

REPORT TO CONGRESS

ON THE 2012 ACTIVITIES OF GRANTEEES

RECEIVING FEDERAL FUNDS UNDER THE

GRANTS TO REDUCE VIOLENT CRIMES

AGAINST WOMEN ON CAMPUS PROGRAM

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Award Process	2
Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed by Campus Program Grantees	3
Campus Program Grantees' 2012 Activities	4
Technical Assistance	10
Additional Information	14
Future Activities	15
<u>Appendices</u>	16
Appendix A: Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2009 Awards	
Appendix B: Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2010 Awards	
Appendix C: Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2011 Awards	
Appendix D: Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2012 Awards	
Appendix E: Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2013 Awards	
Appendix F: Summary of the Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed by Campus Program Grantees	
Appendix G: Summary of Victim Characteristics, Victims Served through Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus (January 1, 2012 through December 31, 2012)	

Introduction

The Office on Violence Against Women (OVW) established the Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus Program (Campus Program) in accordance with the Higher Education Amendments of 1998. Under this grant program, institutions of higher education may use funds for enhancing victim services and developing programs to prevent violent crimes against women on campuses, including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

The statutory provisions of Section 826(d)(4) of the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 require the Attorney General to submit an annual report to the committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate responsible for issues relating to higher education and crime. The report must address the activities of grantees receiving federal funds under the Campus Program, provide information about the effectiveness of these programs, and include a summary of persons served. Specifically, the Attorney General must report to Congress on the number of grants and the amount of funds distributed; a summary of the purposes for which the grants were provided and an evaluation of the progress made under the grants; a statistical summary of the persons served, detailing the nature of victimization, and providing data on age, sex, race, ethnicity, language, disability, relationship to offender, geographic distribution, and type of campus; and an evaluation of the effectiveness of programs funded. Campus Program grantees with calendar year 2012 activities are described in this report received funding through awards made in Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 and FY 2011.¹

¹ Grantees are required to report to OVW on their grant-funded activities on a semiannual basis and thus, information from Campus Program grantees from two reporting periods (January 1 – June 30, 2012 and July 1 – December 30, 2012) is included in this Report.

Award Process

As required by the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, the Campus Program grantees awarded funding in FY 2010 – FY 2012 were geographically diverse and distributed between private and public institutions of higher education located in rural, urban, and suburban communities with a broad range of student population sizes. These applications were reviewed and scored by external peer review panels comprised of campus-based experts, including campus law enforcement officers, victim advocates, faculty, researchers, and administrators with Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) grant program expertise. The OVW Director made final funding decisions.

Congress appropriated \$9,000,000 for the FY 2012 Campus Program. Additionally, the Campus Program had \$1,307,254 in prior year carryover funding and \$181,996 in FY 2012 recoveries for a total of \$10,489,250 available funding for FY 2012. OVW set aside \$1,200,000 for FY 2011 technical assistance² and \$1,670,000 for FY 2012 technical assistance and \$80,040 for evaluation, \$426,060 for salaries and expenses, and \$267,631 for the FY 2012 rescission: the total remaining amount available for grant awards was \$6,845,518.³

The Campus Program received 108 applications of which 22 were recommended for funding, totaling \$6,811,752. The recommendations represented funding for 13 new grants and 9 continuation grants. The enclosed chart (Appendix D) lists each of the institutions that received awards and the award amounts for the FY 2012 grants. Appendices A, B and C list each of the institutions that received awards and the award amounts for the FY 2009, FY 2010 and FY 2011 grant years respectively.

²The \$1,200,000 represents a carryover balance from the previous fiscal year.

³Numbers may not total due to rounding.

Statutory Purpose Areas and Campus Program Minimum Requirements

The Campus Program has the following statutory purpose areas:

1. To provide personnel, training, technical assistance, data collection, and other equipment with respect to the increased apprehension, investigation, and adjudication of persons committing sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking on campus;
2. To develop and implement campus policies, protocols, and services that more effectively identify and respond to the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, and to train campus administrators, security personnel, and personnel serving on campus disciplinary or judicial boards on such policies, protocols, and services;
3. To implement and operate education programs for the prevention of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking;
4. To develop, enlarge, or strengthen victim services programs on the campuses of institutions involved, including programs providing legal, medical, or psychological counseling, for victims of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, and to improve delivery of victim assistance on campus. To the extent practicable, such an institution shall collaborate with any entities carrying out nonprofit and other victim services programs, including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking victims services in the community in which the institution is located. If appropriate victim services are not available in the community or are not accessible to students, the institution shall, to the extent practicable, provide a victim services program on campus or create a victim services program in collaboration with a community based organization;
5. To create, disseminate, or otherwise provide assistance and information about victims' options on and off campus to bring disciplinary or other legal action, including assistance to victims in immigration matters;
6. To develop, install, or expand data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems, linking campus security to local law enforcement for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions with respect to the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking on campus;
7. To provide capital improvements (including improved lighting and communications facilities, but not including the construction of buildings) on campuses to address the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking; or
8. To support improved coordination among campus administrators, campus security personnel, and local law enforcement to reduce sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking on campus.

