

The background of the page features a large, light gray watermark of the University of California seal. The seal is circular and contains the text "UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA" around the top and "1868" at the bottom. In the center, there is a shield with a book, a sunburst, and a hand holding a torch. A banner across the shield reads "LET THERE BE LIGHT".

**Report to the President:
President's Task Force on Preventing and
Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual
Assault - PHASE II, January Milestones**

January 2015 | University of California

Contents

- PHASE II: *Executive Summary* 3**
- Student Perspectives on Progress 4

- PHASE II: *Outcomes and Approach* 6**

- PHASE II Recommendations: *Implementation* 9**

- Next Steps for Remaining Phase II Recommendations from the President’s Task Force* 19**

- Appendices..... 20**
- Appendix A. Task Force and Work Group Members 21
- Appendix B. Glossary 27

PHASE II: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In June 2014, President Napolitano issued a call to action for the UC to be the national leader in prevention and response to sexual violence and sexual assault. To ensure the UC maintains the highest standards of prevention, response, and reporting, President Napolitano formed the “President’s Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault.” The Task Force, led by Senior Vice President Sheryl Vacca and including participation of numerous key constituents from the UC system, began its work in July and issued its first report (Phase I) in September 2014. During Phase I, more than 100 UC representatives participated, including Regents, students, staff and faculty, and made seven key recommendations.

The President, in her initial charge, expressed the need for a consistent and transparent model that would be implemented throughout all UC locations. Building such a model to address the complexity and diversity of the UC system presented a unique challenge and opportunity for the Task Force. Out of this opportunity came a consensus that all locations would adopt consistent policies as they address issues of sexual violence and sexual assault in five key functions: responding and reporting, prevention, education, and advocacy.

These five key functions are the foundation for the overarching UC model with its seven recommendations accepted by President Napolitano and reported to the Board of Regents in September 2014. These seven recommendations were:

Recommendation 1: Establish a consistent “response team” model at all campuses

- January 2015 Implementation

Recommendation 2: Adopt systemwide, standard investigation and adjudication standards

- July 2015 Implementation

Recommendation 3: Develop a comprehensive training and education plan

- July 2015 Implementation

Recommendation 4: Implement a comprehensive communication strategy to educate the community and raise awareness about UC programs

- January 2015 Implementation

Recommendation 5: Establish an independent, confidential advocacy office for sexual violence and sexual assault on each campus

- January 2015 Implementation

Recommendation 6: Establish a comprehensive systemwide website with campus customization capabilities

- January 2015 Implementation

Recommendation 7: Initiate/develop a systemwide standard data collection system

- July 2015 Implementation

This report highlights the implementation process and the steps taken in regards to the four recommendations for January implementation for preventing and responding to sexual violence and sexual assault at all UC locations.

Student Perspectives on Progress

We, the students, are happy to report that, over the course of the second phase of work by the UC Presidential Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault, student engagement and participation has been robust and fruitful. With 53 students in attendance and participating in the Work Group and Task Force meetings, we were able to ensure that more student voices were involved in the development of these recommendations. This has directly manifested in key policy advances that will serve to benefit student survivors and to create a more equitable university response.

Most notably, we have participated in the establishment of a set of key values and criteria that will help guide the survivor advocate offices that will be created across the UC system. In consideration of the student feedback, these offices can act as confidential and/or privileged resources to ensure that student survivors can feel safe and, most of all, they can receive support and information without being forced to report. Furthermore, we have worked collaboratively to establish how we are going to measure the effectiveness of these offices and ensure long-term sustainability.

Other important milestones include the development of a consistent model for creating teams to address response, prevention education and policy research initiatives, establishing a system-wide website, and ensuring a comprehensive communication plan – all of which are necessary to create campus cultures of healing and support by educating all students on this important and often-stigmatized issue.

As we near the completion of this second phase, we want to be certain that the focus remains on ensuring that our UC system produces a holistic, student-focused response to ensuring that we prevent and fully respond to instances of

sexual violence. On each and every UC campus, we must have a robust system in place to educate, prevent, and respond if necessary in a care-centered approach. This is but one more step in a continued effort to bring sustainable change to each UC campus.

Sadia Saifuddin

Student Representative, UC Presidential Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault

Rishi Ahuja

Student Representative, UC Presidential Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault

Savannah Badalich

Student Representative, UC Presidential Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault

All of the participants who have engaged in helping to shape the model for implementation are identified in the Appendix. There are many nuanced terms used to describe aspects of this complex issue; for purposes of this report, three terms are used for clarity and consistency: sexual misconduct, complainant, and respondent. Sexual misconduct includes: dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual violence, and stalking. Use of sexual misconduct in this report should in no way indicate that these issues are any less traumatic or serious; rather, its use provides one term to describe multiple issues addressed by the UC model. Complainant includes survivor, victim, and someone who files a report of sexual misconduct. Respondent refers to someone against whom a report of sexual misconduct is filed.

While the timelines recommended for implementation are aggressive, the Task Force is confident that—with the tremendous support from the different functional areas at all the campuses—the recommendations are achievable and will allow UC to develop a consistent model across the UC System. This effort could not have been possible without the ongoing support from President Napolitano, the Chancellors, and the funding support provided by the President for these January milestones. We are confident that this model will continue to evolve and be sustainable for the future.

Sheryl Vacca

Task Force Lead

HIGHLIGHTS OF ACTIVITY SINCE SEPTEMBER 2014

Following the September 2014 acceptance of Phase I recommendations, President Napolitano recognized that implementation of the seven key recommendations required careful planning and charged the Task Force with moving to Phase II Implementation of four key recommendations due by January 2015, with the remaining three recommendations implemented by July 2015.

The Outcomes

Phase II January milestones and outcomes included implementation of four recommendations from Phase I, which were:

Recommendation 1: Establish a consistent “response team” model at all campuses.

