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Executive Summary

The Project Group’s goal was to create a report that could inform a Task Force on Third-Party Actions that would in turn enable behavioral and cultural modifications that could enhance the reputation of MIT as a welcoming, supportive environment for all people. Initial meetings were spent in discussion and planning, utilizing tools and skills learned in the Leader to Leader curriculum. The Project Group sought clarification from its clients, and, guided by their comments, focused its inquiries on bystander training specifically. The Project Group met frequently for discussion and planning, conducted a series of interviews to understand the perspectives and advice of experienced stakeholders around the Institute, and researched the approaches of other organizations. The accumulated information and opinions were discussed, analyzed, and synthesized.

The Project Group’s conclusions indicate that the issue has three parts: 1) the prevalence of uncivil behavior, 2) the lack of preparation of MIT community members to deal with the incivility, and 3) the need for Institute systems that foster positive norms of behavior. Periodic efforts have been temporarily successful to increase civility within targeted groups. The Project Group recommends an ongoing program that can be Institute-wide or adopted by multiple units so that bystander training can be incorporated into MIT cultural norms to prepare people with the aptitude to react confidently, quickly, and effectively to preclude and address incivility.

The Project Group’s analysis yields the following characteristics of effective programs: 1) a combination of clear expectations and education/training programs, 2) sufficient scope of training to be widely inclusive, 3) repeated opportunities to introduce strategies to new people and to reinforce skills and awareness, 4) creative approaches that illustrate and engage. Creating a sustainable and effective program at MIT will require addressing the following areas: MIT community culture and structure, communications, training, planning and reinforcement, metrics and reporting, budget and administration. The Project Group report includes additional examples and insights, and a comprehensive appendix provides potentially useful articles and documents from existing programs.
Task

Donna Behmer, Senior Associate Dean for Finance and Administration, Sloan School, and Annette Jacobs, Executive Director, MIT Medical, submitted a scope statement that outlined the context and goal for the work (see Appendix A for the full scope statement). The specific goal for the Project Group was “to develop an exploratory, groundwork document that would be the basis for a task force on Third-Party Actions and other necessary behavioral and cultural change on campus at MIT.” The overall aim was “to further the components of our culture that are positive, and to be comfortable holding each other accountable for our behaviors in non-judgmental ways.” The clients expressed a wish for MIT’s internal and external reputation to be that of a “welcoming, supportive environment” for all people. The Project Group was asked to produce a written report with the following characteristics:

- Positive focus
- Proactive stance
- Usefulness to engaged groups of all sizes

Based on this assignment, the Project Group focused on the objective of developing a framework and plan for implementing successful third-party (“bystander”) intervention training for MIT.

Process

To start, the Project Group created a work timeline that included frequent meetings. Initial meetings were spent in discussion and planning, utilizing tools and skills learned in the Leader 2 Leader curriculum, including a stakeholder analysis (Appendix B) and SWOT analysis (Appendix C). Discussion ensued about whether the group’s investigation and recommendations should focus at a unit or institute level, whether the research should focus solely on third-party programs or more broadly on issues of civility and behavior modification, and what the intended outcomes should be. The Project Group sought clarification from its clients, and, guided by their comments, decided to begin its inquiries by focusing on bystander training specifically, and to let its investigations direct outcomes for the other topics.

As part of its research, the Project Group conducted a series of interviews to understand the perspectives and advice of experienced stakeholders around the Institute, including the following people:

- Toni Robinson and Mary Rowe, Ombudspeople
- Alison Alden, Vice President for Human Resources
- Rafael Reif, Provost
- Working Group on Support Staff Issues
- Ruthy Kohorn Rosenberg, Assistant Director of The Office of Student Citizenship and Director of Student Mediation
Problem Analysis

Even the language describing the issue is far from clear. People may use the same words to characterize quite different behaviors. The topic also may trigger emotional responses that add to the complexity of definition and understanding. Terms like “verbal abuse,” “bullying,” “harassment,” “incivility,” “bad behavior,” and the like were used to describe unacceptable ways of treating other people that inspired the desire for intervention training for MIT community members. Our discussions led us to view the issue as “misbehavior” or “incivility”: essentially, inappropriate behavior to other people that falls short of harassment, which is covered by MIT policies (see Appendix D). Inappropriate behavior that victimizes a person or people also creates discomfort for those who observe it; hence the desire for third-party, or bystander, intervention training.
Bystander intervention requires training because the situations it seeks to address are inherently complex and daunting, and, while incivility is frequently evident in the collective experience of the MIT community, each person’s need to witness such behavior is relatively rare. Witnessing inappropriate behavior raises a multitude of issues fraught with emotional, ethical, cultural, social, and political implications. Intervening may escalate animosity, create negative repercussions for all concerned, and result in embarrassment instead of resolution. Deciding whether, how and when to intervene is challenging. Most of us are ill prepared to act and indecisive about whether and how to intervene when we see inappropriate behavior to others.

Nevertheless, incivility is a serious MIT issue. The Project Group’s interviews and discussions elicited many reports of observed, inappropriate interpersonal behavior at all levels of the MIT community: e.g. faculty-faculty, faculty-student, faculty-staff, staff-faculty, staff-staff, staff-student, student-student, student-staff. The bystanders’ perceived status in the power hierarchy relative to the perpetrator and victim seems an important factor in their willingness to intervene. Other important factors include the complexity of the MIT community – diverse in race, national origin, gender, sexual orientation and other aspects – and the MIT culture, with its high tolerance for eccentric and antisocial behaviors. In considering bystander intervention in general, Mary Rowe, Ombudsperson, mentioned that there are 40 reasons for hesitance to intervene: half depend on the bystander’s perception of the power structure and the institution; the other reasons are personal.

Resolution of the problem requires acknowledgment that it exists, along with the development of long-term and widespread solutions. However, the growing sense of community complexity at MIT may obscure clear channels of responsibility and make long-term solutions more challenging. Changes in administration result in policy revisions and loss of institutional memory. MIT’s focus on achievement and specialization may trump an emphasis on common sense and social skills. As Mary Rowe notes, new people get acclimated to the “mundane pathology of the natural environment.” MIT’s cultural norms include the acceptance of eccentric behaviors and confidence in the problem-solving abilities of MIT community members, which may mask problem recognition and preclude traditional support mechanisms.

The need for an Institute-wide solution is another arguable point. Bystander intervention can only provide a temporary intercession regarding incivility; permanent resolution depends on appropriate cultural norms and respected systems for resolution. Mary Rowe indicates that only a very small fraction of cases where intervention takes place are considered appropriately resolved, pointing out the need for a well-designed, comprehensive solution. Since inappropriate interpersonal behavior crosses departmental and disciplinary boundaries, and its accepted presence seems an indication of MIT’s institutional culture, a solution at the Institute level seems warranted and necessary. However, this Institute solution may come in the form of a portfolio of solutions developed at the unit level to reflect the values and nuances of that community.
Findings from the Project Group’s research show that the problem has three parts: 1) the prevalence of uncivil behavior, 2) the lack of preparation of MIT community members to deal with the incivility, and 3) the need for Institute systems that foster acceptable norms of behavior and appropriate repercussions for those who fail to respect them. Solving this problem in its entirety seems possible and important; creating a more positive MIT environment and image may aid in the attraction, retention, and satisfaction of our community members. In order to help to create positive change, people will need bystander training to know how to adapt to specific situations and to react confidently, quickly, and usefully.

**Brief Overview of Relevant Programming**

The brief history described below indicates nearly fifteen years of programming to address issues of community relations and behavior. Notably, the attempts to resolve these issues seem often to be implemented by one unit (e.g. Sloan) or by one method (e.g. creating a website), and they are also typically short-term or at best periodic.

**Past Programs at MIT**

Early efforts included complaint-handler training for supervisors, which focused on faculty and utilized training videos developed by Jay Keyser, Mary Rowe, Ike Colbert, and Kim Vandiver.

