

# HSU's 2020 Safer Campus Survey Results

In Fall 2020, Humboldt State University's Sexual Assault Prevention Committee (SAPC) re-surveyed the HSU student community to:

- continue researching the scope and pervasiveness of sexual assault, intimate partner violence, stalking, and sexual harassment experienced by HSU students;
- learn about their experiences of reporting these forms of harm, barriers to reporting, and gauge student awareness about these types of violence in our campus community;
- inquire whether students see themselves as having a role in preventing or ending sexualized violence;
- assess students' engagement with CHECK IT, HSU's bystander intervention prevention program.

## Survey History

In 2012 Mary Sue Savage, the Prevention Coordinator for the Department of Justice Grant to Reduce Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, and Stalking on Campus Grant, worked with other campus and community members of the SAPC to review existing college survey instruments and to design the 2013 survey for HSU students. Gay Hylton and Michael Le in Institutional Research designed a process for ensuring anonymity for respondents. An invitation to take an anonymous online survey was sent to all students who were at least 18 years of age and enrolled at Humboldt State University. This survey was first implemented in Fall 2013 and re-implemented in Fall 2016 and Fall 2020.

## Methodology

In Fall 2020, Dr. Amy Moffat and Seth Bradley from the Office of Institutional Effectiveness assisted with survey revision and rebuilt the instrument within Qualtrics in order to facilitate survey administration. Revisions were centered around institutional structural changes since the last administration (names of offices/resources), updating language to be more inclusive, and environmental changes due to the Coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, and the addition of a section on student's engagement with CHECK IT. The survey's third implementation occurred in Fall 2020 utilizing the anonymity and distribution features in Qualtrics.

In November 2020, all HSU students above the age of 18 were invited to take the survey; of the 7,074 students invited, 669 participated in the survey for a 9% response rate. While the response rate was lower than the 2016 iteration (which had 19% rate of response), the 2020 administration is unique in that it occurred during a global pandemic which likely had a detrimental impact on students' willingness to complete the survey. Additionally, the survey was administered in the weeks following a contentious presidential election with disputed election results, likely depressing response rates as well.

While the number of respondents changed from question to question, roughly 403 cisgender women, 126 cisgender men, 97 trans\* students, and 43 students who did not specify their gender identity participated in the 2020 survey.

## Gender Terminology and Aggregation

The gender identity question on the survey allowed respondents to select as many boxes as applied to them; additionally respondents were able to write in a text box. For data analysis purposes, respondents were aggregated into four gender categories: cisgender women, cisgender men, trans\* and unspecified. Throughout the report, the category “cis women” refers to respondents who only checked the box for “woman,” and the category “cis men” refers to respondents who only checked the box for “man.”<sup>1</sup> The category “trans\*” is used as an umbrella category to refer to respondents who checked any of the following boxes along with, or in lieu of, “woman” or “man”: transgender man/FTM spectrum; transgender woman/MTF spectrum; Two-Spirit; nonbinary; genderqueer, gender non-conforming. The umbrella category also includes written identities outside the binary of man/woman. The purpose of this aggregation and classification was to enable comparisons with national data that reveal differential rates of harm for cis women, cis men, and trans and non-binary persons. Some limitations of this method of aggregation of gender categories for the purposes of analysis are discussed in the section titled “Limitations and Recommendations” below.

## Interpretation of the Data

When interpreting the data presented in this report it is important to remember that response bias is expected in any voluntary survey. We cannot determine whether survivors of these forms of violence were more or less likely to participate in the survey. Thus we cannot deduce that the percentages reported in the survey are representative of the campus community as a whole, nor can we make definitive comparisons with our 2016 and 2013 Safer Campus Survey results, or with studies from other campuses or national averages.

