



Attachment-Additional Questions for the Record
Responses from the U.S. Center for SafeSport
July 30, 2018

The Honorable Gregg Harper

1. During the May 23 hearing, you testified that the U.S. Center for SafeSport (the Center) had received reports, complaints, and allegations regarding sexual abuse that related to 38 of the National Governing Bodies (NGBs). Can you please provide a list of these 38 NGBs that have been associated with reports, complaints, and allegations received by the Center regarding sexual abuse?

Please see Appendix B to April 2018 responses.

- a. Have you received reports, complaints, or allegations regarding sexual assault from additional NGBs since the hearing? If so, from which NGBs?

No, there have not been reports, complaints, or allegations regarding sexual assault received from additional NGBs since the hearing.

2. During the May 23 hearing, you testified that the Center had received over 800 reports regarding sexual abuse since the Center opened in March 2017. Please provide an update on the total number of reports regarding sexual abuse that the Center has received since it opened in March 2017 and the date associated with this updated count.

As of July 27, 2018, the Center has received 975 reports involving some form of sexual misconduct.

- a. How many reports have been resolved since the Center opened in March 2017?

There are currently 398 open matters. 223 of the reports have been resolved (i.e., investigated and adjudicated) through the Center's process since it opened in March 2017.

- b. On average, how long does it take the Center to resolve a case relating to sexual abuse?

63 days.

- c. Of the NGBs that are associated with these reports of sexual abuse, how many NGBs have over 100 complaints associated with them, over 50 complaints associated with them, and over 25 complaints associated with them?

- Over 100 complaints: 3 NGBs
- Over 50 complaints: 2 NGBs
- Over 25 complaints: 5 NGBs

3. From the documents we received during our investigation, the Committee learned that the Center requested the historical codes of conduct from each NGB on March 14, 2018 to create a comprehensive database of policies.

a. Based on SafeSport's Code of Conduct, there is no statute of limitations that prevents the Center from investigating, assessing, or considering relevant conduct under its provisions, correct?

Correct – there is no statute of limitations.

b. Was the March 14, 2018 request the first time that the Center requested that the NGBs provide the Center with all of their historical codes of conduct?

March 14, 2018, was the first time the Center requested that the NGBs provide the Center with all historical codes of conduct to create a database of historical policies. But it was not the first time Center requested the applicable policy or policies from an NGB if and when it received allegations of sexual misconduct that pre-dated the SafeSport Code. Rather, if the Center did not have a policy in its database, it would request applicable documentation from the relevant NGB on a case-by-case basis.

c. The Center indicated that it was requesting the historical codes of conduct because, if a report is made regarding conduct that occurred before the effective date of the SafeSport's Code, the Office will apply the relevant NGB's substantive rules and regulations and/or other standards applicable at the time of the alleged conduct. Do you now have a database of historical policies from each NGB?

No. The Center anticipates completing the process of creating a database of historical policies by August 31, 2018. Because there is no statute of limitations, matters may date back as far as the 1960s.

d. What did the Center do when investigating historical cases during the first year of its operation?

During its first year of operations, the Center requested applicable policies from the NGB as needed and on a case-by-case basis. In addition, if policies were not (or are not) available, the Center identifies community standards in effect at the time.

e. As you have worked through the first year, how else have you changed or adapted your operating procedures to more efficiently handle your caseload?

- Criminal dispositions
 - Broadened the definition of criminal disposition
- Modified process for temporary suspensions
 - Clarified notice provisions and the time within which a hearing must be provided (72 hours from the request for a hearing)
 - Added requirement that Responding Party share in the costs of an interim measures hearing
 - Created a rebuttable presumption that allegations are true for purposes of interim measures hearing
- Removed the option for a three-judge panel for merits hearing (now all panels will be one judge)
- Removed an ex-parte communication provision during hearings
- Added provision making willful tolerance of a violation an independent violation

4. Does the Center have a standard process for investigating reports regarding sexual abuse? If so, please describe this process, including the parties that generally are involved in the process, their roles, and how the parties are updated on the status of the investigation.

Yes, the Center has a standard process for investigating reports regarding sexual misconduct.

