



ICPSR 3814

National Evaluation of the National Institute of Justice Grants to Combat Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus Program, 2000-2002

Cheron DuPree

Institute for Law and Justice

User Guide

First ICPSR Version
October 2003



National Institute of Justice
Data Resources Program



Inter-university Consortium for
Political and Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Terms of Use

Bibliographic Citation: Publications based on ICPSR data collections should acknowledge those sources by means of bibliographic citations. To ensure that such source attributions are captured for social science bibliographic utilities, citations must appear in footnotes or in the reference section of publications. The bibliographic citation for this data collection is:

DuPree, Cheron. NATIONAL EVALUATION OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF JUSTICE GRANTS TO COMBAT VIOLENT CRIMES AGAINST WOMEN ON CAMPUS PROGRAM, 2001-2002 [Computer file]. ICPSR version. Washington, DC: Institute for Law and Justice [producer], 2003. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor], 2003.

Request for Information on Use of ICPSR Resources: To provide funding agencies with essential information about use of archival resources and to facilitate the exchange of information about ICPSR participants' research activities, users of ICPSR data are requested to send to ICPSR bibliographic citations for each completed manuscript or thesis abstract. Visit the ICPSR Web site for more information on submitting citations.

Data Disclaimer: The original collector of the data, ICPSR, and the relevant funding agency bear no responsibility for uses of this collection or for interpretations or inferences based upon such uses.

Responsible Use Statement: In preparing data for public release, ICPSR performs a number of procedures to ensure that the identity of research subjects cannot be disclosed. Any intentional identification or disclosure of a person or establishment violates the assurances of confidentiality given to the providers of the information. Therefore, users of data obtained from the ICPSR archive and/or any of its special topic archives agree:

- To use these datasets solely for statistical analysis and reporting of aggregated information, and not for investigation of specific individuals or organizations, except when identification is authorized in writing by ICPSR
- To make no use of the identity of any person or establishment discovered inadvertently, and to advise ICPSR of any such discovery
- To produce no links among ICPSR datasets or among ICPSR data and other datasets that could identify individuals or organizations

Redistribution: ICPSR data may not be redistributed or sold to other individuals, institutions, or organizations without the written agreement of ICPSR.

Table of Contents

	Page
Summary.....	1
General Study Overview.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	3
Methods.....	4
Study Design.....	4
Sources of Information.....	5
Sample.....	5
Response Rates.....	6
Date(s) of Data Collection.....	6
Summary of Contents.....	6
Description of Variables.....	6
Presence of Common Scales.....	6
Unit of Observation.....	6
Geographic Unit.....	6
Extent of Processing.....	7
Extent of Collection.....	7
Data Collection Notes.....	7
File Specifications.....	7
Publications.....	7
Related Publications.....	7
Final Reports and Other Publications.....	7
NIJ Data Resources Program.....	8
About the DRP.....	8
Data Completeness Report(s).....	9

Summary

This study was undertaken as a process evaluation of the Grants to Combat Violence Against Women on Campus Program (Campus Program), which was conducted by the Institute for Law and Justice under a grant from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and funding from the Violence Against Women Office (VAWO). The Campus Program was comprised of 38 colleges or universities, which received funding in 1999 and 2000. Part 1 data consist of basic demographic information about each campus and the violence against women programs and services available at each site. Data for Part 2, collected from questionnaires administered to grant project staff, documented perceptions about the Campus Program project and participation and collaboration from those involved in the partnership with each college or university (i.e., non-profit, non-governmental victim service providers).

General Study Overview

Title: National Evaluation of the National Institute of Justice Grants to Combat Violent Crimes Against Women on Campus Program, 2000-2002

