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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

National surveys have documented that sexual abuse and harassment occur in public schools at all levels, and research has shown that it is harmful to students who experience or observe it (Lee, Croninger, Linn, & Chen, 1996; Shakeshaft, 2004). Federal legislation has addressed the issue, and Supreme Court decisions have clarified issues of liability for school districts. Scholars and educational organizations have recommended policies and practices for districts to help prevent sexual abuse and harassment and to deal with it if it occurs. This study was designed to determine what policies and procedures are in place in Texas high schools to prevent educator sexual misconduct and addressed it appropriately when it is was discovered.

Shakeshaft (2004) defined the term educator sexual misconduct to refer to a wide range of inappropriate behavior that encompasses any behavior of a sexual nature that may constitute professional misconduct. This could range from inappropriate language to sexual abuse of students. Cultural change has led to greater public concern and scrutiny of educator sexual misconduct and to changes in the legal environment for educators.

In 1996, Fossey and Demitchell reported, “School officials are often lax when it comes to preventing sexual abuse by school employees” (p. 594). The 1993 Harris Scholastic study supported by the American Association of University Women revealed that 25% of Grades 8-11 females and 10% of males reported educator-to-student sexual misconduct ranging from comments to coerced sex (American Association of University Women Education Foundation, 1993). A review of Texas Education Agency
records showed that between 2001 and 2005, approximately 200 teachers had active sanctions on their certification for sexual misconduct (Carlton, 2008). Although national studies have been conducted to determine the prevalence of educator-to-student sexual misconduct, most of the public knowledge of such sexual misconduct comes from news media reports of these allegations (Shakeshaft, 2003).

The following reports represent examples of such newspaper reports of educator-to-student sexual misconduct in Texas:

1. A convicted former teacher and coach read a speech in a Corpus Christi, Texas courtroom that detailed his life and his relationship with a 16-year-old student. The speech, directed at other educators, was a condition of his shortened jail sentence. His speech lamented the end of his greatest ambition, which was to be a career high school football coach (Robbins, 2001).

2. An Atlantic City, Texas female teacher was convicted of three counts of sexual misconduct with a 16-year-old student. The boy, who was a sophomore and the 33-year-old teacher, started the relationship by meeting on country roads and in parking lots (LaRowe, 2009).

3. Dallas officers responded to a report of people having sex in a parked car. A 17-year-old 11th Grade male student was questioned by police about his relationship with the female high school teacher who was leaving his car. The student reported that they had been dating for two months and had sex several times (Thompson, 2009).

4. A former coach from Upshur County schools received two consecutive 15-year terms after pleading guilty to sexual misconduct with a 15-year-old student. The
charges also included online solicitation of a minor. The coach was required to surrender his teacher certificate and register as a sex offender (Williams, 2009).

5. A Plano, Texas, special education teacher was arrested for sexual assault of a 14-year-old boy after allegedly getting him drunk and driving him to her home to have sex (Haag & Jennings, 2009).

Such serious cases represent the most extreme incidents, but they raise the public profile of educator misconduct. School administrators are responsible for ensuring student safety, which includes prevention of sexual misconduct by school employees (Bithell, 1991; Shoop, 2000). Administrators are empowered by law to take steps to ensure student safety. An administrator who can be determined deliberately indifferent to a situation such as educator-to-student sexual misconduct could be held liable for damages based on the requirements of Title IX of the education amendments of 1972 (Walsh, 2008).

Legal Framework

Federal and state laws address educator-to-student sexual misconduct and identify policies and procedures that must be in place in public schools to prevent sexual discrimination, sexual harassment, and sexual abuse in schools. This section discusses federal and state requirements and related court cases that have clarified expectations for school officials.

Title IX of the education amendments of 1972 addresses sex discrimination, including sexual harassment in schools. Sexual harassment has been identified as a form of sexual discrimination when such actions create a hostile environment. Title IX of
the education amendments of 1972 declared, “No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance” (USLegal, 2009).

Title IX requires schools to distribute policies that address sexual discrimination policy information to employees, students, and parents. These policies are required to include grievance procedures. School districts are required to appoint one employee as the Title IX compliance officer to process complaints involving sexual discrimination. Schools are required to respond promptly and effectively to sexual harassment. This responsibility includes the responsibility to respond to sexual harassment that occurs in the context of an employee’s aid, benefits, or services to students (U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was designed to prevent employment discrimination based on race, sex, religion, color, and national origin. The federal statute has been used in cases of peer-to-peer sexual harassment that has occurred in schools based on the existence of a hostile environment (Carins, 2006). Title VI provides freedom from retaliation against any person who opposed an unlawful educational practice or policy, or made charges, testified, or participated in a complaint under Title VI. The Office of Civil Rights (OCR) in the education department enforces Title VI. While the OCR’s responsibility is to ensure compliance with Title VI, investigation and resolution of complaints is the primary enforcement activity (Office of Civil Rights, n.d.).

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits sex discrimination in the workplace, also prohibits sexual harassment against school employees. The definition
of employer includes *learning institutions* (Carins, 2006).

States have added guidelines and requirements related to sexual misconduct. The Texas Education Code, Chapter 37, SEC 37.083 provides the following:

(a) Each school district shall adopt and implement a discipline management program to be included in the district improvement plan under Section 11.252. The program must provide for prevention of and education concerning unwanted physical or verbal aggression, sexual harassment, and other forms of bullying in school, on school grounds, and in school vehicles

(b) Each school district may develop and implement a sexual harassment policy to be included in the district improvement plan under Section 11.252 (Texas Constitution and Statistics, n. d. )

An important step to ensuring safety is to communicate the district and campus sexual misconduct policy to all staff, parents, and students (Goorian, 1999). The use of a district online policy service is a convenient way to have policy readily available. The Texas Association of School Boards (TASB) maintains legal and local policies and makes the policy available to school districts through their online service. Ninety percent of the school districts use the TASB policy online service. The legal policies reflect the language of the U.S. and Texas constitutions and federal and state statutes, including the Texas education code. The local policy codes are developed to reflect the intentions of the board in areas not addressed by law. The district’s enforcement of policy is intended to implement the combined use of legal and local policy codes (Texas Association of School Boards, 2009).
A result of the Supreme Court decision that holds schools responsible for providing a safe environment, educators and lawmakers began developing guidelines for prevention and response to sexual harassment involving misconduct by school staff members of students. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission created guidelines on harassment in November of 1980 (McCagh, 1985). The equal employment opportunity commission defined sexual harassment and listed a variety of circumstances in which sexual harassment can occur. The commission stated the following:

Prevention is the best tool to eliminate harassment in the workplace. Employers are encouraged to take steps necessary to prevent sexual harassment from occurring. They should clearly communicate to employees that sexual harassment will not be tolerated. They can do so by establishing an effective complaint or grievance process and taking immediate and appropriate action when an employee complains. (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2002).

Alexander v. Yale (1980) established a precedent for hearing sexual harassment grievances under Title IX, but the federal statutes did not contain a “uniform definition of sexual abuse in the education setting, and there were no standards for all institutions to follow” (Wishnietsky, 1991, p. 164). The Office of Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Education identified two forms of sexual harassment as quid pro quo and hostile-environment harassment (Stein, 1999).

Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools (1992) established the right to sue for compensatory damages under Title IX. In a case in Georgia, a student who was
sexually molested by a coach eventually won the right to sue the school district over sexual misconduct (Shakeshaft, 2004; Sutton, 2004). The Supreme Court ruled that a student who suffered intentional sexual harassment or abuse by a school employee can seek monetary damages under Title IX. Although given the right to sue, the Franklin case did not give a clear framework for educators in understanding their responsibility to provide an atmosphere free from harassment (Fossey & DeMitchell, 1996).

In Nabozny v. Podlesny (1996), the seventh circuit court provided the first equal protection claim under the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment of sexual harassment based on sexual orientation. The student complained that school officials did not respond to his complaints of harassment that included a bathroom assault. School officials’ indifference included telling the student he was responsible because he revealed that he was gay. The court’s decision stated that there was no reason the student would not be protected like all other students. The school district was not entitled to qualified immunity. Because of the student’s established constitutional right of equal protection, the school officials could be sued (Adkison, Fossey, & Camp, 2008).

Gebser v. Lago Vistas Independent School District (1998) determined that districts could only be liable for monetary damages for sexual harassment of a student under Title IX if school officials in a position of authority were informed of the misconduct and then failed to act. In Gebser v. Lago Vistas Independent School District (1998), the court found that the notice received by the principal of a teacher’s sexually suggestive remarks made during class was not sufficient to alert the principal that the teacher was involved in a sexual relationship with the student. In addition, the lack of a grievance procedure did not support a finding of deliberate indifference (Sutton, 2004).
In response to the Gebser ruling, the Secretary of Education sent a letter to school superintendents and college and university presidents informing them that the ruling did not change a school’s responsibility to take action under Title IX to prevent and eliminate sexual harassment (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). The rulings in Gordon v. Ottumwa Community School (2000) and Doe v. School Administrative District No. 19 (1999) held that actual notice requires more than a simple report of misconduct by the school employee. However, the standard is not set so high that a school district must receive a clear, credible report that a student has been sexually abused before having a legal responsibility to respond (Nance & Daniel, 2007).

The question of whether a student has a constitutional right to be free of sexual abuse was answered in Doe v. Taylor I.S.D. (1994). The Fifth Circuit ruled by answering in the affirmative to three important questions, which included a student’s right to be free of sexual abuse at school, to be protected by the U.S. Constitution, and to make school employees accountable for protection of the student. In the case, a student stated that the principal and the superintendent both knew of her affair with a district coach. The court found that the superintendent was not liable but that the principal was aware of certain facts and did not respond; therefore, the principal was deliberately indifferent to the violation of the student’s constitutional right to bodily integrity (Walsh, Kemerer, & Maniotis, 2005).

In Doe v. Warren Consolidated Schools (2003), a Michigan district court ruled that a school district could be held liable for teacher sexual harassment under Section 1983 and Title IX based on administrators’ knowledge of a teacher’s history of sexual
misconduct and failure to protect students from having contact with the teacher (Sutton, 2004).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to add to the literature about school practices and policies that address educator sexual misconduct by surveying principals about district and campus policies and procedures designed to prevent educator-to-student sexual misconduct and to inform administrators and policy makers about the current status of school and school district practices. The study also sought to determine if the district and campus policies and trainings reflect policies and prevention practices outlined in the literature as best practices.

Statement of the Problem

This study sought to determine what practices and policies are in place in Texas high schools to prevent educator-to-student sexual misconduct and addressed problems that were reported to school administrators.

Research Questions

1. What do high school principals know about educator-to-student sexual misconduct?
2. What direct experience have high school principals had with educator-to-student sexual misconduct?
3. What campus policies are in place at the secondary level to address educator sexual misconduct?

4. What district-level training is provided for principals regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct?

5. What campus training is provided for secondary school staff regarding the prevention of educator-to-student sexual misconduct?

6. Do school educator misconduct practices and policies differ by school size, type of community, and Title I eligibility (SES)?

Significance of the Study

There has been no overview of district and school policies to examine whether they comply with federal requirements and conformity to best practices in the area of educator-to-student sexual misconduct (Shakeshaft, 2004). This study addressed that gap for secondary schools in Texas.

Limitations of the Study

This study addressed the prevention of educator-to-student sexual misconduct. The survey I developed probes the extent of the high school campus principals' awareness of district and campus policies (Appendix C). The survey items were designed to question the district training of administrators and the campus training of faculty, students, and parents. No surveys were conducted to address the awareness and understanding of principals of district and campus sexual harassment policies and level of training provided at the district and campus levels (Shakeshaft, 2004; Thoenes, 2009).
The research was limited to regular education 9th Grade to 12th Grade schools. Alternative education placement schools, 9th Grade centers, special programs high schools, and charter schools are not included in the study. This study focused on the existence of district and campus level policies and training. No correlation was made between the prevalence of educator-to-student sexual harassment at the surveyed high school campus and the existence of policies and training. The findings could be subject to other interpretations.

Definitions of Terms

A variety of terms included in this study reference behaviors that are considered sexual in nature. Shakeshaft’s 2004 U.S. Department of Education synthesis of literature provides terminology educator sexual misconduct to encompass terminology referenced in this study. The review used the Ontario College of Teachers Professional Advisory on Professional Misconduct Related to Sexual Abuse and Sexual Misconduct (2002) as a guide for defining the behaviors of educators that are associated with sexual harassment. I incorporated the term educator sexual misconduct and defined the term to mean any behavior of a sexual nature, which may constitute professional misconduct. The terms were often used interchangeably by sources to describe adult-to-student misconduct in schools. Shakeshaft indicates that the selection of the term educator sexual misconduct includes “the larger set of inappropriate, unacceptable and unprofessional behaviors” (Shakeshaft, 2004, p. 1).

Educator sexual misconduct is any behavior of a sexual nature that may constitute professional misconduct to include:
• Any conduct that would amount to sexual harassment under Title IX of the (U.S.) Education Amendments of 1972

• Any conduct that would amount to sexual abuse of a minor person under state criminal codes

• Any sexual relationship by an educator with a student regardless of the student’s age, with a former student under 18, or with a former student (regardless of age) who suffers from a disability that would prevent consent in a relationship. All students enrolled in the school and in any organization in which the educator holds a position of trust and responsibility are included

• Any activity directed toward establishing a sexual relationship such as sending intimate letters; engaging in sexual dialogue in person, via the Internet, in writing, or by phone; making suggestive comments; or dating a student

The following definitions are used interchangeably and are encompassed under the definition of educator sexual misconduct:

• Sexual abuse - an illegal sex act, especially performed against a minor by an adult (Garner, 2004)

• Sexual harassment - unwanted and unwelcomed sexual behavior that interferes with life (American Association of University Women Education Foundation, 2001)

• Hostile-environment harassment - a setting in which the following behaviors are tolerated: unwelcome sexual advances; requests for sexual favors; and other verbal, non-verbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature by an employee, by another student, or by a third party that is sufficiently severe, persistent, or
pervasive to limit a student’s ability to participate in or benefit from an education program or activity or to create a hostile or abusive educational environment (U.S. Department of Education, 2001)

- Quid pro quo sexual harassment - unwelcome verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature that is imposed on the basis of sex by an employee toward a student and that either denies, limits, provides different, or conditions the provision of aid, benefits, or services on acceptance of the sexual conduct (Scott, 2005)

The following define the two major groups referenced in the study:

- Educator - includes any person older than 18 who works with or for a school or other educational or learning organization. This service may be paid or unpaid, professional, classified, or volunteer

- Student - includes any person, whatever age, in an educational institution up through 12th Grade (Shakeshaft, 2004)

Summary

When the news media reports student sexual harassment by an educator, the public is shocked that such an event could occur by an educator and without colleagues, students, and parents knowing that it occurs. In order to provide a safe school environment, school administrators must take steps to address educator-to-student sexual misconduct. Failure to respond to complaints or information of sexual misconduct could result in administrator and district liability for damages.
CHAPTER 2
LEGAL BACKGROUND AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature review is an overview of research related to educator-to-student sexual misconduct. The review provides a historical background of educator-to-student sexual misconduct and proposed prevention policies and practices. The literature review for this study began with Carol Shakeshaft’s 2004 *Educator Sexual Misconduct: A Synthesis of Existing Literature* authorized by the U.S. Department of Education in response to Section 5414 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). This review was conducted under a contract from the U.S. Department of Education to fulfill a requirement of Section 5414 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 that required *a national study of abuse in schools*. In addition to the Shakeshaft synthesis, dissertation abstracts, ERIC® ([http://www.eric.ed.gov](http://www.eric.ed.gov)) and 2010 Google ([http://www.google.com](http://www.google.com)) searches, and various databases were used to provide the necessary overview of the issue of educator-to-student sexual harassment. Literature includes surveys of the extent of educator sexual misconduct, school systems’ responses to educator sexual misconduct, and commentary for preventing educator sexual misconduct and school policies and practices. Two studies of school principal knowledge and practices were found.

Shakeshaft noted the terms sexual harassment, sexual abuse, sexual exploitation, and sexual misconduct were used interchangeably in various studies, reports, and news articles. The term *educator sexual misconduct* was used in the synthesis to include the various sexual behaviors.
Extent of Misconduct

The reality of behaviors associated with sexual misconduct was revealed at a public forum in Ithaca, New York, at a 1975 session where women met to give testimony of how their lives had been affected by actions of employers. In 1975, the term sexual harassment entered the English language (McCaghy, 1985). Public awareness of educator sexual harassment against student's kindergarten through Grade 12 had recently become an important social issue. Professional and governmental organizations, scholarly journal articles, newspapers, magazines, and courtrooms have addressed the existence, prevention, and legal implications of educator-to-student sexual harassment (Goorian, 1999; Shakeshaft, 2003).

Bithell's 1991 Educator Sexual Abuse provided educators and the public an overview of the information for recognizing, intervening, and preventing child abuse. In addition, the author addressed sexual misconduct by educators and the impact upon the student victims. Bithell noted that the growing knowledge of educator sexual harassment had resulted in the increased reporting of educators as sexual abuse offenders.

The case studies in the book provided information about behaviors of sexual predators as well as a profile of victims. I addressed Public Law 93-247 (the 1974 Child Abuse and Neglect Act) and Public Law 100-294 (the 1988 Reauthorization Act) that mandate reporting of actual or suspected abuse by requiring each state to have reporting statutes. Additionally, I pointed out in the guidelines for reporting, that it is the responsibility of the educator to report the abuse but not to investigate it. Bithell outlined
sexual prevention education based on six basic principles that children should be taught in the school and taught by parents as a measure of prevention (Bithell, 1991).

There is some disagreement regarding the extent of sexual misconduct in public schools. Many educators believe that educator-to-student sexual misconduct is an uncommon and uncharacteristic occurrence (Sutton, 2006). In 1982, a study of the legal implications of educator sexual harassment revealed that educator-to-student sex was widespread and that sexual relationships between a teacher and student has an adverse effect not only on the those involved but also on the other students and teachers (Winks, 1982). Often, educators who are accused of sexual misconduct seek the appeal process and retain their license throughout the process (Zemel & Twedt, 1999). A 1990 survey of North Carolina superintendents indicated that 27% of the respondents had disciplined a teacher or administrator for sexual harassment during the past three years, 44.6% had no written guidelines within district policy to prevent sexual harassment, 43.1% had school board established guidelines, and 12.3% followed the general statutes of the state of North Carolina. The survey comments revealed that of the superintendents who did not have written preventive guidelines, two superintendents stated, they do not hire teachers who sexually harass students and four superintendents expect their teachers to behave in a professional manner and to use good judgment (Wishnietsky, 1991).

As of 1992, no research had been conducted to determine how many teachers were involved in student sexual harassment (Graves, 1994). However, surveys of student experiences have been conducted. In 1993, the American Association of University Women (AAUW) investigated the experiences, behaviors, and attitudes by
gender of Grade 8 through Grade 11 public school students, asking the students to reflect on their entire school history. The eventual *Hostile Hallways* report revealed that sexual harassment was widespread and crossed gender and races. According to the survey results, females were more likely than males to report harassment by a teacher or a staff member. One in four girls and one in ten boys who had been harassed in school said the action was perpetrated by a school employee (American Association of University Women Education Foundation, 1993).

In 1993, 185 college students completed a survey in which they were asked to describe any personal instances of sexual harassment by high school teachers. Most of the students involved in the study did not think teacher sexual harassment was a frequent problem at their schools, although half provided examples of involvement of other students. The study did reveal that 6% of the respondents reported experiencing sexual harassment by high school teachers (Corbett, 1993).

The state of Connecticut conducted a 1993-94 school year study of high school students from seven school districts. The results were released in the 1995 publication *In Our Own Backyard: Sexual Harassment in Connecticut’s Public High Schools*. Of the 427 students who reported some form of sexual harassment, 282 students revealed they had experienced sexual harassment by a teacher, coach, or staff member (Permanent Commission (CT) on the Status of Women, 1995).

The American Association of University Women (1993) and the replicated 2000 *Hostile Hallways* surveys provided nationwide data on educator misconduct. Shakeshaft conducted a secondary analysis of the *Hostile Hallways* data from the 1993 and the 2000 surveys. The 2000 data revealed that 9.6% of all students in Grades 6-12 reported
educator sexual abuse. Shakeshaft’s comparison of regional surveys showed that of the students who reported abuse, 21% of the abuse was educator related. In addition, 38% of the adult abusers focus on elementary students, while 56% target high school students, leaving 6% to expand the range across kindergarten through Grade 12 (Shakeshaft, 2003). In preparation for a national synthesis of existing literature on educator sexual misconduct, Shakeshaft noted for reporters that the 2001 AAUW study offered the best insight into the number of students targeted for sexual misconduct by an educator (Hendrie, 2003).

Disabled students are more frequently victims of sexual abuse than nondisabled students. In addition, disabled students may not be aware they are being abused, hence may not report the offense (Shoop, 2004). Shakeshaft (2004) analyzed the 2000 data tables from the Omaha, Nebraska, school system to determine that 8.8% of students with disabilities were sexually abused in comparison to 2.8% of non-disabled students. Students with behavior disorders are five times more likely to be sexually abused, while mentally disabled students are three times more likely than non-disabled students.

In 1999, Education Week published a three-part series, A Trust Betrayed, authored by Education Week Associate Editor Caroline Hendrie and Deputy Managing Editor Steven Drummond. At that time, no national data existed on the frequency of educator sexual harassment. The series was based on archive searches, wire service clippings, and computer databases of news articles from March through August 1998. As a result, a database of 244 active cases in criminal or civil courts or cases being investigated by school districts was developed. The cases included events ranging from unwanted touching to years-long sexual relationships and serial rape. In two-thirds of
the cases examined by *Education Week*, the students involved were high school students 14 years and older. Of those school employees accused of sexual misconduct, 20% were women. In the reviewed cases, at least a third involved were directors of extracurricular activities. In an effort to compile additional information, state officials were surveyed regarding state laws and policies on sexual relations with students and the guidelines for reporting abuse by educators. The report also noted that legal experts saw an increase in civil lawsuits regarding educator sexual harassment, but the consensus was it did not signal an increase in such conduct. Rather it was an indication it was easier for plaintiffs to win damages against school districts due to the 1992 U.S. Supreme Court ruling in *Franklin v. Gwinnett Public Schools* (Hendrie, 1998).

The series was updated in 2003 in a two-part series, *Betrayed Trust: Update on Sexual Misconduct in Schools*. The author determined through a survey that more than half of the states now had sexual assault laws regarding educators who have sex with students. The survey also showed that in 42 states, applicants seeking state certification were required to have criminal-background screenings with fingerprints checked through the Federal Bureau of Investigation and state police. In addition, 17 states required school districts to report if educators leave a job due to suspicion of sexual misconduct (Hendrie, 2003).

