

Sexual harassment in academia: what now?

Geoff Marcy's Downfall

How the astronomer's case signals a new era of activism against sexual harassment

By Robin Wilson FEBRUARY 21, 2016

"I Am Student X": how graduate students are seizing their #MeToo moment
Some say universities haven't had the same reckoning around sexual harassment or media. Students and faculty are trying to change that.

By Anna North Jan 17, 2018, 1:

It's not just actresses who are wearing black.

On Friday, graduate students and other attendees at the annual Society for Social Work and Research conference in Washington, DC, wore black to show support for survivors of sexual harassment in their field and beyond. Their campaign, called I Am Student X, was inspired by a lawsuit filed by Karissa Fenwick, a doctoral student in social work at USC, who says her then-advisor made an unwanted advance toward her at the same conference last year, then threatened that if she told anyone, "it would ruin both of our careers." He denies any misconduct. In recent months, many graduate students and faculty members have joined the chorus of people speaking up about their experiences with sexual harassment and assault. But some say that because of the culture and structure of academia, those accused are not yet facing the same consequences as powerful people in other industries. Now, students and faculty are demanding their professional communities take the issue of sexual misconduct seriously, much as women in Hollywood have begun to do.

He is a professor and you are just an associate.
Part one of a series on sexual harassment in the academic world

Nieuws | door Ingeborg van der Ven
21 december 2017 | "Women are supposedly not able to reach the academic top because they lack ambition or want to have children. However, we are afraid to openly discuss the existing culture of intimidation in the academic world." A professor points out a missing conversation in academia. This is a reason for female academics to share their story of sexual harassment with

Sexual harassment entrenched in academia, says physicist

By Bridie Smith and Henrietta Cook

Updated 13 October 2015 - 9:28pm first published at 3:15pm

Sexual harassment in academia is so entrenched that on multiple occasions Melbourne University physicist Katie Mack has warned students to avoid known perpetrators before they attended conferences, applied for graduate positions or visited departments.

Yale's Renowned Global Justice Professor Is Accused Of Sexual Harassment

COLLEGE
21/06/2016 6:26 AM AEST

169 Philosophers Condemn One Of Their Own Accused Of Sexual Harassment

Thomas Pogge's peers deplored his "harmful actions toward women."

I Worked With Avital Ronell. I Believe Her Accuser
Chu, Andrea Long, Chronicle of Higher Education, 00095982, 9/7/2018, Vol. 65, Issue 1

When genuine criticism is undertaken at the risk of ostracism, marginalization, retribution -- this is a culture where abuses like hers grow. The humanities are ablaze. This month The New York Times reported that the Title IX office had found Avital Ronell, a professor of German and comparative literature at New York University and a superstar in literary studies, responsible for sexually harassing a former student, Nimrod Reitman, now a visiting fellow at Harvard. A lawsuit filed by Reitman fills in the details. Leading feminist and queer scholars like Judith Butler, Lisa Duggan, and Jack Halberstam have defended her -- or at least deflected criticism.

Sexual harassment is rife in the sciences, finds landmark US study

Existing policies to address the issue are ineffective, concludes a long-awaited report from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.

Alexandra Witze

Sexual harassment is pervasive throughout academic science in the United States, driving talented researchers out of the field and harming others' careers, finds a report from the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in Washington DC. The analysis concludes that policies to fight the problem are ineffective because they are set up to protect institutions, not victims -- and that universities, funding agencies, scientific societies and other organizations must take stronger action

Faculty and Staff Sexual Misconduct A Conference Report Suzanne Egan PhD

Sexual harassment entrenched in academia, says physicist

By Bridie Smith and Henrietta Cook

Updated 13 October 2015 - 9:28pm first published at 3:15pm

Sexual harassment in academia is so entrenched that on multiple occasions Melbourne University physicist Katie Mack has warned students to avoid known perpetrators before they attended conferences, applied for graduate positions or visited departments.

