



**REPORT OF THE  
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE  
ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT PREVENTION  
AND CULTURE CHANGE**

**Barbara A. Lee**

*Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chair*

**Karen R. Stubaus**

*Vice President for Academic Affairs, Co-Chair*

**Joan Wennstrom Bennett**

*Distinguished Professor of Plant Biology and Pathology  
Special Advisor to the Committee*

**April 30, 2019**

**RUTGERS**  
THE STATE UNIVERSITY  
OF NEW JERSEY

## Contents

<b>Statement of the Problem</b> .....	3
<b>Rutgers University’s Commitment to Resolving the Issue</b> .....	7
<b>National Academies’ Report</b> .....	10
<b>The Rutgers Committee on Sexual Harassment Prevention and Culture Change</b> .....	16
<b>Subcommittee Reports and Recommendations</b> .....	18
Consensual Relationships .....	18
Faculty and Staff Rewards .....	18
Transparency .....	20
Training, Information and Communication .....	21
Leadership .....	21
Assessment .....	22
<b>Sexual Harassment Committee Report Development and Dissemination Process</b> .....	22
<b>Implementation Plan</b> .....	23
National Academies’ Action Collaborative to Prevent Sexual Harassment in Higher Education .....	23
Rutgers University Implementation Task Force .....	24
<b>Conclusion</b> .....	28
<b>Appendix A: Committee Membership</b> .....	30
<b>Appendix B: Recommendations of Consensual Relationships Subcommittee</b> .....	36
<b>Appendix C: Recommendations of Faculty Reward Systems Subcommittee</b> .....	38
<b>Appendix D: Recommendations of Transparency Subcommittee</b> .....	48
<b>Appendix E: Recommendations of Training, Information and Communication Subcommittee</b> .....	58
<b>Appendix F: Recommendations of Leadership Subcommittee</b> .....	65
<b>Appendix G: Recommendations of Assessment Subcommittee</b> .....	74

**REPORT OF THE RUTGERS UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON  
SEXUAL HARASSMENT PREVENTION AND CULTURE CHANGE**

**Barbara A. Lee**  
**Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, Chair**

**Karen R. Stubaus**  
**Vice President for Academic Affairs, Co-Chair**

**Joan Wennstrom Bennett**  
**Distinguished Professor of Plant Biology and Pathology**  
**Special Advisor to the Committee**

**April 30, 2019**

**I. Statement of the Problem**

Sexual harassment has been an ongoing and troubling issue in American higher education for decades. Research studies highlighted in a recent report by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine reveal that between 20 and 50 percent of women students and over half of women faculty and staff report experiencing sexually-harassing behavior during their years in the academy.<sup>1</sup> Every college and university in the country has policies prohibiting it, training to discourage it, presidential pronouncements decrying it, and mechanisms to sanction those who practice it. It disrupts personal and professional lives, causes mental and physical distress, and leads to under-participation or complete withdrawal of targets-- as well as bystanders-- from the workforce. And yet it persists. Although this report is focused particularly

---

<sup>1</sup> See the full National Academies Report for the results of several relevant studies. National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2018. *Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi: <https://doi.org/10.17226/24994>. Hereafter referred to as "National Academies Report."

on the problem of harassment and discrimination on the basis of sex, virtually every recommendation included below also applies to other forms of harassment and discrimination, including race, national origin/ethnicity, religion, age, disability, sexual orientation, LGBTQ status, and other characteristics. Indeed, when sexual harassment and/or discrimination occurs where non-majority individuals are the targets, it is often difficult to determine the basis or bases of the harassment. Rutgers University policy prohibits discrimination on the basis of all of these characteristics, among others.

To the great chagrin of the universities involved, some of the more egregious examples of sexual harassment in the academy often catch the attention of the national press. Just a few recent examples appear below:

**March 2018:** *The New York Times* reported on the resignation of a “prominent” professor of government at Harvard who had been accused of sexual harassment and inappropriate behavior by as many as 18 women, including faculty, students, and staff, over several decades. A female faculty member, an assistant professor at Harvard in the 1980s, said that he had made “repeated attempts to kiss her, attempted to run his hand up her dress and, at another point, made a reference to raping her. As she rebuffed his advances....he reminded her of how powerful he was.” Following her repeated complaints, Harvard found in 1983 that he had committed serious misconduct, and temporarily removed him from his administrative duties. His harassing behavior continued, even as he was repeatedly promoted to higher and higher levels of prominence and responsibility.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Stephanie Saul, “Harvard Professor Resigns Amid Allegations of Sexual Harassment,” *The New York Times*, March 6, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/03/06/us/harvard-professor-resigns-sexual-harassment.html>

**August 2018:** *The Los Angeles Times* ran a story concerning a “prominent” architecture professor at the University of California at Berkeley, also chair of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies for nearly two decades, who was suspended for three years without pay for sexually harassing a UC doctoral candidate who was also his advisee. According to the university’s investigation, the faculty member “spent months ingratiating himself with her before placing his hand on her upper thigh, proposing they become ‘close friends’ and suggesting they go to Las Vegas.”<sup>3</sup>

**November 2018:** *The Chronicle of Higher Education* reported on a lawsuit filed by a professor of medicine, a renowned cardiologist and researcher at Yale, who five years earlier had been “stripped of an endowed chair for sexually harassing a young postdoctoral researcher.” He also publicly denigrated the postdoc’s boyfriend (later her husband), removed him from a grant, and blocked his opportunities for promotion. The professor told the postdoc that she was “choosing the wrong man since the professor was in a position to ‘open the world of science’ to her.” His lawsuit, referencing the #MeToo movement, charged the university with “unseemly pandering to the rage of activists”. As *The Chronicle* writer noted at the time, “His case reflects the tensions that flare up when researchers who bring millions of dollars into their medical schools’ coffers are given what some feel are insufficient penalties for sexually harassing junior colleagues.”<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Associated Press, “UC Berkeley Suspends Professor for Sexual Harassment,” August 20, 2018. <https://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-berkeley-professor-sexual-harassment-20180820-story.html>

<sup>4</sup> Katherine Mangan, “A Star Professor, Removed from Endowed Chair for Harassment, Accuses Yale of ‘Pandering’ to #MeToo Activists,” *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 10, 2018. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/A-Star-Professor-Removed-From/245063>

**November 2018:** *The New York Times* reported that seven women had filed suit against Dartmouth College, charging three prominent professors with sexual assault, harassment and discrimination. The professors allegedly “leered at, groped, sexted, intoxicated and even raped female students,” and had turned the human behavior research department “into a 21<sup>st</sup>-century Animal House.” The lawsuit also alleged that the offending behavior extended back to 2002, and that the Dartmouth administration had ignored the problem for more than 16 years. The women charged that the professors used their power over their students’ academic careers and future employment “to coerce them into participating in an alcohol- and sex-saturated party culture and to discourage them from complaining.”<sup>5</sup>

These very public cases are the exception, however. Most sexual harassment in work settings, including academic settings, is much more subtle, and as a result, harassers are rarely disciplined. Sexual harassers engage in largely covert behaviors. They make lewd, sexual, and denigrating comments about appearance, hostile or demeaning jokes, ask for dates, and use offensive/sexual language. Harassers also make comments about women’s inferiority and inability to perform tasks competently, or in the same manner as their male counterparts. These comments mostly fly under the radar. Yet, they too are a form of gender discrimination. The impact of these comments on the harasser’s victims is just as powerful and harmful as are more physical forms of sexual harassment.

The past few years have seen growing national attention to the problem of sexual harassment in a wide variety of employment venues. The #MeToo movement went viral on social media in the Fall of 2017 with the goal of forcefully demonstrating the prevalence of

---

<sup>5</sup> Anemona Hartocollis, “Dartmouth Professors Are Accused of Sexual Abuse by 7 Women in Lawsuit,” *The New York Times*, November 15, 2018. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/11/15/us/dartmouth-professors-sexual-harassment.html>

sexual assault and sexual harassment, particularly in the workplace. In September of 2018, the National Science Foundation published a new term and condition for awards that requires awardees to notify the agency of “any findings or determinations that an NSF-funded principal investigator or co-principal investigator committed harassment, including sexual harassment or sexual assault.”<sup>6</sup> Notification is also required if the principal investigator or co-principal investigator is placed on administrative leave, or if there is any other administrative action related to a sexual harassment or sexual assault finding or violation. The National Institutes of Health is taking similar steps, clarifying expectations for both academic institutions and principal investigators that if a PI or other key individual named on an NIH grant award is no longer able to fulfill their obligations to conduct research because they are under investigation, or because they have been removed from the workplace due to sexual harassment concerns, NIH requires the institution to notify them of that fact.<sup>7</sup> In addition, in 2018 NIH followed up on sexual harassment-related issues at more than two dozen academic institutions, resulting in the removal of 14 principal investigators.

## **II. Rutgers University’s Commitment to Resolving the Issue**

Rutgers joins its peers (and an increasing number of federal agencies and other employers) in being firmly committed to “fostering an environment that is safe and secure and free from sexual and gender-based discrimination and harassment, sexual violence, dating and

---

<sup>6</sup> See NSF News Release 18-082, “NSF announces new measures to protect research community from harassment,” September 19, 2018. [https://www.nsf.gov/news/news\\_summ.jsp?cntn\\_id=296610](https://www.nsf.gov/news/news_summ.jsp?cntn_id=296610)

<sup>7</sup> See National Institutes of Health website posting, “Update on NIH’s efforts to address sexual harassment in science,” February 28, 2019. <https://www.nih.gov/about-nih/who-we-are/nih-director/statements/update-nih-efforts-address-sexual-harassment-science>

domestic violence, stalking and other related misconduct. The University recognizes its responsibility to increase awareness of such misconduct, prevent its occurrence, support victims, deal fairly and firmly with alleged offenders, and diligently investigate reports of misconduct. In addressing these issues, all members of the University must come together to respect and care for one another in a manner consistent with our deeply held academic and community values.”<sup>8</sup>

In order to carry out that commitment, Rutgers has a variety of offices, policies, and procedures dedicated to dealing with, ameliorating the impact of, and seeking to prevent the sexual harassment of its students, faculty, and staff. Every new Rutgers employee receives sexual harassment training upon joining the University, and continuing employees are required to refresh their training at regular intervals. In addition, various offices at the University provide or will arrange for small-group face-to-face sexual harassment training upon request.

The [Student Policy Prohibiting Sexual Harassment, Sexual Violence, Relationship Violence, Stalking and Related Misconduct](#) is a resource for student-to-student misconduct outside of the employment realm. If a student is found responsible under the Policy, the consequence may include suspension or expulsion from the University. In general, a complaint against a student arising out of their conduct as a student, as opposed to their conduct as a student employee, is reported to the campus’s Title IX Coordinator for Students. Complaints by students or others alleging sexual harassment, sexual exploitation, gender-based harassment, stalking, relationship violence, and related misconduct against a current Rutgers employee, including faculty, staff, and students, or against third parties such as interns, volunteers, vendors, contractors, and subcontractors, are made to the Office of Employment Equity (OEE) under the

---

<sup>8</sup>Policy Statement, Rutgers University “Policy Prohibiting Sexual Harassment, Sexual Violence, Relationship Violence, Stalking, and Related Misconduct by Employees and Third Parties”.



[Policy Prohibiting Sexual Harassment, Sexual Violence, Relationship Violence, Stalking, and Related Misconduct by Employees and Third Parties.](#)

Significant additional support for undergraduate and graduate students on all three geographical campuses of the University as well as Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS) is provided by the [Office for Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance \(VPVA\)](#), under Student Affairs. VPVA provides crisis intervention, advocacy, and counseling to victims or survivors of sexual violence, domestic or dating violence, stalking, and sexual harassment. The campus counseling centers and health centers are also significant sources of support. Several schools, programs, and departments have developed additional statements of professional ethics, responsibility, and behavior that students learn and agree to abide by as part of their programs, in addition to the policies described above. For instance, in December of 2018 the School of Graduate Studies (SGS) Executive Committee and the SGS Committee on Responsible Conduct and Professionalism in Graduate Education unanimously voted to establish a “Code of Responsible Conduct”. Among the “Inappropriate Behaviors” cited are: Mistreatment, abuse, bullying, or harassment; Requests for personal services; Sexual assault or sexual harassment; Discrimination; and Indifference to inappropriate behaviors that are witnessed.”

Rutgers’ policies, procedures, and offices devoted to preventing and seeking to ameliorate the impact of sexual harassment are on a par with those of our peers. Nevertheless, as is the case with our peers, the incidence of harassing behavior in higher education has not noticeably diminished over the decades. Of particular concern for our purposes here is sexual misconduct where there is a significant power differential, e.g., faculty to student, principal investigator to postdoc, advisor to doctoral candidate, senior faculty to junior faculty, etc. That

type of sexual misconduct or sexual harassment is the focus of a recent report issued by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine entitled *Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine*,<sup>9</sup> outlined below, which in turn was the inspiration for the creation of the Rutgers University Committee on Sexual Harassment Prevention and Culture Change. Perhaps the most salient measure of Rutgers' strong commitment to reducing and preventing sexual harassment is President Barchi's institutional and financial support for Rutgers to become a Founding Member of the National Academies' *Action Collaborative on Preventing Sexual Harassment in Higher Education*. The first meeting of the Action Collaborative was held at the National Academies' flagship building in Washington, D.C. on March 12, 2019, with Rutgers in attendance, along with 27 other Founding Member institutions, including Caltech, Dartmouth, Duke, Harvard, Michigan State, University of Michigan, Stanford, Vanderbilt, and Yale. More on the Action Collaborative's charge can be found in the Implementation section of this report, below.

