

**REPORT TO CONGRESS  
ON THE 2007 ACTIVITIES OF GRANTEEES  
RECEIVING FEDERAL FUNDS UNDER THE  
GRANTS TO REDUCE VIOLENT CRIMES  
AGAINST WOMEN ON CAMPUS PROGRAM**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I.	Introduction	Page 1
II.	Award Process	Page 1
III.	Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed by Campus Program Grantees	Page 2
IV.	Campus Program Grantees' Activities	Page 2
V.	Flagship Initiative	Page 6
VI.	Technical Assistance	Page 7
VII.	Additional Information	Page 7
VIII.	Future Activities	Page 8

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix A - Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, Fiscal Year 2005 Awards

Appendix B - Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, Fiscal Year 2006 Awards

Appendix C - Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, Fiscal Year 2007 Awards

Appendix D -Summary of the Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed by Campus Program Grantees

Appendix E - Summary of Victim Characteristics of Victims Served (January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007)

Appendix F - Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, Fiscal Year 2008 Awards

## **I. 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 domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

The statutory provisions of Section 826(d) (3) 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, information about the effectiveness of grant-funded 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.

## **II. Award Process**

The institutions of higher education that received awards in Federal Fiscal Year 2007 were geographically diverse and distributed between private and public institutions, as required by the Higher Education Amendments Act of 1998. Campuses receiving funds are located in rural, urban, and suburban communities with a broad range of student population size. 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 VAWA grant program expertise. The OVW Director made final funding decisions.

Congress appropriated \$9,052,000 for the Federal Fiscal Year 2005 Campus Program. OVW received approximately 166 applications requesting \$38,975,718 in funds. \$271,560 was set aside for management and administration, \$200,000 for peer review and \$1,500,000 for technical assistance. Of the 166 applications received, 31 were recommended for funding, totaling approximately \$7,051,762. This represented funding for 24 new grants and seven continuation grants. The enclosed chart (Appendix A) lists each of the institutions that received awards and the award amounts for the Federal Fiscal Year 2005 grants.

Congress appropriated \$8,938,000 for the Federal Fiscal Year 2006 Campus Program. OVW received approximately 105 applications requesting \$20,983,635 in funds. \$250,000 was set aside for technical assistance, \$270,000 for peer review and \$268,140 for management and

administration. Of the 105 applications received, 39 were recommended for funding, totaling approximately \$8,668,156. This represented funding for 19 new grants and 20 continuation grants. The enclosed chart (Appendix B) lists each of the institutions that received awards and the award amounts for the Federal Fiscal Year 2006 grants.

Congress appropriated \$8,962,000 for the Federal Fiscal Year 2007 Campus Program. OVW received approximately 117 applications requesting \$41,799,860 in funds. \$448,100 was set aside for technical assistance, \$100,000 for peer review and \$ 291,265 for management and administration. Of the 117 applications received, 17 were recommended for funding, totaling approximately \$8,157,975. This represented funding for 11 new grants and 6 continuation grants. The enclosed chart (Appendix C) lists each of the institutions that received awards and the award amounts for the Federal Fiscal Year 2007 grants.

### **III. Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed by Campus Program Grantees**

The Higher Education Amendments Act of 1998 identifies specific statutory purpose areas for the Campus Program. Based on these purpose areas, OVW awarded grants to colleges and universities to establish coordinated campus and community-based responses to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking and to improve coordination between campus entities, local criminal justice agencies, nonprofit, non-governmental victim services agencies. Grant funds also supported programs designed to establish and enhance support services for victims on campus. Institutions received funds to create and revise policies and protocols regarding violence against women. For example, funds supported the establishment of formal procedures for responding to victims' reports of sexual assault. Grants were also awarded to campuses seeking to develop comprehensive education programs for the prevention of violent crimes against women and the development and expansion of student codes of conduct. Appendix D details the statutory purpose areas addressed by activities supported with Campus Program funds from July 1 through December 31, 2007.

