

Ernest G. Trakas, Esq. ATLANTA, GA | LYNCHBURG, VA | ST. LOUIS, MO Senior Litigation Counsel

Whistleblower Responds to Washington University Transgender Center Internal Review

NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Contact: V. Broyles 770.448.4525 vbroyles@childparentrights.org E. Trakas 314.608.8350 etrakas@childparentrights.org

St. Louis, Missouri - Upon review of Washington University's Transgender Center Internal Review Summary of Conclusions ("SOC") issued in response to Jamie Reed's Whistleblower Complaint, several points are obvious.

The SOC plainly acknowledges the validity of several of Ms. Reed's allegations. It is now irrefutable that the Center has never obtained written informed consent prior to authorizing and providing gender altering care, including puberty blockers and hormone therapy, to minors. Similarly, the Center is now requiring that families provide copies of "custody agreements before an initial visit at the Transgender Center by a patient under age 18," admitting it has never done so in the past.

In addition, the SOC claim that the Center follows "appropriate policies and procedures and treats patients according to the currently accepted standard of care..." is dubious at best. The World Professional Association for Transgender Health ("WPATH") Standard of Care, to which the Center says it has adhered for years, is not at all a "standard of care" in any ethical or legal sense. A standard of care has a specific meaning, and is defined as "the caution that a reasonable person in similar circumstances would exercise in providing care to a patient." WPATH is an advocacy organization that relies very little on sound, proven evidence and much more on the idea that trans health care is about the right to the embodiment of cosmetic goals on demand.

Equally challenging to the credibility of the SOC is the fact that the Oversight Committee that conducted the review never bothered to interview Jamie Reed. This, despite Ms. Reed's more than four year tenure as a Case Manager at the Center.

Worse, the data, cited in and relied upon, in the SOC is inaccurate. The SOC reports "A total of 1,165 patients have sought care at the Center since June 2018. These interactions range from an informational phone call to medical treatment but were of sufficient depth to create a medical record". It goes on to state that "531 received cross-sex hormones, including some who were initially on puberty blockers... an additional 67 patients were prescribed puberty blockers and not cross-sex hormones. The remainder (567 patients) were not prescribed puberty blockers or cross-sex hormones."

However, systematic review and comparison of detailed data sets, created and maintained by Jamie Reed during her time at the center, it appears unlikely that the numbers reported in the SOC are correct. Ms. Reed's data was collected from February 1, 2020 until May 1, 2022, capturing all unique patients who were actually seen by a Center provider. That data set encompasses 28 months of the Center's operations. The University claims that its Oversight Committee reviewed the records from June of 2018 until the current time. A total of 55 months. The number reported by the University therefore **should far exceed** the numbers in the Reed data set, because the University is reporting 27 additional months of data. This is clearly not the case based on the data reported by the Oversight Committee.

The data maintained by Ms. Reed establishes that the Center saw a total of 1,138 unique patients in the Center in the 28 months recorded. Moreover, 710 intake calls were documented over a 35 month period. All of those calls had medical charts created, at least 25 % of those intakes were never seen in the Center. Which results in an additional 177 patient charts that should have also been reviewed and reported in the SOC. These two data sets alone equal 1,315 unique patients (over 28 months). A number that exceeds the total 1,165 patients (over 55 months) self-reported by the University.

Of the 1,138 patients seen in the 28 month period recorded in Ms. Reed's data, 613 reflect a documented initiated medical transition. Of the 1,138 seen in the Center 226 were only seen by psychology. Meaning that of the 912 patients seen by a hormone prescribing physician 613 were medicalized, a 67% initiation rate.

In the end, the SOC is little more than a self-serving finding. What ultimately will matter most are the conclusions and findings reached as a result of the objective and comprehensive investigations currently underway by the Missouri Attorney General, the Missouri Department of Social Services and Department of Commerce and Insurance, Board of Healing Arts.