### **III. National Academies' Report**

The National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, through its Committee on Women in Science, Engineering, and Medicine, issued a consensus report in June of 2018 entitled *Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine*. This research-based report acknowledged and applauded the continual increase in the percentage of women in STEM fields, but also noted the stubborn persistence of sexual harassment and its impact on women's careers, both for the targets of the harassment as well as for the bystanders, causing at least some to leave academic science

---

<sup>9</sup> National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. 2018. *Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. doi: <https://doi.org/10.17226/24994>.

altogether. “The consequence of this is a significant and costly loss of talent in science, engineering, and medicine,” and it specifically called out the “special responsibility” of universities to provide “a welcoming and effective environment for women students.”

The Academies’ research found that the most salient predictor of sexual harassment is organizational climate,<sup>10</sup> “the degree to which those in the organization perceive that sexual harassment is or is not tolerated,” and that thus academic institutions can reduce sexual harassment by making systemic changes that demonstrate how seriously they take the issue, and that they are listening and supporting those who speak up to report their experiences with harassment. The emphasis should thus be shifted from legal compliance and reporting mechanisms, to prevention via significant culture change.

In order to most effectively change the culture and climate in higher education, the Academies’ report emphasized the importance of robust diversity initiatives; examination of faculty hiring, evaluation, and reward practices; ending the practice of one-on-one advising of graduate students and postdocs; reduction in the isolation of the target of harassment; and provision of effective sexual harassment training based on measurable outcomes and not merely legal compliance.

Among the most radical of the Academies’ recommendations were those involving faculty hiring, evaluation, and reward practices, including 1) calling on institutions to consider NOT hiring an otherwise-qualified candidate if they have a history of behavior inconsistent with the values of the institution; 2) explicitly evaluating faculty on their “cooperation, respectful work behavior, and professionalism” as well as on the more traditional criteria of teaching,

---

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., Preface, page x.

scholarship, and service;<sup>11</sup> and 3) ending the practice of protecting academic “stars” from the normal institutional consequences of their harassing behavior. Relatedly, the Academies’ report also strongly encourages serious examination of the practice of requiring confidentiality and/or non-disclosure agreements related to sexual harassment settlements, as they shield perpetrators who have harassed repeatedly.

The Academies’ fifteen final recommendations are as follows:<sup>12</sup>

- 1) **Create diverse, inclusive, and respectful environments.** More diverse environments, particularly those that improve the representation of women at every level, are less likely to tolerate harassing behavior. Faculty and staff should be evaluated on respectful work behavior and professionalism at the time of hiring and promotion.
- 2) **Address the most common form of sexual harassment: gender harassment.** Leaders should pay increased attention to and enact policies at their institutions that address gender harassment, which is the most common form of sexual harassment and which often creates a climate that tolerates and indeed encourages other forms of sexual harassment.
- 3) **Move beyond legal compliance to address culture and climate.** University leaders need to approach sexual harassment as a culture and climate issue, and not merely as a legal issue. The emphasis on relying solely on formal reports made by targets should be replaced with engaging with and listening to students and other vulnerable community members about the problem.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., page 127.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., pages 169-187.

- 4) **Improve transparency and accountability.** Academic institutions need to develop and clearly disseminate their policies on sexual harassment and their expectations for appropriate standards of behavior. Escalating disciplinary consequences, calibrated to the severity and frequency of the harassment, should also be publicized. Institutions should be as transparent as possible concerning how they are handling reported instances of sexual harassment. The results of investigations and any disciplinary actions taken should be shared with the targets and/or the person(s) who reported the behavior.
- 5) **Diffuse the hierarchical and dependent relationship between trainees and faculty.** Institutions should consider introducing power-diffusion mechanisms such as mentoring networks, committee-based advising, and departmental rather than principal investigator funding to diminish the opportunities for sexual harassment to occur.
- 6) **Provide support for the target.** Reporting sexual harassment is usually a difficult and courageous act. Those who do so should be provided with appropriate support services, such as legal, professional, or medical. More informal means of recording information about the experience should be available if the target does not wish to file a formal report. Above all, targets must be protected from retaliation for filing either a formal or informal complaint.
- 7) **Strive for strong and diverse leadership.** All levels of academic leadership must be vocal in their commitment to reducing and preventing sexual harassment. Academic institutions should provide skill-development programs for leadership in recognizing

and handling sexual harassment, and in how to create a culture and climate to reduce and prevent it.

8) **Measure progress.** Academic leaders should work with researchers to accurately evaluate and assess their efforts to create a more diverse, inclusive, and respectful environment; to assess the efficacy of their policies, procedures, and training programs; and to measure the incidence and types of harassment at their institutions. Results of validated climate surveys should be shared publicly to encourage transparency and accountability.

9) **Incentivize change.** Federal agencies, accreditation bodies, and private foundations should incentivize and reward institutional efforts to reduce sexual harassment and create diverse, inclusive, and respectful environments.

10) **Encourage involvement of professional societies and other organizations.**

Professional societies should increase their efforts to be viewed as organizations that work to reduce or prevent sexual harassment, and to create positive cultures of civility and respect. They should also hold their leadership and staff accountable for their own behaviors, as well as members for their behavior while at professional association meetings.

11) **Initiate legislative action.** State legislators and Congress should consider new legislation with the goals of better protecting sexual harassment claimants from retaliation, prohibiting confidentiality in settlement agreements that currently enable sexual harassers to move from institution to institution and conceal past findings of violations, and requiring institutions receiving federal funds to publicly disclose

results from campus climate surveys and/or the number of sexual harassment complaints filed.

- 12) **Address the failures to meaningfully enforce Title VII’s prohibition on sex discrimination.** “Federal judges should take into account demonstrated *effectiveness* of anti-harassment policies and practices such as trainings, and not just their *existence*, for use for an affirmative defense against a sexual harassment claim under Title VII.”<sup>13</sup>
- 13) **Increase federal agency action and collaboration.** Federal agencies should approach sexual harassment in the same manner as they approach research misconduct, and sanction researchers for policy violations in either area. Institutions should be required to report to federal agencies when faculty or other researchers on grants have been found to have violated the institution’s sexual harassment policies, or when they have been placed on administrative leave related to sexual harassment.
- 14) **Conduct necessary research.** Research should be supported and funded in several areas discussed in the Academies’ report, including but not limited to the harassment experiences of those in underrepresented and/or vulnerable groups; the most effective policies, procedures, trainings, and interventions; target-led resolution options; protecting targets from retaliation; and the most effective incentive systems for motivating institutional leaders to address issues of sexual harassment on their campuses.
- 15) **Make the entire academic community responsible for reducing and preventing sexual harassment.** Every member of the academic community should be actively

---

<sup>13</sup> National Academies’ Report, p. 185.

involved in the effort to reduce and prevent sexual harassment, and to create a positive, inclusive, and respectful culture and institutional climate.

#### IV. **The Rutgers Committee on Sexual Harassment Prevention and Culture Change**

In the fall of 2018, President Robert L. Barchi asked Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs Barbara Lee to create a committee of faculty, students and staff to consider the recommendations of the National Academies' report and to examine how they might be operationalized at Rutgers. Forty-five individuals volunteered or were invited to join the committee; committee members are listed in Appendix A.

Because of the scope of the issue and the size of the committee, the committee was divided into six subcommittees that would meet frequently and prepare proposed recommendations in each of six areas:

- **Consensual relationships** between employees and students or staff
- Incorporating findings of policy violations into considerations concerning **faculty appointment, promotion, reappointment, tenure, merit pay** and other rewards
- **Training, information and communication** with respect to the creation of a culture and climate of respect
- **Transparency**—What kind of information about confirmed reports and findings of harassment and discrimination should be shared, and with whom
- **Leadership**—In what ways can top university leaders make a tangible difference in communicating zero tolerance for harassment, and creating a climate of civility and respect



- **Assessment**—what is the current climate, and have our revised policies, training, and emphasis on a climate of respect been successful? How can they be improved?

At a full committee meeting on December 11, 2018, committee members reported on a variety of issues they had been discussing, and solicited feedback from their colleagues. Subcommittees gathered policies, procedures, and other information from peer institutions around the country, including Big Ten and AAU institutions. While most of the institutions contacted were in the early stages of discussing the same issues as our committee, a few had taken steps to address certain aspects of the problem of harassment and discrimination, and provided models for our committee to consider adopting or adapting. Subcommittees were asked to prepare preliminary recommendations for presentation at the next full committee meeting in February, and were encouraged at this stage of their work not to be constrained in their thinking by current Rutgers organizational structures, policies, procedures, or resources.

At the next meeting of the full committee on February 5, attended by Dr. Frazier Benya, Co-editor of the National Academies report, each of the six subcommittees shared their preliminary recommendations for group discussion and feedback. There was a great deal of engagement and high-level debate among committee members, and a clear acknowledgement that many recommendations would require significant discussion with and involvement of University Human Resources and the Office of General Counsel before implementation could be achieved. The members of each subcommittee then worked intensively over the course of the next four weeks, presenting their final recommendations at the last meeting of the full committee on March 5.

## **V. Subcommittee Reports and Recommendations**

The recommendations are summarized as follows. The full reports from each subcommittee are included as Appendices B – G.

### **1. Consensual Relationships**

- Develop a new policy that prohibits all relationships between employees or University affiliates and undergraduates; prohibits relationships between employees or affiliates who supervise, evaluate, teach, manage, or advise graduate students; prohibits relationships between intercollegiate athletics coaches or club coaches, affiliates, and their staff and student athletes; and prohibits relationships between employees or affiliates who teach, manage, supervise, advise, or evaluate another employee.
- Develop a reporting structure for alleged violations of the policy.
- Develop a mitigation process in the event that the conflict can be mitigated (for example, assigning the student to a different advisor).
- Release a statement from leadership (President, chancellors) re: how the policy addresses the prevention of harassment.

### **2. Faculty and Staff Rewards**

These recommendations address whether and to what extent we may use determinations that an employee has violated our policy against harassment (or those of other institutions), or other Rutgers policies, in making decisions such as hiring, merit pay, promotion, tenure, and reappointment.

- Require candidates for faculty (and staff) positions at the time they apply to disclose whether they have been or currently are the subject of an investigation or a finding concerning harassment, discrimination, or other misconduct.
- Require any finalist to waive confidentiality and to provide or release any reports from prior employers where there is a finding that the finalist violated the institution's policies prohibiting harassment or discrimination. Include in reference checking questions regarding whether the potential hire would contribute positively or negatively to the culture and climate of the department/school.
- Incorporate language from the University's *Statement on Professional Ethics* (University Policy 60.5.1) into the criteria statements for scholarship, teaching and service in Appendix D of the Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions.
- Ensure that reports documenting violations of University policy be placed in the employee's official personnel file and made available to individuals and committees involved in reappointment, promotion and tenure recommendations (already permitted under University policy).
- Ensure that the required annual meeting between every faculty member and their department chair or dean include discussion of any allegations or determinations of unprofessional or inappropriate behavior by the faculty member.
- Ensure that the merit pay process takes documented findings of unprofessional conduct into account.
- Create awards and incentives for faculty and staff that recognize contributions to a positive and inclusive university culture.

- Facilitate and recognize the creation of community by faculty, administrators, students, and staff who are actively working to effect significant culture change.

### **3. Transparency**

- Issue annual aggregate reports on harassment and sexual misconduct cases involving both the employee and student context.
- Include number of harassment complaints made to OEE, how many involved findings of a violation, and category of sanctions issued.
- Break the data down, if possible, by category of complainant and alleged perpetrator, nature of the allegation, and outcome.
- Issue a similar report for Title IX complaints of student-student harassment and assault.
- Develop a communications strategy for these reports (see examples from Michigan, Berkeley, Northwestern and Columbia).
- Conduct climate surveys among faculty, staff and graduate students and share results with the campus community.
- Place letters of determination re OEE findings, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of the complainant and witnesses, in official personnel file of alleged perpetrator.
- Inform OEE of the sanctions imposed.
- Communicate to the complainant the outcome of the investigation and what sanctions were imposed.
- Work with Government Affairs staff to explore with legislators the creation of legislation similar to New Jersey's "Pass the Trash" law<sup>14</sup> that would protect colleges and

---

<sup>14</sup> New Jersey Senate Bill S414 (Law A 3381), effective June 1, 2018.

universities in the state from legal liability for sharing investigation outcomes with other institutions.

- Explore a partnership with Callisto (an online, trauma-informed website for students to document and report sexual assault).
- Provide coaching to chairs, institute directors, and others on informal approaches to dealing with alleged unprofessional behavior by faculty or staff.
- Offer training to students, especially graduate students, on how the university will respond to their concerns about harassment or unprofessional conduct, and encourage them to use our processes.

