



Defense Advisory Committee for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct

DAC-PSM Public Meeting June 27, 2024

For tech support issues, contact Ms. Emma Groo
202-878-1691 or emma.w.groo.ctr@mail.mil

Please remain muted unless speaking

Agenda

- Roll Call
- Opening Remarks
- Public Comment Review
- Briefings and Discussions
 - DoD Prevention Updates
 - SAPRO Annual Reports
 - Database Anonymity
 - Exit Interviews and CATCH Program
- Subcommittee Updates
- Meeting Close

Roll Call and Opening Comments

- **Roll Call**
 - DAC-PSM Members
- **Quorum**
 - Confirm if quorum has been met
- **Opening Comments**

DAC-PSM Members

Co-Chairs:

Ms. Gina Grosso (Lt. Gen. USAF (Ret))
Dr. Lindsay Orchowski

Dr. Antonia Abbey
Mr. Clem Coward (MG USA (Ret))
Dr. Dorothy Edwards
Dr. Armando Estrada
Ms. Stephanie Gattas
Dr. Sharyn Potter
Dr. John Pryor
Ms. Lynn Rosenthal
Ms. Jennifer Silva
Dr. Amy Slep
Ms. Glorina Stallworth
Dr. Michele Ybarra

Public Comment Review

- No public comments received
 - No statements were received by email or phone by the submission deadline specified in the Public Register Notice

2024 Integrated Prevention Update



Dr. Andra Tharp
Director, Violence Prevention Cell
Office of Force Resiliency
As of June 18, 2024

Agenda



- Overview of Integrated Prevention Advancements
- Prevention Workforce
- Prevention Research and Evaluation
- On-Site Installation Evaluations
- Next Steps
- Questions and Discussion

Integrated Prevention Advancements



2019

PPoA 1.0

Identified a prevention system and prevention process that are necessary for successful prevention efforts – based on the public health approach to prevention

2020

DoDI 6400.09

Codified the prevention system and data-informed actions necessary for integrated primary prevention; outlined strategies for integrated primary prevention

2021

DoD IRC-SAM

Independent Review Commission on Sexual Assault in the Military made 82 recommendations in 4 key priority areas, one of which was prevention; plans of action and milestones developed for recommendations

2022

PPoA 2.0

Updated to focus on integrated primary prevention and align prevention recommendations from PPoA 1.0 and DoD IRC-SAM

Prevention Workforce Model

Outlined roles and responsibilities of a dedicated primary prevention workforce

DoDI 6400.11

Codified the roles and responsibilities, training requirements, and expectations of leadership and the dedicated primary prevention workforce; established OSIEs as recurring requirement

2023

First Annual Fielding Window for Command Climate Assessments

Provided an in-depth understanding of command climate to incorporate in the appropriate comprehensive IPP plan

DoD Credentialing Program for Prevention Personnel (D-CPPP)

Established a required professional credential promoting a consistent and qualified prevention workforce across all military installations

2024

Summer Internship

Paid internship being stood up in collaboration with the Partnership for Public Service and the military Services that will expand the pipeline of talent for the prevention workforce

PPoA Updates

As directed by USD(P&R), updates started to expand and incorporate lessons learned from PPoA 2.0, including prevention self-assessments that will feed PPoA 3.0

Comprehensive Integrated Prevention (CIPP) Plan Submissions

Living documents guide the prevention workforce's prevention efforts for the military community



[PREVENTION]


Prevention Workforce Updates



- Outreach
- Internship
- Enhanced Recruitment
- Hiring
- Credentialing
- Training and Technical Assistance
- Evaluation
- Prevention in Action Spotlights

- Clearinghouse
- Research Agenda
- Item Bank
- Selected Activities

Relationship Resource Tool



- Understanding perpetration
- Prevention in complex settings
- Alcohol policy
- Enhanced resources and support to mitigate pre-military risk factors

On-Site Installation Evaluations (OSIEs)




- **OSIEs**

- Designed to provide early detection of risk and protective factors so leaders can take corrective actions and enhance prevention

- **OSIE Dashboard**

- Developed for biennial site selection and tracking progress of OSIE sites on climate factors
- Provided as a DoD tool for visibility and targeted action
- Initially leveraged 2021 Force-wide Defense Organizational Climate Survey (DEOCS)
- Evolved to 5-factor Risk Index that integrates DoD and non-DoD data sources that assess risk and protective factors for interpersonal violence and self-directed harm
- Conducting predictive analyses to support 2025 site selection




OSIE Reports



2023 ON-SITE INSTALLATION EVALUATION SUMMARY


2023 - In accordance with Secretary of Defense Lloyd Austin's direction and Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 6400.11, "DoD Integrated Primary Prevention Policy for Prevention Workforce and Leaders," On-Site Installation Evaluations were conducted in 2023 to better understand current gaps and best practices to enhance prevention of harmful behaviors, including sexual assault, sexual harassment, suicide, retaliation, domestic abuse, and child abuse and neglect. The site visits occurred at 13 sites and 12 ships between January and May 2023.