### **IV. Campus Program Grantees' Activities**

Working in collaboration with campus and community-based victim advocacy organizations, the Campus Program grantees have developed mandatory prevention and education programs about violence against women for incoming students. An estimated 53,946 incoming students were educated with Campus Program funds from January 1, 2007 to June 30, 2007. An estimated 107,530 incoming students were educated with Campus Program funds from July 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007. Campus Program funds supported a wide range of programs for incoming students. Topics of prevention and education program events included: sexual assault prevention; dating violence prevention; domestic violence prevention; stalking prevention; and, overviews of, dynamics of, and services for dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Campuses used grant funds to create curricula for training programs, to hire education coordinators, and to train volunteer peer educators to implement the training. From January 1, 2007 through June 30, 2007, Campus Program funds supported 115

full-time employees including 38 program coordinators, 19 victim advocates, 16 administrators, and 24 trainers/educators. From July 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007, Campus Program funds supported 102 full-time employees including 31 program coordinators, 13 victim advocates, 15 administrators, trainers/educators and 8 support staff members.

Under the minimum requirements for the Campus Program, grantees are required to train campus law enforcement or public safety personnel to respond effectively in domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking cases. They are also required to strengthen programs to train 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 violent crimes against women, 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. An estimated 698 campus law enforcement officials have been trained with Campus Program funds and another 546 trained with funding from another source from January 1, 2007 to June 30, 2007. An estimated 307 campus judicial/disciplinary board members have been trained with Campus Program funds and another 157 trained with funding from another source from January 1, 2007 to June 30, 2007. An estimated 476 campus law enforcement officials have been trained with Campus Program funds and another 670 trained with funding from another source from July 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007. An estimated 411 campus judicial/disciplinary board members have been trained with Campus Program funds and another 236 trained with funding from another source from July 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007. In all of these trainings, the most frequent topics of training include: sexual assault overview, dynamics and services; dating violence overview, dynamics and services; stalking overview, dynamics, and services; campus police/security response; domestic violence overview, dynamics, and services; drug facilitated sexual assault; disciplinary/ judicial board response; coordinated community response; and confidentiality.

Campus Program funds have supported campus education projects including Sexual Assault Awareness Month, “tabling” at public events, “Take Back the Night” marches, media campaigns, and “Clothesline Projects”. Grantees have also used Campus Program funds to develop, install, and expand data collection and communication systems to enhance victim safety.

From January 1, 2007 through June 30, 2007, approximately 1,517 victims were provided services supported by Campus Program funds and 36 victims were partially served. From July 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007, 1,237 victims were served and 10 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, and response to hotline calls, support group/counseling services, and legal advocacy/court accompaniment. Additional information on the victims served with Campus Program funds during 2007 is contained in Appendix E.

The number of victims served is far greater than the number of crimes reported by victims. Campuses reported 684 offenses of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking were reported during the time period of January 1, 2007 through June 30, 2007, with 128 offenses resulting in criminal charges being filed in the local jurisdiction and 170 offenses resulting in campus disciplinary or judicial board actions. From July 1, 2007 through December 31, 2007, campuses report that 601 offenses of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking were reported, with 131 offenses resulting in criminal charges being filed in the local jurisdiction and 178 offenses resulting in campus disciplinary or judicial board actions.

Grantees unanimously report that programs and services supported by funds from the Campus Program have had a tremendous impact on their campuses. The following quotations from grantees were collected from the narrative section of their Semi-Annual Progress Reports:

#### Illinois Valley Community College

“Campus program funding has allowed us to 1) increase communication between the entire campus community and ADV & SAS, our local domestic violence and sexual assault program 2) provide an avenue for educating students, faculty, staff and administrators; and 3) through Campus Institutes and webinars, provide opportunities to network with other Campus grantees to learn about other innovative programming that could be applied to Illinois Valley Community College. Due to this funding, two ADV & SAS staff, a full-time counselor and a part-time project coordinator/educator, are housed in offices on campus conveniently located within the college's Counseling Center. This arrangement has created a very strong and fluid relationship between the college and the project staff. This relationship has also significantly helped to strengthen victim support and services and has created greater opportunity to provide presentations and trainings on the topics and issues surrounding violence against women.”