Response to Sexual Abuse in Schools

In *Classroom & Courtrooms: Facing Sexual Harassment in K-12 Schools*, Stein (1999) outlined sexual harassment’s existence in schools through the results of various surveys that included various state surveys, the 1993 *Seventeen* magazine survey, and
The emergence of lawsuits brought attention to the problem of educator-to-student sexual harassment and student-to-student sexual harassment. Stein (1999) provided an overview of the U.S. Courts of Appeals opinions in the Second, Fifth, and Eleventh circuits versus the Seventh Circuit and Ninth Circuit along with the divided Supreme Court 1998 decision in *Gebser v. Lago Vista Independent School District* and its impact on the liability of schools. Stein provided information for adjudication of complaints through the Office of Civil Right of the U.S. Department of Education, which would provide “speedy time lines for investigations and the fact that one does not need an attorney” (p. 43). The author concluded that educators had the opportunity to learn from lawsuits and complaints on how to address sexual harassment in the school. Consequently, the reviewed lawsuits and complaints signaled the evidence of sexual harassment in schools (Stein, 1999). The researchers in a four-year study of 225 cases of educator-to-student sexual misconduct documented the outcomes of the accused teachers. As reported by the superintendents, school attorneys, teachers, and parents of the involved districts, the following actions occurred:

- 38.7% resigned or retired
- 15% were terminated
- 8.1% were suspended and resumed teaching
- 11.3% received verbal or written reprimand
- 17.5% received an informal conference
- 7.5% were falsely accused
- 1.9% cases were unresolved at the end of the study (Shakeshaft & Cohan, 1995).
In 1999, the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette published a three-part series investigating how teachers accused of sexually abusive acts continue to remain in education. The series was prompted by recent accusations in Pittsburgh area schools. The series related various accounts of students who were subjected to sexual misconduct by educators only to find out later that the offending educators had successfully gained employment in an unsuspecting school district. The authors gained insight from notable authorities in the field of teacher discipline cases, many of whom are referenced in this study. In addition, the reporters interviewed various victims of educator-to-student sexual misconduct.

One particular account involved a 13-year-old male student who was sexually abused by his La Porte, Texas football coach and homeroom teacher in 1994. After the abuse was reported to his family and school authorities, the La Porte superintendent learned that his district had been a victim of a trend known as passing the trash. The teacher’s previous district, Elwood, Nebraska, was eager to remove the teacher after receiving reports and complaints of inappropriate behavior. The Elwood administration allowed him to complete the school year, clean out his personnel file, and resign without incident. The district also provided a letter of recommendation. The Texas family sued the Elwood, Nebraska School District and the superintendent for allowing the abusing teacher to leave the Nebraska district with a clean record. The suit claimed that the administrators had failed as educators to protect students from a teacher with a history of sexual misconduct complaints.

The Post-Gazette reviewed 727 U.S. cases of educators who lost their teaching license due to sex offenses, during a five-year period. The findings revealed that the
number of teachers who lost their license due to sex offenses increased 80% from 1994-1999. Most surprising was the reporters concluded that many offending teachers received help obtaining another job on the recommendation of administrators of the district from which they were asked to leave. In 1999, states’ dedication to detecting and removing sexual predators from classrooms varied. Some states did not require background checks. Although a private, national clearinghouse tracked problem teachers, the director indicated states’ reporting was inconsistent. The reporters concluded that lazy reference checking, dismissal of the signs, lack of procedures, absence of a national database, lack of cooperation among states and in-state agencies, and too many deals between school officials and bad teachers allowed offending teachers to remain in classrooms. The 1999 report provided information by state on various checking procedures used to protect students. The report revealed that only 34 states required state criminal background checks, while 28 added the additional requirement of federal background checks. Only 24 states required fingerprinting for certification, while 19 states required disclosure of outstanding warrants and arrests. In three states, school code or state law required accurate recommendations for employment, and 27 states required prior dismissal disclosure. The three-part series concluded with the recommendations from Carol Shakeshaft, a Hofstra University professor who studies teacher misconduct, to keep such teachers out of the classroom (Zemel & Twedt, 1999).

educator sexual misconduct and its existence examined incidence and prevalence, offender descriptions, target/victim descriptions, patterns of conduct, school district responses, legal remedies, effects on targets and other consequences to offenders of allegations, union and professional organization roles, and prevention. The synthesis research included 900 citations of which only 14 U.S. and 5 Canadian or UK were empirical studies. The data descriptors required for inclusion in the synthesis were documented frequency, described offenders/predators, described student targets/victims, identified patterns of misconduct, detailed school district responses, examined legal solutions, described effects on targets, documented consequences for offenders, detailed union and professional organization involvement, and document prevention interventions. While the author pointed out that there are no studies of effectiveness of prevention, the report included a list of practices that could reduce educator sexual harassment (Shakeshaft, 2004).

During a seven-month investigation, Associated Press reporters investigated the 2001-2005 educator disciplinary records from all fifty states and the District of Columbia. The investigation found that 2,570 educators’ teaching credentials had been revoked, denied, surrendered, or sanctioned, because of sexual misconduct. More than 80% of the victims in the resulting 1,801 cases were students. At least half of the educators who suffered state repercussions were convicted of crimes for sexual misconduct (Irvine & Tanner, 2007).

A 2010 Dallas Morning News report related that the Texas Education Agency investigated 123 cases of inappropriate educator relationships with students in 2009, an increase of 37 cases from the previous year. The state’s sexual misconduct cases of
sexual assault and fondling increased from 169 to 218 cases. The *Dallas Morning News* reviewed 20 Dallas Independent School District (DISD) cases that dated from 2005 to 2009. The investigation revealed that the accused faced criminal charges in about half of the cases. The remainder was allowed to resign without a criminal record. The investigation did determine that in almost all of the cases, DISD did report the cases to the Texas Education Agency. Although state certifications were removed, without a criminal record, the accused could continue to work with children in private schools and other centers that provide services to children. In addition, even though state and federal legislation does not require parents to be notified of educator sexual misconduct, the 2005 DISD school board trustees discussed a policy requiring parental notification when educators are jailed for educator-to-student sexual misconduct. The DISD board did not support such a measure (Hobbs, 2010).

In *T.S. v. Rapides Parish School Board* (2009), a Louisiana appellate case determined a school district should be held liable when an educator sexually abuses a student. A popular Louisiana teacher and coach repeatedly kissed a student who was not an assigned student in his class but often was sent to his classroom. The student did not report the incidences to school authorities for a variety of reasons to include embarrassment, shame, and guilt. When other students reported other such events, the student in question cooperated with authorities, even receiving ridicule from fellow students.

Although the teacher was charged with indecent behavior, served jail time, and paid a fine, he could have had his record of conviction expunged. The student then sued the school board and was awarded $45,000 in damages. The school board
appealed the decision, arguing that the student was not his assigned student; thus, he was acting outside his teaching duties. The appellate court rejected that argument and stated that his conduct was employment related.

Although state courts vary on rulings regarding the question of a teacher's sexual misconduct and the school district's liability, the federal regulation, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, provides an avenue for a student to sue a school district. Title IX also requires that the abused student must have reported the incident to at least one school official with supervisory authority whose response could be determined as *deliberate indifference* (Fossey, 2010).

The 2007 National Climate Survey by the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) sampled 6,209 gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) middle school and high school students. Of those, 427 were Texas students, of which 95% attended public schools and 81% were in urban or suburban schools.

The Texas students (99%) often heard the word *gay* in a negative connotation, and 91% heard *faggot* or *dyke*. In addition, 31% heard school staff's negative remarks about someone's gender, and 27% heard homophobic remarks. The GLBT students experienced verbal and physical harassment with 90% experiencing verbal harassment and 20% experiencing physical harassment because of sexual orientation. Of the students who experienced verbal and physical harassment, 63% did not report it to school staff. Only 32% of those who reported the harassment said that the school staff provided effective intervention.

The impact of the verbal and physical harassment of the Texas GLBT students resulted in absenteeism and a lower grade-point average. Safety issues resulted in 31%
of the GLBT students missing class at least once a month, while 32% of the students missed a full day due to safety concerns. The students who frequently experienced physical harassment had a lower grade-point average of 2.5 versus a 3.0 grade-point average of GLBT students who were less frequently victims of physical harassment.

The presence of a supportive school staff positively affected student attendance. Of those who had six or more supportive school staff members, 35% of the surveyed GLBT students did not miss school days due to safety, while 26% without such support missed school days.

Although the importance of staff support for GLBT students was noted, only 25% of the students indicated having such supportive staff. Of those who had supportive staff, 47% would report verbal and physical harassment, but only 27% of those without support would report harassment and assault.

Of those surveyed, 39% of the GLBT students felt their school had policies for reporting harassment, while only 9% reported that the policy directly addressed sexual orientation as well as gender identity. In schools with specific policies, 29% of the students experienced staff intervention. In schools with policies common to all students, only 14% of the students reported support through staff intervention. In schools where no policies existed, only 12% of the GLBT students indicated staff intervention. In addition, only 12% of the Texas GLBT students stated that their school had a school club to provide support and address issues of the GLBT students (GLSEN, 2009). In the 2007 GLSEN survey of 1,580 K-12 public school principals, only 4% reported that professional development was provided on GLBT issues within the past year (Markow & Dancewicz, 2008).
In the *2009 National Climate Survey* of 7,261 middle and high school students, 9 out of 10 GLBT students claimed harassment in the last year, which included 63.7% students reporting verbal harassment, 27.2% reporting being physically harassed, and 12.5% reporting physical assaults because of gender expression. The GLBT students (61.1%) felt unsafe because of their sexual orientation, and 29.1% missed at least one day of school. The GLBT students most frequently harassed reported grade-point averages of 2.7 as compared to those less often harassed who had average grade-point averages of 3.1 (GLSEN, 2009).

To provide a safe environment, GLBT advocates recommend school district and campus policies should include specific policy protections based on sexual orientation and gender identity. In the Public Health – Seattle & King County 2002 Report, students who had been victims of harassment or an attack at school because of perceived identification as gay or lesbian were six times more likely than their peers to carry a gun to school. Those harassed or attacked because of their gender were twice as likely to do so (Safe Schools Coalition, n.d.). A second factor to ensure tolerance is the inclusion of a school organization such as gay-straight alliance that addresses issues and promotes positive discussions about sexual orientation. A supportive staff contributes to reduced absenteeism, an increased sense of safety and school belonging, improved academic achievement, and higher education goals (Chesir-Teran & Hughes 2009; GLSEN, 2009).

*Prevention*

The effort to prevent child abuse during the 1980s was centered on services,
advocacy, public education, and public involvement. The primary focus of services was preventive education, which included training children to say no to expected abuse and to go tell someone. The programs then focused on self-esteem, conflict-resolution skills, and adult-child relations to provide protection. Advocacy programs have been successful in creating special funding for abuse prevention and directing new legislation to expand existing programs and creates new prevention programs. Public education has supported prevention by providing information about not only the problem but also how to deal with the issue. Educating the public involved the use of television programming, radio, newspaper, and magazines. During the 1980s, the focus moved to increasing the number of organizations dedicated to a prevention focus. By 1985, half of the states had legislation that provided funding for child abuse prevention in the child's trust fund, while in 1990, all but one state had established funds. In 1980, the use of funds was limited in the area of prevention, but by 1990, approximately 50% of the funds were allocated for prevention (Donnelly, 1991).

In the 1991 *Educator Sexual Abuse: A Guide for Prevention in the Schools*, Bithell's analysis of educator-to-student sexual abuse cases revealed how unprepared educators were to handle the situations. “Educator’s lack of knowledge regarding sexual abuse prevention contributes to the victimization and revictimization of students” (p. 97). Bithell (1991) provided the recommendation to use the guide as a training tool by school districts. The following include recommendations for prevention:

1. Sexual abuse prevention training should be provided for educators.
2. Sexual abuse personal safety prevention should be taught to students.
3. School districts need to transfer notice of sexual abuse offenses to the state
credential file and contact previous employers for prior offenses by potential employees (pp. 100-102).

Prevention of educator sexual abuse was addressed in 1994 in the education journal *School Administrator*. Administrators who received a complaint of educator sexual abuse were advised to immediately notify the legal authorities and remove the accused educator from contact with students. School administrators were advised to conduct their own investigation only if the situation had been determined not to be a crime. The author noted that prevention begins with policies developed by the school boards that address inappropriate conduct. In addition, the policies should support employees reporting suspicion of sexual misconduct and the discipline measures for failure to report (Graves, 1994).

In a 1999 report, *Sexual Misconduct by School Employees*, author Brad Goorian provided guidelines designed to prevent educator sexual misconduct. The development and communication of a clear sexual misconduct policy is the first important step. The policies should clarify the nature of sexual misconduct with simple, age-appropriate examples. Grievance procedures should be clear to students, parents, and school employees. Timely investigation of complaints must provide the opportunity to present evidence and witnesses with outcomes of complaints reported to the parties involved. In addition, effective policies are required to protect the victim’s confidentiality and to ensure no retaliation. To ensure the effectiveness of the policies, the policy guidelines and the problem of sexual misconduct should be discussed at school assemblies, orientations of new staff, and meetings with parents (Goorian, 1999).
In an effort to provide guidance and information regarding sexual harassment, the Office for Civil Rights (1997) provided an information pamphlet for school administrators, teachers, students, and parents. A section of the pamphlet addressed prevention of sexual harassment to include the following:

- Develop and publicize a sexual harassment policy that clearly states sexual harassment will not be tolerated and that explains what types of conduct will be considered sexual harassment
- Develop and publicize a specific grievance procedure for resolving complaints of sexual harassment
- Develop methods to inform new administrators, teachers, guidance counselors, staff, and students of the school’s sexual harassment policy and grievance procedure
- Conduct periodic age-appropriate sexual harassment awareness training for students
- Establish discussion groups for both male and female students where students can talk about what sexual harassment is and how to respond to it in the school setting
- Survey students to find out whether any sexual harassment is occurring at the school conduct periodic sexual harassment awareness training for parents of elementary and secondary students
- Work together with parents and students to develop and implement effective, age appropriate measures for addressing sexual harassment
Shakeshaft reported in the 2004 *Educator Sexual Misconduct: A Synthesis of Existing Literature* that educator sexual misconduct has not been systematically addressed in schools.

While Shakeshaft acknowledged the ability to sue for damages because of Title IX and increased media coverage and the increase in school officials accepting that educator-to-student sexual harassment has occurred, the author pointed out that educator sexual misconduct continued to exist in schools. The synthesis of the Shakeshaft literature revealed that 43% of all educator sex offenders are women. Educators who are required to have contact with students outside the normal school day are more likely to be involved in educator-to-student sexual misconduct. Although media attention is directed to teachers and coaches, sexual misconduct is prevalent in all school job categories. Shakeshaft’s 2004 report recommended a study of prevention strategies.

Shakeshaft (2004) pointed out that districts need written policies prohibiting educator-to-student sexual misconduct to include consensual relationships between staff and students. Prohibited behaviors should be clearly defined. Shakeshaft identified the suggested policies of United Educators (2004) to clarify policy established for school districts:

- Descriptors of educationally appropriate touching
- Limitations on closed-door and afterhours activities with only one student
- Investigatory rights without formal complaint
- Required reporting by other teachers and employees
• Required reports of any criminal investigation of conviction during period of employment
• Required chaperones, at least one male and one female, for off-site trips
• Deadlines for reporting allegations with the option for waiving the time limit

In addition, the prevention section of the 2004 synthesis provided the following recommendations on hiring practices:

• Use of common applications with questions on work history
• Possible termination resulting from background check information, criminal history information, and incomplete or false information
• Interviewers trained to identify issues in the applicant’s background.

The districts should appoint a case coordinator to centralize educator sexual misconduct information. In districts that receive federal funds, the district is required to designate an employee to oversee Title IX requirements. The Title IX coordinator is generally the employee assigned to receive sexual complaints and oversee investigations. All allegations should be reported to law enforcement and child protective services. The district should develop investigative practices that include training regional investigators who can complete investigations and follow-up reports within 48 hours.

Shakeshaft concluded that, in general, sexual abuse training for educators and school staff does not include information regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct. While the training does include the process to report sexual or any other kinds of abuse, educators and school staff require training that provides guidelines on behaviors that are not acceptable. By providing guidelines for behaviors, the educators
and staff have a measure of unacceptable behaviors and a clearer understanding of their responsibility to report such behaviors.

Students should also be included in the training process. Students need to know the guidelines for acceptable and unacceptable educator behavior. Along with that knowledge, students who observe or target students need to know who to report to if confronted with such an issue. Along with reporting, the school community training should include signs of sexual misconduct.

Shakeshaft took the steps to prevention beyond the school to include the following guidelines at the state and federal levels:

- Include educator sexual abuse training in state certification requirements
- Maintain national registry list by the state of educators involved in sexual misconduct to prevent offending educators from crossing state lines and gaining new certifications
- Enact and standardize state policies and statues
- Provide laws that give immunity to public employees who provide references
- Expand Title IX to make the damage intent clear by incorporating the guidelines used in Title VII in deciding liability

In 2005, prevention and investigation strategies were outlined in the *Texas School Administrator’s Legal Digest*. The guidelines were developed under the presumption that in cases involving educators and high school students, the sexual conduct is nonconsensual. The guidelines support the synthesis of procedures as outlined in the Shakeshaft report. The author noted that an effective sexual harassment policy should include the following:
• A broad definition and examples of sexual harassment that include a wide range of inappropriate acts of sexual nature
• A designated Title IX Coordinator for student and employee complaints
• An avenue for the complaint to bypass the accused
• Description of the penalties for harassment to include employment termination
• Retaliation safeguards
• An investigative written report
• Internal procedures to ensure investigated complaints
• The allowance of the filing of grievances and appeals regarding investigation outcome

An additional element of the prevention strategy included the training of employees and students regarding the established policies. The policies should be included in all employee and student handbooks in multiple languages with a signed receipt. The policies should be displayed on public bulletin boards to ensure widespread knowledge of expectations. New employees should receive an orientation regarding the policies and the grievance process with yearly review for all employees on the existence and purpose of the harassment policies. Additional training should be required to provide an in-depth study of sexual harassment and the purpose of the district policies.

Administrator training is an important component of the prevention process. Supervisors need training to understand the legal obligations and the risks to the school district and the supervisor if sexual harassment signs and complaints of sexual harassment are ignored. Investigation strategies are important in the training of administrators. Effective investigations reduce the legal liability and support a safer
environment for employees and students.

Investigations include the following steps:

- Interview the complainant
- Interview the complainant’s witnesses
- Interview the accused
- Interview the accused witnesses
- Ask follow-up questions
- Make a decision, and prepare an investigation report
- Implement discipline and recommendations
- Follow-up and monitor
- Make required reports (Scott, 2005)

School Principal Knowledge and Practices

School administrators are charged with the responsibility of ensuring student safety, which includes prevention of sexual misconduct by school employees (Shoop, 2004). A 2006 qualitative Florida study was conducted to determine the language a school district and principals were using to define educator sexual misconduct. It also sought to determine what principals understood about educator sexual misconduct, the district policy, legal and moral responsibility, and actions that they should take or have taken in situations of reported educator-to-student sexual misconduct. Four elementary, three middle, and three high school principals from an undisclosed Florida school district agreed to participate in interviews. In addition, the researcher indicated that three principals contacted for the purpose of the study who had dealt with educator
sexual misconduct issues were unwilling or reluctant to speak with the interviewer.

The study revealed that principals viewed the term educator sexual misconduct as more appropriate than harassment because misconduct is broader. The interviewed principals felt administrators should be able to recognize acceptable and unacceptable behavior and the signs of misconduct. In addition, the principal should demonstrate sensitivity to an educator accused of misconduct. This is based on the understanding that the educator’s perception of an incident may be different from that of the student. The principals reported that they followed the district’s misconduct policy, that the district policy was included in the parent-student handbook, and that the staff received yearly training. The principals also shared that if confronted with an incident, they would contact the district office. The principals also stated that they would assist in the investigation of an accusation, and they felt they had a duty to protect the accused.

In the Florida study, the principals reported they felt they were inadequately prepared for dealing with issues of educator sexual misconduct. The principals reflected on their university programs and the need for training in the practical implications of sexual harassment and personnel issues. In addition, the administrators concluded that state and district professional development training lacked sufficient training in the procedural aspects of responding to sexual misconduct. Carins (2006) concluded that the university leader preparation programs should include reviews of state and district policies, interviews of principals who have been involved in the reporting and investigation sexual misconduct cases, building skills for various educational and criminal databases, and designing specific training in conducting investigations that protects both the victim and the accused.
A 2009 quantitative Michigan study investigated secondary principals’ beliefs and the extent of training regarding educator sexual misconduct. The purpose of the study was to examine the principals’ beliefs and the extent of training by gender, years of experience, and ethical lens. I collected responses from 245 secondary administrators, 177 males and 62 females, using a 38-question online survey.

It was concluded that secondary principals have diverse beliefs regarding educator sexual misconduct and need more training regarding understanding the legalities of a case of educator sexual misconduct and the manner in which to handle a case of educator sexual misconduct. The study concluded that the training should come from university coursework, district professional development, and various other sources. The ethical lens of the principals was the Ethics of Justice, which supports the use of laws and district policies for guidance. Gender and years of experiences did not produce any significant differences in principals’ beliefs of educator sexual misconduct. The only ethical issue that showed a significant difference was in how the principals viewed the characteristics of the student victims.

Many of the principals (88.1%) did not believe the victims would report the actions of the offending educators. In addition, 92.6% agreed that educator sexual misconduct involving female students was just as harmful as cases involving male students. Of the respondents, only 5.1% of the principals thought educator sexual misconduct was a serious problem in their own district and only 27.8% thought it was a serious problem in education.

The principals (84.7%) reported that they had little training to recognize the characteristics of offenders and accompanying warning signs. Moreover, 7.9% of the
principals revealed that they had little or no training in their district’s policies for reporting and documenting allegations. In addition, 70.7% had insufficient training regarding disciplinary actions aligned with their district’s policy on educator sexual misconduct (Thoenes, 2009).

Child Abuse Laws and Requirement to Report

Child abuse and neglect, in all its forms is a serious problem that can be addressed with early detection and prevention education. In the 1960s, Dr. C. Henry Kempe and a group of physicians became convinced that mandating certain professions to report all cases of suspected child abuse was the only way to raise the social awareness of the problem. As a result of such efforts, in 1974, the Federal Child Abuse and Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA) was enacted, and the National Center for Child Abuse and Neglect was established with a minimum definition of child abuse that states were required to use in state statutory definitions. Consequently, each state followed with child abuse discovery and reporting laws (Shoop & Firestone, 1988).