1994-1995: Presentation by Mary Rowe and Maureen Scully to Sloan Community (see Appendix E for article by Professor Scully).

1997: At the recommendation of its Diversity Committee, the Sloan School established a School-wide Diversity Day in the spring of 1997. Classes were canceled, and all faculty, students, and staff were encouraged to participate. Other past programs have focused on demonstrating the benefits of a diverse workplace as well as bystander awareness training.

1999: The Sloan Diversity Committee launched the "$10K Return on Diversity" Competition in which teams were invited to submit a case study, a research proposal, or an action plan illustrating the mutual gains for businesses or organizations with diverse workforces.

2003: Carol Orme-Johnson and colleagues from Mediation@MIT developed a bystander training program and website to provide community resources online at [http://web.mit.edu/bystanders/](http://web.mit.edu/bystanders/). The site offers definitions and philosophical information, tools for assessing situations, appropriate responses, advice, interactive scenarios and other resources similar to the content outlined in Appendix E.

2003: The Committee on Community, chaired by Phillip Clay, developed a website: [http://web.mit.edu/community/index.html](http://web.mit.edu/community/index.html). The Committee’s mandate was to:
work to preserve our community and its values, given the challenges and opportunities of the current world situation by facilitating open communication and dialogue; by reminding the community of our values and commitment to a supportive environment; by creating an effective communication system for immediate response.

2006: The Ad Hoc Committee on Reasonable Behavior at MIT formulated a report based on discussions of the Committee on Student Life (2005-2006) (See Appendix F below)

Provost Reif invited the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) Theatre Program Players from the University of Michigan to provide training to a meeting of Department Heads. The group was supported by the NSF ADVANCE program for the purpose of improving the hiring, retention and institutional climate for women faculty in the sciences and engineering. ADVANCE had commissioned sketches on these topics from the CRLT, and the group was planning performances in the Cambridge area for another university. Provost Reif requested a sketch depicting a faculty discussion involving a faculty search to illustrate how gender and rank influence the conversation. The group’s website is http://www.crlt.umich.edu.

Recent Activities at MIT

Two divisions – Sloan and HST – developed Professional Standards documents (see Appendix G and Appendix H, respectively). Sloan has also recreated its bystander program to address social justice issues within Sloan with a small group of students.

The Ombuds Office works with many Institute offices on resolving specific issues, and it also provides trainings and services related to conflict resolution, mediation, and interpersonal dynamics, among a range of other assets. Mary Rowe, Toni Robinson and others have recently updated the videos developed with Keyser et al. in the early 1990s.

The Dean for Graduate Education has offered grants focused on building community and improving support systems for graduate students for several years. The Resources for Easing Friction and Stress (REFS) Programs arose from those grants, and currently REFS mentoring programs exist in the departments of Biology, Chemistry, EECS and Physics.

The Office of Student Citizenship (OSC) has several related initiatives:

- Ruthy Kohorn Rosenberg conducts mediation training skill workshops twice a year (IAP and summer). Once trained, the mediators serve as a resource to their fellow students providing advice, mediation, and support for students with issues.

- The OSC maintains an Active Bystander Training website: http://web.mit.edu/bystanders/. This site will also be updated and tied back to the main website
• The OSC is seeking a Program Coordinator to join their group to, “assist with the development and implementation of the Bystander Program.”

The MIT Medical Wellness group’s Chad Waxman and Gordon Braxton offer a Male Sexual Assault Active Bystander Program. Chad Waxman goes to fraternities and other all male student groups to talk about the nature of sexual assault and appropriate bystander intervention.

**Research on Programs at Other Organizations**
The Project Group’s research on third-party training programs at other organizations indicates that few such programs exist at peer institution. Colleges and universities support diversity awareness and harassment training, but bystander intervention remains unexplored. However, some corporations and non-profit organizations have bystander training available. (See Appendix I for contact information and website addresses for examples of training programs at peer institutions, along with sample programs promoted by mediation and training organizations.)

**Characteristics of Effective Programs**
The Project Group’s interviews, research, and discussions have clarified some characteristics and principles that are likely to yield successful results.

• Education/training programs combined with clear rules of expected behavior (credos) offer a strong basis for change. Training alone lacks sufficient reinforcement; a credo alone lacks activation potential.

• Programs with wider scope provide more consistent reinforcement than unit-level programs. An Institute-wide credo and trainings seem ideal, but multiple units establishing similar principles and programs can achieve important success.

• Repetition is crucial. However creative a one-time program may be, its effects are diluted by time and population turnover. Repetition introduces new people to the practices, and habituates those already trained so they are ready to act when the need arises. Civility is a standard that requires maintenance, especially in a community like MIT, with its high levels of tolerance, individualism, and discipline-specificity.

• Creative methods may be successful for inducing behavior change because they aid in problem recognition, overcome reluctance and build enthusiasm, are memorable, and bear repeating.

Given the characteristics noted above, the Project Group recommends that a Task Force focus on the aspects below in order to develop a successful program:
• **MIT Community Culture and Structure:** Identify the cultural implications, what types of community members are most affected by the issue, and the level of influence needed to address the issue effectively. Understanding power structures is imperative for ensuring credibility and participation.

• **Communications:** First, a credo can be used to establish expectations. Then ongoing communications can create “messaging” that civility is expected, and remind community members about training opportunities.

• **Training:** Different types of community members may require different bystander training methods. Therefore, the Task Force will need to discover what the most effective methods are for the various communities, levels, and types of people at MIT; how best to provide access; and what combination of variety and repetition will be needed to ensure that everyone who needs or wants the training has the opportunity to be introduced and habituated to it over time.

• **Planning and Reinforcement:** Long-term solutions are needed, so that as people join the Institute, they have the opportunity to understand the expectations, receive training, and develop techniques for dealing appropriately with inappropriate behavior. Hopefully, the need for large-scale training opportunities will lessen over time: eventually, trainings may become part of the orientation for new community members, with optional, periodic refresher trainings available for those who desire them. Positive incentives to participate may be useful in keeping people aware and involved. Likewise, administrative policies are needed to reinforce the community standards, so those who are noncompliant understand and experience repercussions that hopefully lead to future compliance.

• **Metrics and Reporting:** Deciding how success will be measured and reported is an important aspect of the program overall. Without clear standards and metrics, the costs in time and money that it takes to maintain the program will eventually seem unreasonable. A reporting structure is also needed at a department or committee level to make sure that civil behavior and its maintenance through bystander training becomes integrated into MIT decisions about recognition, tenure, merit raises, and other important aspects of individual and community life.

• **Budget and Administration:** The brief review of programming for behavioral modification shows that attempts that are too limited (e.g. one unit, one method, one year) are ineffective in addressing the issue and creating substantial, long-lasting change. While short-term, area-specific solutions may seem relatively inexpensive compared to widespread, long-term programming and messaging, they also seem only partially and temporarily able to address the issue. Raising funds and creating an administrative structure sufficient to support a widespread, long-term effort may not only resolve the larger issues but also cost less overall as maintenance may be less expensive than constant program creation in different units.
Additional Notes and Suggestions

The Project Group is well aware of the complexity of the problems associated with behavior modification, especially within the meritocracy of MIT. The number of problems and concerns includes the following:

- Agreeing on standards of behavior is difficult.
- Many stakeholders may consider themselves too busy to participate.
- The goal-oriented nature of MIT inures people to avoid confrontation in favor of moving forward until no further progress is possible.
- Those who need behavior modification are least receptive to it and are unlikely to attend trainings or to recognize their behaviors as problematic.
- Current resources are under-utilized, and creating new resources is unlikely to resolve the problem without simultaneously creating incentives to participate.
- A reputation for unjust administrative reactions (e.g. repercussions for people who report behavioral issues) may leave administrators uninformed about the frequency of inappropriate behavior.
- MIT culture is conflict averse.