Memo: ["Department of Defense Actions to Address Findings of the 2023 On-Site Installation Evaluations"](#)




2023 MILITARY SERVICE ACADEMIES ON-SITE INSTALLATION EVALUATION REPORT

2023 - Secretary of Defense Lloyd Austin directed On-Site Installation Evaluations be conducted at the military service academies (MSAs) after an increase in the estimated prevalence of unwanted sexual contact, sexual harassment, and other concerning climate issues at the MSAs during the 2021-2022 academic year. These visits provide the Department with ways to comprehensively improve its prevention efforts, better support efforts to advance the approved recommendations of the Independent Review Commission on Sexual Assault (IRC) in the Military and the Suicide Prevention and Response Independent Review Commission (SPRIRC) and inform future policy development.



2021 ON-SITE INSTALLATION EVALUATION REPORT

2022 - Secretary of Defense Lloyd Austin directed On-Site Installation Evaluations (OSIEs) at select installations in 2021. OSIEs focus on an installation's prevention capabilities and ability to effectively address risk for sexual assault, harassment, and suicide. OSIEs aim to provide insights on risk and protective factors on the ground, what works, what does not, how the Department can improve efforts more comprehensively, and support efforts to implement the approved recommendations of the Independent Review Commission on Sexual Assault in the Military (IRC).



Next Steps



- Updated **strategy** and **policy**
- Upstream factors and conditions incorporated into **data analytics**
- Continued outreach and professional development for the **prevention workforce**
- Enhanced **leadership** buy-in and understanding
- Ongoing **research** to systematically close gaps
- Improved translation to support action
- Oversight of compliance with **command climate** requirements



Questions & Discussion

BREAK

**DAC-PSM Public Meeting will
resume at 10:15 AM ET**

Department of Defense (DoD) Fiscal Year 2023 (FY23) Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military



DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office (SAPRO)

Briefing to the Defense Advisory Committee for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct (DAC-PSM)

June 27, 2024

Dr. Rachel Breslin
Assessment, Reporting, & Oversight
Program Manager, SAPRO

DoD Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military




- Since 2004, Congress has required the Department to provide an annual report
 - Current reporting requirements include:
 - Sexual assault prevalence and reporting data
 - Military justice sexual assault case outcomes
 - Sexual harassment, domestic and child sexual abuse reports
 - DoD, Military Service, and National Guard reports on prevention and response program activities
- The Department assesses sexual assault progress via two primary metrics:
 - Sexual assault **prevalence** (estimated number of Service members experiencing sexual assault) measured by scientific surveys: Desired state is **decrease**.
 - Sexual assault **reporting rate** (number of victimized Service members choosing to file Restricted and Unrestricted Reports): Desired state is **increase**.
 - Both metrics rely on results from the *Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Military Members (WGR)*.
- The 2023 *WGR* was part of the force-wide climate assessment conducted between August and November of last year.
 - Estimates from the 2023 *WGR* provide the Department's first assessment of progress since the release of the findings and recommendations of the Independent Review Commission on Sexual Assault in the Military (IRC).
- While we are cautiously optimistic about the FY23 report's results, we must continue to see reforms through to ensure maximum and enduring impact for our Service members.

Sexual Assault/Unwanted Sexual Contact (USC) Past Year Prevalence Estimates



- In 2023, an estimated 6.8% of Active component women and 1.3% of Active component men experienced at least one incident of USC in the year prior to being surveyed. This is a statistically significant decrease in the rate for Active component women since 2021, driven by statistically significant decreases in penetrative and attempted penetrative USC. Rates for Active component men trended downward, but the decrease was not statistically significant.
- This translates to an estimated 29,061 Active component members experiencing USC in the past year (15,201 women and 13,860 men). In 2021, an estimated 35,875 Active component members experienced USC in the past year (19,255 women and 16,620 men).



Percent of all DoD Active Component Service Members


Note: The number of Service members who experienced past year unwanted sexual contact is an estimate with an associated margin of error. Some rates by type of USC may not add to the overall past-year USC rate due to rounding.

*Denotes a metric change
Statistically significant ↑ Increase from 2021 or ↓ Decrease from 2021


USC Past Year Prevalence Estimates: By Service



- In 2023, estimated prevalence of USC trended downward across all Services.
- There was a statistically significant decrease in estimated prevalence of USC among Navy and Air Force women.



- In 2023, there were no statistically significant changes by Service in USC prevalence for men.







*Denotes a metric change

Statistically significant ↑ Increase from 2021 or ↓ Decrease from 2021



Additional Risk Factors for Past Year USC – Active Component



- Prior research shows that experiencing a sexual assault puts an individual at a higher risk for experiencing additional sexual assaults. In 2023, Active component women indicated experiencing less USC since entering the military, and across their lifetime, compared to rates for Active component women in 2021.
- There was a significant decrease in USC rates for Active component women who are junior enlisted and those under the age of 21. However, these groups remained significantly more likely to experience USC in the prior year than other segments of the Active component.



