SMH Allies Cue Card

Tips:
- Be approachable and visible
- Center the target and their desires - ask what they want or need
- Empathize - “That sounds terrible, I’m so sorry that happened to you, I imagine that was an awful experience…”
- Offer water/snack
- Record potential witnesses

Questions/Concerns?
- Email: smhconduct@gmail.com

Modelled after SMARTS
SMH Intake Committee Cue Card

Target Interview:

- No anonymous reporting
- Two interviewers should be present
- Ask target if they would like anyone with them
- Get contact info for follow up and take notes
- Use active listening and validate
- Focus on what happened
- Ask target what they want or need
- Consider risk to other potential victims, look for a pattern
- Ask if target wants to know outcome
- Do not make promises
- If necessary, help target get to a crisis center or contact police

Harasser Interview:

- Keep target and/or reporter names confidential
- Two interviewers should be present, at least one senior scholar
- A member of the Referee Committee should be present
- Get contact info for follow up and take notes
- Use active listening
- Do not make promises
- Put burden on violator, not on the target

Modeled after SMARTS

Questions/Concerns: Contact smhconduct@gmail.com
SMH Referee Committee Cue Card

Objective and Guidance:
● Determine if alleged violator gets to stay at event
● Impact supersedes intent
● Keep target/reporter’s names as confidential as possible
● Choose minimum sanction that will protect the community
● Aim is safety and inclusion not retaliation/punishment
● Consider legal risk of not acting in the case of a clear violation

Questions/Concerns: Contact smhconduct@gmail.com

Likely Allow to Stay with Warning:
● Alleged violator acknowledges offense, volunteers apology, and states will not repeat the behavior

Likely Ask to Leave:
● Alleged violator argues policy/Code of Conduct is wrong and does not affirm willingness to follow the policy
● Alleged violator insists on knowing identity of target/reporter
● Alleged violator asserts rank/status and does not acknowledge impropriety of asserting privilege
● Alleged violator argues intent matters more than impact
● Alleged violators displays DARVO tactics (defend, attack, reverse victim and offender)

Less Clear:
● Alleged violator denies accusation/has different experience of events - seek witnesses
● Witnesses differ or if there are no witnesses

Modeled after SMARTS