

**Sexual Misconduct Policy Task Force**  
**Meeting Minutes Summary from transcript**  
**2/14/18**

Updates:

Kate worked with UR expert about survey language related to socio demographics and is settled now. Survey questions have been sent to Nursing who will set the survey up in Redcap. It will be ready soon for the group to test before it goes out. Kate was contacted to ask if graduate students can also take survey, and we can separate out grads from undergrads in our analysis of the survey data.

Kate can meet with a sub-group about the survey outside of our scheduled meetings. Also, she isn't able to attend anymore night meetings.

Graduate student association contacted Jordan and would like someone to sit on the committee. Interested in the work the Task Force is doing, and we can tell them what our limited focus is (on student to student sexual misconduct). Group is good with that.

Policy discussion:

Discussion of intimate relationships policy. Group thinks there is a need for students to better understand nuanced relationships between students and graduate students (power dynamics that may be present) and that faculty should understand these relationships as well. Statement about intimate relationships is in the Faculty handbook, but is not referenced in the student code of conduct handbook. Some would like the statement to be included or at least referenced in the student handbook. Other thought is if it is listed in student handbook then a student can be held responsible if they have a relationship with a faculty member/ graduate student and would make it seem that both parties are held accountable. May want to include just enforceable policies in the student handbook.

A disclaimer can be included if this is added to student handbook to tell students they will not be held accountable if involved in a relationship with a faculty member so if they find themselves in a situation where they felt pushed into having a relationship with a faculty person, then they can feel comfortable to come forward to report. Don't want to include text that says "relationships with a faculty member are not permitted" or "don't get involved with a faculty member" as that could hinder students from coming forward to report if they end up entering to a relationship with a faculty member or are forced into one. Want policy to tell students they have protection from and the right not to be harassed by a faculty member (that these are rights they have as students and individuals at UR). Could add in the prohibited behavior section that a faculty member who even makes an attempt to begin a relationship with a student is not acceptable behavior. We could add this to the flow chart so students are aware of inappropriate conduct by professors. Then we could recommend that the Faculty Senate should change the faculty policy to make the language much clearer that intimate relationships with students are completely unacceptable. Regardless of where the policy is listed (student code of conduct is our main suggestion), the group feels in some way/ place students need to be made aware of what type of relationships are inappropriate.

Opposing thought- that if a student is dealing with a sexual misconduct issue (victim or perpetrator) they will look at the sexual misconduct policy only, so we should focus our recommendations on the text in these policies and there isn't a need to reference it in the broader student conduct handbook.

Group thinks students who have any sort of interaction with sexual misconduct will just look at the sexual misconduct policy section and won't look at the rest of the student code of conduct for more information, so when adding in information to the policy that faculty/ student relationships are not acceptable, we can then say something like "if the perpetrator was a faculty member please refer to the faculty handbook, and don't just rely on this document for all policy information." This will make it so information about faculty is referenced, but if the student is encountering student to student misconduct then they don't have to read the whole section on faculty conduct. They only need to read it if it applies to their situation.

Dean Runner recently found out that the student code of conduct handbook covers all students- undergraduates and graduates in all schools (Nursing, Simon, etc.). Warner follows same policies as AS&E. Simon has its own set of policies, as does the Oral Institute, and nursing and medical schools.

Group wonders about the "Student Policy Against Discrimination and Harassment" policy, pg 28- this policy applies to all University-wide undergraduate and graduate college students.

Thought that as a group we should be cognizant that the policy changes we recommend could be made and may in future, unintentionally by us, be used against students.

What various student relationships is group focusing on- TAs, undergrad building manager, undergrad supervisor, etc. Group wants to focus on intimate relationships where there is a power imbalance. We should look at policies that are for the person who holds the power and think of how policies can safeguard the person who is in the vulnerable position. Want to make sure that power dynamic is focused on and that people who are most vulnerable in power dynamics are protected. Want to make the policy language clear and concise so students know they are protected against, for example, coercion from a TA who asks a student out and the student feels that they have to go on a date/ have a relationship with that person so they don't get a bad grade.

Group wants to add in information about power dynamics and coercion to sexual misconduct policy to let students know they are protected from these situations. Also, adding it will call attention to these issues that not every student knows about or considers these forms of harassment/ abuse.

Instead of telling students who they can and can't have a relationship with, we could recommend that a person who holds power over a student needs to fill out a disclaimer that the relationship was already in process/ when it starts. Disclaimer will serve as a way to tell Professor about relationship so it is known. Also, the disclaimer could serve to tell the professor and then they will know their first TA can't be the TA for that person's significant other and that they need to assign their second TA to work with the student who is dating TA 1. Group feels if a TA is in a relationship with a student and they are in their class then they should not be that person's TA due to their intimate relationship.

Group thinks the disclosure of TA/ student relationships is needed because there is no current policy in place to protect the non-TA student who holds less power.

Quid Pro Quo section is not as strongly worded and as clear as group thinks it could be. Most students don't know what the term means. Idea that wording should be changed to something that students understand more easily/ make clearer. Can include definition of term and examples.

List of areas group wants to discuss further and or make recommendations on:

- Amnesty (medical)
- Complicity
- Training
- Centralization of offices
- One streamline set of policies for all students/ centralization of policies
- Finalizing interview questions and procedures
- Responsible employee reporting/ mandated reporting
- Interim measures
- Policy 106
- Flow chart (3 drafts that Morgan Levy sent that we can work from and could condense into one)
- Discuss hearing process (may not have enough time to make recommendations on this but we can suggest it should be something in future that the administration reviews); more clearly define relationship between Title IX coordinator and student conduct office/ judicial officer- how they work together, and what their processes and hearings look like. Talk about ways to more clearly explain what the responsibilities of the Title IX office are (could include the office's role in the flow chart), and what it does and is supposed to do- students are not clear about it.
- Discuss advisors role- who on campus is specifically trained to be victim advocates

Will also discuss survey results once they are out and interviewees responses once interviews are completed.