

## CONSEQUENCES COMMITTEE

Campus Community Coalition

August 4, 2005

1:30 PM

Police Services and Public Safety Building, CWU

### Minutes

**Attending:** Mark McClain, William Holmes, Steve Rittereiser, Pam Stoneburg, Mike Flippo, Armentia Tenner, Dovie Sigle, Lynne Imamshah

**Guest:** Stephanie Wise, DASA

1. **Complete discussion on automatic assessments.** It was clarified that any consensus reached by this committee would go forward to the CCC as a committee recommendation. With CCC agreement, a recommendation could then go to the prosecuting attorney's office or another agency.

Mark said that the prosecuting attorney's office has discussed the issue of automatic assessments in light of the feedback from the committee and from individuals who have contacted his office. Any policy decision will be made by Greg Zemple. Discussion ensued on the pro's and con's of automatic mandatory assessments for first offenses with a stay of prosecution. Bob Trumpy had provided a written summary of the university's perspective. Comments were made. The discussion was completed without any consensus or recommendation for the Coalition, but the prosecuting attorney's office has the benefit of the committee's views as it makes its decision.

William redirected the committee to the objectives as agreed upon by the CCC. The objectives are (1) to compare and contrast sanctions and consequences of various agencies; and (2) to facilitate the development of appropriate and consistent consequences within institutions and agencies. We need to accomplish #1 before we can tackle #2.

It was agreed to go back to the draft summary of consequences put together with information from committee members and have all committee members check their sections. Then Lynne will get help from Pam's staff person and/or Laurie Haberman to put it into a table to help identify gaps in service. A flow chart could show consequences for 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> offenses, population served, parameters of authority, & interrelationships among agencies/populations. Consequences should include assessment, treatment, and education.

2. **Washington Coalition to Prevent Underage Drinking – recommend CCC join?** The purpose of the WA Coalition to Prevent Underage Drinking is to protect state laws regulating sales of alcohol products, in opposition to legislative proposals to permit internet and phone sales. Such sales would make it very easy for minors to purchase and access alcohol products. Funding for the coalition is from the WA Beer and Wine Wholesalers Association. It was agreed that

although the purpose has merit, the funding support would prohibit many CCC members from attaching their names to this coalition; it will not be presented to the CCC for consideration.

3. **Summarize issues to be presented to CCC at September 14 meeting and confirm committee spokesperson.** It was agreed that the only report at this time for the CCC is that the Consequences Committee is in the process of compiling and comparing sanctions and consequences.

**The next meeting was scheduled for September 21 at 10 am.** Armentia will see if the conference room in the Morris Sorenson Building is available.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lynne E. Imamshah

***Objectives:***

- ? **To compare and contrast sanctions and consequences of various agencies**
- ? **To facilitate the development of appropriate and consistent consequences within institutions and agencies**

***Goal:*** Enhance effectiveness of policies, sanctions, and consequences within and among institutions and agencies.

***Key target area:*** A need for appropriate & consistent consequences within institutions & agencies.