The state has the primary responsibility for child welfare services, and each state has its own legal requirements and programs. Although the state has the major responsibility, states are required to follow the federal requirements and guidelines to be eligible for federal funding for various programs (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2009).

In the Family Code Section 261.001, Texas provides a definition for child abuse that includes sexual harassment and the definition of neglect. Physical abuse includes injury that results in substantial harm or threat of harm to a child, failure to make
reasonable effort to prevent injury, the current use by a person of a controlled
substance, and causing or permitting a child to use a controlled substance. Neglect
Includes placing a child in a threatening situation or failing to remove them, and failing
to provide required medical attention for a child at risk of death, disfigurement, or bodily
injury; failing to provide food and shelter necessary to sustain life, placing a child in or
failing to remove a child from a situation involving sexual abuse or permitting a child to
return home without ensuring that a responsible person is available upon the child’s return.

The Texas Family Code Section 261.101 identifies professionals required to
report child abuse and neglect. The citation defines a professional as an individual who
is licensed or certified by the state or who is an employee of a facility licensed, certified,
or operated by the state and who, in the normal course of official duties or duties for
which a license or certification is required, has direct contact with children.
Professionals include teachers or daycare employees; nurses, doctors, or employees of
a clinic or health-care facility that provides reproductive services; and juvenile probation
officers or juvenile detention or correctional officers.

In addition, the code also mandates that a person who believes a child has been
adversely affected by abuse or neglect must immediately make a report. The standard
for reporting is outlined in the Texas Family Code Section 261.001, which states that a
report is required when the child suffers from substantial harm or a genuine threat of
substantial harm (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2010).

Texas Statutes Penal Code Chapter 21.12 identifies educator sexual misconduct
and indicates such action is a felony offense. Section 21.006 requires the reporting of
any sexual abuse involving an educator and a student or minor. The superintendent or
director of a school district, regional service center, or shared services arrangement
must report to the State Board of Educator Certification the termination of an educator
based on determination that the educator abused or committed an unlawful act with a
student or minor (ONECLE, 2010).

The State Board of Educator Certification Administrative Rules Chapter 61.1051
requires that the board of trustees establish and review policies for reporting child abuse
and neglect. The policies must include the directive to every school employee, to
provide a written or oral report within 48 hours or less to a local or state law
enforcement agency, state or local child protective services, or the state agency that
operates, licenses, or registers the facility where the abuse or neglect occurred who
suspects child abuse or neglect. (Texas Administrative Code, 2009)

Although educators are required to report expected abuse, some educators are
reluctant to make such reports. Only 1% to 5% of the cases of educator sexual
misconduct are reported to law enforcement or child protective services. When
investigations are handled internally, the offending educator often resigns only to be
later hired by another school district (Grant, 2010).

Fear of retaliation is one of the most frequent reasons for not making the
appropriate report of abuse. A solution for fear of retaliation has been provided by the
Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA). CAPTA requires states to
safeguard the confidentiality of all child abuse and neglect reports and records, even
though reports from educators are made public and admitted as evidence in a court
hearing. In addition to the fear of retaliation, additional reasons for not reporting include
the following:

- Lack of recognition of the characteristics associated with child abuse
- Lack of awareness of legal responsibilities
- Fear that the school’s reputation or an educator’s prestige would be impaired
- Lack of knowledge regarding correct legal procedures for reporting such cases
- Perception that child abuse is a problem for the courts or social welfare agencies
- Lack of sufficient evidence
- Belief that the child or family will be harmed more than helped
- Belief that reporting constitutes an intrusion into the privacy of the family

(Shoop, 2004, p. 50)

Educators are reluctant to believe that their colleagues would be involved in a sexual relationship with a student. Educators believe that educator sexual misconduct would not occur in their community. As a result, the issue is not given appropriate attention. Educators often resist required training on the issue, because they think educators should already know that a relationship with a student is improper. Teacher preparation programs and school district professional development trainings do not prepare teachers to recognize educator sexual abuse and the state reporting laws; therefore, teachers are not aware of the extent of the problem. Educators often do not acknowledge educator-to-student sexual misconduct because of misguided loyalty to their school’s reputation. As a result, suspected employees are allowed to resign, and administrators hope the problem goes away. This type of attitude then becomes a problem for the next district that is unaware of the teacher’s past actions.
Educators hold inaccurate stereotypes about who commits such crimes. In reality, those who commit sexual abuse are often respected by the community, their colleagues, and students. Even when the accusations are found to be true, some community members and parents are reluctant to accept the allegations. The fear of falsely accusing and harming an innocent person is a common barrier. Concerns about false accusations and the damage such complaints can cause to a career cause some administrators to be reluctant to move forward with investigations. In addition, some inaction is caused by a fear of being sued by the accused educator. An accused educator could sue the administrator and district for such actions as wrongful dismissal and defamation of character. Failure to understand the state reporting laws is another cause of inaction (Shakeshaft & Cohan, 1995; Shoop, 2004).

Title IX Coordinator

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 federal law prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in any federally funded education program. School districts were required to comply with the Title IX regulations when the Title IX final common rule was published on August 30, 2000. The Title IX coordinator has the responsibility to coordinate any investigation of complaints received that are covered within Title IX regulations. Federal regulations direct the adoption and publication of internal grievance procedures to promptly and equitably resolve complaints alleging discrimination based on sex in its education program or activities (United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, 2001). The establishment of strong policy
and fair grievance procedures signals that a school district is demonstrating no
tolerance to sexual harassment and students can report without fear of consequences

Title IX Coordinators are required to implement and administer a grievance
process. The following tasks and responsibilities are included in establishing a
grievance process:

- Provide consultation and information regarding Title IX requirements to potential
  complainants
- Distribute grievance forms to potential complainants
- Receive formal grievances and provide notification to complainants of receipt of
  the grievance
- Schedule grievance hearings
- Moderate grievance procedures
- Notify all parties regarding grievance decisions
- Notify complainants of the right and procedures of appeal
- Monitor compliance of all requirements and timelines specified in grievance
  procedures
- Train staff responsible for grievance procedures
- Maintain grievance and compliance records and files
- Provide ongoing training, consultation, technical assistance, and information
  services regarding Title IX requirements, grievance issues, and compliance
  programs (United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, 2001).
In addition to the responsibilities of a Title IX coordinator, the United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division (2001) lists the expertise that a Title IX coordinator should exhibit to effectively administer a grievance procedure:

- In-depth knowledge of the Title IX regulation
- General knowledge of other Federal and state non-discrimination laws
- Knowledge of the recipient agency’s Title IX grievance procedures
- Knowledge of personnel policies and practices of the recipient agency
- Ability to prepare reports on the Title IX compliance activities and make recommendations for action by appropriate decision makers
- Ability to communicate effectively
- Ability to establish a positive climate for Title IX compliance efforts

**Code of Ethics and Standard Practices for Texas Educators**

The Texas Administrative Code, Title 19, Part 7, Chapter 247, Rule 247.2 (adopted to be effective March 1, 1998, 23 TexReg 1022, amended to be effective August 22, 2002, TexReg 7530) requires the Texas educator “to comply with standards and practices and ethical conduct toward students, professional colleagues, school officials, parents, and members of the community and to safeguard academic freedom.” The ethical conduct requirements toward students apply to an educator’s conduct in the solicitation or engagement in sexual conduct or a romantic relationship with a student. The ethical conduct requirements address an educator’s actions that adversely affect student learning, physical health, mental health, or safety to include physical mistreatment of a student. An educator cannot prevent a student from participation,
deny benefits, or grant an advantage to a student based on race, color, sex, disability, national origin, religion, or family status.

Requirements of Texas Education Code, Chapter 37 SEC 73.001; SEC 37.083

The Texas Education Code, Title 2, Public Education Subtitle G, Safe Schools outlines discipline and law and order issues for Texas schools. Texas Education Code, Chapter 37, SEC 37.001 requires that a school district’s board and district-level committee establish and adopt a student code of conduct that is posted at each campus and available for review in the principal’s office. The student code of conduct must specifically address the issue of harassment by prohibiting bullying, harassment, and making hit lists and ensure that district employees enforce those prohibitions and prevent and intervene in student discipline problems, including bullying, harassment, and making hit lists. School districts are to include the following definition of harassment in the student code of conduct:

Harassment means threatening to cause harm or bodily injury to another student, engaging in sexually intimidating conduct, causing physical damage to the property of another student, subjecting another student to physical confinement or restraint, or maliciously taking any action that substantially harms another student’s physical or emotional health or safety.

Texas Education Code, Chapter 37, SEC 37.083 addresses discipline management programs and sexual harassment policies. School districts must adopt and implement a discipline management program that is included in the district improvement plan under Section 11.252. The program must include the prevention of
and education regarding unwanted forms of physical and verbal aggression, sexual harassment, and other forms of bullying in school to include school grounds and school vehicles (Texas Constitution and Statistics, n.d.).

Summary

The literature review found surveys that attempted to document the incidence of educator sexual misconduct and recommendations of practices to prevent it; however, limited research was found on the extent of implementation of requirements and recommended practices. This study contributes to the literature as the first statewide survey of practices of Texas school districts.
CHAPTER 3
OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGY

The literature review provided a framework of recommended policies and procedures to prevent educator sexual misconduct and to address cases of educator sexual misconduct. The framework was used to develop a survey instrument that identifies the policies and practices. The survey process and sample are described below.

The General Perspective-Survey Research

Quantitative research expresses objective reality in a numerical format. Studies employ strategies such as experiments and surveys to yield statistical data used for developing knowledge (Glatthorn, 1998). The survey method is the quantitative research design selected for this study. The survey method provides a “quantitative or numeric description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population” (Creswell, 2003, p. 153).

The purpose of this study was to determine what prevention methods have been established in Texas public high schools in the form of district and campus policies and district and campus training of faculty and staff. The study also sought to determine if the district and campus policies and trainings aligned with the prevention policies and practices outlined in the literature.

Identifying the Sample

The schools in the sample were regular 9-12 public high schools in Texas. The
high schools were identified by size using the Texas University Interscholastic League (UIL) schools for the 2010-2012 athletic competitions:

- 5A  2065 and up
- 4A  990 to 2064
- 3A  430-989
- 2A  200 to 429
- 1A  199 & below (University Interscholastic League, 2010)

I developed a survey instrument to be completed by high school principals. The study does not include 9th Grade schools, charter schools, or alternative schools. The participants in this cross-sectional study were high school principals from urban, suburban, and rural Texas public high schools. The Texas Education Agency (TEA) provided the names and email contact information of principals of 9-12 high schools. For the purpose of this study, a Texas public high school was defined as a regular instructional public high school, offering instruction in Grades 9-12.

The survey was administered through Survey Monkey™ (www.surveymonkey.com) and e-mails were sent to principals’ school e-mail addresses. Data was collected over approximately six and a half weeks time. Multiple reminders were sent to principals who had not responded to the request for participation in the survey. Initially, 967 surveys were mailed. After repeated attempts, I was unable to contact 70 individuals. Messages returned as bounced or the message was labeled as spam despite multiple attempts resending the survey. Overall, 190 completed surveys were received. Using the figure of 897 respondents as the total initial sample (967 individuals minus the 70 who could not be contacted), this gave a total response rate of
21.18%. Additionally, a total of 238 partially or totally completed surveys were received. Using that figure, this gave a total response rate of 26.53%.

Survey Instrument

The instrument for this study was an online questionnaire developed by me. The advantages of survey research are the lower cost compared to other methods to include the wide access to geographically dispersed samples, reduced biasing error, anonymity for respondents, and more time to consider answers or consult with other sources (Frankfort-Nachmias, 2000). The development process of the survey consisted of writing and revisions based on the consultation with the dissertation major professor, committee members, the University of North Texas Center for Interdisciplinary Research and Analysis (CIRA), and practitioners in public education. The survey consisted of 27 items. The survey consisted of descriptive information about the school and the principal's awareness of district and campus sexual harassment policies and training opportunities for administrators, faculty, students, and parents.

To determine content validity, a Title IX coordinator central administrator from a Texas public school district who is responsible for investigating reports that indicate violation of Title IX guidelines reviewed the draft. Three high school principals reviewed the survey and provided comments related to the clarity and purpose of the questions. The panel addressed the content validity of the items related to district and school practices. In addition, the central level administrator and the high school principals considered the time requirement for completion of the survey as a test to determine likelihood that a principal would complete the survey.
Procedures Used

Survey Monkey™ was used to prepare the survey for distribution and collection of data. The survey design provided a rapid response to data collection and the collection of attributes from a large population (Babbie, 1990; Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2000). E-mails requesting participation and providing the link to the instrument were sent to the sample of principals. The application put the collected data into a Microsoft Excel© (www.microsoft.com) spreadsheet for analysis.

Survey Monkey™ contains several features that make it an optimal method of survey dissemination and collection. Individuals who participated in the survey were tracked using a number of methods, so that multiple responses from the same person or computer were not counted twice. Methods include tracking over e-mail as well as tracking respondents using an anonymous, unique identification number. Survey Monkey™ also allows respondents to save the survey while in the midst of completing it so they could resume later. It also allows users to send reminder e-mails to individuals who have not yet responded to the survey. The system has several methods that to use in order to keep the surveys anonymous. Data collected through Survey Monkey™ was kept private and confidential, allowing for the adherence to IRB guidelines.

Data Analysis

All analyses were conducted using the SPSS® (http://www.spss.com) software package. Descriptive statistics for all items were computed in order to better describe the sample as well as to assess the data for any errors that may have occurred during data collection and processing. Descriptive statistics were presented in the form
of frequency tables and bar charts. Statistical analyses were conducted as appropriate in order to test the research questions presented in this study. The research questions that are the focus of the study are provided along with a description of the analyses that were conducted in order to test them.

1. What do high school principals know about educator-to-student sexual misconduct?

This research question was answered using the responses to Questions 4 and 5 in the survey. The analyses conducted in order to test this research question yielded data in the form of bar charts and frequency tables, used to describe the level of knowledge that high school principals have about educator-to-student sexual misconduct.

2. What direct experience have high school principals had with educator-to-student sexual misconduct?

This research question was explored using items 8 through 13 of the survey. These questions included topics such as involvement in sexual misconduct investigations and sexual misconduct complaints received (if any). Similar to the previous research question, the analyses conducted in order to test this research question yielded data in the form of bar charts and frequency tables.

3. What campus policies are in place at the secondary level to address educator sexual misconduct?

This research question was answered using Questions 6 and 22 through 27 of the survey. These questions included topics such as the nature of student training, how students and parents are notified of campus policies, how often student training occurs,
and how students are surveyed in order to determine whether sexual harassment is occurring within the school. The analyses conducted in order to test this research question yielded data in the form of bar charts and frequency tables.

4. What district-level training is provided for principals regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct?

This research question was explored using items 7, 14, 15, 16, and 18 in the survey. These questions discussed how well prepared the principal felt in responding to an incident of sexual misconduct, how often the district trained administrators regarding sexual misconduct, and the options available to help principals address questions and problems regarding sexual misconduct. The analyses conducted in order to explore this research question yielded data in the form of bar charts and frequency tables.

5. What campus training is provided for secondary school staff regarding the prevention of educator-to-student sexual misconduct?

The final research question was examined using Questions 17, 19, 20, and 21 from the survey. These questions included the areas of training the principal has received, the format the district used to provide information regarding sexual harassment policies, how often teachers received training regarding sexual misconduct, and the topics included in teacher training. The analyses conducted in order to explore this research question yielded data in the form of bar charts and frequency tables.

6. Do school education misconduct practices and policies differ by school size, type of community, and Title I eligibility (SES)?

Where appropriate, differences among groups were examined using Pearson’s chi-square test to determine if the observed results differed from the expected results.
Then as appropriate, post-hoc analyses were conducted to determine further differences between school size categories and the various community types. Differences among principals based on school size, location, community, and Title I eligibility were examined.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to add to the literature on school policies and procedures that address educator sexual misconduct through an examination of the policies and procedures that are currently in place in Texas high schools. The policies and procedures examined focus specifically on the prevention of educator-to-student sexual misconduct and serve to address problems that are reported to school administrators. Additionally, this study aimed to determine whether policies and training put in place by districts and campuses reflect those policies and prevention practices that are outlined in current literature as the most effective practices. This study serves to add to the current body of literature, as currently, studies have not been conducted that present a thorough overview of district or school policies in this area. Additionally, there are lack of studies that focus upon conformity to best practices regarding the area of educator-to-student sexual misconduct.

The data consists of responses of 230 Texas high school (Grades 9-12) principals to an on-line questionnaire. The focus of this questionnaire was on district and campus-level policies and training.

Analyses

The research questions focused upon in this study consisted of the following:

1. What do high school principals know about educator-to-student sexual misconduct?
2. What direct experience have high school principals had with educator-to-student sexual misconduct?

3. What campus policies are in place at the secondary level to address educator-to-student sexual misconduct?

4. What district-level training is provided for principals regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct?

5. What campus training is provided for secondary school staff regarding the prevention of educator-to-student sexual misconduct?

6. Do school educator misconduct practices and policies differ by school size, type of community, and Title I eligibility (SES)?

In this section, descriptive data and chi-square analyses was presented for each research question and a summary of post-hoc analyses where applicable.

Research Question 6 is a summary question that compares the significance of principals’ responses to survey questions and school size, community type, and Title I school eligibility. Chi-square analyses were conducted to determine whether there were statistically significant differences in responses among schools by school size, type of community, and student SES defined by Title I eligibility. Where the chi-square analysis test was found to be statistically significant and more than one comparison was made in the analysis, then additional post-hoc chi-square analyses were conducted to further explore comparisons between the groups included in the analysis. This pertains only to the chi-square analyses conducted on school size and community type. A single comparison was made in each Title I chi-square analysis, rendering any additional post-
hoc analyses unnecessary. Where no significant differences were found, further information was not provided in the test.

For the purposes of the chi-square analyses, the categories of *limited knowledge* and *no knowledge* were combined into a single category in Survey Questions 4 and 5 with regard to all the research questions.

**Principals’ Self-Rated Knowledge of Federal and State Laws and District Policies**

This research question was answered using the responses to two survey questions that addressed principal knowledge of state and federal regulation and their school districts’ policies and procedures. Frequency tables are presented. Then, differences in principals’ self-rated knowledge among school groups categorized by size, community type, and Title I eligibility are shown followed by results of chi-square analyses.

**Knowledge of Federal and State Regulations**

Table 1 presents a summary of responses to Question 4, which asked principals to rate their knowledge of the state and federal laws and regulations related to educator sexual misconduct. Most of the respondents reported that they had a great deal of knowledge or some knowledge regarding the items included in this question relating to state and federal laws and regulations.
Table 1

*Knowledge of State and Federal Regulations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>A great deal knowledge</th>
<th>Some knowledge</th>
<th>Limited knowledge</th>
<th>No knowledge</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>% No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual discrimination</td>
<td>99 (47.5%)</td>
<td>106 (52.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>119 (57.4%)</td>
<td>87 (42.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse of a child</td>
<td>117 (56.4%)</td>
<td>79 (38.7%)</td>
<td>10 (4.9%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile environment</td>
<td>87 (41.7%)</td>
<td>98 (48.0%)</td>
<td>20 (9.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment and discrimination of gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender students</td>
<td>74 (35.8%)</td>
<td>102 (50.7%)</td>
<td>26 (12.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities</td>
<td>67 (31.9%)</td>
<td>101 (49.5%)</td>
<td>34 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (2.0%)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment aspects of bullying</td>
<td>91 (43.6%)</td>
<td>99 (48.5%)</td>
<td>14 (16.7%)</td>
<td>2 (1.0%)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator liability for conduct of others in the school</td>
<td>106 (51.0%)</td>
<td>87 (42.6%)</td>
<td>11 (5.4%)</td>
<td>2 (1.0%)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Size

Principals’ self-rated knowledge of state and federal regulations were analyzed by school size categories. Chi-square analysis showed there were no significant
differences among the school size categories in the knowledge of laws and regulations
related to sexual discrimination, sexual abuse of a child, hostile environment, and
sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities, sexual harassment aspects of
bullying, or administrator liability for conduct of others in the school.

A significant association was found between school size and knowledge of
sexual harassment and harassment and discrimination of GLBT students. The results of
the analysis are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 4</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-rated knowledge of state/Federal laws regarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment</td>
<td>12.634</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment/discrimination of GLBT students</td>
<td>26.212</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the high school principals’ responses sorted by school size for the
two areas of federal and state policy where significant differences occurred.
Table 3

Sexual Harassment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>&gt; 2065</th>
<th>990-2064</th>
<th>430-989</th>
<th>200-429</th>
<th>199 &amp; below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>31 (60.7%)</td>
<td>22 (48.8%)</td>
<td>19 (42.2%)</td>
<td>14 (42.4%)</td>
<td>12 (38.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>20 (39.2%)</td>
<td>23 (51.1%)</td>
<td>26 (57.7%)</td>
<td>19 (57.5%)</td>
<td>18 (58.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square significance -.013 N=205

Sexual Harassment and Discrimination of GLBT Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>&gt; 2065</th>
<th>990-2064</th>
<th>430-989</th>
<th>200-429</th>
<th>199 &amp; below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>20 (40.0%)</td>
<td>21 (47.7%)</td>
<td>13 (29.5%)</td>
<td>11 (33.3%)</td>
<td>9 (29.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>29 (58.0%)</td>
<td>20 (45.5%)</td>
<td>27 (61.3%)</td>
<td>13 (39.3%)</td>
<td>12 (38.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>1 (2.0%)</td>
<td>3 (6.8%)</td>
<td>4 (9.0%)</td>
<td>9 (27.2%)</td>
<td>10 (32.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square significance -.001 N=202

Post-hoc analyses were conducted to determine where the differences were.

Principals in schools in the largest size category (greater than 2065 students) reported a higher level of knowledge regarding sexual harassment than those in all other groups. Almost 61% of principals in the largest schools reported having a great deal of knowledge of sexual harassment, while nearly 100% reported a great deal or some knowledge. There were no significant knowledge differences among other size categories.

Next, a significant association was found between school size and principals’ self-rated knowledge of laws and regulations relating to harassment and discrimination of gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender (GLBT) students. Principals of the largest
schools (greater than 2065 students) were found to have significantly higher self-rated knowledge than those of the two smallest school categories (199 or fewer students and 200-429 students). Principals of schools in the next largest size category (990-2064 students) had significantly higher self-rated knowledge than those in the two smallest categories (200-429 and 199 or fewer students). Principals of schools with 430-989 students were found to have significantly higher self-rated knowledge as compared with principals of schools with 199 or fewer students. It appears that the larger the high school, the more knowledgeable the principal is about harassment and discrimination of GLBT students.

