

**EVALUATION OF THE SEXUAL HARASSMENT
INFORMATION SESSIONS AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON**

Jessica K. Winchell and Jennifer Sheridan
WISELI Research and Evaluation Staff

July 12, 2006

(Revised September 2006)

This material is based on work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 0123666. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

Table of Contents

Background.....	3
Session Development.....	3
Session Participation.....	3
Sexual Harassment at UW-Madison.....	5
Evaluation.....	7
Post-Session Evaluation Survey.....	8
<i>Worlife</i> Survey Data.....	18
Conclusion.....	20
Appendix A1: Sexual harassment items from the <i>Study of Faculty Worklife at the University of Wisconsin – Madison</i> (2003).....	22
Appendix A2: Sexual harassment items from the <i>Study of Faculty Worklife at the University of Wisconsin – Madison</i> (2006).....	24
Appendix B: Survey Data on Sexual Harassment at UW-Madison.....	25
Appendix C: Sexual Harassment Information Session Evaluation Survey.....	35

Background

The University of Wisconsin-Madison's Equity & Diversity Resource Center has included information about resolving sexual harassment concerns in educational sessions for employing units and graduate assistants for many years. In 1997, the Committee on Women in the University proposed the development of new information sessions for faculty, in response to community concerns that faculty, many of whom supervise staff or student employees, were unaware of and unprepared to respond to sexual harassment issues on campus. Initially, the committee proposed that the Faculty Senate require all federally-funded principal investigators to attend mandatory Sexual Harassment Information Sessions (November 1997). The Faculty Senate resolved to offer voluntary Sessions to all campus employees (February 1998). Since 1999, a team of facilitators coordinated by the Equity and Diversity Resource Center (EDRC) and the Office of the Provost has presented information sessions for more than 2,000 faculty, staff, and student employees.

Session Development

Sexual Harassment Information Session content and format was developed collaboratively by a working group including representatives of the Committee on Women in the University, the Equity & Diversity Resource Center and the offices of the Provost, Administrative Legal Services, Human Resource Development, with additional input from the entire Committee on Women in the University, the University Committee, the Faculty Senate, the Academic Staff Executive Committee, and members of the Graduate School and University Police.

The session incorporates presentations on sexual harassment laws and university policies, principles for responding to sexual harassment allegations, and campus resources. A second component of the session is a group discussion of case-study examples. This discussion allows participants to work through possible sexual harassment and consensual relationship situations. All together, the session is intended to raise awareness of sexual harassment and consensual relationship concerns and to equip participants with the tools to seek advice and respond to these concerns in their respective departments or units.

Session Participation

The EDRC and Office of the Provost have worked in partnership with deans, directors, chairs, and other campus leaders to encourage voluntary participation in Sexual Harassment Information Sessions. In some instances, leaders have opted to mandate attendance. The dean of the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences (CALS) has required all employees, including faculty, to attend. Since fall 2005, the chancellor has required all limited appointees to attend. Differences in reported experiences of voluntary participants and participants required to attend are discussed below.

Complete participant data is not available for the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions. Attendance was not recorded at voluntary sessions, though evaluation surveys returned to the EDRC and records of Information Sessions held suggest some general participation patterns.

A total of 2,026 evaluation surveys were completed by Session participants and returned to the EDRC between January 2000 and May 2006. Plausibly some participants chose not to return the evaluation survey, suggesting that the gross number of participants may significantly exceed 2,000. It is also possible that some individuals may have attended more than one session and returned more than one evaluation survey, thus it is possible that some participants may be double-counted. Overall, we can estimate that more than 2,000 campus employees attended the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions in this five-and-a-half year period.

Records of Sessions held for different divisions and units on campus suggest that faculty participation has been highest in the College of Agricultural & Life Sciences, where participation is mandated; the Medical School, which has hosted nearly fifty sessions at facilities on campus and throughout the state; the School of Education, and the College of Engineering. Furthermore, staff participation has been highest in Athletics, the Division of Information Technology, the General Library System, and the State Laboratory of Hygiene, which offer sessions regularly.

Additional information about Session participation can also be gleaned from faculty-wide surveys conducted in 2003 and 2006. Conducted by the Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI), the *Study of Faculty Worklife* asked faculty to report on their participation in a variety of campus programs including the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions. Aggregate responses to these items are presented in Appendix B, Tables B7-B8. Here we summarize faculty participation patterns.

In 2003, 206 of 1241 faculty respondents (16.6%) reported that they had ever attended the Sessions. By 2006, the gross number and proportion of faculty indicating that they had ever attended the Sessions had risen to 266 of 993 respondents or 26.8%. This growth in participation is statistically significant at $p < 0.05$ and is consistent across a number of faculty characteristics, including gender, tenure status, and division.

Despite gains in faculty participation observed during this three-year period, a notable minority of faculty remain unaware of the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions. Slightly less than one-quarter of faculty reported that they had never heard of the Sessions in both 2003 and 2006 (23.1% and 22.0%). This suggests that there was no appreciable decline in the proportion of faculty who do not know about the Sessions.

Some other systematic variations in reported participation are worth noting. In 2003, significantly more women faculty indicated that they had participated in the program (20.1% vs. 15.1%, difference significant at $p < 0.05$). The proportion of men faculty reporting participation grew to surpass that of women faculty by 2006 (27.8% vs. 24.5%, respectively).

Untenured, junior faculty reported significantly lower rates of participation in both 2003 and 2006 as compared to tenured, senior faculty (9.8% vs. 18.7% in 2003 and 14.1% vs. 30.9% in 2006, differences significant at $p < 0.05$). Junior faculty were also significantly ($p < 0.05$) more likely to report that they had never heard of the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions in survey periods (42.7% vs. 16.9% in 2003 and 38.9% vs. 16.1% in 2006).

Faculty in the biological sciences reported higher participation rates than any other division in both 2003 and 2006 (22.1% and 35.6%, respectively). This due to the fact that the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, in which many biological sciences faculty are housed, required many of its faculty to attend the Session.

The survey participation data suggests that while the number of faculty who attended the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions increased between 2003 and 2006, faculty participation remained modest overall. Lack of awareness about the Sessions may contribute to low participation rates among some groups of faculty, especially untenured faculty.

Taken together, these data suggest that while thousands of campus employees have been trained in the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions, those trained have included many more staff than faculty. This, in turn, raises the question of whether the Sessions have succeeded in reaching the audiences that the Committee on Women in the University and other concerned parties had identified as in need of training on sexual harassment issues in the late-1990's.

Sexual Harassment at UW-Madison

Before moving to evaluate the impact of the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions, it is helpful to consider the scope and context of sexual harassment issues on the UW-Madison campus. Data collected through 2003 and 2006 *Study of Faculty Worklife* illuminate faculty experiences with and perceptions of sexual harassment on campus. Aggregate responses to the relevant survey items are presented in Appendix B, Tables B1 – B6. Selected features of and trends in the data are discussed below.

The 2003 survey asked faculty to report whether they had experienced sexual harassment on campus in the past five years, and if so, how often. Overall, 7.6% of faculty respondents indicated that they had been sexually harassed at least once in the past five years. Of those who had been harassed, they reported that they had experienced an average of 2.4 incidents (standard deviation of 1.8). Many more women faculty than men indicated that they had experienced sexual harassment (15.9% vs. 3.9%, difference statistically significant at $p < 0.05$), with women faculty in the humanities especially likely to report having been harassed at least once (23.4% vs. 13.2% for all other women faculty). Faculty who identified as gay or lesbian also reported higher rates of sexual harassment as compared to those who identified as bi- or heterosexual¹ (22.6% vs. 7.2%, difference significant at $p < 0.06$).

