

2026 Dartmouth College Sexual Misconduct Student Survey

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Overview

This executive summary is intended to provide a brief overview of the results of the 2026 Sexual Misconduct Survey of Students, administered at Dartmouth in the winter of 2026. The content and timing of the survey are in compliance with New Hampshire RSA 188-H, which requires that institutions of higher education in the state of New Hampshire administer a sexual misconduct survey to all students biennially beginning in 2022. Prior to this statute, Dartmouth had been administering its own sexual misconduct survey.

A dashboard on the Dartmouth website presents the full results of the 2026 Sexual Misconduct Survey, along with the 2024 data, allowing the longitudinal findings to be viewed in one place. This executive summary of 2026 results is provided to the New Hampshire Department of Education and is also available on Dartmouth's web site along with the dashboard. See https://www.dartmouth.edu/oir/sexualassault_misconduct_surveys.html.

Overall, the 2026 Sexual Misconduct Survey continues the encouraging trend seen in 2024.

Survey Design

New Hampshire RSA 188-H requires institutions to administer a set of core questions developed by the state-level Task Force on Sexual Misconduct. Dartmouth supplemented these questions with items related to bystander behavior. Where appropriate, comparisons between the 2024 and 2026 results are presented.

Survey Administration and Response Rates

The survey was administered to graduate and undergraduate students over the age of 18 between January 12, 2026 and February 16, 2026. A BBQ was offered as an incentive to the class year with the highest participation rate.

A total of 592 responses were received for an overall student response rate of 7.9%. The respondent sample demonstrated mixed representativeness compared to the population. Several demographic characteristics showed significant deviations: gender representation was highly skewed ($p < 0.0001$), with females overrepresented by 8.31 percentage points; school affiliation was skewed with A&S undergraduates underrepresented and Guarini, Geisel, and Tuck students overrepresented; financial aid

recipients were overrepresented ($p=0.0083$); and first-generation students were underrepresented ($p=0.0061$). In contrast, race/ethnicity and Pell eligibility were adequately represented, showing no significant differences between respondents and the population.

Weighting

Both the 2026 and 2024 results were weighted to address potential nonresponse bias and improve comparability across years. In 2024, 1,477 responses were received, for a response rate of 19.8%. In both years, women responded at higher rates than men, and response rates also varied by school and other student characteristics; these differences were generally more pronounced in 2026, making weighting especially important for this cycle's results.

A two-step weighting procedure was used. Response-propensity weights were first estimated through logistic regression, using characteristics associated with survey response that could be measured consistently across years: gender, academic stage (grouped into Graduate/Professional, UG Early, and UG Late), race, and financial-aid status. These base weights were then raked to known institutional population margins for gender, school, academic stage, race, and Pell status, aligning the final weighted sample with the underlying student population on key demographic and institutional characteristics.

The propensity and raking steps drew on an overlapping but not identical set of variables, since the two procedures serve different purposes: the propensity model predicts response using the most stable, parsimonious set of predictors, while raking calibrates the sample to known institutional population margins, regardless of how well a given variable predicts response on its own. First-generation status showed a statistically significant response gap in unadjusted comparisons but was not included in either step, largely because the number of first-generation respondents was small, particularly in 2026.

The weighting process was evaluated by comparing unweighted, propensity-based, and final raked estimates. The final raked weights matched the selected institutional population margins as intended, confirming that the calibration performed as designed.

Presentation of Results

In presenting results, Dartmouth's intention is to provide a full set of information in a complete, accurate, and accessible format, without exposing individuals or individual responses. To that end, results are communicated in the following ways:

- An Executive Summary, designed to communicate key findings to a broad audience.
- A user-friendly, web-based dashboard containing frequency distributions of the responses to all questions, available on the Dartmouth web site. To protect against the potential identification of individuals, the best practice of masking data is followed where the response count is fewer than 5.
- A user-friendly, web-based dashboard containing the aggregated responses to all questions, with no data masked when cell sizes are small. This dashboard is available to Dartmouth's Title IX Coordinator, who provides access on a limited basis to others within the College as appropriate.

The online dashboards are constructed to show all responses to all questions, but data in the public dashboards are suppressed when the response count is fewer than 5. While suppressing data in the case

of small cell sizes is important to preserve confidentiality, it can render small populations invisible. This is especially problematic in a survey like this, where across-the-board breakouts by gender are warranted because of the nature of the topic, and where some questions appear only to a subset of respondents, depending on how they answered one or more of the preceding questions. This means there are a number of items for which the count of respondents will, categorically, be small.

