



Appendix C: Metrics and Non-Metrics on Sexual Assault



Table of Contents

Appendix C: Metrics and Non-Metrics on Sexual Assault.....	4
Metrics	4
Metric 1: Past-Year Estimated Prevalence of Sexual Assault.....	4
Metric 2: Estimated Prevalence and Reporting of Sexual Assault.....	5
Metric 3: Bystander Intervention Experience in the Past Year.....	12
Metric 4: Immediate Supervisor Addresses the Continuum of Harm	14
Metric 5: Full-time Certified Sexual Assault Response Coordinator and SAPR Victim Advocate Personnel Currently Able to Provide Victim Support	15
Metric 6: Victim Experience – Satisfaction with Services Provided	17
Metric 7: Percentage of Cases with Victims Declining to Participate in the Military Justice Process.....	18
Metric 8: Perceptions of Retaliation	19
Metric 9: Service Member Kept Regularly Informed During the Military Justice Process	20
Metric 10: Perceptions of Leadership Support for SAPR.....	21
Metric 11: Reports of Sexual Assault over Time	22
Non-Metrics.....	27
Non-Metric 1: Command Action – Case Dispositions	27
Non-Metric 2: Court-Martial Outcomes	29
Non-Metric 3: Time Interval from Report of Sexual Assault to Court Outcome.....	30
Non-Metric 4: Time Interval from Report of Sexual Assault to Nonjudicial Punishment Outcome	31
Non-Metric 5: Time Interval from Report of Investigation to Judge Advocate Recommendation.....	32
Non-Metric 6: Investigation Length	33

List of Figures

Figure A – Metric 1: Past Year Estimated Prevalence as a Share of the Active Duty Population, CY06 and FY10 – FY18 5

Figure B – Metric 2: Estimated Prevalence and Reporting of Sexual Assault, CY04 – CY06 and FY07 – FY20 6

Figure C – Metric 2a: Army Estimated Prevalence and Reporting of Sexual Assault..... 7

Figure D – Metric 2b: Navy Estimated Prevalence and Reporting of Sexual Assault..... 8

Figure E – Metric 2c: Marine Corps Estimated Prevalence and Reporting of Sexual Assault..... 9

Figure F – Metric 2d: Air Force Estimated Prevalence and Reporting of Sexual Assault 10

Figure G – Metric 3a: Service Members Who Indicated Observing Inappropriate Behaviors or Comments in the Past Year 12

Figure H – Metric 3b: Inappropriate Behaviors or Comments..... 13

Figure I – Metric 3c: Type of Action Taken After Observing Inappropriate Behaviors or Comments Among Service Members of All Paygrades 14

Figure J – Metric 4: Agreement with Whether Immediate Supervisor Addresses the Continuum of Harm 15

Figure K – Metric 5: Full-time Certified SARC and SAPR VA Personnel Currently Able to Provide Victim Support, by Military Service 16

Figure L – Metric 6: Satisfaction with SAPR Response Personnel During the Military Justice Process 17

Figure M – Metric 7: Cases with Victims Declining to Participate in the Military Justice Process, FY10 – FY20 18

Figure N – Metric 8: Perceived Retaliation Among Female Service Members Who Made a Report of Sexual Assault..... 19

Figure O – Metric 9: Service Member Kept Regularly Informed During Military Justice Process 20

Figure P – Metric 10: Service Member Perception of Leadership Support if a Report Was Made 21

Figure Q – Metric 11: Reports of Sexual Assault Over Time, FY07 – FY20 22

Figure R – Metric 11: Army Reports of Sexual Assault Over Time, FY10 – FY20..... 23

Figure S – Metric 11: Navy Reports of Sexual Assault Over Time, FY10 – FY20 24

Figure T – Metric 11: Marine Corps Reports of Sexual Assault Over Time, FY10 – FY20..... 25

Figure U – Metric 11: Air Force Reports of Sexual Assault Over Time, FY10 – FY20..... 26

Figure V. – Non-Metric 1a: Command Action for Cases Under DoD Legal Authority, FY09 – FY20..... 27

Figure W – Non-Metric 1b: Completed Command Actions for Penetrating and Sexual Assault Crimes Investigated..... 28

Figure X – Non-Metric 2: Sexual Assault Court-Martial Outcomes Completed by Crime Charged	29
Figure Y – Non-Metric 3: Time Interval from Report to Court Outcome, FY14 – FY20.....	30
Figure Z – Non-Metric 4: Time Interval from Report to Nonjudicial Punishment Outcome, FY14 – FY20.....	31
Figure AA – Non-Metric 5: Time Interval from Report of Investigation to Judge Advocate Recommendation, FY14 – FY20.....	32
Figure BB – Non-Metric 6: Investigation Length, FY13 – FY20	33

Appendix C: Metrics and Non-Metrics on Sexual Assault

In collaboration with the White House, the Department of Defense (DoD) developed the following metrics and “non-metrics” in 2014 to help illustrate and assess DoD’s progress in sexual assault prevention and response (SAPR). As part of the development process, DoD examined sexual assault programs throughout the nation to identify potential points of analysis. Unfortunately, DoD could not find widely accepted, population-based metrics to serve as a reference. Therefore, in a collaborative process involving DoD SAPR program experts and researchers, DoD developed the following 11 metrics and six non-metrics.

