

**1. Sexual Harassment Taskforce Recommendation Proposal**

**Date Proposed:** 11/12/19

**WEBSITE: Clarity, Transparency, Process, Resources**

**Proposal Sponsored By: (sponsoring subcommittee and list membership)**

**Communications Subcommittee:** Nancy Amedee, Jeff Connors, Kerry Donohoe, Noah Hillier, Sanjeev Manohar, Keith Mitchell, Christos Protonotarios, Lauren Turner

**Recommended Action (Exact wording of the proposed recommendation):**

Clearly communicate information about policies, processes, and resources related to sexual harassment, sexual assault and bullying – ensuring that information is readily accessible to all members of the UML community, and aligning this information with our values of care and accountability. Strategies should include a redesign and relaunch of the UMass Lowell Prevent website and a clear commitment to a culture of care and accountability, recognizing that care and accountability must be concatenate with compliance and risk-avoidance.

**Summary of Principle Ideas and any Background that might help the Taskforce to better understand the Proposal:**

While adhering to compliance – make information to reporters more accessible to the UML community, i.e., someone who has experienced sexual harassment, a supervisor seeking to find resources to assistant, or a member of the community who has been accused – information and resources are available and clear to all involved parties. This recommendation should be part of a stronger University mandate – doing better regarding sexual harassment, sexual assault, and bullying.

Redesign and relaunch UMass Lowell website:

- (1) Redesign website content and layout (modeling after University of Michigan) with clear visual of process (flow chart) for different people, expected timelines, clear and easy to see resources for support on and off campus, and how to file a complaint. Currently, the website contains lots of information, but it's easy to become overwhelmed by all of the information.
- (2) Look and feel of website – to emphasize more stridently a culture of care and accountability (beyond compliance and risk-avoidance).
- (3) Website currently too text heavy – need clickable (2 clicks maximum links) to make the website easier to navigate. The website will feature easy-to-follow flowcharts outlining processes. There is an important need to gather information regarding whether or not data is available (from University Relations) on our current use of/access to web resources, i.e., number of clicks on various campus websites related to sexual harassment, sexual assault, and bullying. These efforts may help us to determine how best to restructure and redesign content going forward. Where are people currently looking for information regarding sexual harassment, sexual assault, and bullying?
- (4) The website should clearly define various forms of sexual harassment, sexual assault ad bulling.
- (5) The website should be redesigned to raise awareness about sexual harassment, sexual assault, and bulling, to a higher level on the HR/EOO website and Student Affairs website, including a “report a concern” click at top of page (consider “report a concern about sexual harassment”).
- (6) On the website, Clara’s and Annie’s names and information needs to be prominently featured and there should be clarity about each of their duties and responsibilities.
- (7) The website should include searchable key words – from the UML website and through Google.

(continued on next page)

**Summary of Principle Ideas (continued from page 1):**

(8) Include clearly designated icons for students, staff/faculty so that the processes for each are clear.

(9) Make sure relevant other websites are connected and links are up-to-date, i.e., HR/EOO, Student Affairs, Prevent.

(10) Review student website – “NOW” Dashboard also to include a link for reporting concerns regarding sexual harassment, sexual assault, and bullying on front page.

(11) Design and layout – mobile compatible.

**Justification/Goals (What the proposal is trying to accomplish):**

The general goal for the website redesign is to offer a clearer understanding of processes, procedures, and resources, and clearer and easier access to this information on website for all members of the UML community.

**Pros and Cons (Three possible benefits of the proposal and 3 possible drawbacks):**

Pros: Clearer understanding of policies, processes, resources, and procedures. This will increase the likelihood that members of the UML community will avail themselves of these resources. When they do, we are better able to serve the UML community and our overarching goal of care and accountability.

Cons: University needs to allocate more resources in order to redesign, build, and maintain the website. This would include periodic reviews of the website in order to keep it current. With the website redesign, there may be an increase in reporting, so will need to ensure sufficient resources available to respond with timely and actionable outcomes.

**Alternatives to proposal:**

We recognize that the web is only one mode of communication, and it might be valuable to consider other mechanisms for relevant campus communications, i.e., periodic messages from the upper-Administration.

\*Please attach any additional materials to this proposal if the space provided is not sufficient.