#### Texas Woman's University

“Numerous activities have been made possible with funding. Most significantly, prior to funding, victims of violence were not identified and were not offered specialized services. Funding allowed these victims to be identified and referred to appropriate services. Counseling and advocacy services tailored to victims of violence are currently available and being utilized and the demand for such services is growing quickly. Organized education efforts were not possible prior to funding. No information on violence against women was disseminated at orientations or at university forums, and faculty and staff were not provided with consistent training and information on responding appropriately to victim outcries. The Judicial Review Board had never received specialized training on violence issues prior to funding. Prior to funding, it would have been very

difficult to organize and maintain a campus community response team addressing violence against women. Funding has ensured buy-in from campus components, as well as community partners. TWU had no method of collecting and monitoring reports and incidences of violence prior to funding, and funding has allowed that critical function to begin. Funding has also led to changes in policies across campus, from the Campus Department of Public Safety to the Counseling Center. Such changes would not have occurred prior to funding.”

#### The University of Tennessee

“[O]ur program started with hardly any existing programming specifically designed to address violence against women. All of our crisis intervention services that specifically address victims of violence against women are grant funded. All of the educational materials used in the programming are grant funded. All of the police training in this area has been granted funded. All of the training for faculty, staff, and students has been grant funded. In sum, without these funds, these programs and services would either not exist or would be fragmented and lack any coordinated message or goal, making it less likely that services and programs are victim centered in ways that require offender accountability. When the university had a highly publicized gang rape in Fall 2005, the Chancellor was able to point to the program as clear evidence of our commitment to and services for victims. He also has used the existing program to lay the foundation for a new Women's Center that is still in its early stages of development. The grant funds were used to create a half time state funded staff position which never would have happened without the OVW funds. State funding of a position and creating a Women's Center are concrete steps toward sustainability which will ensure that at least some programming will endure regardless of federal funding.”

#### Gonzaga University

Campus Program funding has provided substantial credibility for sexual and relationship violence prevention and support efforts amongst Gonzaga University administrators, staff and faculty and also at the city and state level. It has opened doors for partnership and collaboration in new and innovative ways. With DOJ grant funds we have been able to hire part time support staff, purchase necessary equipment and materials, develop victim resources, training materials and educational programs. Campus Program funds have enabled us to provide training opportunities for campus security as well as pay for consultation services from local and nationally recognized experts. In addition, campus program funds are helping to strengthen the infrastructure which will be necessary to sustain prevention and response efforts at this institution. This is achieved by providing services that have enhanced the overall function and reputation of the Institution

including reducing risks and potential litigation. Prior to receiving DOJ grant funds, the prevention efforts on campus were inconsistent and over time those who cared about the issues became disillusioned. This grant has provided funds to consult with area experts, provide community support services for victims and has provided a foundation upon which we can build partnerships that will last beyond the funding period. The Technical Institutes, webinars and resource sharing amongst grant recipients has provided valuable support, information and tools to carry out our work with minimal expenditure. With DOJ grant funds we have been able to tailor support services toward the specific needs of underserved student populations. One example is the development of our international student orientation presentation on relationships in the U.S. Funding has provided a way for us to reach this underserved student population with prevention education and printed resources in their language. With the knowledge that Asian women are often targeted as victims and that they are less likely to report, it is reassuring to know that we are providing valuable prevention education. Campus program funds have allowed us to develop the following: a new judicial/discipline board training, an Intimate Partner Violence training curriculum for campus security and residence life staff, resource materials for GLBTQ students, enhanced response training, website, brochures, posters, policy and procedure revisions, a multidisciplinary advisory committee, Clery Act training, Student surveys, a data collection system, new student orientation, a panel discussion on the causes of rape and much more. Without these funds we would be operating from a very limited support and resource base and we would not be able to support students in a consistent and comprehensive manner.”

## **V. Flagship Initiative**

The 2007 Campus Program Solicitation announced a Flagship Special Initiative Project for the Campus Program. These projects would consist of two or more institutions of higher education that share and are accountable to a common legislature, Board of Regents, governing board, or system with enforcement capabilities. The principal institution, a past OVW grantee, would provide leadership to other schools within their system, sharing key practices, policies, project activities, and products. With this new initiative, OVW hopes to maximize the benefits of successful implementation of campus program grants for entire state university systems while further leveraging federal dollars.