Furthermore, when making comparisons to our 2016 and 2013 Safer Campus Survey results, we must understand that any increased rates of harm *reported* do not always reflect increased rates of harm *experienced*. [\*Not Alone\*](#), Obama’s White House Task Force report on sexual assault on college campuses, states, “When a school tries to tackle the problem – by acknowledging it, drawing attention to it, and encouraging survivors to report – it can start to look like a dangerous place. On the flip side, when a school ignores the problem or discourages reporting (either actively or by treating survivors without care), it can look safer.... Schools have to get credit for being honest – and for finding out what’s really happening on campus.... [A] school that is willing to get an accurate assessment of sexual assault on its campus is one that’s taking the problem – and the solution – seriously.”

While the results are not generalizable, they highlight the unfortunate reality that sexual assault, intimate partner violence, stalking, and sexual harassment remain serious issues at HSU. However, the survey also highlights effective and empowering responses to the harm. The quantitative and qualitative data on CHECK IT provide concrete evidence of the ways in which this program has empowered students to recognize and disrupt potential moments of harm and to promote consent-centered community norms.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Cis women” is a shortened version of cisgender women and refers to women who were assigned the category of female at birth; similarly, “cis men” is a shortened version of cisgender men and refers to men who were assigned the category of male at birth. The method of assigning those who only selected the category of “woman” or “man” to the categories of cis women and cis men respectively is imperfect and may have miscategorized some respondents.

Overall, the results of this survey offer important points for reflection and action in our community:

1. they make visible students' experiences of sexual assault, intimate partner violence, stalking, and sexual harassment;
2. they provide the SAPC with data for evaluating our efforts to prevent and respond to violence in our campus community;
3. they enable the campus to more effectively prevent and respond to these forms of violence;
4. and they reveal important insights about the effectiveness of CHECK IT, HSU's bystander intervention prevention program.

## Limitations and Recommendations

While the university experience is dynamic in general, the limited on-campus and remote learning environment of higher education during the 2020 pandemic marked a significant divergence from how HSU students would normally experience university life. Because the 2020 survey was administered during the COVID-19 pandemic, we expect that survey response rates were impacted, and that some respondents would not have as much, if any, direct experience on-campus. For this reason, some of the 2020 results in this summary will offer a rate that excludes first-year (students who started at HSU during the pandemic) responses in addition to the rate from all respondents. Beyond first-year students, the isolated nature of the current learning environment is likely to have impacted student awareness of and experience with instances of harm. The longitudinal nature of this project will be served by conducting an additional iteration of this survey once pandemic conditions have lessened and the campus has returned to majority in-person learning.

Additionally, limitations of time and resources did not enable a disaggregated, nor intersectional, analysis of the data. The umbrella category of trans\*, by aggregating a number of distinct gender identities (e.g., trans woman, trans man, nonbinary), prevents an analysis of important differences in rates of harm that would likely be revealed if data were disaggregated. Additionally, differences of race/ethnicity, sexuality and disability are also concealed by reporting rates of harm by gender category alone. The project will be served by disaggregating the category of trans\* and analyzing the data at the intersection of sexuality, race and disability. While some resulting sample sizes may be too small to draw meaningful inferences, we expect this disaggregated and intersectional analysis will provide additional insights into patterns of harm on our campus. The SAPC will continue to explore avenues for further analysis of the data.

## Key Findings of Incidents of Harm

In 2020, for incidents of sexual assault or abuse, 128 students gave relationship information about the individual responsible for the harm. Of these, 41% indicated they were in a dating or hooking-up relationship with the responsible party, 34% identified them as a friend, and 26% indicated they were strangers.

The vast majority of harm detailed by respondents was not reported to the police or campus officials, with 69% of respondents not reporting the incident(s). HSU's office for Title IX and Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation Prevention had the highest reporting rate with 12% of respondents, while the other reporting options all had less than 10% report rates. Similarly, 63% of respondents indicated that they did not report their incident(s) of stalking, with the highest report rate (10%) being to HSU's Police Department. Additionally, the survey indicates even lower rates for instances of intimate partner

violence and sexual harassment: 79% of respondents did not report intimate partner violence and 84% did not report sexual harassment incident(s).

