.....	3
Findings from the Survey Narrative Reports	5
Perceptions of Safety and General Campus Climate	6
Perceptions of Institutions’ Readiness and Ability to Address Issues of Sexual Violence	6
Institutional Next Steps.....	8
Costs Incurred	11
Findings from the Aggregated Incident Data.....	11
Statewide Findings.....	12
Findings by Sector and Type of Institution.....	15
Summary of Findings from the Survey and Statewide Data.....	16
Conclusions.....	17
Appendix A - Survey Methods Employed by Institutions.....	21
Appendix B - Incident Data by Sector and Institution Type	23

Executive Summary

The State of Maryland and its colleges and universities are leading the nation in an effort to address the problems of sexual assault and sexual misconduct on campuses, and this report represents the next step in that endeavor. Chapter 436 of the Acts of 2015 requires Maryland colleges and universities to conduct surveys and report incidents of sexual assault and other sexual violence. The aggregated survey data indicate that students feel safe. The incident data indicate that the chance of a student being a victim¹ of sexual assault or other sexual misconduct is very low (according to the statewide data, 3 in 1,000) overall on Maryland's campuses.

Framing this incident data within a national or regional context is difficult because estimates of the prevalence of sexual assault on college campuses and in the United States in general vary considerably. These estimates can differ significantly depending on the method of data collection, the definition of sexual assault, the wording of the survey questions, and the population under study. In addition, Maryland, with this legislation, is the first state to collect institution-level data so comparisons to other states' data are not possible at this time. Therefore it is difficult to compare the incident data outside Maryland.

Maryland's legislation arose within a larger national discourse on sexual assault and sexual violence on college campuses. Federal government intervention has deepened over the past five years, with changes to legislation and guidance that expand the scope of institutional responsibility for reporting incidents of sexual violence on campus. This federal activity has been accompanied by an increase in attention on college campuses from students, activist groups and the media, all engaging in the discourse on the prevalence of sexual violence and the need to keep students safe on college campuses. Another concern among many groups is the issue of underreporting of sexual assault and other sexual violence, a problem which can be exacerbated by a hostile campus climate or a lack of clarity regarding the process of reporting.

Despite these challenges, Maryland's institutions report that they are enacting comprehensive plans to address issues such as the importance of peer support, the need to create a culture of trust and support, and underreporting. By improving the campus climate, institutions can aid survivors in finding help and can ensure safety for all on campus.

Plans are underway and practices are already in place at Maryland's institutions to continue improvements to the incident reporting process. Some steps include strengthening educational programming to students so they better understand the process and creating or improving the training faculty and staff receive so they are aware of their role in the reporting process. Increasing incident reporting and pursuit of formal complaints also relies on student trust and confidence that the systems in place will support them through a difficult and traumatic process.

¹ Throughout this report the terms "victim" and "survivor" are used interchangeably to refer to persons who have experienced sexual assault, sexual misconduct, and other forms of sexual violence. Both terms are used in federal and state laws as well as in college and university policies. It must be acknowledged that there is some debate about the use of these terms, and that different individuals and organizations encourage the use of one over the other in different contexts and for a variety of reasons. MHEC encourages respect for the expressed preferences of individuals for one term or another.

Title IX coordinators on all campuses are central to these efforts, and campuses are committed to providing the training and support these staff members need to do their jobs well and to serve the needs of the students. Many institutions discussed forming or strengthening Title IX teams, wherein the Title IX coordinator assembles a team of experts from around the campus to aid with training, education, reporting, policy, and compliance.

Improving the campus climate around sexual assault is a more complex task requiring a longer time horizon. Perceptions of campus climate include the attitudes and beliefs members of the institutional community (students, faculty, and staff) have regarding the issues of sexual assault and sexual violence. Students report trusting faculty and administrators to a greater degree than their own peers, and yet peer relationships are paramount in college. As a result, institutions are improving and expanding their bystander behavior training. This will help achieve two concurrent goals: (1) increase the chances of incidents being reported and (2) leverage the students' intentions as helpful bystanders to create a stronger culture of support and caring. These in turn, can help improve the overall campus climate for all students.

Moving forward, campus climate surveys will be central to an improved understanding of the campus community and its needs. The data that result from these efforts are of greatest help at the institution level because the findings can affect immediate change and help in longer-term planning. As an assessment tool, surveys can help the institution determine whether the policies and practices implemented have made a difference, allowing for faster adaptation.

Future plans for reporting the incident data include revising the data collection process so that institutions can provide more information on such details as accommodations offered (e.g., counseling, housing accommodations), timelines to complaint resolution, and outcomes of formal complaints. The report will allow for a cross analysis of outcomes by type of incident. For example, data will discern which incidents (by type) were reported to law enforcement or resulted in suspension versus expulsion.

In sum, the institutional survey and incident data collected in 2015-2016 set a foundation from which the institutions and MHEC can build. In the coming year, additional materials will be distributed to the institutions to guide them in the process of collecting data and conducting surveys in preparation for 2018. In the meantime, institutions are well underway in their plans to strengthen processes and practices to ensure the safety of all their students. The State of Maryland and its colleges and universities are leading the nation in an effort to address the problems of sexual assault and sexual misconduct on campuses, and this report represents the next step in that endeavor.

Introduction

During the 2015 legislative session, the General Assembly enacted HB 571 (Md. Education Article, Section §11-601) which put forth a number of requirements for all higher education institutions in the State of Maryland. These institutional requirements include providing the Maryland Higher Education Commission (MHEC) a report on institution-level data on incidents of sexual assault and other sexual misconduct and submitting the results of a sexual assault campus climate survey. The following report addresses these two aspects of the legislation.

The legislation arose within a larger national discourse on sexual assault and sexual violence on college campuses. Since 2011, the Department of Education and its Office of Civil Rights (OCR) have issued stronger and more detailed guidance on college and universities' obligations to prevent and respond to sexual violence under the gender equity law known as Title IX.² In July 2015, provisions from the federal Campus Sexual Violence Elimination (Campus SaVE) Act (as part of the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act) went into effect. This update of the Clery Act expands the scope of what institutions are responsible for in terms of prevention education and response to incidents of sexual violence on campus. Amidst these changes, the OCR has increased the number of investigations for Title IX violations. These investigations might arise from either a civil rights complaint or a proactive compliance review completed by the OCR.

As of September 19, 2016 the OCR was investigating 213 out of approximately 4,700 postsecondary institutions nationwide for possibly mishandling reports of sexual violence in violation of Title IX. These include five out of 51 colleges and universities in Maryland.³ At the same time, some lawmakers and other interested parties have suggested that OCR's guidances exceed what is permissible outside formal regulatory and statutory procedures.

This federal activity has been accompanied by an increase in attention on college campuses from students, activist groups, and the media. Protest movements have emerged from student-based groups, and state and local activist organizations have provided additional attention to the issue of sexual violence. Local, state, and national media have also engaged in this discourse, and students, their families, administrators, and faculty have sought to voice their concerns and issues.