Sexual Harassment Past Year Prevalence Estimates by Service



- For the Active component, an estimated 24.7% of women (55,464 Service members) and 5.8% of men (60,330 Service members) experienced sexual harassment in the year prior to the survey. Statistically significant decreases in sexual harassment prevalence for women were observed among Army, Navy, and Marine Corps women and among Army men.



*Denotes a metric change

Statistically significant ↑ Increase from 2021 or ↓ Decrease from 2021

Impact of Other Problematic Behaviors on Risk For USC in Active Component Members



- Many key indicators of unhealthy climate that are highly correlated with USC decreased for both women and men between 2021 & 2023. Reducing these risk factors can also reduce Service members' risk of unwanted sexual contact.
- In 2023, Active component women experienced simultaneous decreases in rates of both risk factors and unwanted sexual contact.
- However, experiencing a behavior highly correlated with USC still increases the risk of having experienced past-year USC.

% Experienced Unhealthy Climate*

Women	Men
FY23: 25% ↓ FY21: 29%	6% ↓ 7%

FY23: 20% ↓ FY21: 24%	7% ↓ 8%
---------------------------------	-------------------

FY23: 13% ↓ FY21: 16%	1% 1%
---------------------------------	-----------------

FY23: 37% FY21: 38%	27% 27%
-------------------------------	-------------------

FY23: 56% ↓ FY21: 58%	41% ↓ 42%
---------------------------------	---------------------

If Service men and women experience one of these *climate-related risk factors*, their risk for unwanted sexual contact *increases by...*

Sexual Harassment**

12.2x **40.5x**
...times the risk

Compared to those who did not experience each risk factor.

Psychological Climate for SH

3.2x **10.2x**

Gender Discrimination**

3.1x **11.4x**

Low Levels of Leader Support for Intervention

2.5x **4.4x**

Low Levels of Unit Support for Intervention

2.7x **4.8x**

Women

Men

*Unhealthy climate for scales defined as follows: Psychological Climate for SH: mean score less than 3; Leader Support for Intervention: mean score less than 4; Unit Support for Intervention: mean score less than 4

**Sexual harassment and gender discrimination are defined as experiences of the behaviors which met criteria for inclusion in the past year rate.

Statistically significant ↑ Increase from 2021 or ↓ Decrease from 2021

† More Likely ‡ Less Likely



Excellence | People-Centric | Integrity | Collaboration | Respect

Women's Satisfaction with Responses/Services Received



- There were no significant differences observed between 2021 and 2023 for either the resources used or resource satisfaction for women

Thinking about this unwanted event, overall how satisfied or dissatisfied were you with responses and services you received from the following individuals and service providers?




Percent of Active Component Women Who Experienced and Reported Unwanted Sexual Contact in the Past Year
Results for men who reported USC are not shown due to high margins of error

Trust in Military System and Leadership




- Overall, trust in the military system and in leadership increased in 2023 compared to 2021.
- Active component personnel rated supervisors more favorably in 2023 compared to 2021.
- Women's ratings of the military, leaders, and supervisors were lower in 2023, compared to men.


If you are sexually assaulted, you can...




Trust the military system to ensure your safety following the incident.




Trust the military system to treat you with dignity and respect.




How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about your immediate supervisor?



Your supervisor ensures that all assigned personnel are treated fairly.




Your supervisor evaluates your work performance fairly.



Statistically significant ↑ Increase from 2021 or ↓ Decrease from 2021
Within Year Comparisons by Gender: † More likely ‡ Less likely

Sexual Assault Prevalence and Reporting



- ◆ Survey-Estimated Number of Service Members who Experienced Unwanted Sexual Contact in the Past Year
- ◇ Survey-Estimated Number of Service Members who Experienced Sexual Assault in the Past Year
- Number of Reports of Sexual Assault by Service Members for Incidents that Occurred During Military Service
- ◆ Survey-Estimated Number of Service Members who Experienced Unwanted Sexual Contact in the Past Year
- % Estimated Percentage of Service Member Victims Accounted for in Reports to DoD

7,266 Service members who reported sexual assault that occurred during military service

+ 541 Service members who reported a sexual assault that occurred prior to military service

+ 612 Non-Service members who alleged sexual assault perpetrated by a Service member

+ 96 Relevant data not available

8,515 Total reports of sexual assault received by DoD in FY23


- The Department assesses progress with sexual assault via two primary metrics:
 - **Prevalence** (i.e., estimated total of Service members experiencing sexual assault measured by scientific surveys – desired state is *decrease*)
 - **Reporting rate** (i.e., percentage of victimized Service members making Restricted and Unrestricted Reports – desired state is *increase*)
- In 2023, **1 in 4** Service members reported their incident to a DoD authority (~35 percent of women and ~15 percent of men)

Academic Program Year (APY) 22-23 MSA Report Overview and Compliance with Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Policy and Actions Directed by the Department



Section 532 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 requires an annual report for each APY on the effectiveness of the policies, training, and procedures of the MSAs regarding sexual harassment and sexual violence involving academy personnel, as well as reporting data.

