

Sexual Misconduct Policy Task Force

3/7/18

Meeting Minutes Summary

Group tested/ reviewed draft survey Kate entered into Red Cap- saw places that need to be changed:

- Question 14- What resource did you use that was not a mandated reporter? Would like to be able to check multiple responses, only one allowed now
- When answering first question- are you a current graduate or undergraduate- when you say no, it goes to the next page and says you can't take survey/ not accepting surveys from non-students then survey ends, but they can click "previous" and go back to select "yes" they are a student and could still take the survey. Can the "previous" button on the second page in this case be disabled so they can't go back?
- Question 5A- Morgan's/ Title IX name listed twice on list. Delete one entry.

Kate called into meeting to discuss survey and interview:

Kate needs to know what the interview questions are and what the process will look (the interview sub group is working on this), then she can give suggestions on it so interviews are conducted well- Jordan will send it to Kate.

We need to determine if we want to get the perspectives of witnesses and what their experience were with the hearing processes- members agree this will be good to get.

Kate needs any survey feedback the group has by next week at latest so that she can make the changes in Red Cap to get it ready to open for students to take.

After the survey is finalized, send out e-mail to student body on Wednesday, 3/21, then some members from the group can table and use the chalk board in Wilson Commons (if it is open) to promote the survey.

Amber on the Task Force is also in the SEGWay student group and the week of Sexual Assault Awareness week is the first week of April. She has an idea to host an event then to tell students what the task force has been working on thus far.

Group went over list of draft recommendations and continued conversation from last week's meeting (2/28), then completed final draft:

[DRAFT] Recommendations from the Students' Association Task Force to Review Sexual Misconduct Policy

Overall:

1. We recommend that contact information for all offices responding to complaints of sexual misconduct, as well as relevant organizations offering support for victims (such as Restore and SANE), be clearly listed on the front page of Student Sexual Misconduct Policy.
2. We recommend the commencement of periodic interdisciplinary reviews of student knowledge of sexual misconduct policy. Further, after each review, the assessor(s) should recommend steps to make these policies more accessible.
3. We recommend that a clear, concise flowchart be provided to all students at Orientation. This flowchart should also be easily accessible on the Title IX website, and should be added as an Addendum

to the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy. Additionally, it should be given to students immediately upon their involvement in sexual misconduct cases to provide a more user-friendly guide through the Title IX process.

Amnesty:

1. We recommend the addition of a thorough and explicit medical amnesty policy to the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy. This policy should apply to the claimant and should include an explicit statement that the University will not act on information about a claimant's use of illegal drugs or alcohol.

Complicity:

1. The UR Student Code of Conduct currently states "Complicity in misconduct: Students are expected to disengage themselves from all acts of misconduct, and are expected to report serious code violations to appropriate authorities." This is too vague and doesn't clearly define who is and who is not responsible. In addition to UR's requirement to report known violations, we recommend including something similar to University of Connecticut's definition of complicity, which states:

"Complicity is any act taken with the purpose of aiding, facilitating, promoting or encouraging the commission of an act of Prohibited Conduct by another person."

This new language should be added to the Student Code of Conduct *and* the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy.

2. We recommend the addition of an explicit complicity policy that holds organizations responsible for the actions that occur at their events by their members. This policy should:

- Clearly outline when students are and are not responsible for intervening in and reporting incidents of potential misconduct, and should use examples to illustrate the difference between being an inactive bystander and being complicit.
- Use clear and concise language to define and state what complicity is and when students or student groups are responsible, as well as when it is reasonably safe to intervene in a situation and/or report misconduct.
- Clearly outline when responsibility for a misconduct allegation(s) falls on a student group (such as a Greek organization, athletic team, or Special Interest Floor), and what the

Training:

1. We recommend a thorough review of all training received by undergraduate students, including a review of trainings before, during, and after orientation. The group that reviews training should include undergraduate students. Training topics:

