

Committee on Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response

Annual Report

August 27, 2024

*Prepared by Professor Lerna Ekmekcioglu and
Sarah Rankin, Co-Chairs*

Contents

Committee Membership.....	3
Charge of the Committee	4
Committee Accomplishments.....	5
Other Committee Activities	9
Recommendations	10
Committee Work Plan, Academic Year 2023-2024	10
Appendix A Educational Interventions Sub-Committee Final Report.....	11-23

Committee Membership

Prof. Lerna Ekmekcioglu, Co-Chair, *History Section*

Sarah Rankin, Co-Chair, *Institute Discrimination and Harassment Response Office (IDHR)*

Asst. Prof. Sara Brown, *Music and Theater Arts*

Prof. Paul Dill, *DAPER Intercollegiate Sports*

Prof. Tami Lieberman, *Civil and Environmental Engineering*

Prof. Matthew Shoulders, *Department of Chemistry*

Prof. Justin P. Steil, *Urban Studies & Planning*

Prof. Amos Winter, *Mechanical Engineering*

Rebecca Lizarde, Undergraduate Student '24, *UA Representative*

Santi Cantu, Undergraduate Student, '24, *PLEASURE Representative*

Morgan Everett, Undergraduate Student, '24, *UA Representative*

Leah Budson, Graduate Student, *GSC Representative*

Jose Espinosa, Graduate Student, *GSC Representative*

Emmie Le Roy, Graduate Student, *IDHR Student Liaison Representative*

Lauren Backus, *Office of Minority Education*

Dr. Suraiya Baluch, *Office of Graduate Education*

Don Camelio, *Student Support Services*

Dr. Ashley Carpenter, *Office of Graduate Education HQ*

Tasha Coppett, *Residential Life Programs*

Joan Fusco, *Human Resources*

Vera Grbic, *Institute Discrimination and Harassment Response Office*

Nina Harris, *Institute Discrimination and Harassment Response Office*

Elizabeth Jason, *Fraternities, Sororities, and Independent Living Groups (FSILGs)*

Kate McCarthy, *Student Support & Wellbeing*

Brandon Milardo, *Mind Hand Heart*

Loren Montgomery, *MIT Police*

Simi Ogunsanwo, *Institute Discrimination and Harassment Response Office*

Kwadwo A. Poku, *MIT Medical*

Rose Poyau, *Violence Prevention and Response*

Moriah Silver, *Institute Discrimination and Harassment Response Office*

Christiaan M. Stone, *Lincoln Laboratory*

Jaren Wilcoxson, *Office of the General Counsel*

Catherine Barrett, Staff to Committee, *Institute Discrimination and Harassment Response Office*

Annual Report 2023-2024, *Committee on Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response (CSMPR)*

Charge of the Committee

As charged by the President, the Committee on Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response (hereafter, “CSMPR” or “the Committee”) is an advisory body that provides guidance to the Provost, Chancellor, Vice President of Human Resources, and the Institute Community and Equity Officer. The mission of the CSMPR is to encourage a campus environment that is safe, respectful, and free from discrimination and to oversee an Institute-wide approach to prevent and respond to sexual misconduct and other forms of gender-based discrimination.

The 32 members of the committee represent a broad cross-section of the MIT community, including faculty, staff, undergraduate students, and graduate students.

Committee Accomplishments

During the 2023-2024 academic year, the Committee on Sexual Misconduct Prevention and Response finalized the Educational Interventions Sub-Committee recommendations.

The Educational Interventions Sub-Committee was formed in 2021-22 to review the current educational opportunities (both internal and external to MIT) for people accused of causing harm and develop recommendations on how to best access these resources when someone agrees to engage in educational interventions and/or as part of a resolution process after someone has been found responsible for violating a policy. See Appendix A for the full report.

The sub-committee conducted peer benchmarking and an internal audit of educational programs available at MIT, and reviewed relevant literature. The Science-based Treatment, Accountability and Risk Reduction for Sexual Assault (STARRSA) Active Psychoeducation (AP) program emerged frequently both in research and practice among our peers. Many are using some form of the STARRSA program either in name or model.

The STARRSA Active Psychoeducation program is an empirically based intervention developed specifically to be utilized with college students found responsible for engaging in sexual misconduct or those who are committed to learning more about promoting healthy, consensual, and wellness-focused relationships.

The primary goal of the STARRSA program is to increase knowledge and awareness of factors related to sexual behavior and misconduct and to facilitate basic skills development through knowledge acquisition. The program attempts to facilitate positive behavioral change by providing information that can help students address and resolve risk-relevant thoughts, feelings, and behaviors associated with sexual misconduct and have respectful, prosocial intimate relationships.

Below are some of the highlights that make STARRSA a successful program, as well as an overview of the base curriculum:

- It is a highly developed, evidenced-based risk assessment and reduction curriculum with proven efficacy
- It can be applied as a part of disciplinary sanction, Adaptable Resolution, or informal remedy
- A comprehensive needs assessment tool will provide baseline determination of what learning outcomes are needed and the program length
- 1:1 delivery with responsible party for individualized attention and support
- Tailored to be delivered by student life professionals with some upskilling via a train-the-trainer model
- Scripted, detailed and easily customizable curriculum content
- Built-in opportunity for post-program referrals to other educational and supportive resources
- Post-program evaluation and check-in with responsible party (30 and 90 days post process)
- In addition to the psychoeducational component, there is a cognitive behavioral component for conduct that includes physical contact, malicious or other high-risk behavior and is to be conducted by a clinician (with voluntary treatment)

Below is a list of the core modules in the standard curriculum:

Module 1: Orientation, Assessment, & Active Psychoeducation (AP) Planning Meeting 1: Orientation & Assessment

Module 2: Sexual Behavior & Sexual Misconduct

Meeting 1: Sexual Behavior & Sexual Misconduct: How They Differ

Meeting 2: Relationships & Consent: What is Consent?