For the purposes of this document, the term “metric” describes a quantifiable part of a system’s function. Inherent in performance metrics is the concept that there may be a positive or negative valence associated with such measurements. In addition, adjustments in inputs to a process may allow an entity to influence a metric in a desired direction. For example, DoD aspires to encourage greater reporting of sexual assault by putting policies and resources in place. Therefore, an increase in the number of sexual assaults reported may indicate that DoD’s efforts may be working.

DoD uses the term “non-metric” to describe outputs of the military justice system that should not be “influenced,” or be considered as having a positive or negative valence in that doing so may be inappropriate or unlawful under military law. Figures A through BB illustrate points of analysis for metrics and non-metrics.

Metrics

Metric 1: Past-Year Estimated Prevalence of Sexual Assault

(Biennial Metric; Not Measured in FY20)

DoD administers the *Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Active Duty Members (WGRA)*¹ to assess the estimated prevalence, or occurrence, of sexual assault among active duty members over a year’s time. The Office of People Analytics (OPA) conducts the WGRA in accordance with the biennial cycle of human relations surveys outlined in Section 481 of Title 10, USC. In the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year (FY) 2021, Congress allowed DoD to conduct the Active Duty and Reserve Component surveys in the same year. Metric 1 provides estimated active duty prevalence rates for Calendar Year (CY) 2006, FY10, FY12, FY14, FY16, and FY18. The Department was due to administer the WGRA in 2020, but was unable to do so due to the coronavirus pandemic. The Department will estimate prevalence rates again in FY21.

As with all surveys, OPA classifies Service members as having experienced sexual assault based on respondents’ memories of the event as expressed in their survey responses. A full review of all evidence may reveal that some respondents whom OPA classifies as not having experienced sexual assault in fact did have one of these experiences. Similarly, some whom OPA classifies as having experienced a crime or violation may have experienced an event that would not meet the minimum DoD criteria. OPA’s rigorous survey development sought to minimize such errors, but these errors cannot be eliminated in a self-report survey.

Metric 1 (Figure A) illustrates the estimated past-year rates of unwanted sexual contact (USC) in CY06, FY10, and FY12 and sexual assault in FY14, FY16, and FY18. Therefore, prevalence of

¹ In FY14, the RAND Corporation designed a prevalence estimate measure more closely aligned with legal language in the Uniformed Code of Military Justice (UCMJ). Consequently, “sexual assault” replaced “unwanted sexual contact” as the survey measure that estimates prevalence in the active and reserve components of the U.S. Armed Forces.

sexual assault as estimated in FY14, FY16, and FY18 are not directly comparable to prior years.




Figure 1 – Metric 1: Past Year Estimated Prevalence as a Share of the Active Duty Population, CY06 and FY10 – FY18

Source: *Gender Relations Survey of Active Duty Members (2006); WGRA, 2010-2012, 2016-2018; RAND Military Workplace Study (RMWS, 2014).*

In FY18, DoD estimated that 6.2 percent of active duty women and 0.7 percent of active duty men experienced an incident of sexual assault in the 12 months prior to being surveyed.² Compared to FY16, the FY18 sexual assault rate is statistically higher for women (from 4.3 percent in FY16 to 6.2 percent in FY18) and remained statistically the same for men (from 0.6 percent in FY16 to 0.7 percent in FY18).

Metric 2: Estimated Prevalence and Reporting of Sexual Assault

(Annual Sexual Assault Reporting Data Added for FY20)


Underreporting occurs when crime reports to law enforcement fall far below statistical estimates of how often a crime may occur. Nationally, sexual assault is one of the most underreported crimes, with estimates indicating that between 67 and 75 percent of sexual assaults are not reported to police.³ Underreporting also occurs in DoD and interferes with providing victims

² OPA used scientific weighting to estimate prevalence rates that were representative of the entire active duty population. OPA provides confidence intervals for all statistics that are interpreted as population estimates. The estimated 6.2 percent prevalence rate among women has a confidence interval of 5.9 percent to 6.6 percent, meaning that we can infer with 95 percent confidence that the estimated prevalence of sexual assault among active duty women is between 5.9 percent and 6.6 percent. The estimated prevalence rate of 0.7 percent among men has a confidence interval of 0.6 percent to 0.8 percent, meaning that we can infer with 95 percent confidence that the estimated prevalence of sexual assault among active duty men is between 0.6 percent and 0.8 percent.

