



Existing Complaints and Reporting Policy

Stanford Pod

Below, you will find a summary of the existing complaints and reporting policies. Each section is divided up by different levels: (1) Stanford University, (2) School of Earth, Environment, and Energy, (3) Departmental, and (4) Lab.

Relevant links for reporting policies

Stanford University Level:

Although one can report concern through the Diversity and Access Office [here](#), the student non-academic grievance procedure, found [here](#), is where students are recommended to file race-based harassment grievances. Title IX sexual violence, sexual harassment, gender discrimination incidents are reported [here](#).

Some other important links include accessing the mediator through the Ombuds office ([here](#)), the non-academic staff grievance policy ([here](#)), and the academic staff grievance policy ([here](#)).

Once a staff grievance has been filed, one can find out more about the following steps [here](#). If a faculty member is involved, the process follows the procedure outlined in sect 4.3 [here](#). Threat and violence reporting system can be found [here](#). This seems to be more for people who have threatened violence (e.g. school shooting).

The “Acts of Intolerance” program ([here](#)) through the Dean of Students was introduced over 20 years ago, and the policies related to that program are [currently being reviewed](#) (last review was 10 years ago). Rates of reporting through this program are not listed in a public place.

School of Earth Level:

School-level reporting structure is outlined along with university-level structures on the [Stanford Earth website](#) and in the [Stanford Earth Policy on Respectful and Inclusive Behavior](#). From the second document, the Respectful Community Committee “regularly reviews this Policy on Respectful and Inclusive Behavior”, which would include the reporting structure.

Department Level:



No information can be found on the “Resources” tab for any of the departments stating policies for reporting at the department level. ERE has a link to the Title IX Office website for reporting.

Lab Level:

There are no guidelines for labs when it comes to reporting. Some labs have their own methodology for combating inequality.

Relevant mechanisms of reporting

Stanford University Level:

For complaints, bias, microaggressions, harassment, and overt racism, the Diversity and Access Office is the most likely place to go. Reports can be made by email (equal.opportunity@stanford.edu) or phone (650) 723-0755, so *not* online and *not* anonymously. Students are able to be accompanied by an advocate. If students would like a confidential place to report, they can contact anyone of the people listed [here](#).

Physical injuries can be reported [here](#) within 24 hours. The incident report then is reviewed by University supervisor/managers, Environmental Health and Safety, and Risk Management. However, these are not in explicit regards to microaggressions, harassments, or overt racism.

An alternative is reporting “Acts of Intolerance” (hereafter referred to as ‘AOI’) through the Dean of Students [here](#). Reports are made online and can be anonymous. Note that this is not a judicial or investigative process, but designed to collect data and help affected students. Reports go to the Student Affairs staff and are maintained by the Office of Inclusion, Community and Integrative Learning. Involvement of other offices/police is dependent on the situation of the report.

School of Earth Level:

Sources include:

- 1) Publicly available “Reporting structures and resources” page ([link](#))
- 2) Private SE3 resource (require SUID and SE3 attendance), “Stanford Earth Respectful Community Resources” ([link](#))
- 3) Private SE3 resource, “Graduate Student Life Resources” flowchart ([link](#))

General recommended procedure

There are no confidential reporting resources at the school level. The general recommended procedure is a hierarchical reporting process for the reporter. In other words, the School recommends the reporter to:

- (1) Initially consider reporting to immediate supervisor, instructor, or advisor
- (2) If not appropriate, then reporters/individuals may go to higher levels within department, program, school or university

Designated individuals/positions

Sexual Harassment Advisors



Sexual Harassment Advisors (SHA) are authorized to receive complaints and will treat information discreetly and privately. Individuals with concerns may go to any SHA campus-wide. <https://harass.stanford.edu/help/advisers>. Strict confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, and an SHA has an obligation to notify SHARE-TitleIX of concerns of harassing behavior that they either witness or are told about. The SHA may consult with SHARE-TitleIX without providing party names before a decision about reporting is made. If a report goes to SHARE-TitleIX, the SHA may remain involved or the process may shift fully to the SHARE-TitleIX team.

For who: Anyone in Stanford who seeks guidance about (1) sexually harassing behavior or (2) information about the University's policy and procedures.

What: The advisors are authorized to receive complaints. They are non-confidential resources and will treat information "discreetly and privately".