#### **4. Training, Information, and Communication**

- Create an “R is for Respect” campaign with University Communications and Marketing, including a webpage. Reiterate that the University has a “No Tolerance” stance with regard to harassment. Use this as the central repository of information about training, OEE reports, etc.
- Create training programs for deans, chairs, faculty, staff, and students on the prevention of and how to deal with harassment in any form.
- Create assessment mechanisms to ensure that the training is effective and responsive to University needs.

#### **5. Leadership**

- Develop a No Tolerance statement that senior leaders communicate to the University community on a regular basis.

- Develop practical roadmaps for deans and chairs to help them know how to respond to complaints of harassment or other misconduct.
- Establish an ombuds for faculty and staff in every chancellor unit who reports directly to the chancellor.
- Require orientation for new chairs and deans, and retraining for all chairs and deans when policies change, to make them aware of how to respond to informal complaints or observation of harassment or other unprofessional behavior.
- Hold leaders accountable for how they manage their units with respect to the maintenance of a respectful work environment.
- Conduct ongoing assessments of climate.

## **6. Assessment**

- Each chancellor-led unit should perform an environmental survey to establish baseline experiences of undergraduate students, graduate students, postdoctoral fellows, faculty, and staff regarding mistreatment or harassment of any kind.
- Conduct follow-up surveys every 3-4 years.
- Adopt “real time” electronic reporting mechanism for reporting inappropriate behavior.
- Give students in clinical and field settings a way to report harassment from third parties.
- Provide sufficient resources to maintain and coordinate ongoing assessment efforts.

## **VI. Sexual Harassment Committee Report Development and Dissemination Process**

A draft report was developed and shared with Committee members in early April, inviting their comments. The report was also shared in draft with University Human Resources,

the Office of General Counsel, and the President's Senior Leadership Team, as well as with Chancellors and Provosts. After considering all comments, the report was finalized and prepared for release to the University community. The University Senate and the four Faculty Councils (in Newark, Camden, RBHS and New Brunswick) will be provided the opportunity to comment on the report.

## **VII. Implementation Plan**

### **A. National Academies' Action Collaborative to Prevent Sexual Harassment in Higher Education**

Sponsored by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, the Action Collaborative is a membership-limited group of colleges and universities that will convene academic leaders and key stakeholders to enable collective action on addressing and preventing sexual harassment. We are very proud to have been among the 28 Founding Members of the Action Collaborative at its initial meeting at the Academies' flagship building in Washington, D.C. on March 12, 2019. In order to be accepted, Action Collaborative members must commit to the following goals:

- To raise awareness about sexual harassment and how it occurs, the consequences of sexual harassment, and the organizational characteristics and recommended approaches that can prevent it;
- To share and elevate evidence-based institutional policies and strategies to reduce and prevent sexual harassment;
- To contribute to setting the research agenda, and gather and apply research results across institutions; and

- To develop a standard for measuring progress toward reducing and preventing sexual harassment in higher education.

Meetings of the Action Collaborative as a committee of the whole will be held twice a year over a four year period, with more frequent virtual meetings of the various focused working groups. Rutgers is participating actively in the Collaborative and will share with the other Collaborative members those strategies that have worked at our institution (and those that have not), as well as learning from our peers, and our work with the Collaborative will inform and strengthen our work at Rutgers. The next meeting of the Action Collaborative is June 9-10, 2019 in Washington, D.C., and Rutgers will be there.

## **B. Rutgers University Implementation Task Force**

A small Implementation Task Force has been created and charged with designing and leading the University's implementation of the recommendations included in this report, as well as any others that will be developed as we continue the multi-year effort to reduce and prevent sexual harassment and to create a more respectful and inclusive culture and climate for faculty, students, and staff. For every implementation area, goals will be set according to a specific timeline, and expected outcomes will be articulated.

### **1) For Summer 2019 Implementation:**

Work could begin on the following as soon as the Report and its recommendations are approved. In some cases the work could be completed by the beginning of the Fall 2019 semester; other tasks will take longer.



- a) Develop an “R is for Respect” campaign in collaboration with University Communications and Marketing.
- b) With University Communications and Marketing, create a Sexual Harassment Prevention Communications Plan for FY20 for University leadership (President, Executive and Senior Vice Presidents, Chancellors, Deans, Directors) to highlight leadership’s concern about harassment and the priority they place on its prevention.
- c) Create a website devoted to Rutgers’ efforts to reduce and prevent sexual harassment and to develop an inclusive and respectful culture and climate at the University. Website should include links to all applicable offices, policies, procedures, and resources, to the National Academies’ report, and to Rutgers’ work as part of the National Academies’ Action Collaborative. Launch in Fall 2019.
- d) Update Appendix D criteria statements on teaching, scholarship, and service with appropriate language from University Policy 60.5.1, Statement on Professional Ethics. Instruct deans that the expanded criteria are to be included in every offer letter to new faculty, and in notice to faculty coming up for reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure.
- e) Draft a new policy on consensual relationships and prepare for approval by the Board of Governors during academic year 2019-20.
- f) Add questions to the student course evaluation instrument that ask whether they and other students were treated with respect by the instructor.
- g) Begin work with Institutional Research and University subject matter experts to select an appropriate climate survey or surveys for use among faculty, staff, postdocs, undergraduate students, and graduate students to ascertain their perceptions of the extent of the problem of harassment and discrimination. If at all possible, utilize instruments

recommended in the National Academies' report or by fellow members of the NAS Action Collaborative to enable future analysis of results across institutions.

**2) For Academic Year 2019-20 Implementation:**

- a) Develop and deliver effective, evidence-based training for deans, department chairs, center directors, program directors, and lab directors.
- b) Develop a "tool kit" for the use of the above, as well as all members of the University community, regarding how to respond to informal reports of harassment or discrimination and how to direct those who wish to make a complaint, whether formal or informal, to the correct office or individual. Include in the tool kit bystander responsibilities.
- c) Develop and deliver training for faculty, graduate students, and postdocs on creating a climate of respect and professionalism at Rutgers.
- d) Charge a small committee with reviewing the current policies prohibiting sexual harassment and discrimination to determine whether they need updating (for instance, an expanded definition of sexual harassment) in light of the National Academies' report and evolving practice among our peers.
- e) Create an ombuds position in every Chancellor's Office as a point person for resources, policies, and procedures regarding sexual harassment and gender discrimination. Broadly disseminate information to the University community on a regular basis regarding the location, purpose, and functioning of these new positions.
- f) Create a suite of services and supports for students whose concerns about harassment have been found credible, such as a semester of funding for graduate students whose concerns about unprofessional conduct by advisors or supervisors have required them to

change their lab or academic assignment. Make this list of services part of the toolkit provided to chairs, deans, and directors.

- g) With University Human Resources, Student Affairs, and Office of General Counsel, create policies and procedures to ensure that information concerning prospective or current employees who have been found to have engaged in harassment, discrimination, or other unprofessional conduct can be considered as hiring and/or promotion decisions are made:
- a. Create a process to vet prospective faculty and staff for findings of unprofessional or harassing conduct at previous jobs, including adding questions to the background checks performed on all prospective employees;
  - b. Create a process to consider findings of unprofessional or harassing conduct at Rutgers in decisions involving faculty reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit pay.
  - c. Ensure that documented findings of harassment, discrimination, or other misconduct that violates University policies are placed in the faculty or staff member's personnel file.
- h) With the Office of Employment Equity, develop an annual report to be shared with the University community and posted on the website referenced above that would provide aggregate data on harassment, discrimination, and sexual misconduct in both the employment and the student-on-student contexts. The report should include the number of complaints, broken down into number investigated, number involving findings of violation of policy, and categorization of sanctions. In addition, the data should be

disaggregated by category of complainant, category of alleged perpetrator, and type of harassment.

- i) With chairs and deans, ensure that annual reviews of faculty and staff include discussion of any concerns about the individual's behavior during the previous year, including informal or "rumored" behavior issues.
- j) With chancellors and provosts, hold deans, center and institute directors, and department chairs accountable for how they manage units with regard to sexual harassment, climate, and culture.
- k) Ensure that these recommendations are assessed and evaluated on an annual basis and modified as needed.

## **VIII. Conclusion**

As noted at the beginning of this report, sexual harassment has been an ongoing and troubling issue in American higher education for decades. It is still with us today, including at our own institution. It is unjust, it disrupts personal and professional lives, causes mental and physical anguish, and often leads to the under-participation or complete withdrawal of its targets as well as those who witness the harassing or discriminatory behavior. Members of our community who live and work in the toxic climate it creates are also deeply impacted. It has no place at Rutgers.

As the report by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine demonstrates, policies, procedures, training, and other strategies employed by universities for decades have done little to move the needle on reducing or preventing sexual harassment. But there is hope. The Academies' report and recommendations offers us new ways of thinking about

sexual harassment and discrimination, and a roadmap to reducing its incidence and ultimately, to preventing it altogether. What a world that would be. Our status as a Founding Member of the Academies' Action Collaborative to Prevent Sexual Harassment in Higher Education bears witness to our institutional commitment to creating an academic community free of harassment and discrimination, once and for all. Rutgers can and should be a national leader in this effort. If not us, who. If not now, when.

## Appendix A

### Rutgers Committee on Sexual Harassment Prevention and Culture Change

Barbara A. Lee  
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Committee Chair

Karen R. Stubaus  
Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Committee Co-Chair

Joan Wennstrom Bennett  
Special Advisor to Committee

Nikol Alexander-Floyd  
Associate Professor  
Department of Women's and Gender Studies  
School of Arts and Sciences--NB  
[ngaf@womenstudies.rutgers.edu](mailto:ngaf@womenstudies.rutgers.edu)

Sharon Anderson  
Assistant Dean and Assistant Professor  
Division of Advanced Nursing Practice  
School of Nursing  
[sharon.anderson@rutgers.edu](mailto:sharon.anderson@rutgers.edu)

Julianne Apostolopoulos  
Associate General Counsel  
General Counsel  
[japostolopoulos@ogc.rutgers.edu](mailto:japostolopoulos@ogc.rutgers.edu)

Sherri-Ann Butterfield  
Executive Vice Chancellor and  
Associate Professor of Sociology  
Office of the Chancellor  
Rutgers University--Newark  
[sbutter@rutgers.edu](mailto:sbutter@rutgers.edu)

Carmen Castro  
Senior Program Coordinator  
Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
[carmen.castro@rutgers.edu](mailto:carmen.castro@rutgers.edu)

Itzamarie Chevere-Torres  
Associate Director of Postdoctoral Affairs  
Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
[ict@oq.rutgers.edu](mailto:ict@oq.rutgers.edu)

Mary Beth Daisey  
Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs  
Office of the Chancellor  
Rutgers University—Camden  
[daisey@camden.rutgers.edu](mailto:daisey@camden.rutgers.edu)

Nora Devlin  
Student in Ph.D. in Higher Education Program  
Graduate School of Education  
[nora.devlin@rutgers.edu](mailto:nora.devlin@rutgers.edu)

Adrienne Eaton  
Dean  
School of Management and Labor Relations  
RU-NB  
[Aeeaton@smlr.rutgers.edu](mailto:Aeeaton@smlr.rutgers.edu)

Pat Fitzgerald-Bocarsly  
Provost RBHS and  
Professor, Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine  
New Jersey Medical School  
[bocarsly@njms.rutgers.edu](mailto:bocarsly@njms.rutgers.edu)

Sonia Garcia-Laumbach  
Assistant Dean for Student Affairs  
Robert Wood Johnson Medical School  
RBHS  
[sgarcia@rwjms.rutgers.edu](mailto:sgarcia@rwjms.rutgers.edu)

Sally Goldfarb  
Professor  
School of Law - Camden  
[sfg@camden.rutgers.edu](mailto:sfg@camden.rutgers.edu)

Yvonne Gonzalez  
Director, Mentoring and Career Development  
Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
[yvonneg@rutgers.edu](mailto:yvonneg@rutgers.edu)

Lisa Grosskreutz  
Director of Employment Equity  
University Human Resources  
[lsg44@hr.rutgers.edu](mailto:lsg44@hr.rutgers.edu)

Perry Halkitis  
Dean, School of Public Health  
RBHS  
[Perry.halkitis@rutgers.edu](mailto:Perry.halkitis@rutgers.edu)

Oscar Holmes  
Assistant Professor  
Business – Camden  
[oscar.holmesiv@rutgers.edu](mailto:oscar.holmesiv@rutgers.edu)

Susan Nelson Hamilton  
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs  
Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences  
[Susan.hamilton@rutgers.edu](mailto:Susan.hamilton@rutgers.edu)

Marianthi Ierapetritou  
Associate Vice President for SciWomen and Distinguished Professor  
Chemical and Biochemical Engineering  
School of Engineering  
[marianth@soe.rutgers.edu](mailto:marianth@soe.rutgers.edu)

Olaf Jensen  
Associate Professor  
Department of Marine and Coastal Science  
School of Environmental and Biological Sciences  
[ojensen@marine.rutgers.edu](mailto:ojensen@marine.rutgers.edu)

Michael Kelly  
Associate Dean for Graduate Medical Education  
Robert Wood Johnson Medical School  
RBHS  
[kellymj@rwjms.rutgers.edu](mailto:kellymj@rwjms.rutgers.edu)

Eileen Kowler  
Distinguished Professor  
Department of Psychology  
School of Arts and Sciences--NB  
[Eileen.kowler@rutgers.edu](mailto:Eileen.kowler@rutgers.edu)