Despite the recent upsurge of attention to this issue, the scope and nature of the problem are difficult to determine. A 2016 study by the federal General Accountability Office showed that four federal agencies use at least ten different methods and 23 different terms – some of which are defined differently in different places – to collect and report data on sexual violence. This has

² Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in all education programs or activities that receive federal financial assistance.

³ These institutions are: Morgan State University (one case); Johns Hopkins University (one case); Mount St. Mary's University (one case); University of Maryland, Baltimore County (one case), and St. Mary's College of Maryland (four cases). Investigations can take months or years to resolve. Findings can result in negotiated agreements spelling out steps the institution must take.

resulted in considerable confusion about the scope of the problem and the best ways to address it.⁴

Colleges and universities have nevertheless sought to confront issues of sexual violence and have also expanded their attention to include issues of sexual misconduct, a term that includes offenses that are not violent but nevertheless constitute physical or emotional harm. They have sought to promote student safety and security, provide support for those who encounter violence or misconduct, and educate students about proper conduct and response to harmful events involving themselves or others. They have done this while seeking to balance the needs for privacy and transparency, protect the rights of students, address the concerns of student and national activist groups, and avoid the risk of federal sanctions in the absence of detailed guidance from OCR.

In this environment, the requirements of HB571 offered both opportunities and challenges for colleges and universities as well as for the State. What would be the best ways to advance the multiple goals of education, prevention, student safety, student independence, institutional responsiveness, enforcement, and compliance, as well as transparency and privacy, especially when those goals might come into conflict?

MHEC collaborated with campus representatives to develop a process for the administration of the sexual assault campus climate survey and the aggregation of incident data. MHEC convened a workgroup, including representatives from all segments of higher education with expertise in Title IX regulations, student and academic affairs, and survey administration, in order to address this charge. The 14-member group met frequently in the summer and fall of 2015. The group consistently emphasized the need for more information to support educational efforts on campuses, a scope broad enough to include misconduct as well as the more severe cases of assault, and the desire to account for different kinds of responses to different kinds of incidents, while also considering the diverse needs of, and resources available to, different institutions. As a result, the group developed procedures for collecting and aggregating data on incidents of sexual assault and other sexual misconduct and guidelines on how institutions should administer the survey and report the results of the surveys to MHEC. The collaboration resulted in the creation of an incident report template, an incident log to aid institutions in capturing relevant incident data for the incident report, a sample survey instrument, and guidelines for the survey and the incident report. Although MHEC provided a sample survey instrument, the guidelines instructed institutions to select the survey instrument that best suited their needs. The survey guidelines also provided a framework for how institutions had to submit their required survey results.

In October 2015, MHEC distributed these materials to leaders of the Segmental Advisory Council, representing 16 community colleges, 13 public four-year colleges and universities, and 13 independent colleges and universities, along with a memo providing instructions for the distribution of materials to the institutional presidents among their segments. These same

⁴ “Sexual Violence Data: Actions Needed to Improve Clarity and Address Differences Across Federal Data Collection Efforts,” Government Accountability Office, GAO-16-546.

materials were mailed to nine additional private institutions⁵ in early December 2015, and a training session was held at MHEC for those institutions to familiarize them with the materials and answer questions.

All institutions were required to submit incident data and campus climate survey narrative reports by June 1, 2016. Of the 51⁶ institutions of higher education in the state that were required to submit reports and data to MHEC, 48 were compliant.⁷

What follows is a summary of the findings from review of the 48 campus climate survey narrative reports along with the results from collecting and aggregating the incident data. The conclusions include an analysis of the findings in the context of the larger national landscape of sexual assault on college campuses. Appendix A of this report describes the methods institutions used to conduct the survey.

The next section explores the results of the Sexual Assault Campus Climate surveys that 48 Maryland colleges and universities conducted in the 2015-2016 academic year.

Findings from the Survey Narrative Reports

All institutions met or exceeded the expectations put forth in the legislation and guidelines for administering the sexual assault campus climate survey. The vast majority of the institutions held themselves to the highest standards when it came to using a sound survey instrument, attempting to obtain a valid survey sample, and protecting the privacy of their respondents.

Institutions were required to answer four question prompts within their survey narrative reports. Reports detail the mechanics of how the institution implemented the survey, the response rate, and how the respondents compared to the larger student and/or campus community. In addition, institutions reported on the students' perceptions of safety of the campus and the general campus climate, and their perceptions of the institution's readiness and ability to address issues of sexual assault and other sexual violence. Each report concludes with a summary of next steps the institution will take based on the results of the survey. Lastly, institutions provided a detailed list of costs incurred in developing and implementing the survey and analyzing its results. The following section is divided into the three major areas of the report and summarizes the findings reported by the institutions (see Appendix A for a summary of the institutions' methods for conducting the survey). Volume 2 of this report contains the survey narrative reports for all institutions.

⁵ These include: Yeshiva College of the Nation's Capital, Maalot Baltimore Women's Institute of Torah Seminary, Brightwood College, Seafarers Harry Lundberg School of Seamanship, St. Mary's Seminary and University, Ner Israel Rabbinical College, Maryland University of Integrated Health, Lincoln College of Technology, and Binah Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies for Women.

⁶ The 51 colleges and universities represent those collegiate institutions that sought Commission approval to operate in the State of Maryland and are regulated by MHEC.

⁷ Three private institutions did not submit the required materials. Two are small non-profit single-sex religiously-affiliated institutions: Maalot Baltimore Women's Institute of Torah Seminary and Binah Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies for Women. The third is Lincoln College of Technology, a for-profit institution.

Perceptions of Safety and General Campus Climate

Key Findings:

- The vast majority of students attending Maryland's colleges and universities feel valued, respected, and safe.
- Students feel that faculty and administrators are concerned for their welfare.
- Those institutions perceived to be less safe were more likely to be urban or to have recently faced a crisis of some kind.

The majority of institutions reported positive results regarding respondents' perceptions of safety and general campus climate. For the most part respondents felt valued, respected, and safe. Students felt that the institutions were concerned about their welfare and that they were treated fairly. When the questions specifically distinguished among perceptions of faculty concern for student welfare versus concern on the part of administrators or staff, students reported trusting faculty to a greater degree. This is an important distinction for two reasons. First, students often confide in faculty regarding incidents of sexual misconduct and so their trust of the faculty is paramount as they seek help. Second, since Title IX coordinators and most student affairs staff are administrators, it is imperative that they take steps to strengthen relationships with students and build trust, as they are often the staff dedicated to addressing issues of sexual assault and other sexual misconduct.

There are some common characteristics for those institutions that reported lower scores on perceptions of safety and campus climate. The institutions that were perceived to be less safe were more likely to be urban or to have faced some kind of recent campus crisis or a highly publicized sexual misconduct case. Other characteristics, such as institutional size, appeared to have little effect on student perceptions of safety and climate. The institutions that collected written responses noted that students requested additional safety measures such as better lighting at night or a stronger security presence to increase feelings of overall safety.

