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Executive Summary

Overview and Conclusion

We were able to determine that enlisted Service members who reported being sexually assaulted were more likely to experience a disruption to a normal career progression following their report of the assault than those not reporting a sexual assault. It should be noted that it was not possible during the course of this audit to determine whether alleged victims were more likely to experience a disruption to a normal Navy career path specifically because they reported being sexually assaulted. There are many varying factors within the different Navy career paths and also between the characteristics of each reported sexual assault that may have contributed to the alleged victims being more likely to experience a disruption to a normal Navy career path. Additionally, because our career progression analysis required alleged victims’ careers to be tracked over their entire career, our audit results could not be based on the most recently reported assaults. Therefore, we could not determine if more recently assaulted members experienced or are likely to experience career disruptions similar to those identified during this audit.

The then Chief of Naval Personnel (CNP) noted that the Navy’s significant focus on sexual assault warrants a “then and now” comparison of career progression. We agree with CNP, and, at his request, plan to conduct a follow-on audit to determine if Navy’s focus on sexual assault since 2011 has resulted in improvements to the career progression conditions described in this report.

Section A of this report contains details on our finding that alleged sexual assault victims were more likely to experience a disruption to a normal Navy career progression following their report of the assault. Section B of this report contains a detailed analysis of sexual assault incident characteristics.

Audit Objectives and Reason for Audit

The three announced audit objectives for this audit were to determine whether:

1. Those reporting to have been sexually assaulted subsequently follow normal Navy career paths;

---

1 Controls were factored into the career path analysis to mitigate the differences between different Navy career paths. See Exhibit B for additional detail of the scope and methodology of the career path analysis.
2 Alleged victims refers to those who reported being sexually assaulted.
2. The Naval Inspector General Hotline Tracking System (NIGHTS) contains any information pertaining to individuals who had reported a sexual assault, alleged perpetrators, supervisory personnel, and others; and

3. Sexual assault hotline complaints were appropriately resolved.

The audit was requested by the former Director, Personnel Readiness and Community Support, Office of the Chief of Naval Operations. The admiral asked us to determine what happened professionally to Service members who reported being sexually assaulted. Specifically, the Director was interested in tracking victims’ career progression as it related to performance and separation subsequent to reporting a sexual assault incident. During the audit, Naval Inspector General (NAVIG) requested that we also address the second and third objectives shown above. However, due to delays caused by resolving denial of access issues to the NIGHTS database, we were unable to obtain appropriate evidence to address the second and third objectives. During the audit, Department of Defense Inspector General (DoDIG) clarified that DoD Instruction 7600.02 inadvertently included hotline records and databases among the information to which auditors “must have full and unrestricted access.” (The revised instruction was issued on 15 March 2016.) In July 2016, the General Counsel of the Navy directed NAVIG to grant Naval Audit Service auditors access to DON hotline records, but stipulated that NAVIG may not disclose information that was received under the Defense Hotline Program. Due to the timeframes associated with the coordination process, it was decided that the second and third objectives will be addressed in a separate audit. (Enclosure B contains additional details.)

---

3 The intent for audit objective 3 was to determine whether NAVIG took the appropriate steps to resolve DON hotline complaints related to reports of sexual assault. For purposes of the audit, “appropriately resolved” refers to NAVIG compliance with established procedural requirements, and is not an audit assessment of NAVIG resolution decisions. This was clarified with the NAVIG and NAVIG staff during the audit.
Section A:

Finding

Finding: Alleged Sexual Assault Victims’ Navy Career Paths

Synopsis

We found that alleged sexual assault victims were more likely to experience a disruption to a normal Navy career progression following their report of a sexual assault. Military departments are required to make every reasonable effort to minimize disruption to the normal career progression of a Service member who reports that he or she is a victim of a sexual assault, according to Department of Defense (DoD) Instruction 6495.02. Specifically, we found that alleged victims:

- Experienced a drop in average performance evaluation score after report of a sexual assault;
- Advanced at a slower rate than a control group;
- Were more likely to separate under negative circumstances than a control group; and
- Experienced a greater disruption to career progression when the sexual assault was reported earlier in their career.

A drop in performance may lead to a lower promotion recommendation and missed advancement opportunities. Missing an advancement opportunity may have a lasting impact on the alleged victim’s career. Separation prior to Completion of Required Active Service results in a loss of investment to the Navy and a potential increase in accession requirements.

Our specific finding is discussed in the sections below.

Audit Universe

The universe for this audit consisted of 1,465 Navy enlisted Service members who made 1,501 unrestricted sexual assault reports between Fiscal Years 2007-2011 and had their cases closed on or before 30 June 2012. We focused on sexual assaults reported in

---

4 Due to the many aspects of a Navy enlisted Service member’s career, we did not determine the underlying reasons (cause) why some alleged sexual assault victims had a disruption of their career progression.


6 Unrestricted reporting is when there is an official investigation, whereas restricted reporting allows alleged victims to confidentially disclose the assault and receive medical treatment, without an official investigation.
FYs 2007–2011 because sufficient data was needed to assess career progression after the reported sexual assault. Career progression data\(^7\) was as recent as April 2014. The majority of the cases (85 percent) involved Service members in pay grades E1 through E4. The cases were reported by Service members from 11 communities,\(^8\) consisting of 67 ratings or Professional Apprenticeship Career Tracks (PACTs). Chart 1-1 below shows reported sexual assault incidents by community.

**Chart 1-1**

**Reported Sexual Assault Incidents by Communities**

- **Surface Engineering**: 185 (12%)
- **Surface CS/Ops**: 240 (16%)
- **Supply**: 103 (7%)
- **Submarine**: 26 (2%)
- **Aviation**: 317 (21%)
- **Information Dominance**: 127 (9%)
- **Medical**: 113 (8%)
- **Seabee**: 46 (3%)
- **Security**: 81 (5%)
- **Special Warfare/Ops**: 2 (0%)
- **Administration**: 65 (4%)
- **Other (S-PACTS)***: 196 (13%)

\* Individuals within the “Other (S-PACT)” category were in the Seaman Professional Career Track (S-PACT) program at the time of report.

**Audit Results**

We found that alleged victims were more likely to experience a disruption to a normal Navy career progression following their report of a sexual assault. Specifically, we found that alleged victims showed a drop in performance following the report of a sexual assault.

---

\(^7\) Alleged victims’ performance evaluations (June 2013), Separations/Active Duty Status (September 2013), and Advancements (April 2014). Control group data was as recent as: Separations/Active Duty Status (September 2013) and Advancements (April 2014).

\(^8\) Count of individual communities. Administrative/Surface Cs/Ops was not included in the count as these communities (Administration and Surface/Ops) were already counted individually.
assault, advanced at a slower rate, and were more likely to separate under negative circumstances. Furthermore, we found that Service members who had a sexual assault report earlier in their career experienced a greater disruption to their career progression.

To determine whether those reporting to have been sexually assaulted subsequently followed a normal Navy career progression, we analyzed three areas of a Navy enlisted Service member’s career: performance evaluations, advancement in pay grade/rate, and separations (see details below).

**Performance**

To analyze alleged victim performance, we judgmentally selected a sample of 406 out of 1,465 alleged victims from our universe. The judgmental sample was selected based on the top three rating/PACTs with the highest number of reported sexual assaults within the audit scope and alleged victims who filed multiple reports of sexual assault. See Exhibit B for additional information regarding the selection of the judgmental sample.

