Pathways for Engagement:

Institutional and Program-level Considerations to Engage Men and Prevent Sexualized and Gender-Based Violence on Post-Secondary Campuses

POSSIBILITY SEEDS

COURAGETOACT.CA

#IHaveTheCourageToAct

Land Acknowledgement

We would like to begin by acknowledging that this work is taking place on and across the traditional territories of many Indigenous nations. We recognize that gender-based violence is one form of violence caused by colonialism that is used to marginalize and dispossess Indigenous peoples from their lands and waters. Our work on campuses and in our communities must centre this truth as we strive to end gender-based violence. We commit to continuing to learn and grow and to take an anti-colonial and inclusive approach to the work we engage with. It is our intention to honour this responsibility.

Authors: Leah Shumka, Ian DeGeer, Daniel Brisebois, Sharon Miklas, Lisa Trefzger Clarke, and Eric Craven.

Engaging Men on Campus Community of Practice: Leah Shumka, Ian DeGeer, Daniel Brisebois, Sharon Miklas, Lisa Trefzger Clarke, Eric Craven, and David Garzon.

Peer Reviewers: CJ Rowe, Jennifer Flood, Emily Livingston, Belinda Karsen, Robyn Wilson, Britt Harvey, Emily Colpitts, Roxanne Runyon, Dee Dooley, and Johannah May Black.

Courage to Act Project Team: Farrah Khan, CJ Rowe, Anoodth Naushan, Carina Gabriele, Andréanne St-Gelais, Emily Allan, Darshana Patel, and Kelly Prevett.

Graphic Designer: Stacey Johnstone.

Funding Acknowledgement: *Pathways for Engagement: Institutional and Program-level Considerations to Engage Men and Prevent Sexualized and Gender-Based Violence on Post-Secondary Campuses*, a project by Courage to Act's Engaging Men on Campus Community of Practice, was graciously funded by the Ministry of Women and Gender Equality, Federal Government of Canada.

Women and Gender Equality Canada | Femmes et Égalité des genres Canada

To reference this document, please use the following citation: Shumka, L., DeGeer, I., Brisebois, D., Miklas, S., Trefzger Clarke, L., & Craven, E. (2021). *Pathways for Engagement: Institutional and Program-level Considerations to Engage Men and Prevent Sexualized and Gender-Based Violence on Post-Secondary Campuses*. Courage to Act: Addressing and Preventing Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions in Canada.

Table of Contents

Introduction

About Courage to Act

Courage to Act is a national initiative created to address and prevent gender-based violence (GBV) at post-secondary institutions in Canada. It builds on the key recommendations presented in Possibility Seeds' report, entitled Courage to Act: Developing a National Framework to Prevent and Address Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions. This national collaboration, made up of experts from across Canada, has made it their mandate to share strategies and create tools and resources for taking concrete action to end GBV on post-secondary campuses. The Courage to Act report is a national call to action.

Following the release of the Courage to Act report in 2019, ten national communities of practice were established, each focused on a specific area of concern in regards to GBV. Each of them has worked to respond to the recommendations laid out in Courage to Act by creating resources to address policy and programming gaps regarding gender-based violence. Each Community of Practice is made up of 5–10 people from across Canada with specific subject matter expertise. *Pathways for Engagement* is work of Courage to Act's of the *Engaging Men on Campus Community of Practice*.

About the Engaging Men on Campus Community of Practice

The Engaging Men on Campus Community of Practice (CP) is composed of six members, each of whom has brought their unique expertise and skill to the creation of this toolkit. In addition to these six, the CP benefited early on from the insights and collaboration of Anise Ebrahimian-Diznabi, Aspen apGaia, and David Garzon.

MEMBERS

Leah Shumka is the Associate Director, Conflict Engagement and Investigations at the University of Victoria in British Columbia. Previous to this, she held the position of Manager, Sexualized Violence Education, Prevention and Support. In that role, Leah worked to create a shared understanding among all students, staff and faculty at UVic about how to define sexualized violence, key principles in its prevention and response, as well as protocols and processes for responding to disclosures and filing reports. She further created tailored education for different university stakeholders, all of which focus on combining accessible information with concrete tools while engendering a shared responsibility to engage collectively in this work.

Ian DeGeer, PhD, is a social worker and Contract Teaching Faculty at Wilfrid Laurier University and Mohawk College. Ian has been working in the area of Intimate Partner Violence and Gender-based Violence for over 20 years, focussing on engaging men who use violence in their relationships. His work has also included community-based research that explores how communities respond to violence and build/sustain programs that enhance community capacity.

Daniel Brisebois, MA, is a Residence Life Manager at the University of Guelph. In his position, Daniel has taken an active role in the education of students, staff and faculty about Gender-Based Violence and prevention efforts. Daniel has focused his work towards creating campus communities that cultivate and share a culture of healthy masculinity and male allyship.

Sharon Miklas, Hon. BComm, M.Sc. (Marketing), is the Director of the RMC Success Centre at the Royal Military College of Canada (RMC) in Kingston, Ontario. Sharon has been deeply involved in RMC's work on the prevention of and response to sexualized violence since 2014. She is also a member of the Executive for RMC's 2SLGBTQII group, Agora, and a member of the Working Group for RMC's Restorative Services Project (pilot).

Lisa Trefzger Clarke, Hon. BA, M.Ad.Ed, is a first-generation settler from Germany, mother, and consultant with ATZ Equity Consulting. She has worked in non-profit research, communications, education, activism and community development for over 20 years, most recently as the Executive Director of the Kawartha Sexual Assault Centre. Her professional and research interests include gender-based violence, developmental disabilities, decolonization, 2SLGBTQII+ and youth engagement, public and feminist pedagogies, and transformative learning. Her original research explored the learning experiences of feminist public educators when facilitating conversations about consent and gender-based violence.

Eric Craven is the Community Development Librarian at the Atwater Library and Computer Centre in Montreal. He completed his MLIS at McGill University. Eric's work focuses specifically on using digital media to disrupt normative expectations and perceptions in the community. Since 2011, as coordinator of the Digital Literacy Project, he has created programming that directly responds to community needs, creating spaces for participants to express themselves, find new ways to talk about things important to them and to help them build their own communities and work towards their own goals through creative digital media projects. This includes a series of projects focused on gender intersections with economy, gender-based sexual violence and gender-based cyberviolence. Eric has worked with a wide range of academic and community stakeholders bringing different groups of people together, ages 6 through 96, to express themselves through digital art and media, including several community new media projects focusing on seniors and digital music and video.

Principles

The goals and principles that guide the work of our Community of Practice and underwrite the *Courage to Act* report include the following:

COLLABORATION AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF EXPERTISE

This document builds on a body of academic and community scholarship as well as a long history of feminist and 2SLGBTQ+ community-based advocacy. The CoP collaborated with experts from across Canada working in the field of GBV prevention to identify strategies to better engage men on university and college campuses. In so doing, this document responds to recommendations set out in the Courage to Act Report. This work further complements the work of the other nine CoPs working collaboratively under *Courage to Act*.

ACCESSIBLE, PRACTICAL AND USABLE INFORMATION

This document is designed to be accessible to all community members working in the area of GBV prevention. Our goal is to remove barriers to accessing information and tools to assist those working in this area, often with inadequate resources. This tool is therefore written in plain language, translated into French (Canada's second official language), and formatted in a manner that allows easy navigation.