Yale's Renowned Global Justice Professor Is Accused Of Sexual Harassment

A former Yale student has struggled for years to get the government to investigate her claims that a professor harassed her and that the school mishandled the case.

By Tyler Kingkade

Harassment Allegations Against a Star Scholar Put a Familiar Spotlight Back on Berkeley

#MeTooSociology

Geoff Marcy's Downfall
How the astronomer's case signals a new era of activism against sexual harassment

By Robin Wilson
"I Am Student X": how graduate students are seizing their #MeToo moment
Some say universities haven't had the same reckoning around sexual harassment or media. Students and faculty are trying to change that.

It's not just actresses who are wearing black.

On Friday, graduate students and other attendees at the annual Society for Social Work and Research conference in Washington, DC, wore black to show support for survivors of sexual harassment in their field and beyond. Their campaign, called I Am Student X, was inspired by a lawsuit filed by Karissa Fenwick, a doctoral student in social work at USC, who says her then-advisor made an unwanted advance toward her at the same conference last year, then threatened that if she told anyone, "it would ruin both of our careers." He denies any misconduct. In recent months, many graduate students and faculty members have joined the chorus of people speaking up about their experiences with sexual harassment and assault. But some say that because of the culture and structure of academia, those accused are not yet facing the same consequences as powerful people in other industries. Now, students and faculty are demanding their professional communities take the issue of sexual misconduct seriously, much as women in Hollywood have begun to do.

He is a professor and you are just an associate.
Part one of a series on sexual harassment in the academic world

Nieuws | door Ingeborg van der Ven
21 december 2017 | "Women are supposedly not able to reach the academic top because they lack ambition or want to have children. However, we are afraid to openly discuss the existing culture of intimidation in the academic world." A professor points out a missing conversation in academia. This is a reason for female academics to share their story of sexual harassment with ScienceGuide.

COLLEGE
21/06/2016 6:26 AM AEST

169 Philosophers Condemn One Of Their Own Accused Of Sexual Harassment

Thomas Pogge's peers deplored his "harmful actions toward women."

When genuine criticism is undertaken at the risk of ostracism, marginalization, retribution -- this is a culture where abuses like hers grow. The humanities are ablaze. This month The New York Times reported that the Title IX office had found Avital Ronell, a professor of German and comparative literature at New York University and a superstar in literary studies, responsible for sexually harassing a former student, Nimrod Reitman, now a visiting fellow at Harvard. A lawsuit filed by Reitman fills in the details. Leading feminist and queer scholars like Judith Butler, Lisa Duggan, and Jack Halberstam have defended her -- or at least deflected criticism.

Sexual harassment is rife in the sciences, finds landmark US study

Existing policies to address the issue are ineffective, concludes a long-awaited report from the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine.

Alexandra Witze

Sexual harassment is pervasive throughout academic science in the United States, driving talented researchers out of the field and harming others' careers, finds a report from the US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine in Washington DC. The analysis concludes that policies to fight the problem are ineffective because they are set up to protect institutions, not victims -- and that universities, funding agencies, scientific societies and other organizations must take stronger action

Faculty and Staff Sexual Misconduct Conference: Sharing knowledge and formulating solutions to address power based faculty and staff sexual misconduct. Wisconsin, USA, June 30 – July 2 2019

As part of my research at Rape and Domestic Violence Services Australia, I was fortunate to be able to travel to the USA to participate in the first international conference on academic sexual misconduct, which was held over three days at the University of Madison, Wisconsin. Organised by a dedicated committee of academic activists from the UK¹ and USA and funded by a grant from the (USA) National Science Foundation, the conference brought together academics, activists, survivors, students, lawyers and representatives from NGO's drawn from countries across the Global South and Global North. As noted in the Australian Women and Gender Studies Association (AWGSA) report, *Feminist Responses to Change the Course* (Egan 2018) one of the glaring omissions in Australian universities responses to sexual harassment and sexual violence has been the lack of any sustained attention to the problem of academic sexual misconduct. To date the framing of sexual violence on campus has been that it is a problem of the student – and more specifically undergraduate student - population. Therefore, I especially welcomed the opportunity to find out what was happening in other parts of the world and to connect with others particularly given that my role at Rape and Domestic Violence Services Australia focused primarily on developing a sexual violence prevention programme targeting academics.