The Project Group’s interviews and discussions yielded views on solutions that suggest a range of approaches and options. For example, one view suggests that a solution could arise from higher administration: allocating sustained financial resources, supporting an Institute-wide credo, offering consistent messaging about MIT’s established values, and creating an administrative structure to handle incentives and breaches. However, an alternative view suggests that a “grassroots” solution could be equally effective, with programs arising at a department level gradually being adopted by additional units around the Institute.

Bystander training and civility standards may best be developed using strategies that have been successful for other behavior modification campaigns at MIT, such as the ones directed at diversity, including LBGT inclusiveness, and the Institute sustainability campaign that encourages recycling and energy conservation. Some strategic approaches that may be effective at MIT are listed below:

**Messaging**

**Approach**

- Consider Sloan Standard and HST credos as starting points.
- Keep messages brief.
- Make the messaging Institute wide.
- Use logos and images to quickly and effectively remind people.
- Make the credo visible and weave it into the daily routine:
  - Post the code of conduct prevalently around campus and on the web, as has been done with “you are welcome here” cards and stickers posted above light switches as reminders to turn off lights.
  - Make the credo brief and pithy, so it is memorable.
• Ask that the credo be endorsed by higher administration: by the President (via Presidential Statement) as well as Academic Council.
• Use prompts: in the moment, “pre-incident” reminders, almost subliminal messages.
• Focus initially where intervention is necessary.

Content
• At all hierarchical levels, utilize expectation and peer pressure: “Everyone’s doing it.”
• Build on the strengths of MIT’s population to draw people in: for example, MIT’s design competitions contribute to changed behavior regarding energy use.
• Code of conduct should be a value statement with teeth: constitution-like.

Training
• Use natural vehicles.
• Focus on the end goal: “baked-in” civility, tolerance and a bedrock change.
• Offer creative learning opportunities that capture attention/imagination.
• Build on existing resources and programs.
• Vary as needed: stakeholder groups respond differently to different methods.
• Paper doesn’t work to send initial message: use a variety of media.
• Utilize natural vehicles for the most effective distribution:
  o Faculty meetings
  o Administrative Council
  o Chair of Faculty, Deans, Academic Council
  o Student government units or residence halls
• Persist in designing a thorough approach; the goal is not simply
  o Training
  o Intellectual acceptance
  o Punitive, negative, judgmental
  o One-time experience

Inclusiveness
• Overcome the issue of overburdened faculty too busy to respond, e.g.
  o Make bystander training part of new faculty orientation
  o Train staff who can use bystander interventions to address faculty
  o Establish a system with teeth: e.g. faculty retention based on acceptable behavior
• Prepare people in ways that overcome the power hierarchies and guarantee a fair process, e.g.
  o Create a protocol that enables staff and students to report incivility without penalty
  o Consider a reward/recognition system that celebrates successful interventions
Recommendations

These recommendations represent an approach that expresses the collective wisdom of those interviewed as well as the opinions of members of the Project Group. Nevertheless, the Project Group recognizes that this is simply one approach among many possibilities.

1) Develop and articulate a credo for the Institute as a whole, or alternatively work at the level of Schools, Divisions, Departments, Laboratories and Centers with an aim to spread standards across the Institute, unit by unit
   a) Assess which units already have credos
   b) Benchmark against peer universities, relevant industry models

2) Operationalize credo values
   a) Publicize the credo(s) widely, including posting publicly in offices, Web sites, and publications.
   b) Implement a credo review in hiring, training and review processes
   c) Discuss credo values in employee orientation and include in employee manuals
   d) Discuss the credo in Academic Council and Administrative Council
   e) Discuss the credo at Institute events similar to the recent Diversity Congress
   f) Post the credo on Web sites for Institute, Schools, Divisions, Departments, Laboratories and Centers
   g) Create rewards and recognition systems (e.g. Institute Awards)
   h) Decide on and incorporate repercussions for persistent inappropriate behavior and for bystander interventions that require additional support systems
   i) Develop and standardize a self-management process

3) Connect the community
   a) Connect the community involved in the Community Standards Project through biennial gatherings
   b) Create a Web site and listserv to enable the community to connect electronically: e.g. Ombudsman, CCCR, Staff Committee on Diversity, Working Group on Support Staff Issues, Associate Provosts for Equity, Mediation@MIT, Administrative Officers
   c) Connect the MIT Community Standards Project with universities around the world

4) Expand and disseminate
   a) Develop case studies and examples to share with the broader community
   b) Share course materials through MIT OCW

Other suggestions and advice from the Project Group’s interviews, discussions and research are noted below:

- Start with a fraction, e.g. 100-200 faculty annually, and then let the training spread organically
• Passive communication/resources don’t work: first jolt people through widespread messaging and introduce working systems; then make resources accessible through the web and other means
• Use a Presidential/Provost mandate to create initial attendance and compliance
• Work with existing hierarchies e.g. staff with responsibilities for gender and minority issues
• Develop and disseminate a credo: stated standards are “the first centimeter in a mile”
• Use a Presidential Statement and/or Academic Council endorsement to manifest the authority
• Follow up with new employees during orientation
• Hold targeted audience meetings: e.g.
  o Train a small group of faculty from a variety of departments to be good bystanders, so that intervention starts with and is modeled by faculty
  o Hold focus groups to develop a system for reinforcing civil behavior: “the most effective way to stop bad behavior is to reinforce good behavior”
• Develop a “mini packet” of selected key resources and make it widely available

Possible Timeline

January: Senior administrators are identified to sponsor the ongoing effort and appoint a staff person to the task force (could be the new hire in the Office of Student Civility). Budget is allocated.

February: Bystander Group forms and begins monthly meetings that include students, staff, and faculty in multiple areas including central administration; sub-committees with specific foci are created. Metrics are developed.

March: Sub-committees begin outreach and research
• Survey group creates a short survey to determine climate and culture on campus with specific goal of determining extent of issue by category of people (undergraduates, graduate students, staff, faculty, etc.)
• Marketing group begins a marketing campaign with a fall semester delivery date, or starts a community competition with a significant award to incite widespread involvement in creating a marketing campaign while raising awareness
• Separate Staff, Student, and Faculty Training groups are formed and each begins to develop a training program based on previous training programs run by the Ombuds Office, the Office of Student Civility, and in the case of faculty, the Provosts and Deans.

May: Reports from the Survey group inform other groups’ ongoing work

June: Marketing campaign winners are announced at MIT Award Convocation
July: Pilot training programs begin for administrative staff, support staff and graduate students

September: Marketing campaign begins

October: Pilot training programs begin for other staff and undergraduate students.

January:
- Bystander training is offered throughout IAP for all groups
- Survey group begins a second survey of the MIT community with additional questions regarding awareness of training opportunities and the marketing campaign. Spring survey queries include awareness of issue, training received, and awareness of available training, as well as tracking the number of participants in training and the number of participants in the marketing contest
- Metrics and survey data, including a comparison of survey results in for both years, help the Assessment group to determine necessary revisions and levels of success

Conclusion

The challenges of behavior modification at an institutional level are enormous, but they are far less daunting than the consequences of failing to instill a culture of civility. An increasing literature on bullying suggests that it may well be lurking on the horizon as the next big workplace issue, and failure to self-correct may put MIT at risk in our particularly litigious society. Likewise the economic and ethical challenges of today may reflect increasing government and public scrutiny on Institute practices and policies tomorrow.

Also important is the nature of our inherent values as a university. We are developing the leaders of the future, and faculty lead by example whether they do it intentionally or not. Given the examples we set, should we celebrate or deprecate the implications for the future? What values are we instilling as a community?

