

WASHINGTON STATE

Council of Presidents

REPRESENTING WASHINGTON'S PUBLIC BACCALAUREATE INSTITUTIONS

Campus Sexual Violence Prevention Task Force Meeting #10

June 13, 2016

10:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.

University of Washington Police Department

Attendees:

Natalie Dolci, Coalition Ending Gender-Based Violence; Gina Christian, University of Washington - Bothell; Kim Anderson, Washington State University; Paul Francis and Darshan Robertson, Council of Presidents; Tricia Boerger, Bruce Marvin, and Regina Chosid, Washington State Office of the Attorney General; Kelly Schrader, The Evergreen State College; Joe Holliday, Washington State Board for Community & Technical Colleges; Tom Fitzsimmons, Independent Colleges of Washington; Richard DeShields, Central Washington University; Lisa Rakoz, Washington State Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction; Maddy Thompson, Washington Student Achievement Council; James Crandall, Senate Majority Coalition Caucus; Adam Hall, Senate Democratic Caucus; Evan Klein, Senate Higher Education Committee; Megan Mulvihill, House Higher Education Committee; Trudes Tango, House Higher Education Committee; Kat Monusky and Jen Friedlander, Washington State Coalition of Sexual Assault Programs (WCSAP); and Chair John Vinson, Washington Association of Sheriffs and Police Chiefs (WASPC).

Garfield County Sheriff's Department - You Have Options Program

Officer Jim Nelson and Roger Pedersen of the Garfield County Sheriff's Office and Victim Advocate Katherine Troutman joined via telephone.

The Garfield County Sheriff's Office is one of three law enforcement agencies that have fully implemented the [You Have Options Program](#). The program was developed in Ashland, OR in response to the frustration victims were experiencing with law enforcement investigation techniques. The program is victim-centered, and is designed to give victims of sexual assault a level of control in how their investigation is handled. Features of the program include:

- Three reporting options: information reporting only, with no investigation; a partial investigation; and a complete investigation.
- Anonymous and online reporting.
- Forensic Experiential Trauma Interview (FETI).

Garfield County has seen a higher level of reporting since implementing the program, which they believe is a result of victims becoming more comfortable with the reporting process. In the past, some victims feared reporting because they were using drugs or alcohol at the time of the assault. The program doesn't focus on underage drinking or drug use, so charges are unlikely.

Other benefits of the program include:

- An improved relationship between law enforcement and victim advocates.
- Identifying and prosecuting more offenders.
- Connecting more victims with the help they need, including advocacy and therapy.

Garfield County's program was fully implemented within one year, including training for all department personnel, advocates, prosecuting attorneys, and representatives from local school districts. An awareness campaign was conducted which included advertising and media coverage.

The program Launch Team meets regularly to review and evaluate the program. Members of the Launch Team include the Sheriff, Undersheriff, Prosecutor, Officer Nelson, Program Administrator Roger Pedersen, and the Director of Quality Behavioral Health, who helped implement the program. The program was made possible through a grant which requires the Sheriff's office to provide an annual evaluation and report to the Office of Crime Victims Advocacy through the Washington State Department of Commerce. Through these evaluations the Launch Group has been able to refine their implementation of the program.

For more information on the You Have Options Program, including a training schedule and the list of the 20 elements of a victim-centered law enforcement response, visit reportingoptions.org.

MOU Requirements

There was a discussion to clarify whether MOUs are mandatory or recommended. MOUs are an encouraged practice, but not required. It was noted that the Campus Accountability and Safety Act (CASA) is pending in congress, so MOUs are not currently required on the federal level.

The MOU template approved by WASPC was discussed. A concern was raised that community colleges may enter into an MOU with their local law enforcement using the template before fully understanding the complexities of the process. It was explained that the template is a foundation that can be built upon and tailored to each institution, rather than a plug-and-play document. The implementation of the University of Washington's MOU was discussed, and it was suggested that an in-person or electronic training session be held so that other institutions and stakeholders could learn from their experiences.

Subcommittee Updates

Prevention – The group is considering ideas including providing training similar to the technical assistance model available to VAWA grantees, and assembling a cohort which can share best practices and act as an implementation team on campuses. A draft list of recommendations will be sent to the Task Force for review over the summer.

Criminal Justice System Workgroup – Group members are currently reviewing their draft recommendations. The report will contain a section on privacy, and will address overly broad medical release forms completed during SANE exams. The level of training that judges receive is also being discussed. WCSAP will provide the group with the judge’s bench guide which includes a section on sexual violence.

Campus Climate Assessment – There was a discussion about reporting and recommendations; it was suggested that it may be more efficient to combine prevention and response issues into one report. Concerns were raised about low response rates, specifically at the public technical and community colleges. Policymakers are interested in comparing and contrasting results across institutions and sectors, but it was suggested that survey results be used as a baseline for each institution to track their progress and improvements, rather than for comparison with other institutions. The subcommittee will meet in the fall to analyze what the data reflects, and to discuss how it will be reported. It was suggested that disclaimer language be borrowed from the first The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey or from Whitman College, as they have been conducting a campus climate survey for several years.

Advocate Confidentiality – Work continues on a final draft to present to the Task Force for feedback prior to the September meeting.

Student Conduct – The group has identified their recommendations and is working on a draft to present to the Task Force. The single investigator model is being considered and compared with the Administrative Procedure Act. It was noted that the University of Virginia uses this model and their documents are available on their [website](#).

Fall Meeting Planning/Roundtable

It was suggested and agreed that the September meeting be a work session to prioritize what will be included in the report. Virginia’s [Task Force on Combating Campus Sexual Violence](#) closely aligns with our subcommittees; that may be helpful in deciding what recommendations to make. Another suggestion was to organize recommendations into three sections: background information, the recommendation itself, and the rationale for the recommendation. Logistics for the September meeting will be determined at a later date.

There was a discussion about how to request funding for recommendations, and whether detailed numbers should be included in the final report.

Public Comment

A victim of campus sexual assault who chose to remain anonymous provided comments and suggestions which included:

- The need for better representation of student victims at Task Force meetings.
- Victim interviews should be recorded for accuracy.
- The Task Force should receive funding from the legislature.
- The Task Force could enlist student groups to help with its work.