³ Morgan, R. E., & Truman, J. L. *Criminal Victimization, 2019. Bureau of Justice Statistics (2020): 1-53.*

needed care and holding alleged offenders appropriately accountable. To understand the extent to which sexual assault goes unreported, Metric 2 compares the estimated number of Service members who may have experienced sexual assault, as measured by confidential survey data, with the number of Service member victims in sexual assault reports for incidents occurring during Military Service. **DoD will administer the next survey in summer 2021, and results will be included in the FY21 Annual Report.**

Each year, DoD receives reports of sexual assault from military and civilian victims. DoD responds to all reports of sexual assault; however, a focus on Service member victim reports of sexual assault for an incident occurring during military service allows for comparison to prevalence estimates. Figure B depicts the difference between the number of Service members who reported a sexual assault and the estimated number of Service members who experienced sexual assault in the last year, according to survey data. The dotted line at the top of the figure represents the baseline prevalence of sexual assault measured in the first WGRA survey in 2006 for comparison. Although reports to DoD authorities are unlikely to capture all sexual assaults estimated to occur each year, DoD encourages greater Service member reporting of sexual assault to connect victims with restorative care and to hold offenders appropriately accountable.



Note: Error bars represent the 95 percent confidence interval for each estimate.

Figure 2 – Metric 2: Estimated Prevalence and Reporting of Sexual Assault, FY12 – FY20


Figures C through F display data for each of the Military Services. Military Service-level data are presented on different scales for ease of reading and to account for differences in

population sizes of each of the Military Services. The dotted line in each figure represents the baseline prevalence of sexual assault measured in the first WGRA survey in 2006.

Additionally, OPA used scientific weighting to estimate prevalence rates that were representative of the entire active duty population and each Military Service. OPA provides confidence intervals for all statistics that are interpreted as population estimates, and provides the mid-point to estimate the number of Service members who experienced sexual assault in the 12 months prior to survey administration. Therefore, point-estimates displayed separately for each Military Service will not add up to the DoD point-estimate. **The following graphs do not include updated survey data, due to the deferred administration of the 2020 WGRA. DoD intends to administer the next survey in FY21.**

In FY18, DoD estimated that 5.8 percent of active duty Army women and 0.7 percent of active duty Army men experienced an incident of sexual assault in the 12 months prior to being surveyed. Compared to FY16, the FY18 sexual assault rate is statistically higher for women (from 4.4 percent in FY16 to 5.8 percent in FY18) and remained statistically the same for men (0.6 percent in FY16 and 0.7 percent in FY18).

As Figure C shows, 2,501 Service members (or approximately 38 percent of the 6,500 Service members estimated to have experienced sexual assault) reported sexual assault in FY18 to a military authority for an incident that occurred during military service in the past year. This is the same reporting rate as FY16, during which 1,962 Service members made reports to Army authorities, accounting for about 38 percent of the FY16 sexual assault prevalence estimate (~5,200).




Note: Error bars represent the 95 percent confidence interval for each estimate.

Figure 3 – Metric 2a: Army Estimated Prevalence and Reporting of Sexual Assault FY12 – FY20

In FY18, DoD estimated that 7.5 percent of active duty Navy women and one percent of active duty Navy men experienced an incident of sexual assault in the 12 months prior to being surveyed. Compared to FY16, the FY18 sexual assault rate is statistically higher for women (from 5.1 percent in FY16 to 7.5 percent in FY18) and remained statistically the same for men (0.9 percent in FY16 and 1.0 percent in FY18).

Figure D shows that 1,446 Service members (or approximately 21 percent of the 7,000 Service members estimated to have experienced sexual assault) reported sexual assault in FY18 to a military authority for an incident that occurred during military service in the past year. This measures roughly the same as the reporting rate in FY16, during which 1,209 Service members made reports to Navy authorities, accounting for about a quarter (~23 percent) of the FY16 sexual assault prevalence estimate (~5,300).




Note: Error bars represent the 95 percent confidence interval for each estimate.

Figure 4 – Metric 2b: Navy Estimated Prevalence and Reporting of Sexual Assault FY12 – FY20

In FY18, DoD estimated that 10.7 percent of active duty Marine Corps women and 0.8 percent of active duty Marine Corps men experienced an incident of sexual assault in the 12 months prior to being surveyed. Compared to FY16, the FY18 sexual assault rate is statistically higher for women (from 7.0 percent in FY16 to 10.7 percent in FY18) and remained statistically the same for men (0.7 percent in FY16 and 0.8 percent in FY18).

Figure E shows that 835 Service members (or approximately 28 percent of the 3,000 Service members estimated to have experienced sexual assault) reported sexual assault in FY18 to a military authority for an incident that occurred during military service in the past year. This is roughly the same reporting rate as FY16, during which 575 Service members made reports to Marine Corps authorities, accounting for about 27 percent of the FY16 sexual assault prevalence estimate (~2,100).




Note: Error bars represent the 95 percent confidence interval for each estimate.