- Preventative / bystander intervention
- Title IX reporting process
- "What is sexual misconduct?"<-- fix language
- Delineate between sexual harassment and sexual assault
- Healthy relationships
- Red Light/Green Light and other orientation events

2. We recommend:

- The addition of a 1-2 credit required course on sexual misconduct, consent, and healthy relationships. This course would be required during students' first year, similar to the primary writing requirement.
- Continued training throughout a students' academic career, not only at Orientation
- Training on sexual health, sexual misconduct policy, and the Title IX reporting process for D'Lions and Freshman Fellows, who currently do not receive any such training. Currently, Resident Advisors are the only live-in Residential Life staff who receive this training.
- Consideration of outsourced training, which is likely to improve student trust in training material

3. We recommend that all students found guilty of sexual misconduct be required to go through an in-depth, in-person sexual misconduct training workshop. This practice would help prevent repeat offenses.

Interim Measures:

1. We recommend that information about Active Avoidance Orders (AAO) should be clearly displayed and explained in the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy, rather than in the Standards of Student Conduct. Further, it should be explicitly stated that the cost of alternative housing arrangements is paid by the university, not the student.
2. Throughout the materials provided to students, from the Standards of Student Conduct (Appendix C), the Healthy Relationships and Reporting Rights brochures, and the Supportive Resources letter sent from the Title IX Office to survivors, there is conflicting information regarding the medical resources available to survivors. We recommend the inclusion of a thorough description of the medical resources available to survivors, as well as the cost and privacy of these resources, in all of the aforementioned policies and informational handouts. Additionally, we recommend that these resources be checked annually to ensure that all information provided to students is accurate and updated.

Intimate Relationships:

1. We recommend the inclusion of a section in the Sexual Misconduct Policy which states that students are protected from sexual harassment at the hands of anyone affiliated with the University, including their professors, employers, or students in positions of power (such as student teaching assistants, student supervisors).
2. We recommend the development of a process for both graduate and undergraduate TAs to disclose a relationship with a student that formed before or forms during a class. This should be included in the Academic Handbook, and should be referenced in the Intimate Relations Policy and the Student Sexual Misconduct Policy.
3. We recommend that the *Quid Pro Quo* section of the Standards of Student Conduct be rewritten to be clearer. Additionally, we recommend changing the title of the section to include a synonym for the term *quid pro quo* in common English.
4. We recommend that the intimate relationship policy be better defined for a multitude of relationships on campus. We recommend a disclaimer for relationships between undergraduate students and student-held positions, including peer advisors and student supervisors.
5. We recommend a comprehensive review of standards and expectations regarding staff-undergraduate relationships, leading to the creation of a formal policy on the matter.
6. We recommend that the University adopt a policy to mandate that all teaching assistants, both graduate and undergraduate, read and sign a document discussing the implications of the power dynamics with their students that are inherent to their position. This document would also include a disclaimer policy. In signing this document, the TA acknowledges the power dynamic and agrees to the disclaimer policy, which mandates that TAs disclose any prior relationships or existing relationships with students in their course.
7. We recommend that in every course, students should be given the option to disclose past or current relationships with TAs, workshop leaders, or other students who serve in an advisory or administrative capacity.
8. We recommend that the University mandate that every course syllabus must include a section, similar to the academic honesty section, that includes:

- A protection statement, reiterating that every student is protected from sexual harassment
 - The disclosure policy for relationships with teaching assistants and other students in positions of academic power, such as workshop leaders
 - Identification of the instructor based on their responsibility to report, and their confidentiality responsibility
 - A statement directing students on other resources if they need to report an incident.
9. We recommend compiling all Intimate Relations Policies for the University community and making these readily and easily accessible in one location.

Regular Review of Policy:

1. We recommend the mandatory and regular review of policies every 3-4 years. The group reviewing policy should include undergraduate students.

Moving forward:

Jordan will review this, then send it to the Respondent Verification Group for their feedback.

Group will meet after break on 3/21 to add in any feedback from the Respondent Verification Group and finalize recommendations, then send them to President Feldman.