The 2006 survey asked faculty to report whether and how often they had experienced sexual harassment within the past three years. A shortened frame of reference was employed here in an effort to prevent faculty reporting the same incidents in both surveys. The changed frame of reference may account for some of the notable, across-period changes in responses to this item.

Overall, fewer faculty reported having experienced recent sexual harassment in 2006 as compared to 2003 (5.6% vs. 7.6%). As in 2003, women faculty were significantly more likely than men faculty to indicate that they had been recently harassed (11.0% vs. 3.0%, difference

¹ Survey response patterns for faculty who identified as bisexual were more similar to heterosexual than homosexual faculty. Therefore, bisexual faculty have been grouped with heterosexual faculty here.

significant at $p < 0.05$). Despite the higher reported incidence among women, both men and women faculty were significantly ($p < 0.05$) less likely to report recent sexual harassment in 2006 as compared to 2003. A similar trend was observed for gay and lesbian versus bisexual and heterosexual faculty. While faculty who identified as gay or lesbian were more likely to indicate that they had been harassed as compared to bisexual and heterosexual faculty (19.1% vs. 5.4%), the proportion reporting harassment was lower than in 2003 for all orientations.

Faculty were also asked to report whether they knew what steps to take to respond to an allegation of sexual harassment. In 2003, 85.0% of faculty agreed strongly or somewhat that they knew what steps to take. Untenured faculty were significantly less likely to agree that they knew how to respond to sexual harassment as compared to tenured faculty (72.2% vs. 88.7%, difference significant at $p < 0.05$). Similarly, physical sciences faculty were significantly ($p < 0.05$) less likely to report knowing what steps to take in response to sexual harassment than all other faculty members.

In 2006, faculty reported that they were less confident in their ability to respond to a sexual harassment allegation. Overall, 81.6% strongly or somewhat agreed that they knew what steps to take in response to a sexual harassment allegation. This rate of agreement is significantly ($p < 0.05$) lower than in 2003. This pattern held across many faculty groups. Men and women faculty, tenured and untenured faculty, and faculty in the biological sciences, physical sciences, social sciences, and humanities were all less likely to agree that they knew what steps to take in response to a report of sexual harassment in 2006 than in 2003. This difference was particularly pronounced among untenured faculty (72.2% responded affirmatively in 2003, while 66.0% did so in 2006).

Faculty were then asked to report how they perceive the issue of sexual harassment on campus. First, they were asked to indicate whether or not they believe *sexual harassment is taken seriously on campus*. In both 2003 and 2006, a large majority of respondents agreed that sexual harassment is taken seriously at UW-Madison (94.4% and 93.1%, respectively). Women, gay and lesbian, and faculty of color were all less likely to agree that the issue is taken seriously, as compared to men, bi- and heterosexual, and majority faculty. These differences were statistically significant for each group in 2003 and for women faculty and faculty of color in 2006.

Second, faculty were asked whether they believe that *sexual harassment is a big problem on campus*. Overall, about one-quarter of faculty agreed with this statement in both 2003 and 2006. More frequently, however, faculty indicated that they did not know whether sexual harassment was a big problem on campus (33.8% in 2003, 32.2% in 2006). Women, gay and lesbian, and faculty of color were again more likely to indicate that sexual harassment is a big problem as compared to their male, bi- and heterosexual, and majority counterparts. In 2003, these differences were significant at the $p < 0.05$ level for women faculty and in 2006, for all three groups.

Finally, faculty were whether they believe that *the process for resolving complaints about sexual harassment at UW-Madison is effective*. In both survey periods, the most common response given by the faculty overall was that they did not know whether the process for addressing sexual harassment on campus was effective or not (56.8% and 58.3% in 2003 and 2006, respectively).

Among faculty who gave a substantive response, about three-quarters indicated that the process is effective (76.8% in 2003 and 72.6% in 2006). Women faculty were significantly less likely than men faculty to agree that the campus resolution process is effective (69.0% vs. 79.9% in 2003 and 57.1% vs. 79.1% in 2006, differences significant at $p < 0.05$).

These survey data indicate that faculty do experience sexual harassment on the UW-Madison campus. Particular groups, including gay and lesbian faculty and women faculty in the humanities, report rates of sexual harassment that should be cause for concern among campus leaders.

While most faculty report that they are aware of what steps to take in response to sexual harassment, junior faculty appear particularly under-informed about sexual harassment procedures on campus. This reported lack of awareness is compounded by a downward, over-time trend.

Furthermore, there are large gaps in faculty perceptions of sexual harassment issues on the UW-Madison campus. In particular, women and homosexual faculty, who are significantly more likely to report having been sexually harassed, also report that they perceive sexual harassment to be a more serious problem on campus than men and bi/heterosexual faculty. Women and homosexual faculty also tend to assign lower ratings to the effectiveness of the process for resolving sexual harassment complaints as compared to their counterparts. These discrepancies may also be a cause for concern.

Overall, the survey data tend to confirm that sexual harassment is indeed a campus-wide issue that at least some faculty members are under-informed about and unprepared to address. The Sexual Harassment Information Session is an educational tool intended to address this gap in competency. While the number of faculty trained in the program has grown over the past three years, the number who report having attended the Sessions nonetheless remains small.

There appears to be a clear need to ensure that more faculty are informed about and prepared to deal with sexual harassment on campus. If the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions are effective in accomplishing these ends, then it may be reasonable to redouble efforts to encourage or compel faculty participation in the Sessions.

Evaluation

This portion of the report evaluates the effectiveness of the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions in raising awareness of the issue and educating faculty about how to respond to allegations of sexual harassment. Two primary sources of information are brought to bear on the evaluation. First, participant responses to a post-Session survey are used to shed light on what aspects of the Session were perceived as more or less effective by individual participants. Responses to the evaluation survey also address the Session format and suggest ways that the workshop experience might be improved. Second, data from the 2003 and 2006 *Study of Faculty Worklife at the University of Wisconsin – Madison* highlights faculty members' perceptions of the Session and its impact on their perceptions of and ability to respond to sexual harassment.

Post-Session Evaluation Survey

Sexual Harassment Information Session participants were asked to complete and return an evaluation survey (Appendix C). The survey asked participants to rate their pre- and post-workshop familiarity and comfort with sexual harassment topics. This survey included scaled, closed-ended items addressing participants' prior and post-workshop knowledge of sexual harassment and procedure. Other closed-ended items addressed the structure of the workshop and willingness to recommend the workshop to others. Respondents were also prompted to note any open-ended comments regarding the workshop. The feedback contained in 2,026 returned, completed surveys is discussed here.

The first section of the Sexual Harassment Information Session evaluation survey asked respondents to rate their prior knowledge about and comfort with sexual harassment topics. Respondents were presented seven affirmative statements and asked to indicate whether they *strongly agree*, *agree*, *disagree*, or *strongly disagree* with each². The distribution of responses to each prior knowledge item is presented in Tables 1a-1g, below.

Table 1a.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *Prior to this session, I was familiar with the University policies and procedures pertaining to sexual harassment and consensual relationships*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	267	13.2
Agree	926	45.7
Disagree	666	32.9
Strongly disagree	150	7.4

Table 1b.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *Prior to this session, I was aware of the campus resources that were available to assist me in resolving sexual harassment allegations*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	261	12.9
Agree	815	40.2
Disagree	705	34.8
Strongly disagree	161	7.9

² Some responses fell between points on the scale (e.g., respondent chose both *strongly agree* and *agree*). Such responses have been recorded as half a response in both the higher and lower scale points (i.e., 0.5 recorded for *strongly agree* and 0.5 recorded for *agree*).