The organising committee (Anna Bull, Maddy Coy, Julie Libarkin, Heidi Lockwood and Tiffany Page) were clear from the outset that their aim was to organise a conference that was quite different from the type of academic conference with which many of us would be familiar. They were, they said, aiming to create a forum that was about collaboration, sharing knowledge and learning from each other. And they succeeded! It was one of the most genuinely participatory, supportive, exciting (despite the subject) and collaborative experiences I have been part of for a long time. I learnt an enormous amount, gained access to some great resources and networks and came away feeling that people had been genuinely interested in what I had to say. It really was an example of academia at its best.

¹ The UK based committee members form part of the 1752 Group - a research and lobby organisation working to end sexual misconduct in higher education (<https://1752group.com/>)

Perhaps not surprisingly there were many themes in common running through the workshops and discussions, the silencing of victims and the lack of accountability, transparency and fairness of university complaints processes. The ways in which ‘collegial’ relationships often enable and support abuses of power and the pernicious effects that come with being ‘done over’ by (one of) your own – whether they be an admired professor or supervisor, a member of one’s discipline or the colleague who has built their career on issues of social injustice. The time, labour (intellectual, physical and emotional) that goes into responding to and working to prevent this abuse, often by those most precariously positioned – and consequently with the least power and resources.

There were also differences. For example, the issue seems to have generated considerably more media reportage in the USA – even if in the form of the ‘scandal’ genre of journalism involving high profile academics - than it has in Australia. Perhaps this is in part a consequence of our defamation laws? I don’t really know. Grassroots based responses seem to be more usual in some places than in others. For example in some parts of India activists have compiled resources – lists of lawyers, counselors and others who can assist victims- whereas in Australia current interventions (at least for student sexual misconduct) appear to be primarily (although not totally) institution based, driven by the changes universities were required to make after Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC) report. An important distinction I am making here is between grassroots activism to force political or institutional response to an issue and grass roots coalitions that take on the work of providing support, assistance and resources to survivors. In Australia there has been, and continues to be, considerable activism in Australia not the last of which was the campaigns over many years by student organisations that led to the AHRC research.

Although there is not space to do justice to the breadth of the workshop, panels and many informal discussions I would like to briefly name a few of the highlights for me. These included the team of interdisciplinary academics who, cognisant of the limits of administrative interventions, were working to embed sexual harassment and sexual assault prevention through the academic curriculum. The adjunct professor lobbying university administration to have work produced as a consequence of their activist and advocacy work recognised as a legitimate part of and counting towards research ‘outputs’. The great work done by some of the USA based professional and ally organisations. The trail blazing doctoral students taking on their university in a class action and the New Zealand lawyer doing brilliant work on employment based sexual harassment. Finally the first keynote speaker who really set the tone for the conference, suggesting in their opening remarks that

when it came to preventing academic sexual misconduct, taking the high moral ground, dividing the problem into ‘us and them’, while perhaps comforting was insufficient to the task.. It wasn’t they continued, with a nod to behavioral ethics, simply a matter of targeting a few ‘bad apples’ through legal recourse but rather of targeting the ‘barrel’; the collegial, departmental, faculty, disciplinary and institutional cultures and environments that enable sexual harassment, violence and power abuse to flourish. For readers who may be interested I have included a link to the conference programme <https://facultysexualmisconduct.files.wordpress.com/2019/06/faculty-and-staff-sexual-misconduct-conference-program.pdf> because in the remainder of this report, I want to spend some time reflecting on what made the conference a success.