Even when the number of responses from a small group is high enough that the data are not suppressed in the public dashboard, the relatively low response counts sometimes create percentages that seem disproportionately high. It is important to keep this in mind when interpreting results.

Respondent Characteristics

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics by Gender and Level

	Female			Male			Combined		
	Invited	N Responded	% Responded	Invited	N Responded	% Responded	Invited	N Responded	% Responded
Graduates or Professional	1377	139	10%	1305	101	8%	2682	240	9%
Undergraduates	2346	214	9%	2494	138	6%	4840	352	7%
	3723	353	9%	3799	239	6%	7522	592	8%

Response rates differed significantly by gender ($\chi^2 = 26.40$, $p < .0001$).

Table 2. Respondent Characteristics by Race/Ethnicity and Level

	Asian			International			URM			White			Unknown Race			Combined		
	Invited	N Responded	% Responded	Invited	N Responded	% Responded	Invited	N Responded	% Responded	Invited	N Responded	% Responded	Invited	N Responded	% Responded	Invited	N Responded	% Responded
Graduates or Professional	327	32	10%	765	72	9%	397	39	10%	1106	92	8%	87	5	6%	2682	240	9%
Undergraduates	637	40	6%	691	33	5%	1157	73	6%	2178	190	9%	177	16	9%	4840	352	7%
	964	72	7%	1456	105	7%	1554	112	7%	3284	282	9%	264	21	8%	7522	592	8%

Response rates did not differ significantly by race/ethnicity ($\chi^2 = 4.36$, $p = .3598$).

Table 3. Respondent Characteristics by School and Level

	Arts and Sciences - Graduate			Geisel School of Medicine			Thayer School of Engineering			Tuck School of Business			Arts and Sciences - Undergraduate			Combined		
	Invited	N Responded	% Responded	Invited	N Responded	% Responded	Invited	N Responded	% Responded	Invited	N Responded	% Responded	Invited	N Responded	% Responded	Invited	N Responded	% Responded
	898	96	11%	635	56	9%	460	30	7%	689	58	8%	4840	352	7%	7522	592	8%

Response rates differed significantly by school ($\chi^2 = 14.46$, $p < .01$).

2026 Results and Change from 2024 to 2026

A survey is a blunt instrument for measuring experiences of any type, and sexual misconduct is especially challenging because there are many compelling reasons the population surveyed may choose not to respond to the survey, or to respond to some questions but not others. Despite these limitations, an analysis of change from the 2024 administration of the survey at Dartmouth to the 2026 administration provides some indicators of whether change is moving in the right direction, and where we might focus our future efforts. Analysis of change for each item that was the same in 2024 and 2026 was performed using a chi-squared test with a chosen significance level of $p < 0.05$.

Perceptions of Campus Climate

Overall, students remain positive in 2026 about how Dartmouth might handle it if a student reported a sexual misconduct incident. They had the greatest confidence about the privacy of the person making the report being maintained. Fewer students, though still nearly 60%, think it is likely or very likely Dartmouth would take action to address the factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct.

Table 4. How Dartmouth Would Handle a Report of a Sexual Misconduct Incident

The following statements describe how Dartmouth might handle it if a student reported a sexual misconduct incident. Using the scale provided, please indicate the likelihood of each statement.	Response	Weighted Count	Percent
The institution would maintain the privacy of the person making the report.	Very Likely or Likely	500	86%
The institution would do its best to honor the request of the person about how to go forward with the case.	Very Likely or Likely	445	77%
The institution would take steps to protect the safety of the person making the report.	Very Likely or Likely	447	77%
The institution would take the report seriously.	Very Likely or Likely	437	75%
The institution would provide supportive measures to the person who made the report (e.g., academic, housing).	Very Likely or Likely	413	71%
The institution would handle the report fairly.	Very Likely or Likely	391	67%
The institution would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct.	Very Likely or Likely	317	54%
The institution would punish the person who made the report.	Very Likely or Likely	128	22%

All of the items in the table above were present in the 2024 survey, and chi-squared tests indicate that some differences between 2024 and 2026 responses are statistically significant. As shown in the table below, student perceptions of institutional responses showed statistically significant change on some items.