Another aspect of campus climate is the perceptions students have of the support they receive from their peers. At institutions that used such prompts as "Most students at this campus would support a student who made an incident report" or "I feel a part of the student community," some reported that they received lower-than-anticipated scores in these areas. Among the issues that arose was a feeling that students might retaliate against a fellow student who makes a report to administrators, and this concerned campus officials. In addition, some institutions analyzed responses by respondent demographics and found that certain subpopulations of students (primarily women and minorities) reported feeling less safe and more vulnerable than the overall respondent pool. Action steps that institutions plan on taking to address these areas of concern will be summarized in the "Institutional Next Steps" section.

Perceptions of Institutions' Readiness and Ability to Address Issues of Sexual Violence

Key Findings:

- Most students feel their institutions would handle a campus crisis well and would take reports of sexual assault and sexual violence seriously.

- While the majority of students receive training on sexual assault and have the campus resources available, they are not clear about the process of reporting an incident.
- Although most students reported they would intercede to stop a possible act of sexual violence, they are fearful that their peers would respond negatively to someone making a report.

Reports reveal that most students feel their institutions would manage a campus crisis well and would implement fair policies and procedures in an effort to address the issue. Students also feel their campuses would take a report of sexual assault or sexual violence seriously and would respect the wishes of the victim in reporting the incident to police for criminal investigation.

The majority of institutions collected survey data on the effectiveness of their educational outreach. Questions were tied to two primary areas – bystander behaviors and respondents’ knowledge of the process and institutional resources. The majority of institutions reported mixed results for these survey items. For most institutions, the majority of respondents indicated that they were likely to intercede if they witnessed other students being harassed or otherwise taken advantage of and to accompany the student to campus authorities, if needed.

Many institutions noted that, although the large majority of respondents indicated they were likely to help a friend or intercede should they witness a possible incident, they were less confident about how peers would react to a student if he or she reported an incident. When provided such prompts as “Most students at this college would label the person making the report a liar” and “The alleged offender(s) or their friends would try to get back at the person making the report” respondents more frequently scored these items as “Neutral,” “Likely,” or “Very Likely.” Those institutions who reported this trend indicated that steps would be taken to strengthen these aspects of bystander training in an effort to create a more supportive environment for survivors to feel comfortable and safe.

Almost all campuses reported a disconnect between the training and education students received regarding sexual assault and sexual violence and knowledge of the process of seeking help. When respondents were asked whether they had received written or verbal information on aspects of sexual assault and violence since enrolling at the institution, the majority indicated that they had received these materials. Yet a much lower percentage of respondents could, with confidence, say how the process worked and comprehend the role of the Title IX coordinator on campus.

Outliers to these results shed light on how institutions might bridge the gap between students’ commitment to helping themselves and others within the campus community and a clear understanding of how the process works and who to contact for assistance. Campuses who reported comprehensive educational outreach programs seemed to have a higher percentage of students responding that they would not only intervene but were confident in the steps needed to get help and what the results would be. These comprehensive programs seemed to have a few things in common: they (1) ran throughout the academic year, (2) relied on multiple forms of media and communication (e.g., events, lectures, posters, emails, guest speakers), and (3) integrated students and faculty in the planning and implementation.

Although not required for the report to MHEC, a number of institutions included in their narrative reports information on the prevalence of incidents of sexual assault and other sexual violence at their campuses. Institutions asked if respondents had experienced incidents of unwanted sexual contact since enrolling. Respondents who indicated “yes” were asked a series of questions to obtain details on whether they confided in anyone and, if so, whom. If the respondent indicated he or she did not report the incident, some surveys included questions to learn more about the reasons for not reporting it.

There are some key takeaways from the institutions that reported on these data. First and foremost, respondents, if they confided in anyone affiliated with the college or university, found the experience, for the most part, to be positive. For those that didn’t confide in anyone, they most often indicated that they did not do so because they did not think it was an institutional matter, they wanted to move on from the incident, or they didn’t think it was serious enough to discuss. Few institutions reported that a lack of knowledge on the procedures hindered respondents’ reporting.

Institutional Next Steps

Key Findings:

- Institutions are tailoring their responses to the findings of the survey to meet the unique needs of their campus communities.
- Some institutions intend to implement a sexual assault campus climate survey annually, incorporating changes to the instrument from lessons learned in 2015-2016.
- Plans to improve overall campus climate and perceptions of safety and support are multi-year and complex in scope, involving input from faculty, staff, administrators, and students.
- Community colleges and other institutions with non-residential campuses face some distinctive challenges when it comes to engaging students in programming regarding campus safety and sexual violence.
- Many institutions intend to work with student leaders and student groups in developing and strengthening programming and education on such topics as prevention, awareness, bystander behavior, and resources available.
- Institutions plan to expand efforts to educate students through programming that is varied, frequent, and tailored to the needs of the audience(s).
- Faculty and staff may need additional training on issues of sexual assault and violence, especially at those institutions where all are considered “responsible employees” who are required to report incidents to the Title IX coordinator.
- Many institutions are hiring additional staff to support their Title IX efforts.

All institutions reported on action plans they intended to implement in the coming months and over the course of the year. In analyzing the reports, three themes are evident and mirror the three broad areas of their reports.

Surveys

A small percentage of institutions reported that plans were already underway to improve the survey instrument for the next reporting cycle. A few indicated that they were going to

incorporate the climate survey into their annual survey cycle as early as 2016-2017 versus waiting until the next statutorily mandated cycle. For these institutions, their goal is to improve the questions and develop a more comprehensive plan for increasing participation. There are also a handful of institutions that have been implementing climate surveys for several years as a matter of practice. These institutions currently integrate the annual results into their institutional efforts for improvement.

Almost all institutions discussed ways they would try to improve representation of the campus population in the survey respondents in future survey cycles because they found an over-representation along gender (females), race (white students), or other key demographic lines (e.g., housing location, year of enrollment). The result of low response rates and over-representation (and under-representation) of certain sub-populations can skew the data under analysis. Most institutions acknowledged that these circumstances were not ideal, and many discussed steps they would take in the future to obtain greater and more representative participation in the survey. These include such tactics as improved marketing, offering incentives, and/or altering the number of days the survey is open.

Improving overall climate and campus safety

Understanding the perceptions of students, faculty, staff, and/or administrators regarding the campus atmosphere around issues of sexual assault and sexual violence plays an integral role in identifying problems and issues. Survey results help guide institutions in addressing the needs of the campus community so that prevention and responses can be tailored and specific.

For many campuses, plans to improve the overall campus climate were long-range in timeline and complex in scope. Because institutions found that students hold some mistrust of their fellow students, faculty, staff, and administrators, institutions need to improve campus climate through thoughtful, integrated, systemic change. Institutions acknowledged that hard work lay ahead. Many report creating teams of faculty, administrators, and students to establish campus-wide initiatives on programming, training materials, and other resources in an effort to improve communication and build trust among the campus community members. A few institutions shared that institutional leaders might spearhead larger, more complex initiatives aimed at strengthening campus climate.

