

**REPORT TO CONGRESS**

**ON THE 2010 ACTIVITIES OF GRANTEES**

**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	4
Campus Program Grantee Activities	5
Technical Assistance	12
Flagship Initiative and Higher Education Association Special Initiative	13
Additional Information	17
Future Activities	18
Appendices	
Appendix A - Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2008 Awards	
Appendix B - Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2009 Awards	
Appendix C - Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2010 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, 2010 through December 31, 2010)	
Appendix F: Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2011 Awards	

## **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, 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 whose 2010 activities are described in this report received funding under solicitations from FY2008-FY2010.

## Award Process

As required by the Higher Education Amendments of 1998, the Campus Program grantees awarded funding in FY 2010 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 \$9,500,000 for the FY 2010 Campus Program. Additionally, the Campus Program had \$910,601.41 in carryover funding from FY 2009 for a total of \$10,410,601.41 in available funding for FY2010. OVW set aside \$2,090,000 for technical assistance, \$174,905.68 for management and administration, \$47,500 for evaluation, and \$2,100,000 for Flagship special projects. Thus, the total amount available for grants was \$5,998,195.73.

Of the 90 applications received, 20 were recommended for funding, totaling approximately \$5,995,561, leaving a balance of \$2,634.73. The recommendations represented funding for 17 new grants and 3 continuation grants. Three Flagship Initiative projects were funded as continuation projects as well. The enclosed chart (Appendix C) lists each of the institutions that received awards and the award amounts for the FY 2010 grants. Appendices A and B list each of the institutions that received awards and the award amounts for the FY 2008 and FY 2009 grants.

### **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 funding for 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, and nonprofit, nongovernmental victim services agencies.

Grant funds also sustain programs designed to establish and enhance support services for victims on campus. In FY 2010, institutions received funding to create and revise 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 comprehensive education programs for the prevention of violent crimes against women and to develop or expand upon 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, 2010.

### **Campus Program Grantees' Activities**

Working with campus and community-based victim advocacy organizations, the Campus Program grantees developed mandatory prevention and education programs on violence against women for incoming students. A reported 51,975 incoming students were educated with Campus Program funds from January to June 30, 2010. A reported 107,629 incoming students received education on violence against women from July 1 to December 31, 2010.

Campus Program funds supported a wide range of programs for incoming students including prevention and education program events addressing topics such as 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 also used grant funds to develop curricula for training programs, hire education coordinators, and train a reported 836 volunteer peer educators to implement the training. From January 1 through June 30, 2010, Campus Program funds supported 95 full-time employees, including 33.5 program coordinators, 13 victim advocates, 11 administrators, and 19 trainers/educators. From July 1 through December 31, 2010, Campus Program funds supported 97 full-time employees, including 36 program coordinators, 11 victim advocates, 10 administrators, and 21 trainers/educators.

Under the minimum requirements for the Campus Program, grantees must 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 training programs for members of campus disciplinary boards to respond effectively to charges of violence against women. Grantees are not required to use federal funds for this training and may use funds from other sources. 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.

From January 1 through June 30, 2010, an estimated 633 campus law enforcement officials and 218 campus judicial/disciplinary board members were trained with Campus Program funds, and 852 campus law enforcement officials and 153 judicial/disciplinary board members were trained with funding from other sources. From July 1 through December 31, 2010, an estimated 1,127 campus law enforcement officials and 86 campus judicial/disciplinary board members were trained with Campus Program funds, and 715 campus law enforcement officials and 41 campus judicial/disciplinary board members were trained with funding from other sources. The most frequent training topics included sexual assault, dating violence, domestic violence, and stalking (overviews, dynamics, and services); campus police/security response; drug-facilitated sexual assault; disciplinary/judicial board response; coordinated community response; and

confidentiality.

Campus Program funds have 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. Grantees also used Campus Program funds to develop, install, and expand data collection and communication systems to enhance victim safety.

From January 1, through June 30, 2010, 1,060 victims were provided services supported by Campus Program funds and 21 victims were partially served<sup>1</sup>. From July 1 through December 31, 2010, 1,156 victims were served and 39 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 FY 2010 is contained in appendix E.

The number of victims served is far greater than the number of crimes reported by victims to campus security. Campuses reported that 849 offenses of domestic violence, dating violence,

---

<sup>1</sup>Grantees are asked to provide an unduplicated count of victims and services during each reporting period. However, because of confidentiality and other recordkeeping considerations, there is no way to determine if an individual is receiving services in more than one grant reporting period. In certain categories, such as victims served, partially served, or not served, an individual victim may be reported in more than one semiannual reporting period. Because of this, many aggregate numbers are reported in two 6-month ranges. The OVW progress reports define victims/survivors served as those who received the service(s) they requested, if those services were provided under the grant or subgrant; and victims/survivors partially served as those who received some, but not all, of the services they requested, if those services were provided under the grant or subgrant.

sexual assault, and stalking were reported to campus security authorities from January 1 through June 30, 2010. Of those offenses, 141 resulted in criminal charges being filed in the local jurisdiction (17 percent), and 177 resulted in campus disciplinary or judicial board actions (21 percent). From July 1, 2010, through December 31, 2010, campuses reported 740 offenses of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking, with 144 offenses resulting in criminal charges being filed in the local jurisdiction (19 percent) and 184 resulting in campus disciplinary or judicial board actions (25 percent).