EQUITABLE, INCLUSIVE, AND INTERSECTIONAL

This toolkit is written with clear acknowledgement that GBV influences individuals and communities differently depending on where they are socially located — age, sex, gender, sexual orientation, race, religion, socioeconomic and immigration status, among other factors. Our aim is to address systemic forms of oppression in order to make spaces feel safer and more inclusive. This is critical given how sexualized and GBV have historically impacted those living at the intersections of socially marginalized identities.

SURVIVOR-CENTRED AND TRAUMA-INFORMED

This work requires us to be attentive to the lived experiences of survivors, which entails prioritizing the safety and choices of survivors and those impacted by GBV and avoiding practices that could be (re)victimizing or (re)traumatizing.

Purpose

Pathways to Engagement is a Framework designed to provide insight into how Post-Secondary Institutions (PSI) can design proactive, positive, and productive pathways to engage male-identified people (described in this document as 'men') in GBV prevention work on university and college campuses. Here we refer to both sexualized and gender-based violence because most of those working in this area are working under the mandate of sexualized violence prevention and response policies. For many, gender-based violence (GBV) may not be an explicit part of their mandate in terms of prevention and education despite being the broader umbrella under which sexualized violence exists (Benoit et al., 2015).

> *Pathways to Engagement* is designed to be used by any sized institution in Canada.

It provides readers with recommended readings from the grey and academic literature, an environmental scan on what work has been or is currently underway in Canada, some of the key considerations to promote this work at an institutional level, and provides practical advice and considerations on how to engage men in programming. As this is an emerging field of work, there are very few rigorously tested best practices for program design. Every PSI and surrounding community is unique in language, culture, financial and human resources available to address sexual and gender-based harm on campus. Therefore, this Framework explores the key consideration that a PSI may want to integrate into their program design and promotion. Our Framework carries readers from considerations for pre-programming through to the programs themselves, as well as considerations for program evaluation, assessment and review. If you, your organization or institution want to effectively engage men in GBV prevention efforts, or if you have programming in this area and are looking for ways to improve that programming, this Framework may be helpful in its offer of information and direction.

This focused interest on engaging men comes in response to the gendered dimensions of sexualized violence in Canada and elsewhere around the world. While anyone can experience sexualized violence, we know that women, girls and trans people, age 15 to 24, are disproportionately impacted. This includes Black, Indigenous and women, girls and trans people of colour; members of the 2SLGBTQ+ community including non-binary and two-spirit people; and those living with disabilities. Data from a 2014 Statistics Canada report indicates that the majority of those who self-reported sexual violence were women and girls (87%) (Conroy & Cotter, 2017). We know that certain women and girls are disproportionately targeted, including Indigenous women and girls who are 3x more likely to be victimized as compared to those who are non-Indigenous (Conroy & Cotter, 2017). Further, those who identify as bi- or homosexual in the survey were 6x more likely to be victimized (ibid). Notable as well is that these statistics underestimate the impact on men and boys given the unique barriers

to reporting they encounter as a result of gender norms and expectations.

What is significant for our purposes is that the overwhelming majority of those identified as perpetrating sexual violence were identified as men (94%) (Conroy & Cotter, 2017). Further, two-thirds of the incidents reported in this survey cycle were committed by men between the ages of 18–35 acting alone (ibid). The gendered dimensions of this societal problem are historically consistent and highlight the need to address not only the behaviour of individual men, but also how we collectively socialize boys and men into the kind of gender-based norms that perpetuate these forms of violence and oppression. An important part of this discussion are the ways in which masculinity is constructed around an axis of race, whereby what it means to be a "man" can change depending on one's race, ethnicity, and/or the communities one is raised in, and this in turn shapes masculinization of boys and men.

While GBV has historically been seen as "women's issues," as noted above, it is more a systemic issue of hegemonic masculinity, i.e., forms of masculinity that are valorized in our society and which promote the idea that 'real men' must be dominant, strong, forceful, and sexual initiators among other things. To end GBV, we must intentionally and actively encourage the engagement of men and boys in addressing gender inequities.

Another important reason why men and boys need to attend to this issue can be found in a recent Statistics Canada survey. It highlights that while women are disproportionately impacted by GBV, the number of men reporting is on the rise. The 2018 report specifically states that 1/3 or 32% of women in Canada experienced some form of GBV in the last 12 months, while at the same time, so did 1/8 or 13% of men (Cotter & Savage, 2019). Recent Ontario data indicates that trans people experience two times the rate of sexual violence in an intimate relationship than women (CMHA, 2020, SADV Treatment Centres, 2020), and at least 25 percent of trans people have experienced sexual assault after the age of 15 (Jaffray, 2020). The authors of this report are clear that female- and trans-identified people experience a greater total number of incidents of GBV in their lifetime, and are more significantly impacted than men, but that there are similar trends in the specific types of GBV both experience. For example, the most common forms of GBV against women include unwanted sexual attention (25%), unwanted physical contact (17%), and unwanted comments about their sex or gender (12%). These were also the three most common types of behaviour experienced by men, though at a considerably lower rate (each 6%) (Cotter & Savage, 2019). Importantly, younger age and sexual orientation increased the odds of all participants experiencing this kind of behaviour. This data highlights the systemic nature of this problem as well as the need to engage men in GBV work, as self-interested allies who want to create safe and inclusive spaces for all people, regardless of gender identity, gender expression, sexual orientation, race, socio-economic status, age, ability, religion, and culture.

Limitations

It should be noted that learning how to engage men in GBV prevention efforts is a new and evolving area of focus for practitioners. In our environmental scan of what is being done nationally to engage men at PSI's, we found that while many institutions are starting to think about how to engage men, many have not yet designed targeted strategies to recruit men into pre-existing programming. With some exceptions, few have created campaigns or educational opportunities aimed solely or even primarily at self-identified men. There are important non-profit and community-based organizations doing this work across the country, and they serve as a valuable resource for those able to contract or purchase their services (see Content Purchase below); however, most are not designed specifically for post-secondary institutions. Given this context, what emerged from our environmental scan is not a list of best practices for engaging men, as few have had the opportunity to fully develop, implement, or measure the success of these kinds of initiatives. What we did discover were valuable insights into what is being done in this area, the challenges associated with doing GBV violence prevention work, and specifically for engaging men, and what people understood to be pathways forward. Thus, this document does not so much provide best or promising practices, but identifies key considerations for practitioners beginning on this pathway to engage men in the broader effort of preventing GBV. These key considerations will help folks think through how to strategically and sustainably create programming aimed at men that is effective and long-lasting.

Tips on How to Navigate this Framework

This resource is designed to be accessible and contain clear information in key categories in a linear fashion. It is therefore not necessary to read it in its entirety to take aware key considerations. The **Table of Contents** is designed in such a way that the reader can jump to their topic of interest. It is designed to provide a comprehensive overview of all the considerations for creating an effective campaign, workshop or program. Given readers will come to this work with varying levels of knowledge, skills, and resources, it is framed in terms of considerations rather than recommendations. Again, there is little well-tested best practice in this area, and so we offer promising practices that can be individualized to your PSI context.