Meeting 3: Sex & the Law

Module 3: Focus on Socialization & Sexualization in Society

Meeting 1: Gender Socialization & Sex

Meeting 2: Sexual Knowledge, Risky Sex and Sexual Misconduct

Meeting 3: Peer Influences

Module 4: Understanding & Resolving Risks for Sexual Abuse

Meeting 1: Risky Attitudes

Meeting 2: Risky Feelings

Meeting 3: Risky Behaviors

Meeting 4: Risky Situations

Meeting 5: Substance Use & Sexual Abuse

Module 5: Negative Masculinity

Meeting 1: Hostile/Negative Masculinity

Meeting 2: Relationships: Sex v. Attachment

Module 6: Consequences of Sexual Abuse & Effects of Sexual Misconduct on Victims/Survivors and Others

Meeting 1: Impact of Sexual Misconduct

Module 7: Behavior is a Choice: Choosing Wisely

Meeting 1: The ABCs of Human Behavior

Meeting 2: My Values and Goals: Who I Am and Who I Want to Be

Meeting 3: Recognizing and Managing Risky Thoughts, Feelings, Behaviors, and Situations

Module 8: Healthy Relationships

Meeting 1: Friendships and Partners

Meeting 2: Perspective Taking and Empathy: Understanding and Caring about the Needs, Wants, and Feelings of Others

Meeting 3: Communicating Effectively: Interpersonal and Dating Skills

Meeting 4: Developing Positive Relationships

Meeting 5: How Does Sex Fit in My Life?

Module 9: Accountability: Making Amends and Making a Difference

Meeting 1: Accountability and Responsibility

Meeting 2: Making Amends and Making a Difference

Module 10: Wrapping Up & Going Forward

Meeting 1: What Have I Learned? Reinforcing Learning

Educational Interventions Sub-Committee Recommendations:

- 1. Convene an advisory committee to coordinate strategic implementation of an MIT-based educational intervention program pilot utilizing the STARRSA Active Psychoeducational model.**

Rationale for the recommendation: STARRSA provides a best practice model from which to build an effective educational intervention resource. The strategic coordination of key campus partners is essential in creating a comprehensive approach that is aligned with all levels of campus prevention and response initiatives. Recent leadership changes, shifting institutional priorities as well as ongoing

and emerging strategic initiatives require that this project is further refined by leadership from key partner areas to collaborate on identifying the best structural integration of an educational intervention resource for our current campus needs.

Partners from IDHR, Division of Student Life (DSL) Residential & Community Life, Student Support and Wellbeing, the Office of Graduate Education, the Institute Community & Equity Office (ICEO), Human Resources (HR), and the Office of General Council (OGC) would determine how this resource would best integrate into current initiatives, as well as the scope and scale of the resource for a pilot. Providing an institutional framework and guiding language regarding our community values for growth and learning is necessary to anchor the initiative as a strategic part of the accountability process when responding to community harm. The charge of the advisory group would be:

- Identify program pilot goals and priorities
- Determine scope and logistics of educational interventions and sanctioning consistent with community core values and needed learning outcomes
- Identify metrics to measure the effectiveness and determine sustainability

Resources required: Given the foundational content for evidenced-based sexual violence intervention, IDHR should co-lead this initiative with at least one leadership representative from DSL. This phase would include several organized meetings (3-6 meetings), including consultation with STARRSA technical assistance as well as peer institutions implementing similar initiatives to discuss and refine scope. In addition to a no-cost info session, STARRSA also offers introductory one-two hour sessions giving an overview on effective interventions for students who engage in problematic behaviors as well as an overview of the model. Each of those sessions cost \$2350 and are part of an implementation training package. These two sessions can be open to all decision makers and stakeholders in addressing campus misconduct.

Priority status: High priority; should be achieved within fiscal year 2025 as this will determine scope and scale for pilot or full implementation.

2. Build community buy-in with key campus partners for developing pilot.

The advisory committee's work should specifically include engaging student voices and leadership early in the process to get critical feedback and build buy-in for the integration of educational supports as viable response to addressing identity-based harm. Student representatives from Pleasure, REFS, IDHR Student Liaisons, PEP Leaders, Undergraduate Council, Graduate Student Council and Graduate Student Union, as well as residential community leaders would be critical contributors to the initiative. Their support and belief in the value and effectiveness of the program will have a direct impact on the utilization and success of any model, as many students default to a punitive position and believe that students who cause harm must be isolated or removed altogether.

Resources required: Once the advisory committee has worked to establish preliminary institutional boundaries in which the scope of the project may exist, they can work to provide information and feedback sessions/opportunities with various student constituencies. This can be part of their initial phase to determine final scope and content of the pilot curriculum.

3. Convene an implementation working group of campus collaborators responsible for the customization and enhancement of the curriculum and the facilitation of the program.

Rationale for recommendation: The advisory committee should convene a group of key educational and administrative partners to support the development, enhancement and delivery of the program content, as determined by their pilot/implementation design plan.

As the primary content addresses sexual misconduct that falls under the scope of IDHR, the Manager of Adaptable Resolution will provide the lead coordination and facilitation of the pilot. This

implementation group should also include representatives from the Committee on Discipline, and any other sanctioning or referring body the advisory committee may consider for this phase of the project. Partners responsible for delivering campus education on healthy behaviors and community expectations, such as IDHR, VPR, Intercultural Engagement, Student Wellbeing, and HR should work to make sure the final program content aligns with MIT language, resources, and values. This group should also include any partners that can develop the educational content prioritized by the advisory committee. For the purposes of the pilot launch, any administrators identified as program facilitators should also work alongside this group, although their primary responsibility may not be content/curriculum development. This collaborative working style will enhance the effectiveness of the overall development, delivery and facilitation of the program. Consideration should be given for maximizing the cost of training and expanding to facilitators who may later be active if there is staff turnover or expanded need.