Community Type

The chi-square analysis (see Table 4) showed significant differences in principals’ knowledge of state and federal laws related to sexual harassment, sexual abuse of a child, hostile environment, and harassment and discrimination of GLBT students among schools in urban, suburban, and rural communities.

Table 4

Chi-Square Scores and Community Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 4</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-rated knowledge of state/federal laws regarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment</td>
<td>8.100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual abuse of a child</td>
<td>9.881</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostile environment</td>
<td>12.521</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harassment/discrimination of GLBT students</td>
<td>12.446</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 shows the high school principals’ responses for each area by community type.

Table 5

**Sexual Harassment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>32 (68.0%)</td>
<td>43 (66.1%)</td>
<td>44 (46.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>15 (31.9%)</td>
<td>22 (33.8%)</td>
<td>49 (51.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square - .017  N=205

**Sexual Abuse of a Child**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>35 (68.0%)</td>
<td>36 (55.3%)</td>
<td>45 (48.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>12 (25.5%)</td>
<td>25 (38.4%)</td>
<td>42 (45.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>4 (6.1%)</td>
<td>6 (6.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square - .042  N=205

**Hostile Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>26 (55.3%)</td>
<td>29 (44.6%)</td>
<td>31 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>19 (40.4%)</td>
<td>33 (50.7%)</td>
<td>46 (49.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>2 (4.2%)</td>
<td>3 (4.6%)</td>
<td>16 (17.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square - 014  N=205

**Harassment/Discrimination of GLBT Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>22 (48.8%)</td>
<td>24 (36.9%)</td>
<td>28 (30.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>21 (46.6%)</td>
<td>36 (55.3%)</td>
<td>44 (47.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>2 (4.4%)</td>
<td>5 (7.6%)</td>
<td>20 (21.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square - .014  N=202

Post-hoc analyses were conducted in order to explore this relationship in additional detail. There were no significant differences found between urban and
suburban schools. Significant differences were found between urban and rural schools on all items. Principals of urban schools rated their knowledge higher regarding sexual harassment, child abuse, hostile environment, and discrimination and harassment of GLBT students than did principals of rural schools. Principals of suburban schools had higher self-rated knowledge regarding harassment and hostile environment than principals of rural schools. Principals of schools in rural communities tended to report the least knowledge of state and federal laws and regulations.

Title I Eligibility

Title I eligibility is determined by the socio-economic status of students in the schools. The socio-economic status of students in public schools is determined by a student’s eligibility for free or reduced cost of public school meal programs. There was a significant difference in principal knowledge between principals of Title I eligible schools and those in non-Title I eligible schools in only one item, laws and regulations relating to the harassment and discrimination of GLBT students (see Table 6).

Table 6

*Chi-Square Scores and Title I Eligibility*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 4</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Self-rated knowledge of state/Federal laws regarding harassment/discrimination of GLBT students</td>
<td>3.564</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N=200*

Table 7 shows the high school principals’ responses for each area by Title I eligibility.
Table 7

Harassment/Discrimination of GLBT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>Title I</th>
<th>Non-Title I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>48 (42.4%)</td>
<td>26 (29.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>50 (44.2%)</td>
<td>49 (56.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>15 (13.2%)</td>
<td>12 (13.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square - .168  N=200

A higher percentage of respondents who were principals of schools that were not Title I eligible stated that they had limited knowledge or no knowledge of laws and regulations pertaining to the harassment of GLBT students as compared with principals of Title I eligible schools. No other significant results were found between Title I eligible schools and category choices in Question 4.

Summary

The following is a summary of statistically significant ($p<.05$) differences among school groups in the principals’ knowledge of state and Federal laws and regulations governing areas related to sexual harassment. There were no significant differences noted in any of the compared areas of school size, community size, and Title I eligibility in choices of sexual discrimination, sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities, sexual harassment aspects of bullying, or administrator liability for the conduct of others in the school. Significant differences were found in areas of sexual harassment by school and community type, sexual abuse of a child by community type,
hostile environment by community type, and harassment/discrimination of GLBT students by school size, community type, and Title I eligibility.

Table 8

*Summary Knowledge of State and Federal Regulations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 4</th>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Title I/Non-Title I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Categories</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>Urban, Suburban, Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>2065&gt;199</td>
<td>Urban&gt; Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;200-429</td>
<td>Suburban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;430-989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;990-2064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse of a child</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment GLBT Students</td>
<td>430-989&gt;199</td>
<td>Urban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>990-2064&gt;199</td>
<td>Great/Limited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>990-2064&gt;200-429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;200-429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Knowledge of School District Policies and Procedures*

In Question 5, principals indicated how they rated their knowledge of school district policies and procedures regarding a set of similar issues, many of them are identical to those included in the previous question. Table 9 shows their responses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>A great deal of knowledge</th>
<th>Some knowledge</th>
<th>Limited knowledge</th>
<th>No knowledge of the topic</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>% No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual discrimination</td>
<td>128 (62.4%)</td>
<td>75 (37.1%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td>134 (65.7%)</td>
<td>69 (34.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse/child</td>
<td>126 (62.4%)</td>
<td>72 (35.6%)</td>
<td>4 (2.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile environment</td>
<td>93 (45.3%)</td>
<td>94 (46.8%)</td>
<td>14 (7.0%)</td>
<td>2 (1.0%)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment/discrimination of GLBT students</td>
<td>88 (42.6%)</td>
<td>95 (47.0%)</td>
<td>20 (9.9%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct related to students/disabilities</td>
<td>82 (39.6%)</td>
<td>102 (50.5%)</td>
<td>19 (9.4%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment aspects of bullying</td>
<td>101 (49.0%)</td>
<td>92 (45.5%)</td>
<td>11 (5.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating policies/procedures to parents</td>
<td>116 (56.7%)</td>
<td>78 (38.8%)</td>
<td>8 (4.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student education related to sexual misconduct</td>
<td>74 (36.0%)</td>
<td>107 (53.3%)</td>
<td>20 (10.0%)</td>
<td>1 (0.5%)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District improvement plan provisions related to sexual harassment</td>
<td>65 (31.3%)</td>
<td>95 (47.3%)</td>
<td>36 (17.9%)</td>
<td>7 (3.5%)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines provided in the district crisis management plan</td>
<td>80 (38.6%)</td>
<td>101 (50.0%)</td>
<td>21 (10.4%)</td>
<td>2 (1.0%)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development teachers/administrators</td>
<td>93 (45.0%)</td>
<td>87 (43.1%)</td>
<td>21 (10.4%)</td>
<td>3 (1.5%)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting possible sexual misconduct</td>
<td>136 (66.3%)</td>
<td>62 (30.7%)</td>
<td>6 (3.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigating complaints</td>
<td>128 (62.4%)</td>
<td>67 (33.2%)</td>
<td>9 (4.5%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator liability for conduct of others in the school</td>
<td>101 (49.0%)</td>
<td>88 (43.6%)</td>
<td>15 (7.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As with knowledge of state and federal laws and regulations, the vast majority of principals stated that, they had either a great deal of knowledge or some knowledge regarding the various items included in this question. They tended to report more knowledge of the district policies than of the federal and state legal framework.

Among district policies, principals reported the least knowledge of the district improvement plan provisions related to sexual harassment required by the Texas Education Code (TEC) 11.252, guidelines provided in the district crisis management plan required by TEC 37.108, and student education policies related to sexual misconduct.

School Size

Significant differences in self-rated knowledge of district policies and procedures among school size categories were found in only 3 of the 14 district policies: sexual harassment, sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities, and communicating policies and procedures to parents. The results of the analysis are in Table 10. Table 11 shows high school principals’ responses sorted by school size for the three significant school policies/procedures items.

Post-hoc analyses found that principals of schools with 2065 students or more had significantly higher self-rated knowledge regarding sexual harassment and communicating policies and procedures to parents as compared with principals of schools with 430-989 students, 200-429 students, and 199 or fewer students.
Table 10

*Chi-Square Scores and School Size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 5</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-rated knowledge of school district policies/procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment</td>
<td>11.831</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities</td>
<td>18.597</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicating policies/procedures to</td>
<td>18.448</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11

*Sexual Harassment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>&gt; 2065</th>
<th>990-2064</th>
<th>430-989</th>
<th>200-429</th>
<th>199 &amp; below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>42 (82.3%)</td>
<td>31 (70.4%)</td>
<td>26 (60.4%)</td>
<td>17 (51.5%)</td>
<td>17 (54.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>9 (17.6%)</td>
<td>13 (29.5%)</td>
<td>17 (39.5)</td>
<td>16 (48.4%)</td>
<td>14 (45.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square significance -.019 N=202

*Sexual Misconduct Related to Students with Disabilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>&gt; 2065</th>
<th>990-2064</th>
<th>430-989</th>
<th>200-429</th>
<th>199 &amp; below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>26 (50.9%)</td>
<td>23 (51.1%)</td>
<td>14 (32.5%)</td>
<td>10 (31.2%)</td>
<td>8 (25.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>23 (45.0%)</td>
<td>21 (46.6%)</td>
<td>25 (58.1%)</td>
<td>16 (50.0%)</td>
<td>17 (53.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>2 (3.9%)</td>
<td>1 (2.2%)</td>
<td>4 (9.3%)</td>
<td>6 (18.7%)</td>
<td>6 (19.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square significance -.017 N=203

*table continues*
Table 11 (continued).

Communicating Policies and Procedures to Parents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>&gt; 2065</th>
<th>990-2064</th>
<th>430-989</th>
<th>200-429</th>
<th>199 &amp; below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>39 (76.4%)</td>
<td>26 (57.7%)</td>
<td>20 (47.6%)</td>
<td>17 (51.5%)</td>
<td>13 (41.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>11 (21.5%)</td>
<td>17 (37.7%)</td>
<td>21 (50.0%)</td>
<td>12 (36.3%)</td>
<td>17 (54.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>1 (1.9%)</td>
<td>2 (4.4%)</td>
<td>1 (2.3%)</td>
<td>4 (1.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square significance -.018 N=202

Next, post-hoc analyses found that principals of the largest schools (2065 or more students and 900-2064 students) had significantly higher self-rated knowledge of sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities as compared with principals of schools of 200-429 students and 199 or fewer students.

Community Type

A significant association was found between community type and principals’ self-rated knowledge for 10 of the 14 items and they are as follows:

1. Sexual discrimination
2. Sexual harassment
3. Sexual abuse of a child
4. Hostile environment
5. Harassment/discrimination of GLBT students
6. Sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities
7. Sexual harassment aspects of bullying

8. Communications of policies/procedures to parents

9. Staff development, training for teachers/administrators related to sexual misconduct issues

10. Investigation of complaints related to educator sexual misconduct.

The results are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

*Chi-Square Scores and Community Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 5</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-rated knowledge of school district policies/procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual discrimination</td>
<td>14.353</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment</td>
<td>10.601</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual abuse of a child</td>
<td>11.307</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hostile environment</td>
<td>15.074</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harassment/discrimination of GLBT students</td>
<td>14.150</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities</td>
<td>13.109</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual harassment aspects of bullying</td>
<td>13.889</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication of policies/procedures to parents</td>
<td>11.634</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff development training for teachers/administrators related to sexual misconduct issues</td>
<td>13.836</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigation of complaints related to educator</td>
<td>13.819</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 displays the high school principals’ responses sorted by community type on the statistically significant items.

### Table 13

**Sexual Discrimination**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>35 (76.0%)</td>
<td>46 (70.7%)</td>
<td>46 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>11 (23.9%)</td>
<td>18 (27.6%)</td>
<td>46 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square - .006 N=203

**Sexual Harassment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>35 (76.0%)</td>
<td>49 (75.3%)</td>
<td>49 (53.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>11 (23.9%)</td>
<td>16 (24.6%)</td>
<td>42 (46.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square - .005 N=202

**Sexual Abuse of a Child**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>36 (78.2%)</td>
<td>44 (67.6%)</td>
<td>47 (51.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>10 (21.7%)</td>
<td>20 (30.7%)</td>
<td>42 (45.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>3 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-square - .023 N=203

**Hostile Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>25 (54.3%)</td>
<td>34 (53.1%)</td>
<td>33 (35.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>20 (43.4%)</td>
<td>29 (45.3%)</td>
<td>45 (48.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>1 (2.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.5%)</td>
<td>14 (15.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Chi-Square - .005 N=202

*(table continues)*
Table 13 (continued).

**Discrimination/Harassment of GLBT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>27 (58.6%)</td>
<td>33 (50.7%)</td>
<td>28 (30.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>18 (39.1%)</td>
<td>25 (38.4%)</td>
<td>51 (55.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>1 (2.1%)</td>
<td>7 (10.7%)</td>
<td>13 (14.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square - .007 N=203

**Misconduct Related to Students with Disabilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>25 (54.3%)</td>
<td>31 (47.6%)</td>
<td>26 (28.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>19 (41.3%)</td>
<td>30 (46.1%)</td>
<td>52 (56.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
<td>4 (6.1%)</td>
<td>14 (15.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square - .011 N=202

**Sexual Harassment Aspects of Bullying**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>27 (58.6%)</td>
<td>37 (56.9%)</td>
<td>36 (39.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>18 (39.1%)</td>
<td>28 (43.0%)</td>
<td>46 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>1 (2.1%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>10 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square - .008 N=203

**Communicating Policies/Procedures to Parents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>30 (65.2%)</td>
<td>45 (69.2%)</td>
<td>40 (43.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>14 (30.4%)</td>
<td>18 (27.6%)</td>
<td>46 (50.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>2 (4.3%)</td>
<td>2 (3.0%)</td>
<td>5 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square - .020 N=202

**Staff Development for Teachers/Administrators Related to Sexual Misconduct**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>28 (60.8%)</td>
<td>35 (54.6%)</td>
<td>29 (31.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>13 (28.2%)</td>
<td>24 (37.5%)</td>
<td>50 (54.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>5 (10.8%)</td>
<td>5 (7.8%)</td>
<td>13 (14.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square - .008 N=203

(table continues)
Table 13 (continued).

*Investigating Complaints Related to Educator Sexual Misconduct*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge level</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Great</td>
<td>32 (69.5%)</td>
<td>49 (75.3%)</td>
<td>46 (50.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>14 (30.4%)</td>
<td>13 (20.0%)</td>
<td>40 (43.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited/None</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (4.6%)</td>
<td>6 (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson chi-square - .008 N=203

Post-hoc analyses found a significant relationship between community type and principals' knowledge of district policies and procedures. The principals of both urban and suburban schools had higher self-rated knowledge regarding sexual discrimination policies and procedures, sexual harassment, hostile environment, harassment/discrimination of GLBT students, sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities, sexual harassment aspects of bullying, staff development/training for teachers and administrators, and the investigation of complaints related to educator sexual misconduct compared to principals of rural schools.

Urban principals had higher self-rated knowledge of policies and procedures relating to sexual abuse of a child than principals of rural schools. Suburban principals had significantly higher self-rated knowledge regarding policies and procedures relating to the communication of policies and procedures to parents than principals of rural schools.

Title I Eligibility

No significant results were found in relation to Survey Question 5.
Summary

Table 14 is a post-hoc summary of statistically significant issues in Question 5 of the principals’ knowledge of school district policies and procedures governing areas related to sexual harassment.

**Table 14**

**Summary Knowledge of District Policies and Procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 5</th>
<th>Significant Categories</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Title I/Non-Title I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Size</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban, Suburban, Rural</td>
<td>Great/Some/Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;199</td>
<td>Urban &gt; Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;200-429</td>
<td>Suburban &gt; Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;430-989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse of a child</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban &gt; Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile environment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban &gt; Rural</td>
<td>Suburban &gt; Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment of GLBT</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban &gt; Rural</td>
<td>Suburban &gt; Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students with disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>990-2064&gt;199</td>
<td>Urban &gt; Rural</td>
<td>Suburban &gt; Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>990-2064&gt;200-429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;200-429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating policies/ procedures to parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;199</td>
<td>Suburban &gt; Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;200-429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;430-989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment aspects of bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban &gt; Rural</td>
<td>Suburban &gt; Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development/training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban &gt; Rural</td>
<td>Suburban &gt; Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation of sexual misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban &gt; Rural</td>
<td>Suburban &gt; Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School size and community type both are statistically significant in areas of sexual harassment, sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities, and communicating policies and procedures to parents. Significant differences were found in community type only in areas of sexual abuse of a child, hostile environment, sexual harassment aspects of bullying, staff development/training for teachers/administrators related to sexual misconduct, and investigating complaints related to educator sexual misconduct. There were no significant differences noted in any of the compared areas of Title I eligibility.

Experience with Educator Misconduct

This research question was answered using the responses to six survey questions that addressed the principals’ involvement in sexual misconduct investigations, sexual misconduct complaints, and district-level support. Frequency tables are presented. Then, differences in principals’ experiences among school groups categorized by size, community type, and Title I eligibility are shown, followed by results of chi-square analyses.

Involvement in Sexual Misconduct Investigation

The first question included in this group, Question 8, asked principals whether they had been involved in any educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigation involving one of their staff members or students in the past five years. Responses are shown in Table 15. Approximately 53% of respondents were found to have been involved in educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigations involving one of their
staff members or students in the past five years.

Table 15

*Involvement in Sexual Misconduct Investigation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>20.20%</td>
<td>(40)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Size**

Figure 1 presents a summary of responses by school size to Question 8. Being involved in an educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigation was found to be more common in larger schools (2065 or more and 900-2064 students).

*Figure 1. Principal investigation of staff member misconduct by school size.*
A significant association was found between school size and involvement in any educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigations involving a staff member or student in the past five years. The results of the chi-square analysis are presented in Table 16.

Table 16

**Chi-Square Scores School Size**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 8</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Involvement in educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigation involving staff members or students in the past five years</td>
<td>16.091</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-hoc analyses found that principals of the largest schools (2065 students and 990-2064 students) were more likely to have been involved in an investigation as compared with principals of schools with 199 or fewer students. No other analyses conducted for school size for survey Question 8 were found to be statistically significant.

**Community Type**

A significant association was found between community type and involvement in any educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigation involving a staff member or student in the past five years. Figure 2 presents a summary of these responses. Overall, it appears that involvement in educator-to-student sexual misconduct involving
staff members or students was much less common in rural schools as compared with both urban and suburban schools.

**Figure 2.** Principal investigation of staff member misconduct by community type.

The chi-square results (Table 17) showed significant differences in involvement in educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigations of staff members or students among schools in urban, suburban, and rural communities.
Table 17

Chi-Square Scores Community Type Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Involvement in educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigation</td>
<td>18.897</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involving staff members or students in past five years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-hoc analyses found that principals of both urban and suburban schools had a significantly greater likelihood of involvement in any educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigation in the past five years as compared with principals of rural schools.

Title I Eligibility

No significant results were found between this question and Title I eligibility.

Summary

Table 18 is a post-hoc summary of the statistical significance of principals’ investigations of educator-to-student sexual misconduct. Principals in larger urban and suburban schools are more likely to be involved in the investigation of educator-to-student sexual misconduct than principals of smaller rural schools.
Table 18

Summary of Principal Investigation of Educator-to-Student Sexual Misconduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 8</th>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Title I/Non-Title I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Categories</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>Urban, Suburban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in investigation</td>
<td>990-2064&gt;199</td>
<td>Urban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;199</td>
<td>Suburban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District-level Assistance in Campus Investigation

Survey Question 9 was answered only by those respondents who had initially answered yes to involvement in a sexual misconduct investigation in the past five years. Principals responded to whether a district-level administrator assisted in the campus investigation. Among principals who were involved in sexual misconduct investigations in the past five years, approximately 81% reported that a district-level administrator assisted in the campus investigation. The results are presented in Table 19.

Table 19

District-Level Administrator Assistance in Investigations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 9</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>(126)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Size

Figure 3 presents a summary of responses. Overall, having had a district-level administrator assist in campus investigations was found to be more common in the largest schools (2065 or more and 900-2064 students). No other school size analyses were found to be statistically significant.

Figure 3. District-level administrator assistance of investigation sorted by school size.

Community Type

Figure 4 presents a summary of principals’ responses to questions regarding district-level administrator assistance in campus investigations. District-level
administrator assistance was substantially more common in suburban schools than urban and rural schools. No significant results were found relating to community type and Question 9.

Figure 4. District-level administrator assistance of investigation sorted by community type.

Title I Eligibility

No significant results were found in relation to Title I eligibility and Question 9.
Summary

No statistically significant results were found in relation to school size, community type, or Title I eligibility and district-level administrator assistance in campus investigations of educator-to-student sexual misconduct.

School District Attorney Support during Investigations

Question 10 was also asked only of respondents who had initially answered yes to Question 8. Principals were asked whether they had interaction with or support from the school district’s attorney during the course of the sexual misconduct investigation. Among principals who had been involved in sexual misconduct investigations in the past five years, approximately 69% had interaction with or support from the school district’s attorney. The responses are presented in Table 20.

Table 20

| Question 10 | Yes   | 69.4% | 77 |
|            | No    | 30.6% | 34 |
|            | No Response | 36.04% | (127) |

School Size

Responses to Question 10 by school size are summarized in Figure 5.

Interaction with or support from the school district’s attorney during a sexual misconduct
investigation was found to be more common in medium-sized schools as compared with very large or very small schools. No significant results were found in relation to Question 10 and school size.

![Graph showing support from school district's attorney in investigations sorted by school size.]

**Figure 5.** Support from school district’s attorney in investigations sorted by school size.

Community Type

Figure 6 presents a summary of the responses to Question 10. Interaction with/support from the school district’s attorney during investigations appears to be constant across community type. No significant results were found relating to Question 10 and community type.
Figure 6. Support from school district's attorney in investigations sorted by community type.

Title I Eligibility

No significant results were found relating to Question 10 and Title I eligibility.

Summary

No statistically significant results were found in relation to school size, community type, or Title I eligibility and Question 10.
**District Procedures during Investigations**

Respondents who had answered yes to Question 8 were asked whether the district’s procedures were helpful in the course of the investigation. Among those principals who were involved in sexual misconduct investigations in the past five years, approximately 94% stated that the district’s procedures were *very helpful* or *somewhat helpful* in their investigation, as shown in Table 21.