Community colleges and four-year institutions that enroll a high percentage of graduate, commuter, and/or online students face some distinctive challenges when addressing issues of campus climate. The nature of the student population of these institutions makes the traditional efforts of building community challenging. Still, these institutions discussed utilizing student leaders and key organizations as a means to connect with students and strengthen the sense of trust and connection they might feel with the institution. In addition, institutions reported some practical, administrative steps like improving the means by which they collect accurate contact information in an effort to improve communication channels to students.

A number of institutions reported plans to improve safety and security through such provisions as new outdoor lighting, an increased security presence at night, and increased support for safe ride programs. Other institutions acknowledged that education and information campaigns regarding the safety resources available to students (e.g., student escorts, blue light emergency

phones, campus safety mobile apps) needed to be stepped up so a greater percentage of students knew about them and could take advantage of them.

Improving readiness to respond to issues of sexual assault and sexual violence

All institutions reflected that the survey results provided an opportunity for improvement and reported that they would direct resources to education, training, intervention, and prevention efforts. These initiatives will be tailored to the respective needs of their institutions.

For some institutions, establishing mandatory training for all students was a first priority, and the majority hoped to have this in place for the fall 2016 entering class. Some plan to use vendors which offer online education programs with tools in place so that administrators can monitor participation, send reminders, and follow up with students as needed. Other institutions plan to implement mandatory, in-person programming at new student orientation. A number of the independent and public four-year institutions reported plans to deliver specific education programming to student athletes, members of the Greek life community, and resident assistants to target their unique needs. Proposed topics include dating violence, the dangers of alcohol abuse, and bystander intervention.

Smaller, residential institutions reported plans to enhance the community-building activities they already had in place, using such dedicated events as town hall meetings, new student orientations, and student retreats as a means specifically to address issues of sexual assault and student safety. Larger institutions also recognized the importance of face-to-face connection and exchange, acknowledging that amidst their online trainings and events directed to big audiences (such as at orientation), they needed to create opportunities for smaller groups of students to gather and work together. These would reinforce messages delivered via other methods in the hopes of increasing awareness and reducing incidents.

Institutions' plans for educational programming acknowledged the need to increase the frequency of training, events, and messaging. Some institutions discussed plans to ensure monthly opportunities were available and to strengthen marketing for those events. Others reported their plans to use email and social media to remind students on a more frequent basis of such details as the student conduct policy, how to contact the Title IX coordinator, and how to report an incident.

Several institutions noted that more needed to be done to educate faculty and staff in supporting students who confide in them and in understanding their responsibilities as reflected in institutional policies and Title IX compliance. Many institutions implement "responsible employee" policies wherein all employees are required to report to authorities any alleged sexual assaults of which they have knowledge. Regardless of institutional requirements, institutions recognize that faculty and staff play an important role in ensuring student safety and support.

Concurrent with institutional plans to improve and increase training, education, and outreach were reports of adding staff in the coming year. A number of institutions reported hiring (or plans to hire) counselors, additional Title IX staff, wellness and prevention educators, and other administrators who could dedicate time and energy to address issues of sexual assault and sexual violence.

In sum, each institution reported changes it would make and issues it would try to address as a result of the survey's findings. They acknowledge that time and attention to issues raised from the results would be well-spent in making students safer from victimization and more informed about the role they, their fellow students, and their institutions' staff has in creating and sustaining a supportive campus community. Reports reflected the myriad ways institutions would go about addressing the findings in alignment with their unique missions and values.

Costs Incurred

Institutions were asked to report on the costs incurred in administering the survey. Institutional responses varied in thoroughness, with some institutions providing detailed incentive, labor, technology, and promotion costs and others reporting one lump sum with little corresponding detail. The total cost reported by all 48 reporting institutions was \$155,834; the majority of institutions reported spending approximately \$3,000 or less, while 13 institutions spent between \$4,000 and \$27,000. The bulk of these costs come from labor and technology. Some institutions invested thousands of dollars developing their own online surveys, and others incurred their greatest costs in staff labor (calculating the staffing hours, wages, and fringe benefits costs). Several institutions noted the opportunity costs incurred wherein other projects or other surveys were foregone in exchange for the campus climate survey efforts.

Findings from the Aggregated Incident Data

In an effort to collect a standardized set of data on sexual assault and other sexual misconduct at Maryland's colleges and universities, the institutions were required to report on all incidents via an incident report template provided by MHEC. According to the MHEC guidelines that accompanied the report, an incident was defined as an allegation of sexual assault or other sexual misconduct involving a student⁸ which was reported or referred to the institution's Title IX coordinator. An incident did not have to result in a formal complaint or investigation to be reported.

To ensure consistent reporting of the incident data by institutions, the workgroup developed definitions of sexual assault and other sexual misconduct to be used in the guidelines and other materials.⁹

These definitions were:

1. Sexual Assault I - non-consensual sexual intercourse: any act of sexual intercourse with another individual without consent. Sexual intercourse includes vaginal or anal penetration, however slight, with any body part or object, or oral penetration involving mouth to genital contact.
2. Sexual Assault II - non-consensual sexual contact: any intentional touching of the intimate parts of another person, causing another to touch one's intimate parts, or disrobing or exposure of another without consent. Intimate parts may include genitalia,

⁸ Institutions reported student-related incidents (student-student, student-staff/faculty, student-non-student perpetrator) wherein the student could be the alleged victim or perpetrator; counts include graduate and undergraduate students.

⁹ These definitions were strongly influenced by the University System of Maryland's Policy on Sexual Assault.

groin, breast, or buttocks, or the clothing covering them, or any other body part that is touched in a sexual manner. Sexual contact also includes attempted sexual intercourse.

3. Other Sexual Misconduct - Incidents are included in this category if they relate to any other category of violence or misconduct as defined by the institution. These may include dating violence, domestic violence, sexual exploitation, sexual harassment, sexual intimidation, sexual violence, and stalking.

Regardless of the institutions' sexual assault policies and corresponding definitions of sexual assault and other sexual misconduct, these three definitions were used by all institutions in classifying and reporting incidents for the incident report. This ensured consistency across all campus reports and allowed for reliable aggregation of the data.

Each institution reported on the number of incidents of sexual assault or other sexual misconduct that its Title IX coordinator received. The report required that institutions also categorize each incident into one of the three classifications defined above. Institutions were instructed, in the event of a complex case, to select one category for the incident, prioritizing in order of the severity of the incident. So, for example, if an alleged sexual assault was tied to dating violence, the incident was to be reported as a sexual assault, as that is the more egregious and severe aspect of the case. This process mirrors the Hierarchy Rule, as described in the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013.

