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Students for Consent Culture Canada (SFCC) acknowledges that its work across Kanata (Canada) takes place on the unceded territory of different Indigenous communities. Sexual violence is a symptom of the larger colonial system that “Canada” was founded on and continues to perpetuate. We cannot speak of consent on campuses without also moving beyond acknowledging, and towards unpacking and addressing the ongoing non-consensual relationship Canada has with Indigenous communities. SFCC has an explicitly anti-colonial commitment which, among other concrete steps, includes ongoing internal education and training. When doing this work across the artificial borders of the provinces and territories, we must always root our work within the reality that Indigenous women and two-spirit individuals are three times more likely than non-Indigenous women to experience sexual violence, and that our anti-sexual violence work occurs in the midst of a national inquiry into missing and murdered Indigenous women, girls, and two-spirit individuals. SFCC commits to taking an intersectional and anti-colonial approach when invited to do work across the traditional territories of the:

- Coast Salish Peoples, including the territories of the xʷməθkʷəy̓əm (Musqueam), Skwxwú7mesh (Squamish), Stó:lō and Səl̓ílwətaʔ/Selilwitulh (Tsleil-Waututh) Nations (University of British Columbia);
- Cree, Lakota, Saulteaux, Assiniboine, and Métis (University of Regina);
- Anishinaabeg, Cree, Oji-Cree, Assiniboine, Dakota, and Dene Peoples, and the homeland of the Métis Nation (Brandon University);
- Anishinaabeg, Cree, Oji-Cree, Dakota, and Dene Peoples, and on the homeland of the Métis Nation (University of Manitoba, and University of Winnipeg);
- Algonquin Anishnaabeg people (Carleton University and University of Ottawa);
- The Wendat, the Anishnaabeg, Haudenosaunee, Métis, and the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation (George Brown College and Ryerson University);
- Anishinaabeg, specifically Ojibwe/Chippewa people (Lakehead University, Orillia);
- Mississaugas of Scugog Island First Nation (University of Ontario Institute of Technology);
- Huron-Wendat, the Seneca, and most recently, the Mississaugas of the Credit River. (University of Toronto);
- Abenaki people and the Wabenaki confederacy (Bishop’s University);
- Kanien’kehaka (Mohawk) (McGill University and Concordia University);
- The Wolastòkwiyik (Maliseet) and Mi’kmaq Peoples (Mount Allison and St. Francis Xavier University);
- Mi’kmaq people (Dalhousie University);
- Abegweit Mi’kmaq First Nation (University of Prince Edward Island);
- Mi’kmag and Beothuk peoples (Memorial University);
- The Anishinabek Nation, Huron-Wendat, Métis, and Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nations (York University).
The One Year Later Report

Executive Summary

What began as a project led by a handful of students at Carleton University has since transformed into a national movement – uniting student unions and groups across the country to advocate for safer campuses and survivor’s rights, as well as centring the voices of students and student survivors.

For those who are unfamiliar with our work (all of which occurred using our previous name OurTurn / À Notre Tour), over the course of a year we grew from a small collective of students into a national, grassroots, student-led organization, initiated in October 2017. Within one year of its founding, we worked to support over 40 student unions and organizations from 8 provinces. We sought to provide them with the tools they needed to prevent sexual violence, support survivors, and advocate for reforms at the campus, provincial, and federal levels.

The National OurTurn Committee was launched through the publication of the OurTurn National Action Plan (English and French) – a bilingual, adaptable action plan to end campus sexual violence through evidence-based programs and effective action. As part of the Action Plan, OurTurn released a comprehensive review of 60 campus sexual violence policies, including the development of a campus sexual violence policy scorecard with 45 criteria. Working alongside student union partners, within the Action Plan fourteen post-secondary institutions were evaluated with a national average grade of C- (61%).

The members of OurTurn had a vast array of past experiences and expertise working on campus sexual violence from across the country that we sought to share with others. We adopted an anti-oppressive, intersectional, and survivor-centric approach. Thus, our efforts primarily depended on the needs of individual student groups.

In August 2018, the National OurTurn Committee transitioned from an informal grassroots group into a new formalized non-profit called Students for Consent Culture Canada (SFCC) to better reflect the work we had been doing throughout the year which had outgrown the framework of the OurTurn National Action Plan, and to take time to organize ourselves in a way that centred anti-oppressive frameworks and reflected our values as organizers.

The following report seeks to memorialize and celebrate the impacts of the OurTurn National Action Plan and cross-country work of those involved in the National OurTurn Committee. It sets the stage for our next steps as SFCC as we seek to lead advocacy around federal and provincial campus sexual violence legislation, develop intersectional prevention resources, address sexual violence committed by professors, and support the development of student union sexual violence policies. It also outlines some recurring problems and obstacles we have seen in this work over the last year. This report serves to document a first of what we hope to be many steps as we continue to learn, unlearn, and relearn as organizers, building our network of movers and shakers across the country who are working to create cultures of consent in all of our communities.
“This movement has always been student-led” – was the phrase painted across the banner hung from the McGill University staircase. Both myself and Connor Spencer, the SSMU (Students’ Society of McGill University) VP External, had been up until 4am making the final touches.

It was October 11th 2017, the day of the publishing of the Action Plan. It was the culmination of nine months of work across eight provinces, interacting with hundreds of students. For this project, I had given up everything – I took nine months off to pursue completely unpaid labour, moved cities, and flew/drove/train-ed across the country to meet with student leaders and survivors for consultations. I said the phrase “I believe you” countless times as I was told stories of campus sexual violence and failed institutional responses across the country. This was it. The report was finally being published.

We were feeling a mixture of excitement and anxiety that morning – excited to finally share our team’s work with the public but anxious about the response. We were about to release “poor grades” on some of the largest institutions in our country – University of Toronto, Dalhousie University, McGill University, University of British Columbia – effectively calling them out for their failure to support survivors or provide them with adequate campus processes. I had already experienced the backlash that is often experienced by anti-sexual violence activists (particularly in the pre-#MeToo era) on my own campus at Carleton and was uncertain about how the report would be responded to at the national level.

The entire day was a blur. We started with a press conference at McGill University with SSMU and the Concordia Student Union (CSU) in the morning, then drove to Ottawa to participate in another press conference at the University of Ottawa with the Carleton University Students’ Association (CUSA) and the Student Federation of the University of Ottawa (SFUO). This was in conjunction with the release of the sexual violence policy scores in a CBC Toronto report by Lisa Xing, resulting in non-stop interviews throughout the day. The OurTurn report was gaining attention in every province in Canada – sparking a discussion on campus sexual violence policies and whether post-secondary institutions were truly creating the survivor-centric processes for survivors that they claimed they were. More importantly, there were twenty student unions and groups across the country who had partnered with us to release the report and committed to implementing the various prevention, support, and advocacy recommendations we had developed through months of consultation.
The initial blur of the release of the OurTurn Action Plan seemed to continue indefinitely for the rest of the year. In less than a year after the release of the report, as National Chair, I continued to travel across 6 provinces to support students in their anti-campus sexual violence advocacy and consult for provincial governments. I was the youngest individual named to the federal government’s Gender-Based Violence Advisory Committee and our organization is now consulting on the first-ever government led national campus sexual violence framework. During all of this, the number of student group and student unions using the Action Plan grew from 20 to 42.

The impact of the report feels almost immeasurable – it was mentioned in the House of Commons on numerous occasions, cited as an influence in shaping the federal 2018 budget, used by more institutions than we'll ever know in shaping their sexual violence policies, and led to the passing of provincial legislation on campus sexual violence. More importantly to me, it was a tool that gave a voice and empowered students and survivors across the country to challenge their institutions and governments over their failure to adequately support survivors of campus sexual violence.

After the release of the report, we created a National OurTurn Committee. This was a team of incredible students across the country who were dedicated to supporting survivors on campuses through prevention, support and advocacy. They each led work at the grassroots, provincial and national level to promote the Action Plan and move beyond it to develop new strategies to respond to campus sexual violence.

Prior to the one year anniversary of the publishing of the report, the National OurTurn Committee made the collective decision to rename itself Students for Consent Culture Canada (SFCC). This change sought to reflect the development of the organization and the work it does, which although rooted in the same values and principles, has grown greatly beyond what was encapsulated in the original Action Plan.

As we begin our work as SFCC, the writing of this One Year Later (OYL) report was important to us as a way to document the immense impact that the OurTurn Action Plan and National OurTurn Committee had over the past year. This is our way of ensuring that the legacy of the Action Plan continues and all of the resources developed are made and remain public.

As I write this a year after the initial publishing, I can’t help but feel proud. It is not often that we take a step back and reflect on the impact we’ve had in our communities and our country. This report gives us the ability to reflect on the successes and challenges we faced, with the hopes of shaping our continued anti-sexual violence work as SFCC.

With warmth and in solidarity,

CAITLIN SALVINO
Co-founder of OurTurn
OurTurn National Chair 2017-2018
SFCC Advocacy Lead 2018-2019
OurTurn National Action Plan
A Summary

The OurTurn National Action Plan was always envisioned to be a first step; it was an Action Plan to create social and institutional change through evidence-based programs and effective action. The goal of its development was the need to centralize the voices of students and survivors in discussions of campus sexual violence. We believed that as students we were, and continue to be, uniquely positioned to take action to address the crisis of sexual violence on Canadian campuses.