Figure 5 – Metric 2c: Marine Corps Estimated Prevalence and Reporting of Sexual Assault FY12 – FY20

In FY18, DoD estimated that 4.3 percent of active duty Air Force women and 0.5 percent of active duty Air Force men experienced an incident of sexual assault in the 12 months prior to being surveyed. Compared to FY16, the FY18 sexual assault rate is statistically higher for Air Force women (from 2.8 percent in FY16 to 4.3 percent in FY18) and Air Force men (0.3 percent in FY16 and 0.5 percent in FY18). Despite these changes, sexual assault rates among Air Force Service members remains lower than the other Military Services.

Figure F shows that 1,271 Service members (or approximately 33 percent of the 3,900 Service members estimated to have experienced sexual assault) reported sexual assault in FY18 to a military authority for an incident that occurred during military service in the past year. This is lower than the reporting rate in FY16, in which 1,048 Service members made reports to Air Force authorities, accounting for about 46 percent of the FY16 sexual assault prevalence estimate (~2,300).



Note: Error bars represent the 95 percent confidence interval for each estimate.

Figure 6 – Metric 2d: Air Force Estimated Prevalence and Reporting of Sexual Assault FY12 – FY20

While the Department received about the same number of reports in FY20 as in previous years, a comparison between prevalence and reporting data should not be made, since DoD did not field the *WGRA* this year. The Department will estimate past-year prevalence of sexual assault again next year with the *2021 WGRA*.

DoD remains committed to providing Service members who experience sexual assault with a variety of reporting and care options in the DoD response system. In addition, DoD maintains its resolve to strengthen its prevention initiatives and evaluation efforts to ensure the effectiveness of such programs.

Metric 3: Bystander Intervention Experience in the Past Year

(Biennial Metric; Not Measured in FY20)

In FY18, DoD updated its assessment of bystander intervention using the 2018 WGRA. The Department will estimate rates of bystander intervention again on the 2021 WGRA. The new measure included a list of inappropriate behaviors or comments that respondents could indicate they observed in the past year. Results show that 27 percent of active duty Service members observed at least one instance of behaviors or comments they perceived to be inappropriate.

As shown in Figure G, military women were more likely to observe at least one of these situations (40 percent) compared to military men (24 percent). When broken down by paygrade, about half of junior female officers (O1-O3) observed inappropriate behaviors or comments, and about a third of junior male officers (O1-O3) observed inappropriate behaviors or comments, compared to about a quarter of men in other paygrades.




Figure 7 – Metric 3a: Service Members Who Indicated Observing Inappropriate Behaviors or Comments in the Past Year⁴

⁴ Warrant Officers (W1-W4) were not reportable due to a small sample size.

As depicted in Figure H, women most often observed someone who crossed the line with a sexist joke (26 percent) and someone who drank too much and needed help (24 percent). Men most often indicated they encountered someone who drank too much and needed help (17 percent) and observed seeing someone grabbing, pushing, or insulting someone (10 percent). Additionally, women were more likely than men to indicate they had encountered a group or individual being hazed or bullied, someone making unwanted sexual advances on someone else, and horseplay or roughhousing that “crossed the line” or appeared unwanted.




Figure 8 – Metric 3b: Inappropriate Behaviors or Comments Observed in the Past Year by Gender

Figure I illustrates the type of actions taken to address observed inappropriate behaviors or comments. Men and women who observed a situation did not differ in terms of the intervention they used. Of the overall 27 percent who observed one of these inappropriate behaviors or comments, 9 out of 10 (93 percent) said they intervened in some way. Service members were most likely to speak up to address the situation (62 percent) or to talk to those involved to make sure they were okay (58 percent). Figure I depicts all actions taken by Service members after observing inappropriate behaviors or comments.




Figure 9 – Metric 3c: Type of Action Taken After Observing Inappropriate Behaviors or Comments Among Service Members of All Paygrades⁵

Metric 4: Immediate Supervisor Addresses the Continuum of Harm

(Biennial Metric; Not Measured in FY20)

Since FY14, the Department has leveraged the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) Organizational Climate Survey (*DEOCS*) as the instrument to measure Metric 4. While the *DEOCS* remains useful for tracking this metric at the installation and command levels, DoD-level aggregate data did not produce meaningful trend information. Therefore, DoD added the questions that comprise Metric 4 to the *2018 WGRA*, allowing for estimates to be generalized to the entire force. The Department will estimate perceptions of immediate supervisors again on the *2021 WGRA*.

Perceptions of immediate supervisor’s actions in addressing behaviors in the continuum of harm are generally positive. However, women overall have a lower perception of their immediate supervisor addressing these issues, while enlisted women have the lowest average score on this metric. Figure J shows the average perceptions of immediate supervisors’ role in addressing behaviors on the continuum of harm, using a composite score of respondents who indicated their immediate supervisor:

⁵ Percentages may not add up to one hundred percent as more than one action taken could be indicated.