- **In August 2023**, in response to the On-site Installation Evaluations (OSIE) at the Military Service Academies (MSA), Secretary Austin directed actions to transform climate and prevent a range of harmful behaviors at the MSAs.
- The MSAs **previously existing** Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) and Harassment Prevention and Response programs **are operating in compliance with DoD policy**.
 - This assessment did not include actions directed as part of the OSIE's or the Secretary's August 2023 Memo.
- **There are no new estimated prevalence survey data** included in the Annual Report on Sexual Harassment and Violence at the Military Service Academies (MSA), Academic Program Year (APY) 2022-2023. That data will be released next year in accordance with standard timelines.
- While the total number of reports at the MSAs decreased in APY 22-23, **we will not know if this represents a true decrease in prevalence until next year's report**.



Topline Messages



- **The prevalence of sexual assault and sexual harassment declined in the active force, compared to levels last measured in 2021. This is the first time in nearly a decade that the Department has seen a decrease in sexual assault prevalence.**
 - The Department is cautiously optimistic that this year's survey results reflect the impact of the unprecedented actions directed by Secretary Austin to counter these crimes.
 - While we are encouraged by this progress, we must continue to fully implement and resource these reforms to ensure maximum effect and enduring impact for our Service members
- **DoD leaders remain keenly focused on implementing the approved recommendations of the Independent Review Commission on Sexual Assault in the Military (IRC-SAM) to accomplish long-lasting change.**
 - To date, significant implementation actions have been undertaken or completed for 32 approved IRC-SAM recommendations. Implementation of the remaining 50 approved IRC-SAM recommendations directed to the DoD is in progress.
- **DoD will continue to hire skilled professionals to build the Integrated Primary Prevention Workforce (IPPW), professionalize and strengthen the Sexual Assault Response Workforce (SARW), and support the stand up of the Offices of Special Trial Counsel.**
- **Continue to build tools for leaders to gain better near-term visibility on leading climate indicators that are essential for promoting a positive command climate and ultimately reducing harmful behaviors.**
 - The recently overhauled Defense Organizational Climate Survey and the newly launched *Defense Organizational Climate Pulse Survey* will allow the Department to better identify healthy command climates, what is working well, or where additional focus or resources may be needed.
- **The Department is also establishing more focused and frequent assessments to better evaluate conditions throughout the force and the effectiveness of the Department's work**
 - The Department launched the Sexual Violence Support and Experiences Study in 2023 to engage sexual assault survivors to provide feedback on their experiences with victim assistance and military justice reforms.
- **Continuing and future Department efforts include:**
 - Sustain implementation of the approved IRC recommendations according to the guidance issued in 2021 and continue to evaluate recommendations to ensure they are having their intended effect.
 - Complete Command Climate Assessments and Comprehensive Integrated Primary Prevention Plans to ensure leaders have identified how they intend to further promote healthy unit climates.
 - Implement recent policy updates in initial and annual Sexual Assault Prevention and Response training.
 - Continue hiring of DoD's IPPW, and continue to hire, professionalize, and sustain the SARW.
 - Encourage participation in the 2024 *Quick Compass of Sexual Assault Response Personnel* to support the assessment of improvements to the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Workforce and Special Victims' Counsel.



BACKUP

USC Past Year Prevalence Estimates for the Reserve Component by Service



- In 2023, an estimated 3.9% of Reserve component women (6,386 Service members) and 0.7% of Reserve component men (4,228 Service members) indicated experiencing at least one USC in the year prior to being surveyed. Rates for Reserve component women overall trended downward, but the change was not statistically significant. However, National Guard women saw a statistically significant decline.

8%

USC Rate for Women by Service

6%

4%

2%

0%

1.5%

1.0%

0.5%

0.0%

2015

2017

2019

2021*

2023

USC Rate for Men by Service

1.0%

0.5%

0.0%

2015

2017

2019

2021*

2023

DoD Reserve Component
Navy Reserve
Air Force Reserve

Army Reserve
Marine Corps Reserve
National Guard

USC Prevalence by Type of USC Experienced

4.6%

1.2%

1.9%

1.6%

2021

3.9%

0.9%

1.6%

1.4%

2023

Women

Penetrative
Attempted Penetrative
Non-Penetrative

0.7%

0.1%

0.2%

2021

0.7%

0.1%

0.2%

2023

Men

*Denotes a metric change

Statistically significant ↑ Increase from 2021 or ↓ Decrease from 2021

NR = Not Reportable



Sexual Assault Case Outcomes

3,976 Case Dispositions Reported in FY23


- 1,086 Cases Outside DoD Jurisdiction

2,890 Cases Under DoD Jurisdiction


1,821 Case Dispositions: Evidence Supported Command Action

- 537 Case Dispositions: Evidence Supported Nonsexual Assault Charge

1,284 Case Dispositions: Evidence Supported **Sexual Assault Charge**



- Commanders had sufficient evidence to take disciplinary action in 63 percent of cases under DoD jurisdiction in FY23