Jerome Kukor  
Dean, School of Graduate Studies  
RU-NB  
[jkukor@grad.rutgers.edu](mailto:jkukor@grad.rutgers.edu)

Beth L. Leech  
Professor and Vice-Chair for Graduate Studies  
Department of Political Science  
School of Arts and Sciences  
[leech@polisci.rutgers.edu](mailto:leech@polisci.rutgers.edu)

Jacquelyn Litt  
Dean  
Douglass Residential College  
[jlitt@echo.rutgers.edu](mailto:jlitt@echo.rutgers.edu)

Laura Luciano  
Director  
Violence Prevention and Victim Assistance  
Camden  
[lluciano@rutgers.edu](mailto:lluciano@rutgers.edu) <[lluciano@rutgers.edu](mailto:lluciano@rutgers.edu)>

Sarah McMahon  
Associate Professor and  
Director, Center on Violence Against Women and Children  
School of Social Work  
[smcmahon@ssw.rutgers.edu](mailto:smcmahon@ssw.rutgers.edu)

Stephanie Bondockawa Mafla Mills  
Graduate Student  
Biological Sciences  
School of Arts and Sciences--Newark  
[Sjm372@scarletmail.rutgers.edu](mailto:Sjm372@scarletmail.rutgers.edu)

Ashwani Monga  
Vice Dean and Professor of Marketing  
Rutgers Business School  
[amonga@business.rutgers.edu](mailto:amonga@business.rutgers.edu)

Isabel Nazario  
Associate Vice President for Strategic Initiatives  
Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
[inazario@oq.rutgers.edu](mailto:inazario@oq.rutgers.edu)

Judith Neubauer  
Associate Dean  
Robert Wood Johnson  
[neubauer@rutgers.edu](mailto:neubauer@rutgers.edu)

Cathryn Potter  
Dean  
School of Social Work  
[cathryn.potter@rutgers.edu](mailto:cathryn.potter@rutgers.edu)

Denise Rodgers  
Vice Chancellor for Interprofessional Programs  
RBHS  
[Denise.rodgers@rutgers.edu](mailto:Denise.rodgers@rutgers.edu)

Judy Ryan  
Enterprise Risk and Institutional Compliance Officer  
Office of Ethics and Compliance  
[Judy.ryan@rutgers.edu](mailto:Judy.ryan@rutgers.edu)

Lisa Sanon-Jules  
Assistant Dean  
Honors College  
[lisa.sanonjules@rutgers.edu](mailto:lisa.sanonjules@rutgers.edu)

Kathleen Scotto  
Vice Dean  
School of Graduate Studies  
RU-NB  
[Scottoka@rutgers.edu](mailto:Scottoka@rutgers.edu)

Karen R. Stubaus  
Vice President for Academic Affairs  
Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
[stubaus@oq.rutgers.edu](mailto:stubaus@oq.rutgers.edu)

Carol A. Terregino  
Senior Associate Dean for Education and Academic Affairs  
Associate Dean for Admissions  
Professor of Medicine  
Robert Wood Johnson Medical School  
[terregca@rwjms.rutgers.edu](mailto:terregca@rwjms.rutgers.edu)

Beth Tracy  
Senior Director Faculty Development  
Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs  
[beth.tracy@rutgers.edu](mailto:beth.tracy@rutgers.edu)

Ann Treadaway  
Director  
Office of Veteran and Military Programs and Services  
[Ann.treadaway@rutgers.edu](mailto:Ann.treadaway@rutgers.edu)

Penny Venetis  
Clinical Professor  
Rutgers Law School  
[venetis@law.rutgers.edu](mailto:venetis@law.rutgers.edu)

David Vicario  
Professor of Psychology and  
Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences  
School of Arts and Sciences--NB  
[vicario@rci.rutgers.edu](mailto:vicario@rci.rutgers.edu)

Lisa Wahler  
Associate Vice President and  
Deputy General Counsel  
Office of the Senior Vice President and General Counsel  
[lwahler@ogc.rutgers.edu](mailto:lwahler@ogc.rutgers.edu)

Jessica Ware  
Associate Professor  
Biological Sciences  
School of Arts and Sciences--Newark  
[jware42@rutgers.edu](mailto:jware42@rutgers.edu)

Allison Wisniewski  
Associate Dean Supervisor  
School of Arts and Sciences – Camden  
[aemery@camden.rutgers.edu](mailto:aemery@camden.rutgers.edu)

## Appendix B

### Subcommittee on Consensual Relationships Recommendations

#### **OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Create a policy that identifies prohibited targeted behavior (romantic, intimate, sexual), including FAQ document, and to which employees (including faculty) it applies
2. Develop a process for reporting complaints
3. Develop a mitigation process
4. Implement policy with information about reporting behaviors/relationships and mitigation process
5. Provide education and training on policy
6. Release a statement from leadership about how this policy addresses the prevention of sexual harassment. Including protecting all students from the impact of sexual harassment (quid pro quo and hostile environment)
7. Develop a plan for assessment and reassessment, monitoring and aggregate reporting (that is accessible)
8. Support the above recommendations with appropriate personnel and financial resources

Working with senior leadership in University Human Resources and the Office of General Counsel, as well as with the Chancellors, Provosts and other senior administrators, the committee will develop a draft Consensual Relationships Policy document that will then go through the

normal University review processes in preparation for approval by the University's Board of Governors.

Subcommittee on Consensual Relationships Members:

Nikol Alexander-Floyd, Mary Beth Daisey, Laura Luciano, Sally Goldfarb, Lisa Grosskreutz, Sharon Anderson, Lisa Wahler, Chair

## Appendix C

### **RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FACULTY REWARD SYSTEMS**

The Charge: To recommend whether or not faculty sexual misconduct, or other inappropriate or unacceptable behavior on the part of a member of the faculty, should explicitly be taken into consideration at the time of faculty appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure and merit salary increases.

The membership of this subcommittee is ideally suited to take on such a thorny issue, possessing as it does decades of collective years of experience in faculty appointment, reappointment, promotion, tenure, and merit salary considerations, as well as scholarly interest in the field of higher education writ large. Nevertheless, our group struggled with these issues, discussed them passionately and earnestly, and respectfully offers the following recommendations.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

##### I. BEFORE AND AT THE TIME OF INITIAL APPOINTMENT

###### A. Voluntary Self-Disclosure

At the time of initial application for a faculty appointment, via ROCS or any successor electronic system, the candidate should be required to disclose, in writing, on a form developed with the assistance of University Human Resources and the Office of General Counsel, if they have been or currently are the subject of an investigation or a finding concerning sexual harassment, gender discrimination, or other misconduct. If the candidate discloses that they have been subject to an investigation, the search committee

should thoroughly vet the candidate before inviting them for an interview. If there has been a finding of sexual harassment, sexual abuse, or harassment of any kind, the presumption should be that the applicant will not be considered for a position at Rutgers. If the candidate moves on in the search, at some point (determined in consultation with University Human Resources and the Office of General Counsel), the candidate should be asked to waive confidentiality and to provide or release any reports from prior employers/universities. Those reports would be available for inspection by members of the search committee and others making the final hiring determination, but neither photocopying nor digital distribution would be permitted. The search committee, and all levels considering the candidate, should have access to the information outlined above and be required to consider it.

This “voluntary self-disclosure” step would take place at the beginning of the hiring process, at the time of initial application. Lack of truthfulness on the part of the candidate regarding the voluntary self-disclosure would be grounds for dismissal.

#### B. Thorough Vetting of Applicant

The search committee chair, the department chair, the provost, the dean, or any other individual involved in making the ultimate decision on the hire should ask probing questions of both the references provided by the candidate (“on line”) and those not provided by the candidate (“off line”), with the goal of determining whether the potential hire would contribute positively or negatively to the culture and climate of the department and school. Questions such as “Do you have any concerns regarding their interaction with students?” should be raised. University Human Resources and the Office of General Counsel should be consulted in developing a template of permissible and

impermissible questions that may be asked of references, and how to handle follow up. If any areas of concern are raised, they should be addressed directly with the candidate.

### C. Attestation

At the time of hire, accompanying the appointment letter, the candidate of choice would be required to certify or “attest”, via a written document developed with the assistance of University Human Resources and the Office of General Counsel, that there are no unresolved allegations or ongoing investigations concerning them in any venue of which they are aware, internal or external. If there are, those empowered with determining the outcome of the search would be strongly advised to consider delaying making the appointment, pending the outcome of the investigation or investigations.

Lack of truthfulness on the part of the candidate regarding the attestation would be grounds for dismissal.

## II. ONCE THE CANDIDATE HAS BECOME A MEMBER OF THE FACULTY

A. Incorporate Language from the University’s Statement on Professional Ethics (University Policy 60.5.1) into the Criteria Statements for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service in Appendix D of the ARPI.

Language from the University’s Statement on Professional Ethics (University Policy 60.5.1) should be incorporated into the Criteria Statements for Teaching, Scholarship, and Service in Appendix D of the annually-disseminated Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions. The entire Statement on Professional Ethics should be disseminated at the beginning of each academic year, with a strong message of endorsement from the University President, and the Statement should be included with every offer letter to new faculty.



The following excerpts from the Statement on Professional Ethics should receive strong consideration for inclusion in the Appendix D criteria statements of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service:

For Teaching: "...Professors demonstrate respect for the students as individuals and adhere to their proper role as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit....They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom."

For Scholarship: "As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of other. Professors acknowledge academic debt and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues."

For Service: "Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution." In addition, the University's Board of Governors should be petitioned to add the following language to the Statement on Professional Ethics, and then include that language in the criteria statement for Service: "Professors at all levels who engage in service and/or scholarship activities outside of the University are required to adhere to this Statement on Professional Ethics in the conduct of all of those external activities as though they were at the University."

B. At the Time of Consideration for Reappointment, Promotion, and/or Tenure, Ensure that Findings of Policy Violations are Available for Consideration by Academic Reviewers at All Levels

1. Clarify the process and language in the University document entitled “Discrimination, Harassment, Workplace Violence, Sexual Misconduct and Retaliation Complaint Process” (“the Complaint Process”), where it states as follows: “A determination that a Covered Policy was violated, including corrective and disciplinary actions taken in response, will be documented in an employee’s personnel file.”

Our subcommittee recommends that findings of sexual harassment, gender discrimination, and other inappropriate behaviors be taken into account when considering candidates for reappointment or promotion. In order to do that, however, faculty evaluators must have access to some kind of documentary evidence regarding the behavior. According to current language in the Complaint Process, that evidence is to be placed in the official faculty personnel file. The current language is lacking in precision, however, and should be clarified.

The current process holds that if a faculty member has a formal complaint lodged against them, and that complaint falls under the Office of Employment Equity’s policies and OEE investigates the complaint, the Dean (or Chancellor or Vice President) is informed about the complaint by OEE at the time it is assigned for investigation. Upon conclusion of the investigation, the Dean (or Chancellor or Vice President) receives a copy of the report and OEE’s determination, along with a copy of the complaint Process which reads in part (at Section III.B.4) as follows: “A determination that a Covered Policy was

violated, including corrective and disciplinary actions taken in response, will be documented in an employee's personnel file.”

Theoretically, that means that some kind of document is placed in the official faculty personnel file to record the determination of a policy violation and actions taken with regard to the faculty member in question. However, the Policy language in this area is so vague—and so easy to overlook by the Dean, Chancellor, or Vice President—that we suspect it is very often simply not complied with. If findings of harassment, misconduct, or discrimination are to be taken into account by academic evaluators at the time of reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure, the language in the Policy must be clarified with regard to what precisely is to go into the personnel file and who is responsible for putting it there. We recommend that the implementation group succeeding this Committee work with University Human Resources, the Office of General Counsel, and the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs in determining the appropriate language and approach to be taken in this regard. As this implementation group proceeds in its work, the issue of how to ensure that all faculty evaluators—department members, appointments and promotions committee members, chairs, and provosts—treat this material with the utmost confidentiality must be addressed.

In addition, more work is needed to determine how to handle inappropriate behavior that is not reported to OEE or any other University office, whether single or multiple incidents, and what to do about OEE investigations that do not conclude in findings but nonetheless uncover problematic behavior injurious to a healthy university culture. More research is needed, in consultation with University Human Resources and the Office of

General Counsel, regarding the possible creation of an Ombuds Office (or offices) specifically designed to address these types of issues.

2. Emphasize to all levels of review that the official faculty personnel file, held in the Office of the Dean, should be examined at the time of a candidate's evaluation for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, and that any documents therein pertaining to findings of violations of University policies regarding "Discrimination, Harassment, Workplace Violence, Sexual Misconduct and Retaliation" should be considered as part of the reappointment, promotion, and tenure evaluation.

The University's Academic Reappointment/Promotion Instructions, issued annually by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, read in part as follows:

**"Materials to be used in Review**

With the exception of confidential outside letters of recommendation solicited in accordance with these Instructions and those documents that are generally public knowledge such as published student evaluations, published articles, and other similar documents, only those materials in the official personnel file and other materials added to the packet as described in Section H below may be used in conducting the review. The official personnel file for each faculty member is maintained in the office of the appropriate dean."