Who (in SE3):

Amy Balsom (Dean's office), Jef Caers (Geological sciences), Scott Fendorf (Earth System Sciences), Ann Marie Pettigrew (EIPER), Alyssa Ferree (Dean's office, for grad students and postdoc) Sue Crutcher (Human resources, for faculty and staff)

Assistant Dean for Student Services

Who: Alyssa Ferree

For who: For non-confidential concerns from Graduate student or postdoc in SE3

What: (1) Aid resolution at a "local level", (2) "[make] appropriate connections", (3) Referrals to appropriate resources

Microaggression, overt racism, or discrimination

SE3 lists Lupe Carrillo (Director of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion) as a "Stanford Earth Respectful Community Resource" but we couldn't find the scope of the work that they do.

Reporting procedures

Reporting obligation

Most of the school-level reporting resources are non-confidential, but these individuals (and other "Responsible Employees") hold the responsibility to report their knowledge of unreported concerns relating to Title IX Prohibited Conduct, including (1) sexual harassment and abuse, (2) allegations of discrimination, (3) minor abuse, and (4) risk to oneself or others, to "the appropriate cognizant office".

No further information can be found in regards to the procedures after a person reports to one of the resources in the school-level besides "referral and guidance". Procedural information that couldn't be found were (1) the medium of reporting (online, in-person, email, etc.), (2) who the reports go to and who has access, (3) the extent of police involvement, and (4) advocates for the reporter.

**Department Level:**

Geophysics Director of Student Services, Director of Graduate Studies, Associate Chair for Diversity and Inclusion, Department Chair are all listed as contacts on the graduate advising agreement page. Method of contact, protocols, and resources are not listed anywhere I could find.

Other departments Similar reporting structures as those noted above for Geophysics but this hierarchy is not made clear on any public-facing websites we observed.

Lab Group Level:

If mentioned at all, lab group documents generally point students to resources/reporting mechanisms at the department level and above. At least one highlighted specific department and school level personnel for reporting along with their contact information.

Outcomes and Consequences

Stanford University Level:

For AOI reports, the response to the report can be shared with the reporting party if they wish and varies depending on the level of personal and community impact. Data is maintained and analyzed by the Office of Inclusion, Community and Integrative Learning to look for patterns, though where the public can find that data is not clear.

School of Earth Level:

The accountability section on page 4 of [this PDF](#) outlines potential school-level consequences. Consequences for students can include “constructive conversation, formal warning, grade impact, community service, suspension, and expulsion.” For faculty and staff, consequences can include “constructive conversation, formal warning, salary and/or promotion impact, restriction on accepting/advising students or supervising others, removal from leadership positions, and termination.”

Department Level:

Geophysics Unable to find documentation on GP site, reply from staff did not clarify if there is publicly available information on this process.

Other departments There does not appear to be publicly available data for other departments.

Lab Group Level:

We are not aware of any lab groups with their own reporting or stats tracking beyond the department, school, and university level systems.

Protection and resources for reporters

Stanford University Level:

Students who need support or if staff and faculty are trying to support students, they can look through the [Red Folder](#), which has a comprehensive list of resources. [Here](#) is a



comprehensive list of resources available on sexual harassment. There is a subsection of resources which are confidential (not mandatory reporters under Title IX) including Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS), The Bridge (peer counselling), and Confidential Support Team, all of which are confidential and available 24/7 by phone. Stanford staff can find resources for reporting incidences [here](#).

For the student, non-academic grievance process “Neither the grievance nor the appeal process relieve the student from their obligation to timely meet course or degree requirements.” Retaliation is prohibited.

The reporting page for “Acts of Intolerance” through the Dean of Students provides links and information on resources described above on the first page of the reporting form, before any information is requested. Reporting can be done anonymously, and individual cases are reviewed by Student Affairs staff members. Options are presented based on the circumstances of the report (hate crimes or harassment automatically triggers involvement of relevant offices). Party can choose to remain involved, in which case a meeting and path to resolution will be discussed.

School of Earth Level:

Described [here](#). Primary direction is towards the University-wide resources (including CAPS and the Confidential Support Team, both of which are confidential resources). Within the School of Earth level, the same page suggests that primary contacts should be “Department Chairs and Program Directors, Student Services teams, Directors of Graduate and Undergraduate Studies, and/or faculty advisors.” For sexual harassment, there is a specific list of trained faculty and staff whom students are invited to talk with and who are “authorized to receive complaints.” None of these school-level support options are confidential, meaning that they are all mandatory reporters under Title IX.

Department Level:

Geophysics Unable to find any resources outlined on the website, staff did not point me towards any public facing information around this either.

Other departments No public-facing information

Lab Group Level:

Some lab groups make a point to highlight the department/school/university level resources and reporting mechanisms in their group expectations or handbook documents.