> Regardless of the type of initiative being planned or of the process of implementation, this Framework provides the opportunity to think intentionally about how to be effective in this work from conception through to assessment.

We have further provided appendices with information that may be helpful to those interested in taking a deeper dive into some of the specific considerations put forward.

Methodology and Scope

This resource, in part, summarizes what we know is happening in Canada to engage men in GBV prevention at a certain point in time. We identify emerging practices based on our consultation with advocates, educators, and practitioners from across the country. We expect that this Framework will be the starting point for an ongoing and evolving conversation about how to engage men in GBV prevention work.

> We believe it is important that all male-identified people join in this work as self-aware allies and advocates.

We have seen how programs like *Bringing in the Bystander* and *EAAA* developed by Dr. Charlene Senn et al. at the University of Windsor addresses some aspects of engaging men, but few male-specific programs have undergone academic peer review.

While this Framework provides an environmental scan that reflects the dedication and important work currently being done to engage men in preventing GBV, it was also created in a particular social and political climate during a time of great uncertainty at many PSIs across Canada. While there is a growing national interest in, and focus on, preventing GBV generally and in PSIs specifically, the work is happening in an uneven fashion that is dependent on provincial as well as institutional funding and leadership. For example, some provinces have provincial legislation that ensures post-secondary institutions have stand-alone sexual violence prevention and response policies in place, while other provinces and none of the territories have this kind of legislation in place to date. As a result, the work in this area falls along a continuum that is dependent on legislation, leadership, resources, capacity, and expertise. Much, as well, depends on the resourcing and priorities of PSIs and whether they center GBV prevention as an important equity, diversity, and inclusion priority.

Complicating this work further is that our consultation work happened before and during COVID-19 when many were either focused on other priorities around health and safety or actively engaged in finding new ways to engage college and campus communities in education. As a result, there are few recommendations from our consultants about how to conduct this work online. We therefore ask the readers to be intentional in how they translate these considerations into online formats. It may be that new opportunities open up as a result.

In addition to providing a list of recommended readings highlighting some of the work being done in this area across Canada and the United States, the Engaging Men CoP consulted with 32 practitioners, representing seven Canadian provinces between May and July 2020. This group included people with wide-ranging expertise, including student advocacy group members, individuals with expertise working in violence prevention community organizations, on-campus sexual assault centre frontline workers and directors, university

sexual violence prevention educators, coordinators, and directors, among others. While we reached out to individuals in the other three provinces, we were unable to identify someone to agree to participate at the time we were consulting. We were also unable to identify specific individuals in our three territories who were, at the time of writing, working in this area.

We initially identified participants by reaching out to colleges and universities that have sexual violence prevention and response offices. However, over the course of collecting information, we decided to reach out to community organizations, given that many PSIs rely upon relationships with community partners to provide expertise and programming. From there, we did snowball sampling (asking for referrals from other consultants to this project) and contacting individuals listed on PSI's websites to find additional people connected to this work. These processes were generally effective ; however, given the time of the year (summer) and the current challenges many PSIs were experiencing due to COVID-19 restrictions, some PSIs did not acknowledge our requests for interviews.

Interviews were generally conducted by video conferencing or telephone. In order to ensure consistency across interviews, we created an interview guide which consisted of questions the COP determined were important for gathering the most relevant information (see Appendix A). These questions were given out before the interviews so that respondents had an opportunity to consider the questions prior to the interview.

Consultations ranged from 30 minutes to two hours and occurred primarily through video-conferencing due to travel and COVID-19-related restrictions. However, some consultations happened in person, over the phone, or were provided in writing.

Our team organized the data by question number and then coded each question using a grounded theory approach whereby we looked for themes to emerge from the data rather than look for themes based on the literature and our understanding of these issues.

Environmental Scan

Determining the key considerations to assist with engaging men on PSI campuses emerged and evolved from many different sources. It is possible to rely entirely upon the limited academic literature and internet-based information (i.e. the limited community-based programs to engage males in ending gender-based violence) to set out how a PSI might develop programming designed to engage men on campus. In an effort to ground this Framework in a Canadian experience, however, the CoP undertook an environmental scan of various Canadian PSI's to learn about the work being done on campuses across the country. The process of conducting an environmental scan was determined to be an effective method for collecting information about programming that occurs on campuses, challenges that are faced by PSI's engaging men and successes that have occurred in building a movement that addresses sexualized and GBV on campus. The below is organized based on the key themes that emerged from those consultations.

One of the major learnings from conducting the environmental scan was the diversity in programming that exists across PSIs in Canada. There is no "one size fits all" model that exists that can be implemented across PSIs. Despite similarities in themes, each PSI started from a different place, created programming that met their own needs, and each of them had their own successes and challenges that were unique to their institution. Each person we consulted with had their own perspective on how to address the issue of sexualized violence and engage men on campus — from faculty to administrative staff; students, student leaders and student staff; to senior leadership and contractors (such as food services).

Notably, when we began to consider the information that we had collected from across the country, we realized that while we had a considerable amount of "data" and lots of ideas, we were no closer to distilling down a set of "best practices." What we heard in the interviews were many different approaches to sexualized violence prevention training, some of which explicitly attempted to engage men on campus and many that didn't. Of those that did, some were identified as successful while others were not. As we gathered the information, informed by our CoPs reading of the literature, we felt that it might be wiser to review the data we collected thematically in terms of "key considerations." Specifically, key considerations that reflect the importance of the journey that each institution must undertake as they move towards addressing sexualized and GBV.

Environmental Assessment Take-Aways

Tailored programming

Our conversations with individuals from across Canada revealed the diversity of programming that exists at PSIs in this country. Our consultants told us about ongoing projects, 'one-off' events, student-led events and groups. The majority of PSIs that provided input were conducting one-off sexualized violence prevention sessions as opposed to longer-term programming. A variety of partnerships exist between PSIs and community partners, a lesson that we take up later in this document. The consultative process also revealed several partnerships between PSIs and professional athletes who mentored student athletes. We also heard about the extent of the use of Bystander Intervention training on campuses with students. In many cases, the type of programming being done was related to the availability of resources (including staff). The consultations also included contact with PSIs who identified the absence of programming on their campuses. One thing that was clear was that not everyone was explicitly attempted to engage men, but those that were had differing approaches (discussed further in Programming).

> Tailoring programming respects that each PSI is unique and that program design and funding, administrative support and participants must make sense for the institutional investment, culture and sustainability.

Multiple levels of engagement

Speaking with consultants from PSIs revealed differences in the levels of engagement by men on the topics of sexualized and GBV. Some PSIs reported a high level of engagement on the issue, while others indicated that they experienced long-standing challenges engaging men on campus, and often faced a backlash when attempting to do this work. Those PSIs with a long-standing commitment to engaging men on campus through a range of events and activities were more likely to report ongoing engagement by the student population with noted fluctuations over time. Those PSIs that reported challenges engaging men on campus reported facing resistance from men regarding programming. Other challenges included obtaining funding for projects and hiring individuals to facilitate programming, suggesting the importance of institutional buy-in as a predictor of success.

