Policy 6.4 and Procedures related to Faculty

Risa Lieberwitz

Professor of Labor and Employment Law

ILR School

Faculty Senate member

Policy 6.4: Prohibited Bias, Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual and Related Misconduct

Policy 6.4

Procedures to enforce Policy 6.4

- Title IX cases
- Non-Title IX cases

Policy 6.4: Prohibited Bias, Discrimination, Harassment, and Sexual and Related Misconduct

"preponderance of evidence standard" ["more likely than not"]

- Consistent with standard of evidence in prior version of Policy 6.4
- May encourage complainants to come forward.
- Standard used in civil lawsuits

"clear and convincing standard"
[i.e. "highly probable"]

- Consistent with the level of certainty needed for potentially severe sanctions.
- Consistent with AFPS hearings.
- Consistent with AAUP principles.
- Hearings are private; civil suits are carried out in public hearings.

Procedures for Title IX cases

(alleged sexual misconduct/sexual harassment)

STUDENT RESPONDENT

- Investigator decides whether enough evidence to send case to Hearing Panel.
- Full hearing before Hearing Panel ("Hearing A") prior to conclusions on the allegations.

FACULTY RESPONDENT

- Investigator decides whether enough evidence to send case to Hearing Panel.
- Full hearing by Hearing Panel prior to conclusions on the allegations.

Procedures for Non-Title IX cases (alleged sexual misconduct/sexual harassment/other harassment or discrimination)

STUDENT RESPONDENT:

- Investigator decides whether enough evidence to send case to Hearing Panel
- Full hearing by Hearing Panel PRIOR TO conclusions on the allegations.
 - "Hearing A" where potential sanction of suspension/dismissal.
 - "Hearing B" where lesser sanction.

FACULTY RESPONDENT:

- Investigator concludes whether misconduct occurred/recommends sanctions.
- Investigator sends report to Dean to make final decision.
- **Full Hearing only** where there is a subordinate-supervisory relationship or academic freedom issue:
 - Hearing by Senate Committee on Academic Freedom AFTER the decision reached by investigator and the Dean.
- All other non-Title IX cases: NO hearing on misconduct/sanctions
 - Dean reviews investigative report and makes final decision.
 - Faculty respondent may file grievance in college-level grievance procedure.

Non-Title IX cases (alleged sexual misconduct/sexual harassment/other harassment or discrimination)

Current Procedures

FACULTY RESPONDENT:

- Investigator concludes whether misconduct occurred/recommends sanctions.
- Investigator sends report to **Dean to make final decision**.
- Full Hearing only where there is a subordinate-supervisory relationship or academic freedom issue:
 - Hearing by Senate Committee on Academic Freedom AFTER the decision reached by investigator and the Dean.
- All other non-Title IX cases: NO hearing on misconduct/sanctions
 - **Dean** reviews investigative report and makes final decision.
 - Faculty respondent may file grievance in college-level grievance procedure.

Non-Title IX Procedures could be amended with: Full hearings for faculty prior to decisions in ALL non-Title IX cases [note: amendments in red]

- Investigator decides whether enough evidence to send case to a hearing.
- Full Hearing by Senate Committee on Academic Freedom and Professional Status (AFPS) in all non-Title cases.
- Dean must accept the AFPS's findings of fact and conclusions.
 However, Dean may modify the AFPS recommended sanctions.

CONSIDERING THE AMENDMENTS TO NON-TITLE IX PROCEDURES FOR FACULTY

IN FAVOR OF AMENDMENTS

Due Process/Fairness:

- Full hearings by peers (AFPS) in all non-Title IX cases.
- Separates role of investigator and decision-maker
- Timing of hearings prior to decisions.
- Faculty and students have same levels of due process.

AGAINST AMENDMENTS

 This level of due process is not required by law (including Title IX)

[Note: This is also true for student respondents.]

• Students hesitant to bring complaints or appear as witnesses against faculty.

[Note: This applies to any hearings.]