

University Senate Town Hall on Gender-based Misconduct and Sexual Assault

April 16, 2014

Panelists:

Matthew Chou: University Senator (Student, CC); Co-Chair, Student Affairs Committee

Michael K. Dunn: Deputy Title IX Coordinator, Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, CU

Barry Goldenberg: University Senator (Student, TC)

Marc Heinrich: University Senator (Student, CC); Coalition Against Sexual Violence

Terry Martinez: Interim Dean of Student Affairs, CC / SEAS

Lisa A. Mellman: Senior Associate Dean for Student Affairs, P&S

La'Shawn Rivera: Director, Sexual Violence Response, CU

Akshay Shah: University Senator (Student, SEAS); Co-Chair, Student Affairs Committee

Moderated by Sharyn O'Halloran, Chair, University Senate Executive Committee

Sharyn O'Halloran: Good afternoon. I am Sharyn O'Halloran, The George Blumenthal Professor of Political Economy, as well as the Chair of the Executive Committee of the University Senate. I would like to welcome everyone to the second Town Hall meeting on Gender Based Misconduct and Sexual Assault. The purpose of this hearing is to continue the dialogue around issues of inappropriate sexual behavior and sexual violence in our community. What is said today will provide the basis for recommendations of how the Columbia community can best engage this important issue, while staying true to our missions of an open and free environment for teaching, learning and research. So your participation is both welcome and important.

So the process of this panel is as follows. We're going to focus the panel this time on education, outreach, dissemination of information regarding policy procedures and practices, as well as next steps to improving the overall safety and awareness of the Columbia community. The structure is pretty simple. I'm going to ask each panelist to write a very quick, two-minute overview of their role and functions; then Matt Chou and Akshay Shah, co-chairs of the University Senate Student Affairs Committee, will provide overview of recent Senate actions around this area. Then we'll open the floor up for questions and answers.

So just to lay the ground rules a little bit—we want everyone to have an opportunity to express their opinion, and we believe that free expression is essential to the University, and that all members of the Columbia community have the right to express their views and concerns in a safe environment. I'm going to ask that everyone be allowed to state their opinion without interruption, please. And when you come to the mic, please state your name and your Columbia affiliation—unless you choose not to.

Anyway, I want to thank you again for joining us this afternoon, and I really look forward to a very productive discussion.

Let me now just turn to our panelists, and if you can just quickly introduce yourselves, and state your role and function in this area.

Michael K. Dunn: Hi, everybody. My name is Michael Dunn. I am the deputy Title IX coordinator for faculty and staff concerns. I work in the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action. I also

work closely with Student Services for Gender-Based Sexual Misconduct, which manages the disciplinary processes around gender-based misconduct.

Marc Heinrich: I'm Marc Heinrich. I'm one of the university senators for Columbia College; also, I'm a member of the Coalition Against Sexual Violence.

Terry Martinez: Hi. I'm Terry Martinez. I'm the interim dean of students for Columbia College and SEAS, and I work with staff members who have received orientation in the judicial process, and serve as a student voice, and advocate for student needs.

La'Shawn Rivera: Good afternoon. My name is La'Shawn Rivera. I'm the director of Columbia Health Sexual Violence Response. The two programs that support our work in sexual violence response are our men's peer education program, and the Rape Crisis Anti-Violence Support Center. We serve all students across the university.

Lisa A. Mellman: Hi, I'm Lisa Mellman. I'm the Samuel Rudin Professor of Psychiatry and senior associate dean for student affairs at the College of Physicians and Surgeons. I work with our staff and faculty in overseeing orientation programs and workshops for our students, regarding sexual misconduct, and as well oversee the reporting policies that we have for our students, regarding mistreatment.

Barry Goldenberg: Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you all for being here. I'm a doctoral student at Teachers College, and also a member of the University Senate. I definitely want to provide a kind of

graduate voice, and graduate thoughts and opinions on this issue that obviously affects the entire university community. So thanks for being here.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Okay. So now we'll start with Matt and Akshay, if you could just present—

Akshay Shah: Hello, everybody. My name is Akshay Shah. I serve as the co-chair of the Student Affairs Committee of the University Senate, as well as the SEAS representative to the University Senate.

Matthew Chou: Hi, everyone. I'm Matthew Chou. I'm one of the senators in the College, and also co-chair of the Student Affairs Committee, with Akshay.

Akshay Shah: First off, we just wanted to update you on the recent resolution that the University Senate passed on April 4. We had the Executive Committee, the Student Affairs Committee, and the Faculty Affairs Committee as its provenance, so we had a very broad range of support. We did some extensive outreach, to make sure that we heard everybody's views on this resolution, and how the Presidential Advisory Committee on Sexual Assault would be structured.

So there are three main kinds of buckets that one can put all the reforms into. The first one is membership of PACSA itself. The second one is accessibility and transparency for PACSA. And lastly, it's the mandate of PACSA.

So in terms of membership, we streamlined PACSA's membership from 24 to 13, to make it a more effective committee, so that it doesn't get bogged down in scheduling, and so on. We've increased student representation from what was previously 2 out of 24 senators, to now at least 3 out of 13. We've added a member of general counsel to provide legal advice to the committee. We've appointed—there are going to be three tenured professors and one non-tenured professor, with expertise in law, health, and social work, to provide their expert opinions to the committee. Lastly, we've mandated that members serve on it for two years, to ensure that there is continuity, and the committee is very effective.

In terms of accessibility and transparency, previously PACSA's membership was confidential, and going forward, it's going to be public, in that when, in the transition process, Matt and I will be serving on PACSA. So if you have any concerns, we're very happy to take them. There will also be an email address for PACSA that people can reach out to, and a website for PACSA that outlines exactly what its mandate is, what PACSA does, what kind of issues can you bring to it. And finally, it will also have its annual report on its website that will be accessible to everybody.

Lastly, with regards to mandate, the idea was that PACSA was meant to be an empowered group of people that would re-evaluate existing policies and procedures, and bring those recommendations to the Senate, and also advise the president on these matters. Furthermore, we also set a deadline of 12 months for publishing a comprehensive report, since the date of passing this resolution. So on April 4, 2015—by April 4, 2015—there should definitely be a comprehensive annual report on sexual assault.

Matthew Chou: A second major effort has been to figure out what exactly the nature of the data release looks like. We've had a lot of people speak to us now, for their opinions from across the student body,

whether they be undergraduates, graduate students and the like, and recently we've been meeting with [Vice Provost] Andy Davidson and Melissa Rooker [Associate Provost, Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action and Columbia's Title IX Coordinator], who are both members of the provost's office, and have been tasked with coordinating this data-release process.

To give you a view of what we're trying to do, coming into this data-release process, we're thinking about how to balance confidentiality as well as transparency, so that we can both prevent sexual assault and educate members of our community as to what our policies are, while at the same time protecting the individuals, those who have gone through the process, such that they don't feel that in any way they've been outed by this data release.

So with that in mind, we've proposed six points—and they're still up in the air. We're going to be having meetings in the coming weeks, as the semester comes to a close, to figure out what exactly is going to be released, and what that data looks like when it comes out. But those six recommendations are as follows:

First, we asked for aggregate anonymous statistics, segmented by school, on reported violations of gender-based misconduct policies, with more specific categories identifying the types of harm reported.

Secondly, we asked for the number of instances where interim measures and accommodations were requested, granted, and violated.

Thirdly, we asked for the number of cases in which parties were found responsible.

Fourth, the sanctions applied to responsible parties.

Fifth, the number of appeals granted and the instances in which this resulted in a change in sanctions.

Lastly, the average number of days in which these types of cases were resolved, including information on the average length of appeals.

Altogether, we also looked at the possibility of some qualitative information on these cases, and we decided that except in cases where it was absolutely necessary, that we try to shy away from those; though, as we've spoken more to Andy and Melissa, in the past few weeks, it seems that they, as experts, believe this might be helpful in terms of providing more context.

Lastly, in terms of presentation of the data, we're hoping that it will be in a table form, with some explanatory context behind that. Altogether, we hope that this will add some more clarity, and bring Columbia to be a leader in how it displays this data, as opposed to just following the minimums of Clery Act guidelines.