Resources Required: This phase would include training of the campus sanctioning parties as well as program facilitators. The sanctioning training module lasts 2-3 hours, and the facilitator training module is 6-8 hours, costing \$3,525 and \$7,050 respectively. Program evaluation, support and technical assistance for six months post implementation is included in the overall training fees.

4. Recommendations for further consideration by the advisory and implementation committee.

In addition to the recommendations outlined above, there are several factors that the advisory committee should take into consideration as they make determinations for a pilot/project:

- What do educational interventions for student organizations, groups and FSILGs look like and what different learning outcomes are needed to address their distinct experience as respondents?
- What are the distinct needs for education and support for faculty and staff respondents?
 - While the recommendations in this report focus on student interventions, the STARRSA model can be used to develop a staff/faculty-facing program with existing campus learning content. The other need is identifying who is best suited to provide this support for staff/faculty and defining the scope of their assistance.
- Aligning all-student prevention learning outcomes with respondent educational outcomes as part of a comprehensive educational approach. Are there learning outcomes that we are privileging for respondents that all students could benefit from as a part of their co-curricular educational experience?
- What additional supports can assist respondents in reintegrating into campus—including dedicated advising, opportunities for repair to impacted parties and other restorative processes—and help a respondent rebuild trust with their community?

Other Committee Activities

The Committee continues to monitor the implementation of two major initiatives from previous CSMPR recommendations: *Required Ongoing Education for Undergraduates*, and *Ongoing Education for Faculty, Staff, Postdocs, and Graduate Students*.

Summary of Other Committee Discussions:

The CSMPR had several productive discussions and reviews with campus leaders and outside experts, including:

- Annual review regarding Institute Discrimination and Harassment Response Office (IDHR) – presented by Sarah Rankin, IDHR Director
- Annual review regarding Violence Prevention and Response (VPR) – presented by Rose Poyau, Director of Violence Prevention and Response
- Sexual Misconduct Faculty and Staff Climate Survey Results – presented by Sue Rankin and Kevin Swartout, Rankin Climate Consulting
- Creating a culture of wellbeing: promoting health and reducing risk – presented by Robyn Priest, DSL
- Faculty, Staff, and Graduate Students three years and above required training response rate and feedback – presented by Simi Ogunsanwo, IDHR
- Educational Interventions Sub-Committee recommendations – presented by Nina Harris, IDHR
- Status updates on:
 - Undergraduate required annual online training initiative - presented by Simi Ogunsanwo, IDHR
 - New Title IX Regulations - presented by Sarah Rankin, IDHR

CSMPR Recommendations 2023-24

1. The CSMPR supports the bi-annual training requirement for faculty and staff and endorses continuing to develop MIT-specific online training modules.
2. The CSMPR supports the annual training requirement for all undergraduates and will continue to monitor the evaluation data for any needed modifications.
3. The Educational Interventions Sub-committee recommendations:
 - **Convene an advisory committee to coordinate strategic implementation of an MIT-based educational intervention program pilot utilizing the STARRSA Active Psychoeducational model**
 - **Build community buy-in with key campus partners for developing pilot**
 - **Convene an implementation working group of campus collaborators responsible for the customization and enhancement of the curriculum and the facilitation of the program**
 - **Assess identified issues needing further consideration by the advisory and implementation committee**

Committee Work Plan, Academic Year 2024-2025

The CSMPR will engage in the following activities, among others:

1. Monitor the implementation of the Educational Interventions Sub-Committee recommendations.
2. Review assessment data of the sexual harassment prevention training for employees and graduate students three years and above.
3. Review assessment data on the required training for all undergraduates to identify areas for improvement or growth.
4. Develop recommendations to respond to the employee (September 2023) and student (April 2024) sexual misconduct climate survey data results.

Appendix A

CSMPR Sub-Committee on Respondent Educational Interventions

Final Report

Introduction and Scope

In aligning with the goals of our campus conduct processes, MIT seeks to facilitate student growth and learning as part of the process of taking responsibility for violating our community values and standards. A comprehensive educational intervention program for campus community members responsible for misconduct related to identity-based harm is an essential part of a strategic approach to creating and maintaining a safe, welcoming and inclusive environment, free from bias, discrimination, and harassment.

Educational interventions that extend beyond punitive sanctions provide structured, supported processes through which respondents can learn from their actions and take accountability for their conduct. They also can demonstrate to the larger campus the institution's commitment to the growth and wellbeing of all its community members, by providing supports to align with campus values and expectations.

With the inception of an Adaptable Resolution program within IDHR, there was growing recognition of the need for more robust educational resources for respondents in seeking meaningful outcomes to incidences of sexual and gender-based harassment, discrimination and misconduct as well as other identity-based harm.

Working through a multi-phase approach, a CSMPR Educational sub-committee began convening in AY22-23 to discuss the harms occurring on campus and explore opportunities to enhance our response resources. The following staff comprised the working group putting forward the recommendations in this report:

- Nina Harris, Manager of Adaptable Resolution and Restorative Practices (IDHR)
- Simi Ogunsanwo, MPH, Manager, Prevention Education & Outreach (IDHR)
- Beatriz Cantada, Director of Engagement for Diversity and Inclusion (ICEO)
- Rose Poyau, LMHC, Director Violence Prevention & Response
- Nina DeAgrela, Assistant Dean of Intercultural Engagement (DSL)
- Molly McInerney, Assistant Director for Community Learning (ICEO)
- Libby Mahaffy, Organization Development Consultant (HR)

The sub-committee's charge was as follows:

- Identify educational learning outcomes needed to remedy concerns related to sexual misconduct and other forms of bias, discrimination and discriminatory harassment;
- Identify current best practices and available resources for educational support and coaching, for all affiliations (students, staff, faculty, postdocs, etc.), by conducting an internal and external audit; and
- Provide strategic recommendations to enhance the available resources through internal resource management, professional development, and external partners.

