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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...
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