

March 11, 2016

DIP Meeting on Sexual Harassment Policy

Title IX office has little actual power. They decide whether or not to investigate and then hand the outcome of the investigation over to the university and it is up to the university how to act on this.

During Title IX investigation, both parties may have equal representation; however, if after the investigation there is a disciplinary hearing, only the accused faculty has a right to counsel, but the witness does not. This is in the faculty code of conduct. The sexual harassment policy sounds nice, but does not include anything that happens after the investigation, such as this issue that only the defendant may have counsel.

Faculty code of conduct was not changed as a result of new sexual harassment policy, so rule about faculty having counsel makes sense for other more generic cases, but should be edited with relation to the new policy.

Policy is generally very vague. The buck gets passed to the little guy, aka grad students. It seems like it was just written to protect the school, not potential victims.

We should decide if we have an opinion about this and what we can do about it.

Union is protesting this at the regents meeting in San Francisco, but what can we do at the department level? Physics department has signed a letter to fire Katehi in the past, so maybe we can get the department to back this too. Empowering Women in STEM, Sisters of Science, Women in Math, possibly would support our stance too.

Moving forward, we want to draft a letter of complaint outlining our issues with the policy with respect to its role in science specifically and then try to get the department and other groups to sign the letter.

Relate this to the upcoming visit by APS to investigate the climate of the department with respect to women and minorities.

Outrage over corruption in the UC system!