It was to be more than just a policy document, consolidating best practices from student activists from across the country to present a comprehensive Action Plan for students. It gives campus student leaders tools and direction created by student survivors to make meaningful change that will make their universities safer places to study, work, and live.

The Action Plan is comprised of the following guiding principles:

- A Survivor-Centered Approach
- Acknowledging the Existence of Rape Culture
- Affirmative Consent and Consent Culture
- A Trauma-Informed Approach
- Inclusivity and Accessibility
- Collaboration and Integration
- Labour That is Financially Compensated
- Gender Sensitivity and Gender Inclusivity
- Intersectionality

The opportunity to collaborate on the development and launch of OurTurn allowed the space to share my own experiences of sexual violence with those whose stories reflected my reality, and those whose stories were radically different. This collective effort included as many voices as possible, and in my opinion, successfully produced tangible improvement for students on Canadian campuses.

- Greg Owens -
Former National Campaigns Coordinator, Canadian Federation of Students (CFS)
The original document provides guidelines for student unions and groups to take steps to:

- **Prevent** sexual violence and eliminate rape culture on our campuses
- **Support** survivors and create a culture of survivor-centrism in our programs and institutions
- **Advocate** for policy and legislative reforms at the campus, local, provincial, and national levels

It then outlines **twenty actionable steps student groups** could adopt and implement on their own campuses as needed. These steps include:

1. Passing a motion acknowledging the existence of, and committing to eliminating, rape culture on campus;
2. Holding general and closed community consultation meetings;
3. Conducting a student campus sexual violence survey;
4. Developing or adopting a peer-to-peer sexual violence prevention and support training program and mandating members of campus clubs or student union committees/councils to complete the training;
5. Attending and supporting community events related to sexual violence and gender-based violence;
6. Raising awareness of community support resources;
7. Advocating for the addition of sexual violence academic accommodations to course syllabi;
8. Using the OurTurn Campus Sexual Violence Scorecard to grade campus sexual violence policies and identify what needs amending;
9. Advocating for policy reforms at the campus level using the Our Turn Advocacy Guide;
10. Collaborating with other student unions and organizations to advocate for legislative reform at the provincial and federal levels.

The publishing of the *Action Plan* was the beginning of a unified grassroots response to campus sexual violence from student groups that stretched beyond boundaries, regional perspectives and biases, and student political affiliations.
Year in a Snapshot
Impacts of the Report

- Over 4000 Student Signatures on OurTurn Open Letters
- 260+ Club Signatures on OurTurn Open Letters
- 115 Media Articles Written about OurTurn (2017–2018)
- Consulted and Advocated to 5 Provincial Governments
- Youngest Person Named to the Federal Status of Women Gender-Based Violence Committee
- 4 Mentions in the House of Commons
- Participated in 8 Federal Consultations
- First Canadian Student Union Gendered and Sexual Violence Policy Drafted and Passed
- 1500+ Students Trained Through Peer to Peer Anti-Sexual Violence Prevention and Support Training
Since publication, it truly has been a whirlwind of a year. Those involved with leading OurTurn worked with, travelled to, and supported students and survivors across the country in initiating grassroots movements in their communities. The following is a brief timeline of the development of the OurTurn National Action Plan and all of the advocacy that flowed from its publication.

**ACTION PLAN PUBLISHED**

On October 11, 2017, the National OurTurn Action Plan was published. It had 20 student union and group signatories from 8 provinces across the country. Within the action plan was a commitment from all of the student partners to implement recommendations from the action plan on their own campus.

**NEWFOUNDLAND CONSENT CULTURE FORUM**

The OurTurn National Chair, Caitlin Salvino, was invited to lead a workshop at the Canadian Federation of Students – Newfoundland and Labrador Consent Culture Forum with Memorial University of Newfoundland students. The workshop focused on breaking down MUN’s sexual violence policy and identifying ways to advocate for survivor-centric and intersectional reforms.
JANUARY 19, 2018

STATUS OF WOMEN POST-SECONDARY SEXUAL VIOLENCE SURVEY

Three OurTurn members were invited by Status of Women to participate in a consultation and feedback session on the first-ever national Statistics Canada Survey on campus sexual violence.

MAY 9, 2018

UOIT OPEN LETTER LAUNCHES

UOIT We Believe Survivors Coalition, in partnership with OurTurn, launched an open letter before their Board of Governors meeting, calling for 7 survivor-centric reforms to the policy to be made during its review. It was supported by 8 student groups.

MARCH 29, 2018

CONSULTED ON BILL C-65 (WORKPLACE SEXUAL HARASSMENT) WITH SENATOR MARILOU MCPHEDRAN

MAY 28, 2018

OURTURN GENERAL MEETING

Over the weekend of May 28th, the new 2018-2019 team from across the country met in Ottawa for training, planning, mobilization, and strategizing for the upcoming year.

JUNE 22, 2018

INVITED TO THE FEDERAL STATUS OF WOMEN GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

The former OurTurn Chair Caitlin Salvino was invited to sit on the federal government committee advising Status of Women on gender-based violence programming. She is the youngest member who has been named to this committee.
**OURTURN RE-INTRODUCED AS SFCC**

*Students for Consent Culture*

---

**NOV 2018**

**SFCC ATTENDS MULTIPLE STATUS OF WOMEN CONSULTATIONS**

---

**NOV 1, 2018**

**OURTURN RE-INTRODUCED AS SFCC**

---

**NOV 27, 2018**

**SFCC AND AVEQ CO-PUBLISH A GUIDE FOR STUDENT ADVOCATES AND ACTIVISTS ON BILL 151 IN QUÉBEC**

---

**DEC 4, 2018**

**PEI PASSES CAMPUS SV LEGISLATION**

After calls from OurTurn and other groups, PEI passed legislation mandating all postsecondary schools to create sexual violence policies.

---

**JAN 12, 2019**

**BCFS GENERAL MEETING**

SFCC Advocacy Lead and National Chair, Caitlin and Connor facilitated a workshop on sexual violence policy best practices with students unions from across BC.
Cross-Country Student Movement

42 Student groups from across 8 provinces representing 650,000 students signed and/or used the OurTurn National Action Plan to support their anti-sexual violence work.

British Columbia
1. UBC AMS
2. BCFS
3. UFV SUS
4. VIUSU
5. CCSS

Saskatchewan
6. URSU (UR)
7. RPIRG
8. OurTurn Regina
9. U of R Women’s Centre

Manitoba
10. UWSA
11. UM GSA
12. UMSU
13. CFS MB
14. BUSU

For a glossary of acronyms, please see Appendix D
Cross-Country Student Movement
When the Action Plan was first published, the national and regional media focused primarily on the policy scores. Understandably, it was a captivating news story – students grading their institution’s response to sexual violence. Despite the extensive media attention, the goal of the report and scorecard was not to embarrass institutions, but rather to fill a knowledge gap in best practices for campus policies in order to empower student activists and advocates.

In 2016, when Ontario became the first province to mandate the creation of campus sexual violence policies on post-secondary campuses, there was very little information on what should be in these policies. Ontario’s Bill 132, The Sexual Violence and Harassment Action Plan Act – which is similar to other campus sexual violence legislation that has since been passed in British Columbia, Manitoba, Québec, and Prince Edward Island – solely mandated the creation of these policies without basic minimum standards or oversight mechanisms required for these policies. Post-secondary institutions then created policies with little guidance from the provinces and without examples of best practices across Canada.

At its earliest stage, the scorecard was envisioned as a checklist of clauses that should and should not be included in these sexual violence policies. These clauses were developed through the first-hand experiences of individuals on the research team, consultations at Carleton and campuses across Canada, as well as comparative research on policies across Canada. As a result, we ended up with over 45 different recommendations for policies, which became our scorecard.

The goal was to provide a straightforward process to evaluate campus policies in order to clearly identify shortcomings. We sought to fill the gaps in knowledge around the best practices for processes that respond to sexual violence – and to have students and student survivors leading that conversation.
Shortcomings of the Scorecard

As with any campaign, we have always been very open that the scorecard has its shortcomings. As a centralized scoring method, it was not able to properly be adapted to the specific nuances and differing needs between rural, urban, small and/or larger campuses. There were important sections, such as whether institutions have acknowledged the intersectional impacts of sexual violence, that were unable to evaluate whether institutions are actively taking steps to support students from marginalized groups who experience sexual violence beyond a statement in the preamble or definitions section. For some institutions that received “higher” scores (such as B+ or higher), some of our student union partners expressed to us that they experienced administrators using the “better” scores to justify not reforming or amending their school’s policy. These same student unions, however, said that the scorecard was still a helpful tool to identify key sections of their policies that they could advocate be amended.

Finally, the scorecard is based solely on the language written directly in the policy – we did not award points for things institutions claimed they were doing but did not mention in the policy (i.e. rape shield protections needed to be explicitly mentioned in the policy, as opposed to administrators saying they would never ask survivors about their sexual history in an investigation). The scorecard is not designed to document failed implementation of policies (when institutions do not follow their own policies), which is a source of immeasurable harm to survivors filing complaints.