The report reveals disparities between cis women's and cis men's experiences of harm, and significant disparities between cisgender students' and trans\* students' experiences of harm (details provided below). Gender disparities were most evident in the responses to questions asking about the gender identity of the person who caused the harm.<sup>2</sup>

**Please note that this report contains explicit descriptions of violence.**

---

## Sexual Assault

About **17%** of cis women, **13%** of cis men, **36%** of trans\* students, as well as **13%** of students who did not specify their gender, reported experiences of sexual assault since becoming a student at HSU.

- **73** students (38 cis women, 10 cis men, 24 trans\* students, 1 unspecified gender) reported some form of sexual assault or abuse other than the 3 categories listed;
- **66** students (42 cis women; 9 cis men; 14 trans\* students; 1 unspecified gender) reported someone committed sexual acts upon them while they were drunk, drugged, passed out, or asleep;
- **37** students (20 cis women; 7 cis men; 9 trans\* students; 1 unspecified gender) reported oral contact with genitals without consent;
- **36** students (23 cis women; 3 cis men; 9 trans\* students; 1 unspecified gender) reported penetration without consent.

About 82% of survivors of sexual assault identified the gender of the person who harmed them as men (cis and trans), 15% as women (cis and trans), and less than 1% as non-binary.

## Intimate Partner Violence

Since becoming a student at HSU about **18%** of cis women, **17%** of cis men, **25%** of trans\* students surveyed, as well as **25%** of students who did not specify their gender, reported physical violence, sexual violence, threats, monitoring, and other tactics and strategies of power and control that constitute intimate partner violence.

- **51** students (31 cis women, 10 cis men, 8 trans\* students, 2 unspecified gender) reported their partner kept track of them and demanded to know where they were;
- **42** students (26 cis women, 5 cis men, 10 trans\* students, 1 unspecified gender) reported their partner made them have sex when they did not want to;
- **38** students (22 cis women, 6 cis men, 8 trans\* students, 2 unspecified gender) reported that their partners made threats to physically harm them or someone they love;
- **14** students (10 cis women, 0 cis men, 3 trans\* students, and 1 unspecified gender) reported being choked or strangled;
- **12** students (8 cis women, 1 man, 2 trans\* students, and 1 unspecified gender) reported being kicked, bit, burned, or hit;

---

<sup>2</sup>Respondents were provided with the following gender identity options for this question: woman (including Cis and Trans), man (including Cis and Trans), non-binary, unsure, prefer not to state.

- **Additional reports of harm include:** pushing, slapping, shoving; insults and put-downs; controlling budget, clothing, friends; keeping someone from leaving a space; destroying things; using a weapon against them.

About 73% of survivors of intimate partner violence identified the gender of the person who harmed them as men (cis and trans), 23% as women (cis and trans), and less than 2% as non-binary.

## Stalking

About **15%** of cis women, **11%** of cis men, **22%** of trans\* students surveyed, as well as **25%** of students who did not specify their gender, reported experiencing stalking since becoming a student at HSU.

- **57** students (38 cis women, 5 cis men, 14 trans\*, 0 unspecified gender) reported that someone engaged in repeated, unwanted communication (written, email, social media, texting,);
- **45** students (31 cis women, 5 cis men, 8 trans\*, 1 unspecified gender) reported that someone repeatedly followed them;
- **33** students (19 cis women, 3 cis men, 11 trans\*, 0 unspecified gender) reported that someone tracked or monitored their location or actions;
- **18** students (9 cis women, 5 cis men, 4 trans\*, 0 unspecified gender) reported that someone left gifts or written letters/notes;
- **6** students (3 cis women, 1 cis man, 2 trans\*, 0 unspecified gender) reported that someone hacked into their email, social media, and/or another personal account;
- **3** students (1 woman, 0 cis men, 2 trans\*, 0 unspecified gender) reported that someone watched or took photos while they were undressing, nude, or having sex.