Nature of the Campus Misconduct and Needed Learning Outcomes

In AY22-23 there were 155 student reports of gender-based sexual harassment and discrimination. Only sixty-nine fell under IDHR's purview and, of that number, only five resulted in a formal complaint (with the rest opting for supportive measures, informal remedy, or choosing not to move forward). These allegations represented the full range of gender-based sexual harassment, including intimate partner violence, stalking, and discrimination.

During that same period there were 46 cases of non-gender based discriminatory harassment with 64 separate allegations. The range of protected class implicated in those cases is as follows: Race (31); Disability (13); National or Ethnic Origin (10); Religion (8); and Retaliation (2).

In examining the range of IDHR-related allegations over the last two academic years, we looked to identify the key areas of learning that provide the broadest outcomes that address the learning needs as well as align with the conduct policies without being overly prescriptive. Each case represents a complexity of not only impact, but motivating behaviors contributing to the conduct:

- Problematic sexual and interpersonal behaviors
- Awareness and understanding of identity and diversity
- Unconscious bias and microaggressions
- Community values and behavioral expectations
- Free expression and harassment
- Inclusive leadership (individuals and organizations)

The prescriptive nature of each of these learning categories can be further developed as learning outcomes based on emerging campus needs and is further discussed in the recommendations. For example, over the course of the committee's work, a growing need for campus education related to antisemitism and Islamophobia have emerged. As we develop awareness and prevention education related to these specific identity-based themes, we can explore the expansion of respondent education to align with these efforts.

In addition to the scope of conduct impacting our campus community, these numbers also reflect the vast opportunity available in having a comprehensive resource to offer community members seeking meaningful outcomes aside from, or in addition to, outcomes from the formal complaint process.

The possibility that an educational intervention could be entered into voluntarily by a respondent as part of an informal remedy or Adaptable Resolution process could significantly increase the impacted party's decision to seek such a resource.

MIT Campus Inventory

While MIT has a rich resource of educational opportunities, there are limited resources dedicated specifically to managing misconduct versus general themes of prevention, education and awareness.

The Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards has a well-established practice of facilitating education through "intentional sanction design, facilitation and management." The range of topics relating to general misconduct (e.g., academic integrity, values-based decision making, conflict management, etc.) is discussed in detail in their [annual report](#). There are eight standard workshops offered on a monthly basis that students may participate in as part of their sanctioning. In following up with the conduct officer they are asked to reflect on the learnings they engaged in.

During AY22-AY24, through Adaptable Resolution, IDHR utilized educational interventions in four cases, two regarding sexual misconduct and one regarding racial harassment. The offerings were a combination of internal and external resources, identified as a part of the resolution process to specifically address the conduct in the complaint. They included the following:

- Men Can Stop Rape's 3-day Healthy Masculinity Institute (Washington, DC, \$250).
- The Men Center for Growth & Change (Philadelphia, PA) offers several direct service programs at a sliding scale fee of \$35/session.
- Registration in MIT course related to cultural identity and experiences of racial/ethnic groups who have been discriminated against.

- Participation in campus workshop hosted by PLEASURE educators.

In one case, the educational component was provided at the expense of MIT. In the second case, the respondent assumed the cost. In the case of the student who enrolled in a campus course, the educational component came at no additional expense beyond their regular matriculation costs.

Many of the educational workshops and programs offered direct to students are delivered by peer educators or, as part of a prevention/wellbeing strategy through campus offices like Intercultural Engagement, LGBTQ+ Services and Student Wellbeing or via the required modules all community members must take. While the content offers access to a wide range of learning outcomes, the delivery models are not best suited for access by campus respondents, limiting their current application as an educational intervention.

Conversely, the wide range of learning resources available to staff and faculty, that support individual learning, include direct coaching and computer-based modules. The application of educational interventions as part of an informal response to campus conduct is frequently used in various capacities with staff and faculty concerns. However, while the content is diverse and addresses various behavioral concerns that contribute to misconduct, the application process does not have the same strategic educational interventions for students through OSCCS.

During the initial phase of the committee, Molly McInerney's new role in the ICEO was tasked with the development of the Community Learning Initiative to help improve access to the vast learning resources on campus. This development can serve as a supportive resource in harnessing current campus educational offerings into a deliverable program.

Review of Peer Institutions' Initiatives

In addition to examining the internal resources and applications at MIT, we looked at several peer institutions to benchmark their campus initiatives related to respondent education, support and sanctioning: Harvard College, Princeton, Yale, Brown, University of Pennsylvania, Stanford, University of Michigan and Northeastern.

We considered the nature of their respondent resources, the institution's organizational structure to respond to campus harm, the owning/collaborating partners as well as any individual insights to their campus experience in working with respondents.

The range of activities fell into the following categories:

- Little or no educational interventions
- Campus education module/program – external vendor
- Campus education module/program – campus collaborator
- Partnership with external entity/MOU
- Referrals to external programs and/or resources

Below is a brief description of the findings of each campus. All partners recognize significant gaps in respondent support and education and are at various stages and processes of working towards meeting their campus needs.

Princeton University

Institutional Structure:

The **Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity** (Office of the Provost) manages Princeton's efforts to prevent

and respond to bias, discrimination, harassment and sexual misconduct, and promote equitable access for people with disabilities.