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:

*This grant has allowed our overall knowledge regarding domestic violence to expand. Domestic violence has been happening on this campus in the years passed, but it has not always come to light. Now, having had the grant in place for the past 3 years, awareness and accountability are a big part of this campus thanks to the OVW funding for a domestic violence advocate on campus. Because of the CCR team, the monthly meetings, and a concentrated effort towards safety, the United Tribes Technical College has definitely become a safer community. We are a small college campus in comparison to the mainstream colleges. We are located in a rural area and considered a tribal college. We are also extremely thankful to our partner program, the Abused Adult Resource Center. We could not have made the impact that we have without the help from the two local law enforcement agencies—the Burleigh County Sheriff's Department and the*

*Bismarck Police Department.*

United Tribes Technical College, North Dakota

*Grant funding has allowed this university to make the issues of domestic/dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking a priority on campus. The CVPP staff has been able to advocate for student victims on campus and the community and serve as an outlet for students in crisis. The Counseling Center now has a full-time staff member with experience of counseling victims of sexual assault and domestic violence. We also provide assistance to students who reported crimes by calling the appropriate office and asking for the status of their case. Funding has enabled us to bring in speakers, offer training programs, provide educational events. We have been able to send articles to faculty and staff and submit press releases to local media to raise awareness on campus and with the community. As a result of the press releases, the number of students at our events increased. We sponsored and cosponsored various events including two domestic violence vigils, movie and discussion nights, information tables, and health response programming for victims of sexual assault. CVPP started a support group for survivors of sexual assault, an outlet that did not previously exist. Staff brought together agencies for meetings and discussions. For example, CVPP brought the local women's center and the hospital together to discuss training options in regards to domestic violence and sexual assault.*

Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania

*In the last 6 months, 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 in the process of conducting our Bystander Prevention Program with all incoming undergraduate 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. Previously, all incoming students met in a large lecture hall to view a play and engage in limited discussion. Second, 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. Additionally, 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. Finally, the guidance we have received through OVW, CALCASA, and other Campus Program awardees on policy revisions has been invaluable. We are now in the process of creating*

*a much stronger code of conduct.*

Clark University, Massachusetts

*Grant funding has greatly increased the sexual and intimate partner violence and stalking prevention education on our campuses. Prior to receiving this funding, the majority of violence and prevention education occurred outside the classroom. During this reporting period, project staff have given 44 presentations at Chico State and 47 presentations at Butte College. The visible support system of the Safe Place offices provides student victims with a centralized location where they are given all their options for support and receive advocacy that was not available before. Program staff are also able to provide court accompaniments to student victims and through on-campus advocacy. Thanks to this funding, local law enforcement and community service providers have an on-campus contact and liaison for working with student victims. Also, grant staff is able to provide support services and training to faculty and staff on how to respond and serve student or fellow faculty or staff victims of crime when they disclose. Campus program funding also encouraged our campuses to look closely at our policies and changes have been made as a result.*

California State University

## **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 Campus Program grants. As part of the technical assistance provided by CALCASA, the Campus Program conducts semiannual technical assistance institutes. These institutes are hosted by a campus grantee and attended by a mandatory multidisciplinary team of four individuals from each Campus Program grantee, including the project director, a campus law enforcement representative, a judicial affairs representative, and a fourth person representing an internal/external partner (e.g., an administrator, evaluator, student, community-based victim services agency member, local law enforcement officer, or prosecutor.)

In 2010, CALCASA held two institutes with more than 350 participants at each institute. The CALCASA institutes provided training from experts in the field on sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence and stalking. Topics included social networking, cyberstalking, victim response and assessment, understanding the dynamics of assault, providing services for underserved communities, bystander intervention, and false reporting mythology. Prior to the 2-day trainings, pre-institutes were held on forensic compliance; understanding Title IX, the Clery Act, and Office of Civil Rights guidelines; and understanding bystander intervention and

education, using an evidence-based model called the Green Dot Program. CALCASA also provided ongoing technical assistance to grantees through listservs, blogs, site visits, one-on-one support, expert trainings, and monthly webinars focused on current issues faced by campuses. Topics for technical assistance were identified through webinar evaluations and site visits to campuses.