In addition, under minimum requirements established by OVW, all Campus Program grantees must :

1. create a coordinated community response to violence against women on campus, including the establishment of a coordinated community response team;
2. establish a mandatory prevention and education program about sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking for all incoming students;
3. train all law enforcement to respond effectively in sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking cases; and
4. establish or strengthen programs to train all members of campus judicial and/or disciplinary boards, conduct boards and/or hearing officers to respond effectively to charges of sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking.

Campus Program Grantees' 2012 Activities

Based on the Campus Program statutory purpose areas and program minimum requirements, OVW awarded funding for colleges and universities to establish coordinated campus and community-based responses to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking and to improve coordination between campus entities, local criminal justice agencies, and nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services agencies. In 2012, institutions created and revised policies and protocols regarding violence against women. For example, Campus Program funds supported the establishment of formal procedures for responding to victims' reports of sexual assault. Grants were also awarded to campuses seeking to develop or expand upon student codes of conduct. Campuses also used grant funds to develop curricula for training programs, hire education coordinators, and train a reported 3,472 volunteer peer educators to implement the training. From January 1 through June 30, 2012, Campus Program funds supported 124.2 full-time employees, including 43.7 program coordinators, 15.1 victim advocates, 13.3 administrators, and 27.7 trainers/educators. From July 1 through December 31,

2012, Campus Program funds supported 118.7 full-time employees, including 41.8 program coordinators, 16.1 victim advocates, 12.5 administrators, and 30.4 trainers/educators.

To comply with Campus Program minimum requirements, grantees worked with campus and community-based victim advocacy organizations to develop mandatory prevention and education programs on sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking for incoming students. A reported 45,606 incoming students were educated with Campus Program funds from January 1 to June 30, 2012. A reported 98,765 incoming students received education regarding these crimes from July 1 to December 31, 2012 – this increase reflects the larger number of incoming students in the late summer/early fall time period which coincides with the typical academic calendar.

Campus Program grantees also trained campus law enforcement or public safety personnel to respond effectively in sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking cases and strengthened training programs for members of campus disciplinary boards to respond effectively to charges of violence against women. Grantees have been encouraged to include information about the following in their training curricula: investigating sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking; informing victims about campus and community resources; conducting safety planning with victims; enforcing orders of protection; making primary aggressor determinations; understanding the dynamics of violence against women; and working with local law enforcement and criminal justice agencies.

From January 1 through June 30, 2012, an estimated 967 campus law enforcement officials and 361 campus judicial/disciplinary board members were trained with Campus Program funds, and 794 campus law enforcement officials and 405 judicial/disciplinary board

members were trained with funding from other sources.⁴ From July 1 through December 31, 2012, an estimated 1,044 campus law enforcement officials and 513 campus judicial/disciplinary board members were trained with Campus Program funds, and 943 campus law enforcement officials and 488 campus judicial/disciplinary board members were trained with funding from other sources.

Campus Program funds have also supported campus education projects such as Sexual Assault Awareness Month, “tabling” at public events, Take Back the Night marches, media campaigns, and the Clothesline Project (an educational awareness project focused on violence against women). Grantees also used Campus Program funds to develop, install, and expand data collection and communication systems to enhance victim safety.

Grant funds also sustained programs designed to establish and enhance support services for victims on campus. From January 1 through June 30, 2012, 1,110 victims were provided services supported by Campus Program funds and four victims were partially served. From July 1 through December 31, 2012, 1,203 victims were served and 13 were partially served. Victims received victim advocacy services (actions designed to help the victim/survivor obtain needed support, resources, or services such as employment, health care, and victim compensation), crisis intervention, response to hotline calls, support group/counseling services, and legal advocacy/court accompaniment. Additional information on the victims served with Campus Program funds during 2012 is contained in Appendix G.

The Campus Program encourages grantees not only to provide comprehensive, holistic services to victims but also to strengthen efforts to hold perpetrators accountable. Grantees reported that 824 offenses of domestic violence and/or dating violence (426), sexual assault

⁴ It should be noted that although such trainings are minimum program requirements, Campus Program grantees are not required to use federal funds for this training and may use funds from other sources.

(272), and stalking (126) were reported to campus security authorities from January 1 through June 30, 2012.⁵ During that reporting period, 185 criminal charges were filed in local jurisdictions and 357 campus disciplinary or judicial board actions were held. From July 1 through December 31, 2012, campuses reported 761 offenses of domestic violence and/or dating violence (348), sexual assault (296), and stalking (117), 175 offenses resulting in criminal charges being filed in the local jurisdiction, and 390 resulting in campus disciplinary or judicial board actions.