## **2. Sexual Harassment Taskforce Recommendation Proposal**

**Date Proposed:** 11/12/19

### **LEADERSHIP/MANAGERIAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

#### **Proposal Sponsored By: (sponsoring subcommittee and list membership)**

**Communications Subcommittee:** Nancy Amedee, Jeff Connors, Kerry Donohoe, Noah Hillier, Sanjeev Manohar, Keith Mitchell, Christos Protonotarios, Lauren Turner

#### **Recommended Action (Exact wording of the proposed recommendation):**

The Communications Subcommittee recommends that all employees in leadership/supervisory roles across the university (from the Executive Cabinet to front line managers/supervisors/teachers) should, at a minimum, have basic training (mandatory and documented). Leaders/managers should also set clear expectations and hold members of their teams accountable for participating in training/education.

Leaders/managers should also set, and regularly and intentionally communicate, expectations that align with campus policies and our commitment to transparency, culture of care, and accountability. The goal is to have conversations about sexual harassment and bullying become normative.

Leaders should hold other members accountable and ensure that everyone has participated in training. Leaders should then consistently foster on-going conversations about sexual harassment and bullying.

Regarding workplace performance evaluations, leaders should work more with unions to integrate one goal on performance evaluations to be related to maintaining a climate of care and accountability. The Administration should secure union commitment to these aspirations over the next several years. Unions, working with the Administration, should consider expanding performance evaluation factors (professional development and/or inclusion), possibly adding language about manager/supervisor responsibility for training and sustaining (mandatory annual – or some other cycle/frequency - training – in person and/or on-line) and fostering an ongoing climate of caring and accountability. This would include a commitment to on-going conversations, training, and programming).

#### **Summary of Principle Ideas and any Background that might help the Taskforce to better understand the Proposal:**

- (1) Increase standards and expectations regarding the amount and level of training for top level leadership -- to include senior cabinet being trained in an array of programs to increase awareness and accountability and drive expectations for campus-wide participation.
- (2) Top leadership in the administration should set expectations – role modeling.
- (3) Collaborate with members of senior cabinet to identify training and education offerings, i.e., workshops, etc., and collaborate with HR/EOO and the Provost's Office in delivering.
- (4) Increase opportunities for in-person learning opportunities.
- (5) Have Deans/Chairs encourage faculty to include Title IX, ADA and academic integrity information in their syllabi.
- (6) Consider having Provost's Office include more information in their annual e-mail to faculty about recommended language to include in syllabi

**Justification/Goals (What the proposal is trying to accomplish):**

This recommendation's aims is to foster a shift in UML culture and climate – broadly – recognizing that culture change takes time. This would enable leadership accountability, role-modeling, and increased visibility.

**Pros and Cons (Three possible benefits of the proposal and 3 possible drawbacks):**

Pros: This recommendation would help the University Build trust and sense of leadership commitment, as well as a climate of respect that aligns with our values. In other words, the University should walk the talk. This would provide opportunities for the executive and senior cabinet members to role-model.

**Alternatives to proposal:**

N/A

\*Please attach any additional materials to this proposal if the space provided is not sufficient.

### **3. Sexual Harassment Taskforce Recommendation Proposal**

**Date Proposed:** 11/12/19

#### **ALIGNING POLICIES & PROCESSES WITH VALUES: Messaging, Campaigns, Visibility**

##### **Proposal Sponsored By: (sponsoring subcommittee and list membership)**

**Communications Subcommittee:** Nancy Amedee, Jeff Connors, Kerry Donohoe, Noah Hillier, Sanjeev Manohar, Keith Mitchell, Christos Protonotarios, Lauren Turner

##### **Recommended Action (Exact wording of the proposed recommendation):**

The Communications Subcommittee recommends that all members of the UML community further establish our commitment to a culture of care and accountability, concomitant with improved measures regarding compliance and risk-avoidance. There also needs to be an increase in visibility towards this commitment. The University must communicate these important commitments internally, and identify mechanisms to communicate this commitment externally, beyond the university.

##### **Summary of Principle Ideas and any Background that might help the Taskforce to better understand the Proposal:**

UML must ensure that our messaging aligns with our values. In this regard, UML needs to create a values statement that aligns with our messaging. Messages should be aspirational and should stress privacy throughout the process regarding sexual harassment, sexual assault and bullying. For example, one's immediate peers would not be privy to any information regarding the reporting of sexual harassment.

The University should design and implement a campaign(s) of awareness about sexual harassment, sexual assault and bullying that aligns with UML's values.

Specifically, reach out to student athletes to increase awareness and increase programming and training opportunities.

##### **Justification/Goals (What the proposal is trying to accomplish):**

By increasing awareness and accountability in alignment with University values we will instill greater trust and confidence in our reporting processes and outcomes.