- ❖ The Case Management Team (CMT) brings together key cross-functional portions of the administration to ensure that institutional responses to reported cases are timely and appropriate and that complainants and respondents receive fair, objective and equal consideration.
- ❖ The Coordinated Community Review Team (CCRT) brings together a cross-section of campus and community constituents to guide the campus in preventing and responding to sexual misconduct at a campus level with respect to policies, community relations, prevention and intervention.
- ❖ Naming convention for both teams is consistent across the system; they are known as the CMT and CCRT respectively.
- ❖ Senior campus management is involved with both teams to prioritize the prevention of and response to sexual misconduct.

Recommendation 4: Implement a comprehensive communication strategy to educate the community and raise awareness about UC programs.

- ❖ Campuses use consistent messaging with common nomenclature to advise the campus community about how UC prevents and responds to sexual misconduct, which include, in addition to websites described below, fact sheets, frequently asked questions (FAQs), common system glossary, communication models, streaming or self-generated stories, news updates, and student news media.
- ❖ Communications notify complainants and respondents of services available to them and support they can receive.
- ❖ Comprehensive communication strategy leverages existing national, UC system, and campus communication efforts (e.g., White House campaign “It’s on Us”, “yes means yes”).

Recommendation 5: Establish an independent, confidential advocacy office for sexual violence and sexual assault on each campus.

- ❖ At least one full-time advocate is dedicated to survivor advocacy on each campus.
- ❖ The full time CARE Advocate¹ will be in place at each campus in January. All campuses must use a UC common job description and Advocate Office charter.
- ❖ The campus advocate:
 - Provides confidential and/or privileged services as appropriate.
 - Focuses on a trauma-centered approach and informing complainants that they do not have an obligation to file a formal report of sexual misconduct.
 - Participates in discussions regarding case management and assist with identifying potential areas of vulnerability for the campuses.
 - Reports to a senior campus official outside of campus management for investigations and adjudication, and receives training to better assist survivors.
- ❖ Survivor advocacy services are available to students 24/7.
- ❖ While the services for respondents were not specifically addressed in the original recommendations, the Task Force identified that it is important to ensure respondents receive appropriate support based on their circumstances. This support will be specified by the campus and be located in a designated office on campus. The campuses will identify the services available at present and the Task Force will continue to evolve this recommendation for the President's approval and implementation in July 2015.

Recommendation 6: Establish a comprehensive systemwide website with campus customization capabilities.

- ❖ A new, comprehensive systemwide website will be launched in January to make clear where people can go to receive confidential help and accommodations, as well as to inform people about UC's efforts to prevent and respond to sexual misconduct.
- ❖ Each campus website has a consistent method to identify sexual assault services and mirrors the information available on the systemwide site.
- ❖ Common glossaries and FAQs are provided throughout the system.

The Approach

In September 2014, the Phase II approach to guiding implementation of the four recommendations with January milestones included:

- **Research:** Research into "best practices" nationwide continued. To date, over 200 college and university programs, websites, and processes have been reviewed. In addition, in-depth review and discussion of current UC practices continued.

¹ CARE Advocate is the dedicated, full-time advocate in the CARE: Advocacy Office for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence and Misconduct (CARE). CARE Advocate and CARE Advocacy Office are both for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence and Misconduct.

- **Increased Participation:** During this phase, the overall process included an additional 70 participants, and of which, 53 were UC students.
- **Implementation Process:** Phase II Task Force and Work Group participation focused deliberately on steps needed to address the recommendations for January implementation. Charters, job descriptions, space considerations, and defined processes were vetted with working group participants and presented to the Task Force for final discussion and approval.
- **Metrics:** Metrics were established and addressed with each recommendation, recognizing they will evolve as the UC model matures.
- **Incorporation of State and Federal Legislative Updates:** Concerns over sexual misconduct on campus have drawn the attention of both the state legislature and legislative bodies of the federal government and the following are the current activities.

State Legislative Activities:

Two California state bills addressing campus sexual violence received legislative approval and were signed into law by Governor Brown in late September:

- ❖ SB 967 (De León), the “Yes Means Yes” bill, requires colleges and universities to adopt certain policies concerning sexual violence, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking, such as an affirmative definition of consent and a preponderance of evidence standard. The bill also requires UC and other institutions to collaborate with campus and community organizations and implement comprehensive prevention and outreach programs. UC supported SB 967 (and already has an affirmative consent regime in place throughout the system).
- ❖ AB 1433 (Gatto) requires colleges and universities in California to report any Part 1 violent crime, sexual assault, or hate crime received by a “Campus Security Authority,” as defined by the federal Clery Act, to the campus police department and local law enforcement agency without identifying the victim, unless the victim consents.

The Assembly Higher Education Committee has conducted several roundtable discussions at UC campuses (including UCB, UCLA, and UCSB) to examine efforts by these campuses and other institutions to prevent and respond to campus sexual assault.

Federal Legislative Activities:

Several federal bills on campus sexual violence were introduced in late July 2014 and will likely be reintroduced in 2015. These include:

1. Senator Claire McCaskill’s and Senator Gillibrand’s bipartisan Campus Accountability and Safety Act (CASA),
2. Senator Barbara Boxer’s and Representative Susan Davis’ Survivor Outreach and Support Campus Act (SOS Campus Act), and

3. Representative Jackie Speier’s Hold Accountable and Lend Transparency on Campus Sexual Violence Act (HALT Campus Sexual Violence Act).

The proposed legislation includes provisions that impose stricter penalties for Title IX and Clery Act violations and require campuses to establish support services for student survivors, enter into MOUs with local law enforcement agencies, and conduct annual student climate surveys.