Grantees report that programs and services supported by funds from the Campus Program have had a positive impact on their campuses, as evidenced by the following feedback:

Grant funding is providing the University and the community with the means to build a network of both service providers and community participation that approaches [violence against women] issues from both the standpoint of immediate assistance and that of environmental and institutional prevention and response. Prior to the grant, there was no Office or Police Investigator on campus to specifically meet the needs of...victims. Currently, because of the grant, a Violence Against Women Program (VAWP) has been established and is building bridges between the university and the service providers to ensure that victims receive the help that they need. The VAWP also ensures the unification and institution of prevention efforts to ensure a safer environment. The Police Investigator ensures that the Criminal Justice System is available to assist and protect any actual and potential victims and bridges the gap between any victims and both prosecutorial and law enforcement agencies. Practically, the presence of a full time investigator ensures greater protection for victims who come forward through the use of investigative and arrest powers to ensure suspects or perpetrators will not have access to the victim and assisting the victim in receiving services from both on and off campus providers. The provision of a full time office and investigator is also ensuring the regular training of campus law enforcement on a sustainable basis to be better able to provide services and protection to both victims and the community. It is intended to widen training on Campus and to make it accessible to the greater community including surrounding educational institutions.

Alabama State University Montgomery, Alabama

Prior to OVW funding, there was little campus discussion on the effectiveness of campus policies or interventions. Additionally, prior to grant funding, there were no coordinated or ongoing efforts to support survivors and educate the campus about interpersonal violence. The environment is now very different for survivors. For example, they now have access to services and support via a 24/7 Helpline and a dedicated office in the Student Union. Given the

⁵ It should be noted that due to the semiannual reporting requirements, there may not be a direct correlation between crimes reported and disciplinary board actions reported in a given six month period. For example, a crime could be reported in one reporting period and a disposition made by the campus disciplinary board in a subsequent period.

partnerships developed for the implementation of the grant's goals and objectives, the campus has been able to build stronger relationships with community agencies and increase the flow of communication and collaboration. Two strong examples of collaboration include: in September 2012, the Associate Director of the PCA was awarded an Ally Award by the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual and Transgender Student Services Office; and in November 2012, the Associate Director was elected to become a member of the Board of Directors for the Colorado Coalition Against Sexual Assault. Overall, 335 survivors have received direct services via the project hotline and/or in-person advocacy and support; 23,267 new students have received prevention education on interpersonal violence; and 9,043 members of the campus community have received outreach and education on interpersonal violence via classroom presentation and other education programs since the Campus Safety Program's inception in 2009.

University of Colorado at Denver, Denver, Colorado

The Campus Program has afforded Clark University the opportunity to institute many changes on campus across programming, student services, and policy changes. First, we are able to conduct our Bystander prevention program with all incoming undergraduate students, including incoming first year and transfer students. This program is one of the few empirically supported prevention efforts that exist today. We are able to meet with students in relatively small groups to discuss the sensitive issues of sexual assault, dating violence, and stalking. This is due to the fact that the program has also allowed us to provide free training in the program for over 40 facilitators, who are now fully trained to provide the program for us. Prior to receiving campus funding, all incoming students met in a large lecture hall to view a play and engage in limited discussion. We are also able to provide this bystander program to other student groups upon request, and so far, this has included all orientation leaders, all RAs, all athletes, and other select groups. Second, we have been able to institute free intervention services through this Campus Program, which includes free advocacy and/or ongoing therapy with a trained clinical psychology doctoral student or a licensed clinical psychologist. Third, we have been able to engage University Police in the aims of this program. Campus police have been an active participant in our internal CCRN meetings, have attended multiple grant sponsored training sessions, and have worked with us in assuring that our university is in compliance with Clery regulations. We are also working closely with them to evaluate and improve relations between students and university police officials. Fourth, without the support of the Campus Program, we would not be able to assess the particular needs of the international students on campus. In meeting with administration officials, it is clear that this is a population with a potential need for specialized services that can be provided with cultural sensitivity to the many represented national backgrounds. Also, through the Campus Program, we have been able to conduct focus groups with the international students themselves to begin the process of developing specialized programming for them during their orientation. The Campus Program has also allowed us to reach out to our LGBTQ population and begin to work with them on dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking issues that are particularly relevant to them. Fifth, we have been able to bridge discussions with the administration, the Dean of Students Office, and the chair of the judicial board, to critically evaluate our current judicial board process and whether it is suitable for sexual offenses. As a result, the university now has a specialized judicial board for sex offenses and possibly other VAW offenses. Sixth, and relatedly, we have been able to use the Campus Program to revise our sexual violence policy to be more comprehensive, and to create stalking and relationship abuse policies. Seventh, we have been able to consolidate and coordinate across the disparate offices on campus that deal with [violence against women] through our campus CCRN. We have monthly meetings, and have subcommittee group meetings even more frequently. Eighth, we have been successful in extending this

coordination outside of campus through involvement with the Worcester area CCRN, and through our efforts to develop and implement a consortium campus program. We are currently working with three other Worcester-area campuses to develop such a program.