Table 5. 2024-2026 Change in How Dartmouth Would Handle a Report of a Sexual Misconduct Incident

The following statements describe how Dartmouth might handle it if a student reported a sexual misconduct incident. Using the scale provided, please indicate the likelihood of each statement.	Response	2024		2026		p-value
		Weighted Count	Percent	Weighted Count	Percent	
The institution would take the report seriously.	Very Likely or Likely	1166	80%	437	75%	0.022
The institution would take action to address factors that may have led to the sexual misconduct.	Very Likely or Likely	866	59%	317	54%	0.040
The institution would punish the person who made the report.	Very Likely or Likely	392	27%	128	22%	0.030

*Table includes only items with statistically significant change. Green highlights positive change; red indicates negative change.

A high proportion of students reported having received training or information related to sexual misconduct and prevention since coming to Dartmouth:

Table 6. Information Received by Students

Since coming to Dartmouth, have you received written (e.g., brochures, emails, on-line module) or verbal information (e.g., presentations, training) from anyone at Dartmouth about the following?			
	Response	Weighted Count	Percent
Title IX protections against sexual misconduct	Yes	412	82%
Where to go to get help if someone you know experiences sexual misconduct	Yes	382	76%
How to report a sexual misconduct incident	Yes	389	78%
The definitions of types of sexual misconduct	Yes	376	75%
Student code of conduct or honor code	Yes	367	73%
How to help prevent sexual misconduct	Yes	363	72%
Other resources to help you or someone you know deal with a sexual misconduct incident (i.e., community-based crisis center)	Yes	314	63%

Harassment by Student, Visitor or Guest

The most frequently experienced incidents of harassment by a student, visitor and/or guest were offensive sexist remarks (35% of respondents experienced this one or more times) followed by receiving condescending or negative treatment because of sex or gender identity (28%), and sexual remarks, jokes or stories that were insulting or offensive (26%).

Table 7. Harassment by a Student, Visitor, and/or Guest

How many times have you been in a situation in which a student, visitor, and/or guest has done the following things to you, since you enrolled at Dartmouth?	Response	Weighted Count	Percent
Made offensive sexist remarks	One or more times	163	35%
Was condescending to you, or treated you negatively because of your sex or gender identity	One or more times	128	28%
Made sexual remarks, jokes or stories that were insulting or offensive to you	One or more times	119	26%

Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic or sexual relationship with you (i.e., ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc.)	One or more times	93	20%
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you	One or more times	84	18%
Cat-called, followed, honked or whistled at you, flashed you, or directed other sexually aggressive actions towards you in public	One or more times	63	14%
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters	One or more times	69	15%
Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you	One or more times	61	13%
Publicly shamed/humiliated you regarding your sexual activity or experiences	One or more times	50	11%
Spread unwelcome sexual rumors about you through spoken comments or by text, email, or social media (i.e., Instagram, Snapchat, TikTok)	One or more times	60	13%
Displayed, used, or distributed sexually graphic or suggestive materials	One or more times	34	7%
Sent or posted unwelcome sexual comments, jokes, or pictures by text, email, Instagram, Snapchat, Twitter, TikTok, or other electronic means	One or more times	38	8%

Of the twelve types of sexual harassment by students, visitors or guests, none showed statistically significant change compared to 2024.

Among the 2026 respondents who experienced harassment incidents, 29%, or 132 students, answered follow-up questions by thinking about one situation. The most common responses are as follows:

Table 8. Harassment by a Student, Visitor, and/or Guest Incident Details

Question	Most frequent response	Weighted Count
Gender of the person who committed the behavior	Man	99
Role at Dartmouth of the person(s) who committed the behavior	Student	121
Locations where the situation happened most often	On campus public place/building	62
Term the situation happened	Fall	73
Impact on academic progress	Reduced GPA	11
Negative financial impact on academic career	Costs incurred for physical and mental health services as a result of the situation	3

Harassment by Faculty/Staff

Some survey respondents reported having experienced one or more harassment incidents by a faculty member, instructor, or staff member since they enrolled at Dartmouth. Of these incidents, the most frequently experienced were offensive sexist remarks (6% of respondents experienced this one or more times) and being put down, condescended to, or treated negatively because of the student's sex or gender identity (6%).