When the Center receives notice of a matter within its exclusive authority, or accepts a matter within its discretionary authority, it undertakes a preliminary inquiry to determine if there is reason to believe an individual within its jurisdiction violated the SafeSport Code. If, after a preliminary inquiry, the Center concludes there is reason to believe an individual within its jurisdiction has violated the Code, it will initiate proceedings, which may include an informal or formal resolution.

The Center may initiate proceedings without a formal report and reserves the right to initiate proceedings without a report from, or participation by, a complainant (reporting party). The Center may, at any point before a matter is final, seek interim measures.

The parties

There are two parties to the process: the reporting party (often referred historically to as the victim) and the responding party (often referred historically to as the perpetrator).

The parties' roles

During an investigation, both the Reporting Party and the Responding Party are permitted to provide evidence, including written statements, lists of potential witnesses, and other physical or documentary evidence.

Full cooperation and participation in the investigation process is important to ensure that all relevant facts and evidence are presented to the Center so it can determine whether a violation of the SafeSport Code occurred. If a party declines to cooperate or participate in an investigation, the Center will make its decision based on the available evidence.

Other individuals who may have a role in the process include witnesses and the parties' advisor (who may be an attorney).

Formal investigation

If the Center determines that a full investigation is necessary, it will appoint trained investigators. The number of investigators assigned and the length of the investigation will depend on the nature and/or complexity of the matter.

The investigator may take the following steps:

- Seek to notify the Reporting Party that the Center is conducting an investigation into a possible SafeSport Code violation and inform the Reporting Party of the right to meet with the investigator and present evidence in support of the complaint along with the names and/or contact information of any potential witnesses with direct knowledge of the allegations.
- Seek to interview the Responding Party and advise the Responding Party of the nature of the allegations before making a determination. The Responding Party will be provided the opportunity to present a response to the allegations, including evidence and the names and/or contact information of potential witnesses with direct knowledge of the allegations.
- Seek to interview witnesses with direct knowledge of the allegations.
- Seek evidence and take any other action as the investigator may deem relevant to the

- investigation.
- Review the evidence provided by a third-party reporter, the Reporting Party, the Responding Party, or any other source
- Document all investigative efforts, including but not limited to interviews, receipt of relevant documentation, database searches, and review and collection of other publicly-available information (e.g., social media, public records).

At any point before the final resolution the Center may close the investigation if (a) the investigator could not conduct or complete the investigation, (b) it is determined the Center does not have authority or jurisdiction over the alleged violation, or (c) it is determined there is no reason to believe there has been a violation. The Center may, at its discretion, reopen any case it has closed.

Investigative Report

Upon completing the investigation, the investigator prepares a report that, based on the preponderance of the evidence, sets forth findings of fact and references disputed facts and any credibility assessments. The investigator's report will also state whether the Responding Party violated the Code.

The Director's Decision

The Director of Investigations and Outcomes will consider the investigative report and any other relevant information. If the Director decides no further investigation is necessary, the Director will issue a Decision that (a) states whether a violation of the Code occurred, and (b) the code Violation, and (c) the sanction to be imposed (if any), consistent with the sanctioning guidelines. The Decision will incorporate the investigator's report, include a summary of the relevant standards, facts and evidence relied upon in reaching the Decision.

The Director will provide written notice and a copy of the Decision to the Responding Party and the Reporting Party. The written notice states the Responding Party's opportunity to request a hearing to challenge all or part of the Decision. The Decision also includes notice of the Reporting Party's right (as applicable) to request a hearing to challenge a determination that the Responding Party did not violate the Code.

- If the Director decides there was no violation of the Code by the Responding Party, the matter will be closed. However, the Reporting Party may initiate arbitration to request a finding that the Responding Party did violate the Code.
- If a violation of the Code is found, the Responding Party may request a hearing concerning the finding that there was a violation of the Code, the sanction, or both.

All materials created during an investigation are deemed confidential as is the identity of the Reporting Party(ies) (i.e., victim(s)).

- a. After the Center launches an investigation, what information do all parties have access to during and after the investigation? If access to information is different for the various parties involved in the investigation, please describe what information each party can access at the different stages of the investigation.

All parties have access to the same information, including the nature of the allegations (including date and location), relevant policies, the involved individuals, information provided by witnesses – however, that information may be shared at different times with the parties and may be redacted to protect the integrity of the ongoing investigation or the identities of parties or witnesses. After the investigation is complete, the parties both have access to the investigation report, which includes any exhibits and documentary evidence relied upon in reaching the decision, and the Director's Decision.