Three groups of men were mentioned during the consultations as being important to GBV prevention programming: male students, male faculty/staff and male senior leadership. When one or more of these groups was highly engaged in GBV prevention programming, these initiatives were perceived as more successful. Some PSIs cited the importance of relationship-building in establishing the foundation for effective sexualized and GBV programming.

> In particular, it was widely agreed that faculty and/or staff leaders and champions need to be identified and collaborated with to ensure sexualized and GBV prevention programs are positioned as priority a within their PSI.

High visibility leaders can ideally leverage better funding and staffing and, possibly, more male collaborators to share in the work when resources are more scarce.

Mandatory vs. Voluntary programming

One of the most contentious issues encountered during conversations with consultants was the use of mandatory versus voluntary programming. For example, at some PSIs, consent training is mandatory for first-year students, student athletes and student leaders. One PSI annualized in-person sexual violence policy training in each classroom. At other PSIs, the programming is offered in a voluntary manner designed to engage the student body in these important conversations. Across the spectrum, regardless of geography, there was a rationale for both approaches. However, it is difficult to discern if making something mandatory translates into better outcomes such as engagement, safer campuses, lower rates of violence on campus or any other measurable changes in behaviour by male-identified individuals. A more balanced approach to engaging men appears to occur when the programming is voluntary and attached to specific benefits for students (such as co-curricular credits) and the campus community. A voluntary approach requires much more thought regarding recruitment and retention of male participants as well as male collaborators and leaders.

Programming challenges

Consultants were asked about the kinds of programming that they have attempted at their PSI and identified the diversity of opportunities available to students. There was a differentiation of 'one-off' events and longer-term group-oriented sessions. Some PSIs described student events designed to attract attention to the issue of GBV with the hopes of changing student culture. These one-time events were often not well attended and were limited in their ability to engage many male students. In contrast, some PSIs have dedicated significant resources to building support groups or educational/peer groups that last 2-3 months. These longer-term initiatives are labour-intensive and take time to build a dedicated group of individuals.

> Both of these approaches require ongoing commitment from PSIs, including funding and status on campus.

One of the ways to think about the delivery of programming comes from one of our participants who offered this analogy: Think of one-time programming versus long-term programming like this — it is better to take a sprinkler (long-term) approach than a firehose approach (one-time event). With long-term events, individuals are gradually able to absorb the material and engage in transformational learning. Conversely, the challenge with the one-off events is that individuals can "drown" in the amount of new formation they learn or be "turned off" by feeling their gender or other identity is being "attacked."

> In order to inspire cultural transformation on campus, many stakeholders need to come together to have critical and engaged discussions.

In collaborative discussion, there is an opportunity to meet people where they are at, unpack their biases and address stereotypes in order to break through the barriers they might experience in relation to engaging in GBV and associated harms like racism or ableism. The more we can think together, step away and reflect, come back together to discuss, and make connections in our own experiences helps us to create longer-term social justice change. Although the above-suggested programming challenges reflect the opinions and experiences of those consultants who spoke to this topic, there were many voices that were not heard. As there are few promising practices in this field of work, we can look to community-based male allyship, and active bystander programs for inspiration, collaboration, evaluation frameworks, and curriculum development.

Key components to engaging men on campus

Conversations with PSI consultants included a discussion about what they believed were the key components to engaging men on campus. There were some components that were highlighted across interviews that were consistent and engaging, including:

- **Commitment from senior staff to support and mentor this kind of programming, including through policy;**
- **Consistent and adequate funding for staffing and programming so it can be run over a number of years;**
- **Grass-roots, student-oriented programming that is based in 'natural' cohorts such as Varsity sports teams, residence groups, fraternities, clubs/groups or faculties;**
- **Senior leadership and union commitment to training staff and faculty on receiving disclosures;**
- **Engagement of students throughout the life of the program from needs assessment, programming development, and facilitation training to honour peer experiences of toxic masculine culture;**
- **Ongoing evaluation that feeds program design and flexibility, including updated social media, media and popular culture references.**

Assessment and Evaluation

Across all of our conversations, evaluation and assessment was the one area of programming that received the least amount of attention, according to our consultants. This was due to a number of factors, including lack of resources, lack of knowledge and an absence of tools to conduct an evaluation of the programs. Despite the lack of attention given to assessment and evaluation, its importance cannot be understated. Evaluation and assessment can provide insights into factors such as behavioural change and program reach across individual PSIs and can be used to advocate for sustainable funding.

The importance of senior leadership teams

Consultants were asked about their experiences working with senior leadership teams at their respective PSIs. The interviews revealed and reinforced the importance of the support of senior leadership teams in ensuring that staffing and programming designed to engage men continues at PSIs. Senior leadership teams are often the funding source for this programming and look specifically for evaluation outcomes, but can also be champions for these programs. Beyond senior leaders, the interviews revealed the importance of involving other male-identified faculty members and university staff as role models. Having buy-in from men across the university assists in creating a culture that is conducive to addressing toxic masculinities, building a culture of compassion, and caring for all community members.

Pre-Programming

When people think about engaging men in sexualized and GBV prevention work, the focus can quickly move to the creation of awareness-raising campaigns and/or programming and specifically curriculum content and design. Before embarking on this important work, we suggest that there is an essential element of pre-programming that should not be overlooked. Strategically, it is important to consider program purpose and how to ensure its uptake and longer-term success. In order to assist readers in the development of successful programming aimed at engaging men, we have provided a program proposal outline to get started (see Appendix B).

Identifying Purpose in Engaging Men on Campus

While on the surface it may appear obvious 'why' it is important to engage men in sexualized and GBV prevention work on campus, what is less obvious is 'which' men, and 'how.' Each group of men will require tailored strategies to engage them. For example: is the goal to engage male student athletes in a one-time awareness campaign, male international students in workshop series, or is the goal to engage male staff and faculty with the hopes that they can create systemic change as role models and champions? The more you are able to identify who you are trying to engage and for what purpose, the easier it will be to chart a path forward. Below are some key questions and considerations for identifying your purpose.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS:

DO I WANT TO ENGAGE MEN AT AN INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL TO CARE ABOUT THE TOPIC OF GBV PREVENTION?

Alternatively, am I trying to engage certain men in a specific program? The former may require a broad-based awareness campaign focused on positive messaging, while the latter may require targeted recruitment and specialized curriculum designed to help a certain 'type' or participant unlearn harmful cultural and societal messages.

WHICH MEN ARE MOST IMPORTANT TO ENGAGE?

Given that all men are different, they will respond to different kinds of messaging, recruitment and enticements. It is therefore important to consider whether your goal is to reach all male-identifying students or perhaps a specific group (e.g., international students, BIPOC men, student-athletes, or student staff). It might be important to design programming that responds to a pattern

that has emerged whereby one group or event is perpetuating a particular type of harm. Alternatively, it may be important to identify how to engage male-identified staff and faculty as they are role models and champions to younger men on campus and thereby set the standards for the culture on your campus.

AM I TRYING TO ENGAGE MEN IN SEXUAL AND GENDER-BASED VIOLENCE PREVENTION PROGRAMMING THAT IS OPEN TO ALL GENDERS?