We found that alleged victims’ average performance evaluation scores dropped after reporting a sexual assault. To assess the performance of the alleged victims, we analyzed 1,000 performance evaluations for the judgmental sample. Specifically, we compared the trend of all scores received before the report of the sexual assault to those after. The analysis showed that average performance evaluation scores for the sampled alleged victims after the report of sexual assault were consistently lower than scores before the report of sexual assault for the time periods analyzed. Graph 1-1 shows the consistent difference in the average performance scores before and after the report by time served in the military.

---

9 A sub-group of alleged victims from a judgmental sample showed a drop in performance following report of a sexual assault. See Audit Results for details of analysis.
10 We also used the judgmental sample to analyze incidents reported, including alleged victim and alleged perpetrator demographics, characteristics of the sexual assault incident, and dispositions. See Section B for incident statistics.
11 Performance evaluation scores are the performance traits that are graded on a 5-point scale, using performance standards. Please see Methodology, Performance section for details of the 5-point scale.
12 The time periods analyzed were 2-4 years in the military because there were not enough data points to analyze time in the military of less than 1 year or beyond 5 years.
We conducted further analysis to determine what may have driven the average drop in performance scores, and found that observed performance scores after the sexual assault report varied between two sub-groups. The first sub-group (41 percent of sample) consisted of alleged victims who separated for reasons other than Completion of Required Active Service. The alleged victims in this sub-group showed an average drop in performance score of approximately half a performance point (0.45 for 2 years of service, 0.51 for 3 years of service, and 0.37 for 4 years of service) following the report of sexual assault and prior to separation. See Graph 1-2 for additional detail.
The second sub-group (59 percent of sample) consisted of alleged victims who remained on active duty or separated for the reason of Completion of Required Active Service. The alleged victims in this sub-group showed average performance scores that remained relatively consistent before and after the sexual assault report.

**Graph 1-3**

![Graph 1-3](image)

Performance scores between the two sub-groups before the sexual assault report were similar. However, after the sexual assault report, Sub-Group #1’s performance scores were lower than Sub-Group #2’s. See Graph 1-4 for a comparison of the performance scores of Sub-Group #1 and #2’s before the sexual assault report and Graph 1-5 for a comparison after the sexual assault report.

**Graph 1-4**

![Graph 1-4](image)
As noted in Graph 1-4 and 1-5, Sub-group #1’s performance scores appeared to be impacted by the sexual assault report while Sub-group #2’s performance scores did not appear to be impacted. Utilizing available information, we could not identify any distinctive trends\textsuperscript{13} between the two sub-groups. Sub-group #1 appeared to be significantly impacted after their report of sexual assault. Sub-group #1 had an average drop in performance score of approximately half a performance point and separation for reasons other than Completion of Required Active Service, mostly for medical- or misconduct-related reasons. A drop in performance score can lead to a lower promotion recommendation and possibly missed advancement opportunities.

Additionally, we analyzed the performance recommendations for the judgmental sample by comparing the recommendations received prior to the reported assault to those after. We found that 54 of 375\textsuperscript{14} (14 percent) alleged victims sampled received an adverse performance recommendation following their report of a sexual assault on a total of 69 evaluations. Of the 54 alleged victims who received an adverse performance recommendation, 23 (43 percent) did not have an adverse promotion recommendation prior to the report of sexual assault. The remaining 31 alleged victims did not have any evaluations prior to their report of sexual assault, likely due to the sexual assault being reported early in the alleged victims’ career. A performance recommendation was considered adverse if the alleged victim received a promotion recommendation of “Significant Problems.” Adverse promotion recommendations were accompanied by low performance evaluation scores. Table 1-1 provides a breakdown of the reasons each Service member received a promotion recommendation of “Significant Problems.”

\textsuperscript{13}Variables tested included type of assault, report disposition, age, drug/alcohol involvement, location of incident, and victim/subject relationship.

\textsuperscript{14}375 of 408 alleged victims in our judgmental sample had performance evaluations.
Table 1-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Significant Problem</th>
<th># of Evals</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct - Drugs or Alcohol</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct - Military</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct - Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 52 of 54 (96 percent) alleged victims with an adverse performance recommendation subsequently separated from the Navy. Of those who separated, 57 percent of the separation reasons were due to misconduct. An adverse promotion recommendation could be an indicator of a need for counseling and rehabilitation. In accordance with DoD guidance, reasonable effort should be made by Navy commands to improve retention through counseling and rehabilitation of those who exhibit likelihood for early separation.

**Advancement**

To analyze alleged victims’ advancement, separations, and the impact of the timing of the sexual assault report for the audit universe, we established a control group from the Navy enlisted population that did not file an unrestricted sexual assault report. The comparable group was controlled based on unique characteristics found in the alleged victim universe. See Exhibit B for additional information regarding the established control group.

We found that alleged victims were more likely to advance at a slower rate than the control group. To determine whether the advancement of alleged victims differed from the control group, we compared the pay grade/rate progression of the alleged victims to the average progression of the control group. We found a lower percentage of alleged victims were above average in advancement throughout each time period analyzed and a higher percentage of alleged victims had below-average advancement within each time period analyzed. Additionally, a lower percentage of alleged victims had average advancement in comparison to the control group.

---

15 Reasons related to an offense exclusive to the military (e.g., absent without leave, failure to obey order or regulation, insubordinate conduct).
16 Reasons related to misconduct include larceny, assault, disorderly conduct, commission of a serious offense, etc.
18 Progression was measured using the established average total active Federal military service to attain each rate/pay grade. Percentages above, below, and on average were calculated and used as a comparison between the two populations. See Exhibit B for additional detail.
According to DoD policy,\textsuperscript{19} DON must make every reasonable effort to minimize disruption to the normal career progression of a Service member who reports that he or she is a victim of a sexual assault. Missing an advancement opportunity may have a lasting impact on the alleged victims’ career. Graphs\textsuperscript{20} 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3 show a detailed breakdown of the percentage of each population that was above average, average, and below average in advancement by years of service.

Graph 1-1
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\textsuperscript{19}DoD Instruction 6495.02, "Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program Procedures," dated 7 July 2015.

\textsuperscript{20}Some graphs and tables in this report may not add to 100 percent due to rounding. For the Graphs 1-1, 1-2, and 1-3, the numbers will not add to 100 percent due to lack of insufficient data to conduct an analysis, in addition to rounding.
Separations

To determine whether alleged victims’ separations differed from the Navy enlisted population, we compared separation outcomes of the alleged victim universe\(^{21}\) to that of the established control group. Separation outcomes analyzed included the condition of separation, type of separation, reason for separation, and time served. Comparisons of the outcomes were performed on an overall basis as a percentage of each respective population. Table 1-2 provides a summary of the significant differences identified during the separation analysis.

We found that alleged victims had a higher rate of separation under negative circumstances than the control group, and that rate was even higher for alleged victims who separated within 1 year after the sexual assault report. Alleged sexual assault victims were 10.98 percent more likely to be involuntarily separated from the Navy compared to the control group. Furthermore, alleged victims were 9.77 percent more likely to be separated for unfavorable reasons and 10.46 percent more likely to be separated for medical reasons. Subsequent to the report of sexual assault, 25 percent of alleged victims separated within 1 year, of whom 66.49 percent were separated involuntarily for reasons mostly relating to misconduct or medical. Table 1-3 provides a summary of the significant differences for alleged victims who separated within 1 year of the sexual assault report compared to the alleged victim universe. As previously stated, per DoD guidance,\(^{22}\) enlisted Service members’ chain of command should make every

---

\(^{21}\) Analysis was performed on 1,461 of 1,465 alleged victims. See Exhibit B, Separations section for additional information.