Firstly, perhaps because we had gathered to address a common problem, one that in some way affects us all (whether as victims and survivors, as bystanders, or through the impoverishing moral and intellectual effects of what is often euphemistically referred to in the literature as the ‘leaky’ academic pipeline) there was little of the – sometimes - requisite academic performativity or ego. It was for example one of the few conferences where it was not immediately apparent to me who the ‘important people’ were. Nor could I ‘pick’ peoples disciplinary or professional backgrounds. Often it was well into a conversation before I came to know the person I was speaking to was a geoscientist, philosopher or a lawyer, an undergraduate student a professor or a head of department.

Secondly, the goals of knowledge exchange and collaboration were embedded in the conference structures and processes from the outset. For example, rather than abstract submission followed by registration there was an application process that included questions such as what themes and issues we would like to see addressed, what types of knowledge we would bring to the conference and how we expected to disseminate our learnings if selected to attend. These responses were used to decide on the specific issues the conference would address, with participants given the opportunity via a questionnaire to express an interest in working collaboratively in pairs or as part of a small group to put together a workshop or panel. The decision to keep the conference small (maximum of a 100) no doubt helped to make this approach feasible but it still must have meant a lot of work for the committee members. That is aside from the flurry of email correspondence generated by those of us (which was most of us) unfamiliar with this type of collaborative conference process. In addition, the funding made available to meet the costs of travel and accommodation for those who would be otherwise unable to attend increased the diversity of the participants and contributed to a richer and fuller sharing of knowledge and understanding of the breadth and scale of the issue. Importantly, as

the stress was on participation rather than ‘presentation’ funding was open to all, on a needs basis rather, than only to workshop facilitators or panel members. And, as an aside, for both environmental and budgetary reasons there were minimal conference accessories (no conference bags, printed programmes, pens, notepads, promotional leaflets and the like) which was actually a nice change and we did seem to cope just fine with bringing our own. Even the lanyards and nametags were on loan from someone’s university department!

Finally, the conference Code of Conduct a ‘crowd-sourced’ document that aimed to promote an environment intolerant of sexual harassment, bullying or any form of exclusion. The fact that participants were given the opportunity to recommend changes and additions to the Code brought both a sense of ‘ownership’ over and added a discernable depth to the document. In some ways code of conduct, which can have bureaucratic overtones of ‘box ticking’ or paying ‘lip service’ to a problem does not really do it justice. To me it reads more as a document that lays out a particular ethos, a set of values if you like but written in plain English and accompanied by sufficient details and examples of what these look like in practice that there is little room for obfuscation about the expected standards of behaviour. For example in order to ensure workshops were accessible, we were alerted that everyone would be required to use a microphone no matter how small the room or how well we may have been told our voice projects. The links to further information about concepts such as gas lighting, institutional betrayal and implicit bias and to information about accessible presentations and communicating using interpreters were similarly useful. The ‘plain English’ style meant there was little room for misinterpretation. An example from the social media section. ‘Do not photograph, video or audio record anyone without their express permission. This means asking everyone involved before taking photographs’ (p.1).

Given the sensitive nature of the issue under discussion, trauma counsellors were available as was a quiet room and a trained mediator. Finally, in recognition of the frequency with which alcohol is used to enable sexual violence in professional/social gatherings such as conferences (when I worked as a sexual assault counsellor, for example, alcohol was the most commonly used substance in cases of ‘drug assisted sexual assault’) the conference was an alcohol free event. Finally the accompanying Concerns Process document contained clear instructions about who and how to contact as well as the process involved, if we had any concerns about or had been subject to unacceptable behavior. For anyone who may be interested I have attached both the Code of Conduct (Appendix 1) and the Concerns Process document (Appendix 2).