- b. During an investigation, how does the Center typically work with the USOC or NGBs?

The Center's Response and Resolution Office shares information with NGBs as necessary to resolve an allegation and enforce disciplinary action. At a minimum, the Center must always initially determine whether it has personal and subject matter jurisdiction over the individual who allegedly violated relevant policy (i.e., the Responding Party) – information that the NGB must provide as they have exclusive control over their current and historical membership rolls. In addition, the Center shares information with NGBs necessary to enforce a sanction as NGBs are required to and have the ability to enforce sanctions. To this end, the policies and procedures state:

It will be necessary for the Center to:

- a) notify the NGB of an allegation involving a Covered Individual [Responding Party] from that NGB;
- b) if the Office seeks an interim measure (e.g., a no-contact measure, safety planning, or a suspension);
- c) if the Office proceeds to a full investigation, and
- d) any final decision regarding whether a violation occurred and what sanctions, if any, must be enforced.

However, the Center will not disclose the identity of a Reporting Party to the NGB unless necessary to the case.

- Example 1 – The Reporting Party requests a no-contact order be implemented between them and the Responding Party. The Reporting Party and Responding Party are scheduled to compete at an event sanctioned and staffed by an NGB. The two parties compete at different times, but there is a possibility that the two schedules may overlap. To both implement and monitor the no-contact order during the sanctioned event, the NGB must be aware of both the Reporting and Responding parties' identities.
- Example 2 – A Reporting Party notifies the Center of allegations that were previously addressed and resolved by the NGB prior to the opening of the Center in March 2017. This is, in essence, requesting an appeal or a re-review of the previous NGB adjudication. To determine whether such review is appropriate, the Center must obtain any historical files from the NGB.

Interim (Temporary) Measures by an NGB

Under the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act of 2017, the Center must develop a mechanism by which an NGB can “withhold providing to an adult who is the subject of an allegation of child abuse authority to interact with an amateur athlete who is a minor until the resolution of such allegation.” Under certain circumstances, this may require that the NGB be aware of information concerning the identity of both parties.

Reporting obligations and abuse of process

The Center's rules are designed to maximize the disclosure of any and all relevant information to both the Center and any other appropriate agencies (e.g., law enforcement, child protective services, etc.) – through ongoing reporting obligations, a prohibition on the destruction or concealment of evidence, and privacy rules.

Covered Adults¹, such as NGB staff, are mandatory reporters of child abuse. The obligation to report is an ongoing one and is not satisfied simply by making an initial report. The obligation

¹ A Covered Adult is a Covered Individual, who is 18 years of age or older. A Covered Individual is an individual who is within the Center's jurisdiction, i.e., any individual who currently is, or was at the time of a possible violation of the SafeSport Code, within the governance or disciplinary jurisdiction of an NGB or who is seeking to be within the governance or disciplinary jurisdiction of an NGB. This includes NGB staff.

includes reporting, on a timely basis, all information about which a Covered Adult becomes aware. If the Covered Adult learns additional information, including information regarding the nature of an incident, the identity of witnesses, statements regarding the incident including statements by the Reporting Party (the person(s) who may be the victim of the alleged behavior), Responding Party (the person(s) accused of the alleged behaviors), or a third-party Reporter (e.g., a friend, parent, coach, teammate, etc.), or the existence of evidentiary material (including any documents, electronic communications, emails, text messages, medical reports, photographs, audio or video recordings, or social media activity), it must be reported promptly to the Center. See SafeSport Practice and Procedures for the U.S. Olympic and Paralympic Movement at Part II (Reporting, Confidentiality, and Privacy).

The Center prohibits NGBs from and may sanction staff for: (a) **falsifying, distorting, or misrepresenting** information, and (b) **destroying or concealing information** prior to or during an investigation. See SafeSport Practice and Procedures for the U.S. Olympic and Paralympic Movement at Part IV (Misconduct Related to the Office's Proceedings) (prohibiting abuse of process).

- c. What information does a party have access to during and after a SafeSport investigation?

Please see 4(a), above.

