

National Skillshare Series – Working With People Who Cause Harm, April 7th 2021

Transcription is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

Kelly: Hello everyone and welcome to the National Skillshare Series on Addressing and Preventing Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions in Canada. My name is Kelly Prevett, and I'm the Programming Coordinator of the Courage to Act project. We're thrilled to welcome you into our Skillshare session today with the Working With People Who Cause Harm Community of Practice.

Before we begin, a quick note on language and accessibility. Attendees can turn on and off captioning in the controls bar at the bottom of your screen. And you can also listen to the session in French, by selecting the French language channel, using the interpretation menu.

Today's session is being recorded and will be available on our website, along with a transcript of the session. A graphic recording will also be created from today's presentation by Annalee from Drawing Change. Her role is to listen deeply and to translate our ideas into visuals. You can watch Annalee drawing as she follows along with the session. And if you'd like to follow along closely with Annalee's drawing as well, you can spotlight Annalee's video on your own screen.

There will be graphic recordings available for all Skillshare sessions, which you can find on the education tab of our website and when they are released as part of the Community of Practice tools, via the Courage to Act Knowledge Centre.

Courage to Act is a two-year national initiative to address and prevent gender-based violence on post-secondary campuses in Canada. It builds on the key recommendations within the Possibility Seeds report, *Courage to Act: A National Framework to Address and Prevent Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions*. Our project is the first national collaborative of its kind to bring together scholars, experts and advocates from across Canada to end gender-based violence on campus.

A key feature of our project is the National Skillshare Series, which we are all attending today, where our Working Groups, Communities of Practice and keynote speakers will discuss tools, trends and strategies that will shape how we address and prevent gender-based violence on campus.

Through the Skillshare Series, we are so pleased to provide insight into the development of the tools and resources that have been created by gender-based violence experts across the country, which will officially be launching in August 2021. There will be a chance to sign up for piloting opportunities, via the Courage to Act Knowledge Centre, in the Fall of 2021.

Through the National Skillshare Series, attendees will join a connected network of experts and advocates across Canada, who are exploring

urgent issues and promising practices. This project is supported by CACUSS and these National Skillshare Series sessions are part of a recognized learning opportunity. So, attendance at ten or more live webinars or our National Skillshare Series sessions, will count towards an online certificate. And our project is made possible through generous support and funding from the Department for Women and Gender Equality or WAGE, the Federal Government of Canada.

We begin today's session by acknowledging that this work is taking on and across the traditional territories of many Indigenous Nations. We recognize that gender-based violence is just one form of violence, caused by colonization to marginalize and dispossess Indigenous peoples from their lands and waters. Our project strives to honour this truth as we move towards decolonizing this work and actualizing justice from missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls, across the country. This work can be challenging. Many of us have our own experience of survivorship and of supporting those we love and care about, who have experienced gender-based violence.

A gentle reminder here to be attentive to your wellbeing, as we engage in these difficult conversations. You can visit the self-care section of our Skillshare web page or visit our shelf-care room by visiting the link in the chat. You can also follow along on Twitter using the #GBVNationalSkillshare.

You are invited to enter questions into the Q&A box, throughout the session and they will be posed to the presenters at the end of the session. We will try to engage with as many questions that came on during the chat. At the end of this hour, you will find a link to the evaluation form. We would be so grateful if you would take a few minutes of your time to share your feedback, since it helps us to improve. This is totally anonymous and following the session, we'll also email you with a copy of the evaluation form and a link to the recording, so that you can view it again and share it with your networks.

I'm so excited to introduce to you now, to the Working with People Who Cause Harm Community of Practice and to hand things off to them.

Sarah: Thank you Kelly, and I'll just wait till we get our slides up here. Perfect. So, thank you Kelly for that warm welcome. And on behalf of the People Who Have Caused Harm Community of Practice, I'd like to thank everyone for joining us today. My name is Sarah Wolgemuth and I work at the University of Alberta, as Assistant Dean Student Life in the Office of the Dean of Students. And I'm joining you today from Edmonton, which is located on Treaty 6 Territory.

Today we're excited to introduce you to the tool we've developed which focuses on Working With People Who Have Caused Harm. Our plan in the time that we have is to give you a brief overview of the toolkit and then have a panel discussion. And, of course, we'll have time at the end for questions.

As Kelly said, if you do have questions, please enter them throughout our presentation into the Q&A box and we'll get to as many as we can at the end. We're also going to be putting a small glossary of terms and acronyms into the chat box right now, to help us out today and just try and ensure that we're all using a common language.

But if we do use a certain term or an acronym that we haven't defined, or haven't explained, please feel free to ask us about that in the chat box and we'd be happy to clarify it.

Our Community of Practice has put together what we consider a reflective tool that includes content and questions to help you and your teams establish or enhance the work that you do with people who have caused harm on your campuses. We hope that in August, when it's complete, you'll engage with many of the questions that aim to get at the nuanced and complex nature of this work. The tool itself includes a link to a feedback form. As this work is emerging, we want to invite your feedback to improve this tool on an ongoing basis.

And finally, we'd like to dedicate our toolkit, in honour of all the campus complainants, survivors and gender-based violence frontline workers, who all strive to have a safer world, where we can all live, learn, love and play without fear.

Lindsay, if you can move it to the next slide, please. So, I'd like to recognize our Community of Practice Members: Lyndsay Anderson, Chris Avelar, Amanda Cook, Erin Hagan, Zanab Jafry, Greg Mather, Jesmen Mendoza, Carrie Rentschler, Kelly Rico, and Lindsay Robertson.