On my return I thought that one the really practical ways I could ‘disseminate’ my learnings from the conference was to use my membership on the Australian Women and Gender Studies Executive Committee to suggest that we consider implementing a ‘crowd sourced’ Code of Conduct. While not really surprising, I am never the less pleased to say that the committee has been overwhelmingly in favour of the idea. Indeed the decision has been to formalise the undertaking into a project and to approach it an opportunity to garner input from the membership on their views about, experiences with and ideas for essential content for a code of conduct. This project represents phase two of AWGSA’s response to sexual harassment and sexual assault in Australian universities; leading on from our initial work in articulating and documenting a feminist and trauma informed complaints process (*Feminist Responses to Change the Course 2018* <https://awgsa.org.au/news-cfp/>)

Suzanne Egan
Secretary
Australian Women and Gender Studies Association
02.10.2019

FASSM: The International Faculty and Staff Sexual Misconduct Conference

CODE OF CONDUCT

The organizers are committed to making this meeting productive, enjoyable, and safer for everyone, regardless of sex or gender and affirming participants of all gender identities and expressions, sexual orientations, disabilities, physical appearances, body sizes, races, nationalities, religions/beliefs and other identity statuses. Registration at the conference indicates that you are willing to abide by this Code of Conduct.

This conference will be bringing together participants from different backgrounds, with different worldviews, political orientations, religions, and other characteristics. The general principle behind this Code of Conduct is therefore to create an environment where a range of views can be accommodated, even if this means we hear views that we do not agree with. The organizing committee will be on hand, with the support of specialist counseling services, to support people to cope with issues that may come up during the conference.

A. Inclusivity

- Sexual misconduct, harassment and violence will not be tolerated. Sexual misconduct can include harassment, assault, grooming, coercion, bullying, sexual invitations and demands, comments, non-verbal communication, creation of atmospheres of discomfort, and promised resources in exchange for sexual access. This might manifest as (but is not limited to): sexually intimidating behavior and language, unwelcome jokes or comments, unwanted touching or attention, showing or sharing sexualized images, photography without permission, and stalking. See '[About Sexual Misconduct](#)' by The 1752 Group for additional descriptions.
 - About Sexual Misconduct <https://1752group.com/about-sexual-misconduct/>
- The conference has a no tolerance policy for language, discrimination, or harassment/bullying based on sexism, racism, biphobia, queerphobia, homophobia, transphobia, audism, and ableism. See the section on 'raising issues' below for further information about what no tolerance means and how such comments will be addressed.
- Please do not comment on others' gender, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance, body size, race, religion, or other social identities or characteristics.
- Any time you plan to describe a specific experience of sexual harassment or trauma, especially when you will describe details of the specific harms inflicted, please provide trigger warnings or ask for permission to share, and do not assume that other attendees are equipped to handle the burden of secondary trauma that can come from bearing witness to harm.
- Please make sure you are acquainted with some of the challenges that survivors of faculty and staff sexual misconduct in higher education experience. The terms "gaslighting," "DARVO," and "institutional betrayal" are examples of commonly used concepts. For more information, please see Jennifer Freyd's research on [DARVO](#) and [institutional betrayal](#), and Robin Stern's work on [gaslighting](#). Please also feel free to send additional suggestions for background reading to the conference committee.
 - DARVO: <https://dynamic.uoregon.edu/jjf/defineDARVO.html>
 - Institutional Betrayal: <https://dynamic.uoregon.edu/jjf/institutionalbetrayal/>
 - Gaslighting: <https://www.jwi.org/articles/getting-past-gaslighting>



- We would request that prior to attending the conference, attendees avail themselves of the following resources. These resources provide guidance on approaches that can facilitate inclusive and respectful communication:
 - Implicit Bias: <http://kirwaninstitute.osu.edu/implicit-bias-training/>
 - Intersectionality & Sexual Harassment of Women Students of Color - Nancy Chi Cantalupo: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3168909
 - Good and Mad by Rebecca Traister (especially Part III: Season of the Witch). <http://www.rebeccatraister.com/>
 - GLAAD Tips for Allies of Transgender People: <https://www.glaad.org/transgender/allies>
 - Harris, J. C., & Linder, C. (2017). *Intersections of Identity and Sexual Violence on Campus. Centering Minoritized Students' Experiences*. Virginia: Stylus Publishing.