Cross-Country Impacts

Despite these shortcomings, the OurTurn Campus Sexual Violence Policy scorecard has been incredibly successful on campuses across the country due to the efforts of incredible student leaders and survivors. Its use has extended far beyond the initial 14 campuses included in the report. Throughout 2017–2018, OurTurn was featured in over 115 news articles in addition to countless radio interviews. We have heard from students, survivors, and community advocates who have used the scorecard to help them advocate for changes to their campus policies. Although always meant to be a resource primarily for students, we have also heard from government officials and post-secondary administrators who have used the OurTurn National Action Plan as a guide as they’ve sought to develop their policies, provincial/federal legislation, or policy changes.
Reggrading of Policies
Dalhousie as the Example

Some of the most successful policy reform advocacy occurred at Dalhousie University. Due to the year-long efforts of Masuma Asad Khan (VP Academic and External), Aaron Prosper (President), Shannon Pringle (Survivor Support Staff), and others, of the Dalhousie Student Union – working with the University administration and staff – the Dalhousie Sexualized Violence Policy was completely reformed. The policy went from a D+ (57%) to A+ (91%) – making it, although not perfect, one of the best in Canada. This included reforms to cover off-campus activities and co-op placements, the inclusion of rape shield protections and face to face protections, as well as including the ability to submit anonymous and third party complaints. Important to note, however, is that an A+ score and these reforms do not guarantee that the policy will be properly implemented to avoid re-traumatization of survivors. The efforts of these student and survivor advocates at Dalhousie resulted in meaningful changes that will give survivors an effective document to refer to in order to advocate for their rights during a process for years to come. SFCC will continue to work with students at Dalhousie to ensure that the new policy is followed and implemented properly.

“[University Admin] rely on us not being prepared, and what the OurTurn scorecard did was allow a foundation of preparation for student leaders so we had a united front.”

– Masuma Asad Khan
DSU VP Academic & External
## Dalhousie University Policy Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of a policy that covers Sexual Violence (+12)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of a stand-alone policy (+6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible policy - Online (+2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible policy - One document (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined complaint process; requires clearly outlined and defined step-by-step process (+2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of reporting and statistic mechanisms (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to report externally to the criminal justice system and/or human rights tribunal (+2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include the ability to suspend complaint if the complainant also seeks recourse from criminal justice system (+2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal and review of policy (+4 if annual/every 2 years OR review after 1st year and then every 3, +3 if review every 3 years, +2 if reviewed every 4, +1 if review every 5 years)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and staff are processed under the same SVP as students (+4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines consent effectively 1) recognizes drugs/alcohol, 2) power relations, 3) revocation of consent, 4) consent cannot be assumed, 5) cannot be obtained through coercion and threats (+ 6)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers visitors and alumni (+2) (would include any specific mention of the ability to ban visitors and alum from campus and have no contact orders)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures complaints are not suspended if the respondent ends their relationship with the school (i.e. transfers or drops out) (+2 points)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers off campus activity that impacts ability to live and learn on campus (+1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers online activity (+1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers stealthing (+1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly covers co-op and practicum placements (+1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composition of the Decision Maker(s)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of an external third party independent member on the review committee (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of student representatives on the review committee (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly mandating sexual violence sensitivity training (+2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of an independent investigator (+2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal and Informal Complaint Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of informal and restorative justice mechanisms (+1 for informal and +1 for restorative justice)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit rape shield protections – prohibition of questions regarding past sexual history (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of Face to Face Protections (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of specific immunity clause for drug and alcohol use (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit mention that all sanctions ordered against respondent will be made known to survivor (+2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined timelines for complaint process (+2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Measures (+1 for existence and +1 for explicit survivor-centrist stance)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include a frivolous claims section (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to have support person present (+1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of a conflict of interest clause (+1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include an exception clause (+2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of protection from retaliation (+1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of ability to submit anonymous and third party complaints (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include a time limit to file a formal complaint after incident (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include a gag order (confidentiality order) at any point (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal process (+1 ability to appeal and +2 appeal to an external non-administrative body)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creates a prevention, education and support committee (+1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlights support services available for survivors (+2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed funding to support programs (+1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlights prevention programs on campus (+1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus services that are sexual violence specific (+1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectionality recognized (+2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape culture mentioned (+2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations for survivors mentioned (+1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LETTER GRADE</strong></td>
<td>D+</td>
<td>A+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best Practices for Survivor-Centrism

Through our own work, and in consultation with student leaders involved in policy reform advocacy, we have learned that one of the most powerful tools that students can use to advocate for change is research. One of the most impactful tactics used by student leaders was providing examples of other campus policies that included clauses they were advocating for on their campus. Throughout the past year we worked individually with student groups to provide them with research on various policies and specific clauses that they were seeking to have included in their own policies. The following is a list of some of the best practices we researched throughout the year:

Your Policy Should Have:

☑ Well Defined Stand-Alone Sexual Violence Policy

Some institutions place sexual violence procedures within broader student disciplinary documents. It is important to have a standalone document, that is clearly tailored to appropriately addressing sexual violence (i.e. be trauma-informed and survivor-centric).

→ Does not place the process through the Student Code of Conduct or a similar document.
→ Examples of Stand-Alone Policies: UBC’s Policy 131 on Sexual Assault and Other Sexual Misconduct and Lakehead University’s Sexual and Gender Based Violence Response Policy.

☑ Rape Shield Protections

A complainant should not have to undergo questioning about their sexual history at any point in formal or informal processes.

→ UOIT Sexual Violence Policy (2016), Section 15:
  “Students who may have experienced Sexual Violence have the right to […] Be protected from irrelevant questions such as those related to past sexual history or sexual expression”

☑ Right to Both External and Institutional Processes

The ability to report experiences to both the post secondary institution and external bodies (such as the police) should exist without having a complaint suspended due to the other process.

→ Carleton Sexual Violence Policy (2016), Section 8.1:
  “This Policy and the formal complaint process do not prevent and are not intended to discourage an individual from also reporting sexual violence to the police and pursuing a complaint of sexual violence through the criminal justice system and/or from pursuing a complaint of sexual harassment with the Ontario Human Rights Tribunal pursuant to the Ontario Human Rights Code.”
☑ **Mandatory Sexual Violence Sensitivity Training for Decision-Makers**

Individuals involved in hearing sexual violence complaints and deciding their outcomes must receive training in sexual violence sensitivity and trauma informed approaches.

→ **Ryerson University Sexual Violence Policy (2016), Section 3 (a) (v):**

“Personnel involved in the adjudication process including staff in Human Rights Services and other offices assisting with cases of sexual violence, investigators and decision makers, will be trained in their roles, trauma-informed processes and the impact of identities on how an individual experiences sexual violence”.

☑ **Clear and Reasonable Timelines**

Timelines should allow for proper investigations and logistics in organizing accommodations, but should not take unnecessarily long amounts of time. We recommended that formal internal complaints do not exceed 45 days, external investigations 90 days, and 48 hours for immediate accommodations.

→ **Dalhousie Sexualized Policy (2018), F:5(2):**

“Wherever possible, the investigation, including the submission of the investigation report, will be completed within 60 calendar days of the receipt of the materials by the Investigator pursuant to section F5.2a(v) of this Policy.”

☑ **Protections from Face to Face Encounters**

A complainant should not be required to be present at the same time/place as the respondent during any point in the process, and alternative arrangements should be made to ensure the right to due process.

→ **UOIT Sexual Violence Policy (2016), Section 34:**

“Where the Informal Resolution Process involves the Respondent, the Support Worker will take steps to ensure that the circumstances of any meeting will appropriately protect the dignity of the Complainant through accommodations that continue to allow their participation. Accommodations that may be considered include: providing separate rooms before the meeting; alternate means of participation such as telephone, video, pre-recorded answers and statements; prepared written responses; the opportunity to have support and representation at the hearing; and other appropriate accommodations.”

☑ **Recognition of Intersectional Impacts of Sexual Violence**

Policies should recognize explicitly that people from marginalized groups are more likely to experience sexual violence, and that their campus initiatives must address this.

→ **University of Victoria Sexualized Violence Prevention and Response Policy (2017), S.3:**

“Some individuals or groups experience sexualized violence at higher rates. Every effort to address sexualized violence should be grounded in an intersectional understanding that each person’s experience will be affected by many factors, including but not limited to their sex; gender identity and expression; sexual identity; family status; Indigenous, racial, or ethnic background; language barrier; ability; faith; age; socioeconomic status; academic standing; as well as their position within university structures, hierarchies, and power relations.”
Scope Includes Off-Campus/Online/Visitors

Policies must cover students involved in work placement programs/co-ops(stage/field work and online activity, and must have procedures in place for complaints to be made against visitors to the institution.

→ Carleton Sexual Violence Policy (2016), Section 3:

“This Policy applies to all members of the University community (as defined below), whether they are in the University’s learning, living or work environment, on or off campus, or interacting through social or other electronic media [...]”.