Table 1c.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *Prior to this session, I was fully aware of the University's exposure for liability and the potential loss of federal grant funds if issues related to sexual harassment or consensual relationships were not addressed*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	204	10.1
Agree	634	31.3
Disagree	899	44.4
Strongly disagree	263	13.3

Table 1d.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *Prior to this session, I had a clear understanding of my role in creating respectful work and learning environments on campus*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	548	27.0
Agree	1175	58.0
Disagree	223	11.0
Strongly disagree	23	1.1

Table 1e.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *Prior to this session, I was comfortable participating in conversations related to sexual harassment in the University*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	340	16.8
Agree	1078	53.2
Disagree	510.5	25.2
Strongly disagree	70.5	3.5

Table 1f.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *Prior to this session, I knew where to turn if I experienced harassment in the workplace*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	299.5	14.8
Agree	934.5	46.1
Disagree	663	32.7
Strongly disagree	105	5.2

Table 1g.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *Prior to this session, I had a very clear understanding of how I should respond to a report of sexual harassment*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	189.5	9.4
Agree	626.5	30.9
Disagree	1022.5	50.5
Strongly disagree	148.5	7.3

For most questions the modal response category was *agree*, suggesting that many participants felt that they had a moderate base of knowledge about sexual harassment issues prior to attending the session. The statements pertaining to liability for and how to respond to sexual harassment, where the modal response was *disagree*, showed the opposite pattern. Participants' base of sexual harassment knowledge is apparently lacking in these dimensions.

The second portion of the survey asked respondents to evaluate the knowledge and skills they had gained through participating in the session. Items were again presented as statements with responses scaled from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. Response distributions are summarized in Tables 2a-2g, below.

Table 2a.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *As a result of this session, my familiarity with the University's policies and procedures pertaining to sexual harassment and consensual relationships has increased*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	762	37.6
Agree	1135	56.0
Disagree	87	4.3
Strongly disagree	18	0.9

Table 2b.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *As a result of this session, my awareness of the campus resources that are available to assist me in resolving sexual harassment allegations has increased*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	827	40.8
Agree	1048	51.7
Disagree	108	5.3
Strongly disagree	15	0.7

Table 2c.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *As a result of this session, my awareness of the University's exposure for liability and the potential loss of federal grant funds has increased*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	567.5	28.0
Agree	1099.5	54.3
Disagree	303	15.0
Strongly disagree	36	1.8

Table 2d.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *As a result of this session, I have a clearer understanding of my role in creating respectful work and learning environments that support excellence in teaching, research, and service*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	591	29.2
Agree	1166.5	57.6
Disagree	206.5	10.2
Strongly disagree	28	1.4

Table 2e.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *As a result of this session, I am more comfortable participating in conversations related to sexual harassment in the University*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	466	23.0
Agree	1204	59.4
Disagree	286	14.1
Strongly disagree	35	1.7

Table 2f.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *As a result of this session, I have a better understanding of where to turn if I experience harassment in the workplace*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	775	38.3
Agree	1091.5	53.9
Disagree	108.5	5.4
Strongly disagree	18	0.9

Table 2g.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *As a result of this session, my understanding of how to respond to a report of sexual harassment has increased*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Strongly agree	701	34.6
Agree	1085.5	53.6
Disagree	107.5	5.3
Strongly disagree	20	1.0

For this portion of the survey, the modal response was *agree* for all statements. Very few respondents indicated that the session did not contribute to their understanding of any aspect of sexual harassment.

Comparing responses to the first and second portions of the survey, the impact of the session becomes clearer. As Table 3 indicates, the percentage of respondents agreeing that they had gained knowledge from the session is in all cases greater than those agreeing that they were knowledgeable prior to the session. Increases were greatest for items pertaining to university policy and procedure, on-campus resources, liability exposure, and how to report or respond to sexual harassment. This suggests the conclusion that while many participants approach the session with some knowledge of sexual harassment topics, the vast majority also find that the session increases or clarifies this pre-existing knowledge.

Table 3.

Comparison of affirmative pre- and post-Session survey responses, all respondents (n=2026).

	% Agree		Change
	Pre	Post	
Familiar with the university's policies and procedures pertaining to sexual harassment and consensual relationships	58.9	93.6	+34.7
Aware of campus resource that are available to assist me in resolving sexual harassment allegations	53.1	92.5	+39.4
Aware of university's exposure for liability and the potential loss of federal grant funds	41.4	82.3	+40.9
Clear understanding of my role in creating respectful work and learning environments that support excellence in teaching, research, and service	85.0	86.7	+1.7
Comfortable participating in conversations related to sexual harassment in the workplace	70.0	82.4	+12.4
Understanding of where to turn if I experience harassment in the workplace	60.9	92.1	+31.2
Understand how to respond to a report of sexual harassment	40.3	88.2	+47.9

A final portion of the survey asked respondents to consider their overall workshop experience. Two yes-or-no questions asked whether *the structure of the session worked well* for the

respondent and whether s/he *would recommend this session to others*. The distributions of responses to these items are presented in Tables 4a and 4b, below.

Table 4a.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *The structure (format) of the session worked well for me*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Yes	1818.5	89.8
No	125.5	6.2
Did not respond	82	4.0

Table 4b.

Distribution of responses to the survey item: *I would recommend this session to others*, all respondents (n=2026).

	N	%
Yes	1745.5	86.2
No	124.5	6.1
Did not respond	156	7.7

For both items, the vast majority of respondents indicated that the session format had indeed worked well for them and they would recommend it to others.

Disaggregating survey responses by voluntary versus compulsory Sexual Harassment Information Session participation, some differences emerge. Respondents who attended CALS mandatory sessions (n=371) indicated similar levels of prior knowledge as compared to all participants, but tended to evaluate the workshop's contribution less favorably. Respondents who attended Limited Appointee required sessions (n=112) rated their prior knowledge of sexual harassment topics more highly as compared to all other participants but evaluated the session's contribution about as favorably. Finally, as indicated in Tables 5a and 5b, CALS respondents indicated lower satisfaction with the workshop format and less willingness to recommend the workshop, while Limited Appointee respondents indicated more satisfaction and more willingness to recommend as compared to all others.

Table 5a.

Comparison of responses to the survey item: *The structure (format) of the session worked well for me*, by CALS, Limited Appointments, and other respondents.

	CALS (n=371)		Ltd. Appt. (n=112)		All others (n=1543)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	306	82	110	98	1403	91
No	42	11	2	2	81.5	5
Did not respond	23	6	0	0	41	3

Table 5b.

Comparison of responses to the survey item: *I would recommend this session to others*, by CALS, Limited Appointments, and other respondents.

	CALS (n=307)		Ltd. Appt. (n=112)		All others (n=1543)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	240	85	110	98	1390	90
No	31.5	11	2	2	73	5
Did not respond	12	4	0	0	66	4

Overall, responses to the closed-ended survey items suggest that the majority of Sexual Harassment Information Session participants enter the session with some, possibly superficial, knowledge of sexual harassment and consensual relationship issues. Despite their existing background knowledge, most participants also find that the session helps them to gain a clearer understanding of sexual harassment policies and procedures.

In addition to the scaled survey items, respondents were prompted to *feel free to provide specific comments on the back of the evaluation*. This prompt was made with reference to question 3a, which asked whether the structure of the workshop worked well for participants. As a result, many of the open-ended remarks made by respondents addressed the workshop format. Some respondents additionally commented on other issues raised in the survey or their general thoughts and feelings about the workshop experience.

Respondents' comments have been collected and thematically coded. Each common, relevant theme is presented below. A summary of each theme is complemented by illustrative quotations from individual comments.

- *Overall workshop experience* – A large number of respondents (n=92) made general comments about their overall workshop experience. More individuals mentioned a positive (n=78) as opposed to negative (n=14) experience. Many positive comments praised or thanked the workshop presenters, while others simply acknowledged it as valuable. Negative comments typically suggested that the workshop was unnecessary or an unproductive use of time.

POSITIVE REMARKS

- “Good program, well presented. Well informed speakers.”
- “[The presenter] is a great speaker, one of the few interesting workshops.”
- “Thanks – very helpful.”

