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Objectives

- **Objective 1**: Understand the challenges associated with measuring the occurrence and reporting of crime

- **Objective 2**: Recognize DoD data collection and tracking methods

- **Objective 3**: Identify the SAPR program metrics and military justice indicators
Agenda

• Assessing the extent and impact of crime

• Department Survey and Reporting Data

• DoD SAPR Program Metrics and Military Justice Indicators
Assessing Extent and Impact of Crime
Statistics and data should rarely be the message.

Rather...

Statistics and data help you communicate your message.
### U.S. Sources of Crime Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Victims</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• National Crime Victimization Survey</td>
<td>• Uniform Crime Reports</td>
<td>• Research Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey</td>
<td>• National Incident Based Reporting System</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office
BJS, 2015 – about 83% of car thefts were reported to police in 2014; about 70% were reported in 2015
- Self report via the NCVS
Sources of Crime Information

Sexual Assault
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## DoD Sources of Sexual Assault Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People who experience sexual assault</th>
<th>Law Enforcement</th>
<th>Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workplace &amp; Gender Relations Survey</td>
<td>CID / NCIS / OSI Databases</td>
<td>Research Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey</td>
<td>Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office
Sexual Assault is an Underreported Crime

**Estimated number of Service members experiencing sexual assault in 2016 (14,900*)**

**Service member reports (4,794**)**

**Not Reported (10,000+)**

*Estimated Service member prevalence statistics for 2016 sexual assault for 2016
**Service member victims reporting*
### Types of Data to Evaluate

- How many people experience sexual assault in the military
- How often do people report sexual assault
- Survivor experience of sexual assault
- Survivor satisfaction with services and the providers
- How many offenders are held accountable

- How many people commit sexual assault in the military
- Long term impact on retention of survivors
- Unit climate assessments
There was a decrease in past-year prevalence (occurrence) of sexual assault for both active duty women and men in 2016, as compared to rates measured in 2012 and 2014.
While non-penetrative crimes decreased between 2014 and 2016, the experience of penetrative crimes stayed largely the same.
Reporting:
- Increased across all services with women
- Stayed flat with men

Prevalence Decreased:
- Prevalence is down from 2014, where rates for women and men were 4.9% and 0.9% respectively in 2014
- Based on these rates, the Department estimates that about 14,900 Service members experienced some kind of sexual assault in 2016 – down from the 20,300 active duty members estimated to have experienced a sexual assault in 2014
- All services showed downward trends in past-year rates of sexual assault
- Two groups showed statistically significant decreases: Navy women and Army men
- Lower rates reflect a decrease in sexual contact crimes since 2014; penetrating crimes remained about the same
6769 Reports in FY17
- 868 Civilians & Foreign
- 587 Prior to service
- 37 Data not available
5277 Service Member Victims

Service Member Reports for Incidents During Military Service
Army Female 1640 (+11%)
Army Male 483 (No Change)

Navy Female 1063 (+9%)
Navy Male 249 (+8%)

Marine Corps Female 536 (+33%)
Marine Corps Male 158 (-8%)

Air Force Female 954 (+12%)
Air Force Male 194 (-3%)
A Decade of Change in DoD

**FY 2006**
Estimated Number of Service Member Victims: ~34,200
- 7% Reported
- 93% Did Not Report
*2006 WGRA*

**FY 2014**
Estimated Number of Service Member Victims: ~20,300
- 23% Reported
- 77% Did Not Report
*2014 RMWS*

**FY 2016**
Estimated Number of Service Member Victims: ~14,900
- 32% Reported
- 68% Did Not Report
*2016 WGRA*
**Sexual Assault: When and Where**

### Women

**2006**
- 75% • at a military installation
- 45% • during duty hours
- 19% • while TDY, at sea, or during field exercises

**2016**
- 64% • at a military installation
- 27% • during duty hours
- 24% • while TDY, at sea, or during field exercises

N.B. Direct statistical comparisons cannot be made between the 2006 WGRA and the 2016 WGRA due to measurement and survey content changes.

DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office
Sexual Assault: When and Where

Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>At a military installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>During duty hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>While TDY, at sea, or during field exercises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>At a military installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>During duty hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>While TDY, at sea, or during field exercises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B. Direct statistical comparisons cannot be made between the 2006 WGRA and the 2016 WGRA due to measurement and survey content changes.

DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office
Role of Alcohol and/or Drugs

Alcohol/Drug Use by Victim and/or Offender

2006
32% Women
38% Men

2016
60% Women
42% Men

N.B. Direct statistical comparisons cannot be made between the 2006 WGRA and the 2016 WGRA due to measurement and survey content changes.

DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office
Sex of Offender in 2016

Women

- 94% male
- 1% female
- 3% men and women
- 2% not sure

Men

- 57% male
- 25% female
- 12% men and women
- <1% not sure

DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office
Status of Offender in 2016

Women
- Civilian 8%
- Military Member 85%
- Both Military and Civilian 7%

Men
- Civilian 18%
- Military Member 72%
- Both Military and Civilian 10%
### Reasons for Reporting – 2016

#### 2016 Top reasons for reporting, Women:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>To stop the offender from hurting others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44%</td>
<td>Someone they told encouraged them to report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>To stop the offender(s) from hurting them again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2016 Top reasons for reporting, Men:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>To stop the offender(s) from hurting them again</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>To stop the offender(s) from hurting others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41%</td>
<td>It was their civic or military duty to report it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Reasons for Not Reporting – 2016

### 2016 Top reasons for not reporting, Women:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to forget about it and move on</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not want people to know</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt ashamed or embarrassed</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2016 Top reasons for not reporting, Men:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wanted to forget about it and move on</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not want people to know</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt ashamed or embarrassed</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most Positive Interactions:
- 83% indicated interacting with a Sexual Assault Response Coordinator (SARC) during the military justice process. 70% indicated they were satisfied; 18% dissatisfied. Used discretion in sharing details of their case (78%); was beneficial in preparing them for military justice process (50%); provided the majority of information about the progress of the case (12%)
- 77% indicated interacting with a Uniformed Victims’ Advocate (UVA) or a Victims’ Advocate (VA) during the military justice process. 77% indicated they were satisfied with the services of their UVA; 13% dissatisfied. 76% indicated they were satisfied with the services of their VA; 16% dissatisfied. Used discretion in sharing details of their case (81%); was beneficial in preparing them for military justice process (50%); provided the majority of information about the progress of the case (13%)
- 66% indicated interacting with a Special Victims’ Counsel (SVC) or Victims’ Legal Counsel (VLC) during the military justice process. 77% indicated they were satisfied; 12% dissatisfied. Used discretion in sharing details of their case (84%); was beneficial in preparing them for military justice process (66%); provided the majority of information about the progress of the case (53%)

Most Negative Interactions:
93% indicated interacting with a military criminal investigator after their report of sexual assault. 55% indicated they were satisfied; 29% dissatisfied.
58% indicated interacting with their unit commander during the military justice process. 56% indicated they were satisfied; 35% dissatisfied.

55% indicated interacting with their immediate supervisor during the military justice process. 50% indicated they were satisfied; 35% dissatisfied.

54% indicated interacting with their senior enlisted advisor during the military justice process. 58% indicated they were satisfied; 30% dissatisfied.

7% indicated interacting with a Victim Witness Assistance Provider (VWAP) during the military justice process. 63% indicated they were satisfied; 22% dissatisfied.

59% indicated interacting with military trial counsel during the military justice process. 67% indicated they were satisfied; 22% dissatisfied.
U.S. and Military Justice System “Funnel”

Crime Occurrences
Crime Reports
Crimes Charged
Crimes Convicted
Crimes with Incarceration

Not To Scale
This slide provides a summary of disciplinary action taken by Commanders against perpetrators.

It must be understood that Commanders do not have authority to prosecute every alleged perpetrator, these include civilians, foreign nationals, unknown perpetrators, deceased or deserter subjects, or where civilian or foreign authorities choose to exercise jurisdiction over the alleged perpetrator.

