I. CALL TO ORDER: 7:10 pm

a. Present: Representatives Dave M, Malcom Tariq, Sidney Ellington, Pat Pannuto, David B, Stefan, David W, Vice President Mbagwu

b. Absent:

c. Excused: Kyle Lady, Mike Hand, Pier Davis, Michael Benson, President Saccone

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion to approve: David M, second: Pat. Passes Unanimously.

III. APPROVAL OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES

Motion to approve: Pat P, second: Stefan. Passes Unanimously.

Guest:

Holly Ryder Milcovich (sp?). Director of SAPAC (Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center).

RSG recently pushing for efforts to have all faculty trained w.r.t. sexual awareness, not just new hires.

Chuky: Intro from Holly.

Holly: We (SAPAC / colleagues) have been working with RSG / others to develop and finalize our new U policy; passed last August. Since then, federal government has passed new regulations, in particular new faculty and staff (counts grad/prof students) are required to pass training. Result from meetings, federal requirements are only partial – missing bits: sexual harassment in workplace, info on difficulties that are unique to the academic work environment, challenges on dual student/employee roles, no info on alcohol / other drug use. Undergrads often know about campus resources, but graduate body generally doesn’t.

Original goal: Purchase a training program. Nothing to purchase, too new of an idea. Many places copied over the undergrad training, but that’s not really appropriate. The U is currently figuring out which of build or buy some kind of online training that either way will require some wholesale construction by the U of our specific needs. Building this final training will take some time. As of Oct 1, what exists now is an online training following the MyLink program; not as interactive / engaging as necessary. Has all of the minimum material, but really isn’t the final product.
Stage II is the next plan which will include in-person meetings and program-specific training and elements. That said, Stage I meets the federal minimums so moving forward as quickly may be harder, but that’s what we’re beginning to undertake now. That’s what we’re here for now is to check in with graduate students and other orgs as we start the process of building this new piece.

This year, faculty/staff are getting the same training as grad students.

The fact remains, with only incoming staff getting trained, we have a 50-year window until everyone on campus is trained.

Sidney: And that’s the concern that triggered the resolution in the first place.

Holly: Yes, and we’ve heard the most resistance from the older faculty. The resistance isn’t specific to the subject matter, really it’s just resistance to any form of mandatory training at all.

What punishments are actually available?

Holly: Not a lot available from the (federal) top. Institutionally, we can do more. Language will have “mandatory”, people that don’t can get letters / pressures from their dean.

Chris: The AAC (academic affairs committee of SACUA) endorses the spirit of the resolution, but the committee doesn’t endorse the specific requirements laid out by the resolution. They endorse having training that is above and beyond the legal mandate, but don’t necessarily agree with the RSG plans.

Chris: My question, it falls on the university if this policy isn’t “robustly” implemented? What happens in the case of a faculty accusation?

Holly: They follow the faculty grievance procedure, which is substantively different in the case of a student. The victim/survivor has many fewer rights in this process. If someone found responsible, the survivor will learn the outcome (whether or not guilty) but will not learn of the repercussions, if any.

Chris: Is there any movement to change?

Holly: I’ve advocated. The position is that it would violate the right to privacy for employee actions to be made public. What happens instead are assurances that the department/management will take action.

There is also no appeal option on the faculty side, either way.

DaveM: In that case, why don’t people just go to local authorities, outside the U?

Holly: I would support someone being well-educated and able to choose any of their available avenues.
Pat: Can I re-phrase his question? In many cases, the victim has potentially two tracks, through the U or through a separate police entity, how do you decide which avenue to pursue or how to pursue them?

Holly: Not all behavior that is harassment is criminal in nature. Second, county prosecutor makes all decisions on whether to move forward on a case. In particular, our county prosecutor tends to not prosecute cases with unclear recall, a previous relationship, or alcohol involvement. Many of the U cases fall into this

Sidney: This is all very context based

Holly: Yes. And every situation is obviously unique. Most folks are interested in healing resources, protecting themselves more.

Chris: What protections are there against retaliation.

Holly: Yes, there are protections independent of outcome. What’s really challenging are the more subtle and difficult to track ways in which retaliation can occur, especially in smaller, tighter-knit communities, e.g. those where introductions or recommendations are critical.

Sidney: Yes, especially with things like private recommendation letters.

Holly: Yes, or not even bad, but the “somewhat warm” or “good enough” letter versus the robust strong letter that may have been written otherwise.

Holly: Yes, and I’ve also recommended that you have a recommendation letter sent to a trusted colleague to check for this. I have seen this tactic successfully reveal issues before.

Holly: There are many institutional specific elements. E.g. the SPG that we have control over.

Chuky: In your intro you mentioned that our specific student issues should arrive in ~a year, and faculty will have a separate branch, what will all that look like?