**Table 21**

*Importance of District Procedures during Investigations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat helpful</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited assistance</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No procedures in place</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>134 (56.30%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Size**

Figure 7 presents a summary of responses to the usefulness of district procedures and school size. It was more common for principals to feel that the district's procedures were helpful in their investigation in larger schools as compared with smaller-sized schools. No statistically significant results were found relating to Question 11 and school size.
Community Type

Figure 8 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding the importance of district procedures when investigating sexual misconduct. The perceived helpfulness of district procedures was found to be substantially higher in both urban and suburban schools as compared with rural schools. No other significant results were found relating to survey Question 11 and community type.
Figure 8. Effectiveness of district procedures during an investigation sorted by community type.

Title I Eligibility

No significant results were found relating to survey Question 11 and Title I eligibility.

Summary

No statistically significant results were found in relation to school size, community type, or Title I eligibility and Question 11.
Complaints without Investigations

Principals were asked whether they had received any educator-to-student sexual misconduct complaints that did not result in an investigation during the past five years. Table 22 shows that only 12% of respondents were found to have received educator-to-student sexual misconduct complaints that did not result in an investigation during the past five years.

Table 22

**Sexual Misconduct Complaints Not Investigated**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>42 (17.65%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Size

Figure 9 presents a summary of responses to sexual misconduct complaints principals received that did not result in an investigation by school size. Overall, sexual misconduct complaints that did not result in an investigation were most common in very small schools. This was followed by large schools (2065 or more students), medium/large schools (900-2064), medium-sized schools (430-989), and finally by small/medium schools (200-429). No statistically significant results were found relating to Question 12 and school size.
Community Type

Figure 10 presents the results of principals’ responses to questions regarding sexual misconduct complaints that did not result in an investigation by community type. Complaints that did not result in an investigation were most common in urban schools, followed by suburban schools, and followed finally by rural schools. No statistically significant results exist for Question 12 and community type.
Figure 10. Sexual misconduct complaints not investigated sorted by community type.

Title I Eligibility

No statistically significant results were found relating to Question 12 and Title I eligibility.

Summary

No statistically significant results were found relating to school size, community type, or Title I eligibility.
**Number of Complaints without Investigations**

Finally, principals who had received complaints that did not result in an investigation were asked how many complaints they received during the past five years that did not result in an investigation. Among respondents who had received educator-to-student sexual misconduct complaints that did not result in an investigation during the past five years, approximately 15 respondents had received one complaint, with smaller numbers of respondents receiving more than one complaint (see Table 23).

Table 23

*Number of Complaints Received Not Investigated*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>68.18%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>214(90.68%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Size**

Table 24 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding the number of educator-to-student sexual misconduct complaints that did not result in an investigation by school size. Complaints that did not result in an investigation appear to be least common among schools with 200-429 students. No significant results were found relating to survey Question 13 and school size.
Table 24

*Number of Sexual Misconduct Complaints Not Investigated Sorted by School Size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>199 &amp; below</th>
<th>200-429</th>
<th>430-989</th>
<th>990-2064</th>
<th>2065+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Complaints</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You answered YES to Question 12, how many complaints during the past five years did you receive that did not result in an investigation?

Community Type

Responses to questions regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct complaints without a resulting investigation by community type are summarized in Table 25. Complaints that did not result in an investigation were more common in both urban and suburban schools as compared with rural schools. No significant results were found relating to city size and survey Question 13.
Table 25

*Number of Sexual Misconduct Complaints Not Investigated Sorted by Community Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Complaints</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you answered YES to Question 12, how many complaints during the past five years did you receive that did not result in an investigation?

Title I Eligibility

No other statistically significant results were found relating to Title I eligibility and survey Question 13.

Summary

No statistically significant results were found relating to school size, community type, or Title I eligibility and survey Question 13.

Campus Policies Addressing Educator Sexual Misconduct

This research question was answered using the responses to seven survey questions that addressed the campus policies to address educator sexual misconduct. The survey questions include topics such as the reporting and investigating of educator
sexual misconduct, training provided for teachers and staff, the nature of student training, how students and parents are notified of campus policies, how often student training occurs, and how students are surveyed in order to determine whether sexual harassment is occurring within the school. Frequency tables are presented. Then, differences in campus policies addressing educator sexual misconduct among school groups categorized by school size, community type, and Title I eligibility are shown, followed by results of chi-square analyses.

Campus Policies Addressing Sexual Misconduct

Respondents were asked to specify if their school had specific policies in a number of specific areas, including discrimination and sexual misconduct. Table 26 presents a summary of principals’ responses to Question 6. Over 90% of schools had specific policies regarding sexual discrimination and the investigation of reports of possible sexual misconduct. Between 75% and 90% of schools had specific policies for reporting concerns related to sexual misconduct, providing information to parents and community, and providing training and information for teachers and other staff. Policies addressing sexual harassment and discrimination of GLBT students, student educator/training for students in recognizing and responding to sexual misconduct, and sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities were reported by slightly over 50% of the schools’ principals.
Table 26

_Campus Policies in Place_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>% No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual discrimination</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigating reports of possible sexual misconduct including sexual harassment, abuse, discrimination, and hostile environment</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting concerns related to sexual misconduct</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing harassment and discrimination of gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender students</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing information to parents and community</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing training and information for teachers and other staff</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student education/training on recognizing and responding to sexual misconduct</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment aspects of bullying</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39 (19.60%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_School Size_

Principal were asked to identify areas in which their schools had specific
policies in relation to sexual harassment. The following bar chart (Figure 11) presents a summary of responses to questions regarding specific campus policies sorted by school size. Overall, the types of policies held by schools appear to be fairly similar based on school size. However, certain policies, such as ones addressing harassment and discrimination of GLBT students as well as those addressing the sexual harassment aspects of bullying, appear to be more common in larger schools.

Figure 11. Specific policies regarding sexual misconduct sorted by school size.

A statistically significant association was found between school size and sexual discrimination policies; investigation of reports of possible sexual misconduct including sexual harassment, abuse, discrimination, and hostile environment; reporting concerns
related to sexual misconduct; and student education training on recognizing and responding to sexual misconduct. The results of chi-square analyses are presented in Table 27.

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 6</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas in which the school has specific policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual discrimination policies</td>
<td>9.685</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigation of reports of possible sexual misconduct</td>
<td>17.308</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reporting of concerns related to sexual misconduct</td>
<td>11.088</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student education training on recognizing/responding to sexual misconduct</td>
<td>13.730</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-hoc analyses did not result in a clear pattern of results. The analyses did find that principals with 200-429 students were significantly more likely to have specific policies regarding sexual discrimination as compared with schools with 430-989 students. Principals of 2065 or more students, 200-429 students, and 199 or fewer students were significantly more likely to have specific policies related to investigation of reports of possible sexual misconduct and student education/training on recognizing and responding to sexual misconduct than principals of schools with 430-989 students. In addition, principals of schools with 2065 or more students and 200-429 students were significantly more likely to have specific policies related to reporting concerns related to sexual misconduct as compared with principals of schools with 430-989 students.
Community Type

Principals were asked to identify areas in which their schools had specific policies in relation to sexual misconduct. Figure 12 presents a summary of responses to this question based on community type. Generally, principals were found to respond similarly regardless of community type.

![Check each of the areas in which your school has specific policies:](image)

**Figure 12.** Specific policies regarding sexual misconduct sorted by community type.

The only area a statistically significant association was found in type of community comparison was in specific policies addressing harassment/discrimination of GLBT students. The results of chi-square analyses are presented in Table 28.
Post-hoc analyses found that both urban and suburban schools had a greater likelihood of having specific policies addressing harassment and discrimination of GLBT students as compared with rural schools. No other significant relationships were found.

Title I Eligibility

No significant results were found in relation to Question 6 and Title I eligibility.

Summary

Post-hoc analyses were conducted to determine where the differences were in the principals’ identified campus policies regarding sexual misconduct. Significant differences among school size categories were found in campus policies regarding sexual discrimination, the investigation of possible sexual misconduct, reporting concerns of sexual misconduct, and student education/training on recognizing and responding to sexual misconduct. Significant differences in policies on harassment/discrimination of GLBT students were found in the community type analysis. No significant differences were noted in any of the compared areas of Title I eligibility. The summary of results is presented in Table 29.
### Table 29

**Summary of Areas in which Schools Have Specific Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 6</th>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Title I/Non-Title I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Categories</td>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Suburban, Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual discrimination policies</td>
<td>200-429&gt;430-989</td>
<td>199&gt;430-989</td>
<td>200-429&gt;430-989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation of sexual misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment/discrimination of GLBT students</td>
<td>200-429&gt;430-989</td>
<td>Urban &gt; Rural</td>
<td>Suburban &gt; Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting concerns of sexual misconduct</td>
<td>200-429&gt;430-989</td>
<td>2065&gt;430-989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student education/training on recognizing and responding to sexual misconduct</td>
<td>199&gt;430-989</td>
<td>200-429&gt;430-989</td>
<td>2065&gt;430-989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Student Notification of Campus Policies**

Principals were asked about the methods used to provide students notification of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct. A summary of the principals’ responses to this question is presented in Table 30. A student code of conduct handbook was the most commonly used method (89.8%), followed by using a student handbook (79.6%), which was followed by using a counselor (55.4%). The least-used method was advisory/homeroom period training (14.4%).
Table 30

*Methods to Provide Students Information on Campus Polices*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>% No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Code of Conduct Handbook</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Handbook</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular (to include athletics) Handbook</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisory period/homeroom period training</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>64.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus police</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No notification of sexual harassment policies is provided to students</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>81.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(21.01%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Size

*Responses* to questions regarding methods used to notify students of campus policies regarding educator sexual misconduct are summarized in Figure 13, by school size. Overall, using a student code of conduct handbook, extra-curricular handbook, advisory period/homeroom period training, and incorporating the campus police were more commonly used in larger-sized schools. Using a counselor was found to be more common in smaller schools.
A statistically significant association was found between use of the student code of conduct handbook and school size. The chi-square results are presented in Table 31.

Table 31

Chi-Square Scores and School Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 22</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Campus policies in place at secondary school to address educator sexual misconduct Code of Conduct Handbook</td>
<td>11.670</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 236
Post-hoc analyses found that principals of schools with 200-429 students were significantly more likely to utilize a student code of conduct handbook for student notification of campus policies as compared with principals of schools with 199 students. Additionally, principals of the largest schools (2065 or more students) were more likely to utilize a student code of conduct handbook as compared with principals of medium-sized (430-989 students) and the smallest schools (199 or fewer students).

Community Type

Principals' responses to questions regarding methods used to notify students of campus policies regarding educator sexual misconduct sorted by community type are summarized in Figure 14. Overall, responses appear to be fairly similar across community types. No significant association was found between Question 22 and community type.

Figure 14. Methods used to provide students notification of campus policies sorted by community type.
Title I Eligibility

No significant association was found between Title I eligibility and Question 22.

Summary

A post-hoc summary is presented of the only category from Question 22 that asked principals the methods used to provide students notification of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct. The analysis of school size and use of a student code of conduct handbook is the only comparison that resulted in a significant association, as shown in Table 32.

Table 32

Summary Methods Used to Provide Students Notification of Campus Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 22 Significant Categories</th>
<th>School Size No. of Students</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Title I/Non-Title I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Code of Conduct Handbook</td>
<td>200-429&gt;199</td>
<td>Urban, Suburban</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;430-989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Topics Included in Student Training

In Question 23, principals were asked which topics were included in student training regarding educator sexual misconduct. A summary of the responses shows that providing students a definition of sexual harassment and sexual abuse was most common (73.1%); followed by discussing how to report sexual harassment, sexual
abuse, and hostile-environment harassment (67.0%); followed by discussing the consequences of actions of sexual harassment, sexual abuse, and hostile-environment harassment (59.9%). As shown in Table 33, the training areas that included the least are rules regarding retaliation, prevention of sexual harassment and sexual abuse, and grievance procedures.

Table 33

*Topics Included in Student Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>No Response</th>
<th>% No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of sexual harassment and sexual abuse</td>
<td>73.4%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of sexual harassment and sexual abuse</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to report sexual harassment, sexual abuse, and hostile-environment harassment</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>30.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consequences of actions of sexual harassment, sexual abuse, and hostile-environment harassment</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules regarding retaliation</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance procedures</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training is provided for students</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>54 (22.69%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Size

Figure 15 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding topics included in student training sorted by school size. Overall, responses were found to be fairly similar, while certain topics—including the definition of sexual harassment and
sexual abuse, prevention of sexual harassment and sexual abuse, how to report harassment and abuse, consequences of actions, and rules regarding retaliation—were found to be more common in small schools as compared with larger-sized schools.

Figure 15. Topics included in student training sorted by school size.

A significant association was found between school size and whether the prevention of sexual harassment and sexual abuse was included in student training. The results of the chi-square analysis are presented in Table 34.

Table 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 23</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Topics included in student training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of sexual harassment and sexual abuse</td>
<td>11.438</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N= 236
Post-hoc analyses found that the principals of schools with 2065 students or more, 200-429 students, and 199 or fewer students were more likely to work in schools that include training for the prevention of sexual harassment and sexual abuse than schools with 430-989 students.

Community Type

Figure 16 summarizes responses to a list of questions on topics included in student training. Again, responses were found to be fairly similar across community types. No significant association was found between the categories in Question 23 and community type.

Figure 16. Topics included in student training sorted by community type.
Title I Eligibility

No significant association was found between the categories in Question 23 and Title I eligibility.

Summary

A summary of the post-hoc results (Table 35) shows a significant association was found in the comparison of school size and student training in the prevention of harassment and sexual abuse.

Table 35

Summary Topics Included in Student Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 23</th>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Title I/ Non-Title I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Categories</td>
<td>No. of Student</td>
<td>Urban, Suburban Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention of sexual harassment and sexual abuse</td>
<td>199&gt;430-989</td>
<td>200-429&gt;430-989</td>
<td>2065&gt;430-989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency of Student Training

Principals were asked how often student training regarding the aspects of sexual harassment occurred. Table 36 presents a summary of the responses to Question 24. Student training was found to occur once a year in approximately 45% of cases and was found not to occur at all in 25% of cases. In 23% of cases, student training was ongoing throughout the school year.
Table 36

*Frequency of Student Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing throughout the school year</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternating years</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once during the four years of high school career (i.e., freshman orientation)</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training is provided for students</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>51 (21.43%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Size

Figure 17 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding how often students were trained in areas of sexual harassment sorted by school size. Training conducted once per year was found to be more common in very small or very large schools, while ongoing training throughout the school year was most common in very small schools. No significant association was found between Question 24 and school size.
Community Type

Figure 18 presents the results of questions regarding how often students were trained in areas of sexual harassment sorted by community type. Responses were also found to be fairly similar across community type. No significant association was found between Question 24 and community type.
Figure 18. Frequency of student training sorted by community type.

Title I Eligibility

No significant association was found between Question 24 and Title I eligibility.

Summary

No significant association was found between the frequency of student training and school size, community type, or Title I eligibility.
Student Survey Methods

Principals were asked how students are surveyed to determine if any form of sexual harassment is occurring at school. Table 37 presents a summary of the responses to this question. In approximately 52% of cases, no student survey was provided to determine campus sexual harassment. Additionally, students were not surveyed by either the district or the campus in approximately 38% of cases. Students were found to be surveyed using either a district or a campus survey instrument approximately 35% of the time.

Table 37

Student Survey Methods to Determine Occurrence of Sexual Misconduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The students were surveyed using a district-required survey instrument.</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students were surveyed using a campus survey instrument.</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students were not surveyed by the district.</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students were not surveyed by the campus.</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No student survey was provided to determine campus sexual harassment.</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>53 (18.79%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Size

Principals’ responses are summarized in Figure 19. Methods were found to vary substantially based on school size. Regardless of school size, no student survey was provided in approximately 50% of schools. No significant association was found between Question 25 and school size.

![Bar chart](image)

*Figure 19. Student survey methods used to determine occurrence of sexual harassment at school by school size.*

Community Type

Figure 20 presents the results of responses to questions regarding survey methods used to determine the occurrence of sexual harassment sorted by community type. Using a district-required instrument, student surveys were found to be more common in urban and suburban schools as compared with rural schools, while surveys
using a campus survey instrument were found to be more common in rural schools. It was most common among suburban schools to not survey students either by the district or by the campus.

Figure 20. Student survey methods used to determine occurrence of sexual harassment at school sorted by community type.

The chi-square analysis conducted between community type and whether students are surveyed using a district-required survey instrument was found to be statistically significant. Table 38 summarizes the results.

Table 38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-Square Scores and Community Type (N = 235)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. How students are surveyed to determine evidence of sexual harassment at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students surveyed using a district-required survey instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post-hoc analyses found a significant difference in that both urban and suburban schools had a greater likelihood of surveying students using a district-required survey instrument as compared with rural schools.

Title I Eligibility

No significant association was found between Question 25 and Title I eligibility.

Summary

Table 39 is a summary of the post-hoc analysis for survey Question 25. The only significant association was in the use of district-required surveys to determine if students were experiencing sexual harassment at school. Urban and suburban schools are more likely to use district-required student surveys to determine if any form of sexual harassment is occurring at school.

Table 39

**Summary How Students Surveyed to Determine Sexual Harassment Occurring at School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 25 Significant Categories</th>
<th>School Size No. of Students</th>
<th>Community Type</th>
<th>Title I/Non-Title I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students surveyed with district-required survey</td>
<td>Urban&gt;Rural</td>
<td>Urban, Suburban Rural</td>
<td>Suburban&gt;Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Methods to Notify Parents of Campus Policies*

Principals were asked about the methods used to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct. Table 40 presents a
summary of the responses. A code of conduct handbook was used 82% of the time, with districts having a copy of their policy on their website in 76% of cases. The least-used methods of parent notification were parent training in recognizing discrimination or harassment, parent training in preventing discrimination or harassment, and PTA updates.

Table 40

*Methods Used to Notify Parents of Campus Policies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The district does not provide information</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Conduct Handbook</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District website on-line policy</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-curricular (to include athletics) student handbook</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff handbook/personnel guidelines</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA updates</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District newsletter</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent training in recognizing discrimination or harassment</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent training in preventing discrimination or harassment</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>53 (18.79%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Size

Figure 21 presents a summary of responses to Question 26. Some variation in the methods used to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct was found.
A significant association was found between school size and whether a district newsletter was used to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct. The results of this chi-square analysis are presented in Table 41.

Table 41

*Chi-Square Scores and School Size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 26</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Methods used to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct</td>
<td>13.490</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=236
Post-hoc analyses found that principals of schools with 990-2064 students were significantly more likely to use district newsletters as compared with principals of schools with 430-989 students and 200-429 students.

Community Type

Figure 22 presents the results of principals’ responses to questions regarding methods used to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct. Rural schools were least likely to provide parents information. Concerning schools that did provide information, the method in which the information was provided was found to vary somewhat across community types.

Figure 22. Methods of parent notification of campus policies sorted by community type.
A significant association was found between community type and Question 26, which asked principals to identify the methods used to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct. First, the chi-square analysis conducted between community type, and whether parent training in recognizing discrimination or harassment was utilized and was found to be significant. Additionally, a significant association was found between community type and whether parent training in preventing discrimination or harassment was utilized. The results are summarized in Table 42.

Table 42

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 26</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Methods used to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent training in recognizing discrimination/harassment</td>
<td>11.029</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent training in preventing discrimination/harassment</td>
<td>10.786</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=235

Post-hoc analyses found a significant difference between urban, suburban, and rural schools. Specifically, urban schools had a greater likelihood of utilizing parent training in recognizing discrimination or harassment as compared with rural schools. In addition, urban schools were more likely to utilize parent training in preventing discrimination or harassment as compared with both suburban as well as rural schools.
Title I Eligibility

First, a significant association was found between Title I eligibility and Question 26. This question related to the methods used to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct. An association was found between Title I eligibility and whether a staff handbook was used. While there were a larger proportion of Title I eligible schools in this sample, they were found to be less likely to use a staff handbook in order to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct as compared with schools that were not Title I eligible.

Next, a significant association was found between Title I eligibility and whether a district newsletter was used to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct. A larger proportion of schools that were not Title I eligible was found to use district newsletters in order to notify parents as compared with what would be expected based on the proportion of non-Title I eligible schools present in the sample.

The chi-square analyses results are summarized in Table 43.

Table 43

Chi-Square and Title I Eligibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 26</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Methods used to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of staff handbook</td>
<td>4.046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of district newsletters</td>
<td>4.072</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N=233$
Summary

Table 40 is a summary of statistically significant categories in Question 26 of the principals’ knowledge of methods used to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct. The use of the district newsletter indicated significance in the areas of school size and Title I eligibility. Principals of schools with 990-2064 students reported they were more likely to use the district newsletter than schools with 430-989 and 200-429 students, while non-Title I designated schools were more likely to use the district newsletter.

Table 44

*Summary Methods used to Notify Parents of Campus Policies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 26 Significant Categories</th>
<th>School Size No. of Students</th>
<th>City Size Urban, Suburban</th>
<th>Title I/Non-Title I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of district newsletter</td>
<td>990-2064&gt;200-429</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Title I&gt;Title I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>990-2064&gt;430-989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of staff handbook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Title I&gt;Title I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of parent training in recognizing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrimination/harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of parent training in prevention of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discrimination/harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban&gt;Suburban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of the staff handbook is significant only in comparison with Title I eligible schools, with non-Title I eligible schools more likely to use a staff handbook in parent training. The use of parent training in recognizing and preventing discrimination or harassment is significant only in type of community category. The use of parent training
in recognizing discrimination or harassment is more likely in urban than rural communities, while training in the prevention of discrimination or harassment is more likely in urban than suburban and rural communities.

**Sexual Harassment and School Response to Parent Training**

Principals were asked in Question 27 whether parent training regarding sexual harassment, sexual abuse, and/or hostile environment harassment was provided along with how the school would respond to such actions. Table 45 presents a summary of the responses. Parent training was only found to be used in 12% of schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td></td>
<td>53 (22.27%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**School Size**

Principals’ responses are summarized in Figure 23, indicating whether parent training was provided in areas of sexual harassment, sexual discrimination, and/or hostile environment harassment and how schools would respond sorted by school size. Parent training was more commonly provided in small schools (199 students and
below), medium/large schools (990-2094 students), and large schools (2095 or more), as compared with schools having between 200-429 students and 430-989 students. No significant association was found between Question 27 and school size.

Figure 23. Parent training in areas of sexual misconduct and schools’ response plan sorted by school size.

Community Type

Figure 24 presents a summary of responses to Question 27. Parent training was found to be most commonly provided in urban schools, followed by rural schools, and followed finally by suburban schools.
Figure 24. Parent training in areas of sexual misconduct and schools’ response plans sorted by community type.

Summary

No significant comparisons exist between Question 27—which asks if parents are trained regarding sexual harassment, sexual abuse, and/or hostile environment harassment and how the schools would respond to such actions—and school size, community type, or Title I eligibility.