UC supports Senator Boxer’s SOS Campus Act, which requires colleges and universities to establish an independent, on-campus advocate to support survivors of sexual assault and sexual violence. On September 17, Senator Boxer and Representative Susan Davis issued a press release applauding President Napolitano and the Task Force for recommending the establishment of an independent victim’s advocate office on every UC campus by January 2015. They called on other California college and university leaders to follow the lead of the UC system and voluntarily establish an independent victim’s advocate on every campus.

The U.S. Department of Education (ED) issued final rules on October 20, 2014 to implement changes to the Clery Act made by the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act (VAWA), which President Obama signed into law last year. The rules take effect on July 1, 2015. Until then, institutions are expected to make a good-faith effort to comply and UC is working on these areas as well as the Task Force work that is being done.

PHASE II RECOMMENDATIONS: *IMPLEMENTATION*

Each of the four recommendations discussed in Phase II required specific implementation steps and required actions. These steps and actions are listed below for each recommendation. It is important to note that Recommendations 4 and 6 are both part of overall communication strategies, so implementation for these two recommendations were combined to maximize effectiveness.

RECOMMENDATION 1: Establish a consistent “response team” model at all campuses.

Response Teams: Case Management Team (CMT) and Coordinated Community Review Team (CCRT)

The Model

The response team model requires all locations use a similar practice to address sexual misconduct. This model consists of two teams with different functions and purposes. The first team (1a of the recommendation – “the CMT”) functions as a case management team that maintains consistent coordination of reported cases and ensure all cases are addressed efficiently and effectively. The Title IX Officer from each campus provides oversight of this team function.

The second team (1b of the recommendation – “the CCRT”) is responsible for a campus collaborative approach to address sexual misconduct, and focuses on developing and reviewing policies, developing community relations (internal and external), discussing legal updates, providing cross training, and coordinating communication and prevention education and outreach efforts. A designated individual from each campus provides oversight for this team, and this team reports to the Chancellor (or designee).

To ensure effectiveness and efficiency in case management and data collection, a full-time coordinator assists both teams at each location. This role assists with coordination of meetings, data collection, reporting and investigation tracking, and other duties that enhance team functions.

Highlighted Requirements for the Case Management Team (CMT) (1a):

- UC common charter for defining team’s responsibilities
- Document and discuss any reports made
- Identify areas of vulnerability, themes, etc.
- Identify potential corrective action and responsible parties to address concerns
- Membership includes at a minimum, student conduct, Title IX, campus police, complainant advocate, and respondent support. Advocate will attend when no conflict arises. We will further discuss respondent support role in committee
- Meeting frequency is no less than bi-weekly

Highlighted Requirements for the Coordinated Community Review Team (CCRT) (1b):

- UC common charter for this team
- Membership includes key stakeholders across the campus and community and may include: sexual misconduct advocates, Title IX officer, campus and local police, student conduct, student health and counseling, residential life programs, LGBTQ, cross-cultural, and gender-related centers, student government representatives, and local rape crisis and/or community service representatives (the specific composition is to be determined by the campus)
- Meeting frequency is no less than quarterly

Campus implementation steps were identified and these teams begin (and continue, where applicable), in third quarter of FY 14/15. Communication strategy to promote these teams for the system and campus begins in January 2015, which includes highlighted newsletter articles, communication through websites, and other means to reach campus and community stakeholders. The Chancellors have also agreed to promote these committees through charge letters to the participants and provide overall messages to the campus on services and support available in this area.

Campus Metrics

An important consideration for the UC Model is to evaluate its effectiveness both in the short- and long term. To ensure that the campuses are responding effectively, metrics are an important consideration. The Task Force is still discussing metrics and the following possible metrics may be considered for the CMT in January/February 2015.

<u>CMT Metrics</u>	<u>Data Source</u>
Case trends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of sexual misconduct cases handled by CMT; • # of these cases that are student-related sexual misconduct reports; • # of sexual misconduct reports filed with UCPD
Sexual Misconduct cases completed on a timely basis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of reports made from different functions; • # of resolutions on sexual misconduct investigations; • Resolution timeframes; • Any exceptions to process
Cases extensions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of requested extensions; • # of extensions in various groupings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ between 60 and 90 days ○ between 90 and 120 days ○ longer than 120 days

<u>CMT Metrics</u>	<u>Data Source</u>
Methodology behind granting case extensions is applied consistently	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rationale of extension
CMT members communicate with each other and complete their work timely	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discuss and review timeliness using case hallmarks (i.e. average length of time to complete a task in the case, see where lags exist);
Respondent and Complainant receive appropriate and timely communication from CMT members who are responsible for contact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reporting of communication provided to complainant and/or respondent to monitor for timeliness; • Average length of time between communications; • Initial communication provided with timely updates as determined by each office in procedures; • # of communications (as determined by hallmarks)

CCRT Metrics will be further developed in January/February 2015. Campus CCRT will periodically measure items, such as:

- Campus departments’ understanding of where to direct survivors for confidential support.
- Complainants and respondents’ knowledge of rights and what campus resources are available to help them.
- Campus activities provided such as community awareness on response and prevention related to sexual misconduct.
- Participating community groups’ awareness of on-campus activities related to prevention of and response to sexual misconduct.

RECOMMENDATION 4: Implement a comprehensive communication strategy to educate the community and raise awareness about UC programs.

RECOMMENDATION 6: Establish a comprehensive systemwide website with campus customization capabilities.

Recommendations 4 and 6 are both part of an overall communication strategy and have been combined for consistent implementation. University of California Office of the President (UCOP) Communications built, launched, and will initially manage the systemwide website that links to individual campus websites, which all have common types of information, nomenclature, and referrals to similar resources. The systemwide website has links to information on (1) where to get confidential help; (2) how to file a report or complaint; and (3) what other resources are available, on each campus, among other critical information. Each campus website provides this information specific to its location.

