

**University of Melbourne
Respect Taskforce
Meeting 1/2019**

CONFIRMED MINUTES

A meeting was held from 3.00 pm to 4:30 pm, Wednesday 27 March
Level 7 Meeting Room, Raymond Priestley Building

Members present: Pip Nicholson (chair), Hannah Buchan, Evan Kritikakos, Jonas Larsen, Maddy McMaster, Jenny Morgan, Dan Persaud, Damian Powell, Debra Tegoni.

BUSINESS

A. Formal Matters

A1 Welcome and Apologies

Welcome: Evan Kritikakos, Director Students and Equity; Maddy McMaster, Executive Director, Academic Services and Registrar (nominee of the Head of University Services)

Apologies received: Amanda Davis, Sally Eastoe, Cathy Humphreys, Bruce Tobin, Zimo Wang,

In attendance: Merryn Coutts (for Bruce Tobin), Lauren Taylor (for Zimo Wang).

Thanks: to Georgina Sutherland who has left the University to take on senior research and evaluation role at a new statutory agency called Respect Victoria.

A2 Minutes

The minutes from the meeting held on Wednesday 21 November 2018 were confirmed as accurate.

A3 Report from the Chair

A3.1 Governance

Pip Nicholson, Dean of Law, will chair the Respect Taskforce in 2019 as the Vice-Chancellor's nominee.

Richard James will withdraw from his strategic role as part of the Taskforce but will continue in his implementation role. He will also continue as the key liaison with the affiliated colleges.

Celia Scott will continue as executive officer for the Taskforce, as well as project lead (where required) and contact point for the Respect Initiative.

A3.2 Terms of reference

The terms of reference were reviewed, and the following changes agreed upon.

- Note that the chair is the VC's nominee
- Consolidate first and final points to clarify and emphasise the primary role of the Taskforce
- Point three amended to – 'Identify risks and other relevant issues to the University community'
- 'Reflect upon good practice and relevant external expertise' added as an additional term.

Action: EO to update the terms of reference with these changes.

A4. Action items

A4.1 Anonymous reporting

The Anonymous Register for Inappropriate Behaviour went live on March 14. The register is primarily a data collection process to better understand the scope and nature of these behaviours within our community, and to develop, implement and evaluate preventative efforts. Collated data from the register will be published on the Taskforce page. Overall ownership of the register and the data collected sits with the Provost, with their nominee, the Director, Wellbeing responsible for the management of database and reporting on the data collected. Quarterly reports will be provided to the Taskforce, with an interim report requested for the next meeting (May). Following discussion, the Taskforce recommended that an additional option be added to question 7 regarding whether the perpetrator was in a position of power or authority over the victim; and that there be information about support included at the exit point for the form. Considerable effort has been made to ensure that the form is truly anonymous, and that it cannot be linked to a specific user. Clear and repeated information is included to reinforce the understanding that use of this form is separate to making a formal report, and that formal reporting is encouraged.

The next stage is to investigate an informational escrow method of anonymous reporting. Informational escrow being a method of conditional, intermediated reporting, where the user is able to input information into a secure, private system with the condition that the information only be sent to pre-specified recipients under pre-specified conditions. The goal is to be able to contract a service provider for this service with 12 months, but before this can occur it is necessary to determine:

- what, if any, appropriate existing services are already available
- whether this should be UoM specific, or developed and managed in conjunction with other Australian Universities and
- how such an informational escrow service would be managed (scope, purpose and high-level management).

Action: Director, Wellbeing to report on the data collected through the register to the 2019.2 Taskforce meeting.

Action: Policy & Strategy Advisor (Respect Initiative) to organise additions to the register.

Action: Policy & Strategy Advisor (Respect Initiative) to undertake necessary research and planning with regards to informational escrow anonymous reporting.