Principal Investigator(s): Cheron DuPree

Investigator(s) Affiliation: Institute for Law and Justice

Grant Number: 2000-WA-VX-0001

Purpose of the Study: This study was undertaken as a process evaluation of 1999 and 2000 grantees participating in the Grants to Combat Violence Against Women on Campus Program (Campus Program), which was conducted by the Institute for Law and Justice under a grant from the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) and funding from the Violence Against Women Office (VAWO). The research team sought (1) to provide a national program- level process evaluation of the Campus Program, and (2) to inform policies and practices that address violence against women on campuses and ensure victim safety and offender accountability. The research team proposed a process evaluation aimed at describing the process of program planning, implementation, and problem resolution. The premise of the VAWO Campus Program was that colleges and universities had the ability to educate and shape the values, attitudes, and behaviors of young men and women toward the issue of violence against women. In 1994 Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act to improve the criminal justice system's response to the crimes of sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking. The need to address the victimization of college women was supported by research indicating that college women were at a greater risk of rape and other forms of sexual assault than women of comparable age in the general population. In 1998 VAWO received funds for the Campus Program, which recognized that within the college and university environment, educational programming on violence against women, victim assistance resources, reporting and investigative processes, disciplinary policies, and other factors can have a significant influence on women's safety and on whether victims step forward to seek assistance and report these crimes. Federal Fiscal Year 1999 was the first year in which colleges and universities received funding under the Campus Program. The Campus Program grantees varied geographically, by size, and by other demographic characteristics, and included both public and private institutions. The size of the student bodies ranged from approximately 800 to more than 50,000. VAWO's grant application package for the Campus Program outlined three minimum requirements that all 38 projects were required to address. First, all projects were expected to create a coordinated community response to violence against women on campus and were encouraged to form partnerships with at least one non-profit, non-governmental victim service provider. Second, grantees were to

establish a mandatory prevention and education program for all incoming students, working in collaboration with campus and community-based victim advocacy organizations. The program was to include information about dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. Third, grantees were required to train campus police to respond effectively in sexual assault, domestic violence, and stalking cases. An additional requirement was added for fiscal 2000 grantees, which called for training of judicial board members.

Methods

Study Design: Specifically, the process evaluation was to consist of a review of all grantees in the program through visits to each site. Prior to the evaluation's start, the research team established an advisory board to aid in designing the methodology. This board was composed of six individuals, including a researcher who had done work in the area of violence against women on campuses, a student, a university police chief, a sexual assault services coordinator from a university, and a director of student judicial services. Because of the large number of sites in the program, the research team was limited in the extent to which a thorough process evaluation could be conducted. At the request of NIJ, the research staff made only one trip to each site to collect administrative records data and conduct interviews relating to project activities. There were not enough funds to make subsequent trips to sites to judge their progress over time. Moreover, it was not possible to do follow-up telephone calls thereby maintaining contact with grantees on their implementation efforts. In short, the process evaluation depended on a snapshot view of the campuses at the time of the site visit. Each visit typically lasted two to three days, during which as many as a dozen interviews might take place. Interviewees usually included the project director, on-campus advocate, campus law enforcement, judicial affairs personnel, education coordinator, women's center, community partners, dean of students, representatives from student organizations, and project evaluator. Project directors frequently prepared large packets of information on their institutions and their project activities for the research staff. It was common for interviewees to provide documentation of their role in the project, or summary information on their office/organization. From the interviews, the research team typically collected copies of progress reports sent to VAWO, summary sheets of campus demographics, student handbooks, training manuals for advocates and disciplinary board members, and copies of all orientation materials as well as other educational curriculum materials, newspaper articles relating to the project, relevant police orders, crime statistics, and summary advocacy statistics. Other items collected across the campuses ranged from copies of all advertising materials (mailers, posters, mugs, t-shirts, magnets, buttons) to videos of major project presentations. To facilitate the visits, the research team developed several protocols to allow for

structured interviews. The protocols provided for consistent data collection across the campuses. After conducting a visit, the research staff prepared a site report, usually 20 to 25 pages in length, which represented a process evaluation report for a particular grantee/site. These reports were sent to the project directors at the sites for their review. The research staff made appropriate changes to the reports as a result of these reviews and then submitted them to NIJ as a deliverable product from the evaluation. Part 1 data consist of basic information about each grantee's campus and the violence against women programs and services available at each site. Data for Part 2 were collected using a Partnership Survey, which was a supplement to the site visit observations. The purpose of the survey, which was administered to grant project staff, was to document perceptions of project participants about program collaboration. From the 35-item questionnaire, respondents were asked to indicate on a five-point scale the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with items grouped into three categories: those regarding the partnership, the project, and individual participation. Respondents were also invited to provide comments on any survey item. The survey questionnaire was made available for downloading to all project directors through the Institute of Law and Justice's Web site. Copies were also distributed at site visit interviews. Respondents were given the option of mailing or faxing their completed surveys. A total of 247 surveys were received, representing 33 of the 38 campuses.

Sources of Information: For Part 1 administrative records data were collected from the United States of Education, the College Board, and official records provided by representatives from each college's or university's Campus Program. Data for Part 2 were collected from surveys administered to grant project staff and participants.