Table 9. Harassment by Faculty/Staff

Since you enrolled at Dartmouth, have you been in a situation in which a faculty member, instructor, or staff member (i.e., coach, advisor, hall director, etc.) has done the following to you?	Response	Weighted Count	Percent
Made offensive sexist remarks	One or more times	26	6%
Put you down, was condescending to you, or treated you negatively because of your sex or gender identity	One or more times	24	6%
Made sexual remarks, jokes, or stories that were insulting or offensive to you	One or more times	8	2%
Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters	One or more times	6	1%
Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable	One or more times	9	2%
Displayed, used, or distributed sexually graphic or suggestive materials outside of course materials	One or more times	2	1%
Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were offensive to you	One or more times	4	1%
Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed or offended you	One or more times	3	1%
Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic or sexual relationship with you (i.e., ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc.)	One or more times	3	1%
Made unwanted attempts to touch or kiss you	One or more times	2	1%
Mistreated you or threatened you with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative	One or more times	3	1%
Attempted to bribe you or implied better treatment to engage in sexual behavior	One or more times	1	0%

Of the 12 harassment situations listed, one showed statistically significant change from 2024 to 2026:

Table 10. 2024-2026 Change in Harassment by Faculty/Staff

Since you enrolled at Dartmouth, how many times have you been in a situation in which a faculty member, instructor, or staff member... has done the following to you?	Response	2024		2026		p-value
		Weighted Count	Percent	Weighted Count	Percent	
Made sexual remarks, jokes, or stories that were insulting or offensive to you.	One or more times	59	4%	8	2%	0.019

*Table includes only items with statistically significant change. Green highlights positive changes.

Among the 2026 respondents who experienced harassment incidents, 4%, or 19 students, answered follow-up questions by thinking about one situation. The most common responses are as follows:

Table 11. Harassment by Faculty/Staff Incident Details

Question	Most frequent response	Weighted Count
Gender of the person who committed the behavior	Man	18
Role at Dartmouth of the person(s) who committed the behavior	Faculty	12
Locations where the situation happened most often	On campus public place/building	16
Term the situation happened	Fall	12
Impact on academic progress	Reduced GPA	5
Negative financial impact on academic career	Costs incurred for physical and mental health services as a result of the situation	2

Stalking

Twenty percent of survey respondents report having experienced one or more stalking incidents since they enrolled at Dartmouth. Of these incidents, the most frequently experienced are unwanted emails, text messages or social media comments/direct messages (9% of respondents experienced this one or more times) followed by someone spreading rumors online about the student, whether they were true or not (8%).

Of the 11 items describing the types of stalking respondents may have experienced, none showed significant change from 2024 to 2026.

Dating Violence

Fourteen percent of survey respondents report having experienced one or more incidents of dating violence since they enrolled at Dartmouth. Of these incidents, the most frequently experienced were being repeatedly humiliated or put down (6% of respondents experienced this one or more times) followed by pushing, grabbing, hitting or shaking the respondent (5%) and attempting or succeeding in controlling the respondent's personal life (5%).

None of the dating violence items showed statistically significant change from 2024 to 2026.

Of the 22 students who continued from the dating violence module to answer questions about the role of drugs and alcohol in any incidents they experienced, 11 reported that alcohol and drugs weren't involved at all.

Sexual Violence

Eleven percent of survey respondents reported having experienced one or more incidents of sexual violence since they enrolled at Dartmouth. Of these incidents, the most frequently experienced is someone touched, kissed, or rubbed up against the private areas of the respondent's body, removed some of their clothes, or made them touch the person sexually, without the respondent's consent (but did not attempt sexual penetration) (10% of respondents experienced this one or more times). A distant second in terms of frequency (3% of respondents) is someone *attempted* to have oral, anal, or vaginal penetration with the respondent without their consent.

None of the four items in the sexual violence victimization module were statistically significantly different from 2024 results.

Among the 11% of 2026 respondents who experienced sexual violence incidents, 8%, or 32 students, answered follow-up questions by thinking about one situation. The most common responses were as follows:

Table 12. Sexual Violence Incident Details

Question	Most frequent response	Weighted Count
Gender of the person who committed the behavior	Man	25
Role at Dartmouth of the person(s) who committed the behavior	Student	21
Locations where the situation happened most often	Greek Letter Organization building	12
Term the situation happened	Fall	18
Impact on academic progress	Reduced GPA	4
Negative financial impact on academic career	Costs incurred for physical and mental health services as a result of the situation	3

Of the 32 students who answered questions about an incident of sexual violence they experienced, 25 continued to answer questions about the role of drugs and alcohol in the incident. Seven reported that alcohol and drugs weren't involved at all.