In addition to reporting on the total number of incidents and the classifications of those incidents, institutions reported on the timing of the incident report (e.g., within 24 hours of incident, after the end of the semester), the location of the incident, and whether, to the Title IX coordinator's knowledge, the incident was reported to law enforcement. Institutions also reported a count on the number of incidents that involved one or more non-student perpetrators¹⁰ as well as the number of accommodations that were made to the survivor. These included: alternative housing, referral to counseling services, and academic accommodations. Finally, institutions reported on the number of incidents that resulted in formal complaints¹¹, including the outcomes of those complaints.¹²

Statewide Findings

The 48 institutions reported 1,057 incidents of sexual assault or other sexual misconduct for the 2015-2016 academic year. This constitutes 0.3% of the 2015 Maryland college student enrollment for the reporting institutions (358,651 undergraduate and graduate students).¹³ Put another way, these data reflect that approximately 3 out of every 1,000 students reported a sexual assault or other instance of sexual violence last year.

¹⁰ A non-student perpetrator is defined as a person who is alleged to have committed a sexual assault or other act of sexual misconduct who is not a student of the same institution as the person who made the incident report. This can include individuals such as visitors to the campus, faculty, or staff members.

¹¹ A formal complaint is defined as a formal report completed by the student regarding the incident; the complaint can begin a proceeding under the campus student disciplinary system or trigger a formal investigation by the institution. Not all reported incidents result in complaints.

¹² These include sanctions imposed (e.g., suspension or expulsion) and formal complaints that were appealed.

¹³ Source: Maryland Higher Education Commission, Enrollment Information System, 2015.

The data also show that 65.5% (or 692) of the reported incidents were classified as “Other Sexual Misconduct,” which can include sexual harassment, dating and domestic violence, and stalking. These results are not surprising, in part, because the definition for this type of incident is broad and inclusive. These results also reveal that the majority reported incidents are not classified as the most violent assaults.

Taken together, these data indicate that the students attending Maryland’s colleges and universities are generally safe and at low risk of being the victim of sexual assault. Despite these low numbers, there are other patterns that emerge from the data that require institutions to continue to improve practices, procedures, and policies. In turn, these steps can help prevent crime, support survivors, and create a climate where students feel comfortable reporting incidents.

The data show that 300 of the 1,057 incidents (or 28.4%) were known to have been reported to campus or local police. While these data reflect only what the Title IX coordinator had knowledge of, it can be assumed that the majority of victims did not seek help from law enforcement. It is possible that, since approximately 70% of all incidents were not reported within the first 24 hours after the incident, timing may play a role in the low rate of police involvement.

When the timing of the incident report is coupled with the fact that the majority of incidents were for such offenses as stalking, dating and domestic violence, and harassment, victims may see police involvement as unnecessary or intrusive. For some of these cases, the perpetrator could be a family member, a spouse, a supervisor, or a faculty or staff member, which could explain the low rate of police involvement and the fact that 43.0% of the incidents involved a non-student perpetrator.

Research shows that survivors of sexual assault are generally less likely to involve law enforcement authorities in an investigation when they have a close relationship with the alleged perpetrator, were not physically injured, or if the assault was attempted (versus completed).¹⁴ Therefore, the incidents of sexual violence on Maryland’s college campuses may go underreported to law enforcement because the survivors see the timing of the report, the nature of the incident, and the relationship with the alleged perpetrator as reasons to report only to institutional authorities. It is also important to stress that the 1,057 incidents include third-party reports of sexual violence, in which the student, once contacted by the Title IX coordinator, may have refused to pursue the case further.

Just over half the incidents reported (53.8%) occurred on campus and almost one-third occurred off-campus (34.4%). A small percentage (8.3%) was categorized as undisclosed, wherein the person making the report did not know or could not recall the site of the incident.

The majority of students (71.4%) who reported an incident received a referral to counseling and/or health services. For many institutions, this is an accommodation offered to all of those who report, which explains the high rate. Almost one-third (29.0%) receive assistance in

¹⁴ Rennison, Callie Marie. Rape and sexual assault: Reporting to police and medical attention, 1992-2000. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, 2002.

obtaining a no-contact or stay order; this rate may be driven, in part by the nature of the majority of incidents, which include stalking and domestic violence.

The data show that 24.4% of all incidents resulted in a formal complaint. This means that for the 1,057 incidents reflected in the data, 258 resulted in the survivor pursuing a formal complaint against the perpetrator. The process of investigating incidents may shed light on the survivor's choice to pursue a complaint.

Although Title IX coordinators ensure that all reported incidents are investigated, the results of those investigations can vary. If the victim does not respond to communications from the coordinator or refuses to pursue the case further, the Title IX coordinator ensures the student knows of resources available, provides him or her contact information for resources (counseling, crisis center medical personnel), and follows up to check in on the student, as appropriate. But, in almost all cases, no formal case can be pursued without the cooperation of the survivor. If the victim is willing to discuss the incident, the Title IX coordinator allows him or her to guide that process using a trauma-informed or victim-centered approach. Despite these steps, the survivor may still choose not to pursue a formal process. This decision may be guided by feelings of shame and embarrassment, concerns of the time and attention the complaint may demand, a wish to move on from the incident, or a wish to not punish the perpetrator in any way.

Finally the data show that of the 258 formal complaints that were pursued, almost half (46.1%) resulted in one or more perpetrators being found responsible. This number may be driven, in part, by the nature of sexual assault and other sexual misconduct cases, which can take several months or more to resolve. Some institutions noted in their incident data the number of ongoing cases that would be carried over to the next reporting cycle.

Other drivers of this figure include the cases that involve non-student perpetrators. Institutions only can enforce their disciplinary and conduct policies against the members of their own institutional communities and have no power to punish those who do not belong to that community. In addition, Title IX coordinators would not be necessarily privy to the outcomes of a case reported to law enforcement. If a victim decided to report to the police and pursued a criminal investigation, that outcome would not necessarily be reflected in these data nor reported back to the institution. This would be especially true for cases that involved non-student perpetrators.

Among the student perpetrators found responsible for an act of violence or misconduct, approximately one-half of them (47.1%) were suspended or expelled. Other sanctions imposed on students could include alcohol or drug treatment, education and training, and other interventions warranted based on the severity of the incident and/or the wishes of the survivor. Lastly, approximately one-third (30.3%) of the resolved complaints involved an appeal, wherein the perpetrator or the victim challenged the institution's findings regarding the incident.

Table 1 summarizes the data for all 48 institutions that submitted data to MHEC.