- Models respectful behavior
- Promotes responsible alcohol use
- Would correct individuals who refer to coworkers as “honey,” “babe,” “sweetie,” or use other unprofessional language at work
- Would stop individuals who are talking about sexual topics at work
- Would intervene if an individual was receiving sexual attention at work (for example, staring at someone's chest, standing too close, rubbing someone's shoulders)
- Would encourage individuals to help others in risky situations that could result in harmful outcomes (e.g., harmful outcomes include sexual assault, violence, suicide)





Figure 10 – Metric 4: Agreement with Whether Immediate Supervisor Addresses the Continuum of Harm

Metric 5: Full-time Certified Sexual Assault Response Coordinator and SAPR Victim Advocate Personnel Currently Able to Provide Victim Support

(Annual Metric; Updated for FY20)

As illustrated in Figure K, there were 1,128 full-time civilian and Service member Sexual Assault Response Coordinators (SARCs), SAPR Victim Advocates (VAs), and Uniformed SAPR Victim Advocates (UVAs) working to provide victim support in FY20. In addition to fulltime SARCs and SAPR VAs/UVAs, the Military Services also employed collateral duty Service member SARCs and UVAs to provide support to victims on a part-time basis.



Full-time Civilian Personnel		Full-time Uniformed Personnel	
SARCs	SAPR VAs	SARCs	SAPR VAs
407	328	248	145

Figure 11 – Metric 5: Full-time Certified SARC and SAPR VA Personnel Currently Able to Provide Victim Support, by Military Service

Metric 6: Victim Experience – Satisfaction with Services Provided

(Biennial Metric; Not Measured in FY20)

DoD administered the last iteration of the *Military Investigation and Justice Experience Survey (MIJES)* in 2017. *MIJES* results were not representative of the entire population of military victims that participated in the military justice system. To produce more generalizable estimates, DoD added Metric 6 questions to the *2018 WGRA*. The Department will estimate victim satisfaction with services again on the *2021 WGRA*. The results show that satisfaction with SAPR response personnel is relatively high, with roughly three-quarters of those who made an Unrestricted Report of a past-year sexual assault and interacted with SARCs, SAPR UVAs/VAs, and SVCs/VLCs indicating they were satisfied with the services they received.




Figure 12 – Metric 6: Satisfaction with SAPR Response Personnel During the Military Justice Process

Metric 7: Percentage of Cases with Victims Declining to Participate in the Military Justice Process

(Annual Metric; Updated for FY20)

To standardize and consistently improve the reliability and validity of DoD data, representatives from the Military Services meet routinely to review procedures for classifying and annotating case disposition information in DSAID. These meetings allow the Military Services to consistently report information properly and ensure data standardization, despite the turnover and changes in personnel.

After observing an increase in cases that could not progress in the military justice system because victims declined to participate, DoD engaged with Military Service representatives to review case reporting procedures and possible causes. This review led to improvements across the Military Services in their disposition reporting processes. The data for this year reflect the ongoing quality assurance process DoD leverages to ensure consistency between the Military Services and across reporting periods.

The Military Services reported that DoD commanders, in conjunction with their legal advisors, reviewed and made case disposition decisions following the completion of an investigation for 3,358 cases in FY20. However, the evidence did not support taking disciplinary action against everyone accused of a sexual assault crime. For example, disciplinary action is precluded or commanders respect victims' desired non-participation when there is insufficient evidence of a crime to prosecute, or when victims decline to participate in the military justice process. In FY20, 7 percent of cases commanders considered for action did not progress in the military justice system to conclusion because commanders respected victims' desired non-participation in the process. As illustrated in Figure M, the percentage of cases with victims declining to participate decreased from 8 percent in FY19 to 7 percent in FY20.




Figure 13 – Metric 7: Cases with Victims Declining to Participate in the Military Justice Process, FY13 – FY20

Metric 8: Perceptions of Retaliation

(Biennial Metric; Not Measured in FY20)

DoD aims to foster a climate of confidence in which victims feel they can report sexual assault without concern for retaliation. To this end, DoD uses the *WGRA* to ask respondents whether they experienced specific retaliatory behaviors following their report of sexual assault. Subsequent questions then assess the context of those experiences to further categorize which respondents reported experiencing consequences that aligned with prohibited behaviors described in policy and law as retaliation. Those behaviors that do not align with violations of the UCMJ or policy are referred to as “perceived retaliation.” The Department will estimate perceptions of retaliation again on the *2021 WGRA*.




Figure 14 – Metric 8: Perceived Retaliation Among Female Service Members Who Made a Report of Sexual Assault⁶

Of female Service members who indicated on the survey that they experienced a sexual assault incident in the past year and reported it to a DoD authority, 64 percent indicated perceiving at least one retaliatory behavior associated with their report. However, once the context of those alleged behaviors was assessed, 15 percent of victims’ experiences aligned with the legal criteria for professional reprisal, 10 percent aligned with ostracism, and 8 percent aligned with criteria for maltreatment (Figure N). Responses to these survey items do not constitute a report of retaliation, nor do they constitute a finding under the law that the victim experienced some form of retaliation. Rather, these responses allow DoD to gain insight into the broad range of negative consequences Service members associated with their sexual assault reports.