### **Flagship Initiative and Higher Education Association Special Initiative**

#### The Flagship Institutes

In FY 2007, OVW introduced a new component to the Campus Program called the Flagship Initiative, which was developed to maximize the benefits of successful implementation of Campus Program grants and impact entire state university systems while further leveraging federal dollars. The Flagship Initiative consists of two or more institutions of higher education that share and are accountable to a common legislature, governing board, Board of Regents, or system with enforcement capabilities come together to implement a project. One institution is designated as the principal flagship institution and must be able to demonstrate competence and effective implementation of prior Campus Program awards for at least two nonconsecutive grant periods or 4 years. The principal institution uses the key practices, policies, project activities, and products it already has to lead other schools within its system to implement and incorporate these same promising practices on their respective campuses. Four flagship institution grants have been awarded, collectively impacting 31 campuses with 374,975 students and more than 179,625 faculty and staff: the University of Northern Iowa, the University of Puerto Rico at

Humacao, East Central University of Oklahoma, and the University of California at Davis.

The Flagship Initiative award recipients coordinate a model 3-year flagship program designed to improve and strengthen the response to campus-based domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking throughout the campuses. Each project must institute the four minimum requirements of the program across all the campuses. The Flagship Initiative recipients must: 1) provide prevention education on violence against women for all incoming students, 2) train campus law enforcement or security staff on appropriate responses to violence against women, 3) train members of campus judicial or disciplinary boards on the unique dynamics of violence against women, and 4) create a coordinated community response to violence against women.

During FY 2010, Flagship Initiative recipients engaged in numerous activities to improve and strengthen responses to campus-based violence, including the following:

- Updating and revising policy changes made in year one to improve law enforcement and disciplinary board responsiveness to student needs
- Inviting and engaging new members to join coordinated community response teams.
- Overhauling and expanding incoming student orientation curriculum, using technology, music, video, pre-tests, post-tests, and online education options
- Providing a fall orientation for new faculty and staff employees to educate all employees about the grant program and its components

- Providing law enforcement training to develop a core of key trainers at each campus who are able and willing to train other officers, advocates, faculty, and staff
- Developing and distributing awareness information to alert staff how to access assistance for victims
- Coordinating a statewide training for counseling and security officers on stalking and cyberstalking
- Training peer educators to inform other students about violence against women and violence-prevention strategies, including dissemination of educational materials by e-mail to their campus community Developing and implementing training for judicial affairs officers; and
- Shifting efforts to ensure sustainability of these projects beyond federal funds.

This system-wide work across university campuses has increased the involvement and commitment of State governments and participant university Boards of Regents to address violence against women on campus.

#### Higher Education Association Special Initiative

The Higher Education Association Special Initiative requires participants to develop effective practices for responding to and preventing violence against women on campus, using the memberships of participating associations to develop, implement, and disseminate promising models. The objectives of the initiative include the development of coordinated campus community responses, prevention and education programs for incoming students, and training

programs for campus police and judicial disciplinary boards. Tougaloo College was selected to receive funds under this initiative. Tougaloo is a private Historically Black College which partnered with the United Negro College Fund Special Programs Corporation and its more than 40 member institutions. As the lead institution for the Initiative, Tougaloo College conducts the trainings for the member institutions.

In late 2010, working in collaboration with campus and community-based victim advocacy organizations, the Higher Education Association Special Initiative at Tougaloo began activities to establish a mandatory prevention and education program to address domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking for all incoming students (e.g., first year students, transfer students). Specifically, projects included the following:

- Developing a comprehensive core curriculum for member institutions, in collaboration with campus and community partners
- Establishing a mechanism for integrating the "mandatory" requirement that incoming students must attend the education and prevention programs
- Designing a culturally specific structure, theme, graphics, language and overall program to create a sense of "buy-in" from the student population
- Utilizing student "social networks" to increase marketability, access of information, and awareness of program events
- Collaborating with student organizations, such as student government, sororities and fraternities, and college sports teams and athletic departments to increase program participation

### **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 2009 Campus Program grants can be found at the Department of Education website: <http://ope.ed.gov/security>.