Clark University, Worcester, MA

The Campus Grant funding has allowed for a number of needed additions to victim services and educational programming regarding sexual assault, dating and domestic violence, and stalking. Before receiving the grant funding, there was not a full time employee dedicated to these issues. Therefore, comprehensive services for survivors were not available on campus. The grant funding has allowed for creating and maintaining the Violence Prevention and Action Center, a 24 hour hotline, and 24 hour face to face advocacy response. The program coordinator is available to offer survivors support, safety planning, assistance in navigating the legal system/student conduct system, transportation, and accompaniment to the hospital or police department. In addition to the funding providing for comprehensive services, the program coordinator position also formed and continues to maintain a campus coalition comprised of faculty, staff, and administrators from various departments to ensure that victims are receiving an effective and consistent response. Although John Carroll had some partnerships in place before the grant, we have been able to strengthen relationships with these partners and develop new partnerships with agencies we had not previously worked with. Utilizing their expertise has enhanced our services, training, and educational programs. The sub-awards our partners receive from our OVW campus grant has allowed these partners the opportunity to be highly involved in projects on campus. Prior to receiving grant funding, minimal awareness events and prevention education programs were in place at John Carroll. Funding has allowed for significantly more programming and wider publicity of events, thus greatly increasing the number of participants. We have been able to expand our educational programs to include all incoming students, athletic teams, Greeks, residence hall students, and various student groups. We have also expanded the number of peer education programs. The amount of educational programs and awareness campaigns would not be possible without the grant funding. Lastly, we have been able to increase intuitional responsibility by improving policies, protocols, and providing training to the judicial hearing board, law enforcement, and several groups of John Carroll faculty, administrators, and staff.

John Carroll University, University Heights, OH

This grant has been incredible for MIT. We have truly made HUGE strides around campus. People know that violence happens and now they know where to go if it does. This wasn't happening before this grant cycle. They might have known it was happening but no one knew where to go. We are close to having the process streamlined. Last year we implemented a hotline phone – 2 of our rape crisis counselors are available 24 hours a day. Many people thought it wasn't necessary but after the first year, we have shown it to be much needed and a big success. For the first time ever, we have a group of students who are passionate about this topic and are working as peers. This may not seem like a big deal on a college campus but for MIT it is. Social justice issues like sexual violence are not at the top of most students lists here on campus. Most of them are busy creating ways to fly electric cars or cure cancer, but this small group of students is quite a powerhouse. They have facilitated book clubs, rallys, events, and promotion. It's been amazing. That is because we have the staff that is able to bring them together and get the word out. The audit has been a unique and rewarding experience. Two of our staff members were able to travel to Minnesota to work directly with Praxis International and bring their model

back to our campus. It has been fascinating to watch it unfold and see our colleagues process what's working, what's not, and how we could improve our services. We have increased our volume of cases this year by 260%. We went from working on 18 separate cases last year to 54 this year. This is also due to the grant. We are thrilled to be able to start to make an impact in the community and look forward to continuing the growth.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA

The Sexual Assault Domestic Violence (SADV) program's regular educational programs, policy work and law enforcement trainings would not have occurred at the level and frequency that they have with Campus Program funding. We would not have been able to hire 2 positions to focus on SADV and the crisis intervention/case management for survivors would be severely limited. Our focus would have been occasional, large-scale programming but the more effective programming requires sufficient dosage. This would not occur without OVW funding. We have also been able to emerge as a model for other HBCUs who are looking to address SADV on their campuses. Our SADV Coordinator conducted a training for other HBCUs via video-conferencing on how to launch a program like this on their campus, particularly on how to build a [community coordinated response]. The SADV Coordinator also conducted a training for our statewide sexual violence campus consortium on how to move a sexual misconduct policy through the campus system for approval. All of these important activities are possible because of Campus Program funding.

NC Central University Durham, NC

Technical Assistance

OVW partnered with California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA), East Central University (ECU), Mississippi Coalition Against Sexual Assault, Tougaloo College, Green Dot, Inc., and Clery Center for Security on Campus to provide technical assistance to recipients of OVW Campus Program grants. The activities of these technical assistance providers are outlined below:

California Coalition Against Sexual Assault

The California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA), founded in 1980 by a coalition of rape crisis centers, provides leadership, vision and resources to rape crisis centers, individuals and other entities committed to ending sexual violence by engaging local, national and global stakeholders via technology, advocacy, training and capacity development. CALCASA has served as a technical assistance provider for Campus grantees since the inception of OVW's Campus Program by providing expertise related to the response and prevention of

sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking on college campuses, and is currently focusing its work on the support of grantees that are developing victim-centered, coordinated community response teams. CALCASA engaged in the following training and technical assistance activities in 2012:

1. provided basic and advanced training to Campus Program grantees on the importance of developing an effective coordinated community response to violence against women on campus;
2. facilitated and hosted web conferences on emerging issues in responding to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking on campus (Engaging Campuses and Communities for Sexual Assault Awareness Month, Working with Queer Identified Students Who Have Experienced Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence or Stalking on Campus, Engaging Students on your Coordinated Community Response Team, Mandatory Reporting on College Campuses, Planning for National Stalking Awareness Month On Campus, Trauma Survivors and Law Enforcement);
3. provided on-going technical assistance by telephone, in person and email on specific needs of the particular grantee;
4. provided a dedicated listserv enabling grantees to utilize peer learning as a resource for the day to day implementation of their projects;
5. organized and facilitated the FY 2012 New Grantee Orientation for new campus grantees that took place in Washington D.C. December 4 – 6, 2012, with more than 55 attendees from the newly funded universities; and
6. maintained the Campus Program grantee website as a resource for grantees on emerging issues related to sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking on campus.