- Commanders preferred court-martial charges for 36 percent of cases in which evidence supported a sexual assault charge
- 72% of sexual assault court-martial cases ended in a conviction (sexual assault or some other offense); a decrease from 74% in FY22

- For FY24, DoD is prepared to capture Special Trial Counsel case prosecution decisions and case outcomes which started on December 28, 2023

IRC Implementation Update



- To date, significant implementation actions have been undertaken or completed for 32 approved IRC recommendations.
 - The Department implemented 11 recommendations since last year's IRC update in the FY22 Annual Report, including:
 - Establishing the Offices of Special Trial Counsel (modified from rec 1.1);
 - Launching the Defense Organizational Climate Pulse Survey, which is available to Commanders between administrations of the annual DEOCs (3.7.a); and,
 - Establishing new CATCH Program procedures to support victim assistance (4.2.c).
- The Department is tracking IRC implementation via three methods:



- **Implementation progress:** Tracking how IRC Offices of Primary Responsibility (OPR) (e.g., the Military Services, and Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Components) are completing their Plans of Action and Milestones (POAM), including implementation progress and any challenges or past due actions.
- **Performance measurement:** Measuring key outcomes from DoD surveys, administrative data, and other databases to monitor impact and progress associated with the implementation of the approved IRC recommendations.
- **Evaluation:** Assessing of the fidelity of implementation and whether implementation of approved IRC recommendations had the intended effect.

BREAK

**DAC-PSM Public Meeting
will resume at 12:00 PM ET**



NDAA-Directed Studies




FY21 NDAA-Directed Studies for DAC-PSM


FY21 NDAA directed DAC-PSM to undertake 4 studies. The DAC-PSM only restarted in late 2022, and immediately began training study to support another NDAA provision

- In 2023, DAC-PSM staff began discussing options to address each provision

Topic 1: PME Review -- Assess sexual assault prevention and response training in leader professional military education (PME). -- *Subcommittee will provide updates today*

Topic 2: Recruit Screening -- Assess the feasibility of screening recruits who may have been the subject or perpetrator of prior incidents of sexual assault and harassment. -- *DoD to provide info at Nov meeting*

 **Topic 3:** Exit Interviews and CATCH Program-- Assess the feasibility of conducting exit interviews during the discharge process to determine if Service members experienced or witnessed sexual assault or harassment during military service and did not report it, and assess the feasibility of combining such exit interviews in DoD's Catch a Serial Offender (CATCH) Program. -- *For initial discussion today*

 **Topic 4:** Reporting Database Anonymization -- Assess whether DoD's sexual assault reporting databases are sufficiently anonymized to ensure privacy while still providing military leaders with select case details and administrative information. -- *For initial discussion today*

NDAA-Directed Study for DAC-PSM

Topic: Reporting Database Anonymization

NDAA Study Requirement:

- Assess whether DoD's sexual assault reporting databases are sufficiently anonymized to ensure privacy, while still providing military leaders with necessary information, such as:
 - Length of time the victim and assailant were at the duty station where the sexual assault occurred
 - Percentage of sexual assaults occurring while the victim or assailant were on temporary duty, leave, or otherwise away from their permanent duty station
 - Number of sexual assaults that involve an abuse of power by a commander or supervisor

Purpose: Provide overview of DoD's policies and systems in place to address the study topic



Presentation to:

**Defense Advisory Committee for the Prevention
of Sexual Misconduct**

***Response to FY21 NDAA Study Topic:
Database Anonymity***

***Dr. Nate Galbreath
Director, DoD SAPRO***

DoD Systems and Policies in Place to Address: *Reporting Database Anonymization*

As of June 2024

www.sapr.mil



DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
SEXUAL ASSAULT PREVENTION
AND RESPONSE OFFICE



Overview of DoD's Approach



Overview

- DoD has extensive systems in place to collect data relevant to sexual assault allegations
- While that data is protected via access and usage restrictions, the database itself was not designed to be entirely anonymous, since information must be periodically accessed to manage individual cases
- Access and usage guidelines are laid out in DoD policy

Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database (DSAID)

- DSAID serves as DoD system to capture, record, and manage information relating to allegations of sexual assault reported to DoD authorities

Policies on Data Access and Usage



- DoD policy limits access to victim Personally Identifiable Information (PII) to those with official “need to know”
- Commanders cannot access data in Restricted Reports
- But access to PII in Unrestricted Reports is not limited
 - Needed to support Commander’s role in Case Management Group (CMG) meetings
 - Unrestricted Report data in DSAID may also come from Military Criminal Investigative Organizations that operate the systems of record for this data
- Policy specifies that failure to adhere to protection of information could result in administrative or disciplinary action

Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), DSAID, and CATCH



- DSAID does not have protections from FOIA requests like CATCH database
 - NDAA for FY 2020 (Section 550) states victim disclosures under CATCH Program shall be withheld from public disclosures under FOIA