Table 1: Aggregated Incident Data - All Maryland Colleges and Universities		
Total number of incidents	1057	%
Incidents reported within 24 hours	325	30.7%
Incidents reported within the same semester	515	48.7%
Incidents reported after the end of the semester or longer	217	20.5%
Incidents classified as Sexual Assault I	238	22.5%
Incidents classified as Sexual Assault II	105	9.9%
Incidents classified as Other Sexual Misconduct	692	65.5%
Incident location: On campus	569	53.8%
Incident location: Off campus	364	34.4%
Incident location: School-sponsored activity	36	3.4%
Incident location: Undisclosed	88	8.3%
# of incidents reported to law enforcement (to knowledge of Title IX coordinator)	300	28.4%
# that involved one or more non-student perpetrators	454	43.0%
Accommodation: Alternative housing	67	6.3%
Accommodation: Referral to counseling/health services	755	71.4%
Accommodation: No-contact or stay order	307	29.0%
Accommodation: Interim suspension	52	4.9%
Accommodation: Academic accommodations (test rescheduling, class scheduling, etc.)	215	20.3%
Accommodation: Other	217	20.5%
Formal complaint totals		%
Total number of incidents resulting in formal complaints	258	24.4%
Formal complaints in which one or more perpetrators were found responsible	119	46.1%
Result: Suspension	34	28.6%
Result: Expulsion	22	18.5%
Result: Other	68	57.1%
In how many formal complaints was a finding of responsibility appealed?	36	30.3%

Note: The number of incidents by type totals to 1035 because institutions had too little information to classify 22 of the cases; the number of accommodations totals more than the number of incidents because multiple accommodations were made for each incident; the count of results of formal complaints by type exceeds the total number of formal complaints because more than one outcome could occur for each formal complaint

Findings by Sector and Type of Institution

Incident data for Maryland's public and independent institutions can be found in the appendices. In Appendix B, Tables 2 through 5 contain aggregated incident data for public institutions, public four-year institutions, community colleges, and independent institutions respectively.

The aggregated data by sector and type of institution, for the most part, mirror the statewide data. A notable exception to this pattern comes from the community colleges (Table 4). First, incidents at community colleges constitute only 169 of the 1057 incidents reported statewide; this represents 16.0% of all incidents reported (whereas community colleges enroll 36.1% of all students), and the number of incidents is equivalent to 0.1% of total community college enrollments (compared to 0.3% statewide). The resounding majority (82.8%) of incidents were classified as “Other Sexual Misconduct.” Over 60% (65.1%) occurred on campus, and the majority (60.9%) involved one or more student perpetrators. Almost one-third (32.0%) of all incidents resulted in a formal complaint being filed, which is ten percentage points higher than the comparable figure for public four-year institutions’ data (23.8%) and eight percentage points higher than the state figure (24.4%).

The differences in type of incident and outcome may be driven, in part, by the fact that a slightly higher percentage of incidents involved fellow students and almost eight out of 10 incidents were such offenses as harassment and stalking. Students may have been more likely to report incidents that were in clear violation of institutional policy and could be adjudicated within institutional processes. In turn, a greater number of these cases resulted in a perpetrator or perpetrators being found responsible (75.9% versus the statewide percentage of 46.1%).

Another notable difference arises in the independent institutions’ data (Table 5). Of the incidents reported, the majority (60.6%) occurred on campus, which is a higher rate than the figures for statewide (53.8%) and the public four-year institutions (48.4%). These data for the independent institutions are not surprising because of the residential nature of many of their campuses.

In addition, a small percentage (11.2%) of the incidents was known to be reported to law enforcement, which is low compared to the public institutions (33.7 %) and to statewide (28.4%). This lower rate may be a result of the difficulty the Title IX coordinator had in obtaining law enforcement information. It may also reflect a reticence on the part of the student making the report to pursue the case with local or campus police.

A table for the six private institutions that submitted data is not included in this report. When totaled, all six private institutions reported less than 10 incidents of sexual assault or other sexual misconduct and represent less than one percent of the 1,057 incidents reported statewide. The majority of cases involved one or more non-student perpetrators, and all were reported as occurring off campus. None of the incidents resulted in formal complaints. These results reflect the unique nature of these institutions (e.g., vocational, religious) and their small enrollment size. Although their aggregated data is not summarized in a separate table, their incident report data are aggregated with the statewide totals, and their survey data were analyzed and included in the previous findings section of this report.

Summary of Findings from the Survey and Statewide Data

The incident data provide insight into the occurrence of sexual assault and sexual violence on Maryland’s college campuses. When analyzed in conjunction with the results of the survey narrative reports, some noteworthy themes emerge. First, some institutions with the highest reported incidents of sexual violence are also the institutions reporting that students feel the most safe and supported. These institutions also report higher percentages of survey respondents who

know the process of reporting and understand the role of the Title IX coordinator. One explanation for this correlation is that the increase in reported incidents arises when students know and trust the process.

Another finding when analyzing the incident reports and survey reports in conjunction is that no distinctive pattern emerges regarding a type of institution (e.g. urban, high enrollment, commuter institution) that is more or less prone to sexual assault and sexual violence than others. Small, independent, rural institutions provide much of the same safety and security for students as large, urban public institutions. What institutions have in common is their commitment to providing resources to address issues that put their unique student populations most at risk, whether that be through focusing on underage drinking on campus or running programs on domestic and dating violence.

It is evident that institutions are providing accommodations to all those who report incidents. The vast majority receives counseling referrals and almost 25% receive academic or housing accommodations. Use of these services will likely increase as students learn more about how the process of reporting works and institutions devote additional resources and staffing.

It is worth noting that the finding that 25.5% of incidents result in formal complaints mirrors findings from single-institution and national surveys. Research shows that sexual violence on college campuses is an underreported crime. Experts speculate that issues such as re-victimization, the victim's relationship with the alleged perpetrator, and shame over the incident can hinder or delay pursuit of a formal complaint. In addition, some studies show that the incidents go unreported because the survivor does not categorize the incident as a rape or sexual assault. Maryland's institutional survey report data bear this out; those institutions that obtained data on the incidence of sexual violence found that some students did not report incidents because they felt it was a personal matter and not an issue for the institution to handle.

Lastly, the data reported on the rate of appeals is important to note. Much of the national discourse on sexual assault and sexual violence on college campuses rightly focuses on victims' rights. What has also emerged recently is an increased focus on the rights of the accused and the need to ensure due process is provided to both the victim and the alleged perpetrator. The data collected in the aggregated report reflect that systems are in place on college campuses to ensure the incidents are investigated and all involved are given an opportunity to pursue a complaint and to appeal case outcomes.

Conclusions

The results of this analysis reveal that students attending Maryland's colleges and universities feel safe. Data show that the chance of a student being a victim of sexual assault or other sexual misconduct is very low (according to the statewide data, 3 in 1,000) overall on Maryland's campuses.

As noted on page 1, estimates of the prevalence of sexual assault on college campuses and in the United States in general vary considerably. The estimates can vary depending on the method of data collection, the definition of sexual assault, the wording of the survey questions, and the

population under study. For example, a voluntary survey might lead to relatively high estimates of violence because individuals who have experienced sexual violence may be more likely to respond than others; and a collection instrument that classifies a relatively broad range of offenses in its definition of sexual misconduct may also produce higher reports of misconduct. Conversely, estimates that depend on incidents that are reported to law enforcement or to campus authorities are likely to be lower than other estimates because many incidents go unreported for reasons discussed below. Therefore it is difficult to interpret this finding by referring to other surveys or findings.