OVW held discussions with applicants during the week of April 23-27<sup>th</sup>, 2007. The applicants were represented by project partners including representatives of the governing body, lead agency, law enforcement, victim services, and judicial board members. On May 24, 2007, four Flagships projects from California, Puerto Rico, Iowa and Oklahoma, representing 30 colleges and universities, were selected for funding. For the remainder of 2007, these Flagship Projects engaged in planning activities, which included strategic planning and hiring staff for the projects. OVW looks forward to reporting in more detail on implementation activities in future reports.

## **VI. Technical Assistance**

In December 1999, OVW entered into a cooperative agreement with the California Coalition Against Sexual Assault (CALCASA) to provide technical assistance to recipients of grants under the Campus Program. CALCASA coordinates and conducts semi-annual technical assistance institutes. These institutes are hosted by a grantee campus and attended by a mandatory multi-disciplinary team of four individuals from each grantee campus, including the project director, a representative of campus law enforcement, judicial affairs officers, and a fourth representative from internal/external partners that can include administration, evaluators, students, representatives from community-based victim services partner agencies, and local law enforcement officers or prosecutors. In 2007, CALCASA held a total of two institutes with over 300 participants at each institute.

The institutes provide an opportunity for a multi-disciplinary team from each campus community to receive training at the same time and to formulate strategies, policies, and protocols that are tailored to the unique needs of their own campuses. Some grantees have reported that attendance of the multi-disciplinary team at the institutes was the first time the members had met as a group specifically to address issues involving violence against women on their respective campuses. At the January 2007 Institute, CALCASA added a daylong Training for Law Enforcement; as well as a one-day pre-institute training on Judicial Affairs at the July 2007 Institute.

CALCASA staff is also committed to conducting at least one on-site visit to each new grantee campus. The technical assistance program is augmented further with an electronic listserv moderated by CALCASA staff, information packets, one-on-one technical assistance as requested by grantees and OVW staff, as well as continue hosting webinars with grantees. This use of this technology allows the grantees to continue interacting more fully with each other during the presentation.

Since its inception, the listserv maintained by CALCASA has received over 1,200 messages. CALCASA reports that the topics upon which they most frequently receive technical assistance requests continue to be: law enforcement training; working with athletes; campus judicial policies and procedures, particularly on the topics of Title IX, Clery Act, and FERPA; and bystander prevention/intervention, particularly with college-aged men.

## **VII. 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) (3) (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 2007 Campus Program grants can be found at the Department of Education

website: <http://ope.ed.gov/security> (accessed 05/27/09).

### **VIII. Future Activities**

The Campus Program is enabling campus communities to treat violent crimes against women as serious offenses and to develop programs that make victim safety, offender accountability, and the prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault and stalking a high priority. The success of the Campus Program rests on the grantees' ability to address the issues that are of greatest concern on their own campuses.

In 2005, Congress recognized the importance of this grant program when it reauthorized funding for the program through 2011. The statute specified that grants would be three years long and in amounts of up to \$500,000 for individual campuses and up to one million dollars for consortia of institutions of higher education. The Violence Against Women Act of 2005 (VAWA 2005) also required that up to 20% of funds in each grant be used for victim services and mandated that applicants include proof of collaboration with victim service programs. In 2008, OVW awarded grants to 21 institutions of higher education under the statutory criteria of VAWA 2005. (See Appendix F). The activities of these grantees will be addressed in future reports to Congress.

# **APPENDIX A**

**Appendix A**  
**Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus**  
**Fiscal Year 2005 Awards<sup>1</sup>**

Grantee	Location	Type	Amount
Ozarka College	Arkansas	Public	\$200,000
The Regents of the University of California (Davis)	California	Public	\$297,344
California State University Fresno Foundation	California	Public	\$199,796
Santa Clara University	California	Private	\$190,214
Illinois Valley Community College	Illinois	Public	\$197,903
Ball State University	Indiana	Public	\$200,000
Baker University	Kansas	Private	\$200,000
Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Massachusetts	Private	\$199,934
Trustees of Tufts College	Massachusetts	Private	\$306,456
Regents of the University of Minnesota	Minnesota	Public	\$298,524
Mississippi Valley State University	Mississippi	Public	\$200,000
Northwest Missouri State University	Missouri	Public	\$199,215
Central Missouri State University	Missouri	Public	\$200,000
The College of New Jersey	New Jersey	Public	\$181,575

---

<sup>1</sup>These grant award amounts were provided by the Office of Justice Programs' Grants Management System.