Black Women’s Blueprint/ National Organization of Sisters of Color Ending Sexual Assault

Black Women’s Blueprint, Inc. (BWB), a national organization addressing violence against women in Black communities and the National Organization of Sisters of Color Ending Sexual Assault (SCESA), a national organization addressing sexual assault in Communities of Color, partnered to provide targeted culturally specific technical assistance for Historically Black

Colleges and Universities (HBCUs), this included individualized assistance, feedback on educational materials and training curricula. In 2012, BWB/SCESA held a meeting for all HBCU grantees to provide information critical to their efforts to address violence against women issues on campus. In addition, BWB/SCESA facilitated a conference call to share information on the OVW Campus Program with HBCU potential grantees as well as participated in the White House Initiative on HBCUs which included an annual meeting and a nationwide webinar addressing campus safety and violence against women.

Green Dot, Inc.

Green Dot, Inc. is a non-profit organization whose mission is to dramatically reduce rates of power-based personal violence (including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, stalking violence, child abuse, bullying and elder abuse). Nationally known for its evidence-based bystander program and model for community mobilization, Green Dot provides consultation, training and curriculum development for colleges, universities, community-based groups, coalitions, and government agencies to prepare them to implement effective violence prevention strategies. In 2012, Green Dot provided technical assistance to assist grantees in meeting the mandatory requirement of establishing mandatory prevention and education programming for all incoming students. Specifically, Green Dot collaborated with experts in the field and analyzed existing research to build the curriculum for a developmentally appropriate Training Institute. Green Dot presented at new grantee orientation and hosted a webinar for all campus grantees. Green Dot provided extensive technical assistance to 40 schools (ranging from comprehensive reviews of programming materials to campus-specific webinars for implementation teams). In addition to the direct provision of technical assistance, Green Dot began to outline future directions for training and technical assistance for the campus grant

program that build grantee’s foundational knowledge and skills to enable them to develop research-informed, sustainable prevention programs.

East Central University

East Central University's Safety Training and Technical Assistance for Administrators, Boards, and Law Enforcement Campus Program (STTAABLE Campus Program) has more than ten years of focused experience, success in partnerships, and solid expertise in law enforcement training and campus prevention and response related to interpersonal violence. STTAABLE, through collaboration and partnership with state and national law enforcement agencies, provides training and technical assistance to colleges and universities and their security/law enforcement departments in a targeted approach to campus-related interpersonal violence. STTAABLE worked with designated Campus Program Technical Assistance providers to revise and update a technical assistance needs assessment for OVW grantees to identify the most significant training needs for their institution. This technical assistance also modified the law enforcement institute content and framework based on grantee evaluations and trends and provided technical assistance to numerous campus grantees via phone, email and in-person meetings. STAABLE conducted follow-up related to the National Summit on Campus Safety for College and University Presidents for campus leadership and coordinated a webinar for OVW campus grantees entitled “Trauma Survivors and Law Enforcement: Unintended Consequences and Righting the Ship.”

Clery Center for Security on Campus

The Clery Center for Security On Campus (Clery Center) is a nonprofit organization dedicated to preventing violence, substance abuse and other crimes on college and university campuses across the United States, and to compassionately assist the victims of these crimes.

The Clery Center's model for social change is built on the fundamental belief that collaboration among key stakeholders will create safer campus communities. In 2012, the Clery Center worked in cooperation with OVW staff to finalize a campus assessment tool for OVW's use during grant monitoring visits with program grantees. The tool serves as an instrument to assist OVW to determine the successes, challenges, and technical assistance needed by grantees to effectively implement Clery Act requirements.⁶ Clery Center staff and faculty presented a one-day, pre-institute training in Birmingham, Alabama in February 2012. This session focused on the technical requirements of the Clery Act and how they relate to responding and preventing sexual violence on campus. Clery Center staff also worked with campus grantees around any challenges with compliance with the Act. In 2012, Clery Center staff responded to 29 requests for technical assistance.

Additional Information

Section 485(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 requires institutions of higher education receiving federal student financial aid funds to submit an annual report to the Department of Education on the number and types of crimes occurring on and near campuses. Section 826(d) (4) (D) of the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1998 requires information from the Department of Education crime reports to be included in the annual report to Congress on the Campus Program. Information concerning the campus crime statistics for the individual campuses receiving Campus Program funds in 2012 can be found at the Department of Education website: <http://ope.ed.gov/security>.