About 68% of survivors of stalking identified the gender of the person who harmed them as men (cis and trans), 18% as women (cis and trans), and less than 3% as non-binary, and 7% as unsure.

## Sexual Harassment

About **34%** of cis women, **18%** of cis men, and **54%** of trans\* students surveyed, as well as **38%** of students who did not specify their gender, reported experiencing sexual harassment since becoming a student at HSU. (Compared to 2013 results of 46% of cis women, 16% of cis men, 63% of trans\* students surveyed, as well as 53% of students who did not specify their gender.)

Forms of harm included: kissing and touching without consent; whistles and catcalls; inappropriate questions about their sexual life; unwanted sexual phone calls, texts, or social media posts; unwanted exposure of genitals, masturbation, sexual motions, or gestures.

- **143** students (102 cis women, 7 cis men, 32 trans\*, 2 unspecified gender) reported that someone whistled, catcalled, or made noises/comments with a sexual overtone toward them;
- **123** students (75 cis women, 12 cis men, 34 trans\*, 2 unspecified gender) reported that someone asked inappropriate questions about their sex, romantic life, or sexuality;
- **100** students (65 cis women, 9 cis men, 25 trans\*, 1 unspecified gender) reported that someone made nonconsensual sexual contact with them (including kissing and touching above or under clothes);

- **49** students (32 cis women, 4 cis men, 12 trans\*, 1 unspecified gender) reported that someone made sexual or obscene calls, texts, social media posts, or messages;
- **41** students (25 cis women, 6 cis men, 9 trans\*, 1 unspecified gender) reported that someone made sexual motions (such as grabbing crotch or pretending to masturbate) toward them;
- **30** students (16 cis women, 7 cis men, 6 trans\*, 1 unspecified gender) reported that someone exposed their sexual body parts or masturbated in front of them.

About 75% of survivors of sexual harassment identified the gender of the person who harmed them as men (cis and trans), 12% as women (cis and trans), and less than 1% as non-binary, and 10% as unsure.

## Comparing 2013, 2016, and 2020 Survey Results

### Race/Ethnicity

The 2013 and 2016 Safer Campus Survey had comparable response rates, yet there were several significant demographic differences in the sample, while the 2020 Safer Campus survey had a much lower response rate than the prior iterations but also saw some small shifts in demographic response rates.

The rate of Latinx respondents increased from 16.8% in 2013 to 23.4% in 2016, and decreased to 18.1% in 2020. The rate of white respondents dropped from 58.3% in 2013 to 52% in 2016, increasing slightly to 52.7% in 2020. Rates of African-American respondents dropped from 2.9% in 2013 to 2.2% in 2016, but increased to 2.5% in 2020. Asian and Pacific Islander respondents dropped from 4.1% in 2013 to 3.5% in 2016, increasing back to 4.1% in 2020. Native American respondents increased from 0.9% in 2013 to 2.3% in 2016, and decreasing to 1.4% in 2020.

When compared to the ethnic diversity of the [HSU population](#) as a whole in fall 2020, this indicates that Latinx and African American respondents were under-represented while White and Asian and Pacific Islander respondents were over-represented in the survey participants.

### Gender

All three survey iterations had a higher number of cis women respondents (1,215 in 2013, 1,202 in 2016, and 425 in 2020) than cis men (565 in 2013, 502 in 2016, and 135 in 2020), while the number of trans\* respondents increased from 48 respondents in 2013 to 68 respondents in 2016, and 97 respondents in 2020.

### Class Level

One of the most significant demographic changes from the 2013 to 2016 survey was the number of respondents who were in their first year (33% in 2013 vs. 26.8% in 2016), however, the 2020 implementation saw a lower rate for first-year students with 22.6%. The first two survey implementations saw an increase in students who had been at HSU for three or more years (43% in 2013 vs. 49.6% in 2016), while the 2020 survey saw a slight shift to 49.4% for the same group.