If so, is this an intentional approach to the programming or simply the easiest way to move forward with your programming? How will you create a mixed-gender space that feels safe and inclusive for all involved? There is no one-size-fits-all approach to sexual and GBV prevention work. How participants might receive some of the information, e.g., compelling statistics that men perpetuate 96% of all sexual violence, should be considered.

DO I WANT TO CREATE A TAILORED PROGRAM JUST FOR MALE-IDENTIFIED PEOPLE?

If so, why is it important to create a male-only space? While some of the literature suggests that men may be more open to discussing vulnerable topics in a male-only setting, other research indicates it can lead to the perpetuation of harmful rape myths. It is possible to bring the voices of women and non-binary and trans people into a male-only space through the role of professional facilitators. Having two or more facilitators of different genders can help balance the learning and create a safer space to ask difficult questions about GBV with the group most identified with harmful perpetration. Well-trained facilitators can support deeper conversations about unlearning, jocular spaces, and prosocial bystander behaviours.

Identifying purpose in engaging men on campus can support the creation of a project plan that hones in on key goals and/or learning objectives, audience, collaborators, as well as initial ideas around timelines and budgets.

Collaborating and Building Partnerships to Ensure Program Receptivity

For any campaign or program seeking to engage men in GBV prevention to be effective, there needs to be an uptake of promotion and marketing materials, participants willing to engage, compelling content and facilitation, as well as strong endorsement and financial support. As we highlight later in this document, securing adequate funding to sustain the work, as well as recruiting and retaining men in programming, are a couple of the core challenges. Receptivity also depends on issues that include whether students are in two-year or four-year programs, what area of studies are of interest, if they are living on or off-campus, and what incentives will assist their professional goals. In anticipation of these kinds of challenges, it is important to ensure program engagement.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS:

IDENTIFY CAMPUS PARTNERS FOR COLLABORATION.

It is important to think broadly and creatively about individuals and groups who would benefit from such programming and invite them at the outset of the program's development, so they feel invested. Engaged stakeholders can support the creation of programming, and vitally, its implementation and ongoing endorsement. This could include PSI staff and faculty, entire programs or departments, and senior leadership. For example, orientation teams or housing departments can help ensure all students are aware of your engaging men campaign or program and may even integrate some aspects of it into their ongoing efforts to recruit and support students. At the same time, if your campus has student societies, advocacy groups, clubs and/or course unions, they should be carefully consulted to ensure program relevance but also its general uptake.

CONSULT WITH RELEVANT COMMUNITY PARTNERS.

Invite them to engage in the program to their level of capacity. This will help support the creation of a robust program, honour the important work that community advocates are and have historically been engaged in. This, in turn, can mean your program is more widely endorsed on and off-campus. Community partnerships may also help secure alternative funding for the program.

ENSURE LEADERSHIP IS INVESTED FROM THE BEGINNING.

This means making sure institutional leaders, including senior management, faculty and staff, understand the initiative and are invited to comment on it. It

will be important to highlight how and where the program fits in terms of the institution's strategic plan, priorities and concerns. It will also need to fit with risk assessment and liability concerns. This might involve writing a memo or report and then presenting it to your executive council. This prep work will help ensure receptivity now and into the future.

CREATE AN ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR YOUR PROGRAM.

This will create a focused opportunity for all relevant stakeholders to discuss ideas, streamline efforts, redistribute work, and coordinate all topic-related communications. Some PSIs begin this work by reviewing their sexual violence policies and procedures in order to envision strategic programming.

IDENTIFY ASSESSMENT OPPORTUNITIES EARLY ON.

It will be important to think about assessment and engage stakeholders in conversations about key aspects that you would like to measure early on in your planning process. Starting the work early allows for your assessment to have intention, and ideally use that data as leverage for future resources and funding. You may want to develop a long-term assessment plan over 12 months and cross-reference training and program delivery with student conduct complaints, for instance.

Program Longevity

What we heard in our Environmental Scan were ways in which our consultants were spending significant time and resources developing programming only to find the program was not sustainable over the long term. Participants shared that it was difficult to find core funding to run these programs, well-trained staff to facilitate the sessions, and ongoing leadership who promoted these efforts. Both the literature and our environmental scan highlight the importance of 'dosage' whereby change happens on the ground when people are exposed to education in different formats and in the short, medium, and long-term.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS:

SKILLED STAFF ARE CRITICAL TO ENGAGING MEN AND SHIFTING CAMPUS CULTURE.

While elsewhere in this document, we discuss some of the key considerations when hiring a program facilitator (in terms of age, gender, experience), our purpose here is to consider staff in terms of program longevity. The skill level of your team (or perhaps it's a single individual) will impact the short term, and therefore long-term viability of any program.

> For example, word of mouth may be important to recruiting candidates, and the facilitation of the workshop or program can be key to its impact.

Furthermore, this type of work requires a unique and specialized set of skills and disposition that may be difficult to find. It may take longer than anticipated to hire someone into this type of role, and therefore needs to be considered in advance. Finally, it is important to consider your program budget and what kind of staff you are able to hire. While there are pros and cons to hiring people at different stages of learning and career, some of what we learned through our consultations is the importance of having staff skilled in specific areas like trauma counselling where possible. Professionals of this type will anticipate a higher rate of pay or salary.

THE LENGTH OF TIME A PROGRAM RUNS IS HIGHLY DEPENDENT ON BUDGET.

What we heard from consultants is that programming was often developed through a one-off funding opportunity, grant, or budget cycle. It is no doubt important to take advantage of these funding opportunities when they come around. However, given the time, expertise, and relationship-building it can take to create and implement a program, you may want to ensure you are able

to run it regularly, and over the long term in advance of doing the work. It is therefore important to consider ongoing program funding questions such as:

- How often do we want to run this program? What is our capacity if demand is high?
- What are our program learning objectives, and does this require staff with specialized skills?
- When is the next budget cycle, and how can I ensure we receive funds into the future? What rationale can I make to ensure we receive funding, such as from my assessment?
- What kinds of collaborations are available to me to cost-share? How will I feel if I create a program and it only runs for one year, and what will I wish I had done differently?

ONGOING LEADERSHIP TO ENSURE PROGRAM LONGEVITY.

An interest in sexualized and GBV prevention work can come and go depending on institutional priorities and leadership as well as funding. This kind of programming benefits from ongoing support from leaders within your campus community — people who see the importance of investing in programs that deliver change over sustained effort and time. Some things to consider when fostering ongoing leadership include:

- Do leaders on your campus understand the associated benefits of this kind of programming at an institutional level (e.g., a safer campus which is more desirable to students and parents), but also the risks when there is a lack of programming (e.g., news stories about incidences of sexual assault)?
- Are leaders included in the development of programs so that they feel invested in their success? Are they updated regularly on the program's successes and challenges but also the number of disclosures and reports occurring on campus?
- Are leaders talking about the program and encouraging campus partners to participate, collaborate, and invest? Do they need support in how to talk about programming?
- Where are the opportunities to show this work intersects with key campus priorities and objectives (e.g. mental health, international student success, Indigenization)?

CONSIDER TAKING A WHOLE CAMPUS APPROACH.

- Are there pre-existing systems that you could build your program into, such as for-credit courses, co-curricular courses, etc.?
- What opportunities are there to ensure that conversations about involvement opportunities are happening in all aspects of our students' lives? For example, working with orientation teams to ensure content is included in things like pre-arrival programs or residence move-ins.