NEGATIVE REMARKS

- “Sorry, I felt this was unneeded.”
- “So general that I really didn’t get much value from this session.”
- “Complete waste of my valuable time!!”

- *Length of the workshop* – Some respondents (n=19) expressed dissatisfaction with the length of time allotted to the workshop, indicating either that it was too long (n=15) or too short (n=4). Those who asserted the workshop was too long often suggested it be shortened to half-an-hour to an hour in length. Those thinking the workshop was too short, often noted twice the length of time would be appropriate.

WORKSHOP TOO LONG

- “I think that this could be condensed into an hour (which would be more appealing).”
- “A shorter (1/2 to 1 hour) session would be sufficient.”

WORKSHOP TOO SHORT

- “Is 90 minutes enough time to adequately cover all of the important areas? I would be willing to invest at least another 90 minutes in subsequent sessions.”
- “Need more than an hour [for the workshop].”

- *Presentation of the workshop* – A number of individuals (n=17) made critical comments regarding the presentation of the workshop. Two complaints considered here are that the speakers/presenters were difficult to hear (n=8) and that the presentation should include an audio-visual component (n=9). On the latter point, many suggested PowerPoint slides be incorporated into the presentation. Regarding the former, respondents suggested that the presenters use a functioning microphone system.

PRESENTERS DIFFICULT TO HEAR

- “It was very hard to hear the contributions of others at this workshop.”
- “Sitting in circle made it difficult to listen. [Please] use [a] microphone.”

WORKSHOP SHOULD INCORPORATE AUDIO-VISUALS

- “Use more visual[s] (Power Point) [in the] presentation of case studies and action/proposals.”
- “Would have liked [the workshop to incorporate] multimedia.”

- *Discussion workshop components* – Respondents frequently commented (n=46) on the interactive and small-group discussion workshop elements. These expressed both positive (n=18) and negative (n=5) attitudes and many constructive suggestions (n=23) on how to improve this aspect of the workshop were also made. Most commonly (n=10), respondents suggested that more discussion and group interaction be incorporated into the workshop format. Other suggestions (n=11), such as to arrange participant seating in a fashion conducive to interaction, were aimed at improving the effectiveness of discussions.

DISCUSSIONS POSITIVELY RECEIVED

- “I liked breaking down into [a] small group.”
- “I love[d] the case study activity with my group. Great way to start discussions/dialogues.”

- “I was pleased with the interaction/participation that was created by this session – a good training opportunity.”

DISCUSSIONS NEGATIVELY RECEIVED

- “The large group wasn’t effective ... attempts at discussion were too slow and vague.”
- “Small group discussions didn’t work well.”
- “The group breakout was a waste of valuable time.”

SUGGESTION: INCORPORATE MORE DISCUSSION/INTERACTION

- “Need more discussion.”
- “[I] would have liked [the workshop to include] more small group discussions.”

SUGGESTION: TAKE STEPS TO IMPROVE/FACILITATE DISCUSSION

- “[Workshop] should be held in an area where tables are available to facilitate group discussion.”
- “Make sure group[s] ...[enable each] participant ...[to] hear others and interact equally.”
- “Smaller group size might result in increased attendee participation.”

- *Case study workshop component* – Respondents also frequently (n=47) commented on the use of case studies in the workshop. More respondents mentioned a positive (n=16) than negative (n=3) perception of the case study component. A number of remarks (n=28) also suggested how this portion of the workshop might be improved. Again, a frequent suggestion (n=12) was to increase the number of and time allotted to case studies. Other comments (n=16) suggested a variety of ways the case-study might be made more effective.

CASE STUDY POSITIVELY RECEIVED

- “Case studies were excellent.”
- “The case study was outstanding. [It] really made the point. An efficient and effective way to engage in this discussion.”
- “Case study was quite effective.”

CASE STUDY NEGATIVELY RECEIVED

- “The case studies don’t address the issue particularly well.”
- “Too much time spent on [a] single case study.”

SUGGESTION: EXPAND CASE STUDY COMPONENT

- “Provide more case studies for discussion.”
- “It would be good to provide more examples to help folks understand a variety of situations.”
- “[I would like to see] discussion[s] of more case studies with actions and outcomes from each.”

SUGGESTION: IMPROVE EFFECTIVENESS OF CASE STUDY COMPONENT

- “I would like to see ... solutions ... for the case studies. The actual nuts and bolts [of how to address sexual harassment] – aside from phoning contacts – are left up in the air.
 - “Longer time for case study discussion. Give more examples of different types of s[exual] h[arassment].”
 - “It might be helpful if the case study discussions contained one case in which the discussion groups [are] in the position of lesser power.”
- *Recognizing and responding to sexual harassment* – Many respondents (n=45) commented that at the conclusion of the workshop they lacked a clear understanding of how to recognize or respond to an incident or allegation of sexual harassment. Respondents suggested that the workshop incorporate more specific guidance to remedy this. Some respondents also described particular situations that they remained unclear on how to address. Others suggested topics that should be incorporated into the workshop.

SUGGESTION: MORE GUIDANCE ON RESPONDING TO SEXUAL HARRASMENT

- “More info[rmation] on actions to take...[, I am] still unsure as to when you take action – [eg.,] gossip vs. observed actions.”
- “It would be better if you explained how to handle ‘hearsay’ i.e., no direct evidence of harassment or consensual relationship.”
- “Spell out legal methods for resolving sexual harassment: (A) Are there confidential, legally binding methods to finalize the resolution of a sexual encounter? (B) If a supervisor is informed, are they legally bound to maintain confidentiality?”
- “Tell us more about what you would do in these situations.”

SUGGESTION: ADDRESS OTHER SEXUAL HARRASMENT TOPICS

- “More information and examples pertaining to day-to-day behavior...how to mitigate/head off potential problems.”
 - “Session should address more how to recognize sexual harassment.”
 - “I would have liked more examples to illustrate situations that could be seen as harassment – what is harassment, what is not.”
 - “Perhaps [incorporate] a discussion on what a ‘relationship’ is.”
 - “I think it would be helpful to be more inclusive of student [employee] experiences with sexual harassment.”
- *Connecting sexual harassment to related issues* – Some respondents noted that the workshop tended to consider sexual harassment in isolation from related issues. Some individuals discussed their disappointment that the workshop did not address workplace power and climate. Others suggested that other forms of discrimination or harassment should be discussed alongside sexual harassment.

SUGGESTION: CONNECT SEXUAL HARRASMENT TO OTHER ISSUES

- “I would have liked to cover topics such as ... creating good working environments.”

- “[It] would have been nice to have had time to discuss the hostile climate issue.”
 - “I would appreciate getting some more information regarding other forms of discrimination”
 - “Need [to include a] discussion of ‘hostile sexual environment’ issue.”
 - “[Would have liked to discuss] racial discrimination.”
- *Workshop should be mandatory for all UW employees* – A few individuals (n=9) suggested that the workshop should be mandatory for all UW employees.

SUGGESTION: WORKSHOP SHOULD BE MADE MANDATORY

- “This should be mandatory for every UW faculty and staff [member].”
 - “Require [the workshop] of all Chairs.”
 - “I think all new employees should be required to attend this.”
- *Workshop was redundant of previous training* – Many respondents (n=40) noted that the workshop was similar to training they had received in the past. Some individuals indicated that they believed the workshop was nonetheless useful for refreshing or updating their knowledge. Others suggested that they believed the workshop was a poor use of their time and that they had not gained any new knowledge from participation.