For the sake of time, only a few of us will be presenting today, but everybody has contributed in incredibly meaningful ways. Our group is made up of people in diverse roles, in both post-secondary campuses and also community practitioners. It's been a really incredible year of learning together, and we're so excited to share some of that with you today. Now, I'll turn things over to Lyndsay.

Lyndsay: Great. Thank you so much Sarah. So, my name is Lyndsay Anderson. I go by she/her pronouns. I am Assistant Director Student Culture and Experience, at St. Mary's University, located in Halifax, which is on the unceded and unsundered land of the Mi'Kmaq people.

We wanted to start by talking about why it is that we have a Community of Practice that's designated to design this toolkit for Working With People Who Have Caused Harm. This was something that was raised in the larger Courage to Act report and highlighted as an area that required further research and exploration. So that's what our group is intended to do.

Our toolkit spends a great deal of time explaining the importance of Working With People Who Have Caused Harm. So, I want to highlight a few of the reasons why we think this is so important.

First and foremost, when we're working with people who have caused harm, particularly those that are members of the campus community that's the PSI or post-secondary institution community, we want to treat those members like the human beings that they are, with dignity and respect and with trauma-informed approaches.

And we think that, you know, while they're members of our community, that this is something that's important to do. Because it will ensure overall safety and really participation of all members in whatever process it is that we're initiating to address the harm.

So, the other thing that's important to keep in mind, as we think of them as humans and really as taking this as a person-centered approach, we want to kind of deal with the person that's in front of us and all that comes with them. We want to think about, have they experienced any harm or trauma? So, while we take a trauma-informed approach to obviously our survivors and anybody that sort of experienced gender-based violence, we also want to do the same for any participant in our process.

So, it kind of sets a standard that we can approach for all members that might be engaged in a process, all parties. So, we will approach that for any individuals and that really will be helpful in the cases where respondents may have experienced trauma themselves before coming into this.

We also really believe that putting respondents through a process that is procedurally fair, is critical. And the reason why that's so critical is because we need their full participation in a process, in order for that to be fair and in order to ensure the safety of any of the complainants and survivors that are involved.

When a process is procedurally fair and everybody's rights are upheld, it's going to mean that their participation is more active, that their participation is more meaningful, that they feel like, you know, all the members have had a voice, had a say in the process. And that might lead to essentially less appeals or reviews or lengthening of processes, that may come if a procedure or a process is not fair.

We really think that that procedural fairness is critical for the safety of the survivor, of the complainant and any other parties in the process. The idea is, if someone has gone through a meaningful process – someone who's caused harm or a respondent has gone through a meaningful process, it's less likely potentially to be appealed.

But also, it's truly focusing on accountability and that's really what we want here, is for people to be held accountable and they can only reach that true meaning of accountability, if and when the process has been fair, and they've had a chance to sort of engage meaningfully within it.

And ultimately, in the end what this does for us is it creates a campus that is more safe. When there's true accountability and people can take responsibility for their actions in a meaningful way, that's what ultimately leads to a campus that is safe, because we have people that are either

staying on campus, remaining members of our community and we want to make sure that it's preventative, so that they're not doing something to cause harm again.

Or they might be leaving our community. And if they are leaving our community, it's not like they cease to exist. They still exist in the world and in our communities that surround campus. Maybe they go to another campus community. So, we want to make sure that if they're truly held accountable in a meaningful way, that they're going to go and be productive members of another community somewhere else.

So, one thing I do want to talk about quickly is when we talk about people who have caused harm or respondents, who do we mean? And my colleague Chris, is going to talk about our toolkit in more detail in the next couple slides. But just a quick explanation of what we mean when we say, a person who has caused harm and respondents.

So, a person who has caused harm, is really any individual who has committed gendered or sexual-based violence. These individuals are not necessarily part of an investigative or adjudicative process, or they could have been and have completed a process and their role as a respondent has concluded.

So really, a person who's caused harm is anybody who's acknowledged that they've caused harm, or anybody that's engaged in a process where they're being held accountable or concluded a process, where they've been held accountable.

And respondent, refers to that specific role, when you are alleged to have violated the gender-based, or sexual violence policy. So, the person who is responding to the report or the complaint against them. So, the respondent is a bit more of a narrow term. And people who have caused harm maybe is a bit broader, if you want to think of it that way.

And these terms, we've put in that glossary that's in the chat. If you've joined us a bit later and you can't see that, we will be sharing the glossary again, so you will be able to refer back to these points.

So, I am going to turn this over to Chris, to talk a bit more about our toolkit.

Chris: OK. Thanks Lyndsay. My name is Chris, as she mentioned. I just wanted to take a quick moment to recognize that I'm located on Treaty 6 Territory, which is Traditional Indigenous Territory, shared with the Cree, Saulteaux, Metis, Blackfoot, Nakota Sioux, Mohawk and Dene Nations.

I want to acknowledge that I have a very deep voice and I tend to speak quickly. I'm going to try to [temper] that as much as I can. Hopefully with the help of our transcript and the other things that we have for accessibility today, you'll be able to understand me clearly.

But today I wanted to talk – I'm here to talk to you about the toolkit and so what we actually did and what we put together. We wanted to recognize

that there's not a lot of research out of Canadian post-secondary institutions on this topic, on Working With People Who Caused Harm on best practices, on approaches, everything like that.

So, what we did, was we took a lot from our own personal and professional experiences. We did literature reviews from other organizations, from other institutions and we did some primary research with different practitioners.

So, we did a survey with respondents from post-secondary institutions across Canada in different areas. They may have been conduct officers, they may have worked with student life, they may have been support people. And then we also conducted some interviews with campus and community practitioners, who have been doing this kind of work for a long time.