- Lead by **Vice Provost for Institutional Equity and Diversity (Title IX Coordinator ADA/Section 504 Coordinator), Director of Gender Equity and Title IX Administration, and the Director for Institutional Equity and Equal Employment Opportunity**
- The Sexual Harassment/Assault Advising Resources & Education (SHARE) office provides confidential crisis response, support, advocacy, education and referral services to those who are dealing with incidents of power-based personal violence, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, dating/domestic violence and stalking. (Under University Health Services within Vice Provost for Campus Life)

Support/Advising: Princeton will provide an attorney for a respondent in a formal complaint process through the External Adviser Program; Campus administrators serve as emotional supports for students.

Educational Interventions/Outcomes:

Princeton's Community Integrity Program (CIP) uses an individualized approach to tailor the intervention process to meet the needs of the client. It broadly uses the STARRSA (Science-based Treatment Accountability and Risk Reduction for Sexual Assault) framework developed by the federally funded grant from the Department of Justice's Sexual Offender Sentencing, Monitoring, Apprehending, registering and Trafficking Office. It was designed to address the nature of the problematic behavior by targeting attitudes and behaviors that contribute to sexual harm. CIP also evaluates the effectiveness of its interventions, to continue improving service delivery. Below are some further details:

- Developed and overseen by the SHARE office.
- CIP is a sanctioned program either through a formal complaint or informal resolution for any individuals involved in a Title IX or sexual misconduct complaint.
 - Individuals who are suspended complete the program after the term of their suspension.
 - Voluntary usage of the program was not effective.
- Run through the SHARE office and facilitated by a clinician who is subcontracted to the program.
- The CIP consists of 8-10 individual sessions with a licensed practitioner
 - Final report includes a confirmation of completion, a rating on the student's level of engagement, and any recommendations for further supports of interventions.
- Run approximately 12-15 respondents each year through CIP
- Positive response from students who participate

Restorative Processes: Not formally integrated into complaint process, however staff and faculty across the institute are trained and will consult for bias and sexual harassment issues that have a community impact.

Reintegration: The Office of the Dean of Undergraduate Students and Residential College staff and graduate deans work with students to return to campus after disciplinary action.

Other forms of harassment/discrimination: Very few students report. Mostly informal. Work with local deans and Bias Response Team to respond.

Brown University

Institutional Structure:

The **Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity** (OIED) remains focused on enhancing inclusion and diversity, including assessing and expanding inclusion and campus climate efforts, and continues to oversee affirmative action in employment and bias as it relates to campus, including coordinating the Bias Response Team.

The **Office of Equity Compliance and Reporting** (Division of Campus Life) was created to hold all of the

federal compliance, reporting and investigatory functions involving Title IX, Title VI and VII, and ADA/504 when they moved from the OIED in February 2024.

From January 2021 to January 2023, a collection of students, staff, and stakeholders from across the University participated in “the Collective” from [Culture of Respect](#), a two-year program that convenes institutions of higher education that are dedicated to addressing sexual and gender-based violence. The program involves rigorous self-assessment, collaborative strategic planning, and targeted organizational change. One of the key findings was the need to enhance resources for students found responsible for sexual misconduct, including education and reintegration.

Support/Advising: Deans within the office of Student Support Services provide support/advising for student respondents in a Title IX/sexual misconduct or bias/discrimination complaint process. Students also have access to a Student Conduct Ambassador who is a trained peer support resource in the Office of Student Conduct & Community Standards.

Educational Interventions/Outcomes: There is no formally implemented educational intervention program. The University will utilize available classes, workshops and other internal/external educational options as part of sanctioning or agreements.

Restorative Practices/Reintegration: In response to their Culture of Respect Report (2023), the Office of Student Conduct and Community Standards started initiatives to facilitate restorative circles and processes both as an informal resolution and as a part of the post-complaint process to address the healing needs of the impacted parties, as well as reintegration for respondents. The Student Conduct Ambassadors are also trained restorative facilitators who can facilitate processes to support communities impacted by harm.

Harvard University

Institutional Structure:

The **Office of Gender Equity** serves as the central campus resource for Title IX and sexual misconduct prevention, education, support and response. This includes offering confidential support through their SHARE counseling team. Title IX Resource Coordinators are locally appointed to assist community members in navigating the process.

The **Office of Dispute Resolution** provides all investigative services for the Harvard community for individuals seeking formal complaint resolution.

Educational Interventions/Outcomes: This past academic year the faculty voted to include educational interventions as a part of the sanctions. Trainings for a community or group that has been identified as engaging in harmful behavior, or of which an identified individual is a member, may also be an available supportive measure. These trainings typically review Harvard policies prohibiting sexual harassment and other sexual misconduct, skills of bystander intervention, and other relevant prevention and response practices.

Restorative Practices/Reintegration: The SHARE team recently expanded to include a clinician and restorative practitioner to focus on accountability work with people who cause harm.

University of Michigan

Institutional Structure:

The **Equity Civil Rights & Title IX Office (ECRT)** oversees, supports and facilitates the University of Michigan’s

(U-M) equal opportunity efforts, including investigation and resolution of complaints of discrimination, bias and harassment.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Awareness Center (SAPAC): For U-M students, faculty and staff who are survivors of sexual assault, relationship violence, stalking and sexual harassment. The Center also facilitates restorative and informal resolutions for staff and faculty (confidential office).

Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR): Provides support for Adaptable Resolution processes involving student sexual misconduct and bias/discrimination complaints.

Support/Advising: **Respondent Support Program:** Housed in the Dean of Students Office; dedicated staff trained to provide direct support to U-M student respondents who are involved in reports of sexual and gender-based misconduct.

Educational Interventions/Options: The Prevention Education, Assistance & Resources Team in ECRT, will consult to coordinate and identify individually selected educational interventions for respondents from campus partners including: Spectrum Center, the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, and SAPAC.

