

## SLC Meeting Minutes

Dec. 4, 2014

In attendance: Brad Reich, David Latimer, Mike Benveniste, Mike Segawa, Lisa Fortlouis-Wood, Deirdre McNally and Sam Jenkins

Meeting called to order by Brad Reich at 8:06

Reich called for student input and initiatives. No business was submitted.

Reich turned the group's attention to the task of End of Semester Progress Reports, and requested that each working group submit one directly to him, by the next meeting.

Working Group 1 then presented their work. Latimer summarized his findings in identifying initiatives to enhance campus awareness on sexual violence/assault processes/services. He suggested that the student portion is the most complete – he met w/ Marta Cady to discuss sexual assault prevention education. David also discussed with Marta the activities of the campus groups Peer Allies and Green Dot and offered a synopsis of sexual assault awareness activities this semester. Campus web resources were analyzed and assessed as complete “more than adequate.”

Reich asked Segawa how the new sexual assault policy will be implemented, announced, and put into effect.

Segawa responded that Staff is currently formulating what needs to be done in re student policies, and this will not be delivered until next semester. He suggested the possibility of using SLC as one resource to look at drafts of policy change. After the policy is vetted by multiple groups, it would go to the board of trustees, then back to drafting groups, then publicized via email, followed by the revision of print revisions (online). Ultimately, a campus-wide email would likely come from Pres. Thomas.

Wood inquired as to what input from the faculty has been collected for this revision to the sexual assault and awareness policy. Segawa responded that there had been little, outside of formal committees (Diversity, SLC, SBGC). He explained that the policy suggestions and queries first go to committees, then to the Faculty Senate, which then decides if it ought to be vetted by faculty at large.

Wood asked if we could come up with other ways of gathering information that are less administrative, or “rubber-stampy.” She emphasized that it would be valuable to get more direct input from faculty, soliciting direct feedback from faculty or departments. She also suggested the possibility of using the individual Dept. chairs

meeting as point of contact. She advocated developing a questionnaire about sexual assault on campus assessing the desires and informational needs of individual departments. The main idea would be to solicit ideas for changes, and recommendations directly from the faculty as a part of the process of developing new policy.

Latimer asked for clarification on the chain of communication for such information gathering.

Reich averred that such activity falls under the purview of the information gathering recommendation in group 4; he also suggested that developing the mechanism for obtaining faculty feed back should be done in parallel w/ charge 4 and integrated into our charges afterward.

Wood suggested that President and Dean Bartanen could drive/take-on this process (through her meetings with department Chairs).

Segawa agreed that there is precedent for this, so it should be doable. On this particular topic, such a meeting would be immediately viable.

Wood asserted that we could start with assessing baseline information from departments about sexual violence on campus (awareness, procedures, events, resources). Chairs would ask faculty for direct input.

The group agreed that it would be beneficial for “the ask” to come from David to further differentiate the work/position of the faculty from the Dean of Students/the administrative infrastructure.

Wood stressed the importance of the fact that the working group itself be in contact w/ Dean Bartanen on this, to establish a direct line of communication between faculty and Kris. (This was opened to debate).

Reich suggested that this should rest with the Working Group 1 head. David accepted this suggestion, and agreed to approach Dean Bartanen.

Latimer then presented examples of the material informational resources/pamphlets. The group considered ways and means of making the information more visible than simply flier form. Marta forwarded the model taken from Whitman, which places small informational cards in restrooms (contact and emergency information with QR codes). David liked this model of presentation and distribution. Suggested that the committee propose that we adopt this prototype.

All agreed with this suggestion.

Latimer subsequently recommended that an orientation for sexual violence awareness happen (mandatory for students) *after* the deluge of orientation: perhaps mid-term or second term.

Wood stressed that many victims tend to be outliers, outside of typical matriculation; students express that they are “groomed” by predatory upperclassmen. She asked if there were ways to identify those groups of students who might be in a higher risk group because they may have matriculated in non-standard conditions. “Those who stand out because they are not moving with the group.” She introduced the question of how to address this specific phenomenon without simply imposing another component of universal awareness training.

Segawa responded that Resident Advisors are meant to be qualitatively aware of such circumstances in order to track such risks and that this concern is consistent with ongoing initiatives.

8:35 am – Segawa departed the meeting.

Wood asked if student-student sexual violence is treated as distinct from sexual harassment by staff/faculty. She linked this to issue of grooming, unexpected/warranted attention/gifts, etc... and opened the question of how to train students to be skeptical of such selection or benevolence.

Reich reminded the group that the charge concerns initiatives relative to sexual assault. Harassment can, but does not necessarily overlap w/sexual assault. He cautioned the group to be wary of the tendency to bundle issues into a too-broad concern involving all types of harm.

McNally explained that a lot of the current programming is focused on issues of consent, being aware that sexual assault often comes from known/trusted sources. Suggests that faculty view/review these materials.

She also suggested that currently existing workshops were extremely useful, but that there is a high barrier to reaching first-year students due to their own unfamiliarity with the topic, generally. She suggested that this be integrated into orientation, with follow-up breakout sections.

Reich opined that the campus could use SSI 1 classes to disseminate information integral to first-year experience. Perhaps this would be a manageable sized group to disseminate the information (possible objection from faculty).

Wood offered that the residential locus could be an alternative way of addressing students in groups.

Groups 2 and 3 did not present findings due to absence.

Group 4 then presented their work. Wood stressed the necessity for greater information on faculty opinions, and advocated a shift to a new model of representing faculty positions/needs/awareness by establishing a mechanism to conduct straw polls, or gather data, opinions, etc... She suggested a broad change to the committee's procedures and protocols to facilitate this, and advocated that faculty use this group as the vehicle or model for more open, transparent presentation of the faculty voice, as distinct from the voice and prerogatives of the administration. She also made clear that this was a proposal for the consideration of the group, rather than an assertion.

Latimer affirmed the potential value of collecting direct faculty feedback, from his experience working on SAA, and of having access to aggregate information on pertinent faculty opinions, beliefs, knowledge.

Wood opined that it is necessary to have a clearer idea, within the faculty, of the obligations and options in re issues like sexual assault – for both benefit of students and the faculty.

The committee agreed that the issue of the mechanism/protocol/model of this type of input should become the core of working group 4's proposal, to be discussed at the beginning of next term. The current proposal will be modified to include the use of chairs as departmental point of contact.

Group 5 reported that it had nothing to report.

The meeting concluded at 9 am.

Meeting minutes recorded by Mike Benveniste.