When Commanders can exercise authority over an alleged sexual assault perpetrator, and evidence supports Commander action, commanders predominantly prefer court-martial charges.
• Over the past two FYs, SAPRO and the Services conducted a comprehensive review of legal data in DSAID and standardized the way in which they categorized and reported cases. As part of this process, the Services’ legal officers closed and reported a greater number of cases where command action was precluded. This partially accounts for the increase in subjects with command action precluded seen in FY15 and FY16.

A detailed breakdown of actions can be found on slide 28.
Department of Defense Metrics

- 11 SAPR Program Metrics
- 5 Military Criminal Justice “Indicators”
Where do you find the Metrics in the Annual Report?

Appendix C: Metrics and Military Justice Indicators on Sexual Assault

DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office
DoD Metrics

1. Past Year Prevalence of Sexual Assault
2. Reporting of Sexual Assault Compared to Prevalence
3. Bystander Intervention
4. Command Climate*
5. Investigation Length
6. Full Time SARC and VA Personnel

*Source: DEOCS – To Be Revised
See slide 76 for female bystander intervention breakdown
See slide 77 for male bystander intervention breakdown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DoD Metrics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Victim Satisfaction – Support by SVC, SARC, VA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Subjects with Victims Declining to Participate in the Military Justice Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Perceptions of Retaliation – Unit* &amp; Victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Victim Kept Informed of Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Leadership Support of SAPR*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reports of Sexual Assault</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: DEOCS – To Be Revised*
**Metric 8: Subjects with Victims Declining to Participate in the Military Justice Process, FY09-FY17**

![Graph showing percentage of cases with subjects declining to participate in the Military Justice System from FY09 to FY17.](image)

**Fiscal Year**
- FY09: N=1971, 10%
- FY10: N=1,025, 17%
- FY11: N=1,518, 12%
- FY12: N=1,714, 11%
- FY13: N=2,149, 9%
- FY14: N=2,625, 9%
- FY15: N=2,783, 9%
- FY16: N=2,892, 9%
- FY17: N=3,567, 14%

**Description:** The percentage of cases with subjects that DoD cannot hold appropriately accountable because the victim declined to participate in the military justice process.

**Source:** FY09 to FY13 = Service reporting; FY14 to current = DSAID

**Implication:** Provides indication if the Department's changes in the military justice process are having an impact on victim involvement.
Metric 9b: Perceived Retaliation – Victim Perspective (WGRA), FY16

Perceived Professional Reprisal, Ostracism, and/or Maltreatment - WGRA

- 32% Experienced behavior consistent with circumstances military law prohibits
- 27% Experienced behavior but was not consistent with circumstances military law prohibits
- 41% Did not experience behavior

Description: Respondents who indicated whether they experienced specific negative behaviors following their report of sexual assault.
Source: 2016 WGRA
Summary Points: Results suggest that the 32% of victim's behavior consistent with circumstance prohibited by military law.
Military Justice Indicators

1. Command Action for Alleged Offenders
2. Sexual Assault Court Martial Outcomes
3. Time from Report to Court Outcome
4. Time from Report to NJP Outcome
5. Time from Investigation Completion to Prosecution Recommendation
Military Justice Indicator 3: Time Interval from Report to Court Outcome, FY14-FY17

**Description:** Length of time from the date a victim signs a DD 2910 to the date that a sentence is imposed or the accused is acquitted.

**Source:** Start = DSAID DD Form 2910 date, End = DSAID/Offices of the Judge Advocates General (OTJAG) Report of Trial.

**Implication:** Provides transparency into justice process and sets expectations on justice process length.

**Note:** The median is a "midpoint" for a set of numbers; it is the value for which half are above and half are below. Unlike an average, the median is less influenced by outliers in a set of numbers.
Questions

1. Why is it important to understand both “prevalence” and “reporting?”

2. Why do we differentiate between SAPR program “Metrics” and “Indicators” in the criminal justice system?

3. How do you use DoD and Service data in your duties?
Contact Dr. Galbreath:
nathan.w.galbreath.civ@mail.mil

Learn More:
www.sapr.mil

Get Help:
877-995-5247
www.safehelpline.org