There needs to be an increased effort to make the charge of the Sexual Harassment Task Force more prominent than it currently is through the website and through messaging that aligns with University values. This awareness campaign should be aspirational and should be a vehicle to promote appropriate behavior and accountability in the classroom, the workplace, and all other university spaces (including residence halls, the recreation center, dining halls, etc.). These messaging campaigns need to be take care not to present UML as a place where sexual harassment is rampant. Consider an awareness campaign modeled after UML's highly successful microaggressions campaign, i.e., design a logo to increase awareness about sexual harassment, sexual assault, and bullying around campus.

**Pros and Cons (Three possible benefits of the proposal and 3 possible drawbacks):**

Pros: This recommendation's aim is to build greater trust. The more our processes are aligned with values and are clear and transparent, the more the university will be able to instill trust in these processes. Part of the charge of these awareness campaigns is to help ensure that members of the community know that the university cares about them and are here to assist and support them. This would help make UML commitment to a safe environment for all both clear and on-going. It is important that with sustained consistency that the Administration makes it clear what it is doing to combat sexual harassment, sexual assault, and bullying. In other words, the University must make support and promote a sustained commitment to messaging that is aligned with the university's values of safety for all, transparency of the process, and care. The University's commitments to safety, transparency, and care should be on-going and not just messaged when incidents of sexual harassment, sexual assault, and bullying occur. More Listening Sessions and other forums around these issues may be a great vehicle for the Administration to fortify its commitment to "hearing" from members of the community about their experiences. Doing this would provide opportunities for the Administration continuously to articulate its commitment to a culture and climate of care and accountability. This commitment appears only to become more evident when incidents occur that violate University policies, norms, and values.

Cons: Need to grapple with the conflict between messaging about sexual harassment which creates potential public relations concerns versus messaging that could be a positive public relations message, i.e., that UML cares and is accountable. Need to shift public paradigm. Challenges to address the real public relations concerns – shifting the paradigm to being committed and recognize it happens is a good thing. A strong message about commitment to education and prevention and care is a good thing.

**Alternatives to proposal:**

N/A

\*Please attach any additional materials to this proposal if the space provided is not sufficient.

**4. Sexual Harassment Taskforce Recommendation Proposal:**

**Date Proposed:** 11/12/18

**PROGRAMMING – Training & Education**

**Proposal Sponsored By: (sponsoring subcommittee and list membership)**

**Communications Subcommittee:** Nancy Amedee, Jeff Connors, Kerry Donohoe, Noah Hillier, Sanjeev Manohar, Keith Mitchell, Christos Protonotarios, Lauren Turner

**Recommended Action (Exact wording of the proposed recommendation):**

The Communications Subcommittee recommends that mechanisms be put into place that would ensure that all members of the UML community have participated in a basic training/workshop on sexual harassment, sexual assault, and bullying, and that this training be documented for accountability. Beyond this basic education and training, there should be extended opportunities for additional learning/training and campus dialogue about these issues across the classroom and workplace. Ensure that the training is relevant to the care and accountability message/culture discussed in other recommendations, and not just based on organizational compliance.

**Summary of Principle Ideas and any Background that might help the Taskforce to better understand the Proposal:**

1. Increase leadership prioritizing, accountability and expectations for UMass Lowell community;
2. Collaborate with union leadership;
3. Provide more in-person dialog and learning opportunities;
4. Communicate broadly about the importance of training/education;
5. Offer roundtable discussions about sexual harassment for students and staff/faculty;
6. Set expectation for higher level of participation in training/education – set yearly goals;
7. Train student educators;
8. Consider using “Stall Street Journals” in residential life restrooms as means for communicating;
9. Increase opportunities for training for residential life staff and student groups – promote high level of accountability;
10. Increase messages about importance of reporting

**Justification/Goals (What the proposal is trying to accomplish):**

The Communications Subcommittee recommends an increase in leadership accountability and collaboration with campus unions. These actions would help to raise awareness, set clear expectations, and foster a climate of respect and civility regarding sexual harassment, sexual assault, and bullying.

For example, if someone has experienced sexual harassment, sexual assault, or bullying, they should know who to contact for help. Regarding this, we should have clear and understood definitions for what constitutes sexual harassment, sexual assault, misconduct, or bullying

**Pros and Cons (Three possible benefits of the proposal and 3 possible drawbacks):**

Pros: This lends an opportunity to collaborate and involve more members of the UML community in these activities and goals, and to further collaborate with the other UMass campuses in the development and delivery of content and best practices regarding preventing and addressing sexual harassment, sexual assault, misconduct, and bullying.