And so, with that we were able to glean some insights and kind of develop a bit of a framework on how to move forward and how to engage with this process. I say framework specifically, because what we have, it's not a clear-cut, done and done, you take this, and you go and do whatever. We really tried to build something that acknowledged that every post-secondary institution is a bit different, or every community organization is a bit different.

You may have different resources. You may have different structures. You may have different policies in place. Your personnel, your capacity could be different. So, what we tried to do is we tried to develop something that anyone could take back and use themselves to build their own processes and to refer back and to sort of guide this work in a way that you could actually apply it to your own context.

As I mentioned, it is to help people assess what those processes are, adapt where they can and kind of go from there. This is a living document. So, Sarah had mentioned earlier, we do have a feedback survey within the document itself and within the toolkit itself, because we really believe in wanting to collaborate and work together through this.

We've come with what we could over the last year and a bit, but we know that there's going to be more work that emerges. We know that there are going to be new practices, new research that comes out and we want to continue updating this and continue bringing it into this, so that we all have access to these resources and we're all working together to create more and to create new.

Next slide please. So, thank you.

So, just a quick overview of the toolkit. We have broken it down in different sections and we do have guidelines and recommended practices for working with respondents and the people who have caused harm. A lot of this is kind of guided on central principles and values, shared with Courage to Act and things that we've kind of created on our own.

These include things like focusing on accountability; making sure that we're using a person-centered approach; engaging with progressive discipline; having dignity is central to everything that we're doing; making sure that we're using trauma-informed practices; we're being survivor-centered; we're focusing on re-integration and we are considering intersectionality in every step of the way.

So, you'll see that come up within each of the different sections in the toolkit itself. As well as you could see insights from the research. So, of those things, some of the practices, or some of the different recommendations that people might have had, we've included them in these different sections.

We have example cases, for each of the different places, to kind of just give you a bit of context in how you might approach this, if you've never dealt with this sort of situation before. Key considerations for those different stages. So, what are some things that you need to make sure that you're looking and that you are keeping in mind, you're being mindful of?

And as well, we do have reflective questions. So, we have challenges, additional considerations, calls to action in areas where there's more research needed. And those will pop up throughout the toolkit in different ways. And that's again, just to kind of really highlight the idea that this is a reflective toolkit and it's a roadmap to help us kind of go through the entire process. But really, just getting you to think about what it is that we could be doing and what we need to consider and how might I apply this to my own context?

So, the roadmap itself looks like this. So, we have a few different sections as you can see. I do want to mention that this is still a proof of concept, so don't worry about trying to take a screenshot of the image right now. Don't worry about trying to type all – everything that you see or trying to like strain your eyes looking at the screen. This is just a proof of concept. We will – we are still workshopping it a little bit. But this is primarily what it will look like. And it will follow these different sections as are outlined here.

So, we will be looking at interim – or sorry, initial accusations. Then we'll go through the complaint notification, interim measures, the risk assessment, hearings, meetings and interviews. We'll look at those determinations and findings. And throughout that, we'll also look at what it means to be working with respondents and people who caused harm. So, what that, what that type of work could look like. And this is where that split happens that Lyndsay had mentioned.

So, first part is when we're looking at respondents. Afterwards we're looking at somebody where that process may have concluded and they haven't found who caused harm, or they may have acknowledged themselves that they caused harm. So, we could be looking at sanctions, reintegration after that suspension, appeals and what happens after the fact, if they need to transfer institutions.

So, this – again it's just a quick snippet. We will talk a little bit more within the panel discussion itself, as to how these things kind of come into play and how you might be able to use this toolkit.

I also wanted to mention that this lovely diagram and this lovely image was created by Tia Wong who works with First Act Project. You can find more of their work at tiawong.ca.

I'll pass it over to Carrie.

Carrie: Hi everyone. I want to thank Kelly, Sarah, Lyndsay and Chris and all of the other members of our Community of Practice. It has been an amazing experience to work with you. And I look forward to continuing to do so.

I'm a Professor of Feminist Media Studies, at McGill University. And I do research on social movements against gender-based violence and the media and technology that folks use to enact and reimagine social change in this area.

I'll say a little bit more about my role on the panel, but first I just wanted to say that I am in Montreal, on the Traditional lands of the Haudenosaunee and the Anishinaabe Nations. And these Nations are the traditional stewards of the lands and waters on which I'm presenting to you today, a land that has long served as a site of meeting and exchange among Indigenous peoples.

Performing a Land Acknowledgement and reflecting on it, are only the first steps in my own understanding of the long history that has brought me to reside on the land. And I'm working to better understand my own place and responsibility within that history.

And one of the things I want to note in relationship to that too, is sort of in this broad area of practice as well, there is a lot of essential knowledge that has come from Indigenous practitioners who have been working on these issues for many, many years and have also informed our tool and some of the ideas in it.

So, I'm going to moderate this next section of our Skillshare today which is a panel discussion with members of our Community of Practice that are about the tool that we created, so we can get into a little bit more detail. And some of the ideas that it presents for working with respondents and people who have caused harm.

After the panel discussion, we will have some time for Q&A. I want to invite you again to share any questions or comments that you might have, using that Q&A button just at the bottom of your screen. I'm also going to try and keep an eye on the chat, as the Moderator here, because you might have some questions for clarification or terminology that you might want a definition of, or something that's more of a quick answer. Please feel free to post those there and I'm going to do my best to keep my eyes on what folks might want to know.

So, you know, as we've mentioned, we approached working with people who caused harm, as a way to both increase safety for survivors and complainants and folks on campus, but also to address the – sort of more fully – the injustices and the harms of gender-based violence.