The Honorable Michael C. Burgess

1. Larry Nassar was licensed in the state of Michigan, but treated gymnasts at the Karolyi Ranch in Texas without a Texas medical license. He also treated gymnasts during competitions abroad, including at the World Championships and Olympics.
 - a. How does the United States Olympic Committee and its National Governing Bodies ensure that its physicians are compliant with licensing obligations?

The Center refers questions concerning how the United States Olympic Committee and the National Governing Bodies ensures that its physicians are compliant with licensing obligations to those organizations.

However, when the Center is confronted with such issues, the Center attempts to coordinate with the governing medical boards in the relevant jurisdictions.

- b. Is parental consent required for amateur athletes to be treated by a team doctor? Are parents provided with information, such as status of medical license, for these providers?

The Center refers questions concerning how the United States Olympic Committee and the National Governing Bodies addresses parental consent for treatment by a team doctor to those organizations.

2. Many athletes begin training when they are very young and often do so outside of parental supervision.
 - a. Do athletes and/or parents receive training and education when a child joins a sport organization governed by a United States Olympic Committee National Governing Body?

The U.S. Center for SafeSport disseminates all education materials through its website and directly to National Governing Bodies to distribute to their membership, including athletes and parents. In May 2018 the Center published a parent toolkit and a free online parent training. The Center's core SafeSport training covers the topics addressing sexual, physical

and emotional abuse set forth in Attachment A.

In the Education policies that the U.S. Center for SafeSport will be issuing soon to NGBs, per the requirement under the Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act of 2017, all NGBs will be required to offer and provide training annually to minor athletes with parent/legal guardian consent. The Center is currently developing minor athlete training resources, which will be launched and made available to NGBs in October 2018.

- b. Are athletes and parents made aware of SafeSport and how to get in contact?

The U.S. Center for SafeSport is planning to disseminate parent education resources this fall, as part of a back to school awareness campaign. This will include sending NGBs sample communications and resources to distribute to parents, as well as the contact information for the Center. Additionally, the Center has been in communication with the Athletes Advisory Council over the last several months, working to identify a date to meet with and provide training with the AAC.

3. According to audit reports issued in October 2017, 43 organizations under the United State Olympic Committee had deficiencies in their compliance of safe sport policies and procedures. Congress recently passed a \$2.5 million grant program to help fund the U.S. Center for SafeSport, which I understand currently has 9 employees and will have approximately 16 by July 2018.

- a. How do you plan to remedy these deficiencies and continue to evaluate these organizations for future compliance?

The USOC Audit

The audit reports referenced in question 3 were conducted by the USOC to audit NGBs concerning compliance with USOC's NGB Athlete Safety Policy (first effective 2013), an historical USOC policy that predates the Center's 2017 opening and the 2018 federal legislation. The USOC policy will be largely, if not entirely, supplanted by new Center education policies (effective August 2018), which include policies for education requirements and minimizing one-on-one interactions.

Per the information made publicly-available on the USOC website, it "engaged Baker Tilly Virchow Krause, a full-service advisory firm that offers industry-specialized services in audit, to assist the USOC in the completion of audits to assess compliance with safe sport policies and procedures at the USOC and all of its National Governing Bodies and High Performance Management Organizations. The audit focused on compliance with the USOC's NGB Athlete Safety Policy. During the audit, many organizations were in the process of updating their athlete safety polices to identify those individuals who come within the jurisdiction of the newly formed U.S. Center for SafeSport and to comply with the updated NGB Athlete Safety Policy approved in June 2017. Following the initial audit, each organization, the USOC included, was given 90 days to correct remaining deficiencies. Corrective actions are being monitored and reviewed, and follow-up reports" are published and available through teamusa.org.

U.S. Center for SafeSport

The Protecting Young Victims from Sexual Abuse and Safe Sport Authorization Act of 2017 requires the Center to include in its policies and procedures "oversight procedures, including regular and random audits conducted by subject matter experts unaffiliated with, and independent of, a national governing body or a Paralympic sports organization of each national governing body and Paralympic sports organization to ensure that policies and procedures developed . . . are followed correctly."

To this end, the Center is currently creating a compliance department, which will have the

responsibility for developing, implementing, and executing on the audit requirement. The Director of Compliance position is currently posted, and we anticipate filling that role by September. The Director will, in turn, hire two additional compliance staff. The Director of Compliance will work to monitor historical remediation as it prepares to evaluate the NGBs for compliance with Center policies on a moving forward basis.