Conclusion



- DoD's data usage policies and practices are in place to...
 - Protect Service member privacy
 - Limit data access to those with an appropriate role
- Existing oversight practices help surface...
 - Individual situations in which DoD guidance may not be being followed
 - Opportunities to improve upon existing DoD-wide policy

Contact SAPRO:
sapro@wso.whs.mil

Learn More:
www.sapr.mil

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

Questions and Discussion

BREAK

**DAC-PSM Public Meeting will
resume at 1:30 PM ET**

NDAADirected Study for DAC-PSM

Topic: Exit Interviews and CATCH Program

NDAAD FY21 Study Requirement:

- Assess the feasibility of conducting exit interviews during the discharge process to determine:
 - If Service members experienced or witnessed sexual assault or harassment during military service and did not report it
 - The feasibility of combining such exit interviews with DoD's Catch a Serial Offender (CATCH) Program

Purpose: Provide overview of DoD's policies and practices in place to address the study topic

Presentation to:

**Defense Advisory Committee for the Prevention of
Sexual Misconduct**

***Response to FY21 NDAA Study Topic:
Exit Interviews and CATCH Program***

***Ms. Kimberly Lahm, Program Director, Patient Advocacy and Experience,
Women's, Child and Family Health Policy, OASD, Health Affairs***

Mr. Douglas Alexander, Policy Analyst, DoD SAPRO

Dr. Tanya Banchs, Senior Victim Assistance Advisor, DoD SAPRO

Separation Health and Physical Examination

- Active Duty Service members must undergo the Separation Health and Physical Examination before separating from the military to capture health conditions and concerns.
- In collaboration with VA, DoD questions regarding sexual trauma are not included in the Separation Health and Physical Examination.
 - Not all Service members who experience sexual trauma on active duty will want to report their experience.
 - Impacts of sexual trauma, such as need for ongoing mental health care and any associated physical conditions will be captured without identification of the cause of the condition.
 - Allows for Service members to maintain control over their sexual trauma experience and to disclose that experience, should they want, after active service.
- DoD policy provides guidance to examiners on required notifications and documentation, should Service members disclose sexual trauma during the exam.

Catch a Serial Offender (CATCH) Program

- New policy, effective June 30, 2023 addresses intent of FY21 NDAA relative to CATCH as well as IRC-SAM Rec 4.2c Part 2, as approved by the Secretary of Defense
- Policy allows Service members (including those in being processed for discharge from military service) and their adult dependents to connect with a SARC to submit a CATCH entry without having to make an official report of sexual assault
 - Policy facilitated via DD Form 2910-4, which contains victim info should the victim need to be contacted in the future because of “match” in CATCH system

Catch a Serial Offender (CATCH) Program

- Service Members can use their CATCH submissions later as documentation with VA to access healthcare to the extent eligible, or to support a VA disability claim two ways:
 - Request the SARC to provide them a copy of the DD Form 2910-4, and/or
 - Request a copy of their actual CATCH entry from the CATCH system (the SARC can facilitate contact with CATCH system administrator)

Questions and Discussion

BREAK

**DAC-PSM Public Meeting will
resume at 2:15 PM ET**



Defense Advisory Committee for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct

Study Updates: Measurement of Selected Risk and Protective Factors for Harmful Behaviors

Metrics and Performance Subcommittee

June 27, 2024

Agenda

- Study Objective and Scope
- Summary of Study Progress to Date
- Preview: Draft Lists of Identified Risk and Protective Factors
 - Community-level Protective and Risk Factors
 - Organizational-level Protective and Risk Factors
- Issues Under Study Consideration
 - Assessment of Perpetration
 - Data Aggregation
- Next Steps
 - Propose Metrics for Identified Risk and Protective Factors

Study Objective and Scope

- **Phase 1:** Identify community- and organizational-level protective and risk factors for harmful behaviors most relevant to military environments
- **Phase 2:** Recommend measures of performance (MOPs) and measures of effectiveness (MOEs) for the factors identified in Phase 1
- **Goal for Study Recommendations**
 - Assist DoD's efforts to track data trends and changes over time
 - Inform efforts to evaluate prevention programming intended to address the factors identified in Phase 1

Summary of Study Progress: Sept 2023 - June 2024

Literature Review

- Explored measures of community- and organization-level risk and protective factors for harmful behaviors in military social, training, and working environments
- Reviewed rigor of factors and validated metrics

Initial Brief from OPA

- Received initial brief from the Office of People Analytics (OPA)
- Learned about the DEOCS

RFI

- Received written responses from OPA
- OPA Briefing and discussion at DAC-PSM Public Meeting in April 2024

Identified Risk & Protective Factors

- Identified community- and organizational-level risk and protective factors in military environments
- List based on literature review, discussions with OPA, and subject matter expertise

Identify MOPs & MOEs (In-Progress)

- Identifying measures of performance (MOPs) and measures of effectiveness (MOEs) for identified factors to offer as study recommendations