Each of the survey implementations asked about experiencing different forms of violence since becoming an HSU student. Significant differences in response rates, global conditions (and the resultant changes in teaching and living situations for students), respondent demographics, as well as different methodologies for determining rates of harm prevent definitive claims about changes in rates in harm from 2013, 2016, and 2020.

## CHECK IT

Arguably the most significant difference in our campus context between the first two surveys was HSU's launch of CHECK IT, our bystander intervention program, in March 2014. CHECK IT's numerous forms of outreach engage and educate students to recognize dynamics of sexual assault, dating/domestic violence, and stalking; to provide information about strategies to disrupt potential moments of harm; to understand affirmative consent and healthy boundaries; and to educate students about resources for support, options for accountability, and access to accommodations. Fall 2016 marked the fifth full semester of CHECK IT programming on campus. Of the 1,796 students who participated in the 2016 survey, 50% of the respondents had entered HSU with CHECK IT programming in place. By Fall 2020, 96% of respondents entered HSU with CHECK IT programming in place, with 84% of respondents indicating that they are familiar with the CHECK IT program, and 75% of students who responded said they have attended at least one CHECK IT activity. About 92% of respondents indicate that they believe CHECK IT to be important or very important. The 2020 survey is the first time that the vast majority of students at HSU have encountered CHECK IT in their orientation to the campus and have access to CHECK IT events and campaigns throughout their entire experience at HSU.

The 2020 survey gives us additional data to assess some of the impact of the CHECK IT program, including changes in student awareness of affirmative consent, the meanings and definitions of types of harm, and if this has a correlation to the number of HSU students causing harm, as well as changes in attitudes toward bystander intervention, and how many students see themselves as having a role in working to change a culture of normalization and support for violence.

However, it is imperative to note that one of the key methods of culture change employed by CHECK IT – social branding and marketing of core messages – was significantly disrupted due to the pandemic. The visual impact of CHECK IT was woven throughout campus before HSU shifted to online learning. CHECK IT symbols were worn on clothing, visible on water bottles and backpacks, and posted in hallways and on doors. CHECK IT volunteers were on the quad tabling, present at numerous events with the consent-themed (and alcohol free) bar, and CHECK IT messages were found at parties through the CHECK IT party packs. CHECK IT's presence and their core messages were impossible to avoid. During the pandemic CHECK IT quickly pivoted to online messaging and campaigning, hosting numerous virtual trainings and having over 2000 followers on Instagram. We hypothesize that the tremendous work of CHECK IT to keep their messaging strong during the campus shift to primarily virtual operations helped to maintain strong levels of awareness of sexual assault, dating and domestic violence, stalking, and sexual harassment on our campus. However, given that social media is based upon an opt in strategy, not all students were exposed to CHECK IT's branding and social marketing.

### Awareness of issues at HSU

This section attempts to track student awareness of Sexual Assault/Abuse, Sexual Harassment, Dating and Domestic Violence, and Stalking as issues HSU as well as those who do not think any of the categories are issues at HSU. Rates with an asterisk (\*) indicate a statistically significant difference from the prior year's rate ( $p < .05$ ).

#### Sexual Assault/Abuse:

In 2013, only 26% of survey respondents identified sexual assault/abuse as a problem at HSU; this jumped to 46%\* of respondents by 2016, but decreased to 39.4%\* (44.1% without 1st years) in 2020.

#### Sexual Harassment:

Awareness of sexual harassment rose from 39% in 2013 to 60.3%\* in 2016, and decreasing to 48.4%\* (53.1%\* without 1st years) in 2020.

#### Dating/Domestic Violence:

Awareness of intimate partner violence as a problem at HSU was at 28% in 2013, and rose to 38.5%\* in 2016, and dropped to 31.9%\* (36.2% without 1st years) in 2020.

#### Stalking

Awareness of the problem of stalking jumped from 28% in 2013 to 43.8%\* in 2016, and fell to 30.9%\* (34.3%\* without 1st years) in 2020.