The Honorable Chris Collins

1. Non-disclosure agreements are widely used in business resolutions, and serve as useful tools in not only creating confidential relationships between parties, but also protecting certain confidential and proprietary information. Whether it be unilateral or multilateral, they vary in nature - protecting trade secrets and intellectual property, formalizing a relationship between collaborating organizations, or serving as an added layer when resolving disputes between individuals and entities. Within the Olympic community, various news sources revealed some sexual assault victims are bound by NDAs as part of their settlement agreement. One of the most widely publicized instance is the case of Olympic gold medalist, McKayla Maroney, who signed an NDA with USA Gymnastics in late 2016. However, USA Gymnastics chose not to seek action against Maroney when she breached her NDA earlier this year by speaking at the sentencing hearing of serial child molester, Larry Nassar. I would like to better understand the driving factors in NDA utilization within the Olympic community, as it may be indicative of protecting the brand and management more so than treating the problem at its source - stopping sexual abuse.

- a. How many NDAs has your organization entered into since 2005 and when was the most recent NDA or settlement entered into? Of those NDAs, how many were minors at the time of the dispute?

The Center has not entered into any NDAs.

- b. As to the nature of these NDAs or settlements, do the agreements prohibit the victim from speaking about the details of the settlement - such as the amount of any financial award - or do they prohibit the victim from speaking about the details of the case - such as the fact that they were abused, where and when the abuse occurred, who their abuser was, etc.? Are any of these NDAs entered into in lieu of the responding party being given appropriate sanctions, such as being suspended or banned from the NGB?

Not applicable.

- c. Would Safe Sport consider using an NDA in the case of sexual abuse where the NDA would require the victim to not discuss the assault?

The U.S. Center for SafeSport would not consider using an NDA to resolve an allegation of sexual abuse where the NDA would require the victim to not discuss the assault.

The Honorable Diana DeGette

1. How do criminal convictions impact SafeSport's investigation of a misconduct allegation?

It is a violation of the SafeSport Code for a person within the Center's jurisdiction to be convicted of, or subject to, a Criminal Disposition. A "Criminal Disposition" is any disposition of a criminal proceeding, other than an adjudication of not guilty, including an adjudication of guilt or admission to a criminal violation; a plea to a lesser included offense; a plea of no contest; the disposition of the proceeding through a diversionary

program, deferred adjudication, disposition of supervision, conditional dismissal, or similar arrangement; or the existence of a warrant for arrest or any pending charges.”

SafeSport Code at Parts II.G. and III.

Because the standards for finding a violation of criminal law are different (e.g., reasonable doubt) from the standards for finding a violation of the Code (preponderance of the evidence), the resolution of a criminal proceeding is not determinative of (but may be relevant to) whether a violation of the Code has occurred, regardless of the outcome of any criminal process. Conduct may constitute sexual misconduct under the Code even if the Responding Party is not charged, prosecuted or convicted for the behavior that constitutes a potential violation of the Code, is acquitted of a criminal charge, or legal authorities decline to prosecute.

The Center’s resolution will not typically be altered or precluded on the grounds that (a) a civil case or criminal charges involving the same incident or conduct has been filed, or (b) that charges have been dismissed or reduced; or (c) a lawsuit has been settled or dismissed.

SafeSport Practices and Procedures for the U.S. Olympic and Paralympic Movement at Part VII (Effect of Criminal or Civil Proceedings).

- a. Are there any differences in how cases involving felony and misdemeanor charges are handled?

Both felonies and misdemeanors are considered Criminal Dispositions. Whether a Criminal Disposition is a felony or misdemeanor may – but will not necessarily – affect a sanction or disciplinary action.

- b. What would happen in a situation in which a prosecutor permitted an individual charged with felony level offense to plea down to a misdemeanor?

Criminal Dispositions include a plea to a lesser included offense; a plea of no contest; the disposition of the proceeding through a diversionary program, deferred adjudication, disposition of supervision, conditional dismissal, or similar arrangement. The Center may include the original charge in determining a sanction.

2. What happens to a misconduct allegation if there is civil litigation involved where the defendant has been found at fault and damages may have been assigned?

The Center may utilize the civil litigation as evidence in its proceedings.