Identified Protective and Risk Factors

- **Goal for Today's Meeting**
 - Preview the draft list of identified factors
 - Briefly discuss additional factors for inclusion and suggested MOPs and MOEs
- **Post-Meeting Action Item for Committee Members**
 - Opportunity to provide in-depth written feedback on draft list of identified factors
 - Feedback requested by **July 12, 2024**

Study Definitions

■ **Community-level**

- Includes Service members, DoD civilian employees, and dependents who may live and/or work together in the same geographical area, such as a DoD installation, garrisons or ships, or surrounding neighborhoods and towns where military personnel reside
 - Among guardsmen and reservists, community may be better defined by shared organizational and social characteristics of their military communities, than by geographical or physical communities

■ **Organizational-level**

- Aspects of DoD/Service department-level policies, practices, culture, and physical or social environment

Community-Level Protective Factors

- Diverse and inclusive environments
 - Representation and inclusion of women and members of underrepresented groups
- Contact Hypothesis
 - Nature, quality, frequency, meaningfulness, and positivity/negativity of interpersonal contact
- Leadership
 - Transformational leadership
 - Leadership focus on the development of supportive culture and healthy climate
 - Leadership support and prioritization of prevention efforts
- Social support of desired norms and behavior
 - Culture of connectedness and engagement
- Collective efficacy
 - Community ownership of/responsibility for maintaining a healthy climate

Community-Level Risk Factors

- Job/gender context
 - Imbalanced gender ratios and adherence to traditional gender roles (attitudes/expectations)
- Climates tolerant of harassment
- “Dark traits” among leaders and peers
 - Socially aversive personality traits and acceptance of harmful behaviors by leaders creates unhealthy climate and encourages expression of inappropriate behaviors
- Workplace culture that emphasizes masculinity and domination
- Negative forms of “social support”
 - Support for expressing harmful thoughts or behaviors
- Prescriptive/descriptive norms that encourage heavy drinking (on and off-base)
 - Prescriptive norms: policies or rules
 - Descriptive norms: commonly accepted behaviors
- Poorly executed or undermined trainings; trainings that engender defensiveness

Discussion: Community-Level Factors

- Are there any additional factors that are missing from the community-level lists?
- Any suggestions of existing validated measures for the factors on the community-level lists?

Reminder: Committee Members are welcome to provide additional written feedback (due July 12).

Organizational-Level Protective Factors

- Diverse and inclusive environments
 - e.g., strategic recruiting efforts aiming to diversify the Force.
- Transformational leadership
 - Establishment of organizational values and culture of expected behaviors.
- Environments that support effective training
 - e.g., policies that reinforce training concepts and are enforced by leaders at all levels .
- Strategic messaging on prevention
 - e.g., conveying the impact that both misconduct and prevention have on mission readiness.
- Policies that establish and prioritize sufficient infrastructure for support
 - Policies that dictate effective reporting, victim support, resource accessibility, etc.
- Sufficient DoD and Military Department organizational capacity to manage issues related to misconduct.

Organizational-Level Risk Factors

- Imbalanced gender ratios among Senior leaders, especially among those involved in DoD-level decision-making and policy development
- Presence of socially aversive personality traits/dominance orientation (“dark traits”) among Senior leadership
- Climates tolerant of harassment among Senior leadership
- Policies that fail to ensure protective environments for Service members
 - e.g., alcohol-related policies that fail to effectively address problematic drinking that increases the likelihood of misconduct or harmful behaviors.
- Policies that fail to effectively inform prevention training efforts
 - e.g., lack of clear guidance on *who* is responsible for training delivery and *how* training is delivered; absence of rigorous evaluation of prevention training efforts and outcomes.

Discussion: Organizational-Level Factors

- Are there any additional factors that are missing from the organizational-level lists?
- Any suggestions of existing validated measures for the factors on the organizational-level lists?

Reminder: Committee Members are welcome to provide additional written feedback (due July 12).

Issues Under Study Consideration

- Data collection on perpetration and associated challenges
 - What can vs. cannot be done?
- Data aggregation
 - How might this study's recommended factors and measurements be considered in future aggregation efforts?
 - Ideas for different levels of aggregation

Next Steps

Develop
Recommendations
for MOPs & MOEs

Vote on
Recommendations
(Nov Public Meeting)

Finalize Report
(Due Dec 31, 2024)

- **Measures of Performance (MOPs):** determine if program/activity progress is producing desired outcomes (i.e., are we doing things right?)
- **Measures of Effectiveness (MOEs):** assess progress toward creating desired effect and thus achieving objectives and attaining end state (i.e., are we doing the right things?)