The principles of survivor-centeredness, trauma informed perspective and intersectional frameworks, shape our orientation to working with people who have caused harm, in rehabilitative, corrective and ideally transformative ways to address the harms caused.

So, our tool is aiming to make the processes of working with people who have caused harm and the reasons for doing so, more transparent. And we also hope it is easier to implement. We know that some post-secondary institutions struggle to recognize and understand the purpose of working with people who have caused harm, but also knowing what to do along the different points of contact that people have with respondents and people who cause harm on campus.

We also realize that working with people who have caused harm, can be really hard on a number of levels. We know that many of us carry particular stereotypes and labels for people who have caused harm, some of which come to us through really durable and often highly inaccurate media representations of gender-based violence of those who enact it. We also recognize that folks really struggle to understand how best to work with respondents, in light of some of these and other difficulties.

So, our tool makes some suggestions for things to consider at key points in the complaints process, but also in relationship to interim measures that can be instituted for working with people who caused harm, with some of these difficulties in mind.

We also ask a lot of questions throughout our toolkit as well. And we want to note that we don't have all the answers for those questions, but we're hoping that our tool begins to build knowledge in this area. And we recognize that a lot of other people have helped us figure this out as well. And we're super eager to hear your thoughts about your own work in this area, or questions you might have.

So, I want us to turn to our panel. I think we can stop sharing screens now, so that the panelists can all be visible to us. I'm going to be posing three questions to my co-panelists here, as the experts in this area. We're going to take about 25 – 20 to 25 minutes to do this. We have three questions. So, everybody will offer a short answer to each of those questions. And then we'll have about 15 minutes for Q&A thereafter.

If there are questions, we don't get to – from you – in this process, we're hoping we might be able to post a blog response, where we can actually consider some of those questions more deeply and provide some ideas in relationship to them.

So, let's get to our panelists. Here's our first question. Everyone on the panel has worked with people who have caused harm on campus. What are some of the challenges you faced in working with respondents and

people who have caused harm? And how have you addressed those challenges in your own thinking and practice? And we are going to turn this over to Amanda first.

Amanda: Thanks Carrie. Hi folks. I'll just briefly introduce myself. My name is Amanda Cook. My pronouns are she/her. And I'm the Director of Sexual Violence Prevention and Response at the University of Waterloo, which is located in Waterloo, Ontario. I live and work in Waterloo Region, which is situated on the Haldimand tract, land that was promised to the Haudenosaunee of the Six Nations of the Grand River and is within the territory of the Neutral Anishinaabe and Haudenosaunee people.

So, with regard to the question posed, Carrie, there are many preconceived beliefs with regard to those who have been accused of causing harm and the associated labels we assign them, which can include predator, offender, among others.

This label can be quite dehumanizing and can create barriers in collaborating with other campus stakeholders, to work with those who caused harm. These challenges might contribute to further harm for all involved, unfortunately, and our goal is to reduce the potential for harm wherever possible.

One way to address this is through campus presentations in awareness raising with employees and students, and also one-on-one conversations with stakeholders as matters arise. It's important to acknowledge when these thoughts and feelings come up and still engage in these steps needed to ensure and maintain safety for all.

Our toolkit includes a section on working with respondents and people who have caused harm, which discusses these concepts and also encourages those engaging in this work to be aware of their own biases and be proactive in their awareness of potential barriers, to them engaging in a particular case.

I also wanted to note that campuses are micro and macro communities and often when harm is caused there's a ripple effect that can secondarily impact others. And when I say this, I'm thinking about a residence floor, an athletics team, a club or society, a classroom, a lab and so on.

Safety for the victim survivor, as well as the broader campus community, is a primary goal. And to this end, they should also be made for the reactions and responses from the broader community who might also have been impacted.

Carrie: Thanks so much Amanda. Sarah?

Sarah: Thanks Carrie. I'm just going to start off by saying that I wholly agree with Amanda's comments on the challenges that I see when respondents feel or react to that change in their identity. Or an assignment of a new label within our, within our campuses.

This reaction to those labels also highlights the inherent tension that exists in working with respondents. This work and our tool are both values informed and driven. And so, tension and even healthy tension, is absolutely going to exist in this work.

I think it was said already that this work is hard. And many conversations about working with respondents will also be very hard and uncomfortable, as these, as these value conflicts arise.

So, we said there were a number of questions in our tool. And, I think, you know, the one that comes to mind now is how do we navigate these spaces then? How do we, for example, facilitate academic accommodations for a respondent going through one of our processes who can't focus on school, without diminishing the trauma experienced by the survivor?

This can be especially challenging when a respondent doesn't take any responsibility for their actions and feels that they've been unfairly targeted. Until there's been an investigation or finding a responsibility, it's important to try and minimize the negative impacts of the process, including possible interim measures.

If a respondent has been found to have caused harm, it is even more imperative that the person's dignity and personhood be recognized. This doesn't excuse the harm that they've caused, but rather, as we found in a lot of our research in talking to different experts, it's to better understand why and how the person who caused harm, enacted the gender-based violence harms? And also, what strategies then might be most effective in addressing these underlying reasons?

This is really key, because taking accountability depends on understanding the factors that led to the choice to enact gender-based violence harms. Fundamentally, it also means that we must recognize persons who have caused harm as members of our community, as people themselves who might need help and who might have life histories that have led to harming others.

It also represents a vision of addressing harms that seeks to potentially reintegrate persons who have caused harm, as well as respondents, into our communities, after fulfilling whatever sanctions might be appropriate.