To sustain the systemwide site, a dedicated subject-matter expert will be identified to maintain the ongoing website content, work in collaboration with both system and campus communications, and assure websites are continually updated and contain clear and consistent messaging.

UCOP Communications engaged with Task Force and Work Group members, including students, campus communications officers, and other experts to create and implement the communication strategy. Key goals for the communication strategy include:

- A comprehensive systemwide website, with certain common elements mirrored on every campus site.
- Involving students in crafting and delivering the communication messages to the UC community.
- Increasing awareness across the UC community regarding resources and programs.
- Facilitating consistent key messages and information, with UCOP Communications and campus communications offices working closely together.
- Demonstrating UC's commitment to combating sexual misconduct on campus.
- Supplementing and supporting existing campus programs and student campaigns.
- Providing UC fact sheets, UC Glossary, communication models, streaming of self-generated stories, news, updates, and outreach to student news media.
- Leveraging, as appropriate, current campus and national campaigns, such as the White House campaign "It's On Us" and the student leadership initiative, "UConsent."

The Task Force and Work Groups identified specific implementation steps and timelines to meet the requirements set. Due to the inter-connected nature of these recommendations with the Task Force's remaining work, the Task Force will determine how best to measure the effectiveness of these recommendations, in conjunction with its ongoing work during the Spring and Summer 2015.

RECOMMENDATION # 5: Establish an independent²confidential and privileged³ Advocacy Office for sexual misconduct (dating violence, domestic violence, stalking and sexual violence) and sexual assault on each campus.

The Model

Each location will have established by January an independent, confidential Advocacy Office for sexual misconduct (dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual violence, and stalking) called CARE: Advocacy Office for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence and Misconduct (CARE). The office focuses on sexual misconduct and is charged with providing confidential advocacy, participating in case management of reported complaints, assisting with providing professional training in coordination with key stakeholders, and providing input regarding policy creation and revision. CARE serves as the primary point of contact for all complainants, if desired by the complainants, of sexual misconduct to talk about their options and the services available to them. In addition, other members of the University community who receive reports of sexual misconduct must take proactive steps to refer the complainants to CARE for advocacy support.

CARE has a minimum of one dedicated full-time confidential Advocate who is trained and prepared to provide and/or coordinate support. Even though the Advocate cannot be available 24/7, the same qualified and trained level of support exists any time of the day for all complainants, given the size and needs of the individual campus. A UC common job description with minimum qualifications has been developed to ensure consistency throughout the system. In addition, a UC common charter for CARE has also been developed for the offices on campus.

CARE directly reports to a Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs or Campus Ethics and Compliance Officer (CECO), but if either of these roles supervises the office(s) responsible for investigation and/or adjudication of sexual misconduct complaints, the campus has identified another individual equivalent to a Vice Chancellor (VC) level for CARE to report to who meets these requirements.

² Independence refers to CARE reporting to an individual outside the body responsible for investigating and adjudicating sexual misconduct complaints on campus.

³ For domestic violence, the Advocate is not a privileged resource under the law. CARE will ensure complainants are aware of this legal requirement prior to providing services.

CARE must be centrally and neutrally located on campus. It is important for this office to be separate and distinct from any reporting and investigation function to maintain independence, confidentiality and/or privilege. Each campus identified the appropriate reporting structure to assure they are in conformity with these requirements. In addition, the physical space of the office will be accessible to students. If the existing office is currently located on campus, each campus identified any modifications of this location to fit the UC common model. Each campus has identified the location for CARE and is currently implementing its plan. Due to the logistics of space allocation, construction, etc., the campuses may have temporary locations for this office until the permanent location is constructed later in this fiscal year.

Highlighted Requirements for CARE:

- UC common charter for the CARE
- UC common name for office and UC common job description
- CARE on every campus has a minimum of one dedicated position that is/will be trained (by end of Jan/early Feb 2015) and 24/7 qualified, trained support will be provided at any time of day for all complainants, given the size and needs of the individual campus.
- Each campus has identified the reporting structure for the Advocate to address the issue of independence from reporting and investigations. VC level or higher is being utilized as appropriate or alternative reporting identified if these positions are conflicted due to the need to maintain the Advocate's independence from the bodies responsible for investigating and adjudicating sexual misconduct complaints on campus.
- The Advocate initially provides advocacy services for the student population.
- Support for staff and faculty is still under discussion by the Task Force, but current services available are employee assistance, ombudsperson, and police services.

Campus identified implementation timelines and they will meet the milestone deadlines discussed above; implementation steps include use of UC common job descriptions, job classification, posting and hiring, UC common office charter, evaluation of office location and plans for moving office, where applicable, and reporting structure for the role. Systemwide training will begin for CARE Advocates in January 2015, where needed.

Campus Metrics

An important consideration for the UC Model is to evaluate its effectiveness both in the short- and long-term. The Task Force is still discussing metrics and the following possible metrics may be considered for CARE, although none of these are finalized.

Metrics	Data Source
Campus constituents are aware of the advocate role and that they can contact advocacy support 24/7 and are using these services as appropriate	Baseline information for office will be collected the first year. These will be a basis for monitoring activity from year to year, and not as a basis for judging the effectiveness of this office: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of clients seen by CARE; • # of CARE clients who are students, faculty, or staff; • # of cases coming in from various avenues (phone, email, walk-in); • Reports from complainants about how they found out about advocate (on intake form); • # of cases coming in outside regular business hours; • # of campus awareness events/speaking engagement/programs advocate facilitates or collaborates on;
Graduate and undergraduate students are using CARE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify if students who report experiencing sexual misconduct utilize advocate services • Feedback received by CARE
Complainants receive comprehensive advocacy services where appropriate, i.e., academic and/or housing, referrals to other services, protective orders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of accommodations requested; • # of accommodations received; • # of housing accommodations requested; • # of accommodations received

New: Proposal to Include in Formal Recommendations: Respondents should receive support services from an advisor with similar training, equitable resources, and campus support comparable to that of the complainant advocate. July 2015

The Task Force agreed that a fair and balanced process should be provided to both complainants and respondents. While campuses currently provide services to respondents, they are not consistent across the system. To bring equity in this area within the new model, a Task Force subcommittee comprised of representatives from across the UC system—including students and administrators—are developing recommendations about the services that respondents should receive using a deliberative process similar to the one the Task Force used in the design of the Advocacy Office (CARE).