Principals’ District-level Training Regarding Educator-to-Student Sexual Misconduct

This research question was explored using five questions in the survey. These
questions discussed how well prepared the principal feels in responding to an incident of sexual misconduct, areas in which training is provided, how often the district trained administrators regarding sexual misconduct, and the options available to help principals address questions and problems regarding sexual misconduct. Frequency tables are presented. The differences in principals’ responses categorized by school size, community type, and Title I eligibility are shown followed by results of chi-square analyses.

**Prepared to Respond to an Incident of Sexual Misconduct**

Principals were asked how well they thought they were prepared to respond to an incident of sexual misconduct, if it were to occur. Table 46 presents a summary of the responses to this question. Principals felt well prepared to respond to an incident of sexual misconduct in 55% of cases and felt somewhat prepared in 40% of cases.

Table 46

*Principal Preparedness to Respond to Incidents of Sexual Misconduct*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Well prepared</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat prepared</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No preparation to deal with an incident of sexual misconduct</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>39 (16.39%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Size

Figure 25 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding how well prepared the principals felt to respond to sexual misconduct incidents sorted by school size. Overall, principals in larger schools felt better prepared to respond to an incident of sexual misconduct. No significant association was found between Question 7 and school size.

![Graph showing principals' level of preparation to respond to an incident of sexual misconduct sorted by school size.]

*Figure 25. Principals’ level of preparation to respond to an incident of sexual misconduct sorted by school size.*

Community Type

Figure 26 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding the
principals’ level of preparation to respond to an incident of sexual misconduct sorted by community type. Principals felt similarly well prepared to respond to incidents of sexual misconduct in urban and suburban schools, while those in rural schools felt that they had less preparation.

![Figure 26](image)

Figure 26. Principals' level of preparation to respond to an incident of sexual misconduct sorted by community type.

A significant association was found between community type and how prepared principals thought they were to respond to an incident of sexual misconduct. The chi-square results of this analysis are presented in Table 47.
Post-hoc analyses found a significant difference between suburban and rural schools. Specifically, principals of suburban schools rated themselves as being more prepared to respond to an incident of sexual misconduct as compared with principals of rural schools.

Title 1 Eligibility

No significant results were found in relation to Question 7 and Title I eligibility.

Summary

No significant associations were found between Question 7, which asked how prepared the principal was to respond to an incident of sexual misconduct, and the categories of school size, community type, and Title I eligibility.

Principals’ Training in the Last Five Years

In Question 14, principals were asked in which areas they had received training in the last five years. Over 70% of respondents stated that they had received training in
recognizing inappropriate behaviors, recognizing and dealing with sexual harassment in their school, and district policies relating to sexual misconduct. A summary of responses to Question 14 are listed in Table 48.

Table 48

Principal Training Topics Provided in the Last Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to avoid sexual discrimination in your school</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing inappropriate behaviors</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing and dealing with sexual harassment in your school</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse of a child/student</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing situations creating a hostile environment for students</td>
<td>58.5%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventing hostile environment for students</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment and discrimination of gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender students</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual harassment aspects of bullying</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator liability for conduct of others in the school</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District policies related to sexual misconduct</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for investigating sexual misconduct complaints</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to prevent sexual misconduct</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(28.15%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Size

Figure 27 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding principal training in the prevention of educator-to-student sexual misconduct. Responses were found to vary somewhat substantially across school size, with no clear patterns emerging.
A statistically significant association was found between school size and areas in which principals had received training within the last five years. The chi-square analysis conducted found training regarding recognizing and dealing with sexual harassment; sexual abuse of a child/student; harassment and discrimination of gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender students; sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities; district policies related to sexual misconduct; and procedure for investigating sexual misconduct complaints to be statistically significant. The results are presented in Table 49.
Table 49

*Chi-Square Scores and School Size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 14</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Areas of training within the last five years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing/dealing with sexual harassment</td>
<td>15.341</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse of a child/student</td>
<td>14.116</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment/discrimination of GLBT students</td>
<td>10.045</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct of students w/disabilities</td>
<td>11.430</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District policies related to sexual misconduct</td>
<td>15.109</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for investigating sexual misconduct complaints</td>
<td>17.723</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=236

Post-hoc analyses found that principals of schools with 2065 or more, 990-2064, 200-429, and 199 or less students were significantly more likely to receive training (for recognizing and dealing with sexual harassment, sexual abuse of a child, and sexual misconduct of students with disabilities and on procedures for investigating sexual misconduct complaints) than principals of schools with 430-989 students. In addition, schools with 2065 or more, 990-2064, and 199 or fewer students were more likely to receive training regarding harassment and discrimination of GLBT students than schools with 430-989 students. In addition, schools with 2065 or more and 430-989 students were significantly more likely to receive training on district policies related to sexual misconduct than schools with 200-429 students.

The post-hoc analyses did not reveal a significance in the training areas of how to avoid sexual discrimination, recognizing inappropriate behaviors, recognizing and preventing situations that create a hostile environment for students, sexual harassment
aspects of bullying, administrator liability for conduct of others, and strategies to prevent sexual misconduct.

Community Type

Figure 28 presents a summary of principals’ responses to questions regarding training areas in the prevention of educator-to-student sexual misconduct in the last five years. Overall, responses were found to be fairly similar across community types. However, certain types of training, such as training related to harassment and discrimination of gay and lesbian students as well as training related to district policies regarding sexual misconduct, were found to be most common in urban schools, less common in suburban schools, and least common in rural schools.

Figure 28. Areas in which principals received training in the last five years sorted by community type.
A significant association was found between community type and areas in which principals had received training within the past five years. A significant association was found between community type and whether or not they had received training regarding harassment and discrimination of GLBT students, and whether principals had received training in procedures for investigating sexual misconduct complaints. The results for Question 14 are presented in Table 50.

Table 50

*Chi-Square Scores and Community Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 14</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Areas of training within the last 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment and discrimination of GLBT students</td>
<td>6.928</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for investigation of sexual misconduct complaints</td>
<td>10.964</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-hoc analyses found a significant difference between principals of urban, suburban, and rural schools. Specifically, principals of urban schools were more likely to have received training regarding harassment and discrimination of gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender students in the past five years as compared with principals of rural schools. In addition, principals of both urban and suburban schools were more likely to have received training in procedures for investigating sexual misconduct complaints as compared with principals of rural schools.
Title I Eligibility

A significant association was found between Title I eligibility and areas in which principals received training within the last five years. A significant association was found between Title I eligibility and whether principals had received training regarding harassment and discrimination of gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender students. A much higher proportion of schools that were Title I eligible were found to have training in this area as compared with schools that were not Title I eligible. Table 51 presents the results of this analysis.

Table 51

Chi-Square Scores and Title I Eligibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 14</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Areas of training within the last 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment and discrimination of GLBT students</td>
<td>5.008</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

Table 52 is a summary of the post-hoc chi-square results. All the categories determined by post-hoc analyses were statistically significant when compared to school size. The harassment and discrimination of GLBT students is significant when compared to school size, community type, and Title I eligibility. In five of the listed training areas, more principals in schools with 2065 or more, 990-2064, 200-439, and 199 or fewer students had received training in the last five years than principals of schools of 430-989 students. Training in the last five years in district policies related to
sexual misconduct occurred more often in schools of 2065 students and 430-989 students than in schools of 200-429 students.

Table 52

Areas of Training within the Last Five Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 14 Title Significant Categories</th>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Community TypeTitle I/Non-Urban, Suburban, Rural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing/dealing with sexual harassment</td>
<td>2065&gt;430-989, 990-2064&gt;430-989, 200-429&gt;430-989, 199&gt;430-989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse of children/students</td>
<td>2065&gt;430-989, 990-2064&gt;430-989, 200-429&gt;430-989, 199&gt;430-989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment/discrimination of GLBT students</td>
<td>2065&gt;430-989, 990-2064&gt;430-989, 199&gt;430-989 Urban&gt;Rural Title I&gt;Non-Title I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual misconduct with disabilities</td>
<td>2065&gt;430-989, 990-2064&gt;430-989, 200-429&gt;430-989, 99&gt;430-989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District policies related to sexual misconduct</td>
<td>2065&gt;200-429, 430-989&gt;200-429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for investigating sexual misconduct complaints</td>
<td>2065&gt;430-989 Urban&gt;Rural Suburban&gt;Rural, 990-2064&gt;430-989, 200-429&gt;430-989, 199&gt;430-989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The harassment and discrimination of GLBT students training area is significantly related to school size, with only principals of schools with 2065 or more, 990-2064, and
199 or fewer students receiving the training. This training area is also significantly related to community type, with more urban school principals receiving training than rural principals. In addition, Title I school principals received the training more often than non-Title I schools. Training provided for principals in procedures for investigating sexual misconduct complaints was greater in urban and suburban school than in rural schools.

Frequency with which the Districts Train Administrators

In Question 15, principals were asked how often their district trains administrators regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct policies and issues. Table 53 presents a summary of the responses to this question. Principals (62%) stated that the district trained administrators regarding sexual misconduct once a year, and 16% of principals stated that training was never conducted.

Table 53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternating years</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once every five years</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>43 (18.07%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Size

Figure 29 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding how often administrators were trained in educator-to-student sexual misconduct policies and issues. Overall, it was found that it was more common for smaller schools to never have training, while yearly training was reported more often in larger schools. No other significant associations were found between Question 15 and school size.

Figure 29. Frequency with which the districts trained administrators in sexual misconduct policies and issues sorted by school size.
Community Type

Figure 30 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding how often the districts train administrators in sexual misconduct policies and issues sorted by community type. It was found that it was more than twice as common for rural schools to never have district training of administrators regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct policies and issues compared with both urban and suburban schools.

![Diagram showing frequency with which districts trained administrators in sexual misconduct policies and issues sorted by community type.]

*Figure 30. Frequency with which districts trained administrators in sexual misconduct policies and issues sorted by community type.*
A significant association was also found between community type and how often principals’ districts trained administrators regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct policies and issues. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 54.

Table 54

*Chi-Square Scores and Community Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 15</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. How often districts trained administrators regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct policies</td>
<td>13.264</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference was found through post-hoc analyses that suburban schools held training more often as compared with rural schools.

Title I Eligibility

No significant association was found for Question 15 and Title I eligibility.

Summary

No significant associations were found between Question 15, which asked how often the districts trained administrators regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct policies and issues, and school size, community type, and Title I eligibility.

*District Administrator to Investigate Sexual Misconduct*

In Question 16 principals were asked who the district-level administrator was assigned to investigate sexual misconduct in their district. Table 55 presents a summary
of the responses. Of respondents, 23% stated that the Director of Human Resources was the district-level administrator assigned to investigate sexual misconduct in their district, with 22% of principals stating that the Assistant Superintendent was the individual responsible to investigate sexual misconduct and 13.3% of the principals stating that the Title IX Coordinator was assigned to investigate sexual misconduct.

Table 55

Principal Responses Identifying District Administrator to Investigate Sexual Misconduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Option</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I do not know which administrator is the designee</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No central administrator has been designated</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Human Resources</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX Coordinator</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Student Services</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District police chief/designee</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>42 (17.65%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Size

Figure 31 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding who is assigned to investigate sexual misconduct. The district-level administrator assigned to investigate sexual misconduct was found to vary substantially across school size.
Figure 31. Principals’ responses identifying the district administrator to investigate sexual misconduct sorted by school size.

A significant association was found between school size and principals’ identification of their district-level administrator assigned to investigate sexual misconduct. The results of the chi-square analysis are presented in Table 56.

Table 56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 16</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. The district-level administrator assigned to</td>
<td>68.848</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigate sexual misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N=195$

Post-hoc analyses found significant differences in the assigned district-level administrator among principals of schools with 199 or fewer students and schools of
200-429 students, 430-989 students, 990-2064 students, and 2065 or more students. In addition, significant differences were found between principals of schools with 200-429 students and principals of schools with 990-2064 students.

Community Type

Figure 32 presents a summary of responses to Question 16. In both urban and suburban schools, it was most common for the Director of Human Resources to be the district-level administrator assigned to investigate sexual misconduct in their district. Among rural schools, it was most common for another type of administrator (not designated on the list) to serve as the investigator. In addition, it was approximately twice as common for principals of rural schools not to know who the designated investigator was as compared with both urban and suburban schools.

Figure 32. Principals’ responses identifying district administrator to investigate sexual misconduct sorted by community type.
A significant association was also found between community type and Question 16, which asked respondents who their district-level administrator was assigned to investigate sexual misconduct in their district. These results are presented in Table 57.

Table 57

Chi-Square Scores and Community Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 16</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. The district-level administrator assigned to investigate sexual misconduct</td>
<td>47.203</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=194

Post-hoc analyses found significant differences between all three types of schools concerning the district-level administrator assigned to investigate sexual misconduct in their district.

Title I Eligibility

No significant associations were found between Question 16 and Title I eligibility.

Summary

No significant associations were found between Question 16 and the categories of school size, community type, and Title I eligibility.

District Options to Address Sexual Misconduct

Principals were asked in Question 18 the options available in their district to help
address handling questions, problems, grievances, and investigations regarding educator-to-student misconduct. A summary of responses is presented in Table 58. Principals (78%) stated that consultation with an attorney was an option available in their district to help principals regarding these issues, with 68% stating that administrator training in investigation and grievance procedures was available.

Table 58

*District Options for Principals to Address Sexual Misconduct Issues*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator training in investigation and grievance procedures</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with the Title IX Coordinator or other administrator</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with an attorney</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>50 (21.01%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 33 presented illustrates responses to Question 18. Larger schools more often made available administrator training in investigation and grievance procedures, while consultation with an attorney was more common in smaller schools.
A significant association was found between school size and the options available to their district to help principals address handling questions, problems, grievances, and investigations regarding educator-to-student misconduct. First, a significant association was found between school size and whether administrator training in investigation and grievance procedures was available. Next, the chi-square analysis conducted between school size, and whether consultation with the Title IX coordinator or other administrator was available was also found to be statistically significant. The results of the chi-square analysis are presented in Table 59.
Table 59

*Chi-Square Scores and School Size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 18</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Options available in district to help principals address questions, problems, grievances, investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator training in investigation/grievance procedures</td>
<td>16.141</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with Title IX Coordinator or other administrator</td>
<td>9.816</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-hoc analyses found that administrator training in investigation/grievance procedures was used significantly more often among principals of schools with 2065 students or more as compared with principals of schools with 990-2064 students, 430-989 students, and 199 students. In addition, post-hoc analyses found that consultation with a Title IX Coordinator was available significantly more often among principals of schools with 990-2054 students and 2065 students than principals of schools with 430-989 students.

Community Type

Figure 34 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding district options to help principals address questions, problems, grievances, and investigations based on community type. It was more common in suburban and rural schools to have a consultation with an attorney as an available option in their district to help principals
address handling questions, problems, grievances, and investigations regarding educator-to-student misconduct.

Figure 34. District options available to help principals address sexual misconduct issues sorted by community type.

Finally, a significant association was found between community type and the options available to help principals address handling questions, problems, grievances, and investigations regarding educator-to-student misconduct. Community type was found to be significantly associated with whether consultation with the Title IX Coordinator or other administrator was available and whether consultation with an attorney was available. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 60.
Table 60

*Chi-Square Scores and Community Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 18</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Options available in districts to help principals address questions, problems, grievances, and investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with Title IX Coordinator or other administrator</td>
<td>10.975</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with an attorney</td>
<td>6.135</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=235

Post-hoc analyses found a significant difference in that both urban and suburban schools were more likely to make available consultation with the Title IX Coordinator or other administrator as compared with rural schools. In addition, urban schools were less likely to make available consultation with an attorney as compared with both suburban as well as rural schools.

Title I Eligibility

No significant relationship was determined between Question 18 and Title I eligibility.

Summary

Table 61 presents a summary of the post-hoc statistically significant categories of the options available in the districts to help principals address questions, problems, grievances, and investigations regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct. Administrator training in investigation and grievance procedures was only significantly
related to school size, with schools with 2065 students having the option more than schools with 990-2064, 430-989, and 199 students. Consultation with a Title IX Coordinator and consultation with an attorney were significantly related to both school size and type of community. The schools with 990-2064 and 2065 or more students had greater options than schools with 430-989 students. Consultations with Title IX Coordinators were more available to urban and suburban principals than rural principals. Consultation with an attorney was only significantly related to type of community, with the use of an attorney being more prevalent in suburban and rural schools than urban schools.

Table 61

Summary Options Available in Districts to Assist Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 18 Significant Categories</th>
<th>School Size No. of Students</th>
<th>Community Type Urban, Suburban Rural</th>
<th>Title I/non-Title I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator training in investigation/grievance</td>
<td>2065&gt;990-2064 2065&gt;430-989 2065&gt;199</td>
<td>990-2064&gt;430-989 2065&gt;430-989</td>
<td>Suburban&gt;Urban Rural&gt;Urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final research question was examined using four questions from the survey.
The questions focused on the format the districts use to provide information regarding sexual harassment policies, how often teachers receive training regarding sexual misconduct, and the topics included in teacher training. Frequency tables are presented. Then, differences in campus training among school groups categorized by size, community type, and Title I eligibility are shown followed by results of chi-square analyses.

**Formats used to Provide Policies to Campus Staff**

Principals were asked in Question 17, which format their district used to provide information regarding educator-to-student or general sexual-harassment policies. Respondents (89%) stated that a Code of Conduct Handbook was provided by their district, with 78% of respondents stating that the district policy was included on their website. A summary of responses are presented in Table 62.

Table 62

| District Formats used to Provide Information on Sexual Misconduct Policies |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------|
| Answer Options                                           | Response Percent | Response Count |
| The district does not provide information               | 1.6%                | 3             |
| Code of Conduct Handbook                                 | 89.1%               | 171           |
| District website on-line policy                          | 77.6%               | 149           |
| Extra-curricular (to include athletics) student handbook | 32.3%               | 62            |
| Staff handbook/personnel guidelines                      | 76.6%               | 147           |
| PTA updates                                              | 6.3%                | 12            |
| District newsletter                                      | 7.8%                | 15            |
| Teacher training in recognizing discrimination or harassment | 57.8%               | 111           |
| Teacher training in preventing discrimination or harassment | 53.1%               | 102           |
| Other                                                     |                      | 5             |
| No Response                                              | 46 (19.33%)         |               |
School Size

Figure 35 shows responses to questions regarding the district formats used to provide information regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct or general sexual harassment policies. These were found to be fairly similar across school size.

Figure 35. District formats used to provide information on sexual misconduct policies sorted by school size.

A significant association was found between school size and formats districts used to provide information regarding educator-to-student or general sexual harassment policies. The analysis conducted between school size, and whether the district provided information was found to be significant. Next, the analysis conducted between school size and whether PTA updates were used to provide information regarding educator-to-student or general sexual harassment policies was found to be significant. Table 63 presents these results.
Table 63

*Chi-Square Scores and School Size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 14</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Formats used to provide information regarding educator-to-student or general sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District does not provide information</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA updates</td>
<td>11.232</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N=236</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-hoc chi-square analyses did not find any specific comparisons to be statistically significant for school size and whether the district provided information. Post-hoc analyses found that PTA updates were used significantly more often among principals of schools with 2065 or more students than principals of schools with 199 or fewer students. Additionally, PTA updates were used significantly more often among principals of schools with 2065 or more and 430-989 students as compared with principals of schools with 200-429 students.

Community Type

Figure 36 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding district formats used to provide campus staff information regarding sexual misconduct policies sorted by community type. Several formats, including PTA updates and district newsletters, were found to be most common in urban schools, less common in suburban schools, and least common in rural schools.
Next, a significant relationship was found between community type and formats used by district to provide information regarding educator-to-student or general sexual harassment policies. A significant association was found between community type and whether PTA updates and a district newsletter were utilized. These results are shown in Table 64.
Table 64

**Chi-Square Scores and Community Type**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 17</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Formats used to provide information regarding educator-to-student or general sexual harassment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA updates</td>
<td>13.313</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District newsletter</td>
<td>13.730</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=235

Post-hoc analyses found a significant difference in that urban and suburban schools were more likely to utilize PTA updates and a district newsletter as compared with rural schools.

**Title I Eligibility**

A significant association was found between Title I eligibility and formats the districts used to provide information regarding educator-to-student or general sexual harassment policies. A significant association was found between Title I eligibility and whether the district provided information. Table 65 presents the results of this analysis. Out of the entire sample, only three schools were found to provide no information regarding educator-to-student or general sexual harassment policies. All of these cases were found to be schools that were not Title I eligible. No other significant results were found in relation to this question.
Table 65

*Chi-Square Scores and Title I Eligibility*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 17</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>(x^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Formats used to provide information regarding educator-to-student or general sexual harassment District does not provide information</td>
<td>3.972</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(N=235\)

Summary

Table 66 is a post-hoc summary of statistically significant issues in Question 17 of the district formats used to provide information regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct or general sexual harassment policies. School size and community type are both significantly related to the use of PTA updates. Significant differences were found in community type only in the area of the use of a district newsletter. There were no significant differences noted in any of the compared areas of Title I eligibility.

Table 66

*Summary District Format to Provide Sexual Misconduct Policies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 17</th>
<th>Significant Categories</th>
<th>School Size No. of Students</th>
<th>Community Type Urban, Suburban, Rural</th>
<th>Title I/Non-Title I Great/Some/Limited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTA updates</td>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;199</td>
<td>Urban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;200-429</td>
<td>Suburban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>430-989&gt;2000-429</td>
<td>Suburban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Urban &gt; Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suburban &gt; Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

155
Frequency with which Teachers Received Training

In Question 19, principals were asked how often teachers in their school received training regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct policies. Table 67 presents a summary of the responses to this question. Principals (65%) stated that yearly training was provided to teachers as part of their required professional development, with 15% of respondents stating that training was at the discretion of the campus administration.

Table 67

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers do not receive training</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly training as part of required professional development</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternating years training as a part of required professional development</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only teachers new to the district receive training as a part of New Teacher Orientation</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training is at the discretion of the campus administration</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>46 (19.33%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 37 is a summary of responses to questions regarding the frequency with which teachers received training regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct policies. Some differences in training were found, with yearly training being more common in larger schools. No other significant results were found in relation to Question 19.

![Graph showing the frequency of training received by teachers regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct policies, sorted by school size.]

**Figure 37.** Frequency with which teachers received training regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct policies sorted by school size.

**Community Type**

Figure 38 is a summary of responses to questions regarding the frequency with which teachers received training regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct...
policies sorted by community type. No other significant results were found in relation to community type and Question 19.