- Inclusivity requires accessibility. We ask that all participants consider methods that can be used to ensure universal access to communication:
 - Use the microphones provided when you speak, even if you think or have been told that your voice is “loud enough to hear”.
 - Where sign language interpreters are working, make sure they are able to hear you, especially when speaking with others during non-conference times and where microphones may not be available.
 - Follow universal design as much as possible in creating visuals and handouts. Principles of universal design can be found here. We recommend the “perception” principles, but also encourage exploration of all of the principles that can facilitate accessible communication: <http://udlguidelines.cast.org/representation/perception>

B. Communication and interactions

- Many of us are accustomed to attending academic conferences where we engage in debate and intellectual sparring. This conference is different. We are aiming for a truly transnational collaboration, where voices and ideas that are not always expressed or heard are explicitly supported. Remember that what is considered polite and respectful may differ across cultures and err on the side of being supportive when in doubt. Do not, for example, raise your voice; keep comments constructive; be positive as often as possible. Recognize as well that different cultures exhibit positivity and constructiveness differently.
- All communication should be appropriate for an international audience including sexual assault survivors and people of many different backgrounds.
- The following are our expectations for communication and interactions with other attendees:
 - There may be times when you need to challenge what another conference participant is saying. In this case please be sure to phrase your remarks so that it is clear that you are challenging the view, not the person. You might, for example, say “If I have understood the idea correctly, the suggestion is this... And one of the questions/worries about that position might be this...” instead of saying, “You’re wrong” or using phrases that signify personal rejection. Many



participants are talking about issues that are deeply personal, and may be tentatively proposing these ideas for the first time. It is important that we not shut each other down, and that we view the conference as an opportunity to collaborate rather than to critique.

- Be active listeners. This means a) paying attention to both words and body language to try to fully understand meaning; b) paraphrasing a speaker's words to reflect that listening has occurred and before expressing your own opinion. Active listening can help reduce conflict even where parties disagree.
 - Recognize that differences in opinion will occur and treat those differences of opinion as legitimate outcomes of different lived experiences. This includes using active listening and being willing to disagree.
 - Remember that we are an international group, and that there will be varying norms and assumptions that may be associated with both conduct and the words we use to describe that conduct. So, for example, words such as 'civility' and 'politeness' and 'respect' have very different connotations. For some, civility means claiming and caring for one's own identity, needs, and beliefs without degrading others' identities in the process. For others, 'civility' is a word with gendered and racial overtones that has been used to criticize the savage versus the civilized behavior of activists at sit-ins and other protests. Before you ask others to show respect, be polite, or be civil, pause and think about what that might mean in a transnational context, and whether the attempt to mute the protest, anger, or other expression of emotion is a form of gendered and/or racialized/white supremacist/colonialist silencing.
 - Ask for permission before sharing personal experiences around sexual misconduct and violence. This includes respecting an individual's wish not to share or be asked to listen to specific details.
 - Avoid barriers to communication, including name calling and shouting.
- If you feel that communication or interaction has been problematic in a particular section or context, please follow the instructions under 'raising concerns' below.

C. Being in a space with other survivors

- Please be aware that there is no requirement to share your experiences of sexual or gender violence, nor are you required to listen as others share. We hope you will be and feel safe in sitting within this space in whatever way is most comfortable for you.
- If you do wish to share your experience of sexual or gender violence, or other experiences of oppression, with other attendees, please get consent first. Consent can be an explicit question, or an introductory signal in your language that you will be talking about violence/harassment such as "As a survivor" or "When I was going through my experience" or "When I experienced". Be aware that hearing about others' experiences may be triggering or difficult for others. If you are the listener in this scenario, asking someone to stop might sound like "I'm not comfortable/in the right space/ready right now" to hear this. The conference is a space where we aspire to affirm our experiences of misconduct and identities as survivors, while also recognizing the emotional toll of discussing and hearing about violence and harassment.
- There will be trained counseling support available throughout the conference and we encourage you to draw on this support.