Defense Advisory Committee for the Prevention of Sexual Misconduct

Study Update: Preparation of Instructors Delivering Prevention Content in Professional Military Education

Prevention Training and Activities Subcommittee

June 27, 2024

Study Update Agenda

- Study Overview
- Summary of Progress
- Key Observations
- Issues Under Study Consideration
- Next Steps
- Open Discussion

Study Scope and Objective

- Consider the **preparation approach for professional military education (PME) instructors to deliver prevention-related content** and identify the **unique needs/skills** of instructors delivering content to junior leaders (i.e., junior officers (O1-O3) and junior NCOs (E4-E6))
- **Goal for Study Recommendations:** Propose ways in which the Department might expand and improve processes and procedures for preparing instructors to deliver prevention-related content within PME

Summary of Study Progress: Sept 2023 - June 2024

Define the Problem

- Ensure that PME instructors are adequately equipped to effectively deliver prevention instruction to junior officers and junior NCOs

Discussions with SAPRTEC

- Held discussions with SAPRTEC to understand efforts underway and needs of the Department

Literature Review

- Examined:
- Why instructor prep is important
 - Skills associated with positive learning outcomes
 - Specific needs of instructors teaching prevention

RFI

- Submitted and received written responses from the Services
- Service panel brief at DAC-PSM Public Meeting in April 2024

Staff Visit to DEOMI

- Learned how OSD-level schoolhouse trains and develops their faculty
- Emphasis on group facilitation and interpersonal skills

Pre-Study Assumptions

- In conceptualizing this study, we held a number of assumptions that shaped our initial study plan and RFI questions:
 - That PME is received in all junior NCO and junior officer grades
 - That prevention instruction is present within PME for junior NCOs and junior officers
 - That PME instructors are the ones delivering prevention content

Key Observations – General Study Info

- Across the Services, PME is not consistently provided to our focal study population (junior NCOs and junior Officers)

Where does PME* occur across Junior Enlisted/Officer Grades?

	Grades where PME is occurring**	Air Force	Army	Marine Corps	Navy	Space Force	Coast Guard
Junior NCOs	E4	✓	✓			✓	✓
	E5	✓	✓			✓	✓
	E6						✓
Junior Officers	O1		✓	✓			✓
	O2		✓	✓			✓
	O3	✓	✓			✓	✓

* PME for any topic area (not specific to prevention)

** As reported by Services in responses to study RFI


- Where PME is present, there is often an absence of prevention content
 - RFI responses indicate that prevention content is not included. If sexual assault-related content is included, it is typically response focused (e.g., info on reporting)
 - If included, SAPR content is often delivered by personnel familiar with SAPR, but who are not fully trained as instructors

Key Observations – General Study Info

- Limited evidence base identifying key skills and processes for effective prevention instructor preparation
- Gaps in existing DoD-level policy for prevention training and PME
 - Existing policies provide both the directive to conduct prevention-related PME and learning objectives for the audience, but there is no discussion of *who* is assigned the training responsibility
 - DoDI 6495.02, Vol. 2 – Sexual Assault Prevention and Response: Education and Training
 - DoDI 6400.11 – DoD Integrated Primary Prevention Policy for Prevention Workforce and Leaders
 - No establishment of criteria for the selection/certification of those who provide prevention instruction (e.g., criteria in DEOMI internal policy)
 - No communicated expectations for *how* prevention instruction should be delivered, evaluated, etc.

Key Observations – Instructor Preparation

- Prevention subject matter expertise not a requirement for instructor recruitment/selection
- PME instructors are trained to teach via Services' basic instructor training, but not specifically prepared to deliver prevention content
 - Subject matter-specific training exists for other topics, but not for prevention
 - In lieu of dedicated prevention instructors, Services often leverage existing personnel (e.g., SARCs, IPPW) to deliver sexual assault/sexual harassment-related prevention instruction
- DoD/Services are very effective at establishing certain norms and in training individuals to master specific skills or exhibit desired behaviors in the military (e.g., customs and courtesies)
 - How can they achieve similar success in training on topics that involve prevention-related attitude change, climate/culture transformation, etc.?
- RFI responses indicate that the Services conduct specific evaluation of training in other topic areas, but not for prevention



Open Discussion on Key Observations



Issues Under Study Consideration

- Who should instruct?
 - Ideas raised: PME cadre, IPPW, SARCs
- Key skills for instructors
 - General skills to be an effective instructor
 - Skills and subject matter expertise needed to be an effective prevention instructor
- Building training infrastructure/systems across the DoD
 - Determine how to build capacity to adequately prepare instructors to effectively deliver prevention training
 - Must account for 100+ PME school houses across the globe
- Developing the process: recruitment, selection, training and certification, continuing professional development, monitoring and evaluation, etc.
- Implications for improvement in provision of prevention instruction across the career lifespan of a Service member
 - e.g., PME system/structure, leadership development



Open Discussion on Issues Under Study Consideration



Next Steps

Analysis

Develop
Recommendations

Vote on
Recommendations
(Nov Public Meeting)

Finalize Report
(Due Mar 30, 2025)



**End of Subcommittee
Updates**



Meeting Close

- Closing Comments
- Meeting minutes and presentation slides will be available for public review on www.sapr.mil/DAC-PSM



Contact DAC-PSM

osd.mc-alex.ousd-p-r.mbx.DAC-PSM@mail.mil

Learn More

www.sapr.mil/DAC-PSM