Carrie: Thank you Sarah. Lyndsay.

Lyndsay: I just want to quickly say that I think one of the most important things about this work, is making sure that – we can only work with respondents and people who have caused harm and implement these practices, if our process and practices also do this work for the survivor.

And so, I just wasn't sure if we'd stressed this enough, but we're talking about this in the framework of having already had all of these things in place for the survivor, using survivor centric and trauma-informed practices. But suggesting that we also too, sort of have the same lens and the same values and principles when working with a respondent.

And that's because, I think a lot of the respondents and people who have caused harm that I've worked with over the years they, as I mentioned before, they're human beings and they come with their own issues and challenges.

And so, some of those challenges that I've seen students have, is their own trauma from previous incidents, mental health concerns, socioeconomic issues and challenges, academic concerns – like all of these things that make a human being a human, or a student, can happen. And they may exist, or they may not exist.

And, I think, what's important is that we take the time, and we have the resources to learn what those issues might be. So that again, this person can totally participate in a process and fully step into that role of accountability, which they might not otherwise be able to do if they're, you know, dealing with some significant mental health issues. Or, you know can't afford to eat that day, you know they're not going to be able to fully participate.

So, I think, that's – those are some of the challenges I've seen. If they can't fully participate in a process because, you know – they weren't fully prepared for an interview, so they didn't really know what was going to happen at that interview, or they weren't focusing, or they didn't have a support person with them – that's going to lead to issues down the road, in terms of challenges to our process and appeals and the suggestions that it wasn't fair and therefore needs a redo or the results shouldn't count.

So, I do think it's really important that we address those pieces right at the outset. And our toolkit, I think, does a really good job demonstrating how, when we do have these resources to address and manage the respondent issues and challenges, it leads to a more accountable and a more safe and a more fair process. So, I think our toolkit does a good job at sort of framing that up. And I want to give an example of where in the toolkit we do that.

So, there are two spots in the toolkit where we specifically outline what needs to be included when you communicate out to a respondent that they are (a) Being brought into a process or being alleged to have violated a policy. And so, I think at that point when we're communicating, we'd go into great detail, in terms of what needs to be communicated? How much do we put in there? What's explained? How do we deliver it? When is it delivered?

You know taking into consideration, who delivers that message, and have they been trained in trauma informed kind of practices, so that, you know you're the person delivering the message. Are you prepared for the response to that message? And are you delivering in person, or by email or in writing?

So, I think all of these things are sort of teased out in our, in our toolkit. And again, in places where we don't have the answers, we framed up some really great questions and reflections that you need to be thinking

about, in order to address some of the challenges that do come up. So, that's some of the challenges that I've faced and tried to address throughout my work.

Carrie: Lyndsay, thanks. And our final panelist for this question is Chris. I'll turn it over to you.

Chris: OK. Yeah, I think everybody's kind of done a really good job of sort of outlining some of the major challenges that we might face at post-secondaries. And to add to that, I just want to talk about what it's like having to meet people where they're at and how difficult that can be in a lot of different ways, for many different reasons, but primarily I'm looking at what happens when fear comes in? Or how do we recognize that? How do we acknowledge that? Fear from the institution, not wanting to deal with this process, not wanting to put resources or prioritize these issues or this context.

And what happens when that person themselves, the respondent, the person who has caused harm, is afraid to come forward, is afraid to acknowledge what they've done, or is afraid to kind of engage with that process? They might be worried, or they might be afraid that they're going to get kicked out of school. Or that they're going to lose their access to varsity sports or something. Or they're going to lose their communities. Or all these different things. A lot of these fears will come up and that could create psychological reactants for that person.

So, they might double down. They might not want to engage. They might want to just really kind of like defy the process, because they don't want to be seen.

Amanda had mentioned the idea of labelling. That comes up a lot there too. They don't want to be labelled with that. They don't want to be known as an offender. Or they don't want to be known as a perpetrator or something like that. So, it can be difficult to kind of figure that out and see where they're coming from and how to navigate that.

And also, recognizing your own biases with that too. As Sarah had mentioned, there is that inherent tension that comes with this kind of work and it can be challenging to just recognize in yourself, do I, do I want to work with this person? Do I want to help them? Do I want to actually do this? Maybe I really, really don't like what they did, or that touches on something that I might have dealt with in the past. Who knows what it is?

For that, we talk about a lot in the toolkit, the importance of that person-centered approach and acknowledging and recognizing and asking and questioning, what are those biases? Looking at the intersectional piece. What are the different systemic factors that might have caused this type of behaviour to go forward? Or might have lended towards this person making the choices that they did.

How – what questions can you ask yourself, so that you can acknowledge and recognize what biases you might be going into this with and how you might approach this and what you might need to do? Some of the different

sections have specific considerations around that, whether you're the person who should be doing this at all.

If you are not able to engage with this type of context, or with this exact case, is there someone else within your office who can do that instead, or who can help you work through that process? We also have different places within that just focus on what you need to do to acknowledge that.

And one of those things is also we have a resource in the Appendix that looks at kind of a self-audit of yourself. Do you have the training already? Are you ready to engage with this kind of work? What are some of the pieces that you might need? So going through that, I think could also help quite a bit with that.

Because ultimately, what it comes down to is we're working with these people and we're engaging with this process because we want to promote safety for everyone, for the entire community on our campus. And this is one of the ways that we do that, and this is how we disrupt those continuing cycles of violence.

Carrie: Thank you everyone for sharing some of your own experiences with these challenges at both the personal level and at the institutional level as well. And we can – I'm sure some folks who are listening might have some of their own challenges they're facing. And if you have questions about those, again I encourage you to put those in the Q&A, or pop them into the chat. It looks like we're already getting some questions that will be really important for us to address in the Q&A.