- Are there ways to promote programming at the beginning of lectures or other areas of a student's life? For example, online learning portals such as BrightSpace, Microsoft Teams, or CourseSpaces, among others.

Creating institutional systems that support campus initiatives and programs provides more engagement opportunities for everyone on campus. This can remove barriers for entry as well as increase the level of visibility that these programs have on campus. Building these systems also helps to support the longevity of programming due to the workload and investment being carried by many different stakeholders at the institution.

Programming

This section of the Framework will review various considerations when developing programming to engage men in conversations about sexualized and GBV prevention. What we know from research and consultations is that to engage men, this work must be done with that intention in mind. Sexualized and GBV programming that is designed for a broad audience may be successful but may not have the kind of impact on, or broad uptake by, men. It is therefore important to consider how to engage men specifically, from all aspects of program design and implementation. This section will provide you with some of the considerations for developing programming that will help engage men in conversations about GBV on your campus.

Learning Objectives

Before starting to plan your program, it is important to first consider what you want to accomplish and what you are hoping participants will take away (see Appendix B for a Sample Program Plan). These goals will help you develop learning objectives for your program. Ideally, your learning objectives are structured to consider what you would like the audience to achieve, how you will facilitate that learning through activities, and equally how you will assess the learning. This process of holistically designing an educational experience is known as "constructive alignment." This model of curriculum design was created to foster student success by ensuring that all educational initiatives match one another. In essence, the learning outcomes, activities and content are all working together to achieve your learning goals. This approach extends to staff and faculty who, as role models, have an important role to play in creating consistent standards and expectations of behaviour when it comes to sexualized and GBV.

As adult learners within a higher education environment, it is important to use a variety of skill-building activities in facilitation to encourage meaning-making and transformational change. Learning objectives can be achieved by taking into consideration the different learning styles of the participants, using experiential learning techniques such as role play and group activities, and acknowledging the lived experiences of GBV in the attendees' lives.

Finally, there are some important competencies you want to ensure your curriculum highlights:

THESE INCLUDE:

- **How your institution defines sexualized violence and, if it does, gender-based violence;**
- **What sexualized violence specifically, and GBV more broadly "look like" in PSI settings and beyond, in Canada, and globally;**
- **What is meant by "toxic" and "healthy" masculinities, and how these concepts link to gender equity;**
- **How your PSI defines consent and how consent is an essential element of all relationships, especially intimate ones;**
- **How sexualized violence and GBV intersects with other forms of oppression such as racism, ableism, homophobia and transphobia, among others issues to shape who is most impacted by GBV and how;**
- **What it means to be a prosocial bystander who works to interrupt or prevent sexualized and GBV; and**
    - **Where to go on your campus for support and resolution options and other information associated with your PSIs Sexualized Violence Prevention and Response Policies.**

Format (Program, Campaign, Initiative)

KEY CONSIDERATIONS:

LONGER-TERM PROGRAMMING VS. "ONE-OFF" EVENTS.

Essential questions underpinning the format of any sexualized and/or GBV prevention program include:

- What kind of impact do I hope to have? Would it be more effective to run a poster campaign, a one-time workshop, or a more time-intensive program or men's circle?

These decisions are closely linked to learning outcomes, as a campaign or one-time workshop may be sufficient to increase knowledge or awareness of GBV issues to some degree. If the goal is longer-term change in attitudes and/or behaviour, then a series of workshops or perhaps a men's group may be needed. As we learned during our consultations, the majority of PSIs are engaged in sexualized violence prevention programming that consists of one-off workshops or awareness-raising presentations. Many PSIs would like to develop more comprehensive, longer-term sexualized and GBV prevention education programs but are often limited by resources, especially staffing.

PROGRESSIVELY TAILORED GBV CONTENT VS. GENERIC MESSAGING.

With a longer-term approach to programming, PSIs can begin to think about how best to tailor content to reflect the evolution of both students' sexualized and GBV awareness and their life experiences. Prior to starting first year, many PSI students may have received little or no sexualized or GBV prevention education or training. Having left home, likely for the first time, they will suddenly have a great deal more freedom to both engage in and make choices about their personal lives, including their sexual and romantic interactions and relationships. Whereas first-years may need basic awareness-raising information at the outset, they may need more complex, scenario-based education that builds specific skills as their life experiences change. Programming aimed specifically at men may require deeper learning about topics related to gender inequality, gender norms and behaviours, and intersecting forms of oppression including sex, gender, sexual orientation, race, age, ability, and so on.

PROVIDING ACADEMIC OR CO-CURRICULAR CREDIT.

One promising practice that would facilitate a longer-term, sustained approach would be to incorporate GBV prevention education into the curriculum. Academic credit could be given for courses that incorporate this kind of material (e.g., in a Health Promotion or Gender Studies class). Another possibility would be to offer co-curricular credit for completing GBV prevention programming offered by the PSI. Both of these practices were mentioned

as having been successful at PSIs included in our consultations. Although the practice of providing academic or co-curricular credit could potentially help with participation and retention of participants, this practice would not necessarily mediate the lack of resources or institutional support that might limit more sustained GBV prevention programs.

CONSIDER GENDER-SPECIFIC GROUPINGS.

Another crucial decision with respect to GBV prevention programming is whether or not to have interventions be gender-segregated (i.e., all-male, all-female or safe(r) spaces for 2SLGBTQ+ students). A number of studies have recommended gender-segregated groups as being the most effective format for GBV prevention interventions, except where a Bystander approach is used.

> For example, all-male groups provide a "safe space" for men to engage in deeper learning about masculinity and how to disrupt harmful gender norms.

We heard from our consultants that men can potentially make problematic statements in these settings, which can be an opportunity to unpack and unlearn. It is important to ensure, however, that destructive gender and social norms are challenged in all-male groups in order to avoid potential "collusion" in terms of negative attitudes and beliefs. It is also extremely important to ensure that gender-segregated groups do not serve to alienate or exclude diverse gender identities, such as individuals who identify as non-binary, trans or gender-fluid. In these cases, it is recommended that a non-binary group be created/implemented if participants do not feel comfortable in one of the binary gender groups.

TRAUMA-INFORMED APPROACHES.

Another key feature of a sexualized or GBV prevention program related to diverse gender identities is that programming is rooted in trauma-informed understanding, which includes an anti-racist and anti-oppressive framework. As people who both facilitate and attend this programming have unique experiences of adversity in childhood and may have different cultural and socio-economic backgrounds, for instance, it is important to walk with participants on a journey to transformational learning that recognizes everyone's identity without judgement. Principles of trauma-informed practice in program development include recognizing the ways in which GBV hurts on an individual and systemic level, creates safety and accountability in the program space, discusses collaboration and relationship building, and grows trust between facilitators and attendees.

BYSTANDER, CONSENT, HEALTHY RELATIONSHIP FOCUS (PRIMARY PREVENTION AND ABILITY TO PRACTICE POSITIVE BEHAVIOURS).