In order to protect the privacy and confidentiality of both parties, respondents should have an alternate support housed in a location separate from CARE. Also, it is felt that respondent support service advisors should be trained on how to handle incidents of sexual misconduct and that they be well informed about resources for help and support. These features are being considered by the Task Force subcommittee.

To address the training issue immediately, the University will provide the UC training systemwide to those currently performing respondent support. Campuses are working to further develop, refine, and develop a consistent approach to respondent support services throughout Spring 2015, with final recommendations to the President for approval and implementation by July 2015. The Task Force is committed to a thoughtfully created, sustainable model, and therefore, wants to assure that while looking at respondent services, we are also addressing the various intersections between services provided to respondents and the Task Force recommendations to adopt systemwide standard investigation and adjudication standards.

UC Ombuds Offices: These offices offer additional independent, confidential, impartial, and informal conflict resolution support for both respondents and survivors.

UC Ombuds Offices (which are an existing resource) provide confidential, impartial, and informal conflict resolution and problem-solving services for all students, administrators, faculty, and staff. Ombuds Offices are safe places for individuals to talk off-the-record, sort through their options, consider next steps, and obtain information about campus support and reporting resources. Unless there is an imminent risk of serious physical harm to self or others, the Ombudsperson holds all information, including the identity of individuals, in strict confidence.

As an informal resource, Ombuds Offices can clarify or explain University processes, but they do not participate in formal hearings or investigations nor do they have authority to render decisions. In addition, UC Ombuds Offices are not offices of record or offices of notice. According to University policy, individuals who consult with UC Ombuds Offices are advised that their discussions are not considered reports of sexual harassment or sexual misconduct and that without additional action by the individual, the discussions will not result in any action by the University to resolve their concerns. In this way, individuals are able to maintain control of next steps and decide how they want to proceed at their own pace.

Ombuds Offices also serve as a resource for members of the campus community who have concerns about the institution's methods of prevention and response to sexual misconduct to talk confidentially about their experiences and ideas for improvement. For example, if a complainant or respondent is experiencing difficulty or has concerns about the sexual misconduct complaint process,⁴ they may contact an Ombuds Office. With permission of the individual, the Ombudsperson can alert appropriate administrators to issues involving process improvements. If a problem is systemic, the Ombudsperson may, upon his or her own initiative, provide upward feedback without disclosing confidential information. This provides an opportunity for the University to address both the systemic issues and/or individual concerns related to the complaint process.

⁴ In order to avoid any actual or perceived conflicts of interest in their complaint resolution capacities, the UC Ombuds Offices do not participate as decision makers in developing policies or processes. Instead Ombuds Offices served as non-voting, advisory members in working groups of the Task Force.

NEXT STEPS FOR REMAINING PHASE II RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE

Creating a culture of trust on UC campuses is an ongoing process. The remaining three recommendations and the additional respondent support services will be implemented by July 2015 with a final Phase II report on implementation of these recommendations to the President and Regents in September 2015. At this time, we will also provide initial results from our metrics for each of the implemented January milestones. To demonstrate a sustainable model, annual reports from the Task Force will be provided to the President. In addition, as the legislative session gets under way and the U.S. Congress continues to focus on sexual misconduct on our nation's campuses, the UC Model will be reviewed and updated, where applicable, to ensure compliance with all applicable laws and regulations and to ensure UC's position as a national leader in preventing and responding to sexual misconduct on our campuses is maintained.

APPENDICES

A. Task Force and Work Group Members

B. Glossary

Appendix A. Task Force and Work Group Members

Acknowledgements

The Task Force and Work Groups contain members from across the UC system and included faculty, Regents, staff, and students. A special thank you and recognition should be given for the input and work of each member for their time, energy, and passion in helping to bring these recommendations to fruition. The members took these recommendations and created implementation plans and detail to support a trauma-informed, efficient, and sustainable model for UC.

The Task Force would also like to thank the UC Chancellors for their support of these efforts, their work to implement the recommendations, and also for supporting those recognized below who took on this challenge in addition to their ongoing responsibilities.

Task Force Members	
Karen Leong Clancy	UC Regent
Bonnie Reiss	UC Regent
Sadia Saifuddin	Student Regent
Sheryl Vacca	Task Force Lead, Senior Vice President & Chief Compliance and Audit Officer
Deidre Acker	Staff Advisor to the Regents - Designate
Rishi Ahuja	Undergraduate Student
Susan Allen-Ortega	Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs - Health & Wellness
Adele Anfinson	Director, Student Health and Counseling Services
Savannah Badalich	Undergraduate Student
Margo Bennett	Chief of Police
Lori Chamberlain	Director of the Office for the Prevention of Harassment & Discrimination
Wendi Delmendo	Chief Compliance Officer
Jill Dunlap	Director, Campus Advocacy, Resources & Education Women's Center
Jerlena Griffin-Desta	Deputy to the Vice President and Executive Director, Student Services
Paul Henisey	Chief of Police
James D. Herren	Chief of Police
Hallie Hunt	Director, Center for Student Conduct and Assistant Dean of Students
David Lane	Systemwide Deputy Compliance Officer
Janet Lockwood	Manager, Academic Policy and Compensation
David Lopez-Carr	Professor of Geography, UCSB Chair, University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
Janina Montero	Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs

Task Force Members	
Nelson Peacock	Senior Advisor to the President
Luanna Putney	Associate Chancellor
Emily Roxworthy	Professor of Theater, UCSD Chair, University Committee on Affirmative Action
Eleanor Skarakis	Chief of Staff to the Vice President of Human Resources & Director of HR Policy
Holly Swift	Graduate Student
Tracey Tsugawa	Title IX Officer ⁵
Linda Williams	Associate Chancellor
Allison Woodall	Deputy General Counsel

Work Group Facilitators		
Berkeley	Margo Bennett	Chief of Police
Irvine	Paul Henisey	Chief of Police
	Mandy Mount	Director, Campus Assault Resources and Education
	Kirsten Quanbeck	Director, OEOD, Title IX/ Sexual Harassment Officer
Los Angeles	James D. Herren	Chief of Police
Riverside	Susan Allen-Ortega	Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs - Health & Wellness
San Diego	Benjamin White	Director of Student Conduct
Santa Barbara	Briana Conway	Victim Advocacy Specialist
Santa Barbara	Jill Dunlap	Director, Campus Advocacy, Resources & Education Women's Center
Santa Cruz	Caitlin Stinneford	Confidential State Certified Sexual Assault Crisis Coordinator

AVC/ Dean of Students		
Berkeley	Joseph Defraime Greenwell	Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students
Davis	Milton Lang	Associate Vice Chancellor
Irvine	Rameen A. Talesh	Assistant Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students
	John C. Daly	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Human Resources
	Lisa Cornish	Executive Director, Student Housing
Los Angeles	Maria Blandizzi	Interim Dean of Students
Merced	Charles Nies	Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students

⁵ Newly-hired Title IX officer, now serving on behalf of UCSC.

	Brian O'Bruba	Interim Assistant Vice Chancellor for Campus Life & Director, Center for Career & Professional Advancement
Riverside	Susan Allen-Ortega	Associate Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs - Health & Wellness
San Diego	Gary Ratcliff	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Student Life
Santa Barbara	Debbie Fleming	Senior Associate Dean of Student Life
	Angela Andrade	Associate Dean, Student Wellness Services
Santa Cruz	Alma Sifuentes	Associate Vice Chancellor/Dean of Students

Chief of Police		
Berkeley	Margo Bennett	Chief of Police
Davis	Matthew Carmichael	Chief of Police
Irvine	Paul Henisey	Chief of Police
Los Angeles	James D. Herren	Chief of Police
Merced	Rita Spaur	Chief of Police
Riverside	Mike Lane	Chief of Police
San Diego	David Rose	Chief of Police
San Francisco	Pamela E. Roskowski	Chief of Police
Santa Barbara	Dustin Olson	Chief of Police
Santa Cruz	Nader Oweis	Chief of Police

Prevention, Advocacy and Survivor Services (PASS)		
Berkeley	Christine (cici) Ambrosio	Director of Women's Resources and Sexual Harassment/Assault Resource Specialist
	Finn Schneider	Berkeley Cares Program Manager
	Lindsay Maurer	Undergraduate Student
	Marcia Gee Riley	Ombuds for Students and Post-doctoral Appointees
	Meghan Warner	Undergraduate Student
	Mari Knuth-Bouracee	Director of Sexual Assault Prevention & Student Advocacy
Davis	Jacquelynn Lira	Victim Advocate, CVPP
	Sarah A. Meredith	Education and Outreach Coordinator, Campus Violence Prevention Program
Irvine	Mandy Mount	Director, Campus Assault Resources and Education
	Zahabiyah Khorakiwala	CARE - Violence Prevention Coordinator
Los Angeles	Nicole Green	Director of Prevention and CARE - CAPS

Prevention, Advocacy and Survivor Services (PASS)		
	Mark Veldkamp	Student Care Manager/Advocate
Merced	Kari Mansager	Director of Violence Prevention Program
Riverside	Rhonda Dixon	Harassment Sexual Assault Resource Service Specialist
	Romaine L. Arterberry	Student Affairs Officer
San Diego	Jessica Heredia	Assistant Director, Sexual Assault & Violence Prevention Resource Center
	Nancy Wahlig	Director, Sexual Assault & Violence Prevention Resource Center
San Francisco	Adele Anfinson	Director of Student Health Services
Santa Barbara	Briana Conway	Victim Advocacy Specialist
	Jill Dunlap	Director, Campus Advocacy, Resources & Education Women's Center
Santa Cruz	Caitlin Stinneford	Confidential State Certified Sexual Assault Crisis Coordinator

Student Conduct		
Berkeley	Hallie Hunt	Director, Center for Student Conduct and Assistant Dean of Students
Davis	Donald Dudley	Director, Student Judicial Affairs
Irvine	Crystal Rae Lugo-Shearer	Director, Office of Student Conduct
Los Angeles	Debra F. Geller	Executive Director, Community Standards
Merced	Le'Trice Curl	Director, Student Life and Judicial Affairs
Riverside	Tasha Yules	Interim Deputy Director, Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs
San Diego	Benjamin White	Director of Student Conduct
Santa Barbara	Stephan Franklin	Assistant Dean of Students, Judicial Affairs
Santa Cruz	Lucy Rojas	Interim Judicial Affairs Director
	Ross Maxwell	Assistant Director, Student Conduct
Office of the President	Eric Heng	Assistant Director, Student Services

Title IX		
ANR	Linda Manton	Executive Director for Staff Personnel and Affirmative Action and Title IX Officer