Cons: The University will need to increase resources necessary to extend offerings of in-person training/workshops.

**Alternatives to proposal:**

UML could hire a consulting firm or other outside agency to develop and conduct education and training.

\*Please attach any additional materials to this proposal if the space provided is not sufficient.



## 5. Sexual Harassment Taskforce Recommendation Proposal

Date Proposed: 11/12/19

### STAFFING

#### **Proposal Sponsored By: (sponsoring subcommittee and list membership)**

**Communications Subcommittee:** Nancy Amedee, Jeff Connors, Kerry Donohoe, Noah Hillier, Sanjeev Manohar, Keith Mitchell, Christos Protonotarios, Lauren Turner

#### **Recommended Action (Exact wording of the proposed recommendation):**

The Communications Subcommittee strongly recommends an increase in the level of resources (UML and external) allocated to support our on-going commitment to a culture and climate of care and accountability.

#### **Summary of Principle Ideas and any Background that might help the Taskforce to better understand the Proposal:**

The Communications Subcommittee recognizes that we need more resources to support these initiatives.

Consider establishing a campus-wide distributed network of resources that will make this work more feasible and may help to build campus trust: sharing the commitment and collective responsibility throughout the University. Consider establishing campus ambassadors to assist with this work. We will be a need to articulate roles and responsibilities of these ambassadors (i.e., job description), including appropriate training and compensation (i.e., different kinds of compensation, experience, credit, could be a component of faculty service, training, additional). These campus-wide ambassadorships should start with a smaller, trained pilot group. Would have extensive training and be people embedded in the community who would be available as resources as first place for employees with concern to consult.

Process suggestion: Invite members of the community to nominate and/or apply for these ambassadorship roles and engage a committee to work with HR/EOO and Student Affairs to select individuals for these roles.

NOTE: Need to consider process to have immediate manager/supervisor consultation at the front end, duration of appointment, review of performance in appointment, continuation in the role or removal. People in these roles will be expected to perform at the levels aligned with expectations of this role and our values.

Another suggestions: Explore Davis Foundation for start-up grants to help fund these ambassadorships.

These ambassador positions would be a great opportunity to include faculty, staff, and student as “ambassadors” to help facilitate making issues surrounding sexual harassment and bullying more visible in different work and learning spaces. This would also increase access to resources by making community members available as a more local point of contact.

#### **Justification/Goals (What the proposal is trying to accomplish):**

The goal of this recommendation is to find a way to resource these initiatives as cost-effectively as possible while also potentially building access to resources and fostering trust.

**Pros and Cons (Three possible benefits of the proposal and 3 possible drawbacks):**

Pros: This recommendation would help leverage our UML collaborative spirit of safety and care, and find more cost-effective ways to resource this work. This would also providing opportunities for members of the community to connect with a resource that is more local (campus-based), which may make access to our campus processes more accessible. This would provide potential reporters more options regarding how to come forward. This recommendation would reinforce UML's overarching goal of care and accountability.

Cons: More resources will be needed in order to training ambassadors. Although these ambassador positions would aid in the distributions of the work/burden, it would require ambassadors to take on additional work.

**Alternatives to proposal:**

These resources are critical to our ability to deliver on our recommendations.

\*Please attach any additional materials to this proposal if the space provided is not sufficient.

6. Sexual Harassment Taskforce Recommendation Proposal

Date Proposed:

Proposal Sponsored By: (sponsoring subcommittee and list membership)

Recommended Action (Exact wording of the proposed recommendation):

Identify and clearly communicate the rights of targets in the reporting process.

Summary of Principle Ideas and any Background that might help the Taskforce to better understand the Proposal:

- a. The rights of people as they report are not laid out clearly in the current documentation. A scan of other University websites includes a set of rights such as the right to decide on the timing of being questioned for the investigation, the right to have an advocate present during the questioning, the right to ask for a break during the investigative questioning, etc. These are important rights to allow for people to not be retraumatized by the process.
- b. These rights should be decided upon and guaranteed to reporting parties.
- c. These rights should be communicated in writing on the website and other vehicles where the reporting process is laid out.
- d. These rights should be told verbally to people reporting before they are questioned.

Justification/Goals (What the proposal is trying to accomplish):

Ensuring that those who report have a positive experience of the process is key to building a positive climate and supporting an environment that supports reporting.

Pros and Cons (Three possible benefits of the proposal and 3 possible drawbacks):

--

Alternatives to proposal:

There are no alternatives to this proposal
--

\*Please attach any additional materials to this proposal if the space provided is not sufficient.