Akshay Shah: Just to add—the data is definitely going to be released before the end of this school's calendar, which roughly would put us sometime before July.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Thank you very much. We are now going to basically have a dialogue. Out of the first town-hall meeting, people were eager for us to continue the dialogue, and to give more opportunities for questions and answers. So if anyone else would like to speak basically about what other additional actions are being taken? La'Shawn. Did you want to talk about that?

La'Shawn Rivera: What was the question?

Sharyn O'Halloran: Any additional actions currently underway. Any additional reforms that are going on in the way of a response?

Terry Martinez: I'm happy to talk a little bit about what has happened. Regardless, I think there is a difference of opinion as to whether or not the actions that are being taken are the right ones, and given the importance of the problems we're addressing, I think some feel that we're not moving quickly enough. But it's neither truthful nor helpful for us to think about the sincerity of the commitment of everybody, certainly in this room. To make our community safer, and to prevent sexual assault on campus, we really are focusing on the work we can do together in conjunction with students, to change university policies, and to think about what needs to happen moving forward.

So since the second town hall is really devoted to preventing sexual assault, to have the ongoing conversation is important. As everyone knows, the president has shared that he is creating an executive vice-president position for student affairs. We've expanded the scope of training on preventing sexual assault on campus. That's going to be mandatory for all incoming students in the College, Engineering and Barnard, starting with the New Student Orientation Program (NSOP). We've having conversations about ongoing education, not just during NSOP. We've revamped the selection and requirement commitment of the student consent educators. During NSOP, access to peer advocates and the Sexual Violence Response Office will be expanded. We're launching the new Columbia—I think that has already launched—the new Columbia Health website, more prominently displaying resources for survivors. The 4-Help Phone Hotline has been revamped, and is being streamlined. Right now, conversations are happening about resolving the identified problems with Hewitt Hall, the location of the Rape Crisis Anti-Violence Center. There was a meeting that was supposed to happen, actually at this time, so we've rescheduled that, to continue that conversation. Regarding the investigation process, two investigators are now present for testimonies, as transcribed, and we've been working with some of the

students to take a look at the letters that are provided to both the complainants and to the respondents, to ensure that they understand their rights, their responsibilities, and the resources.

You know, these are ongoing conversations. Certainly, as we stated in the first town hall, not the last conversations, and it's a process and a procedure, and we're working through all of those.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Thank you. One of our focuses is on graduate students, in particular the medical school. They have, obviously, a little bit of a different community than the undergraduate schools, but we'd like to hear some of the practices, procedures and activities that have been ongoing.

Lisa A. Mellman: Sure. Thank you very much for the opportunity to be here, and to represent the Medical School. The focus on sexual misconduct and assault is obviously incredibly important, and as you know, these are complex, often challenging situations. In terms of our policies, we want to make sure that students are oriented to the policies, and that they are oriented multiple times to them. So, in particular, during our orientation week, both the Sexual Violence Resource Center staff, as well as the Office of Sexual Misconduct staff, come and orient all of our students to their policies, to their availability. In my remarks to the incoming class at orientation, I also bring this up, reminding them of these resources, and of how important this is.

We have a professionalism workshop during orientation week that is mandatory for all students to attend. That is another place where I then remind the students of the policies that we have. Then, in addition, a year and a half later, the very beginning of January, now of the students' second year, but right at the threshold where they're about to start their clinical work, working in various hospitals in

New York City, both at New York Presbyterian, as well as at our affiliate hospitals, as well as some other hospitals that we're affiliated with, in a few other parts of the country and New York State—we have a professionalism workshop that, again, students are required to attend, and in this workshop we have small group discussions of specific vignettes. One of the vignettes involves the clinical situation, or a situation in which a student is working in a clinical setting in a hospital, and a vignette in which sexual harassment takes place. We have both a small-group discussion as well as a discussion with the entire class, about what to do, what the issues are, what the resources are. So it's, again, to emphasize the importance of the topic, and the importance of utilizing the resources that are available to all students.

I'm a psychiatrist, and I know both in my work as a psychiatrist, as well as, particularly, in my work as student affairs dean, that our role is to protect victims, to make sure that resources are available, and that we are not re-traumatizing victims through our processes—as much as possible, to prevent that. We want to be fair. We want to listen. We want to be fair. We follow the policies of the university, and at the same time, in the Medical School, one of our guiding principles about all kinds of behavior is that of suitability for the practice of medicine, and patient safety and our responsibility to the public. So when we are looking at any kind of disciplinary situation, not just those involving sexual misconduct, in addition to following policies of the university, we also have the guiding principle of suitability for the practice of medicine, knowing that anyone who graduates with an M.D. from our Medical School is then positioned to be out in the public, taking care of patients, and preserving patient safety is vital as well as preserving the safety of all of our students.

Terry Martinez: I just wanted to add one more thing that I forgot. I serve on the All Deans of Students Committee for the university, and one of the things we talked about and mentioned at our last meeting

was—and we got a commitment from every school to dedicate a portion of their orientation to education around these issues.

Sharyn O’Halloran: Thank you. So we’re hearing some pretty good resources that are dedicated to this issue, lots of different educational and outreach activities at orientation, at multiple times and touches throughout their career at Columbia. And yet, I feel that the last time, people felt we needed concrete types of actions. So, Marc, in hearing all of this—would you like to respond, in what ways do you think we could do better, or how we could express this better?

Marc Heinrich: Sure. There are obviously a lot of people here who have different opinions on exactly how to move forward, but I think one of the necessary things, as Dean Martinez was saying—creating the atmosphere that the university is responding, which I think has improved as we’ve moved along with some of the issues, and they’ve been addressed by both President Bollinger and the undergraduate deans, but I also think, with a lot of things, there’s just a lack of information available. There are some issues—for example, there are different stories about when resources at the Crisis Center are available, for example, and that’s something that I think maybe we should be making sure the information is available to students is really helpful. Part of, I think, the issue is that people just aren’t aware of what is available, and I think the new SSGBSM website really helps with that, but I think we do need to make sure people are more aware, and that the processes are constantly responding to students. Because, obviously, there’s a lot of attention to the issue right now, and that’s really important, so we can move the dialogue along. But we want to make sure that every six years we’re not just revisiting the issue, and having multiple town halls and then just pausing. So I think we need to make sure there is a more responsive atmosphere toward this important issue.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Thank you very much. Our graduate student representative—it would be great to hear some of your input from the graduate school.

Barry Goldenberg: Sure. Once again, thank you all for being here, and thank you for allowing me to be here, as well. It's a great opportunity. It's humbling, in a way, not just represent Teachers College, but the kind of graduate constituency here at Columbia. I echo a lot of what's been said, and I think it's important to recognize [unclear] that it seems, at least from media and what's been going on, it's very undergraduate-focused, but this affects the entire population of Columbia. The thing about TAs and gym facilities—all things that graduates and undergraduates really share—so I really think it's important for graduate students in schools, of each graduate school, to really be a part of this conversation. I think we're making inroads with that. I know, for me, at Teachers College, we've seen, since this past year, an outreach of information about how [unclear] director, about how to get involved in resources. Actually, right now, coming out, I noticed a new sign about consent, sexual consent information, so these resources are becoming much more prevalent on campus, even on my campus. I think it's really important that we keep graduate students in mind when we think about this outreach, because they're much a part of this conversation, and very much responsible for what's going on, as well, because of the integration of Columbia, in the proximity of how everyone interacts.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Marc, when you hear all of this, and when you're faced with a particular case, in investigation, what types of information or gaps do you commonly come upon, in that process? So that could kind of inform what we could be thinking about--Michael. I'm sorry. Too many "m's." Michael, when hearing all of this, you hear that there are types of information available, the way the information

gets disseminated to different types of populations, but you also hear that there are gaps. And when you're in an investigation, I'm sure you hear people say, "I didn't know, I wasn't aware of this." What would be helpful for the people to hear--the types of information—or how can that information better reach these folks?