\(^{22}\) According to Department of Defense Instruction 1332.14, "Enlisted Administrative Separations," dated 27 January 2014
reasonable effort to improve retention and prevent significant loss of investment and increased accessions through counseling, retraining, and rehabilitation.

Table 1-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separation Category</th>
<th>Victim Universe</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>65.64%</td>
<td>59.22%</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Separation – Honorable</td>
<td>75.60%</td>
<td>85.63%</td>
<td>(10.03%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Separation - Involuntary</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>37.30%</td>
<td>10.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Separation – Unfavorable</td>
<td>25.86%</td>
<td>16.09%</td>
<td>9.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Separation – Medical</td>
<td>24.92%</td>
<td>14.46%</td>
<td>10.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Required Active Service</td>
<td>32.95%</td>
<td>49.86%</td>
<td>(16.91%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Time Served – Current Enlistment</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Separation Category</th>
<th>Separated w/in 1 yr</th>
<th>Alleged Victim Universe</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>65.64%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition of Separation – Honorable</td>
<td>54.86%</td>
<td>75.60%</td>
<td>(20.74%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Separation – Involuntary</td>
<td>66.49%</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>18.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Separation – Unfavorable</td>
<td>41.35%</td>
<td>25.86%</td>
<td>15.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for Separation – Medical</td>
<td>32.97%</td>
<td>24.92%</td>
<td>8.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Required Active Service</td>
<td>15.14%</td>
<td>32.95%</td>
<td>(17.81%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition of Separation

We found that alleged victims were 10 percent less likely to separate from the Navy under honorable conditions. The condition of separation, also known as characterization of service, can have a direct impact on a separating Service member’s veteran benefits. Service members discharged under Honorable and General conditions are entitled to most veteran benefits. However, certain benefits, such as the Government Issued Education bill, are provided only to Service members with an Honorable discharge. Furthermore, Service members discharged due to Bad Conduct or under Dishonorable conditions would not be entitled to most veteran benefits. Table 1-4 shows a breakdown of the characterizations of service for the alleged victims and the control group.
Table 1-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characterization of Service</th>
<th>Alleged Victim Universe</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Honorable</td>
<td>75.60%</td>
<td>85.63%</td>
<td>(10.03%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Honorable (General)</td>
<td>15.54%</td>
<td>7.16%</td>
<td>8.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Other than Honorable</td>
<td>6.78%</td>
<td>4.74%</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Conduct or Dishonorable</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry-Level Separation and Unknown</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>(1.05%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Separation

Alleged victims were 10.98 percent more likely to be involuntarily separated from the Navy, 6.09 percent more likely to be mandatorily separated, and 16.79 percent less likely to be voluntarily separated. Examples of involuntary reasons for separation included Condition, Not a Disability, Personality Disorder, Unsatisfactory Performance, Misconduct, etc. Alleged victims were 2.42 percent more likely to separate due to Pattern of Misconduct and 5.35 percent more likely to separate due to Misconduct (serious offense), driving the overall deviation in involuntary separations to 10.98 percent. Mandatory reasons for separation included Temporary Disability and Permanent Disability: 8.34 percent of victims separated due to a Temporary Disability versus 2.40 percent of the control group, resulting in the difference of 5.94 percent and overall deviation of 6.09 percent.

For voluntary separations, Completion of Required Active Service was the most common reason for separation for both the alleged victims and control group. However, alleged victims were 16.09 percent less likely to separate due to Completion of Required Active Service, resulting in the overall 16.79 percent deviation. Separation of enlisted Service members prior to their completion of obligated service results in a significant loss of investment and generates a requirement of increased accessions. Table 1-5 shows a breakdown of the types of separation for the alleged victims and the control group.
Table 1-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Separation</th>
<th>Alleged Victim Universe</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>41.50%</td>
<td>58.29%</td>
<td>(16.79%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Required Active</td>
<td>27.63%</td>
<td>43.72%</td>
<td>(16.09%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involuntary</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>37.30%</td>
<td>10.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern of Misconduct</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
<td>1.86%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct (Serious Offense)</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td>5.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>8.86%</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>6.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability, Temporary</td>
<td>8.34%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other and Unknown</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>(0.28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for Separation

Alleged victims were 9.77 percent more likely to separate from the Navy due to unfavorable reasons; 10.46 percent more likely to separate due to a medical reason (i.e., personality disorder); and 20.02 percent less likely to separate for a favorable reason. See Table 1-6 for detailed comparison. Separation for misconduct was the driving factor for the 9.77 percent deviation in unfavorable reasons. Alleged victims were 1.57 percent more likely to be separated due to misconduct for alcohol or drugs and 7.62 percent more likely to be separated for all other types of misconduct (e.g., serious offense, pattern of misconduct, other, etc.). A detailed breakdown of unfavorable reasons for separation can be found in Table 1-6-1.

For medical separations, alleged victims were more likely to separate due to Temporary Disability, Personality Disorder, and Condition, Not a Disability. Table 1-6-2 provides a detailed breakdown of medical reasons for separation for the alleged victims and Navy enlisted population.

Table 1-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Separation</th>
<th>Alleged Victim Universe</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>46.30%</td>
<td>66.32%</td>
<td>(20.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>25.86%</td>
<td>16.09%</td>
<td>9.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>24.92%</td>
<td>14.46%</td>
<td>10.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD and Unknown</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
<td>(0.21%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 Percentages between tables may not match exactly due to rounding.
24 Could not be determined (CBD) if reasons for separations were favorable or unfavorable.
Table 1-6-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alleged Victim Universe</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol or Drug Misconduct</td>
<td>5.42%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts-martial</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct (all other types)</td>
<td>13.35%</td>
<td>5.73%</td>
<td>7.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td>(1.01%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.85%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16.09%</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.77%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1-6-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Alleged Victim Universe</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Condition, not a disability</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability, Temporary</td>
<td>8.34%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>5.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability, Permanent</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>0.37%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Disorder</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
<td>2.54%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>(1.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>24.92%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14.48%</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.45%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Impact of Timing of Sexual Assault Report

To determine the impact of the timing of the sexual assault report, we divided the alleged victim universe into four groups: those that had a sexual assault report in the first year of their career, second, third, and fourth – sixth. After grouping the alleged victim universe by the time of report, similar Service members from the control group were used for comparison to the victims on an individual basis.

We found that alleged victims who made a sexual assault report early on in their career experienced a greater disruption to their career progression. Specifically, alleged victims that reported the sexual assault earlier in their career had greater differences in the time served and highest pay grade attained. For example, alleged victims who had a sexual assault report during the first year of their career served a total of 406 days less than the control group and attained a final pay grade 18.8 percent lower. As the time of report progressed into the second and third years of a Service member’s career, the effect on

---

25 Service members from control group with similar number of re-enlistments, the initial rate abbreviation, initial military entry date, and days in service when first assault was reported.
26 Difference in time served contributed to lower pay grade attained.
27 The team computed the 18 percent from Table 2-2 taking the difference from 1st Year (3.61:2.93) and dividing by 1st Year Control Group (3.61).
time served and the final pay grade attained lessened, but the difference remained
significant. Table 2-1 provides the results of the report timing and the impact on time
served. The results are presented as a fraction of a pay grade. Table 2-2 provides results
of the report timing and impact on highest pay grade attained.