Montclair State University	New Jersey	Public	\$200,000
St. Lawrence University	New York	Private	\$200,000
Plattsburgh State University Of New York Through the Research Foundation of SUNY	New York	Public	\$395,000
Johnson C Smith University	North Carolina	Private	\$199,947
Elizabeth City State University	North Carolina	Public	\$199,994
University of Scranton	Pennsylvania	Private	\$191,052
University of South Dakota	South Dakota	Public	\$199,321
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University	Virginia	Public	\$299,819
Norfolk State University	Virginia	Public	\$200,000
University of Tennessee	Tennessee	Public	\$199,887
The University of Texas at Austin	Texas	Public	\$199,410
Western Washington University	Washington	Public	\$299,301
Pacific Lutheran University	Washington	Private	\$199,975
University of Wyoming	Wyoming	Public	\$199,221

## APPENDIX B

**Appendix B**  
**Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus**  
**Fiscal Year 2006 Awards<sup>2</sup>**

<b>Grantee</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Arizona Western College	Arizona	Public	\$399,714
Cal Poly Pomona	California	Public	\$199,922
California State University –Long Beach	California	Public	\$200,000
University of California	California	Public	\$199,690
Stanford University	California	Private	\$213,814
University of Southern California	California	Private	\$397,641
University of Hawaii	Hawaii	Public	\$199,999
University of Idaho	Idaho	Public	\$236,474
University of Illinois	Illinois	Public	\$200,799
University of Iowa	Iowa	Public	\$199,241
University of Kentucky	Kentucky	Public	\$214,848
Northeastern University	Massachusetts	Private	\$200,000
University of Michigan	Michigan	Public	\$199,733
Michigan State University	Michigan	Public	\$200,000
University of Minnesota	Minnesota	Public	\$129,765
Southeast Missouri State	Missouri	Public	\$199,820

<sup>2</sup>These grant award amounts were provided by the Office of Justice Programs' Grants Management System.

Montana State University	Montana	Public	\$165,063
State University of New York/ Buffalo State College	New York	Public	\$195,719
State University of New York- Old Westbury	New York	Public	\$199,871
State University of New York/ Research Foundation- Fredonia	New York	Public	\$199,996
Research Foundation of State University of New York at Purchase College	New York	Public	\$189,935
Vassar College	New York	Private	\$194,309
Warren Wilson College	North Carolina	Private	\$191,151
East Central University	Oklahoma	Public	\$229,959
Eastern Oklahoma State College	Oklahoma	Public	\$200,000
California University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Public	\$199,756
Indiana University of Pennsylvania Research Institute	Pennsylvania	Public	\$201,267
Slippery Rock University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Public	\$228,953
Crichton College	Tennessee	Private	\$399,889
Collin County Community College	Texas	Public	\$206,247
Texas Woman's University	Texas	Public	\$199,479
University of Vermont and State Agricultural College	Vermont	Public	\$199,912

Virginia Commonwealth University	Virginia	Public	\$200,000
Gonzaga University	Washington	Private-Faith Based	\$189,648
Eastern Washington University	Washington	Public	\$200,000
University of Wisconsin- Stout	Wisconsin	Public	\$199,997
University of Wisconsin- LaCrosse	Wisconsin	Public	\$402,153

# APPENDIX C

**Appendix C**  
**Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus**  
**Fiscal Year 2007 Awards<sup>3</sup>**

<b>Grantee</b>	<b>State / Territory</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Amount</b>
University of California-Davis	California	Public	\$999,369
University of Guam	Guam	Public	\$300,000
University of Northern Iowa	Iowa	Public	\$999,909
St. Cloud State	Minnesota	Public	\$299,500
University of Minnesota	Minnesota	Public	\$200,000
The Curators of the University of Missouri	Missouri	Public	\$296,552
University of Missouri, Kansas City	Missouri	Public	\$289,817
Elizabeth City State University	North Carolina	Public	\$279,293
United Tribes Technical College	North Dakota	Public	\$299,512
St. Lawrence University	New York	Private	\$290,000
The College of Saint Rose	New York	Private	\$448,781
East Central University	Oklahoma	Public	\$999,999
University of Puerto Rico Humacao	Puerto Rico	Public	\$1,000,000
University of Sioux	South Dakota	Private	\$300,00