The Honorable Jan Schakowsky

1. For each of your current board members, please list what prior associations they have with the U.S. Olympic Committee or individual National Governing Bodies.

Summary of Governance Structure

The U.S. Center for SafeSport's Board of Directors is comprised of nine individuals, all of whom must meet the independence requirement (as described below). Of those nine individuals, five are at-large directors, two are recommended by the National Governing Body Council and two are recommended by the Athlete's Advisory Council. (Under the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act, §220504, the U.S. Olympic Committee is required "to establish and maintain provisions with respect to its governance for reasonable representation of— (1) amateur sports organizations recognized as national governing bodies and Paralympic sports organizations in accordance with section 220521 of this title, **including through provisions which establish and maintain a National Governing Bodies' Council** composed of representatives of the national governing bodies and any Paralympic sports organizations" (emphasis supplied)).

Qualifications – Independence

Each director for the U.S. Center for SafeSport's board of directors shall be "independent". A person is "independent" under the Center's Bylaws if he or she has no material affiliation or relationship, directly or indirectly, with any National Governing Body, any Paralympic Sports Organization, the Athletes Advisory Council of the USOC, or the United States Olympic Committee and such person is free of any other direct or indirect relationships that could reasonably be expected to interfere with the exercise of independent judgment of such person. The Nominating and Governance Committee may determine that while a prospective candidate does not strictly meet all of the criteria for independence, such person nonetheless, under all the facts and circumstances, does not have any relationship that would interfere with, or appear to interfere with such person's independent judgment, and thus such person may be deemed independent. The Nominating and Governance Committee will only nominate candidates it determines to be independent for election by the Board of Directors.

By way of comparison, the U.S. Olympic Committee's directors need not all be considered an "independent director" – and three individuals are recommended by the NGB Council and three from the Athlete Advisory Counsel. In this regard, the USOC Bylaws provide that a director will not be considered an "independent director" if, at any time during the two years preceding commencement of or during his or her term as position as a director:

- a) the director was employed by or held any paid position or any volunteer governance position with the corporation, a corporation-member sports governing body, the IOC, the IPC, an OCOG, PASO or ANOC;
- b) an immediate family member of the director was employed by or held any paid position or any volunteer governance position with the corporation, a corporation-member sports governing body, the IOC, the IPC, an OCOG, PASO or ANOC;
- c) the director was affiliated with or employed by the corporation's outside auditor or outside counsel;
- d) an immediate family member of the director was affiliated with or employed by the corporation's outside auditor or outside counsel as a partner, principle or manager; or
- e) the director held a paid position or any volunteer governance or leadership position with, the ACC, NGB Council, or the Multisport Organization Council.

Election

- At-Large Directors (4): At each annual meeting of the Board of Directors, the Nominating and Governance Committee will recommend a nominee for each at-large director position to be filled.
- Athlete Directors (2): Consistent with the independence requirement, athlete directors must be independent. No later than 60 days prior to each annual meeting of the Board of Directors where an athlete director position is to be filled, the AAC shall submit a list of at least two recommendations for each

position to the Nominating and Governance Committee. If the NGC does not wish to submit for election any of the recommended persons, it may request new recommendations for such position from the AAC or nominate a candidate of its own choosing for election by the Board of Directors.

- **NGB Directors (2):** Consistent with the independence requirement, NGB directors must be independent. No later than 60 days prior to each annual meeting of the Board of Directors where an NGB director position is to be filled, the NGB Council shall submit a list of at least two recommendations for each position to the Nominating and Governance Committee. If the NGC does not wish to submit for election any of the recommended persons, it may request new recommendations for such position from the NGB Council or nominate a candidate of its own choosing for election by the Board of Directors.

Current Board of Directors (9)

The first Board of Directors was seated in January 2016.