Table 2-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Assault Reported</th>
<th>Alleged Victim Universe</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td>(406)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>1.528</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>(139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>1.914</td>
<td>(103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th – 6th Year</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td>2.448</td>
<td>(48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sexual Assault Reported</th>
<th>Alleged Victim Universe</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Year</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th – 6th Year</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 2-1 provides a detailed breakdown of the average time served (by months and
years) after report of a sexual assault for the alleged victim universe.\(^{28}\)

\(^{28}\) Analysis was performed on 1,461 of 1,485 alleged victims. See Exhibit C, Separations section for additional information.
The Chief of Naval Personnel (CNP) noted, in response to a discussion draft of this report, that the Navy’s significant focus on sexual assault warrants a “then and now” comparison of career progression. We had recommended in the discussion draft that he conduct such a comparison, but at his request, we now plan to conduct a follow-on audit ourselves to determine whether Navy’s focus on sexual assault since 2011 has resulted in improvements to the career progression conditions described in this report. Therefore, we are not making recommendations in this report.
Section B:

Sexual Assault Incident Statistics of Sampled Alleged Victims

The historical statistics in this section identify trends across fiscal years and relationships between incident characteristics. The historical compilation of sampled incident statistics in this section is specific to Navy Enlisted Service members who had unrestricted sexual assaults and is otherwise unavailable to Department of the Navy (DON) senior leaders, and may aid in resource allocation for preventing future assaults.

We analyzed 442 sexual assault incidents for the 406\textsuperscript{29} judgmentally sampled alleged victims\textsuperscript{30} and we found:

- Alleged victim and alleged perpetrator demographics
  - 91 percent of incidents involved alleged victims who were 17 – 25 years old
  - 90 percent of incidents involved female alleged victims
  - 73 percent of alleged perpetrators were enlisted Service members

- Characteristics of the sexual assault incident
  - 72 percent of incidents involved alleged perpetrators who were an acquaintance, friend, and/or co-worker of the alleged victim
  - 63 percent of alleged victims and/or alleged perpetrators reported alcohol and/or drug usage with the incident
  - 66 percent of incidents occurred within the United States

- Incident disposition
  - 68 percent of incidents either precluded command action or resulted in the command not taking action against the alleged perpetrator
  - 32 percent of incidents were referred for disciplinary action against the alleged perpetrator

\textsuperscript{29} We used the judgmental sample established for the performance portion of the career progression analysis. See Exhibit B, Scope and Methodology for details of the selection of our judgmental sample.

\textsuperscript{30}
Alleged Victim and Alleged Perpetrator Demographics

We found 82 percent of incidents involved alleged victims who were female Sailors under the age of 25. See Table 6-1 for additional details.

Table 6-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 - 20</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

82%

There were 465 alleged perpetrators involved in the sampled incidents. We found 73 percent of alleged perpetrators were enlisted Service members. See Table 6-2 for details regarding alleged perpetrators affiliation and pay grade. Due to a very small number of incidents involving officer alleged perpetrators (2 percent), no conclusions could be drawn from incidents involving officers.

Table 6-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alleged Perpetrator Affiliation and Pay Grade</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior Enlisted (E1 - E3)</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Enlisted (E4 - E8)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign National</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73%

Characteristics of Sexual Assault Incident

We found 72 percent of sampled incidents involved alleged perpetrators that were an acquaintance, friend and/or co-worker of the alleged victim. An additional 7 percent of alleged perpetrators were in the alleged victim’s chain of command. Of the alleged perpetrators that were an acquaintance, friend, co-worker, or in the alleged victim’s chain
of command, 89 percent involved Navy Service members. See Chart 3-1 details of the alleged victim and alleged perpetrator relationships.

Chart 3-1

We found the alleged victim and/or alleged perpetrator reported alcohol and/or drug usage in 63 percent of sampled incidents.\(^3\)

The data shows the majority of alleged assaults involving alcohol and/or drugs occurred with military-affiliated alleged perpetrators; six of those incidents involved alleged perpetrators that were in the alleged victim’s chain of command. See Chart 3-2 for additional details of incidents involving alcohol and/or drugs.

\(^3\) 57 percent of alleged assaults reported stated alcohol usage, 2 percent reported drug usage, 2 percent reported alcohol and drug usage...
Chart 3-2

Sexual Assault Incidents Involving Alcohol and/or Drugs

- Alcohol and/or Drugs: 63%
- Neither: 26%
- Unknown: 11%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alcohol and/or Drugs by Alleged Perpetrator Affiliation</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign National</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation Unknown</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We found 66 percent of the alleged assaults reported occurred within the Continental United States. See Chart 3-3 for a detailed breakdown of alleged assault locations.

Chart 3-3

Sexual Assault Incident Locations

Report Dispositions

We found 302 of 443\(^{32}\) report dispositions resulted in no action taken against the alleged perpetrator. The outcome of most sexual assault reports indicated no action was taken against alleged perpetrator due to:

- 192 of 302 (64 percent) reports precluded command action
  - 150 of 192 (78 percent) – alleged victims declined to participate in the investigation
  - 30 of 192 (16 percent) - lack of sufficient evidence
  - 12 of 192 (6 percent) - alleged perpetrator was unknown
- 92 of 302 (30 percent) commands did not take action\(^ {33}\)
- 18 of 302 (6 percent) Other/Unknown

\(^{32}\) 443 versus 442 because one case had two alleged perpetrators with different outcomes.

\(^{33}\)
The remaining 141 of 443 reports were referred for disciplinary action against the alleged perpetrator. We found:

- 94 of 141 (67 percent) reports were tried at Non-Judicial Punishment or Court-Martial
- 26 of 141 (18 percent) reports were administratively separated
- 21 of 141 (15 percent) reports were referred for civilian investigation

We further analyzed the dispositions by alleged perpetrator affiliation and pay grade and found: (1) commands were more likely to not take action against senior enlisted alleged perpetrators; and (2) alleged victims declined to participate in a significant number of investigations. See Table 6-3 for more information.