OSSCR offers **the Science-based Treatment, Accountability, and Risk Reduction for Sexual Assault (STARRSA) Active Psychoeducation (AP)** program designed to address sexual harm in a college student population. The STARRSA AP program utilizes a multi-modal, empirically informed approach to identify knowledge gaps related to risk factors and increase knowledge about protective factors of students who have engaged in sexual misconduct.

The STARRSA AP program's target population is the "emerging adult" undergraduate student who has violated university policies regarding sexual misconduct. Participants receive an individualized curriculum based on assessment and self-identified goals and values alongside a trained facilitator. Participants typically complete 8-20 one-on-one sessions, and the program requires a 2-6 month commitment.

Modules include:

- Module 1: Orientation, Assessment, & Psychoeducation Planning
- Module 2: Sexual Behavior & Sexual Misconduct
- Module 3: Focus on Socialization & Sexualization in Society
- Module 4: Understanding & Resolving Risks for Sexual Abuse
- Module 5: Negative Masculinity
- Module 6: Consequences of Sexual Abuse & Effects of Sexual Misconduct on Victims/Survivors and Others
- Module 7: Behavior is a Choice: Choosing Wisely
- Module 8: Healthy Relationships
- Module 9: Making Amends & Making a Difference
- Module 10: Wrapping Up & Going Forward
- Module 11: Sexual Citizens

Restorative Practices: The campus offers a range of restorative and restorative-informed practices across the institution through formal Adaptable Resolution in the Office of Student Conduct, to restorative community and impact circles.

Reintegration: The Review and Reintegration (R & R) program provides a pathway to a restorative return to campus for a student found responsible for sexual harm, supporting both the student and the campus community. Facilitated by the OSSCR, Review and Reintegration utilizes Circles of Support and Accountability to offer space for students to reflect on learning, determine the appropriateness of lifting sanctions, identify resources and support for sustained success and plan any additional measures needed to ensure successful reintegration into the community.

University of Chicago

Institutional Structure:

The University of Chicago recently launched the **Center for Awareness, Resolution, Education, and Support (UChicago CARES)**, to enhance efforts and resources to prevent and respond to all forms of harassment, discrimination, and sexual misconduct. The Center offers [prevention education and training](#); [responds to reports](#); [provides services, support, and resources](#); and facilitates investigative and alternative resolution.

The Center for Student Integrity is the primary point of contact for the investigative/administrative or investigative/hearing body resolution processes.

UChicago CARES/Equal Opportunity Programs is the primary point of contact for the investigation & administrative or investigation & hearing body resolution processes for complaints against faculty, other academic appointees, and postdoctoral researchers.

Employee and Labor Relations is the point of contact for the investigation & administrative or investigation & hearing body resolution processes for complaints against staff members. Employee and Labor Relations works in conjunction with UChicago CARES/Equal Opportunity Programs for the resolution of any alleged violations of the Policy on Harassment, Discrimination, and Sexual Misconduct or the Policy on Title IX Sexual Harassment by staff members.

Employee and Labor Relations is the primary point of contact for alternative resolution.

Educational Interventions/Outcomes: They offer 1:1 session with respondents using curriculum from Bringing in the Bystander and One Love. The sessions are developed in house by UChicago CARES staff. Topics include, but are not limited, to consent and communication, the use of alcohol or other drugs, healthy interpersonal relationships, forms of intimate partner violence including coercive and controlling behaviors, stress management and wellbeing.

Advising/Support: UChicago Does not currently have an identified/organized pool of respondent advisors.

Yale University

Institutional Structure:

The **Office of Sexual Harassment and Assault Response Education (SHARE) Center** provides crisis support, advocacy, education and referral to ongoing care for all members of the Yale community.

The **Office Equity and Accessibility under of the Secretary and Vice President for University Life**—which house the offices of [Institutional Equity and Accessibility \(OIEA\)](#), [Student Accessibility Services \(SAS\)](#), the [Title IX Office](#), the [Yale LGBTQ Center](#), Restorative Practices, and Military and Veterans Affairs—supports institutional equity and accessibility, and guides the strategy and initiatives that create a culture of belonging. This group is supported by the team of local Title IX coordinators.

Support/Advising: The Title IX Office and school-based Deputy Title IX Coordinators provide supportive measures for respondents (e.g., accommodations, support). Trained advisors are available through the University-Wide Committee on Sexual Misconduct to help students navigating the formal complaint process.

The SHARE Center is currently searching for a licensed clinician to provide respondent support services. The Office of Institutional Equity & Accessibility offers one-on-one educational conversations for staff and faculty

respondents.

Educational Outcomes: The SHARE Center offers a "Conduct Awareness" program for individuals who have been mandated or self-referred to this resource. This is facilitated by the Respondent Training & Support Specialist and Consultant within the office.

Typically, this program will consist of individual weekly, 1-hour sessions, usually taking place over a period of 6 weeks.

Participants may be "self-referred" (i.e., voluntarily present for services on their own accord, possibly at the suggestion of a peer, staff member, etc.) or required to complete training after being found responsible for a violation of Yale's sexual misconduct policy by the University-Wide Committee on Sexual Misconduct.

The program will be adapted based on the type of referral as well as the needs of the individual and typically involves the following sessions:

- **Session 1:** Introductory Session: Rapport Building and Engagement
- **Session 2:** Reviewing Yale Policies and Identifying Types of Harm
- **Session 3:** Boundaries: Exploring Consent and Healthy Relationships
- **Session 4:** Impacts of Harm
- **Session 5:** Accountability
- **Session 6:** Safety Planning for the Future

The order, number and/or focus of sessions may change, particularly if the participant is self-referred.

Restorative Practices: Yale is currently expanding their campus restorative practice.