Michael K. Dunn: That's a very good point, and one of the key take-aways for me in this ongoing dialogue that we're engaging in is the fact that we need to think about how information is being relayed, and we'll inform the community of the policies and procedures that affect so many of us. I think that this has been a really helpful few months, in that we've had the chance to talk to students in a variety of settings. We've had these town halls. I met, with a colleague, with some Coalition members this past weekend. We've had regular meetings with students, to talk about a possible flow chart, to illustrate the process that student services engages in when it conducts an investigation, and all these touch points have been really helpful for us, to realize what gaps are out there. We may think we're communicating clearly, and that we're getting the information out there in a sufficient way, but when we hear from students that that's not happening, then we need to re-evaluate, and take a look at what else can happen. When we're talking about such sensitive issues of campus climate and campus culture, perception really is reality. So if there are myths out there that aren't accurate, we need to really do our best to address those.

I mentioned that we're working on a flow chart that can easily illustrate how the process works. We have a draft version of that. We're getting feedback from students and from various stakeholders. We're hoping that that can be a really helpful tool, to help people understand how the process works, both online and perhaps on RAs' doors and throughout the community. The other key piece here, as Terry

mentioned, is the training during orientation—making sure they really are getting the time and prominence they deserve, making sure that we’re working closely with La’Shawn and our colleagues in Sexual Violence Response, to make sure that we’re addressing the totality of this issue—because it is very complicated, and we have to address the entire thing.

In addition to that, I think we’re always open to other ways we can get out there—mid-year training sessions, efforts we can make with ongoing students, to make sure that this is a core value of our community, and that prevention and address of these issues is reflected.

Terry Martinez: May I also comment on something, as well? We have to have these conversations, and I appreciate that students I feel are partners in this—we welcome the conversation, we welcome the dialogue. Those have been happening, and, again, it’s a lack of communication “back out,” so I wonder, in particular, for the students whom we’ve been partnering -- what would be helpful as far as having those students report out? Is that something we could think about? Marc, you’ve been in conversations, as I look at others in the room who have been in conversation -- I’m curious, and I would like to hear from the audience, what would be helpful, so that the work that we’re doing with students gets out there, as well.

Sharyn O’Halloran: That’s what we hope the dialogue will be about. La’Shawn, you are frontline on this in many ways. I am sure you hear different types of stories. What is a constant theme that may come forward? In what areas do you wish we could strengthen? What would be helpful? If you could speak to some of the educational process that you’re working on and thinking about hard, at this time.

La'Shawn Rivera: Education is key when we're talking about these issues. So it is really important that everyone understands that this doesn't happen in isolation. So we're not only thinking about the work that we do in Sexual Violence Response, but we're also thinking about the work that is happening throughout Columbia Health, throughout campus-wide, so that people really want to engage students in understanding that attending a session or an education program on alcohol, or healthy relationship building—that they don't see that as something completely separate from a conversation around sexual violence, that all these different types of meetings, conversations, discussions, and spaces that are being created and have been created, not only by my department, by our volunteers, by our team, but also by different social-justice groups, feminist groups, and individuals on this campus. So I want to acknowledge that that is continuing to happen, and I think what our team has been doing, and our volunteers have been doing, is really trying to strengthen that, and really create more of a presence, so more people are coming to these conversations. Because oftentimes it is some of the same individuals who are educating themselves, who are passionate and involved around these issues, who continue to attend.

For instance, right now it's Sexual Assault Awareness Month, so we have these events. Tomorrow night is Take Back the Night. So it would be helpful that the spaces that are being created, that many people who are really trying to really be engaged around this, to participate in that. More specifically, based on the conversation from the last town hall, I know there was a lot of comment, and feedback, and input regarding the New Student Orientation Program that our department facilitated. So we have been working on that. We've just really been rethinking the approach, the model. We've been working with people on Terry's team to really identify best ways that we can implement this program.

As many of you know, this program has been around since the '90s, and was formed by students. So, initially, when we approach the sexual violence education as part of new-student orientation, for students at that time, it felt very critical to them that this is a peer-to-peer education model, that first-year students were hearing from upperclassmen, "What does this mean? What is sexual violence? What does it look like on campus?" And it also felt very critical for those students that it was a consent-based conversation.

Right? So wanting to ensure that the culture around consent—what that really means on a day-to-day basis, and the spectrum of consent, what that looks like. So they really wanted to have more targeted conversations around skills and community building. Since then, we've continued to evolve that program. Last year, in the fall semester, we got a lot of feedback from different students who were involved in the program, in multiple ways. So we've been taking that in. In addition to that, we have regulations. I'm sure some people are familiar with the Campus Sexual Assault Violence Elimination Act—the Campus SaVE Act—which now requires all colleges and universities to provide this type of education and training, to all incoming students.

And so with that in mind, one of the changes that we had to make is really rethinking this approach, that we value the peer-to-peer education approach, we are still in the process of recruiting and hiring consent educators to support this program. But one change that we have made, or that we will be making in this upcoming NSOP 2014, is that we will be taking an approach that staff members will now present and facilitate the content around sexual violence on campus.

With that, we're utilizing consent educators to support the more ongoing education, not only that same day, but in addition to further programming that happens throughout the academic year. Those are just a few of the primary things that we've worked on, and that we're continuing to collaborate with students to address.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Well, thank you very much. That should give you a good sense of key topics. But, as you are hearing we want a dialogue. What areas and gaps would be helpful to promote, to make this a stronger network, and to realize a more holistic approach, as opposed to these wonderful, piecemeal activities that go on, so that we can ensure that this is a safe environment for everyone. Anyone who would like to speak at this time? Ask questions? Comments?

Terry Martinez: Initially—that was a genuine “ask.” We're working with students and we're doing these things, and I want to hear from you how do we inform students about what's happening? What we're working on? How do we get to students who aren't in this room?

[Someone speaks, inaudibly]

Sharyn O'Halloran: We're going to get a mic.

Voice: I can speak from here

Sharyn O'Halloran. No, no. This will be transcribed. And if you could identify yourself—unless you choose not to. So if you could identify yourself, as well as your affiliation, that would be very helpful.

Thank you.

Zoe Ridolfi-Starr: Hi, I'm Zoe. I'm a junior in the College. So I'm interested in talking more about the Rape Crisis Center. We got the email today, and you guys have touched on the commitment to having peer advocates available 24/7 during NSOP, which is excellent. But a lot of students, including myself, feel really strongly that there is a serious need for professional support available at the Rape Crisis Center, full-time, and specifically, 24 hours during NSOP. Peer advocates serve an important role, but, in reality, we need people who are professionally trained, and who dedicate their careers to supporting students in these capacities, when we are in some of our most vulnerable moments that we may ever experience in our entire lives. Columbia is an institution that has phenomenal resources, and I cannot imagine what could be more important, in terms of dedicating those resources, than our continued support and safety, particularly in these dangerous situations. So how can we work on directing more resources to providing professional staff more accessible at the Rape Crisis Center?

Sharyn O'Halloran: So, La'Shawn, you spoke about using staff on a more regular basis, in some of our orientation, so perhaps this is an extension to that.

La'Shawn Rivera: Well, I think education and direct services are two different approaches and are unique, so I do want to clarify that. I think that you raise a really valid concern and that is something that we are still working on and trying to address. I do want to say that the peer advocate program was established by students, so it was student organizers and activists who felt that it was critical to have

students available in this capacity. Many survivors who access our services oftentimes say that it was really great that it was a peer who was the first point of contact, because of their concern and fear, at times, of going to administrators initially. Oftentimes, when students come through our program, accessing services, utilizing a peer advocate, whether it be contacting a peer advocate through our 24/7 on-call service, or accessing an advocate through our peer helpline, then oftentimes, if they're needing or requiring administrative support or staff support, the peer advocates do connect them to those resources. So I want to clarify that that *is* happening. What you're asking, specific to having professional staff available 24/7—when you look at rape crisis centers nationwide, that is not something that is considered best-practice, primarily because, oftentimes, the expectations for survivors coming in for services is that they're in need of—what are my options? What are my rights? What can I be considering around my safety right now? And oftentimes the professional-level staff stepping in for the more long-term support, beyond that critical capacity, has been shown to be very effective.