⁶The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (20 USC § 1092(f)) requires colleges and universities across the United States to disclose information about crime on and around their campuses. The law is tied to an institution's participation in federal student financial aid programs and it applies to most institutions of higher education both public and private. The Act is enforced by the United States Department of Education.

Future Activities

Campus Program grantees must create a coordinated community response to violence against women on campuses and should adopt policies and protocols that treat sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking as serious criminal offenses and develop victim services and programs that make victim safety, offender accountability, and prevention of such crimes a high priority. Through their policies, protocols, and actions, colleges and universities can demonstrate to every student that violence against women in any form will not be tolerated, and that sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking are crimes with serious consequences. The success of the Campus Program depends on its grantees' ability to address the issues that are of greatest concern on their own campuses. In FY 2013, OVW made awards to institutions of higher education under the statutory criteria of VAWA 2005 (see Appendix E). The activities of these grantees will be addressed in future reports to Congress.

Appendix A:
Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2009 Awards

Grantee	State/ Territory	Type	Amount (in \$)
Arizona Western College	Arizona	Public	499,976
Regents of the University of California	California	Public	299,756
Regents of the University of California, U.C. San Diego	California	Public	299,911
Howard University	District of Columbia	Private	434,223
Augusta State University	Georgia	Public	300,000
Loyola University Chicago	Illinois	Private	300,000
University of Illinois at Chicago	Illinois	Public	275,000
Saint Mary's College	Indiana	Private	299,893
Eastern Kentucky University	Kentucky	Public	299,989
University of Louisiana at Monroe	Louisiana	Public	299,995
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Massachusetts	Private	293,022
Northeastern University	Massachusetts	Private	299,884
Trustees of Clark University	Massachusetts	Private	296,988
University of Maryland	Maryland	Public	500,000
University of Southern Maine	Maine	Public	300,000
University of Mississippi	Mississippi	Public	299,986
North Carolina Central University	North Carolina	Public	299,833
North Carolina State University	North Carolina	Public	294,943
University of North Carolina Wilmington	North Carolina	Public	299,968
Bergen Community College	New Jersey	Public	300,000
New Mexico Highlands University	New Mexico	Public	299,192

Board of Regents, Nevada System of Higher Education, on behalf of University of Nevada, Las Vegas	Nevada	Public	299,960
Research Foundation of SUNY	New York	Public	298,276
Research Foundation of SUNY/Buffalo State College	New York	Public	300,000
Ohio University	Ohio	Public	300,000
Indiana University of Pennsylvania Research Institute	Pennsylvania	Public	274,886
Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Public	299,545
Millersville University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Public	299,371
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Public	251,222
Universidad del Este	Puerto Rico	Private	299,984
University of Tennessee Health Science Center	Tennessee	Public	299,495
Washington State University	Washington	Public	299,998
Total			\$10,015,296

Appendix B:
Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2010 Awards

Grantee	State/ Territory	Type	Amount (in \$)
Regents of the University of Colorado, University of Colorado at Colorado Springs	Colorado	Public	499,645
Howard University	District of Columbia	Private	300,000
University of Guam	Guam	Public	300,000
Board of Trustees of Western Illinois University	Illinois	Public	300,000
Northern Illinois University	Illinois	Public	299,724
DePaul University	Indiana	Private	299,006
Fitchburg State University	Massachusetts	Public	300,000
Grand Valley State University	Michigan	Public	265,129
University of Missouri–Kansas City	Missouri	Public	449,975
Mississippi State University	Mississippi	Public	300,000
Johnson C. Smith University	North Carolina	Private	299,270
United Tribes Technical College	North Dakota	Tribal	245,000
William Paterson University	New Jersey	Public	299,464
Marietta College	Ohio	Private	300,000
Western Oregon University	Oregon	Public	299,992
Dickinson College	Pennsylvania	Private	298,037
Winthrop University	South Carolina	Public	299,209
Texas A&M University–Commerce	Texas	Public	282,478
University of Vermont and State Agricultural College	Vermont	Public	108,955
Pacific Lutheran University	Washington	Private	249,677
Total			\$5,995,561

Appendix C:
Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2011 Awards

Grantee	State/ Territory	Type	Amount (in \$)
Alabama State University	Alabama	Public	300,000
Cal Poly Pomona Foundation, Inc.	California	Public	199,991
University of California, Irvine	California	Public	299,993
University of California, Santa Barbara	California	Public	297,799
University of New Haven	Connecticut	Private	299,474
University of Delaware	Delaware	Public	498,138
University of Iowa	Iowa	Public	299,994
Northwestern University	Illinois	Private	299,935
Gateway Community and Technical College	Kentucky	Public	300,000
Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, Shreveport	Louisiana	Public	300,000
Southern University and A&M College	Louisiana	Public	268,963
St. John's University, New York	New York	Private	300,000
East Central University	Oklahoma	Public	200,000
University of Portland	Oregon	Public	158,722
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Public	147,540
Gannon University	Pennsylvania	Private	298,638
University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras	Puerto Rico	Public	300,000
Lone Star College System	Texas	Public	300,000
North Central Texas College	Texas	Public	300,000