Most studies of sexual assault and sexual misconduct suggest that these offenses are underreported for a variety of reasons. As noted above, some Maryland students are unwilling to report an incident if the incident occurred off campus, if the perpetrator was not a student, or if the survivor believes that the incident is no business of the college. In other cases, survivors may stay quiet because of feelings of shame, a wish for privacy, or a perspective that the incident was not worthy of reporting. These patterns are consistent with those identified in national studies and surveys.¹⁵

Further complications around the issue of sexual violence on college campuses include the choices victims are given regarding reporting the incident to campus or local law enforcement. While Title IX coordinators are required to investigate all reported incidents of sexual violence, they are guided by the survivor regarding outcomes and directed by institutional policy regarding the sanctions imposed on perpetrators. Survivors may choose not to pursue a formal complaint. If they do, they may opt not to have the perpetrator face such sanctions as expulsion or suspension. They also have full say, in the vast majority of cases, as to whether the incident is reported to law enforcement and investigated formally by the police. This is especially true when the incident constitutes misconduct rather than assault. This victim-centered approach allows institutional officials to best meet the needs of the survivor and reduces the chances of re-victimizing him or her or causing further harm. It also illustrates the ways in which sexual violence defies easy solutions or even simple description.

Despite these obstacles, institutions report that they are enacting comprehensive plans to address issues such as underreporting, the importance of peer support, and the need to create a culture of trust and support. By improving the campus climate, institutions can aid victims in finding help and can ensure safety for all on campus.

Plans are underway and practices are already in place at Maryland's institutions to further improve the incident reporting process. Steps include strengthening educational programming to students so they better understand the process and creating or improving the training faculty and staff receive so they are aware of their role in the reporting process. Increasing incidence

¹⁵ Krebs, Christopher P., Christine H. Lindquist, Tara D. Warner, Bonnie S. Fisher, and Sandra L. Martin. "The Campus Sexual Assault (CSA) Study." US Department of Justice (2008); Association of American Universities. "AAU Climate Survey on Sexual Assault and Sexual Misconduct." aau.edu. <https://www.aau.edu/Climate-Survey.aspx?id=16525>; Sinozich, Sofi and Lynn Langton." Rape and Sexual Assault Victimization among College-Age Females, 1995 – 2013. www.bjs.gov. <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/rsavcaf9513.pdf>.

reporting and pursuit of formal complaints also relies on student trust and confidence that the systems in place will support them through a difficult and traumatic process.

Title IX coordinators are central to these efforts, and campuses are committed to providing the training and support these staff members need to do their jobs well and to serve the needs of the students. Many institutions discussed forming or strengthening Title IX teams, wherein the Title IX coordinator assembles a team of experts from around the campus to aid with training, education, reporting, policy, and compliance.

Improving the campus climate around sexual assault is a more complex task requiring a longer time horizon. Perceptions of campus climate include the attitudes and beliefs members of the institutional community (students, faculty, and staff) have regarding the issues of sexual assault and sexual violence. Students report trusting faculty and administrators to a greater degree than their own peers, and yet peer relationships are paramount in college. As a result, institutions are improving and expanding their bystander behavior training. This will help achieve two concurrent goals: (1) increase the chances of incidents being reported and (2) leverage the students' intentions as helpful bystanders to create a stronger culture of support and caring. These in turn, can help improve the overall campus climate for all students.

Moving forward, campus climate surveys will be central to an improved understanding of the campus community and its needs. The data that result from these efforts are of greatest help at the institution level because the findings can affect immediate change and help in longer-term planning. As an assessment tool, surveys can help the institution determine whether the policies and practices implemented have made a difference, allowing for faster adaptation.

Future plans for reporting the incident data include revising the data collection process so that institutions can provide more information on such details as accommodations offered and outcomes of formal complaints. The report will allow for a cross analysis of outcomes by type of incident. For example, data will discern which incidents (by type) were reported to law enforcement or resulted in suspension versus expulsion.

In sum, the institutional survey and incident data collected in 2015-2016 set a foundation from which the institutions and MHEC can build. In the coming year, additional materials will be distributed to the institutions to guide them in the process of collecting data and conducting surveys in preparation for 2018. In the meantime, institutions are well underway in their plans to strengthen processes and practices to ensure the safety of all their students. The State of Maryland and its colleges and universities are leading the nation in an effort to address the problems of sexual assault and sexual misconduct on campuses, and this report represents the next step in that endeavor.

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Survey Methods Employed by Institutions

Institutions were given the discretion to choose the survey instrument, the population to survey, and the methods by which to administer the survey. A number of institutions chose to use the instrument MHEC provided, making modifications as needed to tailor the survey to their institutional needs. Other institutions chose to purchase survey instruments from vendors, create their own surveys, or borrow heavily from other free survey instruments available on the internet. Due to the discretion institutions were given regarding their survey instrument selection and the resulting differences in data, MHEC did not require institutions to share their survey results. Instead, institutions were required to ensure their instrument would enable them to provide a thorough report to MHEC in regard to the major areas of the narrative report.

The majority of institutions surveyed solely undergraduate students, but a handful included graduate students, faculty, staff, and/or administrators in the survey population as well. Some institutions randomly selected their survey sample and others distributed the survey to the entire population. Still others pinpointed specific targeted populations to survey such as all students enrolled in a series of entry-level classes or all students within a specific age range (e.g., 18 – 24 year old students only). Most institutions reported a response rate between 5% and 20%, with some obtaining response rates closer to 30% to 50%. Analysis shows that some of the highest response rates were elicited through such tactics as offering prizes or other incentives, administering paper surveys at a specific time and place on the campus (e.g., all students who attended an entry-level health class on a pre-determined date), or heavily marketing the survey via email, posters, and other communication methods. Correspondingly, these institutions reported larger costs associated with the survey administration in the form of money, labor, and time.

The vast majority of institutions implemented an electronic survey delivered via email to the survey sample(s) or population(s). Often, institutional leaders such as the president or the dean of students communicated to the selected population in advance of the survey, discussing the reasons for the survey, the value of participating in the survey, and how the institution would use the results of the survey to benefit the campus community.

Institutions relied on a series of Likert scale prompts (e.g., asking students to score on a scale of “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”) to obtain their survey results. To elicit perceptions of the general campus climate, Likert scale prompts such as “I feel valued in the classroom,” “the institution does enough to protect the safety of students,” and “I feel I am a part of this college” were used in the majority of surveys in an effort to elicit responses. Some institutions also added comment boxes to further understand the respondents’ perceptions of the overall campus climate.

The same scaled questions were used to elicit responses regarding students’ perceptions of institutions’ readiness and ability to address issues of sexual violence. For many institutions, prompts included such items as “If a crisis happened on campus, the college would handle it well” and “College officials handle incidents in a fair and responsible manner” with a scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree presented. In addition, a number of institutions had specific items about perceptions of how the campus might handle situations of sexual assault and sexual violence. These included: “The college/university would take the sexual assault report seriously”

and “If requested by the individual, the college/university would forward the report to criminal investigators (for example the police).”

A sample of the model survey distributed by MHEC is included in Volume 2.

Appendix B - Incident Data by Sector and Institution Type

Tables 2 through 5 summarize the incident data for all Maryland public institutions, the public four-year colleges and universities, community colleges, and independent institutions, respectively.