We have reason to believe that academic evaluators are not accessing the faculty member's official personnel file when conducting their reviews of a candidate for

reappointment, promotion, or tenure. Since that is where findings of Policy violations are to be lodged, they should be required to do so.

C. Annual chair/dean meetings with each faculty member: Ensure that the required annual meeting between every faculty member and their department chair or dean include discussion of any allegations or determinations of unprofessional or inappropriate behavior by the faculty member. Address any alleged inappropriate behavior on the part of the faculty member at that meeting, and conversely, reward and incentivize the faculty member for actions they may have taken during the year to support and expand a positive and supportive University culture and climate.

D. With regard to merit salary increases: Inform all levels of review that components of the University's Statement on Professional Ethics have been added to the official criteria language regarding Teaching, Scholarship, and Service, (once that has been done), and should thus be taken into consideration as part of the evaluation of a faculty member for a merit salary increase.

### **III. REWARD AND INCENTIVIZE THOSE WHO CONTRIBUTE TO A POSITIVE UNIVERSITY CULTURE AND CLIMATE**

The 2018 report of the National Academies entitled "Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine" states repeatedly that the emphasis in academia must shift from legal compliance and ineffective training to real culture change and significantly more effective training mechanisms if we are to see the incidence of sexual harassment in the academy decline significantly. Accordingly, we recommend that each academic department, school, and campus create occasions within its own culture and traditions to reward and incentivize those who contribute to a positive

and inclusive University culture. In addition, we offer the following university-wide suggestions:

- Add awards for contributions to a positive and inclusive University culture to the End of Year Faculty Awards. Include a monetary award that is as high as the highest award for teaching, research, or service. Establish awards for various venues, i.e., classroom, lab, field site, clinic, etc., and particularly encourage nominations from graduate students, postdocs, and other vulnerable populations.
- Encourage with appropriate subvention funds faculty and graduate student research in the area of university culture and climate change, and publish much of that research via a series in Rutgers University Press.
- Host an annual or semi-annual conference at Rutgers on academic culture and climate, invite national and international experts but ensure enough of a Rutgers presence among the presenters that Rutgers becomes known as the national leader in this regard.
- Provide monetary rewards for positive culture change activities at the time of the faculty merit award process. Make explicit in the documentation that that activity is a factor in the salary increase.
- Create a Mentoring Honor Society, modeled somewhat along the lines of the Master Educator Guild in “Legacy UMDNJ.” Membership would be based on the advancement of women and underrepresented and first-generation undergraduates, graduate students, postdocs, residents and interns, and junior faculty, measured by the career success of the mentees (e.g., in academic positions, subsequent tenure, grants, etc.).
- Provide more opportunities to reward and honor faculty who contribute in substantive ways to the creation of a more inclusive and respectful culture, particularly by creating

welcoming environments for those who may not feel they otherwise would have a place in the department.

IN CLOSING:

In coming to these recommendations, our subcommittee struggled with many complicated and weighty issues. Not everyone in our group agrees wholeheartedly with every nuance of every recommendation; our engagement with the issues led to many passionate discussions. But we all are in complete agreement that we must take bold action in order to effectively address the issue of sexual harassment in the academy, and we look forward to making Rutgers a leader in this area.

Finally, we would be remiss if we closed without noting that we have been cognizant throughout the course of our work that while we were charged with addressing the problem of harassment and discrimination on the basis of sex, virtually every portion of our discussion and recommendations apply equally to other forms of harassment and discrimination, including race, national origin/ethnicity, religion, disability, sexual orientation, LGBTQ status, and other characteristics. University policy prohibits discrimination on the basis of all these characteristics, among others, and ending harassment and discrimination wherever it rears its head is essential to creating the kind of university we want and deserve.

Subcommittee Members: Nora Devlin, Patricia Fitzgerald-Bocarsly, Marianthi Ierapetritou, Michael Kelly, Penny Venetis, David Vicario, Karen R. Stubaus, Chair

## Appendix D

### **Transparency**

#### **SUBCOMMITTEE OBJECTIVE:**

To make recommendations regarding “Transparency” practices regarding sexual harassment at Rutgers that are informed by Big Ten and aspirant peer institutions but also place Rutgers in a leadership role on this issue. While our charge was to focus on sexual harassment, we are also concerned about the presence of any form of harassment and/or discrimination at the University, including race, national origin/ethnicity, religion, disability, sexual orientation, LGBTQ status, and other characteristics. Rutgers policies prohibit discrimination on the basis of these characteristics, among others, and our recommendations apply equally to them.

#### **RESEARCH PROCESS:**

Our research was conducted in conjunction with the subcommittee on faculty rewards.

- We reviewed protocols, policies and monitoring procedures for 24 institutions regarding sexual harassment. This review allowed us compare what we are doing here at Rutgers, and to find the best practices across institutions.
- In our review, we inquired whether an institution was engaged with the June 2018 report of the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, or otherwise shifting the emphasis in dealing with sexual harassment from legal compliance to prevention and culture change. If they were doing so, we reviewed how they were doing so.
- Additionally, we inquired whether the institution had publicized the following information:
  - a. Number and type of sexual harassment complaints filed annually



- b. Disposition of those complaints
- c. Sanctions applied to those found “guilty”
- d. Names of those found guilty

We then selected four institutions that have best practices; 1) University of California Berkeley; 2) Columbia University; 3) University of Michigan-Ann Arbor; and 4) Northwestern University.

- These institutions were chosen because they aggregate information on sexual misconduct, harassment violations and complaints, monitor campus situations, and publish reports as well as process full investigations.
- In addition, they identify the number of case reports, describe varied modes of addressing cases, general complaints, and findings. They include corrective action, as well as education and prevention measures.
- All have comprehensive webpages listing investigative/reporting process, and include data, reports, and education, training, and other resources.
- They publish and disseminate an annual report broadly to the university and external communities.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In developing recommendations for our report, we considered “transparency” at two different levels: the “aggregate” and the “individual.”

### AGGREGATE LEVEL

1. We recommend that Rutgers issue aggregate reports on harassment and sexual misconduct cases in both the employment and student-on-student contexts.

These reports should include the number of harassment complaints made to Office of Employment Equity – sexual and other and as defined in Policy 60.1.12.

The report should detail how many complaints were investigated, how many involved findings of a violation of policy and, if so, a list of sanctions that were issued (not attached to specific perpetrators) should be provided.

- b. To the extent feasible, the report should include breakdowns in terms of the number of complaints and outcomes (findings of violations) by category of complainant (faculty/staff and student - possibly with additional breakdowns by subcategories), by category of alleged perpetrator (faculty/staff again with possible further breakdowns), and by type of harassment. This report might also include the number of cases involving retaliation and violation of interim measures or sanctions.
- c. To the extent feasible, a similar report should be issued for student-on-student sexual harassment and other sexual misconduct cases (violations of policy 10.3.12) reported through the Title IX compliance office and other forms of harassment reported to the Office of Student Conduct.
- d. The university should develop a communications strategy for these reports, especially the first year they are issued. That strategy should include a link to the websites where the reports will be housed. We are agnostic about where on the website the reports reside.

## **Benchmarking**

### Communication strategies at University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

The Office of Public Affairs provides background information on topics of current and continuing interest to members of the university community, alumni, the general public and the media. The information is updated regularly.

<https://publicaffairs.vpcomm.umich.edu/key-issues/>

#### Sexual Misconduct Prevention

<https://publicaffairs.vpcomm.umich.edu/sexual-misconduct-prevention/>

They have a comprehensive webpage noting the President's commitment, information on campus climate surveys, annual reports, and relevant policies.

#### Office of Institutional Equity

The Office for Institutional Equity works with partners on campus to foster and support an environment that is inclusive. See the following links for details: Campus

Commitment.” source: <https://hr.umich.edu/working-u-m/workplace-improvement/office-institutional-equity>

*Annual Report Regarding Institutional Response to Reports of Sexual Harassment by Faculty, Staff and Third Parties* (<https://hr.umich.edu/sites/default/files/fy18-sexual-harassment-annual-report.pdf>)

*Institutional Response to Reports of Sexual Harassment by Faculty, Staff and Third Parties July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2018:* <https://hr.umich.edu/sites/default/files/fy18-sexual-harassment-annual-report.pdf>

They identify number of reports, modes of addressing reports, findings, and corrective action, as well as education and prevention measures

Executive Summary Page 1, provides a condensed summary of findings.

*University of Michigan Annual Report Regarding Student Sexual & Gender-Based Misconduct & Other Forms of Interpersonal Violence July 2017 - June 2018*  
<https://hr.umich.edu/sites/default/files/student-sex-misconduct-report-fy-18.pdf>

#### Communication strategies at University of California-Berkeley (UCB)

2018 Annual Report on Sexual Violence/Sexual Harassment:

Report focuses on four areas: Prevention; Survivor support; Incidence rates; and Response [https://svshadvisor.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/general/2017-18\\_ucb\\_svshannualreport\\_0.pdf](https://svshadvisor.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/general/2017-18_ucb_svshannualreport_0.pdf)

P. 57 Identifies reports by Undergraduate, Graduate Students, Faculty, and Staff

UC-Berkeley appointed a Special Faculty Advisor that works in collaboration with the Title IX officer to jointly develop an annual report on campus and establish mechanisms for regularly engaging with students, staff, and faculty to solicit their guidance on and support for the report.

Communication strategies at Columbia University

*Gender-Based Misconduct Prevention and Response* report focuses on resources, prevention, and training. Includes violations & scope of data, and resolutions

<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/studentconduct/documents/Gender-BasedMisconductPreventionandResponse2017-2018.pdf>

(See pages 12-13 sexual assault data = Data charts- include faculty,- see pgs. 15 to 22)

Published by the Student Conduct and Community Standards Office,

<http://studentconduct.columbia.edu/gbm.html>

Communication strategies at Northwestern University

Sexual Misconduct Data Report September 1, 2016-August 31, 2017

Sexual misconduct annual report includes investigative process and charts and faculty data (see pages, 7-9)

<https://www.northwestern.edu/sexual-misconduct/about-us/Annual-Data-Report>

2. We recommend that if a climate survey of university employees is implemented, the results be shared with the campus community. We recommend using the same methods as for the current student climate survey results that are currently shared (see below).

a) Rutgers University-New Brunswick

Climate Survey & Campaign

Student Affairs Compliance > Title IX > About Title IX > Climate Survey & Campaign

<http://compliance.rutgers.edu/title-ix/about-title-ix/climate-survey-campaign/>

Rutgers University conducted a large-scale campus climate assessment, #iSPEAK, in Fall 2014. For more information about the results from this survey please visit the Center on Violence Against Women and Children website.

*Center on Violence Against Women and Children (VAWC)*

*Understanding and Responding to Campus Sexual Assault: Comprehensive Campus Climate Assessment*

In 2014, Rutgers University was asked by the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault to pilot a campus climate survey tool developed by the Department of Justice’s Office on Violence Against Women. During the 2014–2015 academic year, researchers from the Rutgers Center on Violence Against Women and Children engaged in a comprehensive campus climate assessment project at Rutgers University–New Brunswick entitled “#iSPEAK”.

Campus Climate Survey Tool

Reports of Findings

Outreach Strategy Toolkit

Lessons Learned Guide and Tools

In 2018, researchers at VAWC re-administered the Campus Climate survey and they are in the process of analyzing the results. The modified iSPEAK survey tool used for the 2018 Campus Climate survey can be found at <https://socialwork.rutgers.edu/centers/center-violence-against-women-and-children/research-and-evaluation/understanding-and>

## INDIVIDUAL LEVEL

1. Communications to Deans and Chairs, especially new Deans and Chairs, is of concern as institutional memory can be short, and with turnover, information is often lost. The problem we sought to address here is the lack of information flow about individuals from one chair to another, or one dean to another, over time.

- a. We recommend that Letters of Determination and documentation of the resultant sanction, if any, be placed in the official personnel file of the employee.
- b. We recommend sanctions be communicated back to OEE.

2. Communication to complainant

- a. We recommend that the complainant be informed of the outcome of the case including what sanctions were applied.

Note: We considered but rejected a recommendation that complainants in employment cases be consulted before sanctions are issued. This seemed to us to introduce a complication in the development of sanctions which of necessity include many factors of which the complainant may be unaware.

3. Communications outside the university

- a. There is a strong feeling on the part of the sub-committee that changes need to take place to minimize the ability of perpetrators to move from one institution to another. While this is a particular problem with faculty, it can also be a problem with staff. Rutgers should be a leader in the culture change that is necessary to minimize this problem.

- b. We recommend that the appropriate individuals work with Government Affairs staff to explore with New Jersey State Legislators the creation of legislation similar to New Jersey’s “Pass the Trash” law that would protect colleges and universities in the state from legal liability for sharing investigation outcomes with other institutions.
4. CALLISTO Program (for students)

- a. We recommend that the university explore a partnership with Callisto.

Callisto Campus is an online, trauma-informed platform for students to document and report sexual assault. The Callisto Tech Platform offers three options: 1) create a time-stamped, secure record of sexual assault; 2) report electronically by sending a record to the school; 3) only notify the school if another student names the same perpetrator

Other universities currently partnering with Callisto include: Rutgers University-Newark, Canisius College, Central College, Coe College, Hobart and William Smith Colleges, Loyola Marymount University, Pomona College, Stanford University, St. John’s University, University of Oregon, University of Denver, University of San Francisco, University of Southern California, and more.