The most popular approaches to sexualized and GBV prevention programming at the PSIs we consulted was not targeted specifically at men, but looked to attract a diverse audience to discuss topics that include: defining and understanding the social roots of sexualized violence, consent, healthy relationships, and prosocial bystander models. The Bystander Model is widely believed to be the most evidence-based due to its effectiveness in sexualized violence prevention vs. other approaches (although this may be because few other approaches have been rigorously peer-reviewed).

The Bystander Model relies heavily on social norms theory which can be especially influential when targeting PSI students — who tend to be highly focused on their peers' opinions of them — if it is used to challenge their beliefs regarding other people's judgements of their behaviour that might perpetuate GBV. The usefulness of a consent and healthy relationship program is, therefore, about recognizing harm when they see it and then disrupting that harm through action-focused bystander strategies. Content related to primary prevention, e.g., consent and healthy relationships, is essential in order to support participants in building positive skills that will lead to the prevention of GBV through attitude and behaviour change.

> Taken together, these strategies illustrate "what to do" rather than concentrating solely on negative messages of "what not to do" and thereby provide a roadmap for positive behaviour change.

Students who have not had access to sexual health information during adolescence are often interested in sex-positive programming that helps them to explore healthy dating and sexuality, as well as Sexually Transmitted and Blood Borne Infections (such as HIV) prevention; this type of introduction programming can 'get men in the door' to more deeply engage in the topics.

RESPONSIBLE ALCOHOL USE.

Primary prevention programming also influences sexualized violence prevention programs due to the strong connection between alcohol use and sexualized violence. Alcohol use by students at PSIs is both highly prevalent and often highly problematic. Statistics consistently show that alcohol consumption can increase the incidence of GBV. Alcohol impairs judgement, reduces inhibitions and makes reciprocal communication and understanding of consent much more problematic. Conversations about the impact of alcohol on judgement and the fact that consent can legally be deemed not to exist where the survivor was incapacitated are a necessity when addressing male audiences at PSIs about GBV prevention. Bystander approaches are especially helpful in

showing men how to intervene when they believe that a friend, regardless of gender, who has been drinking is going to get into a potentially risky intimate situation. Although some feedback from men during programming will focus on 'how to avoid getting charged with sexual assault,' well-prepared facilitators are able to redirect the learning to the benefits of healthy consent and relationships.

POSITIVE VS. NEGATIVE MESSAGING.

When considering an engagement approach, "blaming and shaming" approaches or models of sexualized and GBV prevention programming are generally perceived to be ineffective and self-defeating when attempting to engage male audiences. Instead, men are much more likely to respond to messaging that appeals to their sense of community and agency to prevent GBV through their actions, as is the case for Prosocial Bystander programming. When combined with social norms theory, a positive approach can highlight the fact that both they and the majority of their peers want to avoid and reduce GBV rather than perpetrating violence. Providing useful skills, as well as examples of how to intervene and act in ways that reduce GBV, can empower men to act as intentional allies vs. unconscious enablers. Many of the PSIs contacted for the environmental scan highlighted the need to avoid negative messaging in order to engage men, often in the form of structured conversations with peers and role models.

ON-CAMPUS RESOURCES AND POLICIES.

Regardless of focus or approach, it is crucial that information on resources and services that provide support for survivors as well as perpetrators of harm, as well as references to the institution's Sexualized Violence Prevention and Response policy and guidance are discussed. Without this information, those who witness or have disclosed incidents of sexualized and GBV will not be able to refer survivors and/or respondents to appropriate services and supports, and worse, may feel unable to help or support someone. In some cases, a person who has caused harm may also identify as a survivor of sexualized violence. Along these lines, it is important that as many members of the PSI community as possible be trained in how to respond to disclosures of sexualized violence. There is no way of knowing to whom a survivor or a respondent will turn when they choose to disclose an incident. Therefore, it is essential to provide basic skills to as many people on campus as possible. This importantly includes staff and faculty who play a key role in ensuring students access the supports and options available to them.

Mandatory vs Voluntary

In looking at program delivery, our scope is often very wide. Some PSIs had mandatory programming, for instance, with athletic teams or first-year students, and some had voluntary programs for co-curricular credit. Some programs are designed as a train-the-trainer option (staff and student peers) to facilitate conversations on sexualized and GBV, while others may look like a program regarding consent education. Equally, as much as the level of content varies, so does the audience.

Although mandating programming can be effective to share policy highlights for student conduct, it is difficult to create participant engagement unless there is some "readiness" for transformational social justice learning. When creating mandated programming that addresses sexualized and GBV, it can be helpful to build champions from within staff, faculty and student leadership, such as team captains. When looking at mandatory participation, it is recommended that participants only be mandated under the following circumstances:

- If the participant is filling a position that could lead to them receiving disclosures, such as student association leaders and student housing staff. This also importantly includes those staff and faculty that work in any kind of support capacity. For example, undergraduate or graduate advisors, accessibility or language centres, Indigenous or cultural support centres, among others.
- If the participant is filling a position that would put them in a position to educate students, staff or faculty on GBV, such as mental health peer supporters.
- If the participant has been mandated to receive psychoeducation based on student conduct or sanctions.

When looking at program involvement, our consultants advised that voluntary involvement is most impactful. Recognizing some positions on campus will require a heightened level of understanding about GBV, it is often that PSIs have chosen to mandate training for specific staff and student roles where this is applicable.

Additionally, when creating programs to engage men around conversations surrounding GBV, it is important to have a group of people who are committed to addressing GBV, the subject matter and who are invested in the program. Generally, it is better to have fewer people attend the program, but have higher engagement than have large quantities of people in attendance who are not engaged in the content.

Facilitation

KEY CONSIDERATIONS:

KNOWLEDGE BASE

Designing discussions about healthy masculinity and GBV takes a nuanced and skilled understanding of intersectional feminist theory, allyship with the 2SLGBTQ+ community, GBV bystander intervention, sex and gender analysis, and social justice. In order to facilitate workshops addressing these topics, facilitators will ideally have an in-depth understanding of these issues. If working intensely with a group of participants, it may also be necessary for the facilitator to have knowledge of trauma and trauma-informed care. Many strong facilitators are able to apply the knowledge to real-life examples that speak to participants.

SKILLS

Many times, it is assumed that if facilitators possess the knowledge related to and underpinning sexualized and GBV prevention that they will automatically be effective facilitators. However, it is clear that being knowledgeable in a particular area doesn't necessarily equate to being an expert at facilitating group dynamics and group discussion.

> The literature is surprisingly silent regarding what skills an effective GBV prevention education facilitator should possess as well as the type of training that is necessary to build the requisite skills.

Most resources consulted merely stated that successful GBV prevention interventions required "well-trained facilitators." Clearly, facilitators must possess the skills needed to manage groups effectively, understand group dynamics, navigate and respond to difficult discussions, de-escalate possible tensions, and effectively handle problematic statements while keeping their audience engaged. Ideally, they will also be trauma-informed in their approach so as to appreciate the potential for secondary trauma during discussions. In addition, facilitators should anticipate and practice, in advance, how to address rape myths and other cultural biases and stereotypes around sexualized and GBV that might come up during workshops.