So, we're going to go to the second question, which builds really nicely on the last point that Chris just made actually, which is in your own experience, I wonder if you could talk about how working with respondents and people who have caused harm, has created more opportunities for survivor care, safer campus communities – as Chris was mentioning – and justice even? I think Sarah, you're going to, you're going to start us off with a, with a response.

Sarah: Happy to start us off. Thanks Carrie. So, yeah, to reiterate, I would agree that in my experience, survivor care and safety has to be at the root of this work. And I'll share some opportunities I see specifically with imposing interim measures, which is where most of my day-to-day work is, in regard to sexual violence.

The work that goes into creating interim measures for respondents in itself, should involve a process that would engage survivors to help them feel safer on campus and to prevent further harm.

We do have a section on interim measures in our tool. And we have a number of suggestions and reflection questions there that ideally will help you to work with those who have experienced gender-based violence and give them a voice, a greater sense of safety, control and predictability in the spaces they use on campus, in relation to the specific interim measures that are crafted.

In my experience, survivors will often ask if, as part of the meeting with the respondent, for information to be provided to the respondent, to help them learn more about gender-based violence, or consent, or communicating consent.

And so, by listening to the survivor and their needs, we can learn more about the specific areas of concern, regarding the respondent's behaviour, that can often act as a starting point for a case manager or whoever – whatever staff member is going to be working with the respondent.

This information can assist with identifying possible referrals to support services and areas of needed education for the respondent. The case manager or staff working with the respondent, needs to be aware of their own role. And Chris, I think, talked about this really well, when – in terms of identifying the needs of the respondent, in case those needs are out of the scope of their role, then it's important to refer to them as necessary and as is appropriate.

And Chris also mentioned in our tool, the inclusion of the training and knowledge self-audit. And I think there's some really good reflective questions in there to go through and kind of see where you're at, in terms of how you and your team might approach this work?

Additionally, some of the information of the specific areas of concern that might be gained or gathered from the survivor can also inform a risk assessment for ongoing risk evaluation, which ideally also helps with the safety piece.

It's also important for both survivor care and for fairness, for the respondent to adapt the interim measures to evolving circumstances, such as switches to remote learning or return to in-person learning or at the end of a term when certain space restrictions may no longer be necessary.

And this continued engagement with the survivor and the respondent, ideally, by two separate staff members if staffing capacity allows, really commits an ongoing focus to the survivor's safety and also creates space for dialogue with the respondent. And this ongoing dialogue with the respondent can demonstrate an engagement that is both shame and judgement free, but with an eye to accountability and focuses on supporting them as a student.

Carrie: Thank you so much Sarah. Amanda, you're next.

Amanda: Thank you Carrie. Sorry. I just lost my notes. One moment please. [Laughs] There we go. So, just building on what Sarah has already shared, taking the lead from the victim or survivor regarding their physical, psychological and safety needs, inherently leads to increased safety for the victim or survivor.

As well as the campus community, centering survivors as much as possible, by providing more opportunities for addressing the harm, such as through restorative and transformative justice approaches, allows for

the victim or survivor to retain greater control over their experience and determine what next steps fit best for their needs.

Supporting respondents and understanding interim measures being implemented, as well as any accountability pathways being taken, helps to create conditions which allow the person who caused harm or respondent, to engage in these processes in a meaningful way and invites the person who caused harm to learn about the impact of their actions, which is often something that victims of survivors I've worked with have brought up as a key need that they have.

We highlight in our toolkit, the goal of preventing future gender-based and sexual violence harm and interrupting the toxic culture that creates conditions for violence to persist. In working with those who cause harm and respondents, we are able to reaffirm this commitment to safety on campus and contribute to the sense of safety for the victim or survivor.

Carrie: Thanks Amanda. Chris, I think you're the next panelist to speak. Thanks.

Chris: So, just building a little bit off of what Amanda just said with the idea of kind of disrupting those toxic cultures, I think one of the biggest things that I've seen in my experience is just the impact of social influence that can come with it. I don't know if you ever tried to plan an event or do anything on campus like that, you can create as many posters as you want, but it's not going to work nearly as well, as students just telling their friends about things.

So, when we're working with respondents, we're working with people who have caused harm, those are opportunities for education. Those are opportunities for us to engage with them and work with them so that they can kind of figure out what they've done, what the impact of their choices, of their actions and that can give us opportunities to create more advocacy through these people and more kind of community accountability, in those ways.

I know we've had some programs at the U of A, that I've worked with – our sports teams for example. And they've looked at gender-based violence. And they've done a lot of communication and a lot of more direct work. And these people who – like big football players – are kind of imposing figures walking around campus, they are very, they are very cognizant of the language that they're using and of the way that their actions influence people. And they're very, very willing to engage with that work and to perpetuate that new style of masculinity and new style of existing in those areas. And I think that the ripple effect can be huge.

The more interactions that you have and the more that you work with people who have caused harm and you tell them, "Hey, this is part of the cycle. We're trying to disrupt a cycle. This, like, you've been a really willing participant throughout the entire process." This is how you can further this. This is how you can kind of continue to contribute to that community justice and that restorative practice that we're looking at and how we can continue to contribute to that safety that we keep coming back to.

Carrie: Thanks Chris. And Lyndsay.

Lyndsay: I'll go, I'll go fast because I see some great questions coming in. I guess what I just wanted to comment on is how few of our respondents, when found responsible for violating one of our policies, are actually removed from campus. It's not the majority, in my experience.