\*\*\*

Recommendations regarding faculty or staff who have never had a formal complaint filed against them but are “known” to be harassers.

This committee considered, briefly, the question of transparency and internal information sharing around alleged perpetrators (particularly faculty) who have not necessarily had formal



complaints filed against them but have “reputations”. This is a difficult area where due process is an important consideration. Thus, we support more informal approaches that do not include “transparency,” but involve interventions by chairs or colleagues. We recommend that University Human Resources, OEE, and the Office of General Counsel provide coaching to chairs or others on more informal approaches either individually or through group training, and that the availability of this service be advertised (transparent). We further recommend that OEE, in conjunction with the Title IX Coordinators, continue to provide training and information to faculty and staff (possibly through increased in-person and group training sessions) about existing policy requirements to report potential violations of the University’s sexual misconduct policies. We believe such reporting facilitates OEE’s ability to address issues involving suspected policy violations by providing individuals information about available options and resources and tracking (and potentially investigating as University actions) repeat reports about the same offender(s) and/or related incidents.

Subcommittee members: Isabel Nazario, Jessica Ware, Julianne Apostolopoulos, Stephanie Mills, and Carmen Castro, Adrienne Eaton, chair.

## Appendix E

### **Training, Information and Communication**

#### Overview

Efforts to change the climate and prevent harassment must include several different approaches and mechanisms in order to address the large, diverse and widely-distributed cohort of students, postdocs, faculty, researchers, instructors, and employees at Rutgers. And while our charge here is to address the problem of harassment and discrimination on the basis of sex, our recommendations could apply equally to the need for training, information, and communication regarding other forms of harassment and discrimination, including but not limited to race, national origin/ethnicity, religion, disability, sexual orientation, and LGBTQ status, as well as others. The goal is a university free from harassment and discrimination of any kind.

The subcommittee's recommendations fall into two main areas: (1) Activities to promote communication and dissemination of information; (2) Specific training goals and training activities. The subcommittee also gave careful attention to the issues of coordination and oversight, as well as the financial and personnel resources needed to ensure success.

#### Communication and Dissemination

- Create the R is for Respect campaign: Develop, deploy, and widely disseminate a new campaign "R is for Respect" from the Department of University Communications and Marketing (UCM). R is for Respect will show that university leadership has an unwavering and permanent commitment to instituting a culture of respect and civility

at Rutgers. The campaign will emphasize that everyone at Rutgers is accountable for preventing and addressing harassment. The campaign will include web sites, posters, and events. The campaign will also provide a vehicle for transparency by publishing the number of reported cases of harassment and their dispositions. Links to the R is for Respect homepage will be widely available through web pages of sites maintained by schools, departments, student organizations, and Rutgers employee service organizations and offices.

- Assemble and disseminate training resources (through the R is for Respect central homepage) a database of all available resources related to prevention and adjudication of harassment of all types, including resources related to training opportunities.

### Training

In agreement with the goals of the NAS Action Collaborative on Preventing Sexual Harassment in Higher Education, the training will encompass “the issue of sexual harassment in the context of other damaging behavior, including incivility, bullying, and other forms of harassment (such as racial and gender harassment).”

Specific learning goals: Participation in training will result in increased:

- Knowledge of how to create, communicate, and encourage an inclusive and welcoming environment and culture
- Understanding of boundaries of healthy and appropriate personal and professional relationships
- Awareness of rights and responsibilities as a community member

- Knowledge of how to recognize and respond to inappropriate language and behavior

To accomplish these goals training will be:

- Focused on both preventing harassment and on creating a culture of respect
- Inclusive of both what to do and what not to do
- Comprised of multiple opportunities to engage, with individuals participating in training periodically over long periods of time – not once and done
- Aligned with training outcomes and learning goals (see above).
- Targeted to individual stakeholder groups (for example, faculty, postdoctoral researchers, staff, undergraduate students and graduate students). The committee notes that training opportunities for undergraduate students may be close to where they should be. However, training for faculty, graduate students, postdocs, and staff needs significant attention and development.
- Inclusive of targeted training directed to those in positions of leadership and responsibility over schools, offices, departments, programs, and centers, so that achievement of a long-term climate of respect and professionalism is integrated into the routine normative functions and activities of these units, and not relegated to a specialized module.
- Inclusive of information on policy, reporting, and accountability
- Delivered by content experts such as those involved in Title IX enforcement, victim response, or HR, in partnership with stakeholders to adapt training to the circumstances of the trainees.
- Presented using multiple and established methodologies, such as case studies.

- Applicable to circumstances in various university settings, including classrooms, research labs, offices, and conferences or meetings.
- Developed in consultation with those specialists responsible for research, evaluation, and assessment, including those involved in delivering periodic reports to the NAS Action Collaborative, so that Rutgers can use appropriate procedures to gather evidence relevant to determining the effectiveness of training in changing behaviors and climate.
- Using the existing Rutgers academic course evaluation system, incorporating statements modeled after those currently found in RWJMS course evaluations:
  1. “I was treated with respect by the faculty in this course.”
  2. “I observed other students, faculty, and staff treated with respect by the faculty in this course.”

#### Implementation, coordination, monitoring, and oversight

To implement the above plans and ensure continued and effective support for the recommended actions, the subcommittee recommends the creation of a standing committee (with adequate staff support) that will report to the SVPAA. The committee will:

- Oversee and assess the status, adequacy, usage, and effectiveness of activities and resources relevant to training and communication, including the R is for Respect campaign. Expertise and resources required to carry out the assessments will be available.
- Recommend any needed revisions.

- Work with UHR and other training providers to identify gaps in the training available to stakeholder groups including students, faculty, postdocs and other researchers, instructors, and staff.
- Identify scientific expertise across Rutgers to facilitate research on the effectiveness of the communication and training practices, including coordinating efforts to allow individuals with the requisite expertise and interest to form collaborative groups for research, and to identify suitable sources for funding (federal; state; private foundation).
- Serve as the university liaison with the newly-formed Action Collaborative on Preventing Sexual Harassment in Higher Education, including the sharing of practices and research results.
- Be representative of the ethnically diverse community which is Rutgers. In particular, we recommend that the composition of the standing committee reflects a balance in gender identity of its constituents, as well as the inclusion of students and postdocs to be active members of this committee.

Financial resources to support the above positions, appropriate support staff, and training materials should be made available to the standing committee.

Specialized resources needed to accomplish the above goals:

To accomplish the goals above, individuals are needed who have the skills, expertise, and resources to develop, deliver, assess, and monitor training and communications. Individuals (FTEs) will be sought with the following areas of expertise:

- Information specialist

- Training specialist, preferably someone with experience training different academic stakeholders (faculty, postdocs, undergraduate students, graduate students, staff) and with the proper understanding of the diverse and different power dynamics/differential between each stakeholder group.
- Communication strategy specialist
- Web development and related technical (software) and analytical expertise.
- Assessment specialists
- Research and assessment specialists
- Administrative and clerical support staff

### Conclusion

The recommendations of the Training, Information, and Communication Subcommittee will be most effective in conjunction with the implementation of other subcommittee recommendations.

For example:

- with respect to Transparency: communication of the disposition of sexual harassment cases is not possible without changes to policies and procedures.
- with respect to Faculty Rewards: effective communication needs to include information that there are demonstrable consequences to inappropriate actions.
- with respect to Leadership: it is of utmost importance that leaders at all levels communicate, implement, and model a culture of respect.

The most important thing is that we work to create a culture of respect. It doesn't end with the training.

Subcommittee members:

Itzamarie Chévere-Torres, Eileen Kowler, Susan Nelson Hamilton, Ann Treadaway, Sonia Garcia Laumbach, Beth L. Leech, Judy Ryan, Lisa Sanon-Jules, Allison Wisniewski, Beth Tracy, chair



## Appendix F

### Leadership

#### Leadership Subcommittee Recommendations for the Prevention of Sexual Harassment

---

##### **Leadership Subcommittee Charge**

As part of the Committee on the Prevention of Sexual Harassment's goal to make recommendations on how we can work to prevent sexual harassment (and other forms of harassment)\* and create a harassment-free and inclusive culture of respect and fairness here at Rutgers, the charge of the leadership subcommittee was focused on benchmarking and generating ideas and recommendations to the full committee related to leadership. Below are our top eight recommendations, based on 1) our subcommittee's discussions, 2) the recent report published by the National Academies of Sciences, "Sexual Harassment of Women: Climate, Culture, and Consequences in Academic Sciences, Engineering and Medicine, and 3) our recent interviews with Rutgers' Chancellors and President Barchi.

---

##### Recommendation #1:

Continue to engage key leadership via a second round of interviews and meetings.

In order to better understand what leaders want to be able to do and what they need in order to effectively prevent sexual harassment, we recommend interviews and meetings be held with key

leaders at the university. (Four of five scheduled 1-hour confidential interviews have already been conducted with chancellors and the President). We propose a second round of interviews be conducted with other senior administrators and academic deans, chairs/division chiefs and center/institute directors who are in supervisory roles in large units.

Implementation Idea: Use the interview format and questions that have been developed by the Leadership subcommittee, which was designed in four sections to increase our understanding with regard to 1) leadership's perspective on the problem of sexual harassment, 2) what they see as the quality of the institutional response, 3) what changes are needed, in their opinion, and 4) the responsibilities and impact of leaders in preventing sexual harassment at the University.

Specifically, interview questions include:

- What's the scope of the problem of sexual harassment as you see it?
- What is the quality of the institution's response, currently, and what could it be in the future?
- What are some things we could do in the future (new solutions) to improve as a university?
- What are the responsibilities of a leader, related to creating a culture that prevents sexual harassment?

#### Recommendation 2:

Define "No Tolerance" and Develop a "No Tolerance" Statement.

Based on interviews with top leadership (the President and Chancellors) it became clear that a "no tolerance" tone at the top means different things to different leaders. As a result, what "no tolerance" looks like in understanding and practice differs. Establishing a shared definition of what we mean by "no tolerance" may prove beneficial for leaders and may help them communicate a more cohesive and consistent message and tone throughout the university. The "no tolerance" statement should be broad-based while being clear that potential sanctions are

determined on a case-by-case basis as to help manage the expectations of complainants, respondents, as well as the leaders of the specific unit, (in addition to the university community).

Implementation Idea: Work with senior university leaders to develop a “no tolerance” definition and statement. Members of the leadership subcommittee can help facilitate the conversation required to generate the “no tolerance” definition and statement, which could potentially happen at a standing meeting of the President and his senior leadership team. Another possibility is to request an external person (to the leadership subcommittee), such as Sarah McMahan, who would be an ideal candidate to facilitate such a discussion.

### Recommendation 3:

Provide support to help leaders better prevent, report, and manage cases of sexual harassment.

As a chair/dean/supervisor, it’s not always clear what to do when a situation arises. For example, when an investigation report comes back, what are the next steps a chair should/can take? As a dean, even if it’s clear what to do when a new incident is presented, it’s not always clear about next steps should a past incident arise. What should a dean do with inherited incidents that may have been poorly managed and/or not reported and are now re/surfacing?

Implementation Idea: Task key units (UHR, OEE, OGC and ALR) to work together to develop practical written and visual documentation that is specific to the Office of the President<sup>15</sup> and Chancellor-led units which provides clear direction with deans, chairs, and supervisors in mind.

---

<sup>15</sup> We are including the Office of the President, (and the offices that report into it), as another unit that is also impacted by issues of sexual harassment, but do not fall under the Chancellor-led units. For example, the Office of Institutional Planning and Operations (which includes facilities and public safety staff) is supervised by an Executive Vice President who reports directly to the President.

The documentation should provide guidance on the reporting process and expectations of how the situations will/may move forward.

Documentation to be developed to include (but is not limited to):

- Office of the President and Chancellor-led unit roadmaps that outline the process, timing, and people/offices involved at each step of the incident and reporting process.
  - Documenting the handoffs, including the different resolution paths for students (Title IX), staff (UHR), and faculty (UHR/ALR) would be very helpful.
  - For the Office of the President, the President should appoint someone from senior leadership to work with UHR, OEE, OGC and ALR in order to establish the roadmap, policies and procedures for the staff who report into those units.
  - For Chancellor-led units, the Chancellor should appoint someone who has a deep understanding of the reporting process (provost, chief of staff, vice chancellor, etc.) to work with UHR, OEE, OGC and ALR to help inform the creation of the roadmap, policies, and procedures that addresses the specific needs of the unit.
  - Document should be vetted with deans/chairs/supervisors to confirm it aligns with their understanding of how things are done at the department/school level.

#### Recommendation 4:

Establish an Ombudsperson for faculty/staff on each of the campuses. The ombudsperson should report directly to the relevant Chancellor.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> The ombudsperson for New Brunswick can report to the NB Chancellor and to the President's designee in the Office of the President for issues in those particular units. If the caseload becomes too unwieldy for one person, two people may be identified in order to address the cases within the Chancellor unit and the Office of the President.

Rutgers has an ombudsperson for students, but not for faculty and staff. When an issue arises that requires an outside safe (objective) perspective and guidance, people are unclear about where to turn. While UHR has a Faculty/Staff Assistance Program, it is an office of one individual that services the entire university faculty and staff population. This individual provides counseling services, but is not well-positioned, nor has the authority, to take action on matters of harassment, and is not easily accessible to faculty/staff who are not on the New Brunswick campus.