MIT’s unique culture is often proudly described as a meritocracy. We look forward to a time when that term reflects our standards of collegiality as well as our competitive prowess.
Appendix A: Client Scope Statement

L2L Sponsored Project – Scope Statements

Draft Scope Statement:
**Diversity: Third Party Actions**

Project Sponsors: Donna Behmer and Annette Jacobs

**Rationale**

Institutionally, MIT promotes a culture of meritocracy. In such an environment or culture, one would place emphasis on contributions rather than the differences amongst our diverse community. The individuals who work and study at MIT hold themselves to high standards, not only for their intellectual contributions, but also for their personal qualities (including being fair minded, well meaning, and respectful). Many have worked to embrace diversity, and to further efforts to increase our diversity, but the data on our demographics do not reflect the global society in which our community works, lives, and competes. The data shows women and non-whites are in a minority in terms of staffing, particularly in faculty and higher level professional staff positions.

Despite our meritocratic culture and our efforts to embrace diversity, there are documented anecdotal stories about individuals of all backgrounds being treated rudely, demeaned, often within structures of power and class, or with negative cultural or racial bias. Many of us are witness to such interactions and would like to intercede in a meaningful, positive manner, but do not feel we have the appropriate tools, skills at hand to assist in improving or neutralizing the situation.

The goal of this project is to further the components of our culture that are positive, and to be comfortable holding each other accountable for our behaviors in helpful non-judgmental ways. We want MIT to have a reputation internally and externally as an institution with a welcoming, supportive environment for people of all genders, ethnicities, races, classes, cultures, religions, and sexual orientations and to continue to be able to attract and retain “the best and the brightest” students and faculty in a multi-cultural world.

**Project Objective**

To develop a framework and plan for implementing successful bystander intervention training for all staff (and students) at MIT with ultimate goal of promoting the positive aspects of the MIT culture that embrace this.

**Major Deliverables**

Develop a project plan to implement bystander training at MIT. Plan should include:

- A feasibility study—
  - Assessment of where leadership at MIT is on this issue
  - Identify key stakeholders
  - Assessment of existing MIT resources
  - SWOT analysis for implementation

- Ownership and responsibility for oversight of program
- Resources Needed
## Appendix B: Stakeholder Analysis

### Diversity: Third Party Actions – Project Team 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keep Informed</th>
<th>Manage closely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central HR</td>
<td>[Important relationship – close contact]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>Senior Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombuds person</td>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Life</td>
<td>Academic Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>VPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provosts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chancellor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduate Officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitor</th>
<th>Keep Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>AOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇝ Undergraduate administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⇝ Graduate administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Associate and Assistant Deans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Influence ➔**
Appendix C: SWOT Analysis

Strengths
- Responsiveness of the Vice President of Human Resources
- Ombudsperson group interest in our work
- Existing talent within MIT in this area - e.g. Scully, other organizations developing programs
- Commitment by two organizations at MIT to pilot a new program
- An institutional commitment to civil behavior
- Educational mission of MIT

Weaknesses
- Challenges in working with faculty: e.g. Faculty are not rule-bound; they are autonomous
- No incentive structure
- There is pent-up frustration within various organization - e.g. Medical
- Incidents may lack a third party to intervene in real time
- Management of bystander programs is decentralized

Opportunities
- Existing receptive community
- Developing a program will make MIT more receptive to individuals from a diverse community
- Opportunity to leverage existing community of programs to build on their success
- New leadership in many key areas of the Institute

Threats
- Potential negative press
- Difficult to measure success/impact
- Time pressures that faculty and staff face may be a deterrent to adoption
- Leadership may be lacking
- Budget may not be available
- Perception that interventions may stifle innovation
Appendix D: MIT Harassment Policies

Excerpt from MIT Policies and Procedures website

Harassment of any kind is not acceptable behavior at MIT; it is inconsistent with the commitment to excellence that characterizes MIT's activities. MIT is committed to creating an environment in which every individual can work, study, and live without being harassed. Harassment may therefore lead to sanctions up to and including termination of employment or student status.

Harassment is any conduct, verbal or physical, on or off campus, that has the intent or effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual or group's educational or work performance at MIT or that creates an intimidating, hostile, or offensive educational, work, or living environment. Some kinds of harassment are prohibited by civil laws or by MIT policies on conflict of interest and nondiscrimination.

Harassment on the basis of race, color, sex, disability, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity, or age includes harassment of an individual in terms of a stereotyped group characteristic, or because of that person's identification with a particular group.

Sexual harassment may take many forms. Sexual assault and requests for sexual favors that affect educational or employment decisions constitute sexual harassment. However, sexual harassment may also consist of unwanted physical contact, requests for sexual favors, visual displays of degrading sexual images, sexually suggestive conduct, or offensive remarks of a sexual nature.

The Institute is committed under this policy to stopping harassment and associated retaliatory behavior. All MIT supervisors have a responsibility to act to stop harassment in the areas under their supervision.

Any member of the MIT community who feels harassed is encouraged to seek assistance and resolution of the complaint. MIT provides a variety of avenues by which an individual who feels harassed may proceed, so that each person may choose an avenue appropriate to his or her particular situation. Institute procedures are intended to protect the rights of both complainant and respondent, to protect privacy, and to prevent supervisory reprisal.

General complaint procedures are described in Section 9.6 Complaint and Grievance Procedures.
Appendix E: Article by Professor Maureen Scully

NOTE: This paper was written by Professor Maureen Scully, Simmons College and appeared in the 2nd edition of Ancona, Kochan, Scully, Van Maneen, and Westney, Managing the Future: Organizational Behavior & Processes, Southwestern, 2003.

ACADEMIC PERSPECTIVE
BYSTANDER AWARENESS
SKILLS FOR EFFECTIVE MANAGERS

A team calls for a break after a productive morning of work. Someone tells an offensive joke. Everyone is silent. A few people laugh quietly but nervously. One or two people may feel the sting of the joke especially sharply. Others worry about what to do and how to get back on track. The team’s momentum is broken.

In this scenario, the “bystanders,” those who witness offensive talk or inappropriate actions, could play a crucial role in signaling that the group values diversity and that offensive jokes are not appreciated. At best, they can help those who are offended understand that they are not alone and those who have given offense, intentionally or unintentionally, to back up, reconsider, and apologize and perhaps still save face. At least, bystanders can call for a halt and break the downward spiral of tension and misunderstanding that can destroy team cohesion.

Bystanders can uphold norms about the importance of valuing diversity. From the cultural perspective, we recognize the importance of norms in the workplace and the ways in which behavior over time can reinforce or erode a norm. If a norm is deeply held, its violation should provoke reactions. What sense can we make, then, of the silence of the bystanders?

Bystanders may very well appreciate that valuing diversity creates the kind of inclusive and culturally rich work world that they want to inhabit and that it encourages the contribution of talent from all people. They just may not know what to do.

FROM VALUING DIVERSITY TO TAKING ACTION
Valuing diversity is an easy goal to espouse. But how do we practice and realize that goal? Diversity training is quite common in companies in the United States and has helped many organizations to find the “positive spiral” of diversity referenced in the Module Overview. However, there has also been significant backlash against diversity training. White men complain that they are demonized and misunderstood. Women and people of color complain that they are set up to speak for their entire group or to reveal their difficulties, only to have their candor come back to haunt them when the trainer goes away.

Diversity training too often delivers lectures to would-be “perpetrators,” offers assertiveness hints for would-be “victims,” or gives legal advice to worried managers. A new, alternative training approach has been designed at the MIT Sloan School of
Management. A number of companies and other departments at MIT have approached Sloan to learn more about this new approach. Instead of focusing on perpetrators, victims, or managers, we focus on another crucial and often overlooked party: the bystander. A bystander is anyone who witnesses offensive or unprofessional behavior. With training, bystanders can have the presence of mind, the understanding of how norms get shaped, and the needed skills to intervene.

It is easy to fall silent in an awkward situation. People rarely have a chance to rehearse how they might intervene effectively in a tense and awkward situation. But the actions of bystanders are often the most crucial for signaling that the norms of respect and inclusivity are to be taken seriously. A norm is empty if no one challenges its violation. Bystanders are concerned parties who take ownership for setting the tone.