SUGGESTION: WORKSHOP WAS REDUNDANT

- “I have attended 3-4 sessions using these same materials and approach. ... We need new issues, angles and approaches in training.
- “I have attended these sessions in the past so [I] already had much of this information but [I] feel [that] a refresher session never hurts.”
- “I didn’t learn anything new, because I had to do this a few years ago. I don’t think I needed to be here.”
- “This was a poor use of my time. I have had more experience with this as a manager in industry than the people conducting the training. ... This taught me nothing I did not know before.”

Worklife Survey Data

The 2003 and 2006 faculty *Worklife* surveys asked respondents to report whether they had participated in a variety of programs on campus, including the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions, and to rate the value of each (original survey questions reproduced in Appendix A). Aggregate responses are presented in Appendix B, Tables B7 – B10. Here we summarize faculty responses and consider relationships between Session participation and reported familiarity with sexual harassment issues.

Faculty were asked to rate the value of the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions on a scale from one to four where one represented *very valuable*, two represented *quite valuable*, three represented *somewhat valuable*, and four represented *not at all valuable*. A majority of faculty respondents agreed that the Sessions are very, quite, or somewhat valuable in both 2003 and 2006 (67.1% and 70.0%, respectively).

Ratings of the program varied across a number of faculty characteristics, though these differences may be artifacts of different Session participation rates across groups. For instance, untenured faculty were significantly more likely to report that they had never heard of the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions, significantly less likely to report ever attending a Session, and significantly less likely to rate the Session as very, quite, or somewhat valuable in both 2003 and 2006 (differences significant at $p < 0.05$). The same pattern was observed for physical sciences faculty as compared to all other faculty in both 2003 and 2006.

Comparing the responses of faculty who reported ever attending the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions to the remaining non-participant group, we find systematic differences in knowledge of and competency about sexual harassment issues (Tables B9 – B10).

In both 2003 and 2006, faculty who reported attending the sessions were more likely to report a recent sexual harassment experience than non-participant faculty. Participating faculty also tended to report fewer recent harassment incidents than non-participating faculty (mean 2.1 vs. 2.6 incidents in 2003 and 1.8 vs. 2.2 incidents in 2006). None of these differences was significant at standard confidence levels.

Both the participant and non-participant groups of faculty overwhelmingly agreed that sexual harassment is taken seriously on campus in 2003 and 2006. Faculty who had attended the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions more frequently indicated that sexual harassment is a major problem on campus in both surveys, as compared to those who had never participated. These differences were not statistically significant in either year, however faculty who had ever attended the Sessions were significantly ($p < 0.05$) less likely to indicate that they didn't know whether sexual harassment was a major problem on campus in both surveys.

Faculty who reported participating in the Sessions were significantly more likely to indicate that they knew what steps to take in response to a sexual harassment allegation as compared to non-participants (96.5% vs. 82.4% in 2003 and 95.8% vs. 77.0% in 2006, differences significant at $p < 0.05$). Approximately three-quarters of each faculty group agreed that UW-Madison's process for resolving sexual harassment complaints is effective in both surveys. Faculty who had participated in the Sessions were significantly less likely to report that they did not know whether the UW complaint resolution process is effective, as compared to faculty who had not participated (29.9% vs. 62.7% in 2003 and 39.9% vs. 65.5% in 2006, difference significant at $p < 0.05$).

Taken together, the survey data presented here suggests how participation in the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions may alter faculty perceptions of and ability to respond to sexual harassment issues on the UW-Madison campus. Faculty who have participated in the Sessions reported significantly more positive attitudes about the value of the program as compared to non-participants. This may indicate that participants find the Sessions to be more useful than they had expected or the trend may simply be an artifact of a selection effect in faculty participation.

The significant reduction in faculty 'don't know' responses to questions about the scope and gravity of sexual harassment issues on campus among participant faculty suggests that the

Sessions are at least somewhat effective in educating faculty about the topic. Excluding ‘don’t know’ responses, however, both the participant and non-participant groups agreed that sexual harassment is taken seriously on campus, that sexual harassment is a big problem on campus, and that the UW-Madison has an effective process for resolving allegations at similar rates. Taken together, we might then suggest that the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions are most effective at informing faculty who have limited knowledge about the issue. For faculty who are already knowledgeable on the topic, the Sessions appear to have little impact on their perception of sexual harassment issues on campus. This is consistent with some of the themes reported in the post-Session evaluation survey.

Finally, the significantly greater proportion of faculty reporting that they know what steps to take in response to a sexual harassment allegation in the participant as compared to non-participant group suggests that the Sessions may be most effective at teaching faculty how to address sexual harassment. Again, this is in agreement with the post-Session evaluation survey where participants, in aggregate, reported the greatest gains in responding to sexual harassment.

Conclusion

Sexual harassment is a persistent issue on the UW-Madison campus. Despite some gains in training faculty about the problem, some groups of faculty continue to report personal experiences of sexual harassment with alarming frequency. That nearly one-quarter of gay and lesbian faculty and women faculty in the humanities reported being sexually harassed between 1998 and 2003 should be cause for concern. Here we have not even considered the scope of sexual harassment directed towards students and staff. We might speculate that the incidence of sexual harassment is greater among these groups than for faculty, who generally occupy positions of greater power and prestige.

The evaluation data presented suggests that the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions are generally well received by participants and are at least partially effective in reaching their training goals. In aggregate, respondents to the post-Session evaluation survey reported knowledge gains in all issue areas addressed with the most gains observed in responding to sexual harassment. Comparisons of responses to the faculty worklife surveys revealed that faculty who reported attending the Session were significantly more confident that they knew how to respond to a sexual harassment allegation than their non-participant counterparts. Furthermore, participant faculty were less likely to choose a ‘don’t know’ response when asked about their perception of sexual harassment issues on campus.

Some evidence suggested that the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions may have a different impact on different faculty. The post-Session evaluation survey responses revealed that participants from the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences, for whom participation was mandatory, were less enthusiastic about their experience than all other participants. Data from the worklife surveys furthermore suggests that the Session may be most effective at informing those faculty who were initially least informed about sexual harassment issues.

Taken together, the persistence of sexual harassment directed towards faculty, faculty members’ limited participation in the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions, and faculty’s own reports

of their uncertainty about sexual harassment issues on the UW-Madison campus suggest more effort should be directed towards educating faculty on this topic. Given that the evaluation presented here has concluded that the Sessions can successfully achieve their training goals, we can reasonably conclude that increased efforts should be directed towards encouraging faculty to participate in the Session. Junior, untenured faculty might in particular be encouraged to participate. Future evaluation efforts might be directed towards gaining a better understanding of how Session training affects sexual harassment outcomes and future revisions to the workshop format should take account of the sometimes conflicting suggestions reflected in respondents' comments.

Appendix A1: Sexual harassment items from the *Study of Faculty Worklife at the University of Wisconsin – Madison (2003)*

27. Have you ever considered leaving UW-Madison?

a. Yes b. No → Go to question 30



28. How seriously have you considered leaving UW-Madison? Please circle one on a scale of 1 to 4.

Not very seriously Somewhat seriously Quite Seriously Very seriously
1 2 3 4

29. What factors contributed to your consideration to leave UW-Madison? _____

UW-Madison Programs and Resources

UW-Madison has implemented a number of programs designed to improve the working environments of faculty on the UW-Madison campus. In the questions below, please help us to evaluate some of these campus-wide initiatives.

30-31. For each program available on the UW-Madison campus, please rate your perception of the value of the program and indicate whether you have used the program.

	30. How valuable is each program? Please rate on a scale of 1 to 4 (whether or not you have used it).					31. Have you ever used this program?	
	Never Heard of Program 0	Very Valuable 1	Quite Valuable 2	Somewhat Valuable 3	Not at all Valuable 4	Yes	No
a. Suspension of the tenure clock	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Dual Career Hiring Program	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Provost's Strategic Hiring Initiative	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Anna Julia Cooper Fellowships	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Inter-Institutional Linkage Program	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Split Appointments	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Family Leave	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Ombuds for Faculty	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. New Faculty Workshops	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Equity in Faculty Salaries Policy	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Women Faculty Mentoring Program	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Committee on Women	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Office of Campus Child Care	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Sexual Harassment Information Sessions	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. Life Cycle Grant Program	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p. Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI)	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

32a. What was your reaction to the compensation provided to some women faculty through the Gender Pay Equity Study in 2000? Circle one response on a scale of 1 to 5.