And so, if they're going to remain on campus, for me it's really important that we work with them in ways that prevent them from causing harm to others. So, I think that the only way to really truly work towards accountability and preventing further issues, is to understand what factors led to the harm occurring in the first place. Which is – I mean that's a big task. I say that so simply, but it's obviously a big job.

But I think that we can do that by really wrapping protective factors and supports around the respondent. And I think about a model that I've heard about in the past – the COSA model – the Circles of Support and Accountability, which is really used when someone's sort of being reintegrated into a community that we would use these Circles of Support and Accountability.

But I actually think we could use them even throughout a process. And, like, a person doesn't have to leave and come back to utilize that model of sort of people quite literally wrapped around a person who caused harm, to be sort of that safety net and that reassurance that, if you feel like you're going to engage in similar behaviours. Or, if there are certain things in place that are not allowing you to be aware of what you're doing, then how do we create this net that's going to make sure that you are aware, or that you are sort of stopping before the harmful behaviour begins?

So, I think that that's something we talk about in our reintegration section of the toolkit, but something that can actually be further developed. I think a little bit is not just using Circles of Support and Accountability as a re-entry pathway, but as something that's actually used throughout a process.

Carrie: Thank you to our panelists. In the interest of time and because we do have some questions coming in, I think we should turn directly to the Q&A at this point, if everybody's cool with that? Great.

And I'm going to start with a question from an attendee who asks, "Does the toolkit provide ideas or thoughts on how to foster accountability with respondents/folks that have caused harm?" They're wondering if the panelists could elaborate on this concept of creating spaces and processes that foster accountability in some of the ways that you've been mentioning.

Anyone want to take a start at that? Or what are some of the key features.

Lyndsay: I don't mind –

Carrie: Yeah. Go for it, Lyndsay.

Lyndsay: I wanted to – just to provide some context on our group and how we began our work way back when. Because when we first were formed, a lot of us had experience working with sort of restorative justice and maybe a little bit with transformative justice, but more restorative justice in my case. And so, we – when we first started writing our toolkit it was – we – I think we called it an accountability framework and we were –

Carrie: We did. Yeah. [Laughs]

Lyndsay – all about, yeah. It was all about restorative justice. It was all about accountability methods. We went to community resources. We went big. We – and I think what happened was we got away from ourselves, in terms [Chuckles] of working directly with respondents and persons who have caused harm.

So, we had to [rein] it back in, in various iterations to bring it back to a toolkit that would be really sort of practical for doing the work with respondents and persons who caused harm.

So, all – I just wanted to kind of mention that like, it's not so much that we don't think that there are ways to sort of increase that accountability, using different methods that are not as traditional as maybe what you see in our roadmap. Like, you know kind of what we see as an adjudicative process, or an investigative process. There are many other ways to be holding folks accountable.

And in fact, one of other Communities of Practice, just presented on this two weeks ago, as sort of these non – I forget what they call it, I'm so sorry – it's going to come to me. Feel free to throw it in the Q&A, [Laughs] the title of what they called their processes, which are sort of non-punitive, I think is what they called it.

So, yeah, I just wanted to throw it out there that we've kind of gone down that road of being a little bit bigger and broader in our approach, but then kind of scaled it back in. But certainly, there are other ways to sort of increase the accountability.

But again, treating the person like a whole person and really trying to get them to engage meaningfully is a way, I think, of holding them accountable, even through some of these more traditional educative processes.

Sarah: I also think –

Carrie: Are there other panelists – yeah, go for it, sorry.

Sarah: I also think – I mean it's a great question. I think it also highlights – I think it's going to depend a lot on your role and how easy it will be to build that relationship. You know just speaking my own experience, I am – I'm never doing investigations. If we're imposing interim measures as part of a process, there's typically been no finding of responsibility.

So, it might be easier for someone sort of, you know in my position to just try and create that space. And going off of what Lyndsay said, sometimes that can be done even using different restorative principles or asking restorative questions.

Because, you know, it's not necessarily my job to know the exact, the exact specific details of the harm that was caused, but it is a recognition that harm has been caused.

And then, I think, like working with any other student, there's some relationship building and however that normally looks for you. You know getting to know the student, getting to know why they're at university or college or in post-secondary, understanding different pressure points on them, understanding what their support network looks like and then taking the information we have about the allegations or accusation, or disclosure.

And there might, there might be some obvious ways around education to start a, to start a conversation, whether that's sharing some of the great educational videos out there around consent. Or there's some really good TED Talks around dealing with rejection or you know getting into masculinity and those sorts of things.

I think – all that to say – I think it's a process and I think, you know you should approach it building a relationship like you would anyone else but valuing that person as a person and then thinking of ways to start those conversations and looking for those inroads.

And education can sometimes feel like almost a neutral way to do that. Cause then you could say, so, you know can you watch this TED Talk? What did you think about that? So, you know the last time we met, I had told you that this was some of the specific harm that had been shared with our office. You know, do you have any – are you approaching it any differently after watching this? Are there other areas that you think you need to learn more about?

So, I think my role makes an education on relationship building a little bit safer or neutral. But I think it would absolutely depend on where you're coming from. If you're a discipline officer or a decision-maker, you probably have a different answer than I would.

Carrie: Good point. Jesmen, I noticed that you put something in the chat. Would you like to turn on your video and say a little bit more about that?

Jesmen: Yeah. I think just to kind of answer Kristin's point, in terms of how do you foster accountability? I think, what has been implicit throughout the entire tool – and what Sarah was also speaking to – depending where you are in the process, the discussion in terms of fostering accountability is going to look somewhat differently.