#### None

Equally noteworthy, the percentage of respondents who said that none of these forms of harm are problems at HSU declined from 45% in 2013 to 25.6%\* in 2016, and increased slightly to 30.4%\* (27.6% without 1st years) in 2020.

### Intervention Role

This section tracks whether students feel they have a role in intervening in instances of harm involving Sexual Assault/Abuse, Sexual Harassment, Dating/Domestic Violence, and Stalking as well as those who do not think they have a role in any of those categories.

#### Sexual Assault/Abuse:

In 2013, 48% of respondents saw themselves as having an intervention role for instances of Sexual Assault/Abuse; by 2016, this rose to 61.9%\*, in 2020 it dropped to 54.5%\* (53.8%\* without 1st years).

#### Sexual Harassment:

In 2013, 55% of respondents indicated they had an intervention role in instances of Sexual Harassment, this increased to 70.7%\* in 2016, but dropped slightly to 64.4%\* (64.4%\* without 1st years) in 2020.

#### Dating/Domestic Violence

The percentage of students indicating they saw themselves as having a role in preventing or ending Dating/Domestic Violence rose from 50% in 2013 to 58.2%\* in 2016, but fell to 51.6%\* (49.8%\* without 1st years) in 2020

#### Stalking



Of respondents, 36% thought they had a role intervening in stalking incidents in 2013, increasing to 46.8%\* in 2016, and decreasing slightly to 43.2% (42.7% without 1st years) in 2020

#### None

The number of students who saw no role for themselves intervening in these forms of violence decreased from 26% in the 2013 survey to 14.3%\* in 2016, but increased slightly to 15.6% (15.9% without 1st years) in 2020.

We hypothesize that the small dips in awareness in the data above are due to either or both of the following: the shift in methods of prevention education due to the pandemic (as discussed above), and the shift in national political culture. It is important to note that the 2016 survey was not only conducted after 2.5 years of CHECK IT programming, but also after 8 years of a presidency that made campus sexual assault a national issue. In contrast, the 2020 survey was conducted after 4 years of a presidency that undermined the work of the prior administration on this issue. Future surveys will enable us to see if a return to in-person campus operations, combined with a presidency once again committed to addressing the issue of campus sexual assault, dating and domestic violence and stalking, will affect students' perceptions of these issues.

## Bystander Intervention Responses

One of the distinctive features of CHECK IT is the focus on educating students to recognize sexual assault, dating and domestic violence and stalking, and empowering them to disrupt potential moments of harm. This survey marks the first time that we have collected qualitative and quantitative data about incidents of bystander intervention.

Since attending HSU, 203 respondents reported witnessing 1 or more potential moments of harm. Out of those who witnessed a potential moment of harm, 136 students (67%) reported intervening 1 or more times. In the optional comment box about intervention, 41 students shared details of CHECKing IT at parties, in public spaces, on campus and in the community. People shared a mix of direct, delegate and distract intervention strategies, however, distract was the most commonly used method.

Utilizing the distract method, one student shared, "At a party I saw a girl who was clearly uncomfortable with the guy she was with. I came over and reached in between them for something on the counter and then started a conversation with her. When I saw she was relieved by this, I kept talking and the guy eventually said he had to go and went away." Another student shared, "I noticed that my friend was being followed by her ex-partner on campus, so I ran up to my friend and pulled them into the Depot. Since there were so many people in the Depot, their ex-partner turned around and walked away." Another student shared, "A guy was trying to hit on a girl and you can tell she's clearly uncomfortable and the guy wouldn't stop so I walked up to her, gave her a hug, and pretended I knew her forever and got her away from the man. She was so thankful, she didn't know how to leave the situation without worrying he'd get mad at her."

Utilizing the direct method, one student shared, “I overheard a couple arguing late at night while walking to my car after work. She was crying and walking away from him, and he was following her and yelling at her. I offered her a ride and she said she was close to home and at that point, the man turned around.”