Holly: It will have components specific to grad students as research, as students, and as teachers. For faculty/staff it will have training to identify if they’re experiencing sexual harassment or what it means to harass. Also specific training on the contexts in which they are acting in their capacity as a faculty member, e.g. out in the field where harassment can still occur. Other sensitivities around things like planning bar crawls, wine & cheese dinners, etc on how to be careful with people

Sidney: Can the training be used as a “stick” to enforce training attendance for incoming hires?
Holly: Yes, for all employees except faculty. There are very few rules that apply to faculty, they don’t have to attend an orientation, they don’t have to fill out timesheets, etc. For the hospital, there are some more enforced rules. The only real decision that must be made is whether they want a parking pass. New this year is the criminal background check, and that is actually enforced (read: will hold paychecks), unclear if this can qualify as well.

DaveM: Could it be structured as a rider to promotions?

Holly: Yes, that is an option. An as institutional will builds we may see more of these.

Sidney: Can it also act as a rider to the criminal background check, e.g. part of that process?

Holly: Again, it will rely on institutional will.

DaveM: Background checks are not hard to get / have done.

Holly: Right, and UM policy now states that all employees will consent to this and they will hold up paychecks.

Chris: I think the idea of tying to promotion is a great idea. That makes this a 7-year timeline, not 50. I was wondering if you’ve talked with GEO at all?

Holly: Short answer, no. I need to preserve my ability to work both sides of the house and not be seen as an adversary to any group. Need to act as a mediator, communicator, between groups. I don’t think it would be effective for me to bring a project to GEO, but if GEO has a project related to these issues I’d be happy to support them.

Chuky: It seems like the policies for new faculty are strong and we really need to focus on the 50-year problem. Where is the next place this effort is going?

Holly: The next goal is Stage II for grad students and faculty/staff. We really want an in-person training as well as the online training. Continuing to build support in SACUA and around the idea that this is training that is part of being a good citizen of the UM community. And partially following the lead of the Provost, the President, and the Office for Civil Rights, where there’s some turmoil now. Kind of exciting with a new President, he seems willing to take bold stands. I’ve been asked to report to the Regents on Oct 18. I will share the situation with them then (good plan for incoming, big gap for current). And we will see if this is something the president’s office wants to take up.

5-10 years from now, how do you evaluate how effective this program is?

Holly: Campus climate assessments. Finding the range of underreported events. We have a robust system for undergrads, looking to put things in place for graduate students and
faculty / staff. We have beautiful data for undergraduate population, need more elsewhere.

**Visitor:** Is there an arm in SAPAC dedicated to grad / faculty / staff or one big entity?

Holly: We are one big system. Lots of volunteers / members, though mostly undergraduates. There’s a men’s activism, lots of mentoring and activism. Our staff serves the entire community.

Chuky: Been very helpful, good discussion.

Holly: I’m pretty excited about where we are now. We are making a big change. Gone from only a few getting some information in context of teaching / work. Now, all incoming students are receiving at least some information on what their rights and responsibilities are. Seems to be some culture change around this issue.

S: What more ideas do you think need to be looked at moving forward.

Holly: Mandated delivered vs. mandated completed. Focusing on completion for all faculty / staff. I like the idea of attaching this kind of training as a rider or at least a consideration for advancement. Faculty are the hardest group. Finding allies in those groups. And we’ll see what the Office for Civil Rights does.

Chuky: We would like to continue working with you on this, through our resolution, through holding forums, and other opportunities that are available.

Holly: Yes, and the fact that there’s no result details passed back down is particularly weird.

Chuky: Yes, and the power dynamic in particular make this weird for us.

Chris: One last question. W.r.t. SACUA, we’ve talked to AAC, are committee for inclusive U and committee on civil liberties people to talk to?

Holly: I don’t know them, but we’ll have to reach out.

S: More info on the student / faculty disparity.

Holly: It’s in the statement of rights & responsibilities / other info, also all in the training. We can send some of that out.

Chris: I think a one-page side-by-side document would go a long way towards effecting change.

Holly: That’s something I should be able to get to you in a week.
Chuky: Any last questions? We appreciate you coming by to speak with us.

Holly: Any final things, please come talk to me. Conversations with me are private and protected by state law.

IV. OFFICER REPORTS
   a. President Phillip Saccone
      <not present, covered by VP>

   b. Vice President Chuky Mbagwu
      Website / communications updated. All minutes from board are up, but need to get committee minutes up. Next gazette coming out in two weeks, please send info, events, etc.

   c. Treasurer
      Have ~19,000+ still.

SAGE FALL SUMMIT
UM was a key partner in founding this. Coalition of graduate student groups. Aims to Present white papers each spring in DC.

Chris: Where is that?

College Station, TX. In ~3 weeks, last weekend of October.

Also coming up will be forming a delegation for that summit, which we will talk about next week.

V. COMMITTEE UPDATES
   a. Academic Affairs Committee
      Did not meet this week. Met last week. Meetings will be scheduled for after board meetings every/other week.

   b. Budgetary Committee
      Met today. Total of 3 applications out, 2 pending. Minutes next week.

   c. Legislative Affairs Committee
      Basically the SAGE fall summit update. Chairs are not here this week, detailed update coming next week. Election forum currently being planned for regent candidates on October 27.

   d. Student Life Committee
      Chairs are out this week. Meeting time is still open.

VI. OPEN DISCUSSION
VII. **ADJOURNMENT** at 8:05pm.
Motion to adjourn by DaveM, second Stefan. Passes Unanimously.