Job Place bullying Committee

November 21, 2011

Present: Carolyn Fallahi, Eva Vrdojak, Kathy Hermes, Jacqueline Cobbina-Boivin, Kate McGrath

Excused Absence: Meg Levvis, Susan Gilmore, Sally Lesik

We started off the meeting review a draft of the Sexual Harassment Policy that CCW was working on a couple of years ago. Our policy is different from other CSU policies. Kate McGrath added some paragraphs that were more in line with other CSU policies. In bold… 2 key differences… includes gender harassment and identifies other avenues that a person can pursue instead of just going through our offices. Given what has happened on our campus, identifying other recourses is important. This does a better job explaining what quid pro quo and hostile environment are and adds gender harassment.

Now new laws on the books about gender identity. Not sure how this is going to be changed, so Kathy Hermes recommends that we keep the wording the same in the document. We all agree that this should be included. Jacqueline wondered about giving examples. Kathy noted that we don’t usually give examples in the policy.

Retaliation…. Should that go in the policy. What about false allegations? Let’s look for some examples of false reporting and retaliation and add to the policy. Could also add FAQ and address that in the FAQ.

Intentional harm using the sexual harassment policy will be investigated. We can ask the following people for their input.

Judicial officer

Carolyn Magnan

Anne Alling

Other schools have in their policies…. How are they handling false accusations?

Might also overlap with our work on the civility policy.

Do they have a dismissal policy? If it is an employment thing… that is one thing. We know what will happen to the employee. If it is student to employee, that is a different situation. Can we say malicious? It is mean, but not to the extent to ruin a career. The outside intention is not to ruin a career. Jackie… intent is irrelevant, but what is the impact? If feel hugged inappropriately, that is where the sexual harassment complaints are so iffy. Base it on a reasonable person standard. Not if you do this, you are guilty. What if you have 1 instance of hugging? It is a balance test. That is why there are investigations to see if something is there. IF we ask the administration to consider this policy, ask them to consider this issue. Kathy worries about the chilling effect…. People wouldn’t report. Things are more professional in the administration now. Too much in the policy is something that might prevent people from responding.

FAQs… .what should I bring with me in terms of information if I am to file a complaint: dates, times, witnesses, how made them feel, share this information with anyone? Put in writing. Did you tell person that you were uncomfortable and the behavior continued? Intent versus impact. Chilling effect is real.

FAQ…. In order to prepare this, we need x, y, z. If we put in the policy, we are saying here is a bar. That might prevent someone from reporting.

Difference….. first time something happens, grabbing of the behind now a sexual assault. In extreme cases, you do not need several incidents in order to report it.

Could have…. *See also policy sexual assault policy*. Add to the end of the policy. We want to make this accessible. Want over-reporting as opposed to under-reporting. Better to have the Diversity Officer say

Jackie would like to see a poster that goes everywhere that says what to do if x, y, z happens. Get permission to put it in the classroom. Should be on the syllabus. Every student has a copy of it. These are the resources on campus.

Send out e-mail at the beginning of the semester with a recommended paragraph and add to student handbook.

Next meeting Wednesday, January 25, 12:15 in Carolyn’s office.