So if you look at rape crisis centers nationwide, volunteerism has been one of the primary ways that the 24/7-type services have been facilitated. So it doesn't mean that we're not open to it; we're taking that in; we're really trying to look at some of our peer institutions, to see what others are doing, and we're still thinking about it. But I do want to say that students who are utilizing our services, who do provide us direct feedback about their experiences in working with a student volunteer -- and I want to remind everyone: These are trained student volunteers who are certified by the state to provide these direct services, They go through continuing education beyond the 50 hours that we require of them, before their certification. So I just want to establish that the peer advocate volunteers have been providing a very critical service to this community since 1991. We want to be mindful of the fact that we do get input and feedback from students who value that service, and don't want to see that service go away. So

we have to consider those voices, in addition to taking in voices like your own, around how do we establish a more professional presence in this 24/7 capacity. We're still working on it and thinking through it, but I just wanted to name some of the complexities, and what it looks like and what it means to have professional services available 24/7.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Okay, thank you very much. This side please, we're going to go back and forth. State your name please.

Marybeth Seitz-Brown. My name is Marybeth Seitz-Brown. I'm a senior in CC. I think a really big challenge to this issue is that it's both an issue of the policies and procedures, but also the culture. I think we noticed this past weekend, when we had Bacchanal, a student actually wrote an op-ed in the *Spectator* that I think was incredibly important, and pointed to the intersection of the policy and the culture in that, because we're not trained to be active bystanders, oftentimes the culture at this university, especially in community events like Bacchanal, where a lot of students are intoxicated, and take advantage of being drunk to enact violence on other people, and to excuse that behavior. When we don't have active bystanders, that enables violence. So we're all complicit in that; but, at the same time, I think that's really a place where we could have used university administrative leadership. I really appreciated the email that Dean Martinez sent out about resources that would be available to help keep students safe, in terms of food, and drink, and sunscreen. But safety is not just those things. Safety also encompasses sexual violence. So I guess I'm wondering, why have we not utilized bystander intervention programs in the past? Why is that not part of every single—every time we talk about safety, why is that not included? And for the future, what are we going to be doing to make sure that not only do we tell people how to intervene safely, to prevent violence, but also targeting people who take

advantage of these situations, and say alcohol is never an excuse to violate anyone's body without consent?

Terry Martinez: I absolutely agree with you. When I saw that letter (and the young woman contacted me before she sent that letter out), I was really alarmed at the response that she got. I just sat this morning to look at some of those, and to think that our community is responding in that particular way is very disturbing for me. I think, again, the folks in this room are committed to this issue. How do we begin to change not just the policies and the procedures—because we're doing that, and we're going to get to that—how do we change the culture on this campus, right? How do we engage students who aren't in this room in the conversation? To answer your question regarding bystander intervention—you know, this past year we did begin a training that was a national model, and we started with different groups, and we need to continue to expand that. We started during orientation, during RA training, during Greek life training, during athletic training. We started to target some other particular populations, but we need to expand that. It can't just be those groups. It has to be part of everybody's responsibility—yours, mine, everyone's—to step in and speak up, and help change the culture of this community. And around behaviors with alcohol, right? They go hand in hand, and we need to be able to start having conversations about those things, as well. I agree.

La'Shawn Rivera: I just want to add to that, to comment. So absolutely, we have this bystander intervention curriculum, but I do want to say that there is education that has been happening on campus, that is around helping skills. There are peer-helping skills in various RA training settings. I know in my department, in my team, we do a lot of helping-skills training around intervening, not only in the aftermath of an incident but also before an incident occurs. So I think that—of course, nationwide, we're

seeing the term and the language “bystander” a lot, but bystander intervention education has existed since the ’60s, and on this campus, many of us educators and people who are doing prevention outreach, a lot of the social justice organizers on this campus, have been providing that level of education. We’re just not coining it as bystander intervention, but those are the same skills that are useful, and some of the examples and situations that you’re disclosing to us today.

Marybeth Seitz-Brown: I don’t want to downplay those organizations that are doing that. I guess I’m just saying, that should be part of our administrative communication about safety. That work needs to be extended outside of those groups, and if the university can be a part of that, they should be.

Sharyn O’Halloran: Marc, did you want to comment?

Marc Heinrich: I agree. I think one of the things from the op-ed I read as well, and students have complained about this, is there is a huge, I think, misinformation about the role of alcohol within consent, and I think that is something that really needs to be addressed. I think with more expanded consent education I hope will be, but I think that also helps change the culture, which I think is something we really need to focus on. Because helping—changing the adjudication process and improving it only goes so far. You want to be able to prevent it in the first place. I think that’s really where we can—I think the University can step in, at least from a student perspective, and really make a difference.

Terry Martinez: I think that’s where the peer-to-peer work comes into play. Because I can send out an email, and I know what happens after those emails go out. But the peer-to-peer, the conversations with

the folks on your floor, or in your residence halls, or your student organizations, are far more powerful than any words that I can put on a paper. That's where the action needs to come in. So our role is to really work with students to educate them, so that students can step in, as well.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Great, thank you very much.

Michela Weihl: Hi. I'm Michela Weihl, a freshman at Barnard, and I'm going to ask a question that was submitted anonymously, online. The student is wondering in light of all the articles that have been published recently, exposing some of the sanctioning that hasn't necessarily been in line with various school policies, what's going to be done after all these policy changes are made, in terms of retroactive action?

Sharyn O'Halloran: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question?

Michela Weihl: Some articles have been published recently about sanctioning that were made, and the student is under the impressions that those sanctions don't fit with the school policies about expelling students after they've been found guilty of certain offenses. And they were wondering whether or not any retroactive action will be taken, now that policy changes.

Michael K. Dunn: Thanks for the question. You know, without speaking to any cases in particular—we can't speak specifically about anything—I would just note that with all the cases that come through this process, all the parties involved do their very best to address the cases thoroughly, fairly, and to reach

the appropriate outcome. So there would not be any retroactive changes to previous decisions that have been made, beyond the usual opportunities for appeals that happen throughout the process.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Okay, so thank you very much. There are a set of questions that are online, so we appreciate your asking those, as well. Yes, please.

Chelsea Carrick: I'm Chelsea. I'm a senior at Barnard. I have a few questions regarding the new position of executive vice president. What specifically is this position going to entail, and what kind of person with what kind of background are you looking for? Basically, how is this person going to advocate for and benefit students, because there is a lot of concern that it's simply adding another layer to an already very bureaucratic process?

Sharyn O'Halloran: Great. So the question is, how is the EVP for Student Affairs going to intersect with the existing apparatus, and what are some of the background qualifications? Do you have any insight on this [to Terry Martinez]?

Terry Martinez: No, I think I'm as informed as you are: that the President sees this as a really important part of our conversation, and is elevating the responsibility to a very high level. I think that we are at just the beginning stages of trying to define what that position will be, but someone who really ties in and takes a look at it, from a very broad perspective. Other than that, I don't believe that the position has been created or posted. That's as much as we know, that it's that important that they are going to create something that takes a bird's-eye view.

Sharyn O'Halloran: And most importantly, the EVP for student Affairs will directly report to the President. And I think the EVP will elevate the issue, so that the president has direct communications as to what the student issues are around sexual assault. I think that was a key reason for the move. My understanding is that they are conducting a national search, and there is a set of criteria -- people who actually work effectively in this area. My understanding is that many other large institutions also have similar types of positions—EVPs for student affairs, looking at many of the same issues—adjudication, the appeals procedures, and having expert knowledge within a centralized location, which has been, from the previous town-hall meeting, one of the important issues to be resolved. The EVP will not in any way undermine all the wonderful work done at each of the schools, which is appropriate. But it will provide a central point, a touch point, within the institution, that has direct access to the president. That was my understanding of the creation of this position; if others have other insights, please let me know.

Marc Heinrich: I've had the same questions that you do. I don't have many more answers, but I have spoken to some of the senior administrators about it, and I think one of the problems at least that we saw with this entire reform process was that it wasn't clear who to contact. I think this is something that the chairman was talking about with the point person is that there are a lot of different administrators you were talking to, and there wasn't a central decision-making party. So I think the idea behind this position is that it's not specifically about sexual assault adjudication and policy, but also other issues. They will be able to make a decision; there will serve as a contact for students, which will be more helpful to centralize things.

Sharyn O'Halloran: But if you have suggestions along this line, I think this is a great opportunity to express those. You'll be able to be a conduit in that effect.