Northeastern University

Institutional Structure:

The Office for University Equity and Compliance (OUEC) is responsible for investigating and resolving reports of discrimination, sexual violence, and retaliation at Northeastern. The Assistant Vice President for University Equity and Compliance and Title IX Coordinator coordinates the University's response to all of these concerns.

The Office of Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution (OSSCR) is responsible for maintaining and enforcing community standards with the student community. In addition to formal conduct processes, they offer a range of conflict resolution support including conflict coaching and informal resolution.

The Office of Prevention Education at Northeastern (OPEN) is a supportive student-facing resource offering prevention education, programs and interventions.

Support/Advising: OPEN's Confidential Resource Advising (CRA) Services provide restorative-informed assistance for Northeastern students who have been accused of any form of sexual violence. Besides OPEN, other confidential resources include University Health and Counseling Services (UHCS) staff on the Boston Campus, Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) on the Oakland Campus, Sexual Violence Liaison Officers on the London Campus, and Spiritual Advisors at The Center for Spirituality, Dialogue and Service.

Educational Interventions/Options: Educational sanctions can include attending a seminar or writing research or reflection papers.

The Sexual Harm and Accountability Psychoeducation (SHAPE) Program is a research-informed education program designed for college students who have engaged in and/or been accused of unhealthy or harmful sexual behavior (it is based on the STARRSA program curriculum).

Students who enroll in the program learn and build skills for healthy and consensual interactions as an opportunity to improve relationships going forward. The program consists of a series of individual meetings with an OPEN staff member and is tailored to address specific educational needs. Participation in the program can be sanctioned, a part of informal resolution agreement, or self-referred. It consists of a series of modules that cover topic areas connected to sexual violence prevention and desistance. The topics that are covered in a program are specific to the educational needs of a particular student who enrolls. Some of the topic areas that could be included in a program are:

- Consent and Sexual Citizenship
- Healthy Relationships and Communication
- Peer Influence
- Alcohol and Other Drug Use
- Power and Control
- Self-Accountability

Highlights of Science-Based Treatment, Accountability, and Risk Reduction (STARRSA) program

[STARRSA](#) emerged frequently both in research and practice among our peers. Many are using some form of the STARRSA program either in name or model. Below are some of the highlights that make STARRSA a successful program, as well as an overview the base curriculum offers:

- It is a highly developed, evidenced-based risk assessment and reduction curriculum with proven efficacy
- It can be applied as a part of disciplinary sanction, Adaptable Resolution, or informal remedy
- A comprehensive needs assessment tool will provide baseline determination of what learning outcomes are needed and the program length
- 1:1 delivery with responsible party for individualized attention and support
- Tailored to be delivered by student life professionals with some upskilling via a train-the-trainer model
- Scripted, detailed and easily customizable curriculum content
- Built-in opportunity for post-program referrals to other educational and supportive resources
- Post-program evaluation and check-in with responsible party (30 and 90 days post process)
- In addition to the psychoeducational component, there is a cognitive behavioral component for conduct that includes physical contact, malicious or other high-risk behavior and is to be conducted by a clinician (with voluntary treatment)

Below is a list of the core modules in the standard curriculum:

Module 1: Orientation, Assessment, & Active Psychoeducation Planning

Meeting 1: Orientation & Assessment

Module 2: Sexual Behavior & Sexual Misconduct

Meeting 1: Sexual Behavior & Sexual Misconduct: How They Differ

Meeting 2: Relationships & Consent: What is Consent?

Meeting 3: Sex & the Law

Module 3: Focus on Socialization & Sexualization in Society

Meeting 1: Gender Socialization & Sex

Meeting 2: Sexual Knowledge, Risky Sex and Sexual Misconduct

Meeting 3: Peer Influences

Module 4: Understanding & Resolving Risks for Sexual Abuse

Meeting 1: Risky Attitudes

Meeting 2: Risky Feelings

Meeting 3: Risky Behaviors

Meeting 4: Risky Situations

Meeting 5: Substance Use & Sexual Abuse

Module 5: Negative Masculinity

Meeting 1: Hostile/Negative Masculinity

Meeting 2: Relationships: Sex v. Attachment

Module 6: Consequences of Sexual Abuse & Effects of Sexual Misconduct on Victims/Survivors and Others

Meeting 1: Impact of Sexual Misconduct

Module 7: Behavior is a Choice: Choosing Wisely

Meeting 1: The ABCs of Human Behavior

Meeting 2: My Values and Goals: Who I Am and Who I Want to Be

Meeting 3: Recognizing and Managing Risky Thoughts, Feelings, Behaviors, and Situations

Module 8: Healthy Relationships.

Meeting 1: Friendships and Partners

Meeting 2: Perspective Taking and Empathy: Understanding and Caring about the Needs, Wants, and Feelings of Others

Meeting 3: Communicating Effectively: Interpersonal and Dating Skills

Meeting 4: Developing Positive Relationships

Meeting 5: How Does Sex Fit in My Life?

Module 9: Accountability: Making Amends and Making a Difference

Meeting 1: Accountability and Responsibility

Meeting 2: Making Amends and Making a Difference

Module 10: Wrapping Up & Going Forward

Meeting 1: What Have I Learned? Reinforcing Learning

Key takeaways informing our final recommendations

In addition to our discussions among the committee, with various campus partners and peers, and reviewing various educational content, we wanted to highlight some learnings that have helped guide us in forming our recommendations.

- MIT has many robust learning resources, specifically for staff and faculty via HR and the Teaching and Learning Center.
- Given the majority of the reports to IDHR do not go to a formal complaint process and are handled informally, an educational resource that can also be utilized outside of a formal complaint process is essential.
- Support for respondents is limited on many campuses, but campuses that provide some level of support report having more positive learning experiences with respondents.
- Community partnership and buy-in has been essential to campus capacity and program efficacy. Many campuses struggle with a chilling effect after community members are identified for alleged misconduct.
- While STARSSA can serve as an evidence-based model to build out a program, additional considerations should be made about the needs and appropriate supplemental materials for staff and faculty.