The lack of support from bystanders often worsens the strains in work groups. Team members who are upset about mistreatment in a team setting do not just complain about the person who was offensive; they may expect that “there is one in every crowd.” Instead, the real hurt often comes from the silence of others, which appears to be consent or indifference. People who are upset by stinging, prejudicial remarks will say things like “I can’t believe no one jumped in to say anything—everyone just sat there,” or “I was left out there alone without any support,” or “Sure Joe is insensitive, but does everyone else agree?”

Practicing in advance helps bystanders know what to do; the word, gesture, or approach that turns around the situation and reinforces a shared commitment to inclusivity and respect.

HISTORICAL AND CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND
Research on bystanders comes from a number of areas of social science: the effects on children of watching someone getting hurt in abusive family settings, the motives of Good Samaritans in stopping to help someone in trouble, the reasons why some people join a social movement to improve conditions while others “free ride” on the collective benefits that may result, as a few examples.

Social psychologists in the United States addressed apparent bystander apathy following a disturbing and much-reported event. In 1965, a woman named Kitty Genovese was murdered on a street in New York at night, while many people from adjacent apartment buildings watched. No one called the police or intervened. Why?

The first reaction of the press and the American public was that New York was a heartless place and New Yorkers were cold and uncaring. But some researchers thought it was not quite so simple. The witnesses were horrified and upset. What is it that causes bystanders not to react?

They focused on two factors: uncertainty about what to do (people freeze when they do not have a well-rehearsed script in an unfamiliar situation) and diffusion of responsibility (everyone thinks that the situation is so serious that surely someone else, perhaps someone better qualified, will do something).
Other factors may affect bystander’s reluctance. Mary Rowe has characterized reasons why complainants do not come forward or request that no further action be taken, reasons that apply as well to bystanders: fear of loss, including the loss of respect, ease, and comradeship with fellow employees; fear of silent disapproval; fear of vulnerability or invaded privacy in speaking from one’s personal perspective; the risks of getting in the middle of things; the belief that they lack sufficient information about the situation; and concern they may be overreacting, as a few examples.

These insights about bystanders can be incorporated into diversity training. Bystander inaction can be reduced if people:

- Practice some interventions in a safe space so they feel more ready.
- Think through various scenarios in advance.
- Expand their menu of possible responses.
- Understand cultural differences in appropriate interventions.
- Learn from others’ experiments and discover new ways to act.
- Take personal ownership for the situation, instead of just sitting back.
- Become self aware and understand the norms they want to uphold.
- Discuss options with one another and make bystander action more open, expected, and legitimate.

Consider emergency medical technicians, who have to respond quickly in crises. They play out many scenarios in their training so they will have the “situational awareness” they need to size up what is happening and intervene effectively.

**THE BYSTANDER IN THE WORKPLACE**

A bystander reacts immediately in the moment. The first step is to be good enough at reading the political and cultural dynamics to know that trouble is brewing. Often the most important thing a bystander can do is just stop the situation from escalating. A simple call for a pause or clarification can help.

A bystander is not charged with dealing justice on the spot. It might be more appropriate to give feedback to individuals at a later time. Calling on institutional resources—such as a mediator or ombudsperson—can help.

To clarify the nature of the bystander, some images of what the bystander is and is not were generated. These are summarized in Table 11.2.

**TABLE 11.2**

**WHAT A BYSTANDER IS AND IS NOT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Bystander Is...</th>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Concerned Party</th>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Colleague</th>
<th>Peer</th>
<th>Helper</th>
<th>Friend</th>
<th>Humble Questioner</th>
<th>Learner</th>
<th>Eavesdropper</th>
<th>Advocate</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>Onlooker</th>
<th>Listener</th>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>Peace-Maker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
A Bystander Is Not...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge</th>
<th>Avenger</th>
<th>Enforcer</th>
<th>Fixer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Know-It-All</td>
<td>Rescuer</td>
<td>Hero/Heroine</td>
<td>Final Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THE COURAGE OF ONE’S CONVICTIONS**

Speaking up rather than remaining quiet requires some moral courage. You can speak from your own vantage point, about how uncomfortable the situation is making you or about your concern that the tone does not reflect the kind of organization in which you want to work. Or you can speak on behalf of another, which is more complex. In general, it is best to intervene just enough to let others have the chance to speak for themselves. Speaking on behalf of another requires:

- **Tactfulness.** Quite simply, a bystander should not drown out or embarrass the person they’re supporting or make them feel helpless or pathetic by jumping in too strongly.

- **Willingness to take risks.** There can be group backlash against the bystander. Bystanders can become the target of the escalating anger in the group. They might be called “Pollyanna” or “bleeding heart liberal” or “knight in shining armor.” They might be asked, “Who are you to say?” A bystander has to be prepared to take some heat.

- **Awareness of one’s own power or privilege.** Diversity training tends to focus on the experience of disadvantage by people who occupy solo roles in a group (e.g., the only older person in a young start-up) or who belong to historically oppressed social groups (e.g., African Americans in the United States). A true understanding of diversity adds the dynamics of privilege (what does it mean to be one of the “young fast-trackers?” What does it mean to be white in the United States?). It is emotionally exhausting for people in disadvantaged positions to keep presenting their perspective and advocating for their rights. Members of a privileged group can develop a sense of empathy and spend some of their “political capital” to speak out when they see injustice. It is powerful when white people speak out against racism, when men speak out against sexism, when straight people speak out against homophobia, etc.

Given the delicacy and risks, why should bystanders do anything? Aren’t they giving away more than they’re getting? Are the costs too great? One benefit of playing an active bystander role is that you get to help create the kind of climate that you want in your organization and of which you may someday be a beneficiary. You can crystallize norms by exemplifying and defending them. Some bystanders who have taken heat from others say it is worth it to be true to themselves and what they believe. Another benefit is that you can demonstrate your group dynamics skills, which are increasingly listed as a factor in performance appraisals.
COLLUSION
Despite the advantages of playing an active bystander role, sometimes it is reasonable not to jump in. What are the costs and benefits of silence? One cost is a feeling of collusion with the offense. For example, sometimes women laugh at sexist jokes to signal that they’re good sports, but afterwards they may wonder if they’re just perpetuating a negative climate of sexism.

At the same time, there can be some benefits to holding back. Sometimes it is necessary to “pick one’s battles.” Timing is important; waiting for “teachable moments” can make an important point. Speaking out too much can dilute one’s message.

Another benefit of not speaking out in the moment is that sometimes it is best to pull people aside afterwards, to reduce embarrassment and wait until tempers have cooled to the point where feedback can be heard and absorbed.

CULTURAL VARIATION IN INTERVENTION STYLES
Whether bystanders act in the moment or wait, both the style and content of the intervention must be considered in cultural context. Cultures vary, for example, on one of the most delicate questions of intervention: whether to reprimand someone else’s children when you see them misbehaving. It might be considered out of line to say something in one culture, or negligent not to say anything in another culture.

Survey your team members to see what kinds of interventions might work or fail in the countries or companies they come from. For example, is it better to stand up and leave than to say something? Is that considered dignified? Or would it be considered rude and awkward?

Bystanders just throw fuel on the fire if they fight one stereotype by invoking another. For example, a bystander intervenes on behalf of a woman on a team by saying, “You men from <wherever> are all so chauvinistic!” and potentially makes the situation worse.

IDEAS FOR BYSTANDERS
Some general types of interventions suggested by a range of participants in bystander training sessions are summarized in Table 11.3.