Table 6-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Disposition</th>
<th>Junior Enlisted (E1-E3)</th>
<th>Senior Enlisted (E4-E8)</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Foreign National</th>
<th>Perpetrator Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Command Did Not Take Action</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Evidence</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perpetrator Unknown</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alleged Victim Declined</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, we found that senior enlisted perpetrators were 11 percent less likely to be found guilty of a sexual assault related charge than junior enlisted perpetrators at court-martial. See Table 6-4 for actionable dispositions by alleged perpetrator pay grade.
Table 6-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report Disposition</th>
<th>Junior Enlisted (E1-E3)</th>
<th>Senior Enlisted (E4-E8)</th>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Foreign National</th>
<th>Perpetrator Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did Not Receive Non-Judicial Punishment</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Non-Judicial Punishment</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found Guilty of SA Related Charge at Court-Martial</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found Guilty of non-SA Related Charge at Court-Martial</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found Not Guilty at Court-Martial</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian Investigation Conducted</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Separation</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lastly, we analyzed additional relationships between gender, grade, locations, alcohol usage, affiliations, and case dispositions. No significant differences in the results were observed; therefore, these analyses were not included in this report.
Exhibit A:
Background and Pertinent Guidance

Background

According to the 2014 “RAND Military Workplace Study” conducted by the RAND National Defense Research Institute, 62 percent of women who filed an official report of sexual assault to a military authority stated they subsequently experienced some form of retaliation. The survey stated that this percentage was unchanged from the “Workplace and Gender Relations Survey of Active Duty Members” conducted by the Defense Manpower Data Center (DMDC) in 2012. According to Department of Defense (DoD) policies, military departments shall protect Service members who report a sexual assault from reprisal, or threat of reprisal, for filing a report. Accordingly, during our audit, we intended to determine whether the Naval Inspector General Hotline Tracking System (NIGHTS) contained information pertaining to individuals who reported sexual assaults, alleged perpetrators, supervisory personnel, and others; and whether complaints made subsequent to report of a sexual assault were appropriately resolved (announced audit objectives 2 and 3).

In July 2013, the Navy established a new directorate, the Twenty-First Century Sailor Office (N17), based on a recommendation from the Vice Chief of Naval Operations’ Task Force, Resilient. N17 is responsible for the integration of the Navy’s objectives for equal opportunity, Sailor personal and family readiness, physical readiness, substance abuse prevention, suicide prevention, sexual harassment and sexual assault prevention and response (SAPR), and hazing prevention. The SAPR branch was tasked with managing policy to prevent and respond to sexual assaults, as well as coordinating SAPR initiatives with Navy stakeholders on behalf of N1, Navy’s SAPR executive agent.

The Officer Career Progression/Officer Boards (PERS 80) and the Enlisted Career Administration/Enlisted Boards (PERS 81) are responsible for executing pay grades E1 through E6 advancements and pay grades E7 through E9 advancements, respectively. The Enlisted Personnel Plans and Policy (N132) is responsible for policy development.

Advancement eligibility requirements and authority to promote vary by pay grade. Table 3-1 summarizes advancement requirements by pay grade per Bureau of Naval Personnel Instruction 1430.16F, dated 2 November 2007.

---

34 Conducted by the RAND National Defense Research Institute in 2014.
36 The Task Force was established by the Vice Chief of Naval Operations on 22 January 2013, and published their final report in April 2013.
### Table 3-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Grade</th>
<th>Advancement Requirement</th>
<th>Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E2 through E3</td>
<td>Advanced based on time-in-rate requirements.</td>
<td>No local action required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4 through E6</td>
<td>Advanced based on advancement-in-rate examination score, performance evaluation, service in pay grade, awards, and previous examination performances.</td>
<td>Commanding Officer/Officer in Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7</td>
<td>Must be designated selection board eligible by completing a Navy-wide advancement examination and meeting final multiple requirements for rate. Advancements are then chosen by the selection board.</td>
<td>Chief of Naval Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8 through E9</td>
<td>Must be designated selection board eligible on the basis of their commanding officer or officer in charge recommendation and time in rate eligibility. Advancements are then chosen by the selection board.</td>
<td>Chief of Naval Personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Navy uses multiple databases to maintain and track Service members’ personnel information. The Navy Enlisted System is the Navy’s authoritative database for all active duty Navy enlisted personnel. The system generates and maintains official automated personnel records, including all advancements in a Service members’ career and their current duty status. The Navy Personnel Database contains current and historical data on over 1.75 million Navy members, including historical separation information. The Official Military Personnel File (OMPF) provides command-level access and is maintained at Navy Personnel Command in the Electronic Military Personnel Records System (EMPRS). The OMPF is the Sailor’s permanent personnel record documenting their career from accession to discharge or retirement and includes performance evaluations.

The Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS) is the responsible special agent that conducts the unrestricted sexual assault investigations. NCIS provides monthly investigation updates to victims of sexual assault until the investigation is complete and sent to the command for adjudication. To monitor and track unrestricted sexual assault investigations, NCIS maintains spreadsheets, titled “Master Spreadsheets,” that contain specific sexual assault incident details from the investigative case file by fiscal year. NCIS spreadsheets are also used to report data to the DoD Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office and the Chief of Naval Operations.

Naval Inspector General (NAVIG) has overall responsibility to ensure full implementation of the “Military Whistleblower Reprisal Protection” instruction.  

---

37 Secretary of the Navy Instruction 5370.7C, dated 14 October 2005.
Military Whistleblower Reprisal Branch, within NAVIG, is responsible for investigating and providing oversight of Echelon II Inspector General (IG) investigations of allegations of Military Whistleblower Reprisal filed by active duty, reserve, retired and former DON military members. NIGHTS is the primary data collection tool for IGs at all levels and is used to track, manage, and analyze Department of the Navy (DON) hotline complaints.

**Pertinent Guidance**

*Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards, 2011 Revision,* states auditors should report any significant constraints imposed on the audit approach by information limitations or scope impairments, including denials or excessive delays of access to certain records or individuals.

**DoD Instruction 7600.02, “Audit Policies,” dated 27 April 2007,** states the DoD audit organizations should have full and unrestricted access to all personnel, facilities, records, reports, databases, documents, or other information or material in accomplishing an announced audit objective when requested by an auditor with proper security clearances.

**DoD Instruction 7600.02, “Audit Policies,” dated 16 October 2014,** states DoD audit organizations must have full and unrestricted access to all personnel, facilities, records, reports, audits, reviews, hotline records, databases, documents, papers, recommendations, or other information or material related to accomplishing an announced audit objective when requested by an auditor with proper security clearances. Full and unrestricted access includes the authority to make and retain copies of all records, reports, audits, databases, documents, papers, recommendations, or other information or material until no longer required for official use.

**DoD Instruction 7600.02, “Audit Policies,” dated 15 March 2016,** states DoD audit organizations must have full and unrestricted access, unless access is precluded or limited by law, regulation, or DoD policy, to all personnel, facilities, records, reports, audits, reviews, databases, documents, papers, recommendations, or other information or material related to accomplishing an announced audit objective when requested by an auditor with proper security clearances. Full and unrestricted access includes the authority to make and retain copies of all records, reports, audits, databases, documents, papers, recommendations, or other information or material until no longer required for official use.

---

38 Text bolded, italicized, and underlined for emphasis.
39 Text bolded, italicized, and underlined for emphasis.
40 Text bolded, italicized, and underlined for emphasis.
DoD Instruction 6495.02, “Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program Procedures,” dated 7 July 2015, states military departments shall make every reasonable effort to minimize disruption to the normal career progression of a Service member who reports that he or she is a victim of a sexual assault.

DoD Instruction 1332.14, “Enlisted Administrative Separations,” dated 27 January 2014, states separation of enlisted Service members prior to completion of their required obligated service periods results in a significant loss of investment and generates a requirement for increased accessions. Reasonable efforts should be made by the chain of command to identify Service members who exhibit the likelihood for early separation and improve their chances for retention through counseling, retraining, and rehabilitation.

DoD Directive 7050.06, “Military Whistleblower Protection,” dated 23 July 2007, states members of the Armed Forces shall be free from reprisal for making or preparing to make a protected communication.