Table 2: Aggregated Incident Data - All Maryland Public Colleges and Universities		
Total number of incidents	803	%
Incidents reported within 24 hours	253	31.5%
Incidents reported within the same semester	394	49.1%
Incidents reported after the end of the semester or longer	156	19.4%
Incidents classified as Sexual Assault I	161	20.0%
Incidents classified as Sexual Assault II	71	8.8%
Incidents classified as Other Sexual Misconduct	549	68.4%
Incident location: On campus	417	51.9%
Incident location: Off campus	294	36.6%
Incident location: School-sponsored activity	33	4.1%
Incident location: Undisclosed	59	7.3%
# of incidents reported to law enforcement (to knowledge of Title IX coordinator)	271	33.7%
# that involved one or more non-student perpetrators	347	43.2%
Accommodation: Alternative housing	30	3.7%
Accommodation: Referral to counseling/health services	609	75.8%
Accommodation: No-contact or stay order	220	27.4%
Accommodation: Interim suspension	43	5.4%
Accommodation: Academic accommodations (test rescheduling, class scheduling, etc.)	157	19.6%
Accommodation: Other	162	20.2%
Formal complaint totals		%
Total number of incidents resulting in formal complaints	205	25.5%
Formal complaints in which one or more perpetrators were found responsible	98	47.8%
Result: Suspension	30	30.6%
Result: Expulsion	17	17.3%
Result: Other	55	56.1%
In how many formal complaints was a finding of responsibility appealed?	23	23.5%

Note: The number of incidents by type totals to 781 because institutions had too little information to classify 22 of the cases; the number of accommodations totals more than the number of incidents because multiple accommodations were made for each incident; the count of results of formal complaints by type exceeds the total number of formal complaints because more than one outcome could occur for each formal complaint.

Table 3: Aggregated Incident Data - All Maryland Public Four-Year Institutions		
Total number of incidents	634	%
Incidents reported within 24 hours	178	28.1%
Incidents reported within the same semester	320	50.5%
Incidents reported after the end of the semester or longer	136	21.5%
Incidents classified as Sexual Assault I	152	24.0%
Incidents classified as Sexual Assault II	52	8.2%
Incidents classified as Other Sexual Misconduct	409	64.5%
Incident location: On campus	307	48.4%
Incident location: Off campus	246	38.8%
Incident location: School-sponsored activity	25	3.9%
Incident location: Undisclosed	56	8.8%
# of incidents reported to law enforcement (to knowledge of Title IX coordinator)	230	36.3%
# that involved one or more non-student perpetrators	281	44.3%
Accommodation: Alternative housing	27	4.3%
Accommodation: Referral to counseling/health services	494	77.9%
Accommodation: No-contact or stay order	155	24.4%
Accommodation: Interim suspension	31	4.9%
Accommodation: Academic accommodations (test rescheduling, class scheduling, etc.)	115	18.1%
Accommodation: Other	123	19.4%
Formal complaint totals		%
Total number of incidents resulting in formal complaints	151	23.8%
Formal complaints in which one or more perpetrators were found responsible	57	37.7%
Result: Suspension	19	33.3%
Result: Expulsion	10	17.5%
Result: Other	31	54.4%
In how many formal complaints was a finding of responsibility appealed?	20	35.1%

Note: The number of incidents by type totals to 613 because institutions had too little information to classify 21 cases; the number of accommodations totals more than the number of incidents because multiple accommodations were made for each incident; the count of results of formal complaints by type exceeds the total number of formal complaints because more than one outcome could occur for each formal complaint.

Table 4: Aggregated Incident Data - All Maryland Community Colleges		
Total number of incidents	169	%
Incidents reported within 24 hours	75	44.4%
Incidents reported within the same semester	74	43.8%
Incidents reported after the end of the semester or longer	20	11.8%
Incidents classified as Sexual Assault I	*	*
Incidents classified as Sexual Assault II	19	11.2%
Incidents classified as Other Sexual Misconduct	140	82.8%
Incident location: On campus	110	65.1%
Incident location: Off campus	48	28.4%
Incident location: School-sponsored activity	*	*
Incident location: Undisclosed	*	*
# of incidents reported to law enforcement (to knowledge of Title IX coordinator)	41	24.3%
# that involved one or more non-student perpetrators	66	39.1%
Accommodation: Alternative housing	*	*
Accommodation: Referral to counseling/health services	115	68.0%
Accommodation: No-contact or stay order	65	38.5%
Accommodation: Interim suspension	12	7.1%
Accommodation: Academic accommodations (test rescheduling, class scheduling, etc.)	42	24.9%
Accommodation: Other	39	23.1%
Formal complaint totals		%
Total number of incidents resulting in formal complaints	54	32.0%
Formal complaints in which one or more perpetrators were found responsible	41	75.9%
Result: Suspension	11	26.8%
Result: Expulsion	*	*
Result: Other	24	58.5%
In how many formal complaints was a finding of responsibility appealed?	*	*

Notes: All figures of ten or fewer are indicated with *. The number of incidents by type totals is less than the total because an institution had too little information to classify one case; the number of accommodations totals more than the number of incidents because multiple accommodations were made for each incident; the count of results of formal complaints by type exceeds the total number of formal complaints because more than one outcome could occur for each formal complaint.

Table 5: Aggregated Incident Data - All Maryland Independent Institutions		
Total number of incidents	251	%
Incidents reported within 24 hours	71	28.3%
Incidents reported within the same semester	119	47.4%
Incidents reported after the end of the semester or longer	61	24.3%
Incidents classified as Sexual Assault I	76	30.3%
Incidents classified as Sexual Assault II	33	13.1%
Incidents classified as Other Sexual Misconduct	142	56.6%
Incident location: On campus	152	60.6%
Incident location: Off campus	67	26.7%
Incident location: School-sponsored activity	*	*
Incident location: Undisclosed	29	11.6%
# of incidents reported to law enforcement (to knowledge of Title IX coordinator)	28	11.2%
# that involved one or more non-student perpetrators	105	41.8%
Accommodation: Alternative housing	37	14.7%
Accommodation: Referral to counseling/health services	146	58.2%
Accommodation: No-contact or stay order	87	34.7%
Accommodation: Interim suspension	*	*
Accommodation: Academic accommodations (test rescheduling, class scheduling, etc.)	57	22.7%
Accommodation: Other	55	21.9%
Formal complaint totals		%
Total number of incidents resulting in formal complaints	53	21.1%
Formal complaints in which one or more perpetrators were found responsible	21	39.6%
Result: Suspension	*	*
Result: Expulsion	*	*
Result: Other	13	61.9%
In how many formal complaints was a finding of responsibility appealed?	13	61.9%

Note: All figures of 10 or fewer are marked with an *. The number of accommodations totals more than the number of incidents because multiple accommodations were made for each incident; the count of results of formal complaints by type exceeds the total number of formal complaints because more than one outcome could occur for each formal complaint.