- 1 Very Positive
2 Somewhat Positive
3 Somewhat Negative
4 Very Negative
5 Don't Know of Program

32b. Please explain: _____

Sexual Harassment

The UW-Madison defines sexual harassment as including unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when such conduct influences employment or academic decisions, interferes with an employee's work, or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive work or learning environment. Please use this definition as you answer the next two questions.

33. Using this definition, within the last five years, how often, if at all, have you experienced sexual harassment on the UW-Madison campus? *Check one response.*

- Never 1 to 2 times 3 to 5 times More than 5 times

34. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about sexual harassment at UW-Madison.

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4.</i>	Agree Strongly 1	Agree Somewhat 2	Disagree Somewhat 3	Disagree Strongly 4	Don't Know
a. Sexual harassment is taken seriously on campus.	1	2	3	4	DK
b. Sexual harassment is a big problem on campus.	1	2	3	4	DK
c. I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem with sexual harassment.	1	2	3	4	DK
d. The process for resolving complaints about sexual harassment at UW-Madison is effective.	1	2	3	4	DK

Balancing Personal and Professional Life

We would like to know to what extent faculty at UW-Madison are able to balance their professional and personal lives.

35. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about balancing your personal and professional lives.

<i>Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4. Circle NA if the statement does not apply to you.</i>	Agree Strongly 1	Agree Somewhat 2	Disagree Somewhat 3	Disagree Strongly 4	NA
a. I am usually satisfied with the way in which I balance my professional and personal life.	1	2	3	4	NA
b. I have seriously considered leaving UW-Madison in order to achieve better balance between work and personal life.	1	2	3	4	NA
c. I often have to forgo professional activities (e.g., sabbaticals, conferences) because of personal responsibilities.	1	2	3	4	NA
d. Personal responsibilities and commitments have slowed down my career progression.	1	2	3	4	NA

36. Have you cared for, or do you currently care for, dependent children?

- a. Yes b. No → *Go to Question 42*



37. We are interested in how the timing of raising children affects career trajectories. For each child that has been dependent on you in the past or at the present time, please list the year that child was born, the year that child entered your home (if different), the child's gender, and year the child first moved out of your home (e.g., to attend college).

	Year of Birth	Year Child Entered Home	Child's Gender	Year child moved away
Child 1			<input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	
Child 2			<input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	
Child 3			<input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	
Child 4			<input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	
Child 5			<input type="checkbox"/> Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female	

Appendix A2: Sexual harassment items from the *Study of Faculty Worklife at the University of Wisconsin – Madison (2006)*

UW-Madison Programs and Resources

UW-Madison has implemented a number of programs designed to improve the working environments of faculty on the UW-Madison campus. In the questions below, please help us to evaluate some of these campus-wide initiatives.

35-36. For each program available on the UW-Madison campus, please rate your perception of the value of the program and indicate whether you have used or participated in this program.

UW-Madison Programs	Never Heard of Program 0	Very Valuable 1	Quite Valuable 2	Somewhat Valuable 3	Not at all Valuable 4	36. Have you ever used or participated in this program?	
						Yes	No
a. Extension of the tenure clock	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Dual Career Hiring Program	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Provost's Strategic Hiring Initiative	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Anna Julia Cooper Postdoctoral Fellowships	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Workshops for Search Committees	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Family Leave	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Ombuds for Faculty	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. New Faculty Workshops	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Equity in Faculty Salaries Policy	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Women Faculty Mentoring Program	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. Committee on Women	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. Office of Campus Child Care	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Cluster Hire Initiative	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
n. Sexual Harassment Information Sessions	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
o. Vilas Life Cycle Professorships	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
p. Plan 2008 Diversity Initiative	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
q. Women in Science and Engineering Leadership Institute (WISELI)	0	1	2	3	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Sexual Harassment

The UW-Madison defines sexual harassment as including unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when such conduct influences employment or academic decisions, interferes with an employee's work, or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive work or learning environment. Please use this definition as you answer the next two questions.

37. Using this definition, within the **last three years**, how often, if at all, have you experienced sexual harassment on the UW-Madison campus? *Check one.*

Never

1 to 2 times

3 to 5 times

More than 5 times

38. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about sexual harassment at UW-Madison.

Circle one number on a scale of 1 to 4 for each statement.	Agree Strongly 1	Agree Somewhat 2	Disagree Somewhat 3	Disagree Strongly 4	Don't Know
	a. Sexual harassment is taken seriously on campus.	1	2	3	4
b. Sexual harassment is a big problem on campus.	1	2	3	4	DK
c. I know the steps to take if a person comes to me with a problem with sexual harassment.	1	2	3	4	DK
d. The process for resolving complaints about sexual harassment at UW-Madison is effective.	1	2	3	4	DK

Appendix B: Survey Data on Sexual Harassment at UW-Madison

Table B1. Experience of Sexual Harassment by Faculty (2003)

	N	Experience Any Harassment	Number of Incidents**	
			Mean	(S.D.)
All Faculty	1296	7.6%	2.4	(1.8)
Women	389	15.9% *	2.3	(1.6)
Men	892	3.9%	2.7	(2.2)
Untenured	320	8.4%	2.0	(1.0)
Tenured	974	7.2%	2.6	(2.0)
Biological	444	7.4%	2.5	(1.8)
Physical	255	2.4% *	1.9	(1.0)
Social	347	8.4%	2.5	(2.1)
Humanities	222	12.2% *	2.3	(1.6)
Science	699	5.6% *	2.4	(1.7)
Non-Science	569	9.8%	2.4	(1.8)
Faculty of Color	106	7.6%	1.8	(0.9)
Majority Faculty	1159	7.7%	2.5	(1.9)
Non-Citizen	138	5.8%	1.5	(0.0)
Citizen	1143	7.9%	2.5	(1.9)
Gay/Lesbian	31	22.6%	3.1	(2.4)
Bi/Heterosexual	1218	7.2%	2.4	(1.8)
Cluster Hire	46	6.5%	1.5	(0.0)
Not Cluster Hire	1222	7.5%	2.4	(1.8)
Multiple Appointments	233	9.9%	2.7	(1.7)
Single Appointment	1035	7.0%	2.3	(1.8)

* T-test between groups significant at $p < .05$.

** Calculated for persons experiencing at least one incident only.

Table B2. UW-Madison's Response to Sexual Harassment (2003)**

	Taken Seriously On Campus (N=1135)		Big Problem On Campus (N=860)		Knows Steps to Take (N=1193)		Effective Process for Resolving Complaints (N=561)
All Faculty	94.4%		24.5%		85.0%		76.8%
Women	90.7%	*	34.4%	*	83.0%		69.0%
Men	96.0%		20.4%		86.2%		79.9%
Untenured	96.6%		19.6%		72.2%	*	81.7%
Tenured	93.8%		25.6%		88.7%		76.4%
Biological	96.0%		22.4%		87.6%		80.1%
Physical	95.7%		14.5%	*	80.4%	*	83.1%
Social	92.8%		26.7%		83.0%		72.7%
Humanities	92.9%		35.8%	*	88.3%		71.9%
Science	95.9%	*	20.0%	*	85.1%		80.9%
Non-Science	92.8%		30.2%		85.2%		72.3%
Faculty of Color	87.6%	*	29.5%		76.3%	*	69.6%
Majority Faculty	95.0%		24.4%		85.9%		77.7%
Non-Citizen	97.0%		14.5%		83.5%		90.9%
Citizen	94.0%		25.6%		85.3%		75.6%
Gay/Lesbian	76.9%	*	45.8%		75.9%		53.3%
Bi/Heterosexual	94.8%		24.5%		85.5%		77.7%
Cluster Hire	100.0%		22.7%		71.8%		87.5%
Not Cluster Hire	94.4%		24.8%		85.6%		76.8%
Multiple Appointments	91.9%		29.5%		85.7%		79.8%
Single Appointment	95.1%		23.5%		85.0%		76.2%

* T-test between groups significant at $p < .05$.