⁶ Data on men for this metric were not reportable due to the sample size being too small.

Metric 9: Service Member Kept Regularly Informed During the Military Justice Process

(Biennial Metric; Not Measured in FY20)

As described above with Metric 6, DoD added questions from the *MIJES* to the *WGRA* in an effort to garner more representative estimates of victims' experiences with response personnel. Metric 9 assesses how well Service members who made Unrestricted Reports for past-year sexual assaults were kept informed by key personnel. Specifically, the question asks, "How frequently did the [individuals/providers] take steps to keep you informed about the progress of your case?"

Data from the 2018 *WGRA* show that victims noted SVCs/VLCs kept them informed of their case progress to a greater extent than other response system personnel. Over half of Service member respondents who experienced and reported their sexual assault indicated that their SVC/VLC kept them informed at frequent to very frequent intervals. The Department will estimate victim's experiences again on the 2021 *WGRA*.




Figure 15 – Metric 9: Service Member Kept Regularly Informed During Military Justice Process

Metric 10: Perceptions of Leadership Support for SAPR

(Biennial Metric; Not Measured in FY20)

DoD administered the last iteration of leadership support for SAPR questions on the *DEOCS*, a survey not representative of the entire active duty population. To produce more generalizable results, DoD added Metric 10 questions to the *2018 WGRA*. The Department will estimate perceptions of leadership support for SAPR again on the *2021 WGRA*. The results show that perceptions of leadership support for SAPR are relatively high, with 90 percent of respondents indicating high scores for a more favorable climate. Below are the proportions for those who agreed and strongly agreed with the following statements for all respondents.

Respondents reported on their perceptions of their chain of command/supervisor's actions if their coworker were to report a sexual assault, which includes their command/supervisor:

- Taking the report seriously
- Keeping the knowledge of the report limited to those with a need to know
- Discouraging military members/employees from spreading rumors and speculation about the allegation
- Promoting healthcare, legal, or other support services to the reporter
- Supporting the individual for speaking up

Figure P depicts the average agreement with these above items by gender and paygrade. Although perception of leadership support for SAPR is high in general, women are overall less positive than men with enlisted women holding the least positive perception of leadership support for SAPR-related issues.





Figure 16 – Metric 10: Service Member Perception of Leadership Support if a Report Was Made

Metric 11: Reports of Sexual Assault over Time

(Annual Metric; Updated for FY20)

In FY20, the Military Services received 7,816 reports of sexual assault involving Service members as either victims or subjects (Figure Q). While DoD received these reports in FY20, a portion of reported incidents occurred in prior FYs and/or prior to military service.



Fiscal Year	Total Reports	=	Unrestricted	+	Remaining Restricted
2020	7,816	=	5,640 (72%)	+	2,176 (28%)
2019	7,825	=	5,699 (73%)	+	2,126 (27%)


Figure 17 – Metric 11: Reports of Sexual Assault Over Time, FY07 – FY20

Of the 7,816 reports in FY20, 614 (8 percent) were made by Service members for incidents that occurred prior to their entering military service.⁷ The Military Services received 5,640 Unrestricted Reports involving Service members as victims or subjects in FY20.⁸ The Military Services initially received 2,712 Restricted Reports involving Service members as either victims or subjects. Of the 2,712 initial Restricted Reports, a fifth (536 reports) later converted to Unrestricted Reports. These converted Restricted Reports are now counted with the Unrestricted Reports. At the end of FY20, 2,176 reports remained Restricted.

⁷ Prior to FY14, an Unrestricted Report of sexual assault may have included one or more victims and one or more subjects. DoD relied upon MCIOs to provide the number of Unrestricted Reports and the subsequent number of victims and subjects associated with those reports each year. In FY14, DoD transitioned to DSAID as the primary source of reporting statistics with each Unrestricted Report corresponding to a single victim.

⁸ Beginning with the implementation of DSAID in 2014, DoD has extracted and analyzed data six weeks after the end of each FY to allow sufficient time for data validation. DSAID is a live database, and its records change daily to reflect case status. During this six-week period, 43 additional Restricted Reports converted to Unrestricted. After a report converts from Restricted to Unrestricted, all data associated with the report is then counted in the Unrestricted Report category. These 43 reports that were made during the FY, converted to Unrestricted in the six-week period after the end of the FY, and are therefore included with the 536 report conversions.


Figures R through U display the reports over time for each of the Military Services.



