

## **Sexual Misconduct Task Force**

**1/17/18**

### **Summary of Transcript- Meeting Minutes**

Incoming President Feldman would like to meet with group in the next few days. Group raised hands to tell when they are available during the next few days during specific times. Group decided to pick three options that work the best when the most amount of members can attend. Kate will e-mail them to the president's scheduler to see which works best for him and will let group know ASAP via e-mail.

Group took time to read over recommendations that were suggested by Marie-Jo White who led the independent investigation into the EEOC report against the University.

#### **Groups discussed their recommendations of the recommendations and or their views on what has been recommended:**

##### Student training-

Student online course is potentially not as effective as the recommendations make it sound, even though they said the University should offer more training for undergrads, the group still feels the online training needs to be updated. Would like to see evaluation of online training program- how long students stay on pages to gauge how long they are studying information, if they are just going through pages as quick as they can to get the credit to meet the requirement for taking the training, how well are they absorbing the information, etc. Suggestion to have 2-credit course for first year Freshmen and transfer students or have a peer-to-peer student facilitated training where students could go over situations together. One member has conducted research on peer to peer training and found that many schools find this type of training to be the most effective. Group feels these interactive trainings would be good addition to online training to keep conversation going throughout year (not just one time) and help teach to various learning styles. This would also give students more time to take in information. Could also create and send powerpoint or video to students as another way to teach sexual misconduct policies or a website could be created where students watch videos/ read scenarios and have to answer questions that they can't skip. Additionally, an idea that an in-person training could be offered 2-3 times in a student's first semester and if they didn't go then they would not be able to register for second semester classes.

Counterpoint: thought that if students have to do initial online training then continued training throughout the year it would be too much training where students would "check out" or get "information overload" when they are at the subsequent trainings and not absorb information.

Suggestion to look into Green Dot program that trains students on sexual misconduct. It is a program being used currently by more and more national colleges.

Group agrees that even though various methods to teach concepts should be utilized, if students just go through the required trainings and don't want to learn about the concepts then no one can make them.

Overall, consensus that student sexual misconduct training needs to be changed to be more effective so students are actually learning from training, and group feels that online training could use input from students to make it more efficient.

### Other thoughts/ ideas-

Recommendations state that Policy 106 should be reviewed after the conclusion of every 106 investigation, but the recommendation does not state when or if in-person and online trainings should be reviewed. Group thinks trainings need to be reviewed at some point as well.

Group discussed that UR polices now state a faculty member is not allowed to have an intimate relationship with an undergraduate, but that it is only highly discouraged for a faculty member to have an intimate relationship with a graduate student unless the faculty member has a supervisory role over the graduate. Recommendations in report said it should be stated in policy that even when a faculty person and graduate student work in same department they should not have an intimate relationship. Group agrees.

Idea for students to have two mentors/ advisors so they aren't relying on just one person to guide their education. This would be helpful in case an issue arises with one person then they will have another who can continue to advise them through to graduation. This would insure their whole educational path is not derailed if any issues arise with one adviser.

Idea that all University Title IX, sexual harassment, sexual assault cases, etc. involving any member of the UR community (faculty, students, grad students, staff, etc.) should be handled by one office (not counsel's office (OOC)), at least at first to be the initial office to respond to incidents and offer resources, then it could go to different departments related to specific situations/ schools. This will allow one set of staff members to begin working on cases and reduce the number of staff overall who work on cases throughout the whole process.

Group will keep thinking about creating a flowchart. The flowchart would not replace the letter Morgan Levy sends out to victims telling them of resources but it would be in addition to the letter. Both documents will allow for information to be in different forms that will help people with various learning types (resources document from Morgan is text based learning while the flowchart utilizes diagrams to share information). The flowchart would be beneficial for the University to send out to students, staff etc. to show updated policy information in a concise and clear manner.

Group wondered if pre-existing intimate relationships should be declared before the people in those relationships start working together, when one is a TA in the others course, etc.