TABLE 11.3
SOME TACTICS FOR BYSTANDERS: IDEAS FROM WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

| Inclusion:                                                                 |                                                                 |
| - Invite someone into the conversation                                  |                                                                 |
| - Solicit the opinions of people who have been quiet                    |                                                                 |
| - Be an ally for someone taking a risk                                   |                                                                 |
| - Be gracious, help others save face                                    |                                                                 |

| Discovery:                                                              |                                                                 |
| - Ask questions                                                         |                                                                 |
• Give people a chance to clarify
• Check assumptions
• Consider the big picture, the broader context
• Cooling things down:
  • Ask for a break
  • Use humor (but with care)
  • Suggest next steps, another meeting, off-line conversations

Heating things up:
• Surface emotions
• Say how the situation makes you feel
• Point to the “unspeakable” issues that may be lurking

Body language/signaling:
• Stand up
• Turn away
• Raise your hand
• Bang the table
• Say “ouch”
• Laugh
• Leave the room


STRUCTURAL SOLUTIONS
The bystander’s role during or just after an incident is important and can help shape cultural norms. However, it is an ad hoc response to issues that often require structural solutions. A successful bystander will interrupt unprofessional behavior, but there must be systems in place that back up the norms and provide any subsequent support or action that is needed to prevent future incidents. Some examples of structural solutions, at both the local and corporate level, include:
• An organizational policy on harassment, distributed to everyone, periodically reviewed, systematically enforced
• A third party (mediator, ombudsperson, employee advocate) who can counsel individuals or groups, whose services are supported and publicized, and who keeps track of aggregate data on incidents
• Clear policies governing promotions, a mentoring program, and a review board that keeps track of who is promoted (or not) and why
• Regular sessions to discuss and consider the alternative ways in which people from different cultural backgrounds might approach the process and product of work, especially helpful for breaking free of taken-for-granted assumptions and “thinking outside the box”
• Training sessions on a variety of issues, such as giving culturally sensitive feedback, curbing sexual harassment, recognizing different leadership styles, etc.

• Celebrations of diversity, to recognize accomplishments and best practices from different teams or departments, to celebrate different heritages (for example, a speaker or film during Black History Month in February)

Structural solutions should align with the organizational vision of how to embrace diversity. Organizations that plan to fundamentally reshape how work is done, based on more diverse inputs, will need more innovative structures to support that approach. Table 11.4 shows an evolution of three approaches.

**Table 11.4**
MANAGING DIVERSITY—THREE PARADIGMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm 1</th>
<th>Paradigm 2</th>
<th>Emerging Paradigm 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discrimination and Fairness</td>
<td>Access and Connecting Diversity to Legitimacy</td>
<td>Work Perspectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tolerate differences</td>
<td>value differences</td>
<td>learn from differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increase numbers</td>
<td>access market niches</td>
<td>work in new ways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample action:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentoring program</td>
<td>employee networks</td>
<td>new processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**A CLOSING THOUGHT**

Jewish tradition gives us a Talmudic story that is relevant:

In the book of Proverbs, King Solomon said:

“A tongue can bring either life or death.”

[Proverbs 18.21]

Why is a tongue mightier than a sword?

A sword can only kill one person at a time.

Hurtful words kill three people at once:

They hurt the one about whom they are spoken.

They hurt the one who said them.

They hurt the one who listened to them.

(Bereshit Rabbah 98)
Appendix F: Committee on Reasonable Behavior Report

Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Reasonable Behavior at MIT, Summer 2006
Follow up from discussions of the Committee on Student Life, 2005/6
August 2, 2006

A. Broad statement of purpose and philosophy (Not a public vision statement)

The focus of this group is to consider mechanisms by which the MIT community can better support reasonable behavior. A first goal of this initiative is to educate and encourage discussion, rather than create a code of conduct for MIT. Consideration spans the continuum of reasonable behavior, unreasonable behavior, and harassment. However, while there are policies and resources in place at MIT to deal with blatant harassment, little attention has been paid to the less well defined area of “unreasonable” behavior. Part of the goal of this initiative then, is to make students and others comfortable with raising issues of unreasonable behavior.

A second goal is to create a mechanism by which relevant resources could be made more easily accessible to the community. The target audience is the entire MIT community, however, different mechanisms may be needed to reach unique constituencies. Initial focus has been on students and faculty, and this effort fits into the larger spectrum of advising and mentoring, but extends into preparation for life in the broadest sense.

B. Mechanism

Two key points are covered. The first initiative defines and publishes a set of Resources that is straightforward and clear. The second suggests the use of specific examples, or scenarios, that would elicit discussion, when presented in different formats. In addition, issues of monitoring, a production timetable, and expectations are discussed.

B.1 Defining a Resource Group

a. Identify a small number of offices around MIT, with designated titled person/people to deal directly with issues of reasonable behavior.

b. This group would include HR, Ombuds Office, MIT Police, SSS, Deans (DSL, DUE, GSO), MIT Medical.

c. This group would form a core “Resource Group” that would formulate common goals and a communications plan.

d. Any one office could serve as a “walk in” point for any member of the MIT community. Each office would be able to “triage” and direct someone to the most appropriate resource.
B.2 Scenarios
Scenarios are designed to stimulate discussion. In particular, focus is not on cases where there would be uniform consensus as to whether good or bad behavior is involved. Rather, more useful situations are those that can be seen from different perspectives, making it more challenging to decide whether specific behavior is reasonable or not.

a. 12 scenarios seems a reasonable place to start (many of these have been written).
b. These presently fall into overlapping categories including: bystander issues, group action, legal but wise, humor or not, gender-based, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, religion, stereotypes, web-based, power-based, international issues.
c. Elicit feedback for scenarios from undergraduate and graduate students and faculty through Focus Groups.
d. Present 2 –3 scenarios to students (in particular) on tentcards that will be placed in MIT dining facilities. Several different tentcards will be prepared. A link to resources will be included, or a more extensive listing can be included inside the tentcard.
e. A more extensive listing of scenarios, as well as full resource information and a brief history/perspective of respect at MIT. Many students are unlikely to read this, which therefore will target faculty and staff.
f. As an introduction to these presentations, a piece from President Hockfield to the Tech on this issue may be an effective way to launch this initiative.

B.3 Monitoring response to the initiative
a. Mail/email response to tentcards.
b. Open an online Discussion – questions include how to monitor discussion/should it be open or monitored, and if so, by whom?
c. Elicit response from students via UA senators, GRT, housemasters, GSC
d. Dinners with Dean could target response by graduate students.
e. Faculty dinners (Keyser) could open discussion amongst faculty.

B.4 Timetable
There is at least one semester’s work necessary to get material described in place. Not clear whether this initiative could be launched in Spring 2006/7 or whether it will need to wait until Fall 2007/8. Preferable to launch with the new academic year.

B.5 What’s next/expectations
The goals of this initiative encompass encouraging discussion and organizing of resources. There are several possible outcomes.
a. Resource organization and discussion form a contained, finite program that ends.
b. If there is interest, could follow up with town meeting.
c. Freshman seminar leaders could discuss scenarios.
d. Part of broader advising initiative that could be discussed with advisor/others.
e. The first phase of the program will end naturally (for students) at the end of the academic year.
f. Could subsequently become part of Freshman orientation.

**Members of the Ad Hoc Committee:** Prof. Hazel Sive (chair), Barrie Gleason (GSO), Tami Kaplan, Mary Langlie (DSL), Prof. Steven Lerman, Nicholas Pearce (U), Brian Rubineau (G).

**Members of the Committee on Student Life:**

**Faculty:**
Prof. Deborah Fitzgerald, Prof. Kimberley Hamad-Schiferli, Prof. Steve Lerman, Prof. Terry Orlando, Prof. Hazel Sive (Chair).

**Administration:**
Dean Larry Benedict (Office of Student Life), Dean Ike Colbert (Office of Graduate Studies), Valarie Poitier (staff: Office of Student Life) **Guests:** Barrie Gleason (Office of Graduate Studies), Danielle Guichard-Ashbrook (Director, International Students Office). Tami Kaplan (Office of Development).

