HOUSESIRESEARCHWatson,ORGANIZATION bill analysis5/19/2017(Leach, et al.)10/2017		
SUBJECT:	Providing amnesty to students reporting incidents of sexual as	sault
COMMITTEE:	Higher Education — favorable, without amendment	
VOTE:	6 ayes — Lozano, Raney, Alonzo, Alvarado, Button, Morrison	
	0 nays	
	3 absent — Clardy, Howard, Turner	
SENATE VOTE:	On final passage, April 10 — 30-1 (Hall)	
WITNESSES:	For — Liz Boyce, Texas Association Against Sexual Assault; but did not testify: Yannis Banks, Texas NAACP; Dwight Han AFT; Zoe Fay-Stindt; Thomas Parkinson)	-
	Against — None	
	On — Ann Hettinger, Center for the Preservation of American (<i>Registered, but did not testify</i> : Bill Franz, Texas Higher Educ Coordinating Board)	
BACKGROUND:	HB 699 by Nevárez, enacted by the 84th Legislature in 2015, higher education institutions to adopt a policy on campus sexu and included certain requirements for the policies.	1
DIGEST:	SB 969 would prohibit an institution of higher education, inclu- private or independent institution, from taking any disciplinary against a student enrolled at the institution for a violation of it student conduct if the student in good faith reported being the a witness to, an incident of sexual assault and the violation of institution's policies was in relation to the incident.	y action s policies on victim of, or
	The bill would apply regardless of where the incident occurred outcome of the institution's disciplinary process on the incident would not apply to a student who reported his or her own com	nt, if any. It

SB 969 House Research Organization page 2

sexual assault or assistance in the commission of sexual assault.

A determination that a student was entitled to amnesty would be final and could not be revoked. SB 969 could not be construed to limit an institution's ability to provide amnesty from application of its policies in circumstances not described by the bill.

The Commissioner of Higher Education would appoint a nine-member advisory committee to recommend rules to implement and enforce the bill. Each member would be a chief executive officer of a higher education institution or a representative designated by that officer. The committee would submit its recommendations to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board by December 1, 2017, and would expire September 1, 2018.

This bill would take immediate effect if finally passed by a two-thirds record vote of the membership of each house. Otherwise, it would take effect September 1, 2017, and would apply beginning with the 2018 spring semester.

SUPPORTERS
SB 969 would provide amnesty to students who reported sexual assault incidents in good faith, allowing victims or witnesses to report such occurrences without fear of being punished for violations such as underage drinking or illegal drug use. Sexual assault on college and university campuses has increased at an alarming rate, yet many offenses go unreported because the witnesses or victims fear repercussions for violating school policies. Campuses that have adopted amnesty policies have seen a rise in reporting, which has improved campus safety and the process of investigating alleged offenses.

If a student committed a serious offense that required law enforcement involvement, the student would not receive amnesty from the legal repercussions of those actions. The bill also would not provide amnesty from institutional policies to a student who perpetrated an act of sexual assault, ensuring the provision would not be abused. Amnesty would be provided only if the violation of campus policies was in relation to an

SB 969 House Research Organization page 3

	alleged sexual assault or harassment incident, not for an academic violation or other violation unrelated to the incident.
OPPONENTS SAY:	Students should not be given amnesty for breaking school policies. The bill could lead to students misusing the amnesty provision to get away with serious offenses.
OTHER OPPONENTS SAY:	SB 969 should allow, rather than require, higher education institutions to provide amnesty so they could make exceptions to their policies as they deemed appropriate.