RESPONDING TO ALLEGATIONS OF GRANTEE WORKPLACE MISCONDUCT

Frequently Asked Questions

Why does MacArthur ask a question about workplace misconduct?

We believe that one indicator of an effective organization is a tolerant and respectful workplace. We have posted an explanation of our approach to workplace misconduct allegations. This includes asking the following question to all grantees about workplace misconduct as part of our pre-grant inquiry and follow up, as appropriate:

*Are you aware of any allegations against the organization made within the last three years regarding workplace issues and culture, including sexual harassment, hostile work environment, toxic work environment, mistreatment of or discrimination based on race, ethnicity, gender, sexual identity, age, or disability, or similar type issues, whether made formally or on social media?*

Who at the grantee organization is responsible for answering the question?

This should be viewed as an institutional answer and therefore inquiry should be made within the organization to persons who would have the knowledge to answer the question. This might include, for example, the human resource department if there is one.

For grants to centers at large organizations where the organization is the actual grantee, who should respond to the question?

The inquiry is directed to the center at the organization that is intended to use the grant funds. For example, if the grant is to a university for a specific school or center within the university, the inquiry is directed to the specific school or center and not the entire university. This is similar to how the Foundation addresses the notification provision in the grant agreement.

If the grantee is a fiscal sponsor for a project to whom is the inquiry directed?

The organization answering the question should be the fiscal sponsor. The inquiry is intended to apply to persons working on the fiscally sponsored project and those persons employed by the fiscal sponsor who are responsible for the oversight, administration, and operation of the project, including persons employed at the fiscal sponsor who have overall responsibility for the fiscal sponsor and its project.
How much detail is required and what are the expectations of confidentiality?

We are aware that individual cases can be sensitive and subject to confidentiality concerns. We are largely trying to understand whether there is a pervasive problem and whether the organization has in place procedures and policies that provide for adequate responses, due diligence, and protection for alleged victims and alleged perpetrators. Individual cases can, however, be a window into broader problems. Conversations are often a better mechanism to get the necessary information. We use the information solely with respect to its consideration of a potential grant and, except as may be required by law, do not share the information with third parties.

How does the Foundation document the answer and where is it retained?

The answer to the question should be documented and maintained in the grant management system (GMS). In general, the documentation should reflect that the program and legal teams have considered the information provided and reflect the course of action determined by the Foundation. In situations where there may be personal information provided in the answer, such as individual names, we will consider whether that information is necessary to the decision-making progress and needs to be maintained in GMS as part of the grant file.

What time period is covered by the question?

Organizations should report allegations made within the last three years.

If the answer is yes without additional detail, what is the next step?

Representatives from the program team and legal department will request a phone conversation if the answer does not provide sufficient information to reach an informed decision.

For repeat grantees how often do we have to ask the question?

The question should be asked with respect to each grant; however, the question can be supplemented by indicating that the grantee can simply state that nothing has changed from its last answer if that is the case.

Would the Foundation decide not to make a grant because of the organization’s response?

We will consider a range of factors in determining whether to make a grant. The organization’s approach to maintaining a tolerant and civil workplace with appropriate procedures to address
claims of workplace misconduct is one such factor. The mere presence of allegations will not be dispositive, and we would expect to discuss with the potential grantee the issues raised by the response and provide the potential grantee an opportunity to explain its approach.