- If you find yourself in a position where you are hearing another's experience and you are finding this difficult, please feel free to 1) alert them to the availability of counseling services, 2) draw on the services of the counseling services yourself, and/or 3) alert one of the organizing committee if you have concerns.

D. Self-care

- Resources will be available during the conference as well as a counselor in a dedicated quiet space to support people's attendance.
- We would encourage you to take time out from the formal conference sessions whenever you need to. You can also leave sessions at any time without explanation.

E. Photographing, videoing, and audio recording policy

Taking and sharing photographs or videos, especially on social media, can be an important way to build community and engage our networks on the issues we will discuss at the conference. However, not everyone is comfortable with having their photographs taken or shared. With this in mind, we ask that you:

- Do not photograph, video or audio record anyone without their express permission. This means asking everyone involved before taking photographs.
- Ask before posting photographs or videos that include others on social media.
- Please respect responses if people are uncomfortable or refuse to be photographed, recorded, or have images posted on social media. Many of us will have experienced violations of our autonomy and/or privacy.

We will make announcements about photographing or videoing keynote or panel speakers, based on their preferences, at the start of these sessions.

F. Social media policy

- There may be highly sensitive information being shared during this conference.
 - Facilitators of each workshop will designate whether it is a no-sharing session. This means no sharing, including on social media via tweeting, etc.
 - Participants should be aware that the conference is not a confidential space, and therefore should be aware that there is a risk that material may be shared on social media despite agreements.
- The policy above for respectful speech also applies to tweets and social media posts and engagement about the conference.

G. Raising concerns

- Our aim is that all participants are empowered to raise concerns with other participants during the conference if they feel that this code of conduct is not being followed. However, we are aware that power and status are relational, and that depending on our own positionality, it may not feel possible to voice concerns. There is no expectation that participants will do raise concerns if they would rather not.
- If you are concerned about any behavior that is inconsistent with this code of conduct, please know that if you alert a member of the organizing committee - our names are below, and we will also introduce ourselves at the start of the conference - **we will hear and take seriously your concerns**. You can also send a text to 'Code of Conduct' in the subject line.



- Any participants asked to stop any behavior inconsistent with this code of conduct are expected to comply, and support will be offered if needed.

If you notice any further ways in which the conference could be made more inclusive, please use one of the following mechanisms: 1) raise ideas or concerns in person with one of the organizing committee; 2) email facultysexualmisconduct@gmail.com with the phrase 'Code of Conduct' in the subject line; 3) send a message through WhatsApp to FASSM Conference. You can download the free WhatsApp application to your phone.

H. Workshops

Written guidelines on holding the space will be provided at each workshop session, and a facilitator will be present at each workshop session

I. Sharing Space and Poster Session

There will be a dedicated session during the conference for participants to promote and disseminate materials about your current campaigns and ongoing work. **We are requesting participants to disseminate materials during this session only**, and not to do so outside of this dedicated space. More details about the Sharing Space and Poster Session will be provided closer to the conference.

J. Organizing committee (alphabetical)

Anna Bull
Maddy Coy
Julie Libarkin
Heidi Lockwood
Tiffany Page



CONCERNS PROCESS

Raising Concerns: What You Can Expect

As the organizing committee of The International Faculty and Staff Sexual Misconduct Conference, we are committed to creating and holding a space that is affirming and welcoming for everyone that attends. The Code of Conduct sets out expectations for ensuring that the conference is as inclusive and accessible as possible. We recognize, however, that there can be a gap between intention and outcome, and that the charged subjects we will discuss at this specific conference might result in tensions. We cannot guarantee a fully safe space within a conference space but we have put in place mechanisms to create a constructive space for dialogue during the conference. This is a living document; we are in ongoing discussions about it which we plan to continue during the conference.