**Figure 38.** Responses to Question 19 by community type.

**Title I Eligibility**

No other significant results were found in relation to Title I eligibility and Question 19.

**Frequency of Teacher Training on Recognizing and Preventing Harassment**

Principals were asked in Question 20 how often teachers received training on recognizing and preventing harassment, including student-to-student harassment.
Respondents (67%) stated that teachers in their school received training once per year, with 13% stating that teachers do not receive sexual harassment prevention training. Table 68 presents a summary of the responses to Question 20.

Table 68

*Frequency with which Teachers Received Training on Prevention of Student-to-Student Harassment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers do not receive sexual harassment prevention training</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a year</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternating years</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only teachers new to the district at New Teacher Orientation</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once every five years</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>47 (19.75%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Size

Figure 39 summarizes responses to questions regarding how often teachers received training on prevention of sexual harassment sorted by school size. Training during alternating years was more common in smaller schools; otherwise, no clear patterns were found. No other significant results were found in relation to Question 20.
Figure 39. Frequency with which teachers received training on recognition and prevention of harassment sorted by school size.

Community Type

Figure 40 presents a summary of responses to questions regarding how often teachers receive training on prevention of sexual harassment sorted by community type. Responses to this question were found to be fairly similar across community types.
Figure 40. Frequency with which teachers received training on recognition and prevention of harassment sorted by community type.

A significant association was found between community type and how often teachers in their school receive training on recognizing and preventing harassment, including student-to-student harassment. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 69.

Table 69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 20</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>x²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Frequency with which teachers received training on recognizing/preventing harassment including student-to-student</td>
<td>18.321</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Post-hoc analyses found a significant difference in the frequency of teacher training regarding recognizing and preventing harassment between urban and rural schools.

Title I Eligibility

No significant results were found in relation to Question 20 and Title I eligibility.

Topics Included in Teacher Training

In Question 21, principals were asked which topics were included in the training if the districts provided teacher training. A summary of the responses to this question is presented in Table 70. Among districts that provided training, over 75% included how to report educator-to-student misconduct and how to report student-student harassment in their teacher training.

Table 70

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to report educator-to-student misconduct</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to report student-student harassment</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative procedures</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of campus police officers</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the counselor</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to identify educator-to-student sexual misconduct</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance procedures</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention procedures</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>64 (26.89%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Size

Figure 41 presents a summary of responses to the various topics included in teacher training sorted by school size. While some differences were found concerning the topics included in teacher training, no clear patterns in relation to school size were found to emerge.

![Figure 41. Topics included in teacher training sorted by school size.](image)

A significant relationship was found between school size and whether investigative procedures and the role of the campus police officers were included in teacher training. Table 71 presents the chi-square results of this analysis.
Table 71

*Chi-Square Scores and School Size*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 21</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Topics included in teacher training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative procedures</td>
<td>13.328</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of campus police officers</td>
<td>11.181</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N=236$

Post-hoc analyses found that investigative procedure training was included in teacher training significantly more often among principals of schools with 199 or fewer students as compared with principals of schools with 430-989 students. Additionally, principals of schools with 2065 or more and 430-989 students included investigative procedures significantly more often than principals of schools with 200-989 students. In addition, the role of the campus police officers was found to be included in training more often among principals of schools with 2065 or more and 200-439 students as compared with principals of schools with 199 or fewer students.

Community Type

Figure 42 presents a summary of responses to the various topics included in teacher training sorted by community type. For many items, responses were fairly similar, regarding certain items—including investigative procedures, the role of campus
police officers, and grievance procedures—training was most likely to be included in urban schools, followed by suburban schools, and followed finally by rural schools.

![Figure 42](image)

**Figure 42.** Topics included in teacher training sorted by community type.

A significant association was found between community type and topics included in teacher training. A significant relationship was found between community type and whether investigative procedures were included in teacher training and whether the role of campus police officers was included in teacher training. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 72.
Table 72

Chi-Square Scores and Community Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 21</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$x^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Topics included in teacher training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative procedures</td>
<td>6.724</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of campus police officers</td>
<td>6.037</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$N=235$

Post-hoc analyses found that investigative procedures and the role of campus police officers were included in teacher training more often in urban schools as compared with rural schools.

Title I Eligibility

No significant results were found in relation to Question 21 and Title I eligibility.

Summary

Table 73 is a summary of the post-hoc chi-square analyses of topics included in teacher training. In school size and community type compared areas, investigative procedures and the role of campus police officers are statistically significant topics. Investigative procedures were provided more often in schools of 199 students than in schools of 430-989 students and schools of 2065 or more students. They were provided more often in schools of 430-989 students than in schools of 200-429 students. The role
of the campus police officer training was more often presented in schools with 2065 or more and 200-439 students than schools with 199 or fewer students. Principals of urban schools reported that the district provided training in investigative procedures and the roles of the campus police more often than principals of rural schools.

Table 73

*Topics Included in Teacher Training*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question 21 Significant Categories</th>
<th>School Size No. of Students</th>
<th>Community Type Urban, Suburban Rural</th>
<th>Title I/Non-Title I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigative procedures</td>
<td>199&gt;430-989</td>
<td>Urban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2065&gt;200-429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>430-989&gt;200-429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of campus police officers</td>
<td>2065&gt;199</td>
<td>Urban&gt;Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200-439&gt;199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

This study consisted of an examination of the policies and procedures in place in Texas high schools concerning educator sexual misconduct. Specifically, the study focused upon policies and procedures that specifically focus on prevention of educator-to-student misconduct and serve to address problems that are reported to school administrators. This study aimed to determine whether the policies and training currently in place by districts and campuses throughout Texas reflect those presented in current literature on the topic as the most effective practices.
A number of important findings were made in this study. First, most principals feel that they have sufficient knowledge regarding issues of harassment, discrimination, and misconduct. Principal involvement in educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigations was found to be fairly common. Additionally, schools were found to be lacking in some areas of sexual harassment prevention. For example, in the majority of schools, no student survey was provided to determine campus sexual harassment, and parent training regarding sexual harassment was found to be fairly rare. In addition, district training regarding sexual harassment was found to be lacking in several areas. Finally, responses to the survey, in general, were found to vary substantially across both community type as well as school size.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to add to the literature about school policies and procedures that address educator sexual misconduct by surveying principals about district and campus policies and procedures designed to prevent educator-to-student sexual misconduct and to inform administrators and policy makers about the current status of school and school district practices. The study also examined if the district and campus policies and trainings reflect policies and prevention practices outlined in the literature as best practices. The survey was administered through Survey Monkey to Texas high school principals to determine what policies and procedures are in place in secondary schools to prevent educator-to-student misconduct and to address problems that are reported to school administrators. The principals’ responses were analyzed by school size, community type, and Title I eligibility as outlined in Research Question 6.

Discussion

Knowledge of Federal and State Laws and District Policies on Educator Sexual Misconduct

High school principals tend to feel that they have a great deal of knowledge or some knowledge of federal and state laws and regulations related to educator sexual misconduct, and their awareness differs by school context. They were most knowledgeable about laws and regulations related to sex discrimination (90% reporting a great deal or some knowledge) and sexual harassment (100% with a great deal or some knowledge). Federal law on these two issues has been in place and widely
discussed since the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Ninety-four percent reported a great deal or some knowledge about laws on sexual abuse of a child, an issue that has been prohibited by law since 1974 and that has always been a public concern. Over 90% reported a great deal or some knowledge of laws related to the sexual harassment aspects of bullying (92.1%) and of administrator liability for conduct of others in the school (93.6%). Principals were least likely to report a great deal or some knowledge of laws on sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities (81.4%). It appears that if a law has been around for a long time, they are knowledgeable. If it is an issue of widespread public concern such as bullying and sexual abuse of children, they are knowledgeable. In addition, interestingly, if it directly affects them, as in the case of administrator liability, they are knowledgeable.

There were differences in principals’ knowledge level depending on school and community context. There were no significant differences among the school size categories in the knowledge of most laws and regulations. There was a significant school size difference in two areas: knowledge of sexual harassment in general and harassment and knowledge of discrimination of GLBT students. Principals in the largest high schools reported a higher level of knowledge of laws and regulations regarding sexual harassment than those in all other school size groups.

Principals of urban schools rated their knowledge higher concerning sexual harassment, child abuse, hostile environment, and discrimination and harassment of GLBT students than did principals of rural schools. Principals of suburban schools had higher self-rated knowledge regarding harassment and hostile environment than principals of rural schools. Principals of schools in rural communities tended to report
the least knowledge of state and federal laws and regulations. Only 36.4% of the rural principals were involved in any educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigations during the last five years. In contrast, 62.8% of principals of urban schools and 69.2% of principals of suburban schools reported involvement in educator sexual misconduct investigations. It appears that the lack of experience dealing with educator sexual misconduct resulted in a limited level of knowledge of federal and state laws for principals of rural schools.

A significant difference was noted in the knowledge of Title I and non-Title I eligible schools’ principals of federal and state laws and regulations pertaining to the harassment and discrimination of GLBT students. Interestingly, a higher percentage of principals of non-Title I eligible schools stated limited or no knowledge as compared with principals of Title I eligible schools. Title I schools are identified by their economically disadvantaged student population. It is likely that a principal of a lower socio-economic student body may deal more often with GLBT harassment issues because of an associated comparison of economics and limited level of education or life experiences that help broaden a student’s understanding of differences among diverse groups of students.

The issue where there was a difference for school size, community type, and Title I eligibility was harassment and discrimination of GLBT students. Although Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 addressed sexual discrimination, which includes sexual harassment, it was not until the Seventh Circuit Court’s decision in Nabozny v. Podlesny (1996) that the first equal protection claim was provided under the Fourteenth Amendment for sexual harassment based on sexual orientation (Adkison et al., 2008).
The 2007 National Climate Survey by the Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network (GLSEN) sampled 427 Texas GLBT middle school and high school students of which 95% attended public schools and 81% were in urban or suburban schools (GLSEN, 2009). A summary review indicates that principals of larger schools, urban and suburban, and Title I schools have greater knowledge of federal and state laws related to sexual harassment and discrimination of GLBT students as a result of a larger population of GLBT students in their schools. A larger population of GLBT students in a particular type of school gives principals more opportunity to deal with a variety of related issues.

As with knowledge of state and federal laws and regulations, the vast majority of the Texas principals stated that, they had either a great deal of knowledge or some knowledge regarding the district policies and procedures. Texas principals tended to report even more knowledge of the district policies than of the federal and state legal framework. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 requires schools to distribute policies that address sexual discrimination policy information to employees, students, and parents (U.S. Department of Education, 2001). Although the 1972 Title IX required the distribution of policies to address sexual discrimination, a 1990 survey of North Carolina superintendents showed that 44.6% of the respondents had no written district policy to prevent sexual harassment (Wishnietsky, 1991).

There were also context differences in principals’ self-reported knowledge of district policies and procedures. Principals’ self-reported knowledge of district policies tended to improve as the size of the school increased. Texas principals of the largest schools (>2065) had significantly higher self-rated knowledge of district policies
addressing sexual harassment and communicating policies and procedures to parents as compared with principals of the three smallest categories of schools. Principals of the two largest size categories had significantly higher self-rated knowledge of district policies regarding sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities as compared with principals of the two smallest categories of schools.

Knowledge of district policies also tended to differ among different community types. The principal's of both urban and suburban schools had higher self-rated knowledge than those in rural communities in the following seven areas: 1) sexual discrimination policies and procedures, 2) sexual harassment, 3) hostile environment, 4) harassment/discrimination of GLBT students, 5) sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities, 6) sexual harassment aspects of bullying, staff development/training for teachers and administrators, and 7) the investigation of complaints related to educator sexual misconduct. Urban principals had higher self-rated knowledge of policies and procedures relating to sexual abuse of a child, and suburban principals had significantly higher self-rated knowledge relating to the communication of policies and procedures to parents than principals of rural schools.

These results are particularly important to rural school principals who reported the least knowledge of district policies and procedures. The importance of the administrators' knowledge of district policies is a key component in prevention of sexual misconduct (Goorian, 1999; Graves,1994; Scott, 2005; Shakeshaft, 2004).

Experience with Educator Sexual Misconduct

Principals were asked whether they had been involved in any educator-to-
student sexual misconduct investigation involving one of their staff members or students in the past five years. More than half of the respondents had been involved in educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigations involving one of their staff members or students in the past five years. Interestingly, 20% of the principals did not respond to this question. In a 2006 Florida qualitative study of 10 principals, to determine the language used to define educator sexual misconduct and what principals understand about educator sexual misconduct, three principals who had dealt with such issues were unwilling or reluctant to participate in the study (Carins, 2006). This finding adds to evidence that educator-to-student sexual misconduct is widespread. For example, in a 1993-94 Connecticut state survey of seven school districts, 66% of the high school students who reported some form of sexual harassment had experienced the harassment by a teacher, coach, or staff member (Permanent Commission (CT) on the Status of Women, 1995). The American Association of University Women’s 2000 Hostile Hallways nationwide survey discovered that 9.6% of all students in Grades 6-12 reported educator sexual abuse (Shakeshaft, 2003).

Principals of the largest schools were more likely to have been involved in an investigation as compared with principals of the smallest schools. In addition, analyses found that principals of both urban and suburban schools had a significantly greater likelihood of involvement in any educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigation in the past five years as compared with principals of rural schools.

Respondents who had initially answered yes to involvement in a sexual misconduct investigation in the past five years answered whether a district-level administrator assisted in the campus investigation. Among principals who were involved
in sexual misconduct investigations in the past five years, most reported that a district-
level administrator assisted in the campus investigation. The assistance of a district
administrator was more common in the largest schools and substantially more common
in suburban schools than urban and rural schools. In addition, Title IX of the Education
Amendments of 1972 requires school districts to appoint an employee as the Title IX
compliance officer to process complaints involving sexual discrimination (U.S.

Respondents who had initially answered yes to whether the principal had been
involved in any educator sexual misconduct investigation in the past five years were
asked whether they had interaction with or support from the school district’s attorney
during the course of the sexual misconduct investigation. More than half had interacted
with or had support from the school district’s attorney, and this was more common in
medium-sized schools as compared with very large or very small schools and appeared
to be fairly constant across community types.

Respondents who had answered yes to whether the principal had been involved
in any educator sexual misconduct investigation in the past five years were asked if the
district’s procedures were helpful in the course of the investigation. Most principals
stated that the district’s procedures were very helpful or somewhat helpful in their
investigation. It was more common for principals to feel that the district’s procedures
were helpful in their investigation in larger schools as compared with smaller-sized
schools and substantially more common in both urban and suburban schools as
compared with rural schools.
Principals were asked whether they had received any educator-to-student sexual misconduct complaints that did not result in an investigation during the past five years. Only a small percentage of respondents reported having received educator-to-student sexual misconduct complaints that did not result in an investigation during the past five years. Overall, sexual misconduct complaints that did not result in an investigation were most common in very small schools and urban schools. Of those respondents who had received a complaint, most received only one complaint, with smaller numbers of respondents receiving more than one complaint.

No statistically significant results were found relating to school size, community type, or Title I eligibility and support of a school district’s attorney, usefulness of district procedures, and educator sexual misconduct complaints that did not result in an investigation, and the number of complaints received.

_Campus Policies Addressing Educator Sexual Misconduct_

Over 90% of the Texas principals reported their schools had specific policies regarding sexual discrimination and the investigation of reports of possible sexual misconduct. Between 75% and 90% of schools had specific policies for reporting concerns related to sexual misconduct, providing information to parents and community, and providing training and information for teachers and other staff.

Slightly over 50% of the principals reported that their school districts had policies addressing sexual harassment and discrimination of GLBT students, education/training for students in recognizing and responding to sexual misconduct, and sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities. It is concerning that almost 50% of the
schools’ principals reported not having such policies. In the 2002 report by Public Health – Seattle & King County, students who had been victims of harassment or an attack at school because of perceived identification as gay or lesbian were revealed to be six times more likely to carry a gun to school (Safe Schools Coalition, n.d.). Disabled students are more frequently victims of sexual abuse than nondisabled students (Shoop, n. d.).

In addition to Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, requiring schools to distribute policies addressing sexual discrimination to employees, students and parents - the Texas Education Code - Chapter 37.083 provides that each school district adopt and implement a discipline management plan for prevention and education concerning unwanted physical or verbal aggression, sexual harassment, and other forms of bullying (Texas Constitution and Statistics, n.d.; U.S. Department of Education, 2001).

Analyses found that principals of smaller schools were significantly more likely to have specific policies regarding sexual discrimination as compared to schools with 430-989 students. Principals of the largest schools and the smallest schools were significantly more likely to have specific policies related to investigation of reports of possible sexual misconduct and student education/training on recognizing and responding to sexual misconduct than schools with 430-989 students. In addition, principals of the largest schools and smaller schools were significantly more likely to report having specific policies related to reporting concerns related to sexual misconduct as compared with principals of schools with 430-989 students. In each of the reported size categories, the principals of mid-sized schools (430-989 students) were least likely to indicate specific policies.
Significant differences in harassment and discrimination of GLBT students were found in the context of community type. More principals of urban and suburban schools reported policies addressing harassment and discrimination of GLBT students than principals of rural schools. Once again, it is likely that larger schools experience a larger population of GLBT students; therefore, they respond to needs by ensuring such policies.

Once policies are established, methods of distributing the information are developed. Principals noted that the most common methods include the use of the student code of conduct handbook (89.8%), the use of a Student Handbook (79.6%), and the use of a school counselor (55.4%). Only 6% of the principals responded that notifications of sexual harassment policies were not provided to students. The only significant communication method was the use of a student code of conduct handbook, used more often by the largest schools than smaller schools.

The communication of district and campus sexual misconduct policies to all staff, parents, and students is important to ensure school safety (Goorian, 1999). The high percentage of schools that provide notification of policies is due in part to the availability of the Texas Association Schools Board (TASB) legal and local policies available to school districts through their online service, TASB online Policy. The legal policies reflect the language of the U.S and Texas Constitutions and Federal and state statutes, including the Texas Education Code. Ninety percent of the school districts use the TASB online service (Texas Association of School Boards, 2009).

Students should be included in the training process as an important prevention measure (Bithell, 1991; Office of Civil Rights, 1997; Shakeshaft, 2004). Surprisingly,
only 14.4% of the principals reported the use of student training to provide student notification of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct. Although training was not commonly provided, the most common training topics reported were as follows: providing students a definition of sexual harassment and sexual abuse (73.1%); discussing how to report sexual harassment, sexual abuse, and hostile-environment harassment (67.0%); and consequences of actions of sexual harassment, sexual abuse, and hostile-environment harassment (60.3%). The least used student training topics included rules regarding retaliation (53.3%), prevention of sexual harassment and sexual abuse (52.2%), and grievance procedures (34.8%).

An important prevention method is training in the grievance procedures and allowance of filing of grievances and appeals regarding investigation outcomes, the least used reported training topic (Goorian, 1999; Scott, 2005). The Office of Civil Rights (1997) provided prevention information for school administrators, teachers, students, and parents that included development and publicizing of specific grievance procedures for resolving complaints of sexual harassment. In addition, school district Title IX Coordinators are required to implement and administer a grievance procedure and provide ongoing training, technical assistance, and information services regarding Title IX requirements, grievance issues and compliance programs (United States Department of Justice Civil Rights Division, 2001).

Analyses determined that the only area of statistical significance in student training areas was in the prevention of sexual harassment and sexual abuse. Once again, the mid-sized schools were least likely to provide this particular form of training.

Even though student training is limited, 45% of the principals answered that the
training that was provided occurred once a year, with only a limited number (23%) providing ongoing training throughout the year. Training was more common in very small schools or very large schools.

In addition to limited student training, approximately 52% of the principals revealed that no student survey had been provided to determine existence of campus sexual harassment, regardless of school size. Of the schools that did use a student survey, a district-required survey instrument was more common in urban and suburban school districts (57.2%), while a campus survey instrument was more common in rural schools (20%). The Office of Civil Rights (1997) included in their guidelines the use of student surveys as a preventive measure to find out whether any sexual harassment had occurred at the school.

Title IX requires schools to distribute sexual harassment policies to parents. Therefore, principals were asked how parents are notified of campus policies. Only 8.2% of the principals answered that the district does not provide information. The most common methods of parent notification were the use of the student code of conduct handbook (82%) and policies posted on the district website (76%). The inclusion of the policies in the student code of conduct handbook is considered an important preventive measure (Scott, 2005).

Parent notification techniques were found significant in relation to school size and Title I eligibility. Principals of larger schools were more likely to use district newsletters to notify parents than mid-size or smaller schools. As noted earlier, principals of the larger schools had experienced more educator sexual misconduct investigations within the last five years than the principals of the schools of other sizes. In addition, it is not
suprising that district newsletters for parent notification were used more often by non-
Title I schools. The cost of production and mailing was likely prohibitive for lower socio-
economic Title I eligible schools. The least used methods of parent notification included
the use of parent training in recognizing discrimination or harassment (6.6%), parent
training in the prevention of discrimination or harassment (4.9%), and the use of Parent-
Teacher Association (PTA) updates (4.9%).

Analyses determined that urban schools (16.7%) were more likely to provide
training in recognizing discrimination than rural schools (1.3%). In addition, urban
schools (14.3%) were more likely to provide parent training in prevention as compared
to suburban (3.3%) or rural schools (1.3%). In an additional question, only 12% of the
principals responded that parents received training regarding sexual harassment,
sexual abuse, and/or hostile environment harassment and how the school would
respond to such acts. To be effective, policy guidelines and the problem of sexual
misconduct should be discussed at school assemblies, orientations of new staff, and
meetings with parents (Goorian, 1999). Based on the responses, it is clear that the use
of prevention training was limited for both students and parents.

Principals’ District-level Training Regarding Educator-to-Student Sexual Misconduct

When asked how prepared they were to respond to an incident of sexual
misconduct, 96% of the principals felt well-prepared (56.3%) or somewhat prepared
(39.2%). Overall, the principals of the largest schools felt better prepared to respond to
an incident of sexual misconduct. In addition, responses indicated that principals of
suburban schools (98.5%) rated themselves as more prepared than principals of rural
schools (93%). This is in contrast to a qualitative 2006 Florida study in which the principals felt they were inadequately prepared for dealing with issues of sexual misconduct. In addition, the Florida principals determined that their university programs and their district professional development training were lacking in areas of sexual harassment and personnel issues and procedural aspects of responding to sexual misconduct (Cairns, 2006). Moreover, in contrast to Texas principals’ responses regarding knowledge of district policies, Michigan high school principals reported little training in district policies for reporting and documentation (67.9%) and disciplinary actions (71%) in the area of educator sexual misconduct (Thoenes, 2009).