GENDER (AND GENDER IDENTITY)

When engaging men in GBV prevention programming, it is important to remember that male facilitators may be better positioned to create psychologically safe spaces for men to express themselves. Additionally, a key

element of this type of programming often involves addressing masculine culture through lived experience. Young men, in particular, show a strong propensity to engage more readily with male peers and opinion leaders when it comes to GBV prevention. As we know, however, the majority of those working in GBV are not necessarily men or male-identified persons. Further, it can also be helpful to have a female or member of the 2SLGBTQ+ community as co-facilitator to speak to the impact of GBV. Ideally, facilitators should reflect the audience in terms of gender identity, as well as potentially other characteristics, such as ethnicity, culture, etc. As previously stated, these considerations should be balanced with the desire to ensure that gender and other social norms are challenged during sessions and that the overall diversity of the community is represented by those leading the discussion.

PROFESSIONAL FACILITATORS

It quickly becomes apparent upon reflection that expectations of "ideal" sexualized and GBV prevention education facilitators can be difficult to meet given the often limited resources of most PSIs. In our consultations, we often heard from PSIs who had engaged outside GBV experts and/or collaborated with external GBV community organizations in order to benefit from their expertise in GBV prevention and response programming. These types of relationships might also provide access to professional facilitators who are both experts on the subject of GBV and skilled in terms of group facilitation due to their practical experience. These colleagues can often also support trauma counselling requests coming out of the program and provide debriefing for peer facilitators.

PEER FACILITATORS

As previously stated, peers can be effective in modelling positive behaviour, challenging social norms and are highly relatable for a student audience. Peer facilitators of GBV prevention education are common at many PSIs for these reasons.

> Peer leadership does not only include males speaking to males and younger adults speaking to younger adults, but can also include peers who represent specific cultural, ethnic or identity-based groups.

As GBV prevention is such a complex topic, students already engaged in these issues through programs such as Indigenous studies, education, social work and psychology, gender studies and some criminal justice programs will have foundational knowledge that can support stronger facilitation skills. Train-the-trainer programs are popular and can assist in building peer educators; however, not all those who participate in the program will be suited to then deliver the program to others. An interesting possibility suggested by one

consultant was to have peer coaches and mentors outside of GBV prevention education interventions who would support and enhance that programming. In addition, monthly peer-led meet-ups to review and discuss the learning can grow community connection and peer support.

TWO OR MORE FACILITATORS

Some of our consultants suggested that having multiple facilitators, typically co-facilitators, is most effective. For example, someone who was particularly expert in the theory and knowledge related to GBV prevention content could be paired with someone who has more experience in group facilitation and/or who may be better able to build rapport with a specific participant group. Similarly, a male or male-identified facilitator could be paired with a co-facilitator with a different gender identity in order to better challenge gender-based stereotypes and/or provide an alternate perspective on GBV issues.

Collaboration for Greater Impact

Staffing Challenges

One of the many challenges facing GBV prevention programs is the lack of resources, including issues related to staffing. Resources for sexualized and GBV prevention are strongly tied to senior leadership support. It is often the case at PSIs across Canada that one individual, small department or team is solely responsible not only for sexualized and GBV prevention education and training, but also for GBV response and support for the entire institution. This makes it all the more crucial that those doing GBV work at PSIs utilize partnerships, including internal allies and external collaborators, as well as student groups and individual students to provide access to both personnel and other important resources. Below we outline some key considerations for doing this work effectively and with minimal burn-out for those doing the work.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS:

RESOURCING IS DIRECTLY LINKED TO SENIOR LEADERSHIP SUPPORT/ENGAGEMENT

It is clear, based on the experiences of the PSIs in our environmental scan, as well as our own lived experience with GBV prevention, that this work is neither prioritized nor resourced in proportion to its importance either by government or our own organizations. The only way to ensure that GBV prevention is accorded institutional priority and resourced in a substantive, formal and ongoing manner is via PSI senior leadership. They are the ones who set the budgets and allocate resources across the organization. A common theme among PSIs is that their senior leaders are publicly supportive of GBV prevention programming but that far too often, this support amounts to "lip service" when it comes to actually providing the resources needed for staffing and programs. Engaging senior leaders in GBV prevention is essential and depends not only on the relationship-building skills of those doing the work, but on their ability to harness the momentum created by external catalysts like the #MeToo and #TimesUp movements or the release of new surveys or GBV-related legislation into a longer-term commitment to GBV prevention.

ONE INDIVIDUAL OR TEAM IS RESPONSIBLE FOR SEXUALIZED AND GBV WORK

At many PSIs, all responsibilities related to GBV prevention and response are concentrated in a single position or office. In far too many cases, there may not even be a dedicated position or office. Instead, individuals may be tasked with this work as a secondary duty or responsibility because they have expressed an

interest in and a commitment to the work. Too often, when individuals who were responsible for GBV programming left an organization, the programs that they had initiated fell apart or were discontinued. Even where dedicated positions exist, they may be dependent on grants, and if funding is cut, positions are cut. It is clear that GBV prevention is a complex issue that requires a comprehensive and multi-level response. Everyone within the PSI community can be a part of the response to GBV, from student volunteers to involved and committed staff allies, and from faculty who incorporate GBV prevention content into their courses to senior leaders who champion the work. Fundamentally, however, the true commitment that a PSI makes to GBV prevention is reflected in whether or not they establish permanent positions, offices and programs for this important work.

STUDENT PARTNERSHIP

Students are a great resource and important allies, although there does tend to be high turnover. Having students involved in programming is key for peer dissemination and cultural shifting. They are also an important renewable resource of peer facilitators and program support that can serve to bolster the resources of full-time GBV staff. Unfortunately, depending on the length of their program at a particular PSI, students may be on their way to graduation just as they have accumulated the training and experience to be successful facilitators. Further, if certain programs are initiated and supported by particular students or student groups, there may be a lack of continuity as students graduate, especially where programming is dependent on students with specific interests or skills. Clearly, students are both valuable and integral to GBV prevention work at PSIs.

> The key is to manage the high turnover of students by providing continuous training of new student leaders, ideally built into overall curriculum design, who understand that they are stewards of programs who must ensure that they pass on their experience and learning to new incoming leaders.

Working committees that include student leaders, housing staff, security staff, student rights and responsibilities staff, counselling services, and the person who is responsible for the sexual violence policy will also help to keep the history and intentionality of this work alive during student body turnover.

COLLABORATION WITH OUTSIDE OR EXTERNAL AGENCIES

Engaging men on campus is a collaborative process in and of itself in terms of curriculum and program design, as well as inspiring peer learning, requiring the involvement of as many people as possible at all levels of the organization. In

addition to student support, another way to creatively draw on supplementary resources for GBV prevention programming is to collaborate with outside campus agencies, such as sexual assault centres and other gender-based violence prevention organizations. These partners will often provide expert training and support at little or no cost. They also provide a wealth of experience in sexualized and GBV prevention and are able to bring both a different and a broader perspective to the PSI's programs. By collaborating with outside partners, the PSI community is connected to the wider community, which underscores the fact that GBV is a community-based issue that implicates and affects everyone.

TAKING ADVANTAGE OF INTERNAL ALLIES/RELATIONSHIPS

As we have indicated, GBV prevention work requires a multi-level, community and comprehensive approach. It is a given that internal partnerships with staff and faculty at all levels are integral to success. Staff involvement is inextricably tied to financial and structural resourcing and