→ Memorial University-Wide Procedures for Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Concerns, (2018), Section 2.8:

“A Concern or Complaint of any form of Sexual Harassment against a Non-University Person should be reported to the Advisor. Where a Complaint has been made against a Non-University Person, the Advisor will determine, in consultation with the Complainant, the appropriate steps to be taken. The Advisor may also seek advice or guidance. Sexual Harassment by a Non-University Person may result in suspension of privileges, such as access to campus or other appropriate action.”

Anonymous and Third Party Disclosures/Complaints Mechanisms

Institutions should have a mechanism in place that allows for anonymous and Third Party reporting.

→ University of Toronto Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment, s. 85 and 86:

“86. An allegation of Sexual Violence made by someone other than the Complainant can also be Reported to the University. However, the University’s ability to address the allegation will depend on a number of factors regarding the information available and the Complainant’s decision respecting whether or not to participate in a University process.

85. It may transpire that an allegation of Sexual Violence is Reported to the University anonymously. The University’s ability to address the allegation will be dependent on a number of factors, including the information available to substantiate the allegation and to permit a fair process.”

Survivor-Centric Interim Measures

Institutions should prioritize the needs of the complainant rather than the respondent when implementing interim measures in order to prevent additional trauma and disruption. We recommend policies explicitly say that their interim measures will be survivor-centric.

→ OCAD Policy on Prevention and Response to Sexual and Gender-based Violence (2016), Section 6.2:

“A Report of Sexual Violence to the University may result in one or more of the following measures and outcomes:

• A safety plan for the Complainant;
• Support in reporting the incident to Police;
• Clear communication to the Respondent that the behaviour is unwelcome and must stop;
• Measures to protect the Complainant during any internal or external process, including interim measures placed on the Respondent;
• Measures to protect the University Community in situations where a risk is determined, including interim measures placed on the Respondent.”
☑ Prevention, Training, Rape Culture and Intersectionality

Institutions must commit to providing prevention and training initiatives, combating rape culture, and acknowledging and adopting principles of intersectionality.

→ **Ryerson University Sexual Violence Policy (2016), Section V (2):**

“The Office of Sexual Violence Support and Education will work with on and off-campus partners […] to develop an annual education strategy that includes campaigns, training sessions, workshops, print and online resources, programs and events on a breadth of topics related to sexual violence on campus. These campaigns will explore topics such as rape culture, consent culture, sexual assault awareness, how to seek support, resources for survivors, advice and resources for first responders, etc. The audience for these efforts would include employees, students and visitors to our campus […] Faculties and departments are encouraged to include education related to rape culture and sexual violence in course materials and program curriculum where appropriate. They are also encouraged to use trained facilitators who understand the sensitivity with which these topics must be raised, who have the skills to respond appropriately to disclosures and those who may be triggered by the content of the material or resulting discussions.”

× A Frivolous or Vexatious Complaints Section

Policies should not have clauses that allow them to pursue disciplinary action against complainants for filing complaints. Such a clause is likely to deter someone from deciding to file a complaint through the policy.

→ **Camosun College Sexual Violence & Misconduct Policy (2017), Section 4.8:**

“False Reports : Any individual who is found to have knowingly made a false report or allegation in connection with this policy will be in violation of the Student Conduct Policy, Standard of Conduct or other relevant College policy, and may be subject to disciplinary action.”

× Time Limits to File Complaints

Policies should not include a time limit to file complaints, as many survivors do not come forward immediately, or may not realize that what they experienced was sexual violence right away.

→ **Memorial University-Wide Procedures for Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault Concerns, (2018):**

“To request an investigation, the Complainant shall complete, sign and file the [forms] with the Advisor, normally within twelve (12) months of the incident or within twelve (12) months of when the Complainant reasonably became aware of the incident. Events prior to the twelve (12) month period can be referenced if the incident(s) is relevant and part of a series of incidents. The Advisor has the discretion to extend the time limit beyond the twelve (12) calendar months of the incident.”
A Gag Order or Broad Confidentiality Section

Policies should not silence survivors or limit their ability to share their experience.

- **Acadia Policy Against Harassment and Discrimination (2007), Section F.1.5:**
  "All members of the University community involved in any proceedings pursuant to this policy are expected to maintain confidentiality. A breach of confidentiality is a disservice to both the complainant and the respondent."

- **Carleton Sexual Violence Policy (2016), Section 8.5 (b):**
  "To ensure procedural fairness while a formal complaint process is underway, the Complainant, the Respondent and others who may have knowledge of the matter, including a support person, must maintain confidentiality in accordance with this Policy and not make public statements (for example: media, public and/or social media statements) that may jeopardize the proper handling of the matter. The confidentiality obligations do not prevent a person from seeking counselling, treatment, support services or from speaking to friends and family. Any questions regarding confidentiality obligations under this Policy can be clarified by contacting the individual who receives the formal complaint."

An Exception Clause

Policies should not allow for exceptions to be made, or procedures to be suspended, for any cases or individuals.

- **University of Ottawa Policy 67b (2016), Section 9.3:**
  "An exception to this Policy will only be considered by the President in rare or in unforeseen circumstances. No exception may be made to this Policy without the written approval of the President."
Policy Checklist Summary

☑ Well Defined Stand-Alone Sexual Violence Policy
☑ Rape Shield Protections
☑ Right to both Criminal and Institutional Processes
☑ Mandatory Sexual Violence Sensitivity Training for Decision-Makers
☑ Clear and Reasonable Timelines
☑ Protections from Face to Face Encounters
☑ Intersectionality of Sexual Violence Recognition
☑ Scope Includes Off-Campus/Online/Visitors
☑ Third Party Investigator
☑ Immunity Clause
☑ Anonymous and Third Party Disclosures Mechanism
☑ Survivor-Centric Interim Measures
☑ Prevention, Training, Rape Culture and Intersectionality Support and Accommodations

× Do NOT include a frivolous or vexatious complaints section
× Do NOT include time limits to file complaints
× Do NOT include a gag order or broad confidentiality section
× Do NOT include an exceptions clause

For a ‘How to Grade Your School’s Policy’ template, please see Appendix C
Impacts Beyond the Scorecard

The scorecard was impactful at the campus, provincial, and federal levels, sparking conversations and calls for best practices.

Campus

Peer to Peer Anti-Sexual Violence Training - OurTurn Carleton and CUSA

The OurTurn Carleton Chapter has successfully trained over 1500 undergraduate students at Carleton University, including student leaders in Clubs & Societies, as well as students associated with Greek Life. In May 2017, The Carleton University Students’ Association (CUSA) Council passed a motion approving a pilot project in which OurTurn Carleton would provide the Sexual Violence Prevention & Support Training to members of CUSA Clubs & Societies. Under the pilot project, Clubs & Societies would be required to send at least 5 members to attend the OurTurn Training in order to receive their clubs funding for the semester. In August 2018, CUSA Council voted to continue the relationship between Clubs & Societies and OurTurn Carleton.

Survivor Speaks

OurTurn Carleton has also supported the CUSA Womxn’s Centre in organizing Carleton’s first (and second and third and fourth!) “Survivors Speak” event. These events give survivors of sexual violence a chance to share their story through various forms of art and expression, namely spoken word poetry, visual art, and music.

What Were You Wearing?

Another example of a Survivor Support Event that can be hosted on campus is a ‘What Were You Wearing’ Exhibition, such as the one hosted by OurTurn UPEI in March 2018 and September 2018. All too often when survivors disclose they are asked “what were you wearing?” This question is a clear example of victim blaming, which results from rape culture. This exhibit seeks to demonstrate that the clothing an individual wears has nothing to do with the sexual violence they experience.
Provincial

One of the unexpected but highly important focuses of our work this past year has been advocating at the provincial level. When the Action Plan was first published, Ontario, BC, and Manitoba had provincial legislation that mandated all post-secondary institutions to implement sexual violence policies. At the time of this OYL report being published, Québec and PEI have also passed legislation. Additionally, Nova Scotia has made the creation of campus sexual violence policies a requirement for increased post-secondary funding under their 2016-2019 Memorandum of Agreement with institutions.

Although provincial governments were well-intentioned in the creation of legislation mandating campus sexual violence policies, they did not sufficiently understand the nuances of the issue. This has resulted in the omission of meaningful clauses that would provide protections to survivors seeking to pursue complaints under these policies. Government continuously places too much faith in institutions and administrators doing the right thing and going above and beyond what is explicitly written in legislation. Moreover, the current legislation fails to provide adequate mechanisms for government to document and hold institutions accountable for violating the rights of survivors who seek institutional processes.

In response to these shortcomings, we developed a set of minimum standards that we used when working with partners across the country to advocate at the provincial level. In addition to the minimum standards, we also advocated for the creation of accountability processes and reforms to privacy legislation to support the well-being and rights of survivors.