Secretary of the Navy Instruction 7510.7F, “Department of the Navy Internal Audit,” dated 27 December 2005, states DON auditors must be granted full and unrestricted access to all personnel, facilities, records, reports, data bases, documents, or other DON information or material that the Auditor General deems necessary to accomplish audit related matters.

Secretary of the Navy Instruction 7510.7G, “Department of the Navy Internal Audit,” dated 12 January 2017, states consistent with the auditors’ security clearances, unless access is precluded or limited by law, regulation, or DoD policy, DON auditors must be granted full and unrestricted access to all personnel, facilities, records, reports, databases, documents, or other DON information or material requested, that the Auditor General deems necessary to accomplish an announced audit objective.

Secretary of the Navy Instruction 1752.4B, “Sexual Assault Prevention and Response,” dated 8 August 2013, states a mandatory, standardized sexual assault victim assistance program must be developed. Additionally, it establishes the development of a database to track sexual assault trends and implement a sexual assault prevention program for Service members.

DON Military Personnel Manual 1910-704, “Determining Separation Authority,” dated 9 July 2013, states Commander, Navy Personnel Command is the separation authority for involuntary separation of active duty members who are victims of sexual assault.
Exhibit B:
Scope and Methodology

We conducted this audit of alleged sexual assault victims’ Navy career paths during the period of 3 February 2012 through 10 August 2016.

We conducted a site visit at the Bureau of Naval Personnel (BUPERS) in Millington, TN from 20 May 2013 – 23 May 2013 to interview Navy enlisted Community Managers for a better understanding of Navy enlisted career progression. Additionally, we met with separations and detailer personnel to obtain information for evaluating separations of Navy enlisted personnel.

To analyze alleged victims’ performance evaluations, we judgmentally sampled 406 alleged victims based on their rating at the time of the sexual assault report. Specifically, we selected the top 3 ratings/PACTs with the highest number of reported sexual assaults within the audit scope, which included Seaman PACT (S-PACT), Hospital Corpsman, and Master-at-Arms. Our sample also included alleged victims who made multiple unrestricted sexual assault reports. The judgmental sample was used for analysis of alleged victims’ performance and to obtain statistics of incidents reported, including alleged victim and alleged perpetrator demographics, characteristics, and case dispositions. See Table 4-1 below for details of the judgmental sample.

---

43 S-PACT is an on-the-job training program that leads to a career field within 2 years on board a Sailor’s first permanent duty station.
44 See Section B of the report for details.
Table 4-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampled Alleged Victims</th>
<th># of Victims</th>
<th># of Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-PACT Program</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Corpsman</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master-at-Arms</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various (18 Different Ratings)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>406</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To analyze the alleged victims’ advancement, separations, and the impact of the timing of the sexual assault report, we established a control group of Navy enlisted population. To create a control group comparable to the 1,465 alleged victims, we obtained career data for all Navy enlisted Service members who served on active duty between FYs 2007-2013 (Navy enlisted population). The career data obtained included initial military entry date, current enlistment date, active duty service date, number of enlistments, initial rate/pay grade, most recent rate/pay grade, separation date, characterization of service, type of separation (e.g. voluntary, involuntary etc.), and narrative reason for separation.

After extracting the alleged victim universe from the data obtained,45 we stratified the Navy enlisted population to account for distinct characteristics found in the alleged victim universe. Distinct characteristics found in this universe included:

- Approximately 90 percent of alleged victims were female
- 1 percent of alleged victims had entry-level separations
- Initial date of military service for alleged victims ranged from FYs 1982-2011
- 85 percent of alleged victims began their military service in FYs 2004-2010
- Initial Rating at the time of enlisted (e.g., approximately 4 percent of the alleged victim universe and control group had an initial rating of Master-At-Arms (MA))

To account for 90 percent of alleged victims being female, we stratified the control group to contain a 9:1 female-to-male ratio. Following, because alleged victims were unlikely to report being sexually assaulted and separate within their first 6 months of service, we eliminated a portion of the Service members in the Navy enlisted population who had entry-level separations. To control for differences in fiscal year of initial military service, we stratified the Navy enlisted population by the percentage of each fiscal year of initial

---

45 Only 1,461 of 1,465 alleged victims were found in the career data obtained. Therefore, the control group was established based on the 1,461 alleged victims included in the career data.
military service found in the alleged victim universe. For example, we found that approximately 9 percent of the alleged victim universe began their military service in FY 2005. Therefore, we stratified the Navy enlisted population to include a random number of enlisted Service members who also began their military service in FY 2005 equating to 9 percent of the total stratified subset. Lastly, we verified that the percentages of each rating within the alleged victim universe and control group were similar.

**Performance**

To analyze alleged victims’ performance, we obtained performance evaluations available in OMPF for each alleged victim in our judgmental sample. We then extracted pertinent information contained in the performance evaluations, including period of report, rate, individual trait average (performance evaluation score), promotion recommendation, and rating official comments. The performance evaluations scores are graded on the following:

- **5.0 – Superstar Performance**: Could be promoted two pay grades, and still be a standout in this trait
- **4.0 – Advanced Performance**: Far more than promotion-ready in this trait right away
- **3.0 – Dependable**: “Fully Qualified,” Journeyman performance – Can handle this aspect of the next higher pay grade
- **2.0 – Useful, Promising Performance**: Needs development in this trait, but is promotable if overall performance warrants
- **1.0 – Disappointing Performance**: Until deficiencies are remedied in this trait, should not be promoted regardless of performance in other trait

Using the performance evaluation scores, we performed a variance analysis by comparing the alleged victims’ trend in performance prior to their report of sexual assault to after. After obtaining initial results, we removed all alleged victims that subsequently separated from the Navy for reasons other than Completion of Required Active Service and re-ran the variance analysis. The second variance analysis was performed to determine the impact of reporting a sexual assault on alleged victims who remained in the Navy or separated for the reason of Completion of Required Active Service versus those who separated for reasons other than Completion of Required Active Service.

To analyze alleged victims’ promotion recommendations, we created and utilized a template providing individual timelines for each promotion recommendation in relation to the alleged victims’ report of sexual assault. We then determined which of the alleged victims in our judgmental sample received an adverse promotion recommendation (recommendation of “significant problems”) for an evaluation prior to the report date, after the report date, or both. Following, we obtained reasons for significant problems
and separation data for those alleged victims who received an adverse promotion recommendation after their report of sexual assault. We then grouped each reason for significant problems into one of five categories:

- **Performance** - reasons related to the underperformance (e.g., failed physical fitness assessment (PFA), weight control)
- **Medical** - reasons due to separation of individual for a medical condition (i.e., personality disorder)
- **Misconduct (Drugs or Alcohol)** – reasons related to alcohol or a controlled substance
- **Misconduct (Military)** – reasons related to an offense exclusive to the military (e.g., absent without leave, failure to obey order or regulation, insubordinate conduct)
- **Misconduct (Other)** – reasons related to any other type of misconduct (e.g., larceny, false official statement)

Lastly, we determined which of the alleged victims that received an adverse promotion recommendation after their report subsequently separated from the Navy and the circumstances of their separation. The circumstances of their separation included the characterization of service, type of separation, and reason for separation.

**Advancement**

To analyze alleged victims’ advancement, we utilized promotion history and advancement reports. Promotion history was obtained for the alleged victim universe and Service members in our control group. Using the promotion history of the control group, we created an advancement report which provided the average total active Federal military service (TAFMS) to advance to each pay grade for each rate and quarter of the fiscal years available. Table 5-1 provides an example of the information contained in an advancement report.