Implementation Idea: Establish an ombudsperson for faculty/staff on each of the four campus locations that reports into the Chancellor and is given authority to give direction and take appropriate action as needed. These individuals will be able to have informal conversations with faculty/staff who are looking for a safe haven to discuss their situations, while serving as knowledgeable people who may be outside of the normal chain of supervision. It is clear that depending on what the ombudspeople hear, they may be mandatory reporters. However, they will be critical resources for those faculty/staff who find themselves in “grey” areas of harassment. It is important to note that the former RU Ombudsperson listened to faculty/staff complaints, but they were not empowered by the institution to do anything beyond that. Thus, the position should report directly to the Chancellors in order to ensure appropriate perception of power and influence. The ombudsperson will require training in order to learn how to manage various situations, once their roles and responsibilities are defined by senior leadership. The role of the ombudsperson should include the responsibility of the ombudsperson to bring forth evidence or patterns of behavior that are brought to their attention by multiple individuals.

### Recommendation 5:

#### Provide Improved Training and On-going Educational Opportunities

##### Implementation Idea:

- Require orientations for new Chairs/Deans/Senior Administrators, including timely re-training once laws/policies get updated from UHR, OEE, Risk Management, and OGC.
- Training should include integration of “if/then” scenarios and activities for leaders to role play and practice appropriate responses and reactions to various scenarios that could take place, including gender harassment and workplace microaggression scenarios
- Educate new leaders on the definition and understanding of “zero tolerance” – especially what it looks like in practice
- Provide improved training for ALL students/faculty/staff through various orientation programs and have this information easily accessible on the Rutgers website; this would educate potential victims and offenders – definition of harassment, acceptable behavior and language, what to do if they have been harassed/been accused of harassment, expectations of how a case will be managed, etc. There is a concern that students (graduate students especially), faculty (junior), and some staff who are especially vulnerable accept behavior from their faculty and/or supervisors that they should not be accepting.

### Recommendation 6:

#### Hold Leaders Accountable for How they Manage Their Units

Implementation Idea: Include metrics in performance evaluations for leaders that include how they work to implement/influence a professional, respectful, and fair climate in their respective units. Changing institutional culture and climate is indeed a multi-year process, but leaders must demonstrate that they are taking steps to do so. Failure to do so will impact performance evaluations and merit increases/compensation.

### Recommendation 7:

#### Adopt a Broader Definition of, and Perspective on, Sexual Harassment

If we prevent sexual harassment at the university but other forms of harassment continue, we won't progress as an institution. Moving forward, we urge the adoption of a broader definition and understanding of sexual harassment to include all forms of harassment.\* Operating from a broader definition will ensure we drive solutions that are inclusive of other forms of harassment such as harassment and discrimination based on race, national origin/ethnicity, religion, disability, sexual orientation, LGBTQ status, and others

Implementation Idea: Moving forward, strategies need to be developed to look at the culture of Rutgers as a whole and determine ways to eliminate/decrease discrimination in all of its domains, including race, ethnicity, gender, and sexual orientation. Examples from Chapter 6 of the NAS report include:

- Appoint more women into empowered leadership positions. (We know that where there is a critical mass of women leaders, there is less sexual harassment.) These appointed leadership positions are not limited just to senior leadership, but ones at all levels (i.e. chairs of search committees, university-wide committees, etc.).
- Establish equity advisor role/position (tailored to the needs of the specific Chancellor-led unit) to aid in making diversity and inclusion a priority in search processes
  - The advisor needs to be empowered and have the authority to directly impact searches that need guidance and/or require intervention

#### Recommendation 8:

##### Implement Ongoing Assessment on Climate

The Assessment subcommittee is recommending the implementation of regular and ongoing Rutgers University-wide climate assessments. Our leadership subcommittee fully supports this recommendation and is available for any guidance/consultation needed from the leadership subcommittee.

Implementation Idea: The assessment subcommittee may consider including questions and analysis by leadership role/type in their climate survey design to better understand how leadership's perspective, understanding, and experiences may differ from others.

---

Thank you for your careful consideration of these recommendations,



Subcommittee members: Ashwani Monga, Jerome Kukor, Denise Rodgers, Oscar Holmes IV, Jacquelyn Litt, Cathryn Potter, Kathy Scotto, Sherri-Ann Butterfield, co-chair; Yvonne Gonzalez, co-chair

\*NAS Definition of Sexual Harassment:

- NPA Definition of Sexual Harassment: **Sexual harassment (a form of discrimination) is composed of three categories of behavior: (1) *gender harassment* (verbal and nonverbal behaviors that convey hostility, objectification, exclusion, or second-class status about members of one gender), (2) *unwanted sexual attention* (verbal or physical unwelcome sexual advances, which can include assault), and (3) *sexual coercion* (when favorable professional or educational treatment is conditioned on sexual activity). Harassing behavior can be either *direct* (targeted at an individual) or *ambient* (a general level of sexual harassment in an environment).**
- The committee is broadening this definition, as supported by the NAS report, to include leadership (e.g. style and tone), overall culture and climate (e.g. microaggressions in the workplace), and intersexuality (e.g. class, position at university, race, orientation, gender identity).

## Appendix G

### Assessment

#### Recommendations

1. Each chancellor-led unit of Rutgers University should perform an environmental survey to establish baseline experiences of students, graduate students, post-doctoral fellows, faculty and staff regarding mistreatment or harassment of any kind, whether on the basis of sex or gender, race, national origin/ethnicity, religion, disability, sexual orientation, LGBTQ status, and other characteristics. (see Appendix for examples).
2. Each individual school unit should prepare a baseline report on the learning and work environment of that school and develop a specific action plan to address the findings.
3. Follow up surveys should be conducted every 3-4 years to allow time for implementation of action plans to address the findings.
4. All surveys should be coordinated with university and campus-wide surveys to prevent survey fatigue.
5. Each unit should adopt multiple avenues for reporting inappropriate behavior, including an “in time” electronic reporting mechanism with the option for use of identifiers or anonymous reporting to track events in real time. (See Appendix for example)
6. Students in clinical and field settings should be provided with regular opportunities to report harassment from third parties outside of the university (See Appendix for Example)
7. Programs, policies, and services proposed by the University-wide committee to prevent harassment should incorporate mechanisms to evaluate their effectiveness.

8. Appropriate resources are needed from the University to maintain and coordinate ongoing assessment efforts

Subcommittee members: Carol A. Terregino and Sarah McMahon

## Appendix G-1

### Examples of Baseline Climate Survey Questions

Q33\_F\_. Over the past year, which of these best describes your experience as a faculty member in the medical school:

- I feel respected in the workplace  I have felt disrespected because of my race/ethnicity  I have felt disrespected because of my gender  I have felt disrespected because of my age  I have felt disrespected because of my sexual orientation  I have felt disrespected because of my marital status  I have felt disrespected because of my religion  I have felt disrespected because of my disability

MODIFIED AAMC GC FOR STUDENTS ET AL

FROM AAMC:

### Baseline Climate Survey

We would happily grant permission to adopt or adapt the mistreatment questions for use in their own surveys, as long as the survey is for non-commercial purposes only. In advance of such permission, we would simply request a list of the items you intend to use, the audience(s) to be

surveyed, the frequency/timing of the surveys, and the purpose. Once you have something more tangible, you can send this information to me or to [GQ@aamc.org](mailto:GQ@aamc.org); the turnaround (providing formal permission) should be swift.



## 2018 Medical School Graduation Questionnaire

	Rutgers-RW Johnson					All
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2018
<b>38. Do you know the procedures at your school for reporting the mistreatment of medical students?</b>						
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	63.6	74.7	87.2	84.8	88.5	88.1
No	36.4	25.3	12.8	15.2	11.5	11.9
Number of respondents	66	95	109	125	104	15,358

- 39. For each of the following behaviors, please indicate the frequency you personally experienced that behavior during medical school. Include in your response any behaviors performed by faculty, nurses, residents/interns, other institution employees or staff, and other students. Please do not include behaviors performed by patients. During medical school, how frequently have you...**

		Percentage of Respondents Selecting Each Rating				Count
		Never	Once	Occasionally	Frequently	
<b>Been publicly embarrassed?</b>						
All Medical Schools	2018	56.7	21.8	20.6	1.0	15,342
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	58.7	26.9	13.5	1.0	104
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	61.6	19.2	17.6	1.6	125
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	51.4	26.6	21.1	0.9	109
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	55.8	23.2	18.9	2.1	95
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	46.2	21.5	32.3	0.0	65
<b>Been publicly humiliated?</b>						
All Medical Schools	2018	77.6	13.7	8.2	0.5	15,340
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	86.5	8.7	3.8	1.0	104
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	78.4	11.2	8.8	1.6	125
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	78.7	11.1	10.2	0.0	108
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	81.1	9.5	9.5	0.0	95
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	78.5	9.2	12.3	0.0	65
<b>Been threatened with physical harm?</b>						
All Medical Schools	2018	98.6	1.1	0.2	0.1	15,325
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	104
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	99.2	0.8	0.0	0.0	125
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	99.1	0.9	0.0	0.0	109
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	98.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	95
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	96.9	3.1	0.0	0.0	64
<b>Been physically harmed?</b>						
All Medical Schools	2018	98.3	1.5	0.2	0.0	15,332
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	98.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	104
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	98.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	125
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	109
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	95
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	95.2	4.8	0.0	0.0	63
<b>Been required to perform personal services?</b>						
All Medical Schools	2018	94.1	4.1	1.7	0.1	15,350
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	93.3	4.8	1.9	0.0	104
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	97.6	1.6	0.8	0.0	125
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	93.6	5.5	0.9	0.0	109
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	86.3	10.5	3.2	0.0	95
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	98.4	1.6	0.0	0.0	64

## 2018 Medical School Graduation Questionnaire

39. For each of the following behaviors, please indicate the frequency you personally experienced that behavior during medical school. Include in your response any behaviors performed by faculty, nurses, residents/interns, other institution employees or staff, and other students. Please do not include behaviors performed by patients.

During medical school, how frequently have you... (Continued)

		Percentage of Respondents Selecting Each Rating				
		Never	Once	Occasionally	Frequently	Count
<b>Been subjected to unwanted sexual advances?</b>						
All Medical Schools	2018	95.1	3.0	1.8	0.2	15,342
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	99.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	104
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	95.2	3.2	1.6	0.0	125
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	97.2	1.8	0.9	0.0	109
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	91.6	5.3	3.2	0.0	95
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	96.9	1.6	1.6	0.0	64
<b>Been asked to exchange sexual favors for grades or other rewards?</b>						
All Medical Schools	2018	99.8	0.1	0.1	0.0	15,352
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	104
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	125
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	109
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	95
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	65
<b>Been denied opportunities for training or rewards based on gender?</b>						
All Medical Schools	2018	93.1	3.4	3.1	0.3	15,341
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	96.2	1.9	1.9	0.0	104
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	92.0	5.6	2.4	0.0	125
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	96.3	0.9	2.8	0.0	109
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	93.7	1.1	5.3	0.0	95
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	93.8	1.6	4.7	0.0	64
<b>Been subjected to offensive sexist remarks/names?</b>						
All Medical Schools	2018	83.5	7.5	8.3	0.7	15,343
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	84.6	7.7	7.7	0.0	104
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	79.8	9.7	10.5	0.0	124
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	86.2	10.1	3.7	0.0	109
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	84.2	8.4	7.4	0.0	95
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	84.4	9.4	6.3	0.0	64
<b>Received lower evaluations or grades solely because of gender rather than performance?</b>						
All Medical Schools	2018	93.6	4.3	1.8	0.3	15,327
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	96.2	2.9	1.0	0.0	104
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	94.4	4.0	1.6	0.0	125
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	95.4	3.7	0.9	0.0	109
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	92.6	4.2	3.2	0.0	95
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	93.8	6.2	0.0	0.0	65
<b>Been denied opportunities for training or rewards based on race or ethnicity?</b>						
All Medical Schools	2018	96.7	1.3	1.6	0.4	15,335
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	96.2	1.0	2.9	0.0	104
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	97.6	0.8	0.8	0.8	125
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	97.2	0.0	2.8	0.0	109
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	98.9	1.1	0.0	0.0	95
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	64



## 2018 Medical School Graduation Questionnaire

39. For each of the following behaviors, please indicate the frequency you personally experienced that behavior during medical school. Include in your response any behaviors performed by faculty, nurses, residents/interns, other institution employees or staff, and other students. Please do not include behaviors performed by patients.  
During medical school, how frequently have you... (Continued)