Working within all of the current provincial legislation and memorandum frameworks, we identified common shortcomings:

1. Lack of Robust Minimum Standards
2. Non-Existential Oversight Mechanisms
Minimum Standards

We recommend that, in order to fulfil provincial legislation, all university policies must adopt the following 11 minimum standards:

1. A Well Defined Stand-Alone Sexual Violence Policy
2. Right to both Criminal and Institutional Processes
3. Mandatory Sexual Violence Training for Decision-Makers
4. Rape Shield Protections
5. Protections from Face to Face Encounters
6. Timelines
7. Protections from Gag Orders
8. Broader Scope
9. Informing of Sanctions
10. Student Representation on Committees:
11. Review of Policy Every 2 Years

For a breakdown of each minimum standard, please see Appendices B and C

Oversight Mechanisms

Provincial governments MUST create an independent oversight body to hear individual complaints from individuals at postsecondary institutions who believe their safety has been compromised and/or that their rights have been violated by their institution. There must be an accessible process for individual students and survivors of campus sexual violence to file a complaint against their institution to inform the Minister or Ministerial Office that their rights under provincial legislation are being violated. Otherwise, situations like the one we are currently seeing in Québec may occur, where institutions are in violation of the legislation however there is no clear way for the province to be able to enforce the legislation.

The lack of meaningful and accessible oversight mechanisms creates a situation whereby institutions, regardless of intention, may violate the rights and/or compromise the safety of survivors with no sanctions from the province, or recourse available to the survivor. There must be a process in place that is referenced in each campus sexual violence policy for someone to file a complaint if their school violates their policy. Betrayal Trauma Theory shows us that the existence of poor policy and unsupportive procedures ends up causing more emotional harm to survivors. Many survivors say that having to navigate procedures and policies with little support caused them more psychological damage than the assault itself.

Provincial legislation gives us an opportunity to make sure that sexual violence policies on campuses are treated as more than just checkboxes, and that the policies that are created are as robust and effective as possible.
Our Work at the Provincial Level

**British Columbia**
January 2018 - Partnered with UBC AMS
Submitted a feedback letter to the British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training suggesting minimum standards and reforms to oversight mechanisms for Bill 23 the **Sexual Violence and Misconduct Policy Act**.

**Ontario**
March 2018 - Met with Minister Mitzie Hunter the Ontario Minister of Advanced Education
Partnered with OUSA and 19 student groups representing over 150,000 Ontario students to present a letter seeking minimum standards and oversight mechanism reforms to Bill 132, the **Sexual Violence and Harassment Action Plan Act**.

**Quebec**
December 2017 – March 2018
Released an open letter to the Minister of Higher Education in Québec in response to the draft that was released of Bill 151 after we testified at the National Assembly on projet de loi 151. It was signed by 20 student organizations, and 327 individual students across Québec.

In April 2018 we wrote another open letter to the Minister of Higher Education in Québec calling for student representation on the committee tasked with creating the guide to accompany Bill 151, and received support from members of the committee.

**Nova Scotia**
March 2018
Invited to present to the Nova Scotia Sexual Violence Prevention Committee on best practices for campus sexual violence policies as they seek to create a guide for post-secondary institutions in Nova Scotia.

**Prince Edward Island**
January 2018 – October 2018
Wrote an open letter to the premier of Prince Edward Island calling for the creation of provincial legislation that was signed by 23 student organizations, and 213 individual students. Members of the OurTurn National Committee and OurTurn UPEI Chapter met with the provincial government on several occasions to consult on their provincial legislation. On December 5, 2018 the provincial government of PEI passed Bill No. 110, the **Mandatory Sexual Assault Law Education Act**. This legislation requires all post-secondary institutions to create campus sexual violence policies that are reviewed every 3 years.
In addition to impacts at the campus and provincial levels, the *OurTurn National Action Plan* also influenced work at the federal level. As a result of our efforts to advocate for the voices of student survivors within federal policy initiatives, we achieved the following:

**OurTurn National Action Plan is Discussed in the Canadian House of Commons**

The *OurTurn National Action Plan* was raised in the House of Commons by Members of Parliament Sheila Malcolmson and Anne Minh-Thu Quach who used the report findings to ask the Prime Minister about the creation of a national strategy on campus sexual violence.

**The OurTurn National Action Plan Influences the Federal Budget**

The 2018 federal budget stated: “The Government proposes to provide up to $5.5 million over five years, starting in 2018–19, to Status of Women Canada to work with stakeholders, including provinces and territories, towards developing a harmonized national framework to ensure consistent, comprehensive and sustainable approaches in addressing gender-based violence at post-secondary institutions across the country. Starting in 2019, for those universities and college campuses that are not implementing best practices addressing sexual assaults on campus, the Government of Canada will consider withdrawing federal funding”.

The *OurTurn National Action Plan* was cited in news articles as an influence in the development of this budget proposal.

**Member Added to the Federal Status of Women (now Women and Gender Equality) Gender-Based Violence Advisory Committee**

The former OurTurn Chair and now SFCC Advocacy Lead, Caitlin Salvino, was invited to serve on the committee advising the Women and Gender Equality Department on gender-based violence policies. She was the youngest person named to the committee.

**Member added to the The Advisory Committee on the Framework to Prevent and Address Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions**

The former OurTurn Chair and now SFCC Advocacy Lead, Caitlin Salvino was invited to serve on the committee advising the Women and Gender Equality Department on the creation of a national campus sexual violence framework. This five-year project has 5.5 million dollars of federal funding to create a national campus sexual violence framework and includes the government exploring the possibility of withdrawing federal funding for universities and college campuses that are not implementing best practices in addressing sexual assaults on campus.
Students for Consent Culture Canada
Towards the end of May 2018, OurTurn was excited about transitioning to this year’s team and welcoming new amazing organizers from across the country. Taking time to reflect on what we had accomplished and brainstorm with this new group about what work and projects we wanted to do next, it became very clear that the work - although still very much grounded in the guiding principles and spirit of the Action Plan - stretched well beyond the scope of the report. We wanted to make sure that the organization and its work reflected the heart and drive of this group. From there, the beginnings of Students for Consent Culture Canada / Étudiant.e.s pour une culture du consentement took place. Over the summer we worked to become an incorporated non-profit with a more formalized structure. Finally, on Nov. 1st 2018, we launched SFCC / ÉPCC, and are excited to share our organization and work with you all!

Students for Consent Culture Canada / Étudiant.e.s pour une culture du consentement is an organization dedicated to supporting intersectional and grassroots anti-sexual violence advocacy and activism on campuses across Canada by serving as a hub of resources, tools, and institutional memory for students to engage with. We engage in advocacy at the provincial and federal levels to create better policies, practices, and accountability measures to protect student survivors. Our overall goal is to work towards creating cultures of consent both on campuses and within civil society en large across Canada. We are explicitly committed to an intersectional, anti-colonial, and emergent approach to anti-sexual violence work, with many of our team members having lived through the change in anti-sexual violence organizing on campuses from before and after #MeToo.
SFCC Operates within Three Main Portfolios:

Education
Overseen by the Education Lead with the immense support of the Education Coordinators, Education within SFCC / ÉPCC includes upkeep and development of our online resources on sexual violence for the general public to access, the development of trainings, the creation of popular education materials, and the writing and publishing of our research reports that are used to support our mobilizations for action at the university, provincial, and federal levels. The Education Team can be reached at education@sfcccanada.org.

Advocacy
Overseen by the Advocacy Lead with the immense support of the Advocacy Coordinators, Advocacy at SFCC/ÉPCC spans three levels - campus, provincial, and federal. This portfolio takes the research done by the Education Portfolio and uses it to support its mobilization and push for change at all three levels. Examples of what this work looks like is a) supporting student unions as they evaluate and push for changes to their university’s sexual violence policy; b) creating guides for student unions that explain and interpret provincial legislation and its requirements for universities and how to report if your university is in violation of provincial legislation; and c) working with the Department for Women and Gender Equality (WAGE) towards a national strategy around campus sexual violence. The Advocacy Team can be reached at advocacy@sfcccanada.org.

Outreach
Overseen by the Outreach Lead with the immense support of the Outreach Coordinators, the Outreach portfolio is responsible for mobilization, strategy, general communications of the organization, and facilitating the network of connections between student unions and groups, community organizations, and SFCC/ÉPCC. They are in charge of our social media accounts, your first point of contact to the organization, and can be reached at outreach@sfcccanada.org.
Chanting “we will not be silenced” and “this will not blow over,” more than 700 students and professors walked out of class and gathered on the McGill campus Wednesday to protest against what they call the mismanagement of sexual misconduct allegations against professors at both Concordia and McGill universities.

“Can everyone here who has been warned of or heard of an abusive professor during their time here please raise their hand,” Connor Spencer of the McGill student union asked the crowd. Nearly everyone did.46

- René Bruemmer
Montréal Gazette, April 13th 2018

Brock University47, UQÀM48, UBC49, Concordia50, McGill51, University of Manitoba52, University of Windsor53, Université de Montréal54, Yukon College55... these are all post-secondary institutions who have had visible media coverage on cases against predatory professors (and there are even more across Canada that did not receive media coverage). As the effects of the online iteration of the #MeToo movement took place, we saw the public conversations on campuses around sexual violence start to shift.