Prairie View A&M University	Texas	Public (HBCU)	225,000
The University of Texas–Pan American	Texas	Public	299,998
University of Houston	Texas	Public	299,758
Utah State University	Utah	Public	297,230
Carilion Medical Center DBA College Health Science	Virginia	Private	240,750
Norfolk State University	Virginia	Public	200,000
Washington State University	Washington	Public	300,000
Total			\$7,231,923

**Appendix D:
Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2012 Awards**

Grantee	State/ Territory	Type	Amount (in \$)
Bucknell University	Pennsylvania	Private	299,818
College of St. Scholastica, Inc.	Minnesota	Private	299,994
Fairmont State University	West Virginia	School Consortium	499,968
Gallaudet University	District of Columbia	Private	300,00
Humboldt State University Sponsored Programs Foundation	California	Public	248,819
Joliet Junior College	Illinois	Public	297,196
Loyola University of Chicago	Illinois	Private	270,000
Minot State University	North Dakota	Public	300,000
North Carolina Central University	North Carolina	Public	268,445
North Central Texas College	Texas	School Consortium	200,000
Ohio University	Ohio	Public	300,000
Old Dominion University Research Foundation	Virginia	Public	300,000
The Regents of the University of California	California	Public	269,871.30
Samford University	Alabama	School Consortium	499,551
Trustees of Clark University	Massachusetts	School Consortium	499,962.48
The University of Mississippi	Mississippi	Public	253,250.99
The University of Montana	Montana	Public	297,731
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	North Carolina	Public	299,978
The University of Tennessee at Martin	Tennessee	Public	270,000

The Research Foundation of State University of New York	New York	Public	270,000
Virginia State University	Virginia	Public	298,437
Wheaton College	Massachusetts	Private	298,731
Total			\$6,811,752.77

Appendix E:
Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2013 Awards

Grantee	State/Territory	Type	Amount (in \$)
Occidental College	California	Private	299,999
Howard University	District of Columbia	Private	300,000
Georgia College and State University	Georgia	Public	299,686
North Central College	Illinois	Private	274,600
Northern Kentucky University	Kentucky	Public	299,989
University of Southern Maine	Maine	Public	300,000
Prince George's Community College	Maryland	Public	300,000
University of Massachusetts Amherst	Massachusetts	Public	269,906
University of Massachusetts Dartmouth	Massachusetts	Public	300,000
Grand Valley State University	Michigan	Public	281,252
Winona State University	Minnesota	Public	293,859
Salish Kootenai College	Montana	Private	35,000
University of Nevada Las Vegas	Nevada	Public	295,448
William Patterson University	New Jersey	Public	300,000
Nassau Community College	New York	Public	300,000
Bennett College	North Carolina	Private	407,242
Elizabeth City State University	North Carolina	Public	293,188
University of Findlay	Ohio	Private	287,000
Northeastern State University	Oklahoma	Public	297,778

Western Oregon University	Oregon	Public	299,922
Lincoln University	Pennsylvania	Public	35,000
University of Puerto Rico Carolina Campus	Puerto Rico	Public	35,000
Voorhees College	South Carolina	Private	300,000
Angelo State University	Texas	Public	35,000
University of Texas at Brownsville	Texas	Public	35,000
Middlebury College	Vermont	Private	272,258
University of Richmond	Virginia	Private	499,984
West Virginia University	West Virginia	Public	300,000
Total			7,337,181

**Appendix F:
Summary of the Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed by Campus Program Grantees
(January 1 – June 30, 2012 Reporting Period)⁷**

Statutory Purpose Areas	Number of Campus Program Grantees
To provide personnel, training, technical assistance, data collection, and other equipment with respect to the increased apprehension, investigation, and adjudication of people committing sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking on campus.	57
To develop and implement campus policies, protocols, and services that more effectively identify and respond to the crimes of domestic violence, dating, violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and to train campus administrators, campus security personnel, and personnel serving on campus disciplinary boards on such policies, protocols, and services.	79
To implement and operate education programs for the prevention of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking.	87
To develop, enlarge, or strengthen victim services programs on campuses of institutions involved, including programs providing legal, medical, or psychological counseling, for victims of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking, and to improve delivery of victim assistance on campus.	70
To create, disseminate, or otherwise provide assistance and information about victims' options on and off campus to bring disciplinary or other legal action, including assistance to victims in immigration matters.	68
To develop, install, or expand data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems, linking campus security to local law enforcement for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions with respect to the crimes of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking on campus.	7
To provide capital improvements (including improved lighting and communications facilities, but not including the construction of buildings) on campuses to address the crimes of dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking.	3
To support improved coordination among campus administrators, campus security personnel and local law enforcement to reduce sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking on campus.	79

⁷ Please note that most grantees report that they are involved in addressing multiple purpose areas.