		Percentage of Respondents Selecting Each Rating					
		Never	Once	Occasionally	Frequently	Count	
Been subjected to racially or ethnically offensive remarks/names?							
All Medical Schools	2018	91.3	4.4	3.9	0.4	15,324	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	87.5	6.7	5.8	0.0	104	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	88.8	6.4	4.0	0.8	125	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	92.7	7.3	0.0	0.0	109	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	94.7	4.2	1.1	0.0	95	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	87.5	3.1	9.4	0.0	64	
Received lower evaluations or grades solely because of race or ethnicity rather than performance?							
All Medical Schools	2018	97.0	1.6	1.1	0.3	15,325	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	96.2	2.9	1.0	0.0	104	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	97.6	0.8	0.8	0.8	125	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	98.2	0.9	0.9	0.0	109	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	94.7	4.2	1.1	0.0	95	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	64	
Been denied opportunities for training or rewards based on sexual orientation?							
All Medical Schools	2018	99.4	0.2	0.3	0.1	15,338	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	104	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	125	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	99.1	0.0	0.9	0.0	108	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	95	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	65	
Been subjected to offensive remarks/names related to sexual orientation?							
All Medical Schools	2018	97.7	1.1	1.1	0.1	15,337	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	99.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	104	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	125	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	97.2	2.8	0.0	0.0	109	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	96.8	2.1	1.1	0.0	94	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	64	
Received lower evaluations or grades solely because of sexual orientation rather than performance?							
All Medical Schools	2018	99.4	0.3	0.2	0.0	15,323	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	104	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	125	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	107	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2015	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	95	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2014	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	65	
Been subjected to negative or offensive behavior(s) based on your personal beliefs or personal characteristics other than your gender, race/ethnicity, or sexual orientation?							
All Medical Schools	2018	91.7	4.0	3.8	0.5	15,316	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2018	96.1	1.9	1.9	0.0	103	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2017	92.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	125	
Rutgers-RW Johnson	2016	89.9	7.3	2.8	0.0	109	





## 2018 Medical School Graduation Questionnaire

	Rutgers-RW Johnson					All
	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2018
<b>40. Percent of respondents who indicated they personally experienced any of the listed behaviors, excluding "publicly embarrassed." The data are derived from the responses to the survey question reported in Q39 above.</b>						
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes	46.2	41.1	37.6	35.2	35.6	42.1
No	53.8	58.9	62.4	64.8	64.4	57.9
Number of respondents	65	95	109	125	104	15,357
<b>41. Sources of "publicly humiliated"-only behaviors experienced personally, as percent of all who answered Q39 above, including those who indicated they "Never" experienced any of the listed behaviors. The actual question was: "Indicate below which person(s) engaged in the behavior that was directed at you. Check all that apply."</b>						
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Pre-clerkship faculty	1.5	0.0	0.9	0.0	1.0	1.0
Clerkship faculty (classroom)	3.1	2.1	0.9	0.8	1.9	1.3
Clerkship faculty (clinical setting)	16.9	9.5	16.5	12.8	7.7	13.7
Resident/Intern	6.2	7.4	6.4	8.8	8.7	10.3
Nurse	7.7	5.3	4.6	4.0	1.0	3.6
Administrator	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.6
Other institution employee	0.0	1.1	0.0	3.2	0.0	1.2
Student	1.5	1.1	1.8	0.8	0.0	1.2
Number of respondents	65	95	109	125	104	15,357
<b>42. Sources of behaviors experienced personally, excluding "publicly embarrassed" and "publicly humiliated," as percent of all who answered Q39 above, including those who indicated they "Never" experienced any of the listed behaviors. The actual question was: "Indicate below which person(s) engaged in the behavior that was directed at you. Check all that apply."</b>						
	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Pre-clerkship faculty	0.0	3.2	0.9	1.6	1.0	2.6
Clerkship faculty (classroom)	0.0	3.2	0.9	0.8	1.0	2.5
Clerkship faculty (clinical setting)	30.8	29.5	21.1	21.6	17.3	20.8
Resident/Intern	9.2	25.3	14.7	13.6	12.5	15.9
Nurse	6.2	6.3	1.8	4.8	5.8	4.8
Administrator	1.5	1.1	1.8	0.8	1.0	1.6
Other institution employee	3.1	3.2	3.7	5.6	4.8	5.0
Student	4.6	2.1	6.4	4.0	8.7	6.2
Number of respondents	65	95	109	125	104	15,357



## Appendix G-2


Sample questions from the RBHS student climate assessment tool on harassment (full tool too long to include)

Since you enrolled at Rutgers Biomedical and Health Sciences (RBHS), have you been in a situation in which a faculty member, instructor, or staff member (same questions asked separately about another student)

	Never (0)	Once (1 times)	Sometimes (2-5 times)	Often (6+ times)
a. Treated you differently because of your gender?	0	1	2	3
b. Displayed, used, or distributed sexist or suggestive materials?	0	1	2	3
c. Made offensive or sexist remarks?	0	1	2	3
d. Put you down or was condescending to you because of your gender?	0	1	2	3
e. Repeatedly told sexual stories or jokes that were sexually offensive to you?	0	1	2	3
f. Made unwelcome attempts to draw you into a discussion of sexual matters?	0	1	2	3
g. Made offensive remarks about your appearance, body, or sexual activities?	0	1	2	3
h. Made gestures or used body language of a sexual nature which embarrassed offended you?	0	1	2	3
i. Made unwanted attempts to establish a romantic sexual relationship with you despite your efforts to discourage it?	0	1	2	3
j. Continued to ask you for dates, drinks, dinner, etc., even though you said "No"?	0	1	2	3
k. Touched you in a way that made you feel uncomfortable?	0	1	2	3

l. Made unwanted attempts to stroke, fondle, or kiss you?	0	1	2	3
m. Made you feel like you were being bribed with a reward to engage in sexual behavior?	0	1	2	3
n. Made you feel threatened with some sort of retaliation for not being sexually cooperative?	0	1	2	3
o. Treated you badly for refusing to have sex?	0	1	2	3
p. Implied faster promotions or better treatment if you were sexually cooperative?	0	1	2	3

### Appendix G-3: Monitoring System in time reports for faculty staff students and residents post docs etc. EXAMPLE

 Please provide as little or as much information as you are comfortable sharing. The more detail that you report will allow for more specific follow up from administration. If this is an issue that is an emergency or affects anyone's personal safety or well-being, please contact a Student Affairs Dean immediately.

This form will be forwarded to Office of Student Affairs Dean, the Senior Associate Dean for Education and the Chair of the Learning Environment Committee. Mistreatment can also be reported by speaking with/e-mailing the Student Affairs Deans directly. Students can also report to the course directors or clerkship and site directors of their specific rotations. Lastly, there is a Student Professionalism Conduct Committee representative from each class that can be reached in confidence.

**Your Name: Terregino, Carol**

Report Anonymously (Reporting this encounter as anonymous mean that you are deidentified from your AMP login.)

**Date:**  

**Class: \***  Course  Clerkship

**Who was the source of mistreatment: \***  

**Name:**

**To Whom was the mistreatment directed: \***  

**Did you witness/experience any of the following: \***

- Public humiliation
- Intimidation
- Threats of physical harm
- Physical harm
- Required to perform personal services
- Subjected to sexist remarks
- Denied opportunities/rewards based on gender or gender identity
- Subjected to racially or ethnically offensive remarks
- Received lower evaluations because of sexual orientation
- Been subjected to negative or offensive behaviors based on your personal beliefs or personal characteristics other than your gender/gender identity, race/ethnicity, or sexual orientation
- Other (please specify in the free response box below):

**Please explain specifics of encounter of above incident: \***

Please know that we respect your privacy and anonymity. However, we encourage you to provide your name as it allows us opportunity to

- 1) followup with questions that may help us address this issue and
- 2) provide you feedback regarding how this issue was handled.

## Learning Environment Encounter

[Back](#)

*?* Please provide as little or as much information as you are comfortable sharing. The more detail that you report will allow for more specific follow up from administration. If this is an issue that is an emergency or affects anyone's personal safety or well-being, please contact a Student Affairs Dean immediately.

This form will be forwarded to Office of Student Affairs Dean, the Senior Associate Dean for Education and the Chair of the Learning Environment Committee. Mistreatment can also be reported by speaking with/e-mailing the Student Affairs Deans directly. Students can also report to the course directors or clerkship and site directors of their specific rotations. Lastly, there is a Student Professionalism Conduct Committee representative from each class that can be reached in confidence.

**Your Name: Esposito, Miranda**

Report Anonymously (Reporting this encounter as anonymous mean that you are deidentified from your AMP login.)

**Date:**

**Class: \***  Course  Clerkship

**Department: \***

**Site: \***

- Camden
- Clinical Academic Building, 125 Paterson St/New Brunswick, NJ
- Jersey Shore University Medical Center
- Private Office
- Raritan Bay
- RWJUH
- Somerset
- St. Peter's University Hospital

**Who was the source of the incident:**

**Name:**

**To Whom was the incident reported:**

**Did you witness:**

- Public humiliation
- Intimidation
- Threats of physical harm
- Physical harm
- Required to perform personal services
- Subjected to sexist remarks
- Denied opportunities/rewards based on gender or gender identity
- Subjected to racially or ethnically offensive remarks
- Received lower evaluations because of sexual orientation
- Been subjected to negative or offensive behaviors based on your personal beliefs or personal characteristics other than your gender/gender identity, race/ethnicity, or sexual orientation
- Other (please specify in the free response box below):

**Please explain specifics of encounter of above incident: \***

Please know that we respect your privacy and anonymity. However, we encourage you to provide your name as it allows us the opportunity to

- 1) followup with questions that may help us address this issue and
- 2) provide you feedback regarding how this issue was handled.

Appendix G-4: Surveys used by other institutions to assess faculty/staff experiences of harassment

Name of survey/institution	Brief Description	Information about validity	Website link to survey
University of Iowa	Campus climate survey about sexual harassment for faculty, staff, and students	The Speak Out Iowa survey is a modified version of the Administrator-Researcher Campus Climate Collaborative (ARC3) survey.	<a href="https://speakout.uiowa.edu/survey-results/">https://speakout.uiowa.edu/survey-results/</a>
University of Akron	All-campus survey, including staff and faculty, about sexual harassment	The content of the survey was largely based on feedback from the Sexual Assault Resource Team (SART) membership, including faculty, staff, students, administration, and external collaborators. In addition, the federal resources provided by the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault were utilized in the development of questions and establishment of measures to best assess perceptions and perspectives of sexual assault and campus climate ( <a href="https://www.notalone.gov/assets/ovw-climate-survey.pdf">https://www.notalone.gov/assets/ovw-climate-survey.pdf</a> ).	<a href="https://www.uakron.edu/dotAsset/36c98570-43ae4fc6-bddf-793636926162.pdf">https://www.uakron.edu/dotAsset/36c98570-43ae4fc6-bddf-793636926162.pdf</a>

SUNY Potsdam	Campus climate survey about sexual issues on campus which included staff and faculty	Part of the uniform campus climate survey mandated for all State Universities of New York. The uniform survey was drafted by a design team and reviewed by an advisory board. In designing the survey, many survey instruments were reviewed that had been administered at more than 100 colleges and universities.	<a href="https://www.potsdam.edu/sites/default/files/CCSFacultyStaffFall16.pdf">https://www.potsdam.edu/sites/default/files/CCSFacultyStaffFall16.pdf</a>
Wesleyan University	Campus climate survey for staff, includes some questions on sexual misconduct	The survey questions were developed based upon questions used by peer institutions by a committee comprised of Institutional Research, Office for Equity & Inclusion, Title IX, Faculty	<a href="https://www.wesleyan.edu/inclusion/2017-2018%20Climate%20Survey%20Report%20.pdf">https://www.wesleyan.edu/inclusion/2017-2018%20Climate%20Survey%20Report%20.pdf</a>

		Chair/Vice Chair, and Human Resources.	
University of California	Campus climate survey for students, faculty, and staff about the atmosphere on campus, including some questions about unwanted sexual contact	The development of the survey instrument was a collaborative effort between Rankin & Associates, Consulting and a System-wide Work Team (SWT). The SWT was comprised of at least two representatives from each UC campus/location	<a href="http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/results/">http://campusclimate.ucop.edu/results/</a>

		as well as representatives from student associations, employee unions, and the faculty.	
University of Denver	Campus climate survey about diversity for students, faculty, and staff; does NOT include sexual harassment questions	The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment and members of the Campus Climate Council developed a survey instrument designed to capture perceptions and opinions of the DU climate for diversity. Models from other higher education institutions were used as guides during the process.	<a href="https://www.du.edu/cme/media/documents/duCampusClimateReport2005.pdf">https://www.du.edu/cme/media/documents/duCampusClimateReport2005.pdf</a>
ADVANCE Program at University of Michigan	Campus climate survey for faculty about diversity on campus and academic life; includes only one question	Information not found.	<a href="https://advance.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/ADVANCE-2017-CW-Survey-Instrument.pdf">https://advance.umich.edu/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/ADVANCE-2017-CW-Survey-Instrument.pdf</a>

	about inappropriate sexual advances		
AAMC Medical School Graduation Questionnaire	Survey for graduates of US medical schools to identify issues such as students' satisfaction with their educational program, career plans, costs of medical education, and students' experiences of mistreatment in the learning environment	The GQ has been approved by the American Institutes for Research Institutional Review Board and endorsed by student leaders of the AAMC Organization of Student Representatives, the American Medical Association Medical Student Section, the American Medical Student Association, and the American College of Physicians, Council of Student Members. Information about the development of questions not found.	<a href="https://www.aamc.org/download/490454/data/2018gqallschoolssummaryreport.pdf">https://www.aamc.org/download/490454/data/2018gqallschoolssummaryreport.pdf</a>