Title IX		
Berkeley	Denise Oldham	Director & Title IX Officer
Davis	Wendi Delmendo	Chief Compliance Officer/Title IX Compliance Officer
Irvine	Kirsten Quanbeck	Director, OEOD, Title IX/Sexual Harassment Officer
	Theresa Gerrior	Senior Investigator/Deputy Title IX Officer
Los Angeles	Pamela Thomason – left UC in December, 2014, replacement will be identified	Sexual Harassment and Title IX Officer
Merced	Wendy Smith	Director of EEO/AA/Title IX & Accommodations Management
Riverside	Debbie L. Artis	Title IX Director
San Diego	Lori Chamberlain	Title IX Compliance Coordinator/Sexual Harassment Officer
San Francisco	Cristina Perez-Abelson	Director, Equal Employment Opportunity, Affirmative Action & ADA Compliance, Title IX Officer
Santa Barbara	Ricardo A. Alcaino	Director and Title IX Coordinator
Santa Cruz	Tracey Tsugawa	Title IX Officer
Office of the President	Jennifer Chin	Representative of the Office of the General Counsel
	Marie-Ann Hairston	Systemwide Employee Relations Director
	Katya Nottie	Title IX Officer/HR
LBNL	Christel Cantlin	Title IX Officer/HR

Additional Phase II Work Group Members		
Berkeley	Sara Thacker	Ombudsperson
	Andrew Goldblatt	Risk Manager
Davis	Susan Park	Ombudsperson
Irvine	J.Michael Chennault	Ombudsperson
	Dyan Hall	Work Life and Wellness Program Manager
Los Angeles	Kathy Canul	Ombudsperson
	Thomas Kosakowski	Ombudsperson
	Petrina Long	Associate Athletic Director
	Ellen Bui	Staff Diversity & Compliance
Riverside	Andrew Larratt-Smith	Ombudsperson
San Diego	John L. Armijo	Ombudsperson
San Francisco	Randy Daron	Ombudsperson

Additional Phase II Work Group Members		
	Leigh Kimberg, MD	HS Clinical Professor of Medicine, UCSF PRIME-US, Program in Medical Education for the Urban Underserved Intimate Partner and Family Violence Prevention, SF DPH
	Patricia O' Sullivan	Director of Research and Development in Medical Education in the UCSF School of Medicine
Santa Barbara	Kirsi Aulin	Ombudsperson
Santa Cruz	Cliff Dochterman	Athletic Director

* Task Force members also participated in Work Group efforts as time allowed

Appendix B. Glossary

Adjudication Process of deciding or resolving a dispute between two parties.

ASCA Association for Student Conduct Administration, whose mission is to support higher education professionals by providing education materials and resources, professional development opportunities, and a network of colleagues.

Campus Any UC location (e.g., campus, medical center, Office of the President) or the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab and Agriculture and Natural Resources.

Campus SaVE Act Campus Sexual Violence Elimination Act; an amendment to the Clery Act that requires higher education institutions to increase transparency about the scope of sexual violence on campus, guarantee victims enhanced rights, provide for standards in institutional conduct proceedings, and provide campus community wide prevention educational programming.

CARE: Advocacy Office for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence and Misconduct (CARE) This office focuses on sexual misconduct and is charged with providing confidential advocacy, participating in case management of reported complaints, assisting with providing professional training in coordination with key stakeholders, and providing input regarding policy creation and revision. CARE serves as the primary point of contact for all complainants, if desired by the complainants, of sexual misconduct, and other members of the University community who receive reports of sexual misconduct will take proactive steps to refer the complainants to CARE.

Case Management Team A team—comprised of student conduct, Title IX, campus police, advocacy and other subject matter experts as needed—maintains consistent coordination of reported cases, provides case management for all ongoing cases, ensures all cases are addressed efficiently and effectively, and coordinate communications with claimant and respondent. The Title IX Officer provides oversight of this team function.

Complainant Includes a survivor, victim, and someone who files a report of sexual misconduct.

Clery Act Jeanne Clery Act is a federal law that requires colleges and universities across the United States to disclose information about certain crime statistics on and around their campuses.

Clery Coordinator A campus officer responsible for ensuring compliance under the Jeanne Clery Act, which includes collecting, maintaining, and reporting campus crime statistics to Department of Education.

Consent Consent is informed. Consent is an affirmative, unambiguous, and conscious decision by each participant to engage in mutually agreed-upon sexual activity.

Consent is voluntary. It must be given without coercion, force, threats, or intimidation. Consent means positive cooperation in the act or expression of intent to engage in the act pursuant to an exercise of free will. Silence does not mean consent.

Consent is revocable. Consent to some form of sexual activity does not imply consent to other forms of sexual activity. Consent to sexual activity on one occasion is not consent to engage in sexual activity on another occasion. A current or previous dating or sexual relationship, by itself, is not sufficient to constitute consent. Even in the context of a relationship, there must be mutual consent to engage in sexual activity. Consent must be ongoing throughout a sexual encounter and can be revoked at any time. Once consent is withdrawn, the sexual activity must stop immediately.

Consent cannot be given when a person is incapacitated. A person cannot consent if they are unconscious or coming in and out of consciousness. A person cannot consent if they are under the threat of violence, bodily injury or other forms of coercion. A person cannot consent if their understanding of the act is affected by a physical or mental impairment.

Coordinated Community Review Team (CCRT)

Brings together a cross-section of campus and community constituents to guide the campus in preventing and responding to sexual misconduct at a campus level. The team is responsible for a campus collaborative approach to address sexual misconduct, and focuses on developing and reviewing policies, developing community relations (internal and external), discussing legal updates, providing cross training, and coordinating communication and prevention education and outreach efforts. The designated individual from each campus will provide oversight for this team and this team will report to the Chancellor (or designee).

Dating Violence Abuse committed by a person who is or has been in a social relationship of a romantic or intimate nature with the complainant and is determined by length and type of relationship and the frequency of interactions.

Dear Colleague Letter Guidance issued by the Office for Civil Rights on April 4, 2011 to assist colleges and universities with meeting their obligations under Title IX and to provide members of the public with information about their rights.

