

## **Intercollegiate Sexual Harm Prevention Council**

Date: 09/14/2021 1:30-3:30pm

### **Attendees:**

Angie Albeck  
Victor Bitca  
Erica Caloiero  
Natania Carter  
Kim Jordan  
Jaqueline June  
Raenetta Liberty  
Domenica Padula  
Dawn Mathews  
Nick Stanton  
Henekis Stoddard  
Ali Tartaglia, Chair  
Catherine Welch  
Sarah Robinson, VTN Staff Support  
Jessica Barquist, VTN Staff Support

**Members not in attendance:** Amy Bremel

### **Meeting Minutes:**

1. Introductions
2. **Review of the 2019 report from the Legislative Task Force on Campus Sexual Harm- Catherine Welch**
  - a. Senators created the taskforce in response to students at UVM who were advocating for the explain the asterisk campaign as a way to look at the issues broadly before legislation
  - b. This group found discrepancies between response and prevention. Students receive very different resources based on where they are enrolled
  - c. Recommended that a group like this one form to share resources and increase access equity across the state
  - d. The taskforce recommended that a uniform campus climate survey would be useful but couldn't agree on the logistics of how to aggregate it so that if it is published it isn't easily identifiable.
  - e. The taskforce divided into small groups to deal with the complex issues and Immunity was one aspect in one of the sub-groups
3. **Decision Making in this group: Proposed that the council operate by majority vote**
  - a. All voted in favor by show of hands
4. **Immunity related to reports of sexual assault**
  - a. Shared survey results with the group. Agreement in survey responses that there should be some form of immunity and all institutions reported having some policy related to immunity already

- b. If institutions already grant immunity, is this being granted to those accused as well as the complainants? Is this immunity across the board for all parties?
  - i. CCV- doesn't provide immunity but provides opportunity for the administrators to not pursue violations
- c. High bar to suggest requiring something for all campuses across the state. Are any other states doing this and if so, what does that look like?
  - i. Vermont Network did some initial research and were unable to find other states who are doing this
- d. Survey went out at a tough time for higher ed, do we need to survey again to get more specific and increased responses?
- e. What is the breathe of the problem? Are people doing this already enough so that it isn't necessary?
  - i. Taskforce recommendation was informed anecdotally by individuals
  - ii. The policies may exist but the muscle behind ensuring that students know the policies exist is where there may be room for growth
  - iii. We want to increase trust in the reporting process
  - iv. We should all get together and compare policies but legislation may be unnecessary
  - v. Balancing legal obligations and due process and making survivors feel heard is something that we need to work on
- f. Navigating the subjective is very hard for advocates and survivors. If it sounds as though there is room for an administration to make a decision to go one way or another, that lack of clarity can be a barrier for a victim to report.
- g. Title IX is not survivor centered; it supports the university. In order to be survivor centered, how does reporting intersect with survivor centered, trauma informed practices? How is this communicated to the students about what the process will be like for them and whether or not it goes against their best interest?
- h. Making the process clear for advocates and survivors
- i. More info on this issue is needed- Council agreed to pull a sub-committee together to get info from all the colleges and send to the full council so that a decision can be made about whether amnesty legislation is needed or if the council should focus on recommendations around messaging?
  - i. Consensus vote to form a sub-committee
  - ii. Questions to ask: What it covers? Who it covers? Procedure for how they make decisions on what will get amnesty.
  - iii. Angie and Ali volunteered to support this work
    - 1. Anyone else who is interested is welcome to join! Please let Aly know.

## 5. Key Priority Areas

- a. Prevention and education themes have already emerged
  - i. Website or central location for policies
  - ii. What does prevention and education look like across the campuses
- b. Survivor information/communication- making sure they know all the information and resources available to them in a way that is not overwhelming
  - i. Messaging
  - ii. Process
- c. Taskforce Recommendation #2: informal resolution and restorative justice with more survivor centered options. There was a lot of energy around this during the taskforce meetings.

- d. Data and campus climate survey – there is so much more for us to understand what is happening on campuses
    - i. Emphasis on demographic/ vulnerable population data to address concerns that certain groups of individuals aren't reporting or engaging in the process
  - e. Social media and other communications on campus (bulletin boards, newspapers) and how they factor into the survivor experience- what is being said and who is saying it and the pressure this creates on campus.
    - i. Anonymous social media used to “out” respondents and this coming back to the complainant as being retaliation
6. Closing and Next steps
- a. The minutes and doodlepoll for the next meeting in January will be sent out via email
  - b. Watch your email for information regarding the immunity conversation
  - c. **Please email Ali if you have the capacity to join the immunity sub-committee**