Institutional Responses

The Institutional Responses Module begins with the question, "Whom did you tell? (Select all that apply.)" Responses indicated a clear preference for peers:

Table 13. To Whom Students Reported Sexual Misconduct

Whom did you tell?	Response	Weighted Count	Percent
Close friend other than roommate	Yes	97	85%
Roommate	Yes	50	44%
Romantic partner	Yes	34	30%
Parent or guardian	Yes	26	23%
Off-campus counselor/therapist	Yes	22	19%
Other family member	Yes	16	14%
Title IX Coordinator	Yes	12	11%
On-campus counselor/therapist	Yes	8	7%
Other [write-in]	Yes	7	6%
Institution faculty or staff	Yes	5	4%
Undergraduate Deans	Yes	3	3%
Campus security or police department	Yes	2	2%
Graduate and Professional School Deans of Student Affairs	Yes	3	2%
Dartmouth Dick's House – Health Services	Yes	2	1%
Doctor/nurse	Yes	2	2%
Resident Advisor or Residence Life staff (e.g., Assistant Directors, UGAs)	Yes	2	2%

Confidential Resource Advisor	Yes	1	1%
Local police	Yes	1	0%
WISE Campus Advocate	Yes	2	1%
Tucker Center (Ordained Priests, Rabbis, Clergy)	Yes	1	1%
Student Accessibility Services (SAS)	Yes	1	1%
Community Standards and Accountability	Yes	1	1%
Religious or congregational leader, including Clergy, Pastor, Rabbi, Imam or another religious leader	Yes	0	0%
Office of Pluralism and Leadership (OPAL)	Yes	0	0%

Among the non-peer resources with sufficient responses to report publicly, on-campus counselors or therapists received the most favorable ratings: 75% of respondents found them Very Useful or Moderately Useful, and 82% found them at least Somewhat Useful. Institution faculty were rated Very Useful or Moderately Useful by 45% of respondents, with 80% rating them at least Somewhat Useful. The corresponding percentages were 18% and 63% for institution staff, and 17% and 49% for the Title IX Coordinator or Office of Equal Opportunity. Results for the remaining resources are not reported because fewer than five respondents rated them. These findings should be interpreted cautiously because of the small number of respondents who used and rated each resource.

For those who chose not to tell anyone about the situation or incident they experienced, most (41%) indicated they didn't think what happened was serious enough to talk about, followed by feeling that it's a private matter and wanting to deal with it on their own (35%).

Campus Safety

Overall, students indicated a high level of agreement with statements relating to campus safety:

Table 14. Feelings of Campus Safety

On or around this campus,	Response	Weighted Count	Percent
I feel safe from dating violence	Strongly Agree or Agree	386	93%
I feel safe from sexual violence	Strongly Agree or Agree	376	90%
I feel safe from stalking	Strongly Agree or Agree	358	86%
I feel safe from sexual harassment	Strongly Agree or Agree	362	87%

Of the four items relating to campus safety, two show significant positive change from 2024 to 2026:

Table 15. 2024-2026 Change in Feelings of Campus Safety

On or around campus,	Response	2024		2026		p-value
		Weighted Count	Percent	Weighted Count	Percent	
I feel safe from sexual violence	Strongly Agree or Agree	1156	85%	376	90%	0.006
I feel safe from sexual harassment	Strongly Agree or Agree	1116	82%	362	87%	0.019

*Table includes only items with statistically significant change. Green highlights positive changes.

Bystander Behavior

Thirty-eight percent of respondents indicated they suspected someone they knew had experienced stalking, harassment, interpersonal violence, or had been sexually assaulted. Of those, 13% directly intervened to stop it, 23% went and got assistance from someone else, and 31% took action in another way. Forty-three percent chose not to get involved for various reasons, 19% because they felt it wasn't any of their business (did not know the victim well).

Final Notes

This summary presents aggregated results for all students, without distinguishing graduate and undergraduate students; women, men or nonbinary; trans or not trans; or other respondent subgroups. When group size is large enough, these detailed results are available in the online dashboard. Differences in what these populations experience related to sexual misconduct can be important, so when the numbers are too small to maintain privacy in the public-facing dashboard, they are available internally to Title IX officers and their designees.

The results plus the trend analysis provide insight into target areas for prevention and overall programming. Where change was significant, the 2026 Sexual Misconduct Survey results showed improvement on several measures, while other areas warrant continued attention.