In response to questions regarding how often the district trained the administrators regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct, 62% stated that the district trained once a year, 12.8% stated training during alternating years, and 16% stated that training was never conducted. Over 70% of the principals stated they had received training in the following areas in the last five years: recognizing inappropriate behaviors, recognizing and dealing with sexual harassment, and district policies relating to sexual misconduct. The areas that principals reported the least amount of training were sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities (35.7%) and harassment and discrimination of GLBT students (35.7%).

Within the school size context, analyses found principals of 2065 or more students, 990-2064 students, 200-420 students, and 199 or less students school sizes more likely to receive training for recognizing and dealing with sexual harassment, sexual abuse of a child, and sexual misconduct of students with disabilities and for procedures for investigating sexual misconduct complaints than principals of schools
with 430-989 students. The principals of the larger schools and the smallest schools were more likely to receive training on the harassment and discrimination of GLBT students than principals with 430-989 students. The principals of the largest schools and the 430-989 student schools were more likely to receive training on district policies related to sexual misconduct than principals of schools with 200-429 students.

Significant differences by community type were found in training concerning harassment and discrimination of GLBT students. Urban principals were more likely to receive training than rural principals were. More urban and suburban principals received training in procedures for investigating sexual misconduct complaints than principals of rural districts. Although no statistically significant results were noted, principals of Title I schools were more likely to receive training regarding harassment and discrimination of GLBT students than principals of non-Title I schools.

In an additional effort to determine principals’ preparation, high school administrators were asked which district-level administrator was assigned to investigate sexual misconduct in the district. The Director of Human Resources was identified by 23% of the principals, while 22% named the Assistant Superintendent, and 13.3% of the principals reported the Title IX Coordinator was assigned to investigate sexual misconduct. Only 8.2% could not identify the designated administrator. Principals of rural schools were twice as likely to be unaware of the designated investigator.

Principals were also asked what district options were available to them to assist in addressing questions, problems, grievances, and investigations regarding educator sexual misconduct. Consultation with an attorney was available to 78% of the principals. It was more common for suburban and rural schools to have consultation with an
attorney as an option. Administrator training in grievance and investigation procedures was available to 68% of the principals. Principals of the largest schools were provided the training more than all other groups of school sizes. Title IX Coordinators were available to 45.7% of the respondents, with principals of the largest schools having available Title IX Coordinators, which is more than principals of schools with 430-989 students. Title IX consultations were made available to urban and suburban principals more often than to rural principals.

**Campus Training for Staff in Prevention of Educator-to-Student Sexual Misconduct**

Another important prevention strategy is to provide district policies to the school staff. The use of the student code of conduct handbook to provide the staff with policy information was indicated by 89.1% of the principals; with 77.6%, identifying the policy was located on the district website. In addition, 76.6% stated the policies were available in the staff handbook/personnel guidelines. Teacher training in recognizing discrimination or harassment was identified by 57.8% of the principals, and preventing discrimination or harassment was identified by 53.1% of the principals. Fortunately, only 1.6% of the principals indicated that the district did not provide information to the school staff. In addition, 65.1% of the teachers received yearly training as part of required professional development.

Similarly, it was found that 66.5% of the teachers were provided once-a-year training on recognizing and preventing student-to-student sexual harassment. A limited number of districts (12.6%) did not provide training on recognizing and preventing student-to-student sexual harassment. Although there is no significance by school size,
urban (72.1%) and suburban (70.3%) schools’ teachers were more likely to be trained once a year than teachers in rural schools (59.8%).

The State Board for Educator Certification Code of Ethics Enforceable Standards prohibits educators’ solicitation and engagement in sexual contact or romantic relationship with a student. The Texas Family Code Section 261.001 provides the standard for reporting child abuse (Child Welfare Information Gateway, 2010). Texas Statutes Penal Code Chapter 21.12 identifies educator sexual misconduct and indicates such action is a felony offense (Texas Statutes Penal Code). Section 21.006 requires the reporting of any sexual abuse involving an educator and a student or a minor. Some educators are reluctant to report educator sexual misconduct. Only 1% to 5% of the cases of educator sexual misconduct are reported to law enforcement or child protective services (Grant, 2010).

In consideration of the widespread problem of educator sexual misconduct, it is critical that teacher training is provided. Among districts that provide training, how to report educator-to-student sexual misconduct (77%) and how to report student-to-student harassment (85%) were the areas the principals reported as most often included in training. The areas of least training reported were the role of the campus officer (31.6%) and investigative procedures (31.0%). It is important to add that 26.89% of the principals did not respond to this question.

In the context of school size and community type, significance was determined in training in investigative procedures and the role of the campus officer. Investigative procedures were provided more often in the smallest schools than in mid-size schools, while they were provided more often in the largest schools and the mid-size schools
than in smaller schools (200-439). Urban schools provided teachers training in investigative procedures and the role of the campus officer more often than the rural schools. Earlier analyses reported in this study indicated that educator sexual misconduct was more prevalent in urban schools. Therefore, it is not surprising that investigative procedures training is more likely to be provided in urban schools. In addition, training in the role of the campus officer is justified in urban schools because of the occurrence of sexual misconduct and the need for the assignment of a campus police officer to an urban campus.

Summary

This study consisted of an examination of the policies and procedures in place in Texas high schools concerning educator sexual misconduct. Specifically, the study focused on policies and procedures that focus on prevention of educator-to-student misconduct and serve to address problems that are reported to school administrators. This study aimed to determine whether the policies and training currently in place by districts and campuses throughout Texas reflect those presented in current literature on the topic as the most effective practices.

A number of important findings were made in this study:

1. Most principals feel that they have sufficient knowledge of federal and state laws and regulations with the exception of those of sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities and discrimination of GLBT students.
2. Principals of the largest high schools, urban and suburban schools, and Title I schools reported a higher level of knowledge of laws and regulations regarding GLBT students than the smaller schools, rural schools, and non-Title I schools.

3. Most principals feel they have sufficient knowledge in district policies, with principals of larger schools and urban and suburban schools having higher self-rated knowledge of district policies.

4. Principal involvement in educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigations was found to be fairly common, with principals of the largest schools and urban and suburban schools reporting higher involvement in educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigations.

5. Most principals involved in educator sexual misconduct investigations had the assistance of a district-level administrator, assistance from the district's attorney, and sufficient district procedures. Assistance of a district-level administrator was more common in the largest schools and substantially more common in suburban schools than in urban or rural schools. Assistance from a district's attorney was most common in medium-sized schools.

6. Most principals felt their schools had specific policies addressing most areas related to educator sexual misconduct.

7. Half of the principals indicated the lack of specific policies addressing sexual harassment and discrimination of GLBT students, training for students in recognizing and responding to sexual misconduct, and sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities.
8. In schools with policies regarding GLBT students, more urban and suburban schools reported having policies specifically addressing the harassment and discrimination of GLBT students than rural schools.

9. A limited number of principals reported student training as a means to provide student notification of campus policies regarding educator sexual misconduct. The least provided student-training topics were rules regarding retaliation, prevention of sexual harassment and sexual abuse, and grievance procedures.

10. More than half of principals indicated they did not use a student survey to determine campus sexual harassment.

11. The most common methods of parent notification of campus policies were use of a student code of conduct handbook and policy posted on the district website, and the least-used methods of parent notification were parent training in recognizing and preventing discrimination and harassment and use of PTA updates.

12. Almost all of the principals tended to feel prepared to respond to an incident of sexual misconduct.

13. Principals reported feeling the least trained in sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities and harassment and discrimination of GLBT students.

14. More than half of the principals reported that the district provided district policy information to the school staff to include teacher training in recognizing and preventing discrimination or harassment, and the areas of least training for teachers were the role of the campus officers and investigative procedures.
Implications for the Profession

The topic of educator sexual misconduct has received a considerable amount of attention in the media. Each time a report of an educator’s inappropriate involvement with a student is reported on television, in the newspaper, or on a website, principals should regularly review their prevention strategies to avoid such occurrences. This study has information to establish the widespread prevalence of educator misconduct. While such events are harmful to the profession, the primary focus must be on the harm to the student victims.

While Texas high school principals feel they have knowledge of federal and state laws and regulations and school district policies, it is also evident that administrators need more training in the laws and district policies on misconduct related to students with disabilities and harassment and discrimination of GLBT students. Even though administrators were not asked where they should receive training, attention to the issues should come from the universities, regional education centers, and school districts’ central administrator responsible for professional development. While current attention in schools is directed at issues of academic accountability, ongoing training and legal updates are essential to providing the secondary principal with the tools needed to implement effective prevention strategies. The safety of the school community is considered by some to be the most important duty of the principal.

It is the responsibility of an administrator to take proactive measures to increase knowledge of the issues and effective strategies for prevention of sexual misconduct. A secondary principal who is ill informed of the laws and the appropriate procedures may become part of a legal and financial liability. Administrators are usually quick to put
preventive measures in place after an event occurs, but for the welfare of the students and education, the practices and policies outlined should be addressed on a consistent basis as a preventive measure.

The data from this study reveals that the preventive strategy most often not provided by secondary principals is training of students and parents. The use of student surveys to determine the presence of sexual harassment on campus is a proven effective tool, although seldom used by Texas school districts or campus principals. Principals must seek information to gain an understanding of actions that may be occurring on campus that have an adverse effect on the students and the learning environment of the school. Moreover, in order to avoid sexual misconduct, students and parents should be trained to identify and report sexual harassment and sexual abuse. Understanding the current laws and district policies can provide not only the necessary information for personal safety, but also the awareness to assist at the implication of sexual misconduct.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study examined the practices and policies of high schools to prevent educator sexual misconduct. High school principals self-rated their knowledge of laws and district policies that apply to various areas associated with sexual misconduct. It would be beneficial for others in roles of leadership to provide information from the perspective of their positions. Other groups such as members of the teaching staff who are responsible for students outside of the regular school day, school counselors, district fine arts directors, district athletic directors, special education directors, assistant
superintendents, and superintendents should be surveyed. This could create a clearer picture of the characteristics of a sexual predator: identification of student victims, requirements to report, laws that protect victims and those who step forward to report the abuse, laws that impact the professional status of an offending educator, criminal charges associated with unprofessional, unethical, illegal actions, and the preventive measures required to ensure a safe school. The study repeatedly found a lack of knowledge of the harassment of students with disabilities and the harassment and discrimination of GLBT students. The educational literature available on the needs of students with disabilities predominantly focuses on the care of disabled students and strategies for learning. Students with disabilities are victims of sexual misconduct considerably more often than their school peers, and more information is needed to address the problem. Several studies have been conducted to determine the frequency of sexual harassment of GLBT students, but limited information has been gathered on effective procedures, guidelines, and implementation of campus actions to reduce the harassment that the GLBT students have revealed.

Although this study focused on secondary schools, it is equally important that studies and interventions be in place for all levels of school populations. Administrators, teachers, parents, and, most importantly, students at each age level have a need for information to ensure prevention. It would be important to know if elementary principals self-rate their knowledge at the same level as high school principals. In addition, it is important to determine the areas of training elementary principals feel are important to providing an environment free of sexual harassment and educator sexual misconduct.
Conclusions

The increased attention to the topic of educator sexual misconduct will undoubtedly force school districts and campuses to address the issue. While laws and guidelines can be identified to ensure that educator sexual misconduct should not occur, it continues to be a serious problem in schools.

Secondary principals have been given the responsibility to lead the school in all aspects that provide opportunities for growth and development of the students. To meet that end, the principal sets the professional standard for the faculty and staff. It is imperative that principals have a clear and complete understanding of the laws and procedures to assist the students, faculty, and parents if confronted with an issue such as educator sexual misconduct. A lack of attention to the details of law and procedures puts the district, the school, the faculty, the students, and even the principal at risk of regrettable circumstances.

Secondary principals from all school sizes, community types, and socio-economic groups face a vast multitude of issues that could impede the safety of the students and the faculty and staff. No school group is immune from accusations or actual criminal actions of such a serious nature as educator sexual misconduct. Principals must not become so complacent due to the schools’ location, student group, or economic level of the community to allow awareness and attention to this well-publicized problem, to be placed as an afterthought only to be addressed after the fact. If the issue is addressed correctly, a principal could anticipate that a well-trained staff and student body would take appropriate actions to address a possible issue before it becomes a serious issue and lives are in peril.
This study addressed only a limited scope of issues tied to educator sexual misconduct. The purpose of the study was to add useful information regarding the practices and policies to prevent educator sexual misconduct. It is important that additional research provide information needed to make decisions to implement laws, professional standards, and safety guidelines to assist principals in their leadership role and protect the welfare of the school community.
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INFORMED CONSENT
INFORMED CONSENT LETTER:

You are being asked to participate in a research study designed to add to the literature about school policies and procedures that address educator sexual misconduct and to inform administrators and policy makers about the status of school and school district practices. The research uses an online survey about campus policies and procedures that address educator-to-student sexual misconduct. Each Texas high school principal of a 9-12 regular high school listed in the database provided by the Texas Education Agency will be contacted by email to participate in the study.

You will be asked to complete a survey that will take approximately 15 minutes. At the end of the survey, you will be given the opportunity to describe any best practices designed to prevent sexual harassment on your campus.

No foreseeable risks to you are involved in this study. This study is not expected to be of any direct benefit to you. However, it may benefit district and campus administrators in the development of sexual harassment procedures. The on-line process protects your confidentiality so that the researcher does not receive your e-mail address or any information that can be traced to your school specifically. The confidentiality of your individual information will be maintained in any publications or presentations regarding this study, as data will be presented in aggregate form only. Your participation is completely voluntary and you may exit the survey at any time. By completing the survey, you are indicating your understanding of the purpose and procedures of this survey. If you have any questions about the study, you may contact Carolyn Spain at telephone number 972-742-5542 or Dr. Judith Adkison, Associate Dean, College of Education, University of North Texas, (940) 565-2249. This research
study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects. You may print this document for your records.

Definition:

This survey collects information on policy and practices related to educator-to-student sexual misconduct. Educator-to-student sexual misconduct is any behavior of a sexual nature that may constitute professional misconduct. Such behaviors could range from: inappropriate language to sexual abuse of a student; to include unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, non-verbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature that is sufficiently severe, persistent, or pervasive to limit a student’s ability to participate in or benefit from an education program or activity, or to create a hostile or abusive education environment.
APPENDIX C

PREVENT EDUCATOR-TO-STUDENT SEXUAL MISCONDUCT SURVEY
PRACTICES AND POLICIES IN HIGHSCHOOLS TO
PREVENT EDUCATOR-TO-STUDENT SEXUAL MISCONDUCT SURVEY

1. How many students are enrolled in the school?
   (a) 199 & below
   (b) 200 to 429
   (c) 430 to 989
   (d) 990 to 2064
   (e) 2065 & up

2. Identify your high school as urban, suburban, or rural.
   (a) Urban, defined to include a central city and the surrounding densely populated areas, together with a combined population of at least 50,000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006).
   (b) Suburban, defined as areas contained in a metropolitan statistical area (MSA), excluding central cities. An MSA is a group of communities socially and economically integrated with an adjacent urbanized area (National Center for Children of Poverty).
   (c) Rural, defined as open country and settlements with fewer than 2,500 people (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006).

3. Is the high school a Title I eligible school?
   (a) Yes
   (b) No
4. Please use the drop down menu at the right of each item to indicate how you would rate your knowledge base regarding the state and Federal laws and regulations governing that issue:

Drop down menu
(a) A great deal of knowledge
(b) Some knowledge
(c) Limited knowledge
(d) No knowledge of the topic

Sexual discrimination
Sexual harassment
Sexual abuse of a child
Hostile environment
Harassment and discrimination of gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender students
Sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities
Sexual harassment aspects of bullying
Administrator liability for conduct of others in the school

5. Please use the drop down menu at the right of each item to indicate how you would rate your knowledge base regarding the requirements of your school district policies and procedures governing that issue:

Drop down menu
(a) A great deal of knowledge
(b) Some knowledge
(c) Limited knowledge
(d) No knowledge of the topic

Sexual discrimination
Sexual harassment
Sexual abuse of a child
Hostile environment
Harassment and discrimination of gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender students
Sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities
Sexual harassment aspects of bullying
Communicating policies and procedures to parents  
Student education related to sexual misconduct  
District improvement plan provisions related to sexual harassment  
Guidelines provided in the district crisis management plan  
Staff development/training for teachers and administrators related to sexual misconduct issues  
Reporting possible sexual misconduct  
Investigating complaints related to educator sexual misconduct  
Administrator liability for conduct of others in the school  

6. Check each of the areas in which your school has specific policies:  

Sexual discrimination  
Investigating reports of possible sexual misconduct including sexual harassment, abuse, discrimination, hostile environment  
Reporting concerns related to sexual misconduct  
Addressing harassment and discrimination of gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender students  
Providing information to parents and community  
Providing training and information for teachers and other staff  
Student education/training on recognizing and responding to sexual misconduct  
Sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities  
Sexual harassment aspects of bullying  

7. How well do you think you are prepared to respond to an incident of sexual misconduct should it occur?  

(a) Well-prepared  
(b) Somewhat prepared  
(c) Limited preparation  
(d) No preparation to deal with an incident of sexual misconduct  

8. Have you been involved in any educator-to-student sexual misconduct investigation involving one of your staff members or students in the past five years?  

Yes  
No  

If you answered YES, in how many investigations have you participated?  

_________
9. If you answered YES to Question 8, did a district-level administrator assist in the campus investigation?

Yes
No

10. If you answered YES to Question 8, did you have interaction with or support from the school district’s attorney?

Yes
No

11. If you answered YES to Question 8, were the district’s procedures helpful in your investigation?

(a) Very helpful
(b) Somewhat helpful
(c) Limited assistance
(d) No procedures in place

12. Have you received any educator-to-student sexual misconduct complaints that did not result in an investigation during the past five years?

Yes
No

13. If you answered YES to Question 12, how many complaints during the past five years did you receive that did not result in an investigation?

__________________

14. Check each of the areas in which you have received training within the last five years.

How to avoid sexual discrimination in your school
Recognizing inappropriate behaviors
Recognizing and dealing with sexual harassment in your school
Sexual abuse of a child/student
Recognizing situations creating a hostile environment for students
Preventing hostile environment for students
Harassment and discrimination of gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender students
Sexual misconduct related to students with disabilities
Sexual harassment aspects of bullying
Administrator liability for conduct of others in the school
District policies related to sexual misconduct
Procedures for investigating sexual misconduct complaints
Strategies to prevent sexual misconduct
Other (write in) ______________________________________

15. How often does your district train administrators regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct policies and issues?

(a) Never
(b) Once a year
(c) Alternating years
(d) Once every 5 years

16. Who is the district-level administrator assigned to investigate sexual misconduct in your district?

(a) I do not know which administrator is the designee
(b) No central administrator has been designated
(c) Assistant Superintendent
(d) Director of Human Resources
(e) Title IX coordinator
(f) Director of Student Services
(g) District police chief/designee
(h) Other
17. Check each of the following formats your district uses to provide information regarding educator-to-student or general sexual harassment policies.

(a) The district does not provide information

(b) Code of Conduct Handbook

(c) District website on-line policy

(d) Extra-curricular (to include athletics) student handbook

(e) Staff handbook/personnel guidelines

(f) PTA updates

(g) District newsletter

(h) Teacher training in recognizing discrimination or harassment

(i) Teacher training in preventing discrimination or harassment

(j) Other (write in) ____________________________

18. Please check options available in your district to help principals address handling questions, problems, grievances, and investigations regarding educator-to-student misconduct:

(a) Administrator training in investigation and grievance procedures

(b) Consultation with the Title IX Coordinator or other administrator

(c) Consultation with an attorney

(d) Other

19. How often do teachers in your school receive training regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct policies?

(a) Teachers do not receive training

(b) Yearly training as part of required professional development

(c) Alternating years training as a part of required professional development
(d) Only teachers new to the district receive training as a part of New Teacher Orientation

(e) Training is at the discretion of the campus administration.

20. How often do teachers in your school receive training on recognizing and preventing harassment—including student-to-student?

(a) Teachers do not receive sexual harassment prevention training
(b) Once a year
(c) Alternating years
(d) Only teachers new to the district at New Teacher Orientation
(e) Once every five years

21. If your district provides training, check each of the topics included in the teacher training.

(a) How to report educator-to-student misconduct
(b) How to report student-student harassment
(c) Investigative procedures
(d) Role of campus police officers
(e) Role of the counselor
(f) How to identify educator-to-student sexual misconduct
(g) Grievance procedures
(h) Prevention procedures

22. Check each of the methods used to provide students notification of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct?

(a) Student Code of Conduct Handbook
(b) Student Handbook
(c) Extra-curricular (to include athletics) Handbook
(d) Advisory period/homeroom period training
(e) Counselor
(f) Campus police
(g) No notification of sexual harassment policies is provided to students

23. Check each of the topics included in student training.
   (a) Definition of sexual harassment and sexual abuse
   (b) Prevention of sexual harassment and sexual abuse
   (c) How to report sexual harassment, sexual abuse, and hostile-environment harassment
   (d) Consequences of actions of sexual harassment, sexual abuse, and hostile-environment harassment
   (e) Rules regarding retaliation
   (f) Grievance procedures
   (g) No training is provided for students

24. How often does the student training occur?
   (a) Once a year
   (b) On-going throughout the school year
   (c) Alternating years
   (d) Once during the four years of high school career, i.e. freshman orientation
   (e) No training is provided for students
25. Check each item below that indicates how students are surveyed to determine if any form of sexual harassment is occurring at school?

(a) The students are surveyed using a district required survey instrument.

(b) The students are surveyed using a campus survey instrument.

(c) The students are not surveyed by the district.

(d) The students are not surveyed by the campus.

(e) No student survey is provided to determine campus sexual harassment

26. Check each of the methods used to notify parents of campus policies regarding educator-to-student sexual misconduct?

(a) The district does not provide information

(b) Code of Conduct Handbook

(c) District website on-line policy

(d) Extra-curricular (to include athletics) student handbook

(e) Staff handbook/personnel guidelines

(f) PTA updates

(g) District newsletter

(h) Parent training in recognizing discrimination or harassment

(i) Parent raining in preventing discrimination or harassment

(j) Other (write in)______________________________________

27. Is parent training regarding sexual harassment, sexual abuse, and/or hostile environment harassment and how the school will respond to such actions provided?

Yes

No
I am interested in learning about what practices schools have found to be especially effective in preventing educator sexual misconduct or dealing with educator sexual misconduct concerns. Please describe any best practices in place on your campus you would recommend to other principals.
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