There has always been a culture within academia that leads to the grooming of young and vulnerable students by older teaching staff in mentorship positions. There have been open secrets on almost every campus, passed down from older (most often female and non-binary) students to the younger ones about which professors and teaching staff were ‘creepy’, who they should avoid being alone with, or who actively pursued intimate relationships with students. I personally was sat down and given this list of names by older women in my faculty within my first 2 weeks on my campus. One of the names was a professor whose class I was enrolled in. He taught one of the largest required first-year courses in the Faculty of Arts. In an effort to be ‘relatable’ he held his office hours in the school bar. I, and many of my classmates, were underage. According to these older women, he had repeatedly been sent on sabbatical after allegations of relationships with students emerged as the university did not want to discipline him due to his prominence in his field.

A culture of predatory professors would come to define my entire experience at university, as more names were added to that original list, and older friends warned me about the serial behaviours of professors who had taken a special interest in me in my departments. This is not the place to detail my own experiences, beyond saying that I know I am not alone.
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In many cases, these professors are often the ones students like best. They are charismatic, engaging, and often publicly identify themselves as feminists. For years, by developing these underground networks and filing complaints (that often go nowhere, or become even more strenuous and traumatizing for the student than the original abuse) students have sought to come up with ways of dealing with this culture. This last year has overwhelmingly shown that our universities have no idea how to properly respond to complaints against faculty.

There is a gap in our data. Invisible numbers of students who have dropped out of post-secondary education or transferred schools because of the sexual violence and predatory behaviour they encountered. A large amount of these invisible students are women of colour, who in addition to facing grooming by older professors, also face fetishization both in and outside of the classroom.

Everyone has a right to a learning environment free of sexual violence and sexual predators that compromise their health, wellbeing, and academic careers. Until we begin to address the culture of predatory teaching staff on our campuses head on, no post secondary institution will be able to guarantee their students – especially women and non-binary students of colour – that right.

This is why SFCC is currently working on a research report which will look at this issue in depth, and will make concrete recommendations at the community/campus, provincial, and national levels. We will be following the launch of this research report with mobilization around the recommendations in January 2020. This report will have 3 main focuses – provincial privacy law and confidentiality, unions and faculty bystanders, and how rape culture on campuses allows these behaviours to happen.

Important to note – as many post secondary administrators where students have been active on this issue seem to misunderstand this – there is a difference between intimate relationships between students and teaching staff, and the predatory behaviours from faculty that students experience. They are different, must be treated differently, and both must be actively and properly addressed by the university or college.

Our hope is that we can work to not only create these tools for students to use to mobilize for change on their campuses and in their provinces, but also to create a network for the students who are working on this issue on the ground at their respective campuses, to support each other and share knowledge and best practices.

The issue of predatory professors is one with an incredible amount of nuance and detail, which we hope this report will be able to – for the first time – flesh out and compile in order to act as a resource for student activists, advocates, and survivors.

To all of the students across Canada who have been working to hold predatory professors on their campuses accountable. We stand with you. With all of our hearts, souls, and solidarities. Keep doing this work. And know you are not alone. We will all keep fighting this together.

*We will not be silenced. This will not blow over.*

With love, rage, and in solidarity.
Gendered and Sexual Violence Policy and Student Unions

In the spring of 2017, after a public callout of an executive of the student union who was a serial predator, an anonymous group called the Community Disclosure Network (CDN) and others on campus called on the Students’ Society of McGill University (SSMU) to create a policy that would be able to deal with violence perpetrated by students in relative positions of power on campus through their relationship with the union. The incidents of that year had made it clear that SSMU did not know how to investigate or respond to disclosures and reports, and the lack of clear procedure, survivor-centric processes and disclosure training perpetuated the re-traumatization of survivors who sought to hold the SSMU executive members accountable for their actions. SSMU was not alone in dealing with the issue of not having an independent and survivors-centric process to respond to elected representatives and union staff perpetrating sexual violence. For example, student unions at Concordia, University of Prince Edward Island, University of Saskatchewan, York University and the University of Ottawa have all had similar incidents over the past few years.

Student unions are gaps in jurisdiction within many university sexual violence policies as universities have limited authority within the context of student unions’ employment, official decision-making bodies, clubs, and services, which is necessary to maintain the independence of the union. To respond to this gap in jurisdiction, SSMU hired a team of 3 individuals—Caitlin Salvino, Bee Khaleeli, and Priya Dube—to spearhead a full time consultation and writing process through the Winter 2018 semester. They conducted extensive consultations (including closed consultations, one co-hosted by the Indigenous Student Alliance and Black Students Network, one in partnership with the Office for Students with Disabilities and one by Queer McGill and the Union for Gender Empowerment) and met with individuals and groups from across campus, as well as a community lawyer. On October 11th 2018, the SSMU Gendered and Sexualized Violence Policy (GSVP) and its Implementation Guide, written as a result of these consultations, were passed by the SSMU Legislative Council, making the SSMU the first student union in Canada to have its own thorough policy and procedures surrounding gendered and sexual violence perpetrated within its jurisdiction.
The overall purpose of this policy is to create a response to gendered and sexual violence within the SSMU community that is holistic and encapsulates the four components of:

1. Prevention
2. Support
3. Advocacy
4. Response

All of these components rely on an intersectional framework to account for the different ways in which various groups experience and are impacted by gendered and/or sexual violence. The accompanying guide is just as important as the policy, as it clearly outlines what is included in the policy without using legal jargon. The accompanying guide also includes diagrams and flowcharts that clearly explain aspects of the policy, such as the steps of reporting and who exactly will be involved throughout the process. The complexity of the process and its results cannot be properly encapsulated by this short text, but we urge all student unions to begin these processes to ensure that their members are protected and that their jurisdictions are covered by GSVPs.

Our hope is that SSMU’s GSVP can serve as a document and process for other student unions to refer to when approaching this work. The student movement has historically been a place where a lot of gendered and sexual violence has occurred, whether at conferences, congresses, events, or at protests. It is time for us to begin to address this culture head on and remove predators from leadership positions in our movements, and hold each other accountable for the harm we cause each other in a concrete and measurable way.

For a link to the GSVP report please click Appendix A
For support in developing your own GSVP please contact us at outreach@sfcccanada.org
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Unpaid Anti-Sexual Violence Labour

We at SFCC wanted to make sure that we took the time to speak to something which we feel very few of the people who were engaged with our work knew – that all of our work for the last year was done entirely unpaid.

Despite multiple organizations promising at some point to fund our labour, all fell through, and as a result – mirroring what happens on almost all campuses, – anti-sexual violence work was done unpaid by women on top of their studies and paid employment. This made it very hard for those on our team, particularly those with intersecting marginalized identities, to continue to work with us, as they had to focus on attaining paid work.

That is why we wish to publicly thank both the Carleton Gender Equality Measurement Group (GEM) and the Concordia Student Union (CSU) for their financial support this year. Professor Doris Buss and the GEM group were the first organisation that provided us with funding to support our travel and labour. This funding at the earliest stage of the project was crucial in ensuring that we were able to continue supporting students across the country before we had fully developed as an organisation. Furthermore, we are also thankful to the CSU, who after hearing last spring the amount of work we did and how it was unpaid, voted not only to give us funds to be used specifically towards our labour in this coming year, but who also voted to pay an honorarium to back pay a portion of the work that was done over the past year.

Our work over the past year is an example of the larger trend of the devaluation of labour that has historically been done by women: support and (specifically early) education work. On our campuses, anti-sexual violence advocacy and student survivor support is done primarily by women, and primarily women of colour, and is almost always unpaid. This makes the work incredibly precarious and unsupported, leading to burn-out of student leaders who compromise their academic careers, health, and well-being for this work, such as many of us did over this past year. We need to shift public opinions of what work we see as valuable, and begin to adequately financially support the students on our campuses doing anti-sexual violence advocacy, activism, and support work, and break this culture of accepting the common occurrence of precarious and unpaid anti-sexual violence work.

The CSU was pleased to support OurTurn, and now SFCC. The struggle to address sexual violence on-campus is on-going. Through the advocacy work undertaken by SFCC, the CSU has been able to push for more comprehensive and survivor-centric policies and process for survivors at our school.

- Sophie Hough-Martin
CSU General Coordinator
Intersectionality in the Era of #MeToo

By coincidence, the OurTurn National Action Plan was published one week to the day before the Harvey Weinstein story broke and the #MeToo hashtag took hold on the internet, beginning what the media largely referred to as the ‘#MeToo movement’. This put us in the incredibly interesting position of doing anti-sexual violence work on campuses both before and after the #MeToo movement. As a result, we witnessed firsthand the shift that took place within this work on campuses and how it has continued to impact anti-sexual violence work since October 2017. For the first time, campus anti-sexual violence work is beginning to go on resumes – something that before 2018 was unheard of unless you were working in a social service field. We saw a sharp difference in how post-secondary administrators spoke to us after #MeToo, such as less push back over an acknowledgement of rape culture on campuses, and using terms such as ‘pro-survivor’. These examples speak to a larger cultural shift that has occurred and whose consequences we are seeing in work across campuses today.

Crucial to this conversation is that what is largely referred to as the #MeToo movement, is actually a wave of the MeToo movement started 12 years ago by Tarana Burke when she first used the phrase to bring awareness to the prevalence of sexual violence.