A4.2 Always on communication plan

A brief overview of the 2019 always on communication plan was given, noting that the plan is primarily focussed on providing proactive messaging in conjunction with existing events in the University calendar, and as such extends beyond just the core Respect agenda. Particular points to note were the VC's video, new posters to be added to the 'Respect means...' series, and promotion of new resources (such as the anonymous register) as they are developed. Positive feedback about the posters, the VC's message and the register have been received from people both internal and external to the UoM community. The communication team are also mapping out pathways for responding to incidents (reactive rather than proactive communications). It was noted that the plan is still very student focussed, and that there needs to be an additional stream of work that focusses on staff (including casual staff who can be hard to reach with broader messaging), and one for providing tailored communications for specific sub-groups (particularly those that the

AHRC report noted as being at high risk). It was also suggested that there are events run by student groups which could also benefit from a Respect presence and assist in promoting the Respect communications.

Action: Marketing and Communications to colour code the 'always on' communication plan to separate Respect specific events from other associated activities.

Action: Marketing and Communications to liaise with student representatives to determine appropriate student led events at which there could be a Respect presence or link to communication campaign.

Action: Marketing and Communications to expand plan to include strategies for ensuring that messages reach all staff, and at-risk groups.

B1.

| Topic | Independent external review (AHRC recommendation 4) |
|-------------------|---|
| Presenters | Pip Nicholson |
| Discussion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All universities made a commitment to undertake an external review within 12 months of release of Change the Course as part of recommendation 4. • After assessing known issues that could be resolved, the University chose to delay the timing of the review until after key new initiatives were in place, to ensure that the findings would be of most value and effectiveness for the process of maturation and bedding down of revised policies, practices and procedures. • The review is now a necessary stage in both evaluating progress to date and enhancing and improving our response in the future. • The review is expected to take 3-6 months and begin in Q3 2019. • It was noted that the recommendation does not cover preventative practices. It was agreed the review should include this, as well policies and response pathways (which includes complaint handling). • It was also agreed that the review would cover the whole UoM community – noting the blurred lines between staff and students. • It is expected that the review would include clear definitions of 'effectiveness' as this is not defined in the recommendation. • It was discussed that the review will most likely require a range of different expert opinions who can view the policies and processes through the lens of both victim-survivor and alleged perpetrator (which is a significant tension in all of this work). This may include sexual violence and trauma response experts as well as legal and compliance expertise. |
| Next steps | <p><i>Action: Terms of reference to be drafted for submission to meeting 2019.2</i></p> <p><i>Action: Director Wellbeing to collate Terms of Reference from other University reviews and submit to the EO.</i></p> <p><i>Action: Any member to send recommendation for reviewers (individuals/companies) to EO.</i></p> <p><i>Action: Chair to work with the Provost to determine the extent of their respective roles in commissioning the review.</i></p> |

B2.

| | |
|--------------|---------------------------|
| Topic | Complaint handling |
|--------------|---------------------------|

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Presenters | Pip Nicholson |
| Discussion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complaint management will be included in the external review. • It was noted that there were still known issues in this area that could be resolved, at least in part, prior to the review. • This includes, but is not limited to – failure to acknowledge the significant overlap between staff and student, instead treating these as two discrete units; lack of information regarding timelines, potential outcomes and the process overall; basic language and structural errors within policies |
| Next steps | <p><i>Action: Chair to work with General Counsel and University Secretary to determine how to act on policy weaknesses.</i></p> <p><i>Action: Director, Students & Equity and DVC (Academic & Undergraduate) to determine how to improve process and management for student specific complaints.</i></p> |

B3.

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Topic | Identifying those with expertise in handling Sexual Assault Prevention and Response within the tertiary sector |
| Presenters | Pip Nicholson |
| Discussion | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It as agreed that it would be beneficial for the Taskforce to build a database of subject matter experts, and good practices and theories to draw upon as required. • When there are subject matter experts visiting the University, it would be beneficial for Taskforce members to meet with them to hear about their work. |
| Next steps | <p><i>Action: Taskforce members to share details of experts with Chair and EO to develop a database of these.</i></p> <p><i>Action: Add a standing item to the agenda, for members to advise of new known experts.</i></p> |