Rakhi Agrawal: Hi. My name is Rakhi [Barnard '14]. My question is about the process of finding consent educators this year. Some changes have been announced. There's going to be an in-person interview, a two-semester commitment, I think. I was just wondering what that looks like. I also notice that the deadline was extended, and I wanted to know why. I am assuming that it is because there weren't enough applications? I was just wondering what you were looking for in your applicants, and what that two-semester commitment will entail for students.

La'Shawn Rivera: Great question. I'll start with extending the application timeline. We need more applicants. We need more students who are interested in getting involved in this. The role is the same. There are still consent educators, they will still be utilizing a peer-to-peer education model, but we have expanded the time commitment. So I think by expanding that time commitment, we're asking for two semesters. We're asking that these consent educators commit to participating in one additional refresher training with Sexual Violence Response. We're also asking that they participate in a few meetings with the Sexual Violence Response team. In addition to that, we're asking that they facilitate a minimum of two additional workshops, or educational programs, within that time frame. So with those expectations, we are looking for candidates who are not only enthusiastic about getting involved in this work, but who are also students who have some level of understanding or education around these issues, but are also students who are connected and involved on campus, who can help spread these messages, and help spread the awareness in education around it. So we're looking just for people who are going to be dedicated, committed to this work, and want to partner with Sexual Violence Response, and collaborate with us.

So we've extended the application deadline because we do need more applicants. We want this to be a competitive process. We want that when we come into the August 2014 term, that students are feeling confident about these consent educators, and that they're great role models; that you all feel that they're representing your undergraduate population well. So that's why we've extended it—because we really want to see more applicants to help our selection process, so that everyone on campus can feel that these consent educators are really modeling what it is that we're trying to reinforce on campus. Did that answer all your questions?

Rakhi Agrawal: Yes. So in terms of the two-semester continued commitment, is that also going to result in more mandatory education for first-year students?

La'Shawn Rivera: Yes.

Rakhi Agrawal: And is that a place where you could perhaps incorporate the bystander intervention training?

La'Shawn Rivera: That is exactly where we're incorporating the bystander intervention more specifically. So the two additional programs that we're working with the deans around, and sharing that we can do that with all the first-year incoming students: One is our Step-up workshop. Step-up is the curriculum that—a collaboration—campus wide. We have administrators at Barnard, Columbia who've been working on this project for about two years, so those students will be facilitating the Step-up curriculum. In addition to that, they will also be facilitating a workshop that we call "How to Help a Peer Who Discloses Sexual Assault." And "How to Help a Peer" is just an extension of the bystander

intervention education, but it really focuses on after an incident has occurred, what does that look like in trying to intervene with that peer, and really do something that is productive and supportive to them. But at the same time—we get this all the time where students say, “Hey, my friend, or my roommate disclosed this to me, and I really didn’t know what to say, what to do, or where to refer them.” So they will be providing those two educational programs, and both of those are a great complement to one another, because both of them are very primarily focused on intervening before and/or after. So that will be the training that the consent educators will get in August, to continue facilitating that throughout the year.

Sharyn O’Halloran: Thank you.

Camille Tinnin: Hi. My name is Camille, and I’m a first-year student in the Graduate School of Arts & Sciences. I study sexual assault a lot on college campuses, it is actually one of my focuses in research. I just wanted to ask that I guess in the vast majority of campus rapes, it’s that the perpetrator has committed multiple offenses, averaging around six rapes, and that’s generalizable around the United States. I’m just wondering how—I love your focus on prevention and education, but how are you going to work with actually sentencing—not sentencing, but disciplining, sanctioning people, when balancing the rights of the person filing the complaint, and the person whom the complaint is filed against, regarding the fact that a lot of times people are multiple offenders?

Michael K. Dunn: Throughout the process, one of the key principles that we have to abide by, under Title IX, is equity. That means that both sides have the right to be heard. So when we are dealing with respondents, and we have multiple accusations against the same respondent, the respondent has the right

to be heard, and the right to be notified of each of those allegations. So we need to treat them all separately. When it comes time for the sanctioning process, if someone has been found responsible for violating the policy, if they have a previous record of violating policies in the past, then, of course, the sanction is going to be amplified to reflect that. I mean, that's kind of the key principles that we go by. Does that answer your question?

Lisa A. Mellman: I just want to underscore that, as with any sanctioning for any kind of disciplinary violation—and so this is across the board for any kinds of disciplinary action, but certainly, we're talking about sexual misconduct and assault here—any previous violation is—I'm just underscoring what Michael said—that any previous violation is taken into consideration in the determination of sanctions.

Jeenie Yoon: My name is Jeenie, and I'm a first-year MSW candidate in the School of Social Work. So, of course, my question is going to be social-work related. I have two questions. The first one is about the use of the word "misconduct." I really feel strongly about that because, one, I think it places focus on the perpetrator and not the survivor. I can't help but notice that misconduct comes before sexual assaults; so, again, you're kind of—the wording and the placement, I think, can make survivors feel oppressed. Even if that seems trivial, I think it is important, so I feel strongly about using the terminology that it is rape and sexual assault and sexual violence, and not just misconduct. So do you guys have any thoughts on that, or how that can be changed?

Sharyn O'Halloran: Just as an outside view—I actually hear that very clearly. We are putting very nice, soft words around this. But we also want words that catch more than just a narrow set of activities,

which includes sexual harassment, issues along those lines. So while I absolutely agree it's being way too soft, too culturally sensitive, and all those other things than to call it what it is—rape, violence—you use the word “inappropriate behavior with children.” These aren't children activities. We hear that. But we also want to make sure, just from my own perspective, when I thought about what the title should be—misconduct is stronger than inappropriate; it catches a lot of things that I think people would not think should be reflected in this community, but don't come over to the criminal side. I think those types of activities should also be part of this dialogue, because those are the activities that set a cultural tone that these other activities are okay. So I want to make sure that we're not only talking about rape and sexual violence, but we're also talking about the activities that gradually lead up to those types of very extreme actions. I'm not the expert here, but that's my thinking around this, and that's why I thought this was an appropriate title for this town-hall meeting. But if others have others have more clinical perceptions on what the appropriate nomenclature should be, I think we should open that up.

Michael K. Dunn: I would just note that Student Services for Gender Based and Sexual Misconduct uses the phrase “gender-based misconduct” to cover a range of behaviors. It's an umbrella term to include sexual harassment, gender-based harassment, stalking, intimate-partner violence, and then sexual assault, non-consensual sexual intercourse, and non-consensual sexual contact. We don't use terms like rape I think because they can be very loaded, weighted terms. We also note that this is not a legal process; these are not criminal definitions that we're applying. We're addressing university policy. So best practices among our colleagues across the country are to use this terminology, and we're doing so, as well.

Jeenie Yoon: And my response to that is, if you're going to insist upon using the word "misconduct," I don't think it should be the first word. That's just my personal opinion.

My second question has to do with the training of people who are working with the survivors on campus, specifically training that has to do with power and privilege. If we're talking about women, or people who are homosexual, or not able-bodied, what kind of training and competency things do you have those volunteers going through?

La'Shawn Rivera: Yes. Our volunteer training consists, actually, of all of the topics you just described. These are topics that not only we think are critical and important for them to do the work of advocacy, but also that is required of us by the State. So we do cover all of those topics. Those are all things that are discussed. I would also say that this is a 40-50-hour training. It typically takes on a full week. What happens for advocates is that it's really a field, a skill that we can train, we can role-play, we can practice those skills, but it's an ongoing practice. So throughout the year we have additional what we call continuums—continued education for our volunteers, to continue to talk about some of these barriers for survivors, issues that may intersect with their own experience of violence, how other systems and oppressive systems might inform their choices, decisions, barriers, all of that. We do that throughout the year. So I wouldn't say that our 40-50-hour training is going to cover—it includes all of that, but I wouldn't say that after that training, that's it, and that we never revisit those subjects, nor that we have all the answers. We have to continue—even myself, as a professional, I continue to get training. I continue to participate in educating myself to really understand some of those different intersections that come up, for a variety of students and survivors who come in to seek support and services. But that

is a critical part of our training. We include professionals and experts throughout the City of New York, and also professionals on campus to help facilitate those conversations for our peer-advocate trainees.

