
Revised Draft of a New WPI Sexual Misconduct Policy

Committee on Governance:

Len Albano

Bruce Bursten (Provost)

Glenn Gaudette (Chair)

Mark Richman (SOF)

Sue Roberts

David Spanagel

Bengisu Tulu

Suzy Weekes

Process to Develop Proposed Policy for WPI

- Working Group Members: ←
 - 3 Trustees
 - Jack Mollen (Board Chair), Joan Szkutak (APC Chair), Marni Hall (APC Vice Chair)
 - 3 Faculty members
 - Kris Boudreau (HU&A), Glenn Gaudette (BME), Mark Richman (ME)
 - Legal Counsel:
 - University Counsel (David Bunis)
 - Committee on Governance: ←
 - Reviewed draft from the Working Group
 - Suggested modifications
 - Forwarded for faculty consideration
 - WPI Faculty: ←
 - Present at March and April faculty meetings
 - Collect feedback
 - On March 2: WPI Board of Trustees approved the draft as an interim policy in effect until May when it will consider a final faculty-approved Sexual Misconduct Policy
-

Needs Addressed in/by the Proposed Policy

- The need for WPI to have a single clear Sexual Misconduct Policy;
 - Faculty-approved policy (January 2014)
 - Board-approved policy (December 2013)
- The need for a single the Sexual Misconduct Policy to apply to faculty, staff, and students
- The general need to update language
 - Current usage
 - Compliance...

Reconcile...

Procedures: Overview

- Initial Assessment:
 - by the Title IX Coordinator: to determine if allegations fall within the policy
- Investigation Phase:
 - Notice given to Respondent
 - Investigator(s) appointed
 - Investigator(s) deliver an investigative report (to Title IX Coordinator)
 - with no determination of responsibility or sanctions
- Following the Investigative Phase:
 - Judicial Panel convened (five members; three faculty members)
 - Judicial Panel review:
 - investigative report, interviews, additional investigation
 - Judicial Panel decides (by majority vote): responsibility and sanctions
- Appeals (by either party):
 - to Appellate Officer – reviews responsibility and sanctions
- Special Appeals (by faculty members in the case of termination):
 - First to the President
 - Next to the Board of Trustees (after a recommendation from a faculty committee)

Improvements Incorporated Since March

- Definition of Sexual Misconduct
 - Sexual harassment (general and examples)
 - Gender-motivated stalking (general and examples)
 - Inappropriate Relationships
 - With Undergrads – prohibited
 - With Graduate Students and Supervisees – awareness of imbalance of power
- Definition of Consent – general
- Supervisors - required to report all violations
- Ombudspersons - added as Confidential Resource Advisors
- Initial Assessment - must include meeting with Respondent
- Judicial Panel - details....
 - Faculty from elected Campus Hearing Board
 - Staff and students – set by Title IX Coordinator

Improvements Incorporated Since March (cont.)

- Sanctions –
 - separate examples provided for faculty, staff, and students
- Explicit application to Administrators
 - general adjustments when the Respondent is an “officer” in the policy
- Training of all participants
- Explicit requirements for written documentation at all stages
- Explicit general language added concerning:
 - conflicts of interest
 - reports made in bad faith
 - good faith participation by all parties and witnesses
 - duties of promptness, care, and confidentiality
 - efforts to restore reputations

Discussion