** Agree Strongly or Agree Somewhat, vs. Disagree Strongly or Disagree Somewhat; Percent Agreeing presented here. Large numbers of respondents selected "Don't Know" for two questions; these responses were coded as missing data and only scaled answers are reported. Only the sample size for entire sample is reported here.

Table B3. Don't Know About Campus Sexual Harassment Incidence/Processes (2003)**

	Don't Know if Harassment is A Big Problem (N=1299)		Don't Know if UW has Effective Process (N=1299)	
All Faculty	33.8%		56.8%	
Women	36.1%		59.6%	
Men	32.9%		55.4%	
Untenured	52.0%	*	81.3%	*
Tenured	27.9%		48.9%	
Biological	28.0%	*	51.5%	*
Physical	46.1%	*	67.6%	*
Social	32.0%		59.9%	
Humanities	32.3%		49.1%	*
Science	34.6%		57.4%	
Non-Science	32.1%		55.7%	
Faculty of Color	41.9%		55.8%	
Majority Faculty	33.0%		56.5%	
Non-Citizen	54.7%	*	75.9%	*
Citizen	31.4%		54.5%	
Gay/Lesbian	25.0%		53.1%	
Bi/Heterosexual	33.9%		56.2%	
Cluster Hire	53.2%	*	83.0%	*
Not Cluster Hire	32.7%		55.6%	
Multiple Appointments	28.8%		48.9%	*
Single Appointment	34.6%		58.3%	

* T-test between groups significant at $p < .05$.

** Percent who responded "Don't Know" to "Sexual harassment is a big problem on campus" and "The process for resolving complaints about sexual harassment at UW-Madison is effective, compared to those who either agreed or disagreed with these statements.

Table B4. Experience of Sexual Harassment by Faculty (2006)

	N	Experience Any Harassment	Number of Incidents**	
			Mean	(S.D.)
All Faculty	1177	5.6%	2.4	(1.9)
Women	383	11.0% *	2.6	(2.0)
Men	792	3.0%	2.1	(1.5)
Untenured	301	7.3%	2.7	(2.0)
Tenured	876	5.0%	2.3	(1.8)
Biological	423	6.6%	2.6	(2.1)
Physical	232	3.9%	1.5	(0.0)
Social	320	5.6%	2.4	(1.8)
Humanities	185	6.0%	2.6	(2.1)
Science	631	5.7%	2.3	(1.9)
Non-Science	529	5.7%	2.5	(1.8)
Faculty of Color	100	5.0%	3.3	(2.8)
Majority Faculty	1077	5.7%	2.3	(1.8)
Non-Citizen	130	3.1%	2.1	(1.3)
Citizen	1045	5.9%	2.4	(1.9)
Gay/Lesbian	21	19.1%	2.8	(1.4)
Bi/Heterosexual	1122	5.4%	2.4	(1.9)
Cluster Hire	54	3.7%	2.8	(1.8)
Not Cluster Hire	1123	5.7%	2.4	(1.9)
Multiple Appointments	214	7.5%	2.1	(1.1)
Single Appointment	939	5.3%	2.5	(2.0)

* T-test between groups significant at $p < .05$.

** Calculated for persons experiencing at least one incident only.

Table B5. UW-Madison's Response to Sexual Harassment (2006)**

	Taken Seriously On Campus (N=1074)		Big Problem On Campus (N=819)		Knows Steps to Take (N=1105)		Effective Process for Resolving Complaints (N=503)
All Faculty	93.1%		25.4%		81.6%		72.6%
Women	89.4%	*	32.2%	*	77.0%	*	57.1%
Men	94.8%		22.8%		83.8%		79.1%
Untenured	93.1%		17.8%	*	66.0%	*	61.0%
Tenured	93.1%		27.1%		86.4%		74.1%
Biological	95.8%	*	21.6%	*	83.3%		75.9%
Physical	92.4%		21.1%		73.6%	*	71.2%
Social	90.5%		28.3%		81.9%		71.0%
Humanities	91.2%		36.9%	*	85.5%		69.1%
Science	94.7%	*	21.5%	*	79.9%		70.8%
Non-Science	90.9%		30.9%		83.4%		74.4%
Faculty of Color	84.3%	*	42.3%		82.6%		64.3%
Majority Faculty	93.9%		23.8%		81.5%		73.3%
Non-Citizen	97.1%	*	19.4%		76.7%		73.0%
Citizen	92.7%		26.0%		82.1%		72.5%
Gay/Lesbian	77.8%		50.0%	*	64.0%	*	66.7%
Bi/Heterosexual	93.4%		24.7%		82.0%		72.4%
Cluster Hire	95.4%		24.2%		72.0%		81.3%
Not Cluster Hire	93.0%		25.5%		82.1%		72.3%
Multiple Appointments	91.0%		27.2%		85.7%		72.6%
Single Appointment	93.4%		25.4%		80.8%		72.7%

* T-test between groups significant at $p < .05$.

** Agree Strongly or Agree Somewhat, vs. Disagree Strongly or Disagree Somewhat; Percent Agreeing presented here. Large numbers of respondents selected "Don't Know" for two questions; these responses were coded as missing data and only scaled answers are reported. Only the sample size for entire sample is reported here.

Table B6. Don't Know About Campus Sexual Harassment Incidence/Processes (2006)**

	Don't Know if Harassment is A Big Problem (N=1207)		Don't Know if UW has Effective Process (N=1207)	
All Faculty	32.2%		58.3%	
Women	41.5%		62.2%	
Men	27.6%		56.4%	
Untenured	50.7%	*	80.8%	*
Tenured	25.8%		50.6%	
Biological	26.7%	*	53.3%	*
Physical	34.5%		68.4%	*
Social	35.4%		58.1%	
Humanities	36.5%		57.8%	
Science	29.2%	*	58.1%	
Non-Science	35.7%		58.5%	
Faculty of Color	32.4%		60.0%	
Majority Faculty	32.1%		58.2%	
Non-Citizen	48.1%	*	71.3%	*
Citizen	30.3%		56.8%	
Gay/Lesbian	44.0%		64.0%	
Bi/Heterosexual	31.8%		58.0%	
Cluster Hire	40.0%		70.9%	
Not Cluster Hire	31.8%		57.7%	
Multiple Appointments	28.2%		53.9%	
Single Appointment	33.0%		59.1%	

* T-test between groups significant at $p < .05$.

** Percent who responded "Don't Know" to "Sexual harassment is a big problem on campus" and "The process for resolving complaints about sexual harassment at UW-Madison is effective, compared to those who either agreed or disagreed with these statements.