Utilizing the direct and delegate method, one student shared, “A man was bothering a young woman at a Humbrews music event, repeatedly trying to touch her and dance with her after being turned down. I asked her if she needed any help, and let her know that me and my friend were available to her. At the end of the night when she left, I saw the guy leave immediately after she did (she didn't see him), so I informed the door guy and they sent an employee to make sure she knew he was following her.”

### Qualitative Data

Survey respondents were given the option to provide general comments about the CHECK IT program. 167 out of the 669 total surveyed chose to write in responses.

#### Negative, neutral or mixed comments

While the responses regarding CHECK IT were overwhelmingly positive, there were 18 negative comments and 29 neutral or mixed responses. In these comments, students shared that they did not think the CHECK IT program was effective, it wasn't addressing faculty related harm, it wasn't focusing enough on sexual harassment, and that the program was treated like a joke.

#### Positive comments

Respondents' written responses overwhelmingly demonstrate the personal and powerful impact CHECK IT has had on HSU students and the campus community. The following common themes emerged within people's responses about the CHECK IT program:

**CHECK IT has increased people's awareness about sexual violence, dating violence, consent and bystander intervention at HSU.** 43 students mentioned that CHECK IT spreads awareness, shares resources, and/or provides educational tools in their comments. Some shared that CHECK IT has increased conversations about sexual violence and dating violence on campus and has made it easier to talk about. Others shared how CHECK IT has helped create a community that does not tolerate violence. For example, one student shared, “Check It does exceptional and incredible work for this campus. They host wonderful events and educational trainings that are helpful and strengthen a culture of consent on campus.” Another shared that CHECK IT “sets the tone on campus as one of ‘no violence tolerated.’”

**Students believe CHECK IT is an essential program on campus.** 34 students noted the importance of the CHECK IT program in their comments. 9 students shared that every college campus should have a program like CHECK IT and 3 students shared that CHECK IT is the best program at HSU. One student shared, “CHECK IT is the first of its kind when there should be such an organization on every single college campus. I was never exposed to consent until I was exposed to CHECK IT. It's one of the best programs HSU has to offer its community.” Another student shared, “Every college and university needs a program like CHECK IT, and talks/programs/educational awareness to let people know that this resource is available.”

**CHECK IT creates a safer campus environment.** 11 students shared that CHECK IT makes them or the university feel safer. As one student shares, “CHECK IT makes it feel like the campus cares about our safety and wants us to be informed about important issues that may affect us at some point.” Another student shared, “Check it makes me feel a lot safer on campus, knowing there's a group of people that are going to look out for you.”

**CHECK IT provides tools for individuals to improve their relationships, communication and engagement with others.** 8 students shared that CHECK IT has empowered them with the language to communicate consent and to grow as a person. As one student shared, “Check It gave me the language to enforce and actively push towards a more consent centered social life.” Another shared, “Check-it taught me the power of saying no, it taught me the information I needed to stop victim shaming.” Lastly, someone shared, “Without CHECK IT I wouldn't talk about consent nearly as much. But it makes my life so much better to talk about it!”

**CHECK IT provides information about survivor support resources.** 8 students mentioned survivor support in their comments. One student shared, “I believe CHECK IT is a great organization that not only provides information on what to do in tense situations but also provides help for those suffering from those situations.” Another student shared, “I think people have a difficult time leaving relationships that may be abusive either verbally or physically and the education you provide is extremely beneficial to all students.”

Overall, the qualitative data demonstrates that CHECK IT has had a positive impact on our campus community. 92% of survey respondents indicate that they believe CHECK IT to be an important program on campus. One student shared, “CHECK IT was definitely one of the reasons, I decided to come to HSU, because I know how prevalent sexual harm is in institutions and to know there is a group on campus that works to prevent that and spread a message of consent, was very empowering and encouraging.”

---

This project was partially supported by Grant No. 2015-WA-AX-0002 awarded by the Office on Violence Against Women, U.S. Department of Justice. The opinions, findings, conclusions, and recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Justice, Office on Violence Against Women.