**Summary of the Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed by Campus Program Grantees
(July 1 – December 31, 2012 Reporting Period)**

Statutory Purpose Areas	Number of Campus Program Grantees
To provide personnel, training, technical assistance, data collection, and other equipment with respect to the increased apprehension, investigation, and adjudication of people committing sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking on campus.	60
To develop and implement campus policies, protocols, and services that more effectively identify and respond to the crimes of domestic violence, dating, violence, sexual assault, and stalking, and to train campus administrators, campus security personnel, and personnel serving on campus disciplinary boards on such policies, protocols, and services.	79
To implement and operate education programs for the prevention of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking.	88
To develop, enlarge, or strengthen victim services programs on campuses of institutions involved, including programs providing legal, medical, or psychological counseling, for victims of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking, and to improve delivery of victim assistance on campus	73
To create, disseminate, or otherwise provide assistance and information about victims' options on and off campus to bring disciplinary or other legal action, including assistance to victims in immigration matters	67
To develop, install, or expand data collection and communication systems, including computerized systems, linking campus security to local law enforcement for the purpose of identifying and tracking arrests, protection orders, violations of protection orders, prosecutions, and convictions with respect to the crimes of sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking on campus	8
To provide capital improvements (including improved lighting and communications facilities, but not including the construction of buildings) on campuses to address the crimes of dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking	5
To support improved coordination among campus administrators, campus security personnel and local law enforcement to reduce sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking on campus	83

**Appendix G:
Summary of Victim Characteristics, Victims Served through Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus**

January 1 – June 30, 2012 Reporting Period

Number of victims seeking services: 1,117 victims

Total number of victims served: 1,110 victims

Total number of victims partially served: 4 victims

Total number of victims who could not be served: 3 victims

Nature of Victimization	Number of Victims Served or Partially Served*
Domestic violence/dating violence	526
Sexual assault	444
Stalking	144

“Partially served victims” are those victims who received some services provided under the Campus Program grant, but not all of the services that they needed.

Victims	Number of Victims Served or Partially Served
Female	1,077
Male	74
Unknown	23

Age of Victims	Number of Victims Served or Partially Served
13–17	7
18–24	798
25–59	234
60+	6
Unknown	69

Relationship to Offender	Sexual Assault Victims	Domestic Violence Victims	Stalking Victims
Current or former spouse or intimate partner	38	289	45
Other family or household member (e.g., in-law, grandparent, etc.)	44	34	6
Acquaintance (e.g., friend, neighbor, coworker, schoolmate, professor, etc.)	236	28	46
Current or former dating relationship	49	166	34
Stranger	53	0	11
Relationship unknown	57	19	14
Total *	477	536	156

*If a victim/survivor experienced more than one type of victimization and/or was victimized by more than one perpetrator, the victim/survivor was counted in all categories that applied.

Race/Ethnicity of Victims	Number of Victims Served and Partially Served
Black or African American	161
American Indian and Alaska Native	49
Asian	63
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	11
Hispanic or Latino	132
White	534
Unknown	169

Note: Some victims report more than one ethnicity.

Other Demographics of Victims	Number of Victims Served and Partially Served
Victims with disabilities	44
Victims with limited English proficiency	9
Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	6
Victims in rural areas	103

Crime Location	Number of Victims Reporting Crimes to Campus Police/Security	Number of Victims Reporting Crimes to Community Law Enforcement
On campus	206	17
Off campus	38	143

July 1 – December 31, 2012 Reporting Period

Number of victims seeking services: 1,223 victims

Total number of victims served: 1,203 victims

Total number of victims partially served: 13 victims

Total number of victims who could not be served: 7 victims

Nature of Victimization	Number of Victims Served or Partially Served
Domestic violence/dating violence	568
Sexual assault	515
Stalking	133

Victims	Number of Victims Served or Partially Served
Female	1,106
Male	104
Unknown	6

Age of Victims	Number of Victims Served or Partially Served
13–17	9
18–24	914
25–59	252
60+	8
Unknown	33

Relationship to Offender	Sexual Assault Victims	Domestic Violence Victims	Stalking Victims
Current or former spouse or intimate partner	18	266	31
Other family or household member (e.g., in-law, grandparent, etc.)	41	79	2
Acquaintance (e.g., friend, neighbor, coworker, schoolmate, professor etc.)	284	26	62
Current or former dating relationship	43	172	25
Stranger	46	0	10
Relationship unknown	96	35	9
Total *	528	578	139

*If a victim/survivor experienced more than one type of victimization and/or was victimized by more than one perpetrator, the victim/survivor was counted in all categories that applied.

Race/Ethnicity of Victims	Number of Victims Served and Partially Served
Black or African American	206
American Indian and Alaska Native	39
Asian	83
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	14
Hispanic or Latino	142
White	617
Unknown	115

Other Demographics of Victims	Number of Victims Served and Partially Served
Victims with disabilities	37
Victims with limited English proficiency	12
Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	21
Victims in rural areas	110

Crime Location	Number of Victims Reporting Crimes to Campus Police/Security	Number of Victims Reporting Crimes to Community Law Enforcement
On campus	159	26
Off campus	34	147