Burke’s exclusion from much of the crediting of her own work is emblematic of the larger shift we have seen taking place across campuses, where new organizers are occupying more public space on this issue rather than those who have put in the years of labour that has allowed these moments to occur for us. This is not to say that new voices are wrong or that they should not be involved – in fact, the reality is quite the contrary. We wish to call on those who have recently begun engaging in this work, or who have found themselves being given prominent space over others on the issue of campus sexual violence, to engage in the following best practices listed on the right.

Best Practices

1. Before you start a new group on campus, see if there is a group that already exists on campus and is doing similar work and find out how you can support them;

2. Reflect on your positionality. Be aware of how much space you are taking up. Step back and reflect on whether someone has already said what you want to say, or if someone is in a better position to speak to what you wish to say;

3. Bring other advocates into the room / into interviews with you. The reality is that white, cis, able-bodied women will most often seem ‘more easily approachable’ by university administrators and media, and for that reason will be invited into more rooms and contacted more often by media for interviews. Bring others into these spaces with you, or refer media to them instead;

4. The student movement against sexual violence has been built by women (particularly women of colour) on our campuses for many years. Make sure your work acknowledges this, as well as the fact that marginalized students with intersectional identities are the ones who are most likely to experience sexual violence as students and are the least likely to be believed by persons in positions of authority;

5. Be intentional in your intersectional practice. It is not enough to merely have a land acknowledgement at the beginning of your events or to have a dedication to intersectionality in your constitutions. Listen to and collaborate with groups led by marginalized students on your campus in order to support the initiatives they are working towards. Have closed consultations for marginalized students and pay the folks who run them. Make space at rallies specifically for just Black and/or Indigenous women, women of colour, and non-binary folks to come and speak if they would like.

We share these few best practices in an attempt to build a better, stronger, more reflective Canadian student anti-sexual violence movement. In order to instill the cultural shifts we need in our communities, everyone needs to be involved. This being said, it is absolutely essential that we understand the history this movement is rooted in, and how we can always better our practices in order to foster change. We need to build and actively participate in the culture we wish to shift towards.
What’s Next?

With the publishing of this report, we turn the page from the OurTurn chapter to the SFCC chapter and focus our sights on our next projects:

→ Preparing an in depth report on changes to campus sexual violence policies in Canada over the last 2 years
→ Creating a national network of students engaged in anti-sexual violence work to share best practices and support each other
→ Continuing to grade policies and support student groups on the ground who reach out to us for assistance
→ Creating more resources on the nuances of best practices for provincial anti-sexual violence legislation
→ Writing a large scale research report on the culture of predatory professors on Canadian campuses
→ Collaborating with other student survivor-led organizations on a zine for students pushing for change from their post-secondary administrators
→ Participating in the Advisory Council for a National Campus Sexual Violence Strategy

Slowly, one by one and all together, we are shifting.

We are challenging decades of visible and invisible power structures on our colonial and patriarchal campuses.

This work will take a long time, but it will be the work that defines our generation’s student movement.

Thank you to all the students, activists, survivors, and advocates who are dedicating their time and energy to bettering their campuses for those who come after them. We have always been, and will continue to be, perpetually in awe of all of your resilience, strength, and power. You show us every day that although change (and healing) is not linear, it is inevitable.
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Open Letter to The British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education, Skills and Training

Open Letter to The Ontario Minister of Education

An Open letter to the Minister of Higher Education in Québec

An Open Letter to the Premier of Prince Edward Island

An Open Letter to Reform the UOIT Sexual Violence Policy

First Open Letter to Carleton Community about Sexual Violence Policy Draft

Second Open Letter re: Carleton Sexual Violence Policy

Open Letter to McGill Calling for External Investigation into Complaints Against Profs
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SSMU Gendered and Sexualized Violence Policy Report

Open Letter in Support of Prof. Macfarlane at the University of Windsor
Appendix B: Breakdown of Minimum Standards

If you would like further clarification beyond this breakdown, please contact advocacy@sfcccanada.org. We recommend the following 11 minimum standards for all university policies to have in order to fulfill provincial legislation be the following:

1. **A Defined Stand-Alone Sexual Violence Policy:** The existence of a stand-alone sexual violence policy that DOES NOT place the process through the Student Code of Conduct. The procedures must be stand-alone and must be clearly outlined in a step by step process for students, staff, and faculty;

2. **Right to both Criminal and Institutional Processes:** The ability to report experiences to both their institution and the police without risk of having a complaint suspended due to the other process;

3. **Mandatory Sexual Violence Training for Decision-Makers:** A mandate of sexual violence sensitivity training on trauma-informed approaches for those involved in hearing the sexual violence complaint and deciding the outcomes;

4. **Rape Shield Protections:** Explicit rape shield protections, whereby a complainant cannot be asked questions about their sexual history at any point of the informal or formal complaint process;

5. **Protections from Face to Face Encounters:** The inclusion of protections from face to face encounters is essential, as a complainant should not be required to be present at the same time as a respondent. Similar to the criminal justice system these interests between survivor protections and procedural fairness can be balanced through the use of a screen and/or video technology;

6. **Timelines:** Clearly defined and reasonable timelines for a complaint process that DO NOT exceed 45 days for a complaint process and 48 hours for immediate accommodations;

7. **Protections from Gag Orders:** Protections from institutions imposing a gag order on complainants, whether it be through an explicit gag order or a broadly defined confidentiality requirement;

8. **Broader Scope:** Campus Sexual Violence Policies must explicitly create a procedure for students to report sexual violence and/or sexual harassment while participating in a work placement, internship or co-op and require that the university keep record of all places in which sexual violence has occurred to ensure that future students are not placed at risk of sexual violence while pursuing co-op or other professional/educational opportunities;

9. **Informing of Sanctions:** A mandate that institutions must inform both the complainant and respondent of all sanctions ordered by the review committee;

10. **Create a Sexual Violence Prevention and Support Taskforce:** The Taskforce must have meaningful student representation of at least 30%, at each institution;

11. **Review of Policy Every 2 Years:** We recommend that institutions be required to review their policy every 2 years at most, with every year being ideal.
Appendix C: How to Grade Your Own Policy

The score card used was developed through extensive consultations and research, introduced in October 2017 in the OurTurn Action Plan. Many student groups have asked us for information so that they could grade their own policies, which is why we’ve added this stand alone document. If you would like to officially grade your policy with our team, you can always reach out to us at outreach@sfcccanada.org and we will go through the process with you.

Grading your institution’s Sexual Violence Policy can be difficult, as the clauses listed below are not always simple to find. Here are a few basic tips for grading your policy:

→ Search for key terms - policies are often long and full of legal terminology. If you are having trouble finding sections, try searching for key terms.

→ Don’t give points for common practice if it isn’t explicitly outlined in the policy. We know that many institutions follow aspects of this scorecard in practice, but it is important that these practices are outlined explicitly in the policy.

→ Consult - once you’ve gone through your policy, take note of the sections you’re unsure about. You can ask staff and administration at your institution about whether or not certain points are included. However, as we know, administrators and university staff often are not the best resource for an objective opinion on how a clause can be interpreted. You can therefore always contact us and we’ll be happy to chat through your policy with you!
## General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Notes for Determining Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existence of a policy that covers Sexual Violence</strong></td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existence of a stand-alone policy</strong></td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible policy - Online</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessible policy - One Document</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clearly defined complaint process; requires clearly outlined and defined step-by-step process</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existence of reporting and statistic mechanisms</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability to report externally to the criminal justice system and/or human rights tribunal</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Does not include the ability to suspend complaint if the complainant also seeks recourse from criminal justice system</strong></td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Renewal and review of policy</strong></td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION SCORE** / Maximum 34 Points
Appendix C

## Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Notes for Determining Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and staff are processed under the same SVP as students</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines consent effectively 1) recognizes drugs/alcohol, 2) power relations, 3) revocation of consent, 4) consent cannot be assumed, 5) cannot be obtained through coercion and threats</td>
<td>+5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers visitors and alumni (would include any specific mention of the ability to ban visitors and alum from campus and have no contact orders)</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures complaints are not suspended if the respondent ends their relationship with the school (i.e. transfers or drops out)</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers off campus activity that impacts ability to live and learn on campus</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers online activity</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers stealthing</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly covers co-op and practicum placements</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION SCORE**

/ Maximum 17 Points
## Composition of the Decision Maker(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Notes for Determining Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of an external third party</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0 points if there is no external third party independent member on the review committee;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent member on the review</td>
<td></td>
<td>also 0 points if there is no review committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of student representatives</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>0 points if there is no student representatives on the review committee; also 0 points if there is no review committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the review committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly mandating sexual violence</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2 if policy explicitly mandates decision makers to receive sexual violence sensitivity training; 0 points if training is not mentioned in policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitivity training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of an independent</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2 if the policy explicitly says the complainant has the ability to request an external investigator. Only +1 if you only have that ability in an appeal process, or if only the institution can decide to use an independent investigator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investigator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION SCORE** / Maximum 8 Points
### Formal and Informal Complaint Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Notes for Determining Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Existence of informal and restorative justice mechanisms**
  - Possible Points: +2
  - Notes: +1 for existence of informal resolution mechanisms included in the policy; +1 for restorative justice mechanisms included in the policy.