**Students:**
Nicholas Pearce (U), Vivek Shah (U), Jamira Cotton (U), Erik Larsen (G), Brian Rubineau (G).

**We consulted with many colleagues in these discussions** including, Ombudsperson Mary Rowe, President Emeritus Paul Gray, MIT Human Resources Director Laura Avakian and colleagues, Chair of COD Margery Resnick, Dean Dan Hastings, MIT IT representative Tim McGovern and LGBT Program Coordinator Abigail Francis and colleagues, Chancellor Philip Clay.
Appendix G: MIT Sloan Standards for Professional Conduct

MIT Sloan’s Professional Standards outline expected professional behavior by students, staff, and faculty both inside and outside the classroom. The MIT Sloan School is committed to maintaining an environment in which every individual can work and study in a culture of mutual respect. The goal in outlining these norms and expectations is to assist each community member in achieving success. Consistent with the general goal of mutual respect, faculty, students, and staff are reminded to demonstrate:

- **On-time arrival to classes and presentations, with uninterrupted attendance for the duration.**
- **On-time initiation and termination of classes and presentations.** A class session or any other public meeting is expected to formally end 5 minutes before its scheduled ending time, and the following class session or meeting is expected to begin 5 minutes after its scheduled starting time.
- **Using respectful comments and humor**
- **Utilizing computers and technology suitably (e.g., silencing wireless devices, no web-browsing or emailing)**
- **Refraining from distracting or disrespectful activities (e.g., avoiding side conversations and games)**
- **Courtesy towards all guests, hosts and participants both inside and outside the classroom.** Such behavior should: 1)—reflect MIT Sloan Professional Standards, and; 2)—be consistent with the North American business practices. In MIT Sloan’s environment, MBA students are expected to observe the proper dress, decorum, and etiquette appropriate to MIT Sloan Professional Standards and North American business customs for each setting they are in.
- **Observance of the most conservative standards when one is unsure about which norms apply.**
- **Observance of MIT’s Classroom Rules of Use.** Please refer to Classroom Rules of Use from the Registrar’s Office.

Upholding these expectations and the standards upon which they are based is a shared right and responsibility for all faculty, students and staff at the MIT Sloan School. As a learning and professional community, we seek and deserve no less.
MIT Sloan Professional Standards

Professional Standards: Academic Integrity

As a member of the MIT Sloan academic community, the highest standards of academic behavior are expected of you.

Responsibility
It is your responsibility to make yourself aware of expected standards and adhere to them. These American-based standards specifically regard plagiarism, individual work, and team work.

Plagiarism
Plagiarism occurs when you use another’s intellectual property (words or ideas) and do not acknowledge that you have done so. Plagiarism is an extremely serious offense. If it is found that you have plagiarized—deliberately or inadvertently—you will face serious consequences.

The best way to avoid plagiarism is to cite your sources—both within the body of your assignment and in a bibliography of sources used at the end of the document.

Internet Research
Materials gathered through research via the Internet must be cited in the same manner as more traditionally published material. Lack of such citation constitutes plagiarism.

These definitions were drawn from the MIT Libraries website. For more information please visit: http://libraries.mit.edu/tutorial/general/plagiarism.html

Additional resources regarding proper source citation are available on the Professional Standards SloanSpace site.

Individual Work and Team Work
When you are asked to do individual work, you are expected to adhere to the following standards:

• Do not copy all or part of another student’s work (with or without “permission”).
• Do not allow another student to copy your work.
• Do not ask another person to write all or part of an assignment for you.
• Do not work together with another student in order to answer a question, or solve a problem, or write a computer program jointly.

• Do not concur or submit work (in whole or in part) that has been completed by other students in this or previous years for the same or substantially the same assignment.
• Do not use print or internet materials directly related to a case/problem set unless explicitly authorized by the instructor.
• Do not use print or internet materials without explicit quotation and/or citation.
• Do not submit the same, or similar, piece of work for two or more subjects without the explicit approval of the two or more instructors involved.

Team Assignments
When you are asked to work in teams, there is a broad spectrum of faculty expectations. Three general types of appropriate collaboration on team assignments are described below. The instructor will indicate in the syllabus what his/her expectations are. If there is any uncertainty, it is the student’s responsibility to clarify with the professor or TA the type of team work that is expected.

Type 1 collaboration: the professor states that collaboration is allowed, but the final product must be individual. An example of this might be a problem set.

• You are allowed to discuss the assignment with other team members and work through the problems together.
• What you turn in, however, must be your own product, written in your own handwriting, or in a computer file of which you are the sole author.
• Copying another’s work or electronic file is not acceptable.

Type 2 collaboration: the professor states that collaboration is encouraged but that each person’s contribution to the deliverable does not have to be substantial (taking a “divide and conquer” approach). An example of this might be a brief progress report.

• Each team member is encouraged to contribute substantially to the team assignment, however, the team
may choose to assign one or more team members to prepare and submit the deliverable on behalf of the team.
  • Regardless of how work is shared or responsibilities are divided among individual team members, each member of the team will be held accountable for the academic integrity of the entire assignment. If, for example, one member of the team submits plagiarized work on behalf of the team, the entire team will be subject to sanctions as appropriate.
  • The team may not collaborate with other students outside of the team unless the professor explicitly permits such collaboration.

Type 3 collaboration: the professor states that collaboration is expected and that each team member must contribute substantially to the deliverable. An example of this might be the FYC or the OP project.
  • Each team member must make a substantial contribution to the assignment. It is not, for example, acceptable to divide the assignments amongst the team members (e.g., part of the team does the FYC and the other part does another project), though the team may divide the work of any one assignment to complete it as they deem appropriate.
  • The team may not collaborate with other students outside of the team unless the professor explicitly permits such collaboration.

To repeat, if there is any question about the rules for a particular assignment the student should check with the faculty member.

You are held personally accountable for all assignments submitted with your name. If you participate on a team project, each member of the team will be responsible for the final submission. Take time to review any final projects prior to submission to assure that the overall product meets your standards. Recognize that you will be held accountable for others' work as they will, likewise, be responsible for yours.

Undesired consequences: Disciplinary Action
When a student(s) is found to have violated academic standards, disciplinary action will result. Possible consequences include grade reduction, a failing grade and loss of academic credit, transcript notation, suspension (delay of degree conferral and graduation), or expulsion from MIT Sloan.

Professional Standards: Personal Conduct

MIT Sloan’s Professional Standards outline expected professional behavior by students, staff, and faculty both inside and outside the classroom. The MIT Sloan School is committed to maintaining an environment in which every individual can work and study in a culture of mutual respect. The goal in outlining these norms and expectations is to assist each community member in achieving success.

Consistent with the general goal of mutual respect, faculty, students, and staff are reminded to demonstrate:
  • On-time arrival to classes and presentations, with uninterrupted attendance for the duration.
  • On-time initiation and termination of classes and presentations. A class session or any other public meeting is expected to formally end 5 minutes before its scheduled ending time, and the following class session or meeting is expected to begin 5 minutes after its scheduled starting time.
  • Using respectful comments and humor
  • Utilizing computers and technology suitably (e.g., silencing wireless devices, no web-browsing or emailing)
  • Refraining from distracting or disrespectful activities (e.g., avoiding side conversations and games)
  • Courtesy towards all guests, hosts and participants both inside and outside the classroom. Such behavior should: 1)—reflect MIT Sloan Professional Standards, and; 2)—be consistent with the North American business practices. In MIT Sloan’s environment, MBA students are expected to observe the proper dress, decorum, and etiquette appropriate to MIT Sloan Professional Standards and North American business customs for each setting they are in.
  • Observance of the most conservative standards when one is unsure about which norms apply.
  • Observance of MIT’s Classroom Rules of Use. Please refer to Classroom Rules of Use from the Registrar’s Office.

Upholding these expectations and the standards upon which they are based is a shared right and responsibility for all faculty, students and staff at the MIT Sloan School. As a learning and professional community, we seek and deserve no less.

---

Professional Standards Resources

Please visit our new site on SloanSpace!