### **Concrete recommendations students have brought up:**

- Facilitated review and update of online training is needed, then publishing review results on an annual basis.
- Recommendation for 2-credit mandatory class during year to further training on sexual misconduct issues.
- Transfer students or students who have been at University for a long period of time should go through training again in a set number of years after being here as a refresher and to learn new information.
- Outsource training- have it created by an organization outside of the University to insure no bias because group thinks outside created trainings are more trustworthy than if UR administration creates them. Issue with this is if we outsource then UR has no control over if trainings are based on evidence based interventions. Group still thinks an outside non-profit, such as an

organization that works with sexual assault victims or with domestic violence issues, would work better to rebuild confidence and maintain trust among students. Group thinks an outside organization should create training for faculty also.

**Recommendations from EEOC investigation (document- "V. Policy Recommendations")- group voted:**

1. A1. Notice of Investigative Process and Rights- Agree in part. We voted to have the complainant notified earlier – 24 hours – to allow for safety planning, etc. once an investigation is being opened.
2. A2. Advisors for Claimants and Accused – in theory we agree. However, we believe it is important to explore options before moving forward. At a minimum – we do not think this person should be in the OOC (Office of Counsel). The two individuals should be in a separate office. Also – we would like to explore the possibility of having an outside entity – such as RESTORE – provide such a position. These advocates and attorneys understand the issues and have sensitivity to clients.
3. A3. Training – we are in agreement that training is essential. However, we do not wish for a rush to decisions. We would like a committee to be formed, which includes students, to review evidence-based training (both on line and in person) to decide what is best for our campus. We would like to see the potential inclusion of a mandatory 2 credit class for all in-coming Freshman, and those entering our community at any stage (graduate, etc.) and transfer students. Additionally – we wish to see a rigorous evaluation plan which includes on-line metrics and whether we have changed attitudes and behaviors. We would like to see a report of annual training – for everyone - published.
4. A4. UR policy 106 – we would like discussions about mandatory reporting and what happens with the reports. Also, would like to see policies reviewed on a scheduled basis to make sure nothing fell through the cracks and determine what policy adjustments/ changes may need to be made for future as well as how they are being implemented to ensure they are working as they are meant to.
5. A5. Confidentiality policies – agreed.
6. A6. Publicize data – agreed
7. A7. IT Policy – agreed.
8. A8. Access to Policies, et al., in theory agreed – however – it should be conveyed in an intuitive format.
9. B1. Relationship Policy – We would like to see a committee with student input, at all levels, about this policy. Currently, there is a “gray zone” – about who it covers: what about staff and students having intimate relationships, what about graduate students and undergrads, what about undergraduate students who are in a relationship with their TAs, what about one undergraduate who works for another undergraduate. There can be power dynamics in some of these scenarios. “Relations” vs. “Relationship”- people can view these terms differently- needs to be discussed further and potentially clarified in policies. Some professors have a policy about disclosures – others do not.
10. B2. Dedicated office – we would like to see considered one office – for everyone. We are one community and the handling of issues for different “titles” – in practice people with different levels of power – leads to difficulty.
11. C1. Cabinet-Level Officer to Oversee Implementation- agreed
12. C2. Trustee or Special Committee to Oversee Implementation- agreed

Group members who can attend the upcoming meeting with Interim President Feldman to brief him on the task force's goals will tell him how the group voted and what recommendations the group has discussed above in regards to the independent investigation's recommendations. The meeting will also be a good opportunity to stress to the president that this task force group is unique because we are reporting on recommendations for students and since Jordan and Becca are the head representatives of the student body, we are able to get input from the student body to make the best policy recommendations that are student centered.

**Next steps:**

If group wants to do survey still to find people to interview on their experiences with the policies, then we need to get moving on it ASAP- send questions to Kate; Read meeting minutes from 12/13/17 meeting to see if group has any questions from Morgan's discussion- send questions to Jesse Stern then have meeting with Morgan. Jesse will set meeting up; Kate and Kirsten will get tonight's notes to group in next day so we have them for meeting with Interim President Feldman; Group will hold another meeting next week on 1/24 to debrief from meeting with president.