Sample: All 38 grantee project sites were targeted for inclusion in the sample for Part 1. Three project sites (Jamestown College, Tulane University, and University of Connecticut) represented consortiums. The Jamestown College and Tulane University projects involved more than one university participating in grant activities, although coordination of the grants took place on their respective campuses. The Jamestown College consortium included five other campuses: the University of North Dakota, North Dakota State College of Science, Lake Region State College, Mayville State University, and Fort Berthold Community College, a tribal institution. Tulane's consortium included Southern University at New Orleans and the University of New Orleans. The third consortium project was administered by the University of Connecticut, which implemented the project on its main campus first, and at the time of the evaluation only represented one institution. The Jamestown College and Tulane University sites were not included in the final sample, resulting in 36 grantee project sites. For Part 2, all project staff (either employees of the college/university or employees of one of the community partners) who were present during the site visit were targeted for inclusion in the sample. A total of 247 surveys were received, representing 33 of the 38 campuses.

Response Rates: Part 1: inap. For Part 2, an average of 11 surveys were returned from each campus, the median return rate was smaller (7 surveys per campus). The range of returned surveys included as few as 1 and as many as 16 surveys.

Date(s) of Data Collection: 2000-2002

Summary of Contents

Description of Variables: Variables for Part 1 include whether an institution was public or private, located in an urban, suburban, or rural area, the number of students comprising the student population, whether students were residential or commuters, the year of the grant award, award amount, level of programming at the time of the award, whether there were campus police special units, conduct code for stalking, coordinated community response, relationship violence counseling, a Sexual Assault Nurse Examiner (SANE), sexual assault counseling, court accompaniment, hospital accompaniment, shelter services, legal advocacy services, hot-lines, language interpreters, and if campus police had any of the following training: sexual assault sensitivity training, domestic violence sensitivity training, stalking sensitivity training, sexual assault procedural training, and domestic violence training. Other variables include type of coordinated community response and educational programming, and the year violence against women services began on campus. Variables for Part 2 include whether a respondent was a university employee, whether respondents agreed or disagreed that the partnership would remain in place once federal funding was gone, if the partners in the project worked well together, were vested in the project, had common goals, were open to outside ideas or suggestions, had the victims' needs in mind, and if the partners perceived a shared responsibility for the success of the joint projects and activities. Respondents also offered their opinions on if relevant information was shared in a timely fashion, if there were barriers to effective communication, if information was shared with the public, if the partnership had realistic, obtainable, and measurable goals, if the partnership was on track for meeting goals, if the project had the potential to improve the safety or well-being of victims, if victims were encouraged to report victimization, if violence against women had increased since the inception of the project, if the project improved victim advocacy services on campus, if the project considered cultural, racial, and ethnic differences when planning projects and activities, and whether the project was considered a success.

Presence of Common Scales: Several Likert-type scales were used in Part 2.

Unit of Observation: Part 1: Colleges and universities. Part 2: Individuals

Geographic Unit: none

Extent of Processing: Missing data codes were standardized by ICPSR. ICPSR checked for undocumented codes, produced a codebook, generated SAS and SPSS data definition statements, converted the hardcopy documentation to a PDF file, and reformatted the data and documentation.

Extent of Collection: This data collection contains two data files with a PDF user guide, a codebook and data collection instrument in a separate PDF file, and SAS and SPSS data definition statements.

Data Collection Notes: The user guide, codebook, and data collection instrument are provided by ICPSR as Portable Document Format (PDF) files. The PDF file format was developed by Adobe Systems Incorporated and can be accessed using PDF reader software, such as the Adobe Acrobat Reader. Information on how to obtain a copy of the Acrobat Reader is provided on the ICPSR Web site.

File Specifications

<i>Part No.</i>	<i>Part Name</i>	<i>File Structure</i>	<i>Case Count</i>	<i>Variable Count</i>	<i>LRECL</i>	<i>Records Per Case</i>
1	Site Comparison Data	rectangular	36	72	807	1
2	Partnership Survey Data	rectangular	247	46	60	1

Publications

Related Publications: DuPree, Cheron, Tom McEwen, Deborah Spence, and Russell Wolff. "Evaluation of Grants to Combat Violence Against Women on Campus." NCJ 201306. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice. National Institute of Justice, June 2003.