Professional Standards on SloanSpace:
https://sloanspace.mit.edu/dotlm/clubs/professionalstandards/
one-community?page_num=0
Appendix H: HST Credo

The primary objectives of HST are to educate leaders in medicine and the biomedical sciences and to develop and conduct research programs that integrate engineering, science and medicine towards the betterment of human health.

Consistent with professional roles, HST students, faculty, and staff will:

- Commit to the highest standards of excellence in the practice of medicine and research. Fulfill responsibilities and be accountable for actions.
- Maintain impeccable integrity and ethics both in laboratory and clinical endeavors.
- Treat patients with respect and honesty. Be altruistic, empathetic and compassionate in their treatment. Honor their right to confidentiality.

Treat colleagues, teachers and students with respect and honesty. Communicate opinions in a constructive manner and encourage free discourse.
**Appendix I: Other Resources and Examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization:</th>
<th>Stanford University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR Diversity Website:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.stanford.edu/dept/diversityaccess/links.html">http://www.stanford.edu/dept/diversityaccess/links.html</a> -- web page on university diversity initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Policy? | Staff and Faculty Resources  
- President's Reaffirmation of Equal Employment Opportunity  
- Employment Policies for Regular Staff - Administrative Guide Memo 22.1  
- Staff Grievance Procedure - Administrative Guide Memo 22.10  
- General Personnel Policies - Administrative Guide Memo 23  
- Faculty Development & Diversity Office  
- President & Provost Statement on Faculty Diversity |
| Student Resources |  
- Stanford University Statement on Nondiscriminatory Policy (See Stanford Bulletin - Page 1)  
- Student Nonacademic Grievance Policy and Procedure (See Stanford Bulletin - Page 43) |
| Trainings: | [http://www.stanford.edu/dept/diversityaccess/dev_seminar.html](http://www.stanford.edu/dept/diversityaccess/dev_seminar.html) -- seminar to identify and develop a diverse group of staff members who have demonstrated an interest in and potential for leadership roles at the University |
| Code of Conduct | None found. |
| Contacts: | Diversity & Access Office  
Rosa González  
Director and ADA/Section 504 Compliance Officer  
Voice: (650) 725-0326  
TTY: (650) 723-1216  
Fax: (650) 723-1791  
[disability.access@stanford.edu](mailto:disability.access@stanford.edu)  
  
Sheila Sanchez  
Disability Accomodations Coordinator  
Voice: (650) 725-0326  
Fax: (650) 723-1791  
[sheilas@stanford.edu](mailto:sheilas@stanford.edu) |
<p>| Other: | <a href="http://www.stanford.edu/dept/diversityaccess/springfest.html">http://www.stanford.edu/dept/diversityaccess/springfest.html</a> -- Multicultural Springfest is an annual event celebrating Stanford's staff and its diversity. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization:</th>
<th>University of Chicago</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR Diversity Website:</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hr.umich.edu/oie/">http://www.hr.umich.edu/oie/</a> -- web page on university diversity initiatives <a href="http://www.urespect.umich.edu/index.html">http://www.urespect.umich.edu/index.html</a> --seems to be a university-wide initiative to increase diversity awareness with particular focus on hate crime prevention/reduction (Primarily supported by OIE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy?</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hr.umich.edu/oie/ndpolicy.html">http://www.hr.umich.edu/oie/ndpolicy.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainings:</td>
<td><a href="https://training.uchicago.edu/categories.cfm?family_id=10">https://training.uchicago.edu/categories.cfm?family_id=10</a> – training course for diversity in the workplace (not very much information on this page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Conduct?</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hr.umich.edu/oie/cc/about.html">http://www.hr.umich.edu/oie/cc/about.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Commitment: The University of Michigan has, as one of its core values, an abiding commitment to sustaining a community in which the dignity of every individual is respected. Key to this value are efforts to foster and nurture an environment of civility and mutual respect by preventing discrimination and harassment on our campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts:</td>
<td>Office of Institutional Equity 2072 Administrative Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>Campus Commitment site has an interactive function to send anonymous emails to OIE personnel. Resources for Diversity/Harassment Avoidance &amp; Reporting <a href="http://www.hr.umich.edu/oie/cc/resources.html">http://www.hr.umich.edu/oie/cc/resources.html</a> <a href="http://www.hr.umich.edu/oie/cc/what.html">http://www.hr.umich.edu/oie/cc/what.html</a> Expect Respect Resource Page <a href="http://www.urespect.umich.edu/resources.html">http://www.urespect.umich.edu/resources.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEWSFOCUS

Truth and Consequences

MARISBURY, WISCONSIN—In these first disquieting months, as fall has turned to winter and the sidewalks were blanketed with snow, the graduate students sometimes gathered in the Union bar, a popular student hangout. There, they drank together at one of the many small gathering places that have been over Lake Mendota, drinking beer and chatting amiably around one another's questions. What do you do when your professor apparently talks dirty, and you are the only one who knows?

Chemical Ly, 32, had already waited through 7 years of a Ph.D. program at the University of Wisconsin (UW), Madison. Turning to her mentor, Ly was certain that it was something she was going to happen to in the lab? Another of the six students felt that their advisor, professor Elizabeth Goodwin, observed a second chemist and wasn't certain that this was what was going to happen. A third was unable to decide because Goodwin had done anything wrong and was too concerned to discuss it with the advisor that she referred to examine possible evidence.

Two days before winter break, at the noon meeting of all six students in the same classroom, they shared their concerns with a university official. On the morning of the meeting, the UW investigation reported data indicating that Goodwin's past experiences with outside faculty members, whom they saw as friends, would be considered in the current investigation. Three graduate students who spoke with Goodwin also described concerning events with outside faculty members, whom they say did not agree with Goodwin's concerns with the faculty involved.

Following Goodwin's advice to everyone involved in the meeting, Goodwin's family members, whom they say met with Goodwin before all the facts become known.

Goodwin's investigation revealed that events like those were typical. "My feeling is it's never a good thing to become a whistleblower," said Kay Fields, a marine biology investigator at ORI, who demanded an explanation for misconduct cases to occur in rights ORI officials maintain that between a third and half of research misconduct cases involving basic scientific research are brought by professional colleagues of grad students or postdocs. Indeed, Goodwin's graduate students spent long hours debating how to handle a situation that might involve Sarah LaMartina, 29, who anticipated to biology after her final exam in her childhood plan to become a veterinarian, had already spent 6 years in graduate school and worried whether all the time and effort would go to waste. "We're thinking, 'Are we stupid for not coming to you?'", says LaMartina, whose master's thesis reflects her major Wisconsin route. "Sure, it's the right thing to do, but right for who?... Who is going to benefit from this? Nobody."

Chemistry
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A rigorous evaluation process was utilized to test the effectiveness of the Training Active Bystanders curriculum.

The qualitative and quantitative evaluation showed:

- Targets and witnesses reported a significant decrease in harmful or violent behavior in TAB schools as compared to control schools—a 20% difference.
- TAB supports school and community safety programs, including improvement plans, civic and educational goals, and mission statements.
- Trainers exhibited a significant increase in use of new terminology and in identifying actions they could take as active bystanders.
- Student trainers exhibited behavior shifts, demonstrating active bystandership and utilizing TAB language and techniques in peer and family contexts.
- Youth leadership development is a key element of TAB.

TAB has been taught in schools, community settings, through employer groups, and at public events, drawing a wide range of people learning how to take action in their own communities.

Contact Information
Quabbin Mediation offices are located in the Orange District Court Building, 13 South Main Street, Orange MA.

Sharon Tracy, Executive Director
Susan Wallace, Training Director
Krely Malone, Lead Trainer

Mailing Address:
Quabbin Mediation
P.O. Box 544
Ashburnham, MA 01331

Telephone (978) 544-6142; (888) 924-2600 (toll free)

"We learned about why bystanders do not act. I can use what I learned today by stepping up for what I believe in, even if it means possibly putting someone else's life in danger to help them.

-10th grade trainer"