And I would say that this training also extends to our peer educators and our men's peer education volunteers. Their training is structured a little bit differently, because their focus is education and outreach. But even in their training, we're talking about power, privilege, oppression, violence. We have to talk about those issues, to really have an effective impact on campus, when trying to combat violence.

Erik Campano: Yes. Hi there. My name is Erik Campano [a student in General Studies]. I'm a member of the amazing men's peer education group. I'm also a survivor of sexual assault. It did not occur at Columbia or within a Columbia context. A couple of weeks—actually, a month ago now—I published an editorial in the *Spectator* about my assault, and what I learned about it, in terms of the nuances of consent. My assailant actually had a master's degree from an Ivy League university, and had gone through a misconduct training. But that apparently wasn't enough. So my question is directed, I think, probably to Lisa and Barry. Graduate schools and graduate students—is there the possibility of implementing a consent-training program that is as robust and comprehensive as within Columbia College?

Sharyn O'Halloran: Thank you.

Barry Goldenberg: Sure. There isn't, right, and there needs to be. Some of my grad school colleagues may disagree, but I think there needs to be a larger conversation just within grad students at each school, to think about not as mentors but as folks who are part of this larger community, and make up a large

population of this community, to have a larger stake. So there are two things. One, yes, I agree there needs to be much more of a robust training. There isn't much at Teachers College, although I know that's improving, because of these conversations we are making a larger effort. Second, I think there needs to be some larger, like I said, stake, at some level. If not a formal program of graduate students formerly involved with the undergrad community—the entire community in general—so I think this is a major issue, and I think because of the, in a sense, decentralization, in a way, of Columbia, it can come across as more difficult because of all these schools, and some are siloed in certain areas, there needs to be a better effort, I would agree with you; that this robust training is really important. I wish I had more information in terms of what each school is doing, but I agree with you that there should be some robust training, and we should take a larger stake in part of this community and what's happening.

Lisa A. Mellman: Thank you for your question, I think it's a really good one. I think that it underscores, actually, the importance of the potential role for the new executive vice-president, to be able to really look across campus, at the downtown-uptown, and then ultimately Manhattanville, and then across the various schools, to look at best practices, to look at orientations, trainings, and so forth, in order to make sure that really across all aspects of all campuses at Columbia, that we're doing the right thing. So thank you very much for your point of view, it's a very good one.

La'Shawn Rivera: I just want to thank you. I appreciate your sharing and disclosing in this public forum, what you experienced.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Thank you.

Student from the School of Public Health: Hi... I'm a first-year at the Mailman School of Public Health. Prior to starting my MPH, I worked for a CDC-funded program on the primary prevention of sexual violence. So this is an issue that's very close to me and my heart and my work.

I want to vocalize that on the CUMC, the medical campus, we do not feel like this issue is being taken seriously. I think that comes in part from maybe a lack of understanding of the dynamics around sexual violence and power and control, in general, on many of the admin and staff. But at our orientation we had a small piece on gender-based misconduct, which was really—they were just talking about sexual harassment, and I think things that do kind of have more of an umbrella are important to have, but when students were asking about, “What do I do if I experience sexual assault while I'm here?” the staff running the program did not know. They were not able to answer questions that students had at orientation, about sexual violence resources. Or everything is, Go to the Sexual Violence Resource Center on the main campus. There was no counselor present. There are no resources on the medical campus regarding sexual violence. Conversely, I've been in trainings for kind of if you're going to be at an event serving alcohol, there are required trainings for groups. And I've noticed that the topic has also been treaded lightly upon, too, sometimes even in a joking manner—I don't think out of mal-intent but, I think, out of discomfort with the seriousness of the subject issue.

Lastly—I don't want to call out names—but I have spoken with administration about the issue, and they have said that it's not something that they feel they need to take seriously, because it's something we should have all covered in our undergraduate experience. So, that being said, I have two questions. One, I want to know what your plans are, if any, to be more inclusive of these issues at the graduate level, specifically at the medical campus, and how we can be involved. Because students are curious. They do

want to be involved. They do care about the issue, but they feel disconnected, and they don't know how to make that connection. Secondly—well, I'll ask that separately.

Lisa A. Mellman: Thank you very much. A couple of things. One is that we've just begun discussions about the possibility of bringing a presence to the medical center from the Sexual Violence Resource Center, so plans are not yet in place, but these discussions have begun in a number of different venues. So that's certainly under discussion, and we understand the importance of that.

Second, I have been in contact—the student affairs deans of all the health science schools meet monthly, and the other student affairs deans, from the other health-science schools, know that I'm on today's panel, and that I plan to report back at our next meeting, in detail, about the discussion. So it's clear that that's something that's underdeveloped at the Medical Center, in a more unified way. I think each school has handled addressing the policies, and so forth, and orientation in their own individual way. So this is clearly raising a really important point, and there is clearly a lot of room for sharing best practices, and for us really making sure that all the schools at the Medical Center—that we're talking to one another, and that we're sharing our policies and best practices, and we clearly, obviously, haven't done that enough. So thank you for bringing this up.

Michael K. Dunn: Can I add something? Thank you for the feedback about the efficacy of the orientation training that you experienced. I actually remember presenting at that training session at Mailman, back in the fall, and I know we covered the definitions under the policy—how the university's disciplinary process works, confidential resources that are available to students on campus for reporting, the duty to report that many faculty and staff have; and we talked about some scenarios, as well. But if

that didn't resonate—I'm very sorry to hear that, and I'd be happy to speak to you after this about some ways we can more effectively relay that.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Did you have a second question?

Student from the School of Public Health: I do. I was a little bit late, so I don't want to take up more time if this topic has already been covered. I'd be happy to speak with you guys individually. But, clearly, we have a public health student, undergrad, social worker, and it's really an interdisciplinary issue, and it calls for interdisciplinary approaches and tackling. I come from the idea of using a socio-ecological model, and trying to prevent perpetration before it begins—although I know a lot of the work that we're doing right now is focusing on response. But, if it hasn't already been discussed, I'd be curious to know what you guys are doing on an individual, relational, and community level, to prevent the perpetration of assault on campus. Again, if it's been covered, I totally respect the time constraints.

La'Shawn Rivera: I do want to acknowledge that there are multiple activities that happen on each of those levels, and I actually appreciate you just bringing this to the conversation. I'm just going to briefly go over what I mentioned earlier. So we do utilize the peer-to-peer education approach. That definitely touches on both individual and relationships at the relational level. But there are other activities that we participate in. We have sexual-assault awareness campaigns, relationship violence awareness campaigns. We're also working with our colleagues around policy. So when we're looking at the socio-ecological model, we're really trying to inform the environment, policy, practice, culture, norms. There are so many different ways that that's happening, and it's not only happening through Sexual Violence Response. It's also happening through the different offices, and departments, and student organizations

throughout campus. So I actually feel—I don't know if you're open to—I know Michael said that if you're willing, I'd love to be able to connect with you. Because we are also working with CUMC—I want to acknowledge that it may not be coming up in these larger-group conversations, but part of the role of Sexual Violence Response is that we are serving the entire university. I just want you to know that I'm committed to making sure that we're always keeping the graduate population as part of our dialogue, and a part of our process. So I just want you to know that I am committed to that, and I will continue to support that, with all of my colleagues throughout Columbia Health and other areas. I'm happy to work with you directly, because maybe it would be helpful to get some more direct input from our graduate students, regarding what should prevention, utilizing the socio-ecological model, look like for this population? So I would be happy to do that.

Lisa A. Mellman: I also just wanted to comment that at the individual and relationship level, that our Center for Student Wellness has a number of workshops, including some focused on healthy relationships. Across the schools, we've been looking, in the last couple of years, at our alcohol policies, and how we can do a better job in making sure that the policies are robust, and that they're appropriately enforced as school-sponsored events. So that's a good community level. Thank you.

Alex Hastings: Hi. I'm Alex. I'm a sophomore at Barnard. My question similar to the question about the use of the word "misconduct." I feel strongly about the use of the words "respondent" and "complainant" when dealing with these cases. I've asked this before, and the usual response is that there's not much to be done about it, because it's kind of like legal language. But, at least for me, I think it really sets a tone going in, especially for a victim or survivor, to be referred to as a "complainant." Is there anything that could possibly be done to change these terms at all?