- **Explicit rape shield protections - prohibition of questions regarding past sexual history**
  - Possible Points: +2
  - Notes: 0 points if there is no explicit protections in the policy.

- **Existence of Face to Face Protections**
  - Possible Points: +2
  - Notes: 0 points if protections for face-to-face encounters are not included in the policy.

- **Existence of specific immunity clause for drug and alcohol use**
  - Possible Points: +2
  - Notes: 0 points if there is no immunity clause for drug and alcohol use included in the policy.

- **Explicit mention that all sanctions ordered against respondent will be made known to survivor**
  - Possible Points: +2
  - Notes: +2 if policy explicitly outlines that all results of the complaint, as well as sanctions if applicable, will be made known to the complainant. This is hard in many provinces due to restrictions in privacy law - it is important that if this is the case in your province that the institution outline this limitation in the policy as well. However they still lose the points, even if they explain it properly.

- **Clearly defined timelines for complaint process**
  - Possible Points: +2
  - Notes: 0 points if clear timelines are not included in the policy.

- **Interim Measures**
  - Possible Points: +2
  - Notes: +1 for the existence of interim measures in the policy; +1 if interim measures are included in the policy with an explicitly survivor-centred stance.

- **Does not include a frivolous claims section**
  - Possible Points: +2
  - Notes: 0 points if policy references frivolous or vexatious claims (also referred to as complaints made in “bad faith”, “malicious complaints”, etc.).

- **Ability to have support person present**
  - Possible Points: +1
  - Notes: 0 points if the ability to have a support person present are not referenced in the policy.

- **Existence of a conflict of interest clause**
  - Possible Points: +1
  - Notes: 0 points if there is not a conflict of interest clause included in the policy.

- **Does not include an exception clause**
  - Possible Points: +2
  - Notes: 0 points if any exceptions to the policy exist (ex. Policy can be suspended by the president/other authority, rules can be changed by the president/other authority, etc.).

- **Existence of protection from retaliation**
  - Possible Points: +1
  - Notes: 0 points if protection from retaliation is not referenced in the policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of ability to submit anonymous and third party complaints</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1 if policy includes ability to submit anonymous complaints/disclosures; +1 if policy includes the ability for third-party complaints/disclosures to be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include a time limit to file a formal complaint after incident</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>1 point can be given if an existing time limit is 3 or more years in length; Full points (2) if the policy does not put any time limitation on filing formal complaints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include a gag order (confidentiality order) at any point</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2 if no where in the policy does it suggest that a complainant is unable to speak about their experiences at any point. Policies will almost never use the term ‘gag order’ and so you will have to watch out for strict language in confidentiality clauses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal process</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>1 point for inclusion of the ability to appeal internal decisions; 2 points if the policy includes the ability to appeal to a non-administrative body; 3 points if both criteria are met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SECTION SCORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>/ Maximum 30 Points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Notes for Determining Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creates a prevention, education, and support committee  +1</td>
<td>0 points if a prevention/education/support committee is not referenced in the policy. Note that committees can be listed with a different name, but must serve the same purposes of prevention, education, and support to receive point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlights support services available for students  +2</td>
<td>+1 point if support services for students are mentioned in the policy; +2 points if support services for students are explicitly highlighted in the policy and examples/names are given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committed funding to support programs  +1</td>
<td>0 points if funding/resources for support programs are not committed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlights prevention programs on campus  +1</td>
<td>0 points if prevention programs are not mentioned in the policy (prevention programs could include committees, strategies, strategic plans, frameworks, working groups, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus services that are sexual violence specific  +1</td>
<td>Even if support services on campus are mentioned, 0 point unless they are specific to/specialize in sexual violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersectionality recognized  +2</td>
<td>+2 points if intersectional impacts of sexual violence are recognized (ex. acknowledges marginalized communities on campus, recognizes the impacts of intersectionality and sexual violence, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape culture mentioned  +2</td>
<td>+2 point if rape culture is mentioned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations for survivors mentioned  +1</td>
<td>0 points if accommodations for survivors are not mentioned in the policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION SCORE**

/ Maximum 11 Points

**FINAL SCORE**

**FINAL LETTER GRADE**

**Letter Grade Scale (Based on Carleton University’s Scale)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>85-89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>80-84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>77-79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>73-76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>70-72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>67-69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>63-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>60-62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>57-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>53-56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>50-52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of a policy that covers Sexual Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of a stand-alone policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible policy – Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible policy – One document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined complaint process; requires clearly outlined and defined step-by-step process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of reporting and statistic mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to report externally to the criminal justice system and/or human rights tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include the ability to suspend complaint if the complainant also seeks recourse from criminal justice system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewal and review of policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and staff are processed under the same SVP as students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines consent effectively 1) recognizes drugs/alcohol, 2) power relations, 3) revocation of consent, 4) consent cannot be assumed, 5) cannot be obtained through coercion and threats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers visitors and alumni (would include any specific mention of the ability to ban visitors and alumni from campus and have no contact orders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures complaints are not suspended if the respondent ends their relationship with the school (i.e. transfers or drops out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers off campus activity that impacts ability to live and learn on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers online activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers stealing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly covers co-op and practicum placements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Composition of the Decision Maker(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of an external third party independent member on the review committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of student representatives on the review committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitly mandating sexual violence sensitivity training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of an independent investigator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Formal and Informal Complaint Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existence of informal and restorative justice mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit rape shield protections – prohibition of questions regarding past sexual history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of Face to Face Protections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of specific immunity clause for drug and alcohol use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit mention that all sanctions ordered against respondent will be made known to survivor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly defined timelines for complaint process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include a frivolous claims section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to have support person present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of a conflict of interest clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include an exception clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of protection from retaliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of ability to submit anonymous and third party complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include a time limit to file a formal complaint after incident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not include a gag order (confidentiality order) at any point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education**

| Creates a prevention, education and support committee |  |
| Highlights support services available for survivors |  |
| Committed funding to support programs                |  |
| Highlights prevention programs on campus            |  |
| On campus services that are sexual violence specific |  |
| Intersectionality recognized                        |  |
| Rape culture mentioned                              |  |
| Accommodations for survivors mentioned              |  |

### Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Section Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITION OF THE DECISION MAKERS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORMAL AND INFORMAL COMPLAINT PROCESS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINAL SCORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Letter Grade**

**Letter Grade Scale (Based on Carleton University’s Scale)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>85-89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>80-84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>77-79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>73-76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>70-72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C+</td>
<td>67-69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>63-66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-</td>
<td>60-62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D+</td>
<td>57-59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>53-56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-</td>
<td>50-52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Glossary of Acronyms Used

AGÉCAR: Association Générale des Étudiants et Étudiantes du Campus de Rimouski
ASCC: Advocates for a Student Culture of Consent - Wilfrid Laurier University
AVEQ: Association for the Voice of Education in Québec
BCFS: British Columbia Federation of Students
BUSU: Brandon University Students’ Union
CCSS: Camosun College Student Society
CASA: Canadian Alliance of Student Associations
CAG: Carleton Academic Student Government
CESAR: Continuing Education Students’ Association of Ryerson
CFS MB: Canadian Federation of Students - Manitoba
CFS NL: Canadian Federation of Students - Newfoundland
CSU: Concordia Student Union
CUSA: Carleton University Students’ Association
DSU: Dalhousie Students’ Union
FAÉCUM: Fédération des associations étudiantes du campus de l’Université de Montréal
GSVP: Gendered and Sexualized Violence Policy
GSU MUN: Graduate Students’ Union of Memorial University of Newfoundland
LUSU: Lakehead University Student Union
MUNSU: Memorial University of Newfoundland Students’ Union
OT Carleton: OurTurn Carleton
OT Regina: OurTurn Regina
OT UPEI: OurTurn University of Prince Edward Island
OUSA: Ontario Undergraduate Student Alliance
OYL: One Year Later
PGSS: Post-Graduate Students’ Society (McGill University)
RPIRG: Regina Public Interest Research Group
RRRA: Rideau River Residence Association (Carleton University)
SFCC: Students for Consent Culture Canada
SFUO: Student Federation of the University of Ottawa
SRC: Student’s Representative Council (Bishop’s University)
SSMU: Students’ Society of McGill University
Students NS: Students Nova Scotia
UBC AMS: University of British Columbia Alma Mater Society
UFV SUS: University of Fraser Valley Student Union Society
UMGSA: University of Manitoba Graduate Students’ Association
UMSU: University of Manitoba Students’ Union
UOIT: University of Ontario Institute of Technology
UPEISU: University of Prince Edward Island Students' Union
UR PRIDE: University of Regina Pride Centre
U of R Women’s Centre: University of Regina Women’s Centre
URSU: University of Regina Students’ Union
UTSU: University of Toronto Students' Union
UWSA: University of Winnipeg Students’ Association
VIUSU: Vancouver Island University Student Union
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