

# INTERCOLLEGIATE SEXUAL HARM PREVENTION COUNCIL

Date: 2/3/23      Facilitators: Ali Tartaglia & Jessica Barquist    Minute Taker: Christina Grier

Present: Henekis Stoddard, Ellie Lane, Kelsey Knapp, Amy Bremel, Emily McCarthy, Kim Jordan, Annabelle Keimach, Lily James, Ellett Merriman, Elliot Ruggles, and Angie Albeck

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Action
<b>Consent Agenda</b>	<p>Jessica &amp; Ali welcomed us with a check-in and introductions. Participants shared the following resources and/or upcoming events information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• H40 – a bill about the non-consensual removal of a condom. Jessica asked if anyone present would be interested in reviewing language and articulating a position from Council. Emily, Ali, and Amy expressed interest in a smaller group conversation outside of these meetings.</li> <li>• Amy shared about a recent Trauma &amp; Addition training through PESI.</li> <li>• Kim shared about the 3-part Network training, “Supporting Disabled Survivors: Disability Justice, Webs of Care, and Mutual Aid”</li> <li>• Elliot shared that they’re having a mini-retreat for the SV Prevention Council on UVM campus; they plan to discuss situational prevention methods, sexual geography and how it impacts SV, and how they will prioritize their energies</li> <li>• Amy asked if UVM would be doing the Dismantling Rape Culture Conference (DRCC)? Kim shared that the most recent DRCC was all virtual and called the Building Radically Connected Communities Conference — to manifest joy as well as dismantling rape culture. No one knew if this was happening again.</li> <li>• Kim shared about the recent “Harm &amp; Forgiveness in Restorative Justice” event at Middlebury College. The link to sujatha baliga’s talk can be found at:  <a href="https://vimeo.com/790501743?embedded=true&amp;source=vimeo_logo&amp;owner=13965424">https://vimeo.com/790501743?embedded=true&amp;source=vimeo_logo&amp;owner=13965424</a> </li> </ul>	December Minutes were approved by a show of hands	December Minutes approved

	December meeting minutes approval once a quorum was reached		
<b>Discussion Topic:</b> Administrative Immunity Policy	<p>Ali recommended that we use the same Immunity language previously adopted by the Council as the Model Immunity Administration Policy for all Vermont institutions. Ali pasted the following language in the chat for review:</p> <p><i>A reporting party or a witness who causes an investigation of sexual misconduct shall not be subject to a disciplinary sanction for a violation of the institution's student conduct policy related to the incident unless the institution determines that the report was not made in good faith or that the violation was egregious. An egregious violation shall include, but not be limited to, taking an action that places the health and safety of another person at risk.</i></p>	Recommend Model Immunity Administration Policy for Vermont institutions	<b>Vote Warned:</b> We will vote on the proposed Model Immunity Administration Policy at the April 7 meeting.
<b>Discussion Topic:</b> Campus Data Collection	<p>The Data Collection Subcommittee reported out from a previous meeting that they continue to question aspects of a campus climate survey. Specifically, they worry about a survey about sexual harm retraumatizing participants. They questioned using existing surveys, but they can be harsh on sexual violence and gender. Clearly data is also incomplete as it only captures reported incidents. The subcommittee questioned whether ongoing surveys were necessary and couldn't we just use national data and assume the same issues are happening here. Ellett compared this to the climate crisis and how some people need evidence to believe it is a problem. Can we use existing data to validate the issue without causing further harm? The subcommittee also reiterated that the simple act of asking about sexual harm will feel validating to some survivors and that they see it as a problem. How do we find the balance of acknowledging it without causing more harm?</p> <p>Jessica paused our conversation and suggested that we revisit this discussion when our guest speakers join us after the break.</p> <p>The Council was on a break from 9:51am-10:00am.</p>		

<b>Action Agenda:</b> Guest Speakers & Continue Discussion Topic	<p>Guests: Sharyn Potter &amp; Jane Stapleton from University of New Hampshire</p> <p>Lily from Every Voice Council provided some background on passing legislation in NH and five other states. NH is in its implementation phase and Lily introduced our guests.</p> <p>Jane &amp; Sharyn validated our concerns about surveys:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Risk of identifiable data especially in smaller schools (there are ways data can be reported to protect marginalized communities)</li> <li>• Causing harm</li> <li>• Adding requirements on staff who are already overburdened and overstretched</li> <li>• Over questioning students</li> <li>• Balancing those concerns with the idea that asking about sexual harm provides validation and awareness</li> </ul> <p>Things to consider to improve efficacy and validity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Timing</li> <li>• Implementation</li> <li>• Best practices around language so as not to cause further harm – there is really good science on what to ask and how to ask, informed by advocacy community and trauma-informed providers</li> <li>• Always give the option to not answer and/or skip a question</li> <li>• Exit at any time</li> </ul> <p>Good examples exist. Other states have already done this work, so we can learn from their process. Get really clear about what you want to</p>		<p>Data Collection Subcommittee will incorporate conversation into next steps and follow up with the full council in April around their recommendations and next steps.</p>

	<p>know and just ask that. If you want a statewide picture, you must use the same survey.</p> <p>A member asked what our goal is of having data through surveys? Some SV providers are against surveys, saying we should just believe national numbers.</p> <p>Jane shared that data can be used to inform:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Prevention</li> <li>2. Policy</li> <li>3. Survivor services</li> <li>4. Institutional communications</li> </ol> <p>The other benefit to surveys is that you can see specific trends. For example, they found that certain sexual harm behaviors were more prominent than others – sexual harassment, hostile environment, sexist comments, LGBTQ bias incidents, etc. were much more common than abuse involving penetration. They learned that there is a higher tolerance and lower recognition for the behaviors on the lower end of the spectrum of violence/abuse. At one school, these results provided the data necessary for an LGBTQ group to get a significant amount of funding from the Administration.</p> <p>Lily offered that the other data point that has emerged from surveys is that Stalking victimization is much more prevalent than the national numbers show.</p> <p>One member asked how to use data to make specific asks of Administration, especially to increase advocacy services. Lily has more information on this for anyone interested.</p> <p>Jane said it's important to use a multi-pronged approach including mobilizing undergrads, graduate students, community members, alumni, etc. Surveys can be used as a recruitment and retention tool.</p>		
--	--	--	--

	We thanked our guests and the conversation ended at 10:50am.		
<b>Closing</b>	<p>Ali and Jessica recommended that subcommittees meet and be prepared to report out the status of their Proposed Bill edits at the April 7 Council meeting.</p> <p>Amy &amp; Kelsey offered to be added to a subcommittee. Christina will reach out to them.</p> <p>Plan for next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>April 7, 2023 from 9am-11am</u> (Restorative Justice practices in Vermont)</li> <li>○ Members were interested in an optional summer meeting to discuss new changes to Title IX rules. Our next official Council meeting would be in September/October.</li> </ul>		Next meeting: April 7, 2023 from 9am-11am