Sharyn O'Halloran: So it's not just the terms, but it's really the environment within which all of these types of issues are discussed, of which the terms are being sort of manifesting that. So I guess there is a legal component on how that has to be done.

Michael K. Dunn: The short answer is that that terminology will not change, most likely. I don't foresee us moving from the word "complainant" to something else.

Alex Hastings: Why?

Michael K. Dunn: Reasonable question. It's totally fair. The language around this is so loaded. We do our best to be sensitive to people's concerns coming forth. We don't want to label a survivor a victim, necessarily. We don't want to label them as an accuser, necessarily. We don't say that they're a plaintiff, because this is not a legal process. I know the word "complainant" has the word "complain" right there in the middle of it, and it does have negative connotations in that way. I think that terminology—the "complainant and the respondent"—we have found is the best, most even-keeled language we can use, so as not to unduly charge the proceedings with other connotations. [Unclear] Could we use the word "reporter" rather than "complainant?" That's a good suggestion. We do have many cases where the reporter is a different person than the complainant. If others have other ideas, we'd be open to hearing them.

Alex Hastings: So legally are we not—is the reason we're still using these terms for legal reasons? Are we legally supposed to be using those terms?

Michael K. Dunn: I'm not sure of the answer to that. I think the use of those terms is legally safe and acceptable, so we do use them. I'm not sure if we're required to.

Alex Hastings: Okay, thanks.

Sharyn O'Halloran: But the real question is, how do you change the overall environment that makes anyone with an issue to come forward, in safe surroundings? I think that's the bigger question, and that's a hard one.

Jeenie Yoon: Doesn't that just perpetuate rape culture?

Sharyn O'Halloran: I think those are some questions we should take a look at when we look at the policy, and then when we come back with—I think we should look at best practices, what's used consistently in some of the strongest programs out there, to get a sense of whether our own language is robust and sensitive, or whether it needs amending.

Michael K. Dunn: Do you have thoughts of other terminology that might be better?

Jeenie Yoon: I'd be happy to sit down with you and have a discourse.

Michael K. Dunn: That would be great.

Sharyn O'Halloran: That would be great. Go off-line on that. So I appreciate your input. Next question?

Megan K.: Hi. My name is Megan K. I'm a Columbia College junior, and my question is about student publications. I'm also the staff director of the *Columbia Spectator*, but I want to express that my views and my questions are my own, not in any way representative of *Spec*.

So, as you've talked about a couple of times during this town hall, there have been several student articles, not just in *Spec* but in *Bwog* and other places as well, that have really impacted the discussion of sexual violence on campus. So another great thing about these kinds of publications on campus is that they are not just limited to students. In the past—at least for *Spec*—you've also had some great contributions from administrators about issues on campus. So I think it can be a great forum to discuss issues like this, and promote dialogue. I know we've had emails from various administrators on campus about this issue, which have been great. But those emails aren't exactly conducive to response. So what I'm wondering—because, as far as I know, the *Lion*, *Bwog*, *Spec*, other student publications, have not published anything from administrators speaking about sexual assault, or violence, or misconduct, or whatever term you'd like to use.

So my question is, has any administrator that you know of, or yourself, really considered submitting one of those kinds of pieces for publication? And if not, why?

La'Shawn Rivera: Well, I just want to speak to the fact that we did do a press briefing with the *Spectator*, and that included people like myself, and Terry Martinez, and Michael Dunn, and Melissa

Rooker, and Dr. Samuel Seward, and Amy Zavadil. So it was a collaboration. It was about six of us who participated, and I think we spent close to two hours with the students who interviewed us, to answer questions, to really provide some educational background around these issues. So many of us had—that was a press briefing that we did, and then others have participated in individual interviews. So I do just want to acknowledge that we have been responding, and I think that might be something we want to consider, in providing—are you asking for like a written statement that’s coming from administrators?

Megan K.: Yes. I’m not so much focusing on a written statement. Interviews are great -- don’t get me wrong -- but, at the same time, having an op-ed, or a guest post or something that comes directly from an administrator, I think would add to the conversation more than a quote or a statement. And it doesn’t have to be official, but I think even a more informal thing, like an op-ed, kind of explaining where you guys are, what your thoughts are—what you said a lot at the beginning of this discussion. I just think that might be helpful, and it might be nice to hear directly from an administrator, and to be able to respond to that administrator’s words, in a public forum. That’s like just what I’m kind of suggesting.

Sharyn O’Halloran: Thank you for the suggestions—and thank you to the *Spectator* for the coverage. We appreciate it—in your official capacity. Okay. Next question.

Shiu-Lin Tsai: Hello. My name is Shiu-Lin. Hi. I’m on faculty, in the Pediatric Emergency Room at the Medical Center. I just wanted to introduce the emergency room as a resource, as well, for folks who have experienced assault, or any other violence. It is a crime. We have physicians who are specially trained sexual assault forensic examiners. We have psychiatrists, who are available 24/7, and we also

have social workers available at all times, to lend support. We also have access to domestic and other violence resources, who are volunteers, specially trained, who come to our emergency room at any time.

So I just wanted to provide that as a resource, to collaborate, as well, with the undergraduate campus, as well as the graduate campus. One of the comments from the medical campus was very disturbing. If there is some kind of educational endeavor, that the medical staff can try to collaborate and do as an outreach, for our community, we would be all for that, as well.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Thank you. I think that is a wonderful suggestion. And yes, given our expertise at the university, we should definitely pull it together under this. So thank you. Thank you very much.

Bianca Figueroa-Santana: Hi. My name is Bianca, and I'm actually here from the Law School. I have one question, and then I have what I hope will be a constructive comment. My first question is that when a lot of these articles came out online, many people in the Law School were really struck by the asymmetry between the sanctions at the school and what would be criminal sanctions. And, picking up on the previous comment, this behavior is criminal, and whether or not I'm expressing a normative statement about that --which I am not—I 'm just pointing out that I don't think there's enough emphasis in the dialogue about just educating people about what the criminal sanctions are for this behavior. Sometimes using words like "misconduct" takes away from the fact that this behavior is really not appropriate morally but also legally, and I think that that needs to be presented more obviously and more robustly.

So, is there a reason why that hasn't been done? And I understand—yes, this is not a legal proceeding. That's great—but I'm not asking for us to normatively say this is a crime. I'm asking, Why isn't the university using a resource like the Law School to say, "This is the law"? And when we're talking about issues of consent—the law does come into that, as well.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Thank you. That's, again, a wonderful suggestion, because we have medical expertise, we have legal expertise, and then we have very detailed practitioners. So, if you'd like to—

Michael K. Dunn: That's a great comment. I certainly don't want anyone to think we turn a blind eye to the legal or moral ramifications of the issues that we deal with here. When a student comes to us, when we have that first conversation about what the survivor experienced, what he or she might want to consider, moving forward, one of the options we talk about is going to the police. We want to leave that decision in the hands of the survivor. If someone does want to go to the police, we work closely with our colleagues in public safety. They'll take the survivor to the police station, stay with them, help them make sure they're getting the support they need. So we are fully supportive when students want to go to the police, and we talk to them about that as an option that they can move forward with.

Bianca Figueroa-Santana: Okay. I appreciate that, but I think my question is more specifically targeted at potential violators. When we're talking about deterrents and about education, when we're telling people, "This is wrong, it's not okay to do this when someone's not consenting," part of deterrence is knowing that your behavior is criminal. So I'm talking not about the victims or survivors or whatever you'd like to call them, but people who may not be aware that this behavior, that is ambiguous—for

example, being drunk when you perpetrate an assault—those ambiguous situations are not necessarily as ambiguous under the law, and that’s a way to clarify some of these issues of prevention.

La’Shawn Rivera: Can I just comment? What we do know (and I just want to take it back to research and what we do know about these issues) is that people who perpetrate these types of crimes or behaviors—even if they know the law, even when they participate in educational programs, they still commit these types of crimes. Because I just heard you say something around the lines of, “If they knew what the crime was, they wouldn’t perpetrate it.” That’s actually not true. And we actually have research to support that.