Domestic Violence Abuse committed against an adult or minor child who is a spouse or former spouse, cohabitant or former cohabitant, or someone with whom the abuser has a child, has an existing dating or engagement relationship, or has had a former dating or engagement relationship. It can be physical, sexual, emotional, economic, or psychological.

ED U.S. Department of Education, whose mission is to promote student achievement and preparation for global competitiveness by fostering educational excellence and ensuring equal access.

DOJ Department of Justice, whose mission is to enforce the law and defend the interests of the U.S., ensure public safety, prevent and control crime, and ensure justice for all Americans.

Governance Oversees the principles and program, ensures compliance and provides high-level strategic direction (the “what”).

Incapacitation is defined as the physical and/or mental inability to make informed, rational judgments. States of incapacitation include, but are not limited to, unconsciousness, sleep, and blackouts. Where alcohol, drugs or other medication are involved, incapacitation is defined with respect to how the alcohol or other drugs consumed affects a person’s decision-making capacity, awareness of consequences, ability to make fully informed judgments, and inability to communicate.

Being intoxicated by drugs, alcohol or other medication does not absolve one’s responsibility to obtain consent. The factors to be considered when determining whether consent was given include whether the respondent knew, or whether a reasonable person should have known, that the complainant was incapacitated.

LGBTQ Individuals who identify as Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning.

OCR Office for Civil Rights, within the DOJ, whose mission is to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation through vigorous enforcement of civil rights.

Ombuds - The Office of the Ombudsman provides a safe and comfortable environment to discuss complaints, concerns or problems confidentially. When appropriate, the office initiates an informal intervention with the goal of facilitating a resolution that is acceptable to all parties involved. The ombudsman acts as an independent, impartial resource. If a matter cannot be resolved through our office, a referral will be made. When appropriate, the office can make recommendations regarding policy review and change. The Office of the Ombudsman serves all students, faculty, staff, and administrators of the campus community.

Ongoing Prevention and Awareness Campaigns Programming, initiatives, and strategies that are sustained over time and focus on increasing understanding of topics relevant to and skills addressing dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual violence, and stalking, using a range of strategies with audiences throughout the institution.

Operations Each unit must implement the program as appropriate, in accordance with management directives (drives toward the “what” with the “how”).

Police Campus police are sworn police officers employed by a public school district, college or university to protect the campus and surrounding areas and the people who live on, work on and visit it. Campus police officers are commissioned through their state Peace Officer Standards and Training after completing established training and pre-licensure preparation. A university police officer has equivalent authority as a municipal or state peace officer. Funding for campus police are provided by the universities.

Primary Prevention Programs Programming, initiatives, and strategies informed by research or assessed for value, effectiveness or outcome that are intended to stop dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual violence, and stalking before they occur through the promotion of positive and healthy behaviors that foster healthy, mutually respectful relationships and sexually, encouraging safe bystander intervention, and seek to change behavior and social norms in health and safe directions.

PSA Public Service Announcement/Ad; messages in the public interest disseminated by the media with the objective of raising awareness and changing public attitudes and behaviors toward a social issue.

Records and information management Policy, regulations, and general principles for appropriately managing, accessing, and preserving administrative records throughout their lifecycle and schedules for their final disposition

Respondent – A person against whom a report of sexual misconduct is filed.

Response Model Teams The response model consists of two teams. 1. A case management team that includes, at a minimum, student conduct, Title IX, campus police and advocacy; team will meet regularly. 2. A team responsible for a campus collaborative approach to addressing sexual violence; to ensure success the team must include key stakeholders across the campus and community.

Sexual Assault Any type of sexual contact or behavior that occurs without the explicit consent of the recipient. This includes, but is not limited to, forced sexual intercourse, fondling, and attempted rape.

Sexual Harassment Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature. It is conduct that explicitly or implicitly affects a person’s employment or education or interferes with a person’s work or educational performance or creates an environment such that a reasonable person would find the conduct intimidating, hostile or offensive.

Sexual Misconduct Includes dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual violence, and stalking.

Sexual Violence Physical sexual acts engaged without the consent of the other person or when the other person is unable to consent to the activity.

Stalking When a person repeatedly engages in conduct directed at a specific person that places that person in reasonable fear of his or her safety or the safety of others.

Student Advocate A student who has the experience, skills, and knowledge to train students on how to recognize and address sexual misconduct and provide advice and assistance to survivors of sexual misconduct (dating violence, domestic violence, sexual assault, sexual violence, and stalking).

Student Conduct Officer University Official responsible for handling resolution meetings or conduct reviews with an individual alleged to have violated the Code of Conduct and to assign or recommend sanctions.

Title IX Officer The designated coordinator or agent of the University with the responsibility for coordinating University Title IX compliance efforts.

Trauma-Informed Approach Services designed to acknowledge the impact of violence and trauma on people's lives and the importance of addressing trauma in education. A Trauma-Informed Approach realizes the widespread impact of trauma and understands potential paths for recovery; recognizes the signs and symptoms of trauma in clients, families, staff, and others involved with the system; responds by fully integrating knowledge about trauma into policies, procedures, and practices; and seeks to actively resist re-traumatization.

Trauma-Informed Services - Trauma-informed services are those in which service delivery is influenced by an understanding of the impact of interpersonal violence and victimization on an individual's life and development. To provide trauma-informed services, all staff of an organization, from the receptionist to the direct care workers to the board of directors, must understand how violence impacts the lives of the people being served, so that every interaction is consistent with the recovery process and reduces the possibility of re-traumatization.

VAWA The Violence Against Women Act is a federal law meant to improve the criminal justice response to violence against woman.

University of California Policy On Sexual Harassment and Sexual Violence Policy that applies to all UC employees and students at its campuses and University programs and activities and furthers the University's commitment to compliance with the law and to the higher standards of ethical conduct.