Fiscal Year	Total Reports	=	Unrestricted	+	Remaining Restricted
2020	3,250	=	2,550 (78%)	+	700 (22%)
2019	3,219	=	2,551 (79%)	+	668 (21%)

Figure 18 – Metric 11: Army Reports of Sexual Assault Over Time, FY08 – FY20


Army received 2,550 Unrestricted Reports involving Service members as victims or subjects in FY20. Army authorities initially received 850 Restricted Reports involving Service members as either victims or subjects. Of the 850 initial Restricted Reports, about a fifth (150 reports) later converted to Unrestricted Reports. These converted Restricted Reports are now counted with the Unrestricted Reports. At the end of FY20, 700 reports remained Restricted.



Fiscal Year	Total Reports	=	Unrestricted	+	Remaining Restricted
2020	1,724	=	1,204 (70%)	+	520 (30%)
2019	1,774	=	1,242 (70%)	+	532 (30%)

Figure 19 – Metric 11: Navy Reports of Sexual Assault Over Time, FY07 – FY20


Navy received 1,204 Unrestricted Reports involving Service members as victims or subjects in FY20. Navy authorities initially received 653 Restricted Reports involving Service members as either victims or subjects. Of the 653 initial Restricted Reports, about a fifth (133 reports) later converted to Unrestricted Reports. These converted Restricted Reports are now counted with the Unrestricted Reports. At the end of FY20, 520 reports remained Restricted.



Fiscal Year	Total Reports	=	Unrestricted	+	Remaining Restricted
2020	1,181	=	791 (67%)	+	390 (33%)
2019	1,149	=	745 (65%)	+	404 (35%)

Figure 20 – Metric 11: Marine Corps Reports of Sexual Assault Over Time, FY10 – FY20

Marine Corps received 791 Unrestricted Reports involving Service members as victims or subjects in FY20. Marine Corps authorities initially received 497 Restricted Reports involving Service members as either victims or subjects. Of the 497 initial Restricted Reports, about a fifth (107 reports) later converted to Unrestricted Reports. These converted Restricted Reports are now counted with the Unrestricted Reports. At the end of FY20, 390 reports remained Restricted.



Fiscal Year	Total Reports	=	Unrestricted	+	Remaining Restricted
2020	1,661	=	1,095 (66%)	+	566 (34%)
2019	1,683	=	1,161 (69%)	+	522 (31%)

Figure 21 – Metric 11: Air Force Reports of Sexual Assault Over Time, FY10 – FY20

Air Force received 1,095 Unrestricted Reports involving Service members as victims or subjects in FY20. Air Force authorities initially received 712 Restricted Reports involving Service members as either victims or subjects. Of the 712 initial Restricted Reports, a fifth (146 reports) later converted to Unrestricted Reports. These converted Restricted Reports are now counted with the Unrestricted Reports. At the end of FY20, 566 reports remained Restricted.

Non-Metrics

Non-Metric 1: Command Action – Case Dispositions

(Annual Metric; Updated in FY20)

The following describes outcomes for completed investigations with case disposition results reported in FY20. Congress requires DoD to report on the case dispositions (outcomes) of sexual assault allegations in Unrestricted Reports made against Service members (DoDI 6495.02). When a person is the subject of multiple investigations, he/she will also be associated with more than one case disposition in DSAID (see Appendix B for further detail).

In FY20, 4,624 cases investigated for sexual assault were primarily under the legal authority of the DoD. However, as with the civilian justice system, evidentiary issues may have prevented DoD from taking disciplinary action in some cases. In addition, commanders declined to take action in some cases after a legal review of the matter indicated that the allegations against the accused were unfounded, meaning they were determined to be false or baseless. Command action was not possible in about 32 percent of the cases considered for action by military commanders in FY20 (Figure V). For the remaining 68 percent of cases considered for command action, commanders had sufficient evidence and legal authority to support some form of disciplinary action for a sexual assault offense or other misconduct. Figure V displays command action taken from FY09 to FY20 and Figure W displays command action in FY20 for penetrating versus sexual contact crimes alleged/investigated.





Figure 22 – Non-Metric 1a: Command Action for Cases Under DoD Legal Authority, FY09 – FY20

Case Dispositions	Count	Percent
Court-Martial Charge Preferral for Sexual Assault Offense	798	24 %
Nonjudicial Punishment for Sexual Assault Offense	353	11 %
Admin Discharge and Actions for Sexual Assault Offense	481	14 %
Action for Non-Sexual Assault Offense	663	20 %
<i>Command Action Precluded/Respected Victims' Desired Non-Participation</i>	1,063	32 %

Notes: Command action may not be possible when there is insufficient evidence of a crime to prosecute, the victim declines to participate in the justice process, the statute of limitations expires, the victim dies before action can be taken, or when the allegations against the alleged offender are unfounded. Percentages may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.




Notes: This figure only includes command actions in which the action was completed in FY20. Command actions pending completion (e.g., court-martial preferred but pending trial) are not included in this graph. Additionally, there were 22 completed command actions that could not be classified as penetrating or sexual contact crimes, because the crime investigated was attempted sexual assault or unknown.