Bianca Figueroa-Santana: I don’t think that’s what I’m saying, respectfully. I don’t think that’s what I’m saying. I’m saying that there needs to be an emphasis on the fact that this behavior *is* criminal, and not just for the fact that it may not deter your right. That’s correct. The research does show that, as well as the legal and social research. However, there is something empowering, also, to victims, to know that you’re at least saying that this behavior is illegal. Not just immoral, or inappropriate on a college campus—it’s illegal.

Sharyn O’Halloran: Right. And these are acts that can have legal and criminal consequences, which *is* a deterrent. So. All right. Thank you. I think that is something that I would encourage being incorporated into the language, because it actually is very important for people to understand they’re taking part in criminal activity that can have criminal consequences, and it’s non-trivial. I think that that’s very important, to be very clear, in all of our dialogue, and I appreciate that point. Thank you.

Bianca Figueroa-Santana: I just have one other point. I just wanted to talk about what some other people have said about—the *Spectator* was talking about issuing a statement, and then someone else mentioned emails, including information about sexual violence—I just wanted to emphasize that that’s really important. I understand that sometimes students don’t read emails in their entirety, or we delete them (I mean I certainly do), but you are in a position of power, and just sending out that message consistently, whether or not people read it, does matter to the people who do, and that that shouldn’t be taken for granted.

Sharyn O’Halloran: Thank you.

Edward Leonard: My name is Edward Leonard. I’m a professor in the Engineering School. I feel a little bit like a tired salmon swimming up a very fast-moving river here. Because I have some contrary stuff to say, and yet, in truth, I’m totally with you on your overall objective to minimize the occurrence of sexual violence and inappropriate behavior.

However, in every advocacy, and every situation where somebody wants to change something that exists, there is the possibility of going too far. There is the possibility of hurting bystanders. We can go all the way back to the time of Senator McCarthy, in the early ’60s, I guess it was, when, in his passionate desire to see that Communism would not run rampant in the United States, he spoiled a lot of people. The issues were pretty clear in the time. The techniques were criticized but not really suppressed.

Let me tell you my story quickly. We're overtime, and I'll make that overtime as short as I can. Last fall I taught a technical course in the Engineering School, with 52 graduate students, mostly all graduate students. At the end of it, there were entries made in CourseWorks. Some of them were not so pleasing to me because of the technical presentations, but two stood out and were reported by my chair. Actually, one stood out, and was augmented somewhere along the line in the Equal Opportunity Office. It said, "Leonard's sexual references are inappropriate for the classroom." The other one said, "Moreover, please be fair to all students. I noticed that you treated students of different race and gender differently. This is especially reflected in your attitude toward students of the minority."

Fortunately, the entire course was filmed, and the films—because we use something called the Columbia Video Network to distribute course material—I made the films available to the Equal Opportunity Office. In the course of time (it's important to me that you understand "in the course of time") they reviewed them. In fact, Mr. Dunn was very much involved in it, and very gracious to me in the way that he behaved. Some weeks later I got a notice from the office that everything was okay; they could find nothing wrong. (He can paraphrase it in any way he wants, but I felt vindicated.)

However, on January 21, at 10:30 in the morning, I received an email from a vice dean saying, "Leonard, you are excused from teaching for the school semester." That meant I could not teach for the school semester, or until a determination was made by the EOAA Office.

Now that had the effect of destroying a course, because I had a large group of students who had registered for the course. They had to be told that the course was not going to be given. They re-registered, and I'm now teaching five people in a course that was intended for many more students. I

think the fact that I was told in that way, moments before, that I had no understanding that there was any investigation that was underway, and that, in fact, none of this occurred, is an overstepping of what should be done in resolving these matters. The investigation, the determination that I did or did not offend, I think is, without question, something that should be done. An allegation was made (although in a very weak way, in the sense that the allegator was not known, and could not be traced, to find out what the allegation was about), and so on. But this really destroyed, I think, academic freedom and the right of a professor to teach. There could be, in my opinion, no harm done. I'm a well-known person on the campus. I don't suppose everybody loves me, but I've been here for more than the age of almost everybody in the room--56 years, in fact, teaching—and I have an okay record. That could have been checked out. The allegation was reported to the EOAA Office more than a week in advance of the time that I was informed, and I was informed, literally, a few hours before teaching.

I think that's wrong. I think that while we *must* do all we can to nip these problems in the bud—and I agree, for example, that it's important to us not only to catch the crimes when they're committed, but to alter the environment in which the crimes can even be conceived of—and I think it's all important, but I think they went too far.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Okay. Well, thank you. Thank you very much. We appreciate that perspective as well.

Zoe Ridolfi-Starr: I actually have a direct response to that, really quickly, before we move on. Thanks.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Some of the panelists would also—

Zoe Ridolfi-Starr: Okay. I'm going to go first, if that's all right. Thanks.

Michael K. Dunn: Can I speak first, please?

Sharyn O'Halloran: Yes.

Michael K. Dunn: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. Thank you for sharing that information. I think that although I can't speak to specific cases, all I can say, in a more general sense, is that we do take allegations very seriously, and when interim actions are put into place, they're done for the safety and well-being of students and other members of the community.

Marc Heinrich: I just want to say, Professor, thank you for sharing that perspective. I don't want to speak for every student involved, and I'm obviously not going to speak to a case unless I have knowledge of it, but I think everyone is pushing for a more equitable and transparent process. So I think that just as some of the concerns you have on both sides, that we need to make sure that everyone is treated fairly. All the students I've been working with—and administrators—have been working to make sure that everyone going through this process, both complainant and respondent, has access to information, knows what the policies are, and understands, if some type of sanctions are levied, why that was so. So I appreciate the feedback. We need to make sure all of our responses are measured, and I think everyone has been working toward that, but I also think it's great that this conversation is happening, so we can make sure we're addressing all these concerns.

Terry Martinez: I think they were both addressed. We take these allegations seriously. I don't know of your particular case. We take interim measures, to make sure that both parties are safe.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Thank you. Now, please.

Zoe Ridolfi-Starr: Firstly, I would just like to suggest that you take those concerns seriously, whether you feel they were true or not. If you made another person feel unsafe or disrespected, I would encourage you, as a human being, to take that to heart, to take it seriously, and reflect on what that means for that other person. Whether or not you feel that it should have been perceived that way, it sounds like it was. But, more importantly to the context of this discussion, I'd like to reiterate what Marc said—that nobody is advocating for an unjust system; we are advocating for a more robust, more transparent set of policies, to help people on both sides of these questions seek justice and healing and safety on campus. That's the real issue here.

Statistically speaking, serial rape or issues of sexual misconduct, violence, harassment, are far more common than false reports of sexual violence or misconduct. So I think it's important that we continue pushing for robust, transparent policies that reflect that reality.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Okay. Thank you. Did you have a question? Thank you, sir.

Jeenie Yoon: I'm not going to respond, because I don't think that this is the place to be doing that. However, I do appreciate your sharing your experience, and I do agree that it shouldn't have been done

six hours before your class. But I also agree that if someone has felt minimized by you, that you should take that seriously.

My comment is actually to the Senate, in just letting you guys know that I know—think—some of us have been a little hard on you, myself included. But I think that you should take that as a sign that you're doing something right, you're stirring the water, and I don't know of any other school that's doing anything like this so actively. So I just want to thank you guys for letting us have a voice, and letting us come here and voice our opinions and our concerns.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Thank you. I appreciate that. This will be our final question.

Shiu-Lin Tsai: I actually don't have a question, but after my comments I've been encouraged and nudged a few times by my neighbors to say that the service at the Medical Center, at any emergency room, at any hospital, is private, is confidential. There is no repercussion for coming to us for help, for any kind of services that you may want to report or not report. So we are there to serve, and we're nonjudgmental. All right? Thank you.

Sharyn O'Halloran: Thank you very much. Thank you for the suggestions on all those resources.

Again, thank you so much to everyone for being here, to our panelists. We really appreciate your comments and questions, and please do reach out to the panelists if you have concerns, if you have questions, if you have suggestions, and we continue this as an ongoing dialogue. Thank you, again.