But I think it's based on the ability to invite people to a tough discussion on responsibility taking, wherever they are in the process – whether being a respondent or a person who's caused harm.

And for those of you that don't know me, I'm a recent member to the CP from Ryerson University and I'm situated on the lens of the Mississaugas of the New Credit.

But coming back to this question, it is about inviting people, however you can find a way. Whether it's trying to create those connections of, why are you, why are you at this institution? What is it that you're hoping to learn and accomplish? And how can we invite you back into the community, or take responsibility, or participate in this process, depending where they are? So, it is about invitation. And I think that it's spoken more explicitly in the Appendix section where we do relate some resources around Alan Jenkins work around Invitation to Responsibility.

And the other part is that – and I can't remember which of the panelists had said this earlier – but it is also recognizing how complex the work can be, right. And I think that that's an important starting point. That it is easy to kind of come into a process like this and possibly pre-judge. And that's why there is a self-awareness tool and a self-audit tool that Chris had talked about earlier.

And that having that wherewithal, that consciousness if you will, allows institutions and workers to create these spaces of accountability. So, there's not enough formula per se. It takes a lot of reflection, invitation and acknowledgement that there is a complex discussion to be had – a tough but an important one too.

Carrie: Jesmen thanks so much. I would like to go to one more question, if that's OK. I know we don't have tons of time, but I think this is a really important question that [Liz Goetel] has asked. Which is, "When a person who causes harm is represented by a lawyer, how does this affect the ability to promote accountability and rehabilitation?" And I'm sure that's a question that lots of people share as well and may have had experience with. So, how might our panelists begin to help our [Laughs], help folks who are thinking about this and having to address that in their work with people who have caused harm?

Yeah, Jesmen, did I see your hand? Yes, please.

Jesmen: Yeah. I was just going to say, I think that this idea of a person who has caused harm or a respondent, you know to use the expression, lawyering, I see it as actually an invitation to the institution to be even more procedurally fair, right.

I think where post-secondary institutions start to worry is that the person is lawyered up, they're going to be litigious, "Oh no. What are we going to do?" And I say, embrace it, right. It may be controversial to say that, but I say, "Embrace it."

And the reason why you would want to embrace it is that if you've developed processes that are procedurally fair, that preserve the dignity of the people that we're working with, I think what tends to happen is you actually get better outcomes, you know and believable outcomes, as far as I'm concerned.

Which then as, you know the panel was discussing earlier Carrie, it prevents having to redo a process, which then I think at the end of the day, is really what we want. We want to be able to go through the process correctly, fairly and once, if at all possible. Because these processes are difficult on everyone, especially the complainants and the victims, right.

And so, I say welcome, welcome them. Work with the reactants that Chris was talking about earlier. And in that way, you know, you have the best process possible. Because they may bring up some important information that might be in our blind spot and we do need to kind of think about that. We want to take a 360 approach. We don't want to take, you know a 180 view to the entire, you know person's experience, as they participate in this process and as we try to work with them.

So, Carrie, I hope that answers – answered the question. I am sure people in the panel might have something else to, might have something else to add.

Carrie: Amanda?

Amanda: I just want to build upon what you've shared with us, Jes, in that we can still offer all of those invitations and have those conversations in foster accountability. And it can be their choice to take those up or not. And, you know further to your point, we want those who've been accused of causing harm or respondents, to be able to access support, wherever they feel that could be both beneficial to them. And so, you know certainly lawyers might be considered one of those supports that they identify for themselves.

And, you know, kind of accepting that as institutions and folding that into the process as like a potential, I think is only to strengthen our processes.

Carrie: Thank you for that Amanda. I think Kelly is going to come in and help bring us to a close. There's so much more to talk about, we know that. We appreciate the questions. We want to answer that question. We weren't able to get to, but we do talk about it in the toolkit, about establishing those relationships, as well.

Kelly: Amazing. Yes, and I mean there's so much still to go over. And I just really want to give a huge thank you to the Working With People Who Cause Harm Community of Practice, for sharing your knowledge and expertise with us today. We're so excited to have your tool launched as part of the Courage to Act project. So, a big thank you again and I wish we could all give you a big round of applause from everybody [Laughs] in the attendees as well.

So, we – as you can see, Annalee from Drawing Changes, has been creating this beautiful illustration to represent the conversation that we've been having today. The final graphic, along with the video recording and transcript, will be available on our website in the coming days.

And as we mentioned, some of the questions that we didn't get to, or for folks who have put comments or questions in the chat, we're going to

pass those off to the Community of Practice and hopefully, they'll be able to answer them in more of a blog post format, so that we can dive a little bit deeper.

If you're interested in learning more about the tool or in learning more about the opportunity to pilot some of these tools that we've been sharing through the Skillshare at your own post-secondary institution, please continue to follow along with the Courage to Act project. And you can sign up for highlighting opportunities, via the Courage to Act Knowledge Centre, starting in Fall 2021. And don't forget that registration is open to sign up for all the remaining sessions that are part of the National Skillshare Series, running through to August 2021.

The Skillshare Series will continue to highlight the work being done across Canada to address and prevent gender-based violence on Canadian campuses. It will showcase the 15 plus tools and toolkits being developed by our over 150 project partners, including our Communities of Practice. And you can sign up for those on the Courage to Act website.

I also wanted to thank our attendees for joining us and for sharing with us today, asking questions and engaging. We appreciate and take inspiration from your commitment to addressing and preventing gender-based violence on your own campuses and we feel really lucky to be able to work alongside each and every one of you.

Thank you for joining us and a kind reminder to please complete the evaluation forms that you'll find at the end of this session. Take care everyone and thank you again.