

**University of Melbourne
Respect Taskforce
Meeting 5/2017**

CONFIRMED MINUTES

A meeting was held from 3.30 pm to 4:45 pm, Wednesday 13 December 2017
Level 7 Meeting Room, Raymond Priestley Building

Members present: Richard James (Chair), Elizabeth Capp, Erin Dale, Amanda Davis, Paul Duldig, Kylie Gould, Cathy Humphreys, Jenny Morgan, Daniel Persaud, Damian Powell

BUSINESS

A. Formal Matters

A1 Welcome and Apologies

Apologies: Max Bergh, John Hee, Sally Eastoe, Georgina Sutherland, Molly Willmott

A2 Minutes

The minutes of the previous meeting were confirmed as accurate.

A3 Action Items

The action items are all in progressed. Some are discussed in greater detail in B1.

B1.

Topic	2017 Stocktake
Presenters	Richard James
Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The 'always on' communication strategy is under development, with key staff in External Relations having been briefed. The first focus point is O-Week. Messaging targeting both staff and students will continue throughout the year. Discussion is under way on how to broaden the tolerance and inclusivity message, without detracting from the core focus on sexual assault and harassment which will remain the main priority.• This broader lens aligns with the proposal to combine or co-brand Respect and Diversity weeks in 2018. It was agreed that it would be good if Respect Week could be themed around the ideas generated by the Taskforce.• A future campaign focused on the consequences of breaching the behaviour policies was agreed to be of value.• Peer-to-peer conversations around consent are the most effective. We need to develop better ways of reaching our students, looking beyond just the elected representatives. The student precinct engagement strategy may provide a good model for this engagement.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first meeting of the Respect Student Reference Group will be held next week. We have not received a copy of the UMSU recommendations. • The Consent Matters module will be delivered to commencing undergraduate students in 2018 as part of their enrolment process and made available to other students as the semester progresses. • The Broderick report has been released, and at a college level at least, may provide a good vehicle for discussion with students.
Next steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further discussions / work around: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ perpetrators, ○ bystanders ○ measuring impact.

B2.

Topic	Policy on student-staff relationships
Presenters	Amanda Davis
Discussion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An article in The Conversation about moving from a misconduct perspective to a professional standards perspective was used to frame the discussion. • Historically, there have always been rules regarding conflict of interest and direct teaching and marking. It was agreed that conflict of interest is still a good approach, but that there needs to be more rigorous oversight and clearer rules about declarations. This will help to normalise behaviours and reduce the likelihood of covert activities. • While all student-staff relationships need to be considered, the focus was on supervisors – research students. These can be the most intense and open to misbehaviour which can have a toxic effect on others in the vicinity as well as the primary participants. • It is important that the policy is responsive to all inappropriate behaviour, not just sexual misconduct. • In writing, reviewing and evaluating policy it is important to keep in mind that it is illegal to discriminate on the grounds of lawful sexual activity, that different cultural sensitivities may be involved, and that relationships may pre-date the staff-student one so blanket bans are inappropriate. • While there are significant concerns around the conscious or unconscious abuse of power dynamics in sexual relationships, the problem is broader than this and may also result in real or perceived bias in assessment, allocation of resources and access to opportunity. • This power dynamic should be used to develop and articulate the framework for review with a focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ degrees of separation and influence ○ time frames ○ gender issues ○ social boundaries • A review of policy should also cover ideas on how to:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ reach the whole community (especially those who are on a small time fraction, and/or recruited at short notice without time for full onboarding and training), and○ use this as means of affirming that respectful relationships are relevant to everyone as part of the university community.
Next steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Subgroup (Richard, Celia, Sally, Jenny, Amanda, Kylie) to undertake review of relevant policies. This will include tightening existing wording and clearly re-articulating what is and is not acceptable.