Figure 23 – Non-Metric 1b: Completed Command Actions for Penetrating and Sexual Assault Crimes Investigated

Non-Metric 2: Court-Martial Outcomes

(Annual Metric; Updated for FY20)

Figure X illustrates case outcomes in the court-martial process, displayed by type of crime charged—penetrating (i.e., rape and sexual assault) compared to sexual contact crimes. Not all cases associated with court-martial preferral proceed to trial. In certain circumstances, the Military Service may approve a resignation or discharge in lieu of court-martial (RILO/DILO). Furthermore, Article 32 (pre-trial) hearings can result in a recommendation to dismiss all or some of the charges. Commanders may use evidence gathered during sexual assault investigations or evidence heard at an Article 32 hearing to impose a nonjudicial punishment (NJP) for other misconduct. As depicted in Figure X, most cases associated with court-martial preferral, for both penetrating and sexual contact crime charges, proceeded to trial.⁹



Sexual Assault Offenses	Penetrating Crimes		Sexual Contact Crimes	
C-M Actions Completed in FY20	299		116	
Cases Dismissed	73	24 %	17	15 %
RILO/DILO Cases	41	14 %	29	25 %
Proceeded to Trial	185	62 %	70	60 %
Acquitted	78	42 %	21	30 %
Convicted (any charge)	107	58 %	49	70 %

Notes: This figure only includes courts-martial in which the action was completed in FY20. Cases associated with court-martial preferral but pending trial are not included in this graph. Percentages may not sum to 100 percent due to rounding.

Figure 24 – Non-Metric 2: Sexual Assault Court-Martial Outcomes Completed by Crime Charged

In FY20, of the 185 penetrating crime allegations that proceeded to trial, 78 (42 percent) ended in acquittal and 107 (58 percent) ended in a conviction of any charge. Of the 70 sexual contact

⁹ Subjects charged with sexual assault crimes at court-martial can also be charged with other misconduct in addition to sexual assault offenses.

crime allegations that proceeded to trial, 21 (30 percent) ended in acquittal and 49 (70 percent) ended in a conviction of any charge at trial.

Non-Metric 3: Time Interval from Report of Sexual Assault to Court Outcome

(Annual Metric; Updated for FY20)

As illustrated in Figure Y, the average and median length of time from the date a person reported a sexual assault to the date that court-martial proceedings concluded was 327 days (10.7 months) and 294 days (9.7 months), respectively. A variety of factors, such as the complexity of the allegation, the need for laboratory analysis of the evidence, the quantity and type of legal proceedings, the availability of counsel and judges, and impacts of the coronavirus pandemic (in FY20) may affect the interval of time between a report of sexual assault and the conclusion of a court-martial.




Figure 25 – Non-Metric 3: Time Interval from Report to Court Outcome, FY14 – FY20

Non-Metric 4: Time Interval from Report of Sexual Assault to Nonjudicial Punishment Outcome

(Annual Metric; Updated for FY20)

In FY20, the average and median length of time from the date a victim signs the official form electing to make a report of sexual assault (DD 2910) to the date that the nonjudicial punishment (NJP) process is concluded (e.g., punishment imposed or NJP not rendered) was 153 days (5 months) and 125 days (4.1 months), respectively (Figure Z). Like Non-Metric 3, a variety of factors influence the interval of time between a report of sexual assault and the conclusion of NJP.





Figure 26 – Non-Metric 4: Time Interval from Report to Nonjudicial Punishment Outcome, FY14 – FY20

Non-Metric 5: Time Interval from Close of an Investigation to a Command Action Taken

(Annual Metric; Updated for FY20)

Figure AA illustrates the length of time from the date of the close of an investigation to the date a command action was taken. In FY20, the average time interval for this metric was 58 days and the median was 46 days. As with Non-Metrics 3 and 4, there is no expected or set time for this to occur.




Notes: This metric describes the length of time from the date of the close of an investigation to the date a command action was taken.

Figure 27 – Non-Metric 5: Time Interval from Close of an Investigation to a Command Action Date, FY14 – FY20

Non-Metric 6: Investigation Length

(Annual Metric; Updated for FY20)

As illustrated in Figure BB, it took an average of 127 days (4.2 months) to complete a sexual assault investigation in FY20. This was a slight decrease from 130 days in FY19. DoD began tracking investigation length in FY13; therefore, data from prior FYs are not available. It is important to note that the length of an investigation does not necessarily reflect an investigation's quality. Investigation length is dependent on various factors specific to the case, including the complexity of the allegation, the number and location of potential witnesses involved, and the laboratory analysis required for the evidence.



Investigation Information	FY19	FY20
Number of Completed Investigations	4,621	4,692
Average Investigation Length	130	127
Median Investigation Length	106	98

Figure 28 – Non-Metric 6: Investigation Length, FY13 – FY20