Avenues to changes to policy

Stanford University Level:

Individuals or groups can raise issues or propose changes at the university level through the Associated Students of Stanford University (ASSU). The ASSU has multiple different [committees](#) with representatives that can be contacted. These special committees range from Community Responsibility, Food Insecurity and Free Speech and Political Engagement. Furthermore, ASSU includes the Undergraduate Senators and Graduate Student Council where individuals can petition changes. Within the GSC, there is a [Diversity & Advocacy Committee](#) which conducts projects and organizes events to support a healthy,



diverse community. ASSU also includes the [Nominations Commission](#), which is a committee composed of undergraduate and graduate students. They are voting members to university committees like the Board of Trustees committees and academic policy committees. Their town hall dates can be found on their main page.

Stanford wide climate reports appear to be conducted every 4 years. The reports are made available [here](#).

School of Earth Level:

There are no school-level cultural or climate surveys. But the school does regularly participate in university-wide climate, well-being, etc. surveys that yield school-level data in all categories when the “N” is sufficient. There are several such surveys set to roll out in Spring 2021.

The Graduate Student Advisory Committee (GSAC) is the main vehicle for student input at the school level. It is a voluntary role and there are 2-3 graduate student representatives from each department and program in SE3. The committee has an advisory role and cannot directly change policies

General procedure for raising issues and proposing changes

- Each quarter, the representatives hold a town hall meeting to solicit feedback and concerns.
- The representatives collaborates an agenda to be sent to the Dean’s office
- Steve Graham (SE3 Dean) holds a town hall with the GSAC representative every quarter where the GSAC members bring up the concerns

Follow up process

- The GSAC co-chair compiles the list of “action items” established in the town hall and send it to the GSAC members and members of the Dean’s office (below):
 - Steve Graham (Dean of SE3)
 - Robyn Dunbar (Associate dean of educational affairs)
 - Lupe Carillo (Director of diversity, equity and inclusion)
 - Alyssa Ferree (Associated dean of student services)
 - Audrey Yau (Educational affairs program director)
 - Barbara Buell (Associate dean, Chief marketing and communications officer)
- The GSAC co-chairs meet with Robyn Dunbar once a month to follow up and raise new issues

The Respectful Community Committee (RCC) was re-envisioned toward a more proactive role in Winter 2020. The committee now meets quarterly to consider changes to the Policy on Respectful and Inclusive Behavior, and to advise on communications, training programs, and events. Input on reporting policies would be collected there and elevated, if need be, to the Dean and/or relevant units for response. A school-wide survey for individual feedback on the Policy went out in Fall 2020 and could be promoted on a regular basis to ensure opportunity for broader input. This survey has not produced much feedback to date, but maintaining and promoting a mechanism for individual feedback remains a priority.



Department Level:

Geophysics

Staff meets with GSAC reps after every quarterly Town Hall, additionally has yearly department wide town hall. GSAC reps are the main empowered group of students to propose changes to policy.

Other departments

GSAC/PDAC representatives are likely the best way to move forward with change as they are often in close association with their department chairs. However, no mechanism/document with instructions of how to make amendments/changes to policy is available for GSAC/PDAC reps.

Lab Group Level:

Some lab groups publicly post expectations/norms documents. Others have these documents, but keep them internal. And other lab groups do not have any such documents. Some lab groups with expectations documents review the document at least once per year and update it based on input from students, post docs, and the advisor. Historically these documents have focused on academic/research/time expectations and include little to no language about anti-racism, reporting misconduct, or DEI-related expectations. Presumably based on these documents, a lab member experiencing or observing negative behavior within the lab could go to the advisor and discuss that behavior as a violation of the group's expectations.

Missing items or items that were difficult to find

1. Quantitative analysis or summary of the reports that answer questions like "how many reports are there each year"?
2. Labs are not integrated into the reporting process. Is there a way to standardize labs' response to racism?
3. How regularly are reporting policies reviewed? Or are they only amended when a group or an individual reaches a discord with the policy?
4. What are the steps to escalate a concern?
5. How are issues that are not legal, such as microaggression, intervened?

In summary, there is a lack of resources in one place. There are a lot of resources that are scattered, which makes it difficult for the reporter to navigate through the system. This might be a result of inconsistencies as to where resources should be kept. Furthermore, it is unclear if any resources will be provided for the reporter like a therapist to help them through the difficult stages. The lack of transparency in the system such as *what are the possible consequences of*



the reported individual; what is the escalation process; how often are reports made; are reports actually kept track of; and if the extreme reports are not clearly addressed, is there confidence that microaggressions will be addressed strain the effectiveness of reporting.