### **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 domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking as serious criminal offenses and to 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 2011, OVW made awards to 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: Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY 2008 Awards**

<b>Grantee</b>	<b>State/ Territory</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Amount (in \$)</b>
Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University	California	Private	299,096
Cal Poly Pomona Foundation, Inc.	California	Private	300,000
California State University, Chico Research Foundation	California	Public	471,529
University of Southern California	California	Public	499,999
Regents of the University of Colorado, University 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
<b>Total</b>			<b>6,262,754</b>

**Appendix B: Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus,  
F Y 2009 Awards**

<b>Grantee</b>	<b>State/ Territory</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Amount (in \$)</b>
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
<b>Total</b>			<b>10,015,296</b>

**Appendix C: Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus, FY2010 Awards**

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

**Appendix D: Summary of the Statutory Purpose Areas Addressed by Campus Program Grantees (July 1, 2010 -December 31, 2010 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 domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking on campus.	52
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.	70
To implement and operate education programs for the prevention of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.	75
To develop, enlarge, or strengthen victim services programs on campuses of institutions involved, including programs providing legal, medical, or psychological counseling, for victims of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, 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	54
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 domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, 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	4
To support improved coordination among campus administrators, campus security personnel and local law enforcement to reduce domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking on campus	74

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

January 1 through June 30, 2010 Reporting Period

Number of victims seeking services: 1,088 victims

Total number of victims served: 1,060 victims

Total number of victims partially served: 21 victims

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

<b>Nature of Victimization</b>	<b>Number of Victims Served or Partially Served*</b>
Domestic violence/dating violence	577
Sexual assault	365
Stalking	139

“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.

<b>Victims</b>	<b>Number of Victims Served or Partially Served</b>
Female	1,027
Male	53
Unknown	1

<b>Age of Victims</b>	<b>Number of Victims Served or Partially Served</b>
13–17	9
18–24	655
25–59	336
60+	15
Unknown	66

<b>Relationship to Offender</b>	<b>Sexual Assault Victims</b>	<b>Domestic Violence Victims</b>	<b>Stalking Victims</b>
Current or former spouse or intimate partner	40	377	46
Other family or household member (e.g., in-law, grandparent, etc.)	55	41	6
Acquaintance (e.g., friend, neighbor, coworker, schoolmate, professor, etc.)	164	25	42
Current or former dating relationship	69	125	44
Stranger	39	1	16
Relationship unknown	37	16	9
<b>Total *</b>	<b>404</b>	<b>585</b>	<b>163</b>

\*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.

<b>Race/Ethnicity of Victims</b>	<b>Number of Victims Served and Partially Served</b>
Black or African American	166
American Indian and Alaska Native	50
Asian	53
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	19
Hispanic or Latino	95
White	534
Unknown	175

Note: Some victims report more than one ethnicity.

<b>Other Demographics of Victims</b>	<b>Number of Victims Served and Partially Served</b>
Victims with disabilities	50
Victims with limited English proficiency	37
Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	18
Victims in rural areas	137

<b>Crime Location</b>	<b>Number of Victims Reporting Crimes to Campus Police/Security</b>	<b>Number of Victims Reporting Crimes to Community Law Enforcement</b>
On campus	101	17
Off campus	28	174

July 1 through December 31, 2010 Reporting Period

Number of victims seeking services: 1,204 victims

Total number of victims served: 1,156 victims

Total number of victims partially served: 39 victims

Total number of victims who could not be served: 9 victims

<b>Nature of Victimization</b>	<b>Number of Victims Served or Partially Served</b>
Domestic violence/dating violence	628
Sexual assault	448
Stalking	119

<b>Victims</b>	<b>Number of Victims Served or Partially Served</b>
Female	1,106
Male	81
Unknown	8

<b>Age of Victims</b>	<b>Number of Victims Served or Partially Served</b>
13–17	14
18–24	708
25–59	328
60+	20
Unknown	125

<b>Relationship to Offender</b>	<b>Sexual Assault Victims</b>	<b>Domestic Violence Victims</b>	<b>Stalking Victims</b>
Current or former spouse or intimate partner	30	282	26
Other family or household member (e.g., in-law, grandparent, etc.)	49	56	3
Acquaintance (e.g., friend, neighbor, coworker, schoolmate, professor etc.)	239	63	40
Current or former dating relationship	46	143	39
Stranger	55	1	11
Relationship unknown	40	92	10
<b>Total *</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>637</b>	<b>129</b>

\*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.

<b>Race/Ethnicity of Victims</b>	<b>Number of Victims Served and Partially Served</b>
Black or African American	199
American Indian and Alaska Native	42
Asian	52
Native Hawaiian and other Pacific Islander	3
Hispanic or Latino	122
White	620
Unknown	167

<b>Other Demographics of Victims</b>	<b>Number of Victims Served and Partially Served</b>
Victims with disabilities	30
Victims with limited English proficiency	17
Immigrants/refugees/asylum seekers	22
Victims in rural areas	122

<b>Crime Location</b>	<b>Number of Victims Reporting Crimes to Campus Police/Security</b>	<b>Number of Victims Reporting Crimes to Community Law Enforcement</b>
On campus	134	9
Off campus	59	188

**Appendix F: Grants to Reduce Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus**  
**Fiscal Year 2011 Awards**

<b>Grantee</b>	<b>State/Territory</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Amount (in \$)</b>
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	300,000
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
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>\$7,331,923</b>