Table B7. Value and Use of Sexual Harassment Information Sessions (2003)

	N	Never Heard of Program		Program is Very, Quite, or Somewhat Valuable**		Ever Used Program	
All Faculty	1242	23.1%		67.1%		16.6%	
Women	367	23.4%		68.9%		20.1%	*
Men	858	22.7%		66.7%		15.1%	
Untenured	300	42.7%	*	51.0%	*	9.8%	*
Tenured	942	16.9%		72.2%		18.7%	
Biological	424	19.8%	*	68.4%		22.1%	*
Physical	246	32.1%	*	58.9%	*	10.8%	*
Social	338	23.4%		68.3%		14.5%	
Humanities	210	18.6%		73.3%	*	15.0%	
Science	670	24.3%		64.9%	*	17.9%	
Non-Science	548	21.5%		70.3%		14.7%	
Faculty of Color	85	28.2%		65.9%		10.8%	
Majority Faculty	1131	22.6%		67.6%		16.9%	
Non-Citizen	130	36.2%	*	55.4%	*	10.8%	
Citizen	1096	21.5%		68.7%		17.4%	
Cluster Hire	45	44.4%	*	48.9%	*	7.1%	
Not Cluster Hire	1173	22.3%		68.0%		16.8%	
Multiple Appointments	222	23.9%		67.6%		16.6%	
Single Appointment	996	22.9%		67.3%		16.5%	
Parent	828	21.0%	*	68.8%		17.9%	
Non-Parent	403	27.5%		63.3%		14.4%	
Stay Home Spouse	222	30.2%	*	60.8%	*	11.8%	*
Working/No Spouse	986	21.5%		68.8%		18.2%	
Used Program	203	--		86.2%	*	--	
Never Used Program	962	--		62.5%		--	

* T-test between groups significant at $p < .05$.

** Compared to Not at all Valuable or Never Heard of Program.

Table B8. Value and Use of Sexual Harassment Information Sessions (2006)

	N	Never Heard of Program		Program is Very, Quite, or Somewhat Valuable**		Ever Used Program	
All Faculty	1125	22.0%		70.0%		26.8%	
Women	367	25.9%	*	68.1%		24.5%	
Men	757	20.1%		70.9%		27.8%	
Untenured	288	38.9%	*	57.6%	*	14.1%	*
Tenured	837	16.1%		74.3%		30.9%	
Biological	404	13.1%	*	75.7%	*	35.6%	*
Physical	222	31.1%	*	62.2%	*	18.2%	*
Social	308	29.2%		64.6%	*	24.3%	
Humanities	174	19.0%		76.4%	*	20.9%	
Science	604	19.7%	*	71.0%	*	29.0%	
Non-Science	504	25.0%		68.9%		22.4%	
Faculty of Color	99	19.2%		75.8%		23.7%	
Majority Faculty	1026	22.2%		69.5%		27.0%	
Non-Citizen	124	33.9%	*	61.3%	*	17.4%	*
Citizen	999	20.5%		71.1%		27.8%	
Cluster Hire	50	32.0%		62.0%		13.6%	*
Not Cluster Hire	1075	21.5%		70.4%		27.4%	
Multiple Appointments	206	18.9%		72.3%		33.3%	*
Single Appointment	895	22.7%		69.8%		25.2%	
Parent	861	19.3%	*	72.1%	*	29.6%	*
Non-Parent	256	31.3%		62.9%		18.0%	
Stay Home Spouse	233	28.8%	*	62.2%	*	19.5%	*
Working/No Spouse	862	19.8%		72.2%		28.8%	
Used Program	263	--		87.5%	*	--	
Never Used Program	671	--		68.7%		--	

* T-test between groups significant at $p < .05$.

** Compared to Not at all Valuable or Never Heard of Program.

Table B9. Faculty Experience, Perceptions, and Awareness of Sexual Harassment, by Reported Participation in the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions (2003).

	<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>
Experienced Any Harassment	11.4%		6.9%
Number of Harassment Incidents **			
Mean	2.1		2.6
(S.D.)	(1.5)		(2.0)
Agree Sexual Harassment is:			
Taken Seriously on Campus †	93.8%		94.6%
Big Problem on Campus †	27.1%		23.9%
Agree that:			
Know Steps to Take in Response to Sexual Harassment †	96.5%	*	82.4%
Effective Process for Resolving Complaints †	76.2%		76.7%
Don't Know if:			
Sexual Harassment is a Big Problem on Campus	18.6%	*	36.7%
UW has an Effective Resolution Process	29.9%	*	62.7%

* T-test between groups significant at $p < .05$.

** Calculated for persons experiencing at least one incident only.

† Agree Strongly or Agree Somewhat, vs. Disagree Strongly or Disagree Somewhat; Percent Agreeing presented here. "Don't Know" responses coded as missing data.

Table B10. Faculty Experience, Perceptions, and Awareness of Sexual Harassment, by Reported Participation in the Sexual Harassment Information Sessions (2006).

	<u>Participants</u>		<u>Non-Participants</u>
Experienced Any Harassment	7.4%		4.7%
Number of Harassment Incidents **			
Mean	1.8		2.2
(S.D.)	(1.5)		(1.5)
Agree Sexual Harassment is:			
Taken Seriously on Campus †	93.9%		93.4%
Big Problem on Campus †	28.4%		23.9%
Agree that:			
Know Steps to Take in Response to Sexual Harassment †	95.8%	*	77.0%
Effective Process for Resolving Complaints †	71.3%		75.1%
Don't Know if:			
Sexual Harassment is a Big Problem on Campus	20.7%	*	36.3%
UW has an Effective Resolution Process	39.9%	*	65.5%

* T-test between groups significant at $p < .05$.

** Calculated for persons experiencing at least one incident only.

† Agree Strongly or Agree Somewhat, vs. Disagree Strongly or Disagree Somewhat; Percent Agreeing presented here. "Don't Know" responses coded as missing data.

Appendix C: Sexual Harassment Information Session Evaluation Survey

Division _____ Department _____ Date _____

Sexual Harassment Information Sessions

EVALUATION

There are two sections below. The first section focuses on your knowledge prior to this session. The second section addresses the knowledge gained through your participation. Please read the following statements and indicate your response by circling one of these choices:

SA = Strongly Agree A = Agree D = Disagree SD = Strongly Disagree.

Section One: Prior Knowledge

SA	A	D	SD	1) Prior to this session, I was familiar with the University policies and procedures pertaining to sexual harassment and consensual relationships.
SA	A	D	SD	2) Prior to this session, I was aware of the campus resources that were available to assist me in resolving sexual harassment allegations.
SA	A	D	SD	3) Prior to this session, I was fully aware of the University's exposure for liability and the potential loss of federal grant funds if issues related to sexual harassment or consensual relationships were not addressed.
SA	A	D	SD	4) Prior to this session, I had a clear understanding of my role in creating respectful work and learning environments on campus.
SA	A	D	SD	5) Prior to this session, I was comfortable participating in conversations related to sexual harassment in the University.
SA	A	D	SD	6) Prior to this session, I knew where to turn if I experienced harassment in the workplace.
SA	A	D	SD	7) Prior to this session, I had a very clear understanding of how I should respond to a report of sexual harassment.

Section Two: Response to Session

SA	A	D	SD	1) As a result of this session, my familiarity with the University's policies and procedures pertaining to sexual harassment and consensual relationships has increased.
SA	A	D	SD	2) As a result of this session, my awareness of the campus resources that are available to assist me in resolving sexual harassment allegations has increased.
SA	A	D	SD	3) As a result of this session, my awareness of the University's exposure for liability and the potential loss of federal grant funds has increased.
SA	A	D	SD	4) As a result of this session, I have a clearer understanding of my role in creating respectful work and learning environments that support excellence in teaching, research, and service.
SA	A	D	SD	5) As a result of this session, I am more comfortable participating in conversations related to sexual harassment in the University.
SA	A	D	SD	6) As a result of this session, I have a better understanding of where to turn if I experience harassment in the workplace.
SA	A	D	SD	7) As a result of this session, my understanding of how to respond to a report of sexual harassment has increased.

Final Questions:

YES NO The structure (format) of the session worked well for me (feel free to provide specific comments on the back of the evaluation).

YES NO I would recommend this session to others.

If you have additional comments, please use the back of this evaluation to express your thoughts and reactions.
Thank you for taking the time to provide feedback!