In attendance: Paula Slowe, Bernadette Brooten, Trish Glover, Mark Brimhall-Vargas, Peter Kalb, Becci Torri, Steve Locke, Sheryl Sousa, Kim Godsoe, Jessica Basile, Carrie Robertson, Rebecca Tillar, Monique Gnanaratnam, Darren Gallant, Sheila McMahon

Agenda Items
1. Proposed Changes to Rights and Responsibilities
2. Proposed Changes to Faculty and Staff Policies

Proposed Changes to Rights and Responsibilities
Sheryl Sousa initiated a continuation of last month’s policy discussion of including Impact Statements during the Special Examiner’s Process. Majority agrees to rename respondent submitted “mitigating statements” to “impact statements.” Majority also agrees to delete written guidance requiring impact statements to describe the “impact experienced from the policy violations.” Alternatively, Title IX Case Manager would provide verbal guidance to the parties as to the content and scope of impact statements.

While a majority of the committee agreed with the concept of impact statements, multiple concerns were raised regarding how and when such statements should be utilized. There was discussion as to whether these statements should be submitted to the Outcomes Administrator or Sanctioning Panel and whether the parties should receive copies of the statements. Ultimately, the Task Force did not reach a consensus. Therefore, impact statements will not be included in the 2017-2018 AY R&R. The Task Force will continue to explore this policy recommendation.

Sheryl Sousa raised suggestions to clarify language in R&R. Task Force agreed to add “so as to cause” after “severe, pervasive or persistent” under Sexual Harassment and other new language under the Adjudication Mechanisms and Disclosure Phase sections of R&R.

There was discussion as to whether investigators should be granted the discretion to explore complainant and respondent sexual proclivities in their fact-finding and report writing. A suggestion was raised to alter current policy to the following: “Sexual history or character will not be admissible. Sexual proclivity may be used if deemed relevant by investigators.” Rebecca and Steve will draft proposed language.

All agree upon adding the following language regarding Advisors in the SEP process: “Investigation interviews and SEP related meetings will not be unreasonable delayed due to the lack of availability of a particular Advisor.” Task Force also agreed to the removal of Advocates due to ongoing student confusion and lack of use.
Proposed Changes to Faculty and Staff Policies
Kim Godsoe circulated four newly revised policy documents:
1.) Non-Discrimination and Harassment Problem Resolution and Appeal Procedure for Claims of Harassment/Discrimination against Staff or Faculty
2.) Employee Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence and Stalking Policy
3.) Sexual Harassment Policy
4.) Non-discrimination and Harassment Policy

There are some inconsistencies within these policies. Mark will make edits and bring changes back to the Task Force for review. Steve and Rebecca will draft proposed anti-retaliation language.

Concerns are raised about how the University is managing Clery reportable offenses experienced by third party vendors. Task Force will defer this matter to Bette Riley.

Regarding the Non Discrimination and Harassment Policy, a question was raised regarding a bullet point list of examples used to define harassment. Although the list isn’t exhaustive, it could be edited to include more specific forms of discrimination (i.e. white supremacy posters). All agree the last bullet point should include “other conduct and communication” and remove wording “verbal or physical.” Suggestion was made to add clarifying language to third bullet point regarding offices and comparable academic spaces. Mark, Kim and Steve will work together on proposed language and distribute their edits to the committee electronically.