- **Becker, Regis**
Former Chief Ethics & Compliance Officer, Pennsylvania State University
Recommended by the NGB Council – Regis Becker was hired in 2013 as Pennsylvania State University’s first director of university ethics and compliance. In this role, he oversaw compliance issues, chaired the university’s Ethics and Compliance Council and developed the university’s first comprehensive program of institutional ethics. Becker was also directly responsible for athletic compliance, youth protection, privacy, export control, investigations and training. Becker has been a member of USA Weightlifting since 1994, served on USA Weightlifting’s Board of Directors and its foundation board from 2008-2012, and its Nominating and Governance Committee from 2012-2014. As of today’s date, it has been more than four years since Becker has had an association with the NGB.
- **Giardino, Angelo**
Chair, Department of Pediatrics, University of Utah, Chief Medical Officer, Primary Children’s Hospital in Salt Lake City
At-Large – Dr. Angelo Giardino currently chairs the Department of Pediatrics at the University of Utah. Previously, Giardino was with the Texas Children’s Hospital, and served as a professor of pediatrics and section chief of academic general pediatrics at the Baylor College of Medicine in Houston. Giardino is a distinguished fellow of the American College of Medical Quality and is sub-boarded in child abuse pediatrics by the American Board of Pediatrics. Giardino has published several textbooks on child abuse and neglect and frequently presents on these and other pediatric topics at conferences around the country. In 2015, Dr. Giardino served as a member of the U.S. Center for SafeSport’s independent Advisory Council (unpaid volunteer), comprised of subject matter experts and thought leaders in abuse prevention. During the Center’s start-up phase, the Advisory Council was responsible for delivering an understanding of industry trends and best practices at the intersection of abuse and sport. Giardino has no prior association with the U.S. Olympic Committee or National Governing Bodies.
- **Herrera-Flanigan, Jessica**
Executive Vice President, Government & Corporate Affairs, Univision Communications, Inc.
At-Large – Jessica Herrera-Flanigan oversees the Univision Communications, Inc. Washington, D.C., office, where she leads the company’s federal and state government relations efforts, coordinates the company’s corporate social responsibility, social impact, and philanthropic efforts, and serves as the President of the Univision Foundation. From 2008 to June 2015, Herrera-Flanigan was a partner at Monument Policy Group, where she advised clients on media, technology, sports/outdoors, and national security policy and communications management. The Monument Policy

Group is currently and has been for the past ten years a registered lobbying firm of the U.S. Olympic Committee. She holds a bachelor's degree in American studies from Yale University and a law degree from Harvard Law School. As of today's date, it has been more than three years since Herrera-Flanigan has had any association with the U.S. Olympic Committee.

- **Harned, Patricia**

- **Chief Executive Officer, Ethics & Compliance Initiative**

Recommended by the NGB Council – Patricia Harned is chief executive officer of the nonprofit Ethics & Compliance Initiative (ECI). The mission of the ECI is to empower organizations across the globe to operate with the highest levels of integrity. As CEO, Dr. Harned oversees all of ECI's strategy and operations. She also directs educational outreach efforts to policymakers and federal enforcement agencies worldwide, and she speaks and writes frequently as an expert on ethical leadership, ethics in the workplace, corporate governance, and global integrity. Dr. Harned chaired the ECI's Blue Ribbon Panel on High-Quality Ethics & Compliance Programs, which established a new industry standard for effective ethics and compliance efforts in organizations. Harned has no prior association with the U.S. Olympic Committee or National Governing Bodies.

- **Jones, Reuben**

- **Executive Director, Kentucky Workers' Compensation Funding Commission**

At-Large – Reuben Jones currently serves as the executive director of the Kentucky Workers' Compensation Funding Commission. Jones previously served as a major general in the U.S. Army where he commanded the Army Family and Morale, Welfare and Recreation Command and oversaw a \$3.5 billion non-appropriated funds program. The Army's World Class Athletes Program was a subordinate organization of his command. Jones has no prior association with the U.S. Olympic Committee or National Governing Bodies.

- **Marshall, Frank**

- **Principal, The Kennedy/Marshall Company**

At-Large – Frank Marshall is an American film producer and director with a career spanning almost 50 years and 80 films. In 1981, Marshall formed Amblin Entertainment with his wife, Kathleen Kennedy, and acclaimed director Steven Spielberg. In 1991, Marshall and Kennedy launched The Kennedy/Marshall Company of which Marshall has been the sole proprietor since 2012. Marshall served on the U.S. Olympic Committee Board of Directors from 1992-2004, as a public sector member on the USA Gymnastics Board of Directors from 2009-2013, and the USAT&F Foundation Board between 2004 and March 2018. As of today's date, it has been more than five years since Marshall has had an association with the U.S. Olympic Committee or a National Governing Body.