- Strategic utilization of external partners and resources can support meaningful outcomes with limited institutional capacity.
- STARRSA is the gold standard for educational intervention in problematic sexual behaviors. It is evidence based both in content and delivery, with many institutions adopting or building on its model.
- More work is needed to identify evidence-based learning and desired campus outcomes regarding conduct related to other forms of bias, harassment and discrimination.

Recommendations:

1. Convene an advisory committee to coordinate strategic implementation of an MIT-based educational intervention program pilot utilizing the STARRSA Active Psychoeducational model.

Rationale for the recommendation: STARRSA provides a best practice model from which to build an effective educational intervention resource. The strategic coordination of key campus partners is essential in creating a comprehensive approach that is aligned with all levels of campus prevention and response initiatives. Recent leadership changes, shifting institutional priorities as well as ongoing and emerging strategic initiatives require that this project is further refined by leadership from key partner areas to collaborate on identifying the best structural integration of an educational intervention resource for our current campus needs.

Partners from IDHR, DSL Residential & Community Life, Student Support and Wellbeing, the Office of Graduate Education, ICEO, HR, and OGC would determine how this resource would best integrate into current initiatives, as well as the scope and scale of the resource for a pilot. Providing an institutional framework and guiding language regarding our community values for growth and learning is necessary to anchor the initiative as a strategic part of the accountability process when responding to community harm. The charge of the advisory group would be:

- Identify program pilot goals and priorities
- Determine scope and logistics of educational interventions and sanctioning consistent with community core values and needed learning outcomes
- Identify metrics to measure the effectiveness and determine sustainability

Resources required: Given the foundational content for evidenced-based sexual violence intervention, IDHR should co-lead this initiative with at least one leadership representative from DSL. This phase would include several organized meetings (3-6 meetings), including consultation with STARRSA technical assistance as well as peer institutions implementing similar initiatives to discuss and refine scope. In addition to a no-cost info session, STARRSA also offers introductory one-two hour sessions giving an overview on effective interventions for students who engage in problematic behaviors as well as an overview of the model. Each of those sessions cost \$2350 and are part of an implementation training package. These two sessions can be open to all decision makers and stakeholders in addressing campus misconduct.

Priority status: High priority; should be achieved within fiscal year 2025 as this will determine scope and scale for pilot or full implementation.

2. Build community buy-in with key campus partners for developing pilot

The advisory committee's work should specifically include engaging student voices and leadership early in the process to get critical feedback and build buy-in for the integration of educational supports as viable response to addressing identity-based harm. Student representatives from Pleasure, REFs, IDHR Student Liaisons, PEP Leaders, Undergraduate Council, Graduate Student Council and Graduate Student Union, as well as residential community leaders would be critical contributors to the initiative. Their support and belief in the value and effectiveness of the program will have a direct impact on the utilization and success of any model, as many students default to a punitive position and believe that students who cause harm must be isolated or removed altogether.

Resources required: Once the advisory committee has worked to establish preliminary institutional boundaries in which the scope of the project may exist, they can work to provide information and feedback sessions/opportunities with various student constituencies. This can be part of their initial phase to determine final scope and content of the pilot curriculum.

3. Convene an implementation working group of campus collaborators responsible for the customization and enhancement of the curriculum and the facilitation of the program.

Rationale for recommendation: The advisory committee should convene a group of key educational and administrative partners to support the development, enhancement and delivery of the program content, as determined by their pilot/implementation design plan.

As the primary content addresses sexual misconduct that falls under the scope of IDHR, the Manager of Adaptable Resolution will provide the lead coordination and facilitation of the pilot. This implementation group should also include representatives from the Committee on Discipline, and any other sanctioning or referring body the advisory committee may consider for this phase of the project. Partners responsible for delivering campus education on healthy behaviors and community expectations, such as IDHR, VPR, Intercultural Engagement, Student Wellbeing, and HR should work to make sure the final program content aligns with MIT language, resources, and values. This group should also include any partners that can develop the educational content prioritized by the advisory committee. For the purposes of the pilot launch, any administrators identified as program facilitators should also work alongside this group although their primary responsibility may not be content/curriculum development. This collaborative working style will enhance the effectiveness of the overall development, delivery and facilitation of the program. Consideration should be given for maximizing the cost of training and expanding to facilitators who may later be active if there is staff turnover or expanded need.

Resources Required: This phase would include training of the campus sanctioning parties as well as program facilitators. The sanctioning training module lasts 2-3 hours, and the facilitator training module is 6-8 hours, costing \$3,525 and \$7,050 respectively. Program evaluation, support and technical assistance for six months post implementation is included in the overall training fees.

4. Recommendations for further consideration by the advisory and implementation committee.

In addition to the recommendations outlined above, there are several factors that the advisory committee should take into consideration as they make determinations for a pilot/project:

- What do educational interventions for student organizations, groups and FSILGs look like and what different learning outcomes are needed to address their distinct experience as respondents?
- What are the distinct needs for education and support for faculty and staff respondents?
 - While the recommendations in this report focused on student interventions, the STARRSA model can be used to develop a staff/faculty facing-program with existing campus learning content. The other need is identifying who is best suited to provide this support for staff/faculty and defining the scope of their assistance.
- Aligning all-student prevention learning outcomes with respondent educational outcomes as part of a comprehensive educational approach. Are there learning outcomes that we are privileging for respondents that all students could benefit from as a part of their co-curricular educational experience?
- What additional supports can assist respondents in reintegrating into campus—including dedicated advising, opportunities for repair to impacted parties and other restorative processes—and help a respondent rebuild trust with their community?