---

<sup>3</sup>These grant award amounts were provided by the Office of Justice Programs' Grants Management System

Falls			
University of South Dakota	South Dakota	Public	\$290,000
Pacific Lutheran University	Washington	Private	\$289,993
West Virginia State University	West Virginia	Public	\$282,886

# **APPENDIX D**

**Appendix D**  
**Summary of the Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed by Campus Program Grantees**  
 (July 1, 2007 -December 31, 2007 Reporting Period)

<b>Statutory Purpose Areas</b>	<b>Number of Campus Program Grantees</b>
To provide personnel, training, technical assistance, data collection, and other equipment with respect to the increased apprehension, investigation, and adjudication of persons committing violent crimes against women on campus	42
Train campus administrators, campus security personnel, and personnel serving on campus disciplinary or judicial boards to more effectively identify and respond to violent crimes against women on campus, including the crimes of dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking	65
Implement and operate education programs for the prevention of violent crimes against women	66
Develop, enlarge, or strengthen support services programs, including medical or psychological counseling, for victims of sexual offense crimes	50
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	54
Develop and implement more effective campus policies, protocols, orders, and services specifically devoted to prevent, identify, and respond to violent crimes against women on campus, including the	59

crimes of dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking	
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 violent crimes against women on campus, including the crimes of dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking	6
Develop, enlarge, or strengthen victim services programs for the campus and to improve delivery of victim services on campus	64
Provide capital improvements (including improved lighting and communications facilities, but not including the construction of buildings) on campuses to address violent crimes against women on campus, including the crimes of dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, and stalking	6
Support improved coordination among campus administrators, campus security personnel, and local law enforcement to reduce violent crimes against women on campus	63

# **APPENDIX E**

## Appendix E Summary of Victim Characteristics

### Victims Served through Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus (January 1 through June 30, 2007 and July 1 through December 31, 2007)

**Number of Victims Seeking Services (01/01/07-06/30/07): 1,558 victims**

**Total Number of Victims Served: 1,517 victims**

**Total Number of Victims Partially Served:<sup>4</sup> 36 victims**

**Total Number of Victims Who Could Not Be Served: 5 victims**

Nature of Victimization	Domestic Violence	Sexual Assault	Stalking
Number of Victims Served and Partially Served	563	754	236

Victims	Female	Male	Unknown
Number of Victims Served and Partially Served	1,461	91	1

---

<sup>4</sup> “Partially Served” victims are those victims who received some service(s), but not all of the services they needed, if those services were the types of services that were provided under the Campus Program grant.

<b>Age of Victims</b>	<b>0-17</b>	<b>18-24</b>	<b>25-59</b>	<b>60+</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
<b>Number of Victims Served and Partially Served</b>	21	1,148	268	11	105

<b>Relationship to Offender</b>	<b>Sexual Assault Victims</b>	<b>Domestic Violence Victims</b>	<b>Stalking Victims</b>
<b>Current or Former Spouse or Intimate Partner</b>	167	321	77
<b>Other Family or Household Member ( e.g., in-law, grandparent, etc.)</b>	63	50	2
<b>Acquaintance (e.g., friend, neighbor, coworker, schoolmate, professor, etc.)</b>	368	19	105
<b>Dating Relationship</b>	65	162	34
<b>Stranger</b>	58		22
<b>Relationship</b>			

<b>Unknown/Other</b>	73	17	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	794	572	260

### **Race/Ethnicity of Victims**

(\*some victims report more than one ethnicity)

<b>Black or African American Victims</b>	158
<b>American Indian and Alaska Native Victims</b>	27
<b>Asian Victims</b>	130
<b>Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander Victims</b>	9
<b>Hispanic or Latino Victims</b>	84
<b>White Victims</b>	835
<b>Victims of Unknown Race/Ethnicity</b>	317

### **Other Demographics of Victims**

<b>Victims who are people with disabilities</b>	54
<b>Victims with limited English proficiency</b>	46
<b>Victims who are immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers</b>	21
<b>Victims who live in rural areas</b>	234