- **Novak, Julie**

- **Vice President of Child Safety, Big Brothers Big Sisters of America**

At-Large – *At-Large* – Prior to her current role with Big Brothers Big Sisters of America (BBBSA), Julie Novak held the positions of Associate Vice President and National Director of Child Safety and Quality Assurance for BBBSA and served as Chief Executive Officer of the organization's northwestern Wisconsin affiliate. She is BBBSA's leading national expert and spokesperson on child safety and youth protection matters. During her time with the organization, Novak has developed nationwide child abuse, violence prevention and crisis management training. Between August, 2013 and February 2014, Novak served as an independent volunteer member (unpaid) of the 2013 SafeSport Working Group for Case Management Models, which recommended externalizing sexual misconduct matters to an independent entity. As of today's date, it has been approximately four years since Novak had any association with the U.S. Olympic Committee or a National Governing Body.

- **Ryther, Megan**

- **Associate Attorney, Ice Miller**

- *Recommended by the AAC* – Megan Ryther is an attorney at Ice Miller in Indianapolis and previously worked as an attorney at Baker & McKenzie and Quarles & Brady and for the NCAA where, she oversaw student-athlete eligibility cases. Nominated by the Athlete’s Advisory Council, Ryther competed as part of the USA Open Water Swimming World Championship Team in 1998, 2000 and 2003, earned a gold medal at the 1998 World Championships and served as Team Captain in 2003. Ryther also served as an athlete representative on the following: United States Sports Insurance Company LLC Board of Directors (2015); USA Swimming Board of Directors (2010-2014); USA Swimming Background Screen Appeals Panel, Vice Chair (2011-2015); USA Swimming Olympic and International Operations Committee (2003-2014); USA Swimming Steering Committee (2012-2014); USA Swimming Rules and Regulations Committee (2010-2011); USA Swimming Audit Committee (2009-2010). As of today’s date, it has been over three years since Ryther had any association with the NGB.

- **Smotek, Connie**

- **Office Manager, Texas A&M University AgriLife Extension**

- *Recommended by the AAC* – Nominated by the Athlete’s Advisory Council (AAC), Connie Smotek is a two-time Olympian in the sport of shooting. Smotek currently is an Extension Program Specialist for Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service where she oversees continuing education activities for tax practitioners and assists with development of risk management materials. Smotek served on the Athlete Advisory Council for the 2005-2008 and 2009-2012 terms. The U.S.A. Shooting Bylaws place the Athlete Advisory Council representative for U.S.A. Shooting on the U.S.A. Shooting Board of Directors Executive Committee. She was also a member of the U.S.A. Shooting Board of Directors as the elected athlete representative from 1995-2001. As of today’s date, it has been over six years since Smotek has had an association with the NGB as a board member and more than six years since Smotek had an affiliation with the AAC.

ATTACHMENT A



Online Training Course Outline

1. Mandatory Reporting: Understanding Your Responsibilities

- Barriers to reporting
- Legal Requirements
- Suspicion of abuse
- Reporting process

2. Sexual Misconduct Awareness Education

- Creating a safe and respectful environment
- Relationship dynamics
 - Coach-athlete relationship
 - Power dynamics and imbalances
- Understanding the differences between laws and policies
 - Criminal laws
 - U.S. Center for SafeSport policies
 - Organizational policies
- What is sexual misconduct?
 - Definition
 - Types of sexual misconduct
- Understanding consent
 - Definition of consent
 - Age of consent
 - Capacity to consent
 - Consent and power imbalances
- Child sexual abuse
 - Legal definitions
 - SafeSport policy definitions
 - Grooming
 - The victim's perspective
 - How victims respond
 - Why they don't report
 - Signs and symptoms of abuse
 - Prevention and response
 - Managing high risk situations (travel, social media and electronic communications, etc.)
 - Do's and don'ts

3. Emotional and Physical Misconduct

- Bullying
 - Definition of bullying
 - Cyberbullying
 - Effects of bullying
 - Preventing bullying behaviors
- Hazing
 - Definition of hazing
 - Preventing hazing
- Harassment
 - Definition
 - Creating a safe environment for all athletes
- Emotional misconduct
 - Definition
 - Types of emotional misconduct
 - Effects of emotional misconduct
- Physical misconduct
 - Definition
 - Types of physical misconduct

***Each module includes a pre- and post-testing component and points users to additional resources.*