Final Reports and Other Publications: The National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS) was established in 1972 by the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), of the U.S. Department of Justice, to provide research findings to criminal justice professionals and researchers. NCJRS operates specialized clearinghouses that are staffed by information specialists who supply a range of reference, referral, and distribution services. Final reports and other publications describing research conducted on a variety of criminal justice topics are available. Publications can be obtained from NCJRS at NIJ/NCJRS, Box 6000, Rockville, MD, 20849-6000, 800-851-3420 or 301-519-5500. TTY Service for the Hearing Impaired is 877-712-9279 (toll-free) or 301-947-8374 (local). The URL for the NCJRS Web site is:

<http://www.ncjrs.org/>

NIJ Data Resources Program

About the DRP: The National Institute of Justice Data Resources Program (DRP) makes datasets from NIJ-funded research and evaluation projects available to the research community and sponsors research and training activities devoted to secondary data analysis. Datasets are archived by the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (NACJD) at the Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan.

The NACJD maintains a World Wide Web site with instructions for transferring files and sending messages. Criminal justice data funded by the Department of Justice are available via the Internet at this site at no charge to the user. NACJD may be contacted at NACJD/ICPSR, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI, 48106-1248, 800-999-0960 or 734-647-5000. The URL for the NACJD Web site is:

<http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/>

DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3814.P1

Table 1: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```

=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
  (Total cases=36)                                    Missing Values
-----
  
```

68.1% (49 of 72 variables) have 0% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 72 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values

6.9% (5 of 72 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values

0.0% (0 of 72 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values

11.1% (8 of 72 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values

JUDICIAL	JUDICIAL BOARD TYPE	5.6%
CA_LOCAT	COURT ACCOMPANCY LOCATION	5.6%
ED_TYPE	TYPE OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMMING	5.6%
POLICE_T	WHERE ARE CAMPUS POLICE TRAINED	5.6%
MENGROUP	USE OF A MEN'S GROUP	5.6%
PDTIMEDE	AMOUNT PROJECT DIRECTOR TIME DEDICATED	5.6%
RELIGIOU	CAMPUS RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION	5.6%
LOCALEVA	INTERNAL OR EXTERNAL LOCAL EVALUATOR	8.3%

5.6% (4 of 72 variables) have > 10% - 20% Missing Values

BOARD_CO	BOARD COMPOSITION	11.1%
CCRLECOO	LE ARRANGEMENT FORMALIZED	13.9%
BOARD_TR	HOW OFTEN JUDICIAL BOARD TRAINED	19.4%
VAWSVCSB	YEAR VAW SERVICES BEGAN ON CAMPUS	19.4%

5.6% (4 of 72 variables) have > 20% - 40% Missing Values

SS_LOCAT	SHELTER LOCATION	22.2%
HOT_LOCA	HOTLINE LOCATION	27.8%
CCRPROSC	PROS ARRANGEMENT FORMALIZED	36.1%
CCRTFCOO	CTF ARRANGEMENT FORMALIZED	38.9%

2.8% (2 of 72 variables) have > 40% - 100% Missing Values

SANELOCA	SANE NURSE LOCATION	52.8%
LI_LOCAT	INTERPRETERS LOCATION	52.8%

```

=====
*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
in the data as coded.
  
```


DATA COMPLETENESS REPORT

This report corresponds to the data file: DA3814.P2

Table 2: Distribution of Variables by Percentage of Missing Values*

```
=====
Variable Name and Label                                Percent of Cases with
(Total cases=247)                                     Missing Values
-----
```

```
4.3% (2 of 46 variables) have 0% Missing Values
2.2% (1 of 46 variables) have > 0% - 1% Missing Values
39.1% (18 of 46 variables) have > 1% - 3% Missing Values
45.7% (21 of 46 variables) have > 3% - 5% Missing Values
8.7% (4 of 46 variables) have > 5% - 10% Missing Values
```

```
QUES26 IMPROVED VICTIM ADVOCACY SERVICES              5.3%
QUES24 EFFORTS CONTINUE W/OUT FEDERAL FUNDING        6.5%
QUES3 PARTNERSHIP WILL REMAIN IF NO FUNDINING        6.9%
QUES16 INFO SHARED WITH PUBLIC                       6.9%
=====
```

*Variables individually listed only if greater than 5% missing values.
Data do not contain skip patterns or skip patterns are not reflected
in the data as coded.