**Number of Victims Reporting Crimes**

<b>Where Crime Occurred</b>	<b>Campus police/Security</b>	<b>Community Law Enforcement</b>
<b>On-campus</b>	205	30
<b>Off-campus</b>	55	179

**Number of Victims Seeking Services (07/1/07-12/31/07):** 1,247 victims

**Total Number of Victims served:** 1,237 victims

**Total Number of Victims partially served:** 10 victims

**Total Number of Victims who could not be served:** 0 victim

<b>Nature of Victimization</b>	<b>Domestic Violence</b>	<b>Sexual Assault</b>	<b>Stalking</b>
<b>Number of Victims Served and Partially Served</b>	640	444	163

<b>Victims</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
<b>Number of Victims Served and Partially Served</b>	1,121	80	46

<b>Age of Victims</b>	<b>0-17</b>	<b>18-24</b>	<b>25-59</b>	<b>60+</b>	<b>Unknown</b>
<b>Number of Victims Served and Partially Served</b>	27	862	193	3	162

<b>Relationship to Offender</b>	<b>Sexual Assault Victims</b>	<b>Domestic Violence Victims</b>	<b>Stalking Victims</b>
<b>Current or Former Spouse or Intimate Partner</b>	110	272	51
<b>Other Family or Household Member ( e.g., in-law, grandparent, etc.)</b>	55	47	4
<b>Acquaintance (e.g., friend, neighbor, coworker, schoolmate, professor, etc.)</b>	285	28	72
<b>Dating Relationship</b>	59	78	15
<b>Stranger</b>	58		11
<b>Relationship Unknown/Other</b>	104	48	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	671	473	173

### Race/Ethnicity of Victims

(\*some victims report more than one ethnicity)

<b>Black or African American Victims</b>	84
<b>American Indian and Alaska Native Victims</b>	24
<b>Asian Victims</b>	68
<b>Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander Victims</b>	4
<b>Hispanic or Latino Victims</b>	47
<b>White Victims</b>	652
<b>Victims of Unknown Race/Ethnicity</b>	387

### Other Demographics of Victims

<b>Victims who are people with disabilities</b>	46
<b>Victims with limited English proficiency</b>	16
<b>Victims who are immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers</b>	13
<b>Victims who live in rural areas</b>	189

**Number of Victims Reporting Crimes**

<b>Where Crime Occurred</b>	<b>Campus police/Security</b>	<b>Community Law Enforcement</b>
<b>On-campus</b>	175	27
<b>Off-campus</b>	72	138

(Please note that the information in this Appendix has been collected from Semi-annual Progress Reports covering a six-month period of January 1, 2007 to June 30, 2007 and July 1, 2007 to December 31, 2007 submitted by Campus Program grantees; also the numbers in the columns do not always match as some progress reports do not contain complete information for each question about victims)

**APPENDIX F**

**Appendix F**  
**Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus**  
**Fiscal Year 2008 Awards**

<b>Grantee</b>	<b>State / Territory</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University	California	Private	\$299,096
Cal Poly Pomona Foundation, Inc.	California	Private	\$300,000
The CSU, Chico Research Foundation	California	Public	\$471,529
University of Southern California	California	Public	\$499,999
Regents of the Univ. of Colorado, Univ. of Colorado Denver	Colorado	Public	\$500,000
University of Hawaii	Hawaii	Public	\$249,994
University of Kentucky Research Foundation	Kentucky	Public	\$178,709
Salisbury University	Maryland	Public	\$299,982
Central Michigan University	Michigan	Public	\$298,159
Michigan State University	Michigan	Public	\$224,987
Regents of the University of Michigan	Michigan	Public	\$274,954
Southeast Missouri State University	Missouri	Public	\$299,939
Jackson State University	Mississippi	Public	\$300,000
The Research Foundation of SUNY Albany	New York	Private	\$299,875
John Carroll University	Ohio	Private	\$298,996
East Central University	Oklahoma	Public	\$274,968

The Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania	Pennsylvania	Private	\$275,000
Texas Women's University	Texas	Public	\$299,896
Carilion Medical Center dba Jefferson College of Health Sciences	Virginia	Private	\$291,639
Norfolk State University	Virginia	Public	\$300,000
The Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System	Wisconsin	Public	\$300,000