### Table 5-1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay Grade</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E5</th>
<th>E6</th>
<th>E7</th>
<th>E8</th>
<th>E9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAFMS (years)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>UKN</td>
<td>UKN</td>
<td>UKN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

46 Also included Service members who did not have any performance evaluations prior to report of sexual assault.
After establishment of the advancement report, we calculated the TAFMS for each rate/pay grade attained for 1,458 of 1,465 alleged victims in the alleged victim universe. We then compared each TAFMS calculation to the advancement report to determine whether the alleged victim was average, below average, or above average for each rate/pay grade attained. For example, if in April 2011 an alleged victim in the Master-at-Arms rating had a TAFMS of 3.5 years when promoted to an E4 and the average was 3.1 years, then he or she would have been categorized as below average in advancement (see Table 5-1, E4). Lastly, we categorized each alleged victims’ career for each time period evaluated as follows: (1) fallen below average at any point in time (below average); (2) did not fall below average, but was average at any point in time (average); or (3) was above average in advancement throughout his or her career (above average). Following, we determined the percentage of the alleged victims that were categorized as below average, average, and above average for each time period. For comparison to the alleged victims’ advancement results, we repeated the analysis and determined the same statistics for our control group. The percentages of each population categorized as below average, average, and above average were then compared to each other to determine whether alleged victims’ advancement deviated from Navy enlisted Service members who did not make an unrestricted sexual assault report (control group).

Separations

To determine whether alleged victims’ separations differed from the Navy enlisted population, we utilized the established control group and obtained separation categories from the career data previously mentioned. The selected separation categories included characterization of service, type of separation, reason for separation, and time served for the Service members’ most recent enlistment. A detailed breakdown of each category and its subcategory is provided below.

- Characterization of service – Honorable, Under Honorable Conditions (General), Under Other Than Honorable Conditions, and Bad Conduct or Dishonorable
- Type of separation – Voluntary, Involuntary, Mandatory, and Other
- Reason for separation – Favorable, Unfavorable, Medical, and Could Not Be Determined (CBD)
- Time served for most recent enlistment – Time from current enlistment date to loss date

For the alleged victim universe and the control group, we calculated summary statistics for the selected separation categories by percentage of each population. If significant differences between the populations were identified in any of the listed categories, a more

---

47 1,458 of 1,465 alleged victims were in the promotion data obtained.

48 1,461 of 1,465 alleged victims were found in the career data obtained. Therefore, separation analysis could only be performed on the 1,461 alleged victims in the career data. The control group used was established based on the 1,461 alleged victims included in the career data.
indepth analysis was performed by subcategory. For example, we found that within the reason-for-separation category, alleged victims had a significantly higher percentage of their population separating for medical reasons (10.46 percent). Consequently, we performed further analysis by calculating the percentages of each population by medical reason (e.g., temporary disability, personality disorder etc.) to determine the subcategory/subcategories causing the 10.46 percent difference.

Impact of Timing of Sexual Assault Report

To determine the impact of the timing of the sexual assault report, we divided the alleged victim universe into four groups: those that had a sexual assault report in the first year of their career, second, third, and fourth - sixth. After grouping the alleged victim universe by the time of report, similar Service members from the control group were used for comparison to the alleged victims on an individual basis. The following alleged-victim characteristics were used to match the alleged victims with similar Service members from the control group: number of re-enlistments, the initial rate abbreviation, the initial military entry date, and days in service when first alleged assault was reported.

For each individual in the alleged victim universe, all individuals in the control group were identified that matched the alleged victim based on the characteristics outlined. In most cases, the comparison between the two datasets was direct. For example, if an alleged victim had two re-enlistments, then only individuals within the universe with two re-enlistments were selected. One exception to these direct comparisons was the matching applied to the date fields. For the entry date, all control individuals with entry dates within 200 days of the alleged victim's entry date were included.

The other non-trivial comparison involved the time in service at the first report date. Individuals were only included as a control if they had served in the military for at least as long as the alleged victim had served at the time of the report of their first assault. Following, the time served and highest pay grade attained for each alleged victim was compared to the average for the similar Service members from the control group. Lastly, summary statistics were calculated to analyze the average differences in time served and highest pay grade attained of the alleged victim universe and control group.

Data Reliability, Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards, and Audit Followup

To assess the reliability of the data elements for the career and case file data used within the Alleged Sexual Assault Victims’ Career Paths audit, we: (1) reviewed source documents, (2) performed electronic testing of required data elements, (3) traced the sample of data to related source documentation, and (4) interviewed activity officials knowledgeable about the data. We determined that the data we obtained from the Case Information System (CIS), Navy Enlisted System (NES), and Navy Personnel Database (NPDB) were sufficiently reliable for the purposes of our report. We attempted to
determine the reliability for the NIGHTS database; however, we were not able to perform data reliability tests because we did not have full, unrestricted, and unfettered access to the database since DoD and DON Hotline records were comingled in the NIGHTS database.

This audit was conducted in accordance with the Government Accountability Office’s Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards (GAGAS), with the exception of the scope impairment relating to access to NIGHTS data. GAGAS standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained regarding alleged victims’ career progression provides a reasonable basis for our finding and conclusion based on our first audit objective. Due to delays caused by resolving the denial of access issues, we were unable to obtain appropriate evidence to address the second and third objectives. Subsequently, DoDIG clarified that the DoD Instruction 7600.02 inadvertently included hotline records and databases among the information to which auditors “must have full and unrestricted access,” and will be revised. In July of 2016, the General Counsel of the Navy directed Naval Inspector General (NAVIG) to grant Naval Audit Service auditors access to DON Hotline Records for the purpose of completing the audit. However, the General Counsel stipulated that the NAVIG may not disclose information that was received under the Defense Hotline Program. NAVIG was directed to determine whether DoD and DON hotline records could be segregated, and if so, take appropriate measures to do so as expeditiously as possible. If the documents cannot be segregated, NAVIG shall provide Naval Audit Service auditors access to DON hotline records but take appropriate measure to prevent disclosure of Defense hotline records. In addition, NAVIG shall take appropriate measures to protect the confidentiality of complainants, as well as other sensitive information during the provision of access to the DON hotline records. Due to the timeframes associated with the coordination process, it was decided that the second and third objectives will be addressed in a separate audit.

There were no previous audits of Alleged Sexual Assault Victims’ Career Paths during the last 5 years by the Naval Audit Service, the Department of Defense Inspector General, or the Government Accountability Office. Consequently, there was no need to perform audit follow up. Also, we reviewed the compliance with regulations. For assessing internal controls regarding sexual assault victims’ career progression, we analyzed the NCIS data collection process and BUPERS’s promotion process. In addition, we also reviewed the Manager’s Internal Control Plan for BUPERS and N17.