If you are concerned about any behavior, before or during the conference, that is inconsistent with the code of conduct, there are multiple ways you can alert us:

-
- raise ideas or concerns in person with one of the organizing committee;
- email facultysexualmisconduct@gmail.com with the phrase 'Code of Conduct' in the subject line;
- **send a message through WhatsApp to "FASSM Conference"**

A. Philosophy

We view this as an opportunity to model practice to be followed when concerns are raised. Our approach to addressing and resolving concerns will be based on the following principles:

2. We will hear and take seriously your concerns

We will find a private space to talk with you. The organizing committee will discuss any concerns with each other and will determine mediator involvement, unless you specifically request that we do not. We will keep our concerns confidential within the committee, and not share anything you tell us outside of the committee without your permission.

3. We trust that you know best what you need

The starting point will be what you want and need to happen. We strive not to be power holders at the conference, and to collaborate with you over what action (if any) you would like to see. Our goal is to avoid putting responsibility on you for resolving the situation. We aim to enable you to enjoy and participate in the conference by exploring with you what could change to make this possible.

4. As much as possible, you will be supported to participate in the conference

We know the emotional and practical costs of raising concerns can be significant. Raising a concern does not and will not affect your valued position as a participant. Simply having a concern raised against them will also not affect a person's valued position as a participant.

5. Sometimes independent intervention is helpful

We have identified a neutral party who can offer mediation for this conference, either involving you directly or acting as your liaison. Mediation can offer restorative justice; at the same time mediation may not always be appropriate. We will explore these options with you.

6. We reserve the right to revoke our invitation to attend at any time

The primary aim of this conference is to ensure constructive dialogue and knowledge-sharing between attendees. If we become aware of any evidence that participants are violating our code of conduct we will take the steps outlined below to assess the evidence and find a way forward.

B. Practical Steps

When we receive a complaint the organising committee will follow these steps:

1. Discuss with the complainant what outcome they would like. If the outcome the complainant wants does not affect other attendees' right to attend and is possible for the organising committee to accommodate immediately (for example, providing support to attend the conference), then this will be implemented.
2. If the outcome the complainant wishes for relies on adjudication of evidence, the organizing committee will ask for evidence from the complainant.
3. Members of an independent mediation team will review the evidence and make a decision as to whether the code of conduct has been violated. If this is the case, the decision is made whether to suggest mediation or whether to withdraw the invitation to attend. This decision depends in part on the wishes of the complainant, and in part on the nature of the evidence that we have received.
4. If the complainant is willing to participate in mediation as a way forward and the nature of the complaint is such that it does not put other conference attendees at risk, the organizing committee will first ask the complainant and subject of the complaint whether they are willing to enter into this process. If they agree, then the mediator (who is not on the organizing committee and will have no knowledge of the complaint) will contact them and meet or talk with each of them separately and if possible agree upon a way forward.
5. If it appears that other attendees to the conference will be likely to be effectively excluded by allowing another attendee to participate, then the organising committee will balance the right to attend of the complainant(s) with the right to attend of those against whom concerns are being raised. In these situations, if we have evidence that (an) attendee/s has violated the code of conduct, then the decision to withdraw their invitation might be made in order to make sure that others are not excluded.
 1. If the evidence is inconclusive or requires corroboration, we will approach the complainant and ask for their permission to share the evidence with the subject of the complaint in order to test the evidence. If this is granted, the evidence will be shared with the subject of the complaint who will then have the opportunity to respond. If this

is not granted, then options for ways forward will be discussed with the complainant, including mediation, no-contact agreements, or other options as suggested by the complainant.

2. This decision will be communicated in writing to the complainant and the subject of the complaint. The subject of the complaint has the right to know the grounds on which this decision is made, which may involve seeing the evidence for the complaint; the respondent needs to have enough information to be able to respond to the complaint. A balance will be made between protecting complainants and allowing the subject of the complaint to respond.

SHARE THIS:

<https://facultysexualmisconduct.com/concerns-process/>