---

40 The revised instruction was issued on 15 March 2016.
Exhibit C:

Activities Visited and/or Contacted

- Office of the Secretary of the Navy, Arlington, VA
- Office of the General Counsel of the Navy, Arlington, VA*
- Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Arlington, VA*
- DON, Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office (SAPRO), Arlington, VA*
- Office of the Chief of Naval Personnel (OPNAV N1), Arlington, VA
- Military Personnel Plans and Policy (OPNAV N13), Arlington, VA*
- Personal Readiness and Community Support (OPNAV N135), Arlington, VA*
- Navy Personnel Command, Millington, TN:
  - Commander, Navy Personnel Command (PERS 00)*
  - Performance Evaluation Division (PERS 32)
  - Enlisted Distribution Division (PERS 40)*
  - Officer Career Progression/Officer Boards (PERS 80)
  - Enlisted Career Administration/Enlisted Boards (PERS 81)
  - Retirement/Limited Duty/Temporary Disability Retired List (PERS 83)*
  - Enlisted Separations (PERS 832)*
  - Career Transition Office (PERS 97)
  - Command Information Office (BUPERS 07)
  - Enlisted Community Management (BUPERS 32)*
  - Community Management Metrics & Analysis Division (BUPERS 34)*
- Navy Advancement Center (N3), Pensacola, FL
- Naval Criminal Investigative Service, Quantico, VA*
  - Family & Sexual Violence Division
  - Threat Management Unit & Insider Threat Division

*Asterisk (*) denotes activities visited
o Criminal Data Analysis Division

• Commander, Navy Installations Command, Anacostia, Washington, DC*
  o Counseling, Advocacy, and Prevention Program

• Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program, Washington, DC
MEMORANDUM FOR NAVAL INSPECTOR GENERAL

SUBJECT: DoD and Component Auditor Access to Hotline Records and Other Matters

Thank you for your memorandum of March 27, 2015, regarding conflicting DoD policy governing auditor access to Hotline records, access to records in the Defense Case Activity Tracking System (D-CATS), revitalization of the DoD Hotline Quality Assurance Review (QAR) program, and related matters. I address the key issues you raised below.

Conflict in Policy Governing Auditor Access to Hotline Records/Databases

DoDI 7600.02, “Audit Policies,” dated October 16, 2014, inadvertently included hotline records and databases among the information to which auditors “must have full and unrestricted access,” and will be revised. This language departed from the prior version of the instruction and conflicts with 47 of the IG Act of 1978, as amended. Hotline records and databases include sensitive information including names of complainants and informants, the identity of which should not be disclosed without consent of the individual or unless the IG has determined disclosure is unavoidable during the course of an investigation.

We recently initiated the process to revise the language in DoDI 7600.02 and are considering appropriate procedures for auditors to request Hotline data relevant to announced audits. Further, the record access provisions of the revised version of DoDI 7600.02 will be consistent with DoDI 5106.62, “Defense Inspector General Program.” Accordingly, the remaining concerns regarding conflicting guidance will be effectively rendered moot.

Government Accountability Office (GAO) Auditor Access to DoD Hotline Records

You inquired about the degree of access GAO auditors had to DoD Hotline records and the D-CATS database. During the recent GAO review of Whistleblower Retaliation Investigations (WRI), auditor access to investigation records in D-CATS was restricted to only those WRI cases closed in FY13 and 14 for which complainants had provided written consent.

Quality Assurance Reviews of Component Hotlines

As noted in your letter, DoDI 7050.01, “Defense Hotline Program,” dated December 2007, assigns responsibility to the DoD IG for QARs of component hotlines. Accordingly, QARs of hotlines are outside the purview of auditing organizations; but your hotline is not prohibited from conducting internal reviews. DoDI 7050.01 is being revised and will include the policies and procedures for QARs to assess the accuracy of hotline data. Further, we are pursuing deployment of D-CATS as an enterprise across the Department. D-CATS has capabilities for running queries to check for errors, completeness, empty fields, etc., and we use it regularly for that purpose to ensure the fidelity and integrity of the data.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
As for your request for a QAR, I recently increased staffing in the DoD Hotline and requested the DoD Hotline schedule a QAR of the Naval Hotline as soon as possible.

I trust you find this information helpful. Should you have questions, please contact me or [redacted], Acting Principal Deputy Inspector General, at [redacted].

Jon T. Rymer
MEMORANDUM FOR NAVAL INSPECTOR GENERAL
AUDITOR GENERAL OF THE NAVY

SUBJECT: Sexual Assault Prevention and Response

References: (a) DoD Instruction 7600.02 CH-1, March 15, 2016
(c) DoD IG Memorandum, May 4, 2015
(d) SECNAVINST 7510.7F
(e) SECNAVINST 5370.5B

The Department of the Navy (DON) has taken significant steps to protect the health and safety of Sailors, Marines, and Civilians in support of the DON’s fight against sexual assault. The DON Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office leads the effort in sexual assault prevention and response. The Naval Inspector General (NAVINSGEN) serves a vital role in investigating reports of retaliation against those who report sexual assault, and the Auditor General of the Navy (AUDGEN) serves a similarly important role in auditing the program.

Over the past several years, there have been extensive discussions between the NAVINSGEN and the AUDGEN, and often disagreement, on whether AUDGEN auditors may be provided access to Hotline Records of the Office of the NAVINSGEN. The Inspector General of the Department of Defense (DoD IG) promulgated reference (a), amending, among other provisions, language pertaining to audits which in the predecessor instruction did not comply with reference (b). References (a) and (b) legally prohibit the disclosure of the identity of an employee who files with the DoD IG under the Defense Hotline Program without the consent of the employee, unless the Inspector General determines that such disclosure is unavoidable during the course of the investigation. The Office of DoD IG recently clarified that reference (a) and (b) do not legally prohibit granting the Naval Audit Service access to the identity of an employee who files a complaint with the NAVINSGEN under the DON Hotline Program.

With respect to the pending Audit Report on Alleged Sexual Assault Victims’ Navy Career Path, the NAVINSGEN is directed to grant AUDGEN auditors access to DON Hotline Records for the purpose of completing the audit. However, the NAVINSGEN may not disclose information that was received under the Defense Hotline Program, per references (a) through (e) and guidance from the Office of the DoD IG. Where DON Hotline Records and DoD Defense Hotline Records are conjoined in a database and/or system of records, the NAVINSGEN shall determine if the records can be segregated, and if so, shall take appropriate measures to do so as expeditiously as possible. If the documents cannot be segregated, the NAVINSGEN shall provide AUDGEN auditors access to DON Hotline Records but take appropriate measure to prevent disclosure of Defense Hotline Records. In addition, the NAVINSGEN shall take
appropriate measures to protect the confidentiality of complainants as well as other sensitive information during the provision of access to the DON Hotline Records. The NAVINSGEN and the AUDGEN shall update references (d) and (e), and any other applicable DON instructions and guidance, and route same to the cognizant approval authority, as necessary.

Not later than 60 days after AUDGEN auditors are granted access to DON Hotline Records, AUDGEN is directed to provide a timeline for completing the Audit Report on Alleged Sexual Assault Victims’ Navy Career Paths.

The DoD IG conducted a Peer Review of the Office of the NAVINSGEN and issued its final report on June 21, 2016. This Peer Review included a Quality Assurance Review of the DON Hotline Program. NAVINSGEN is directed to provide monthly progress updates on the execution of DoD IG’s recommendations.

Paul L. Oosburg Sanz  
General Counsel of the Navy  
Overseeing NAVINSGEN and NAVAUDSVC  
per SECNAV Delegation of Authority of 25 Mar 2016

cc:  
UNSECMCR  
VCNO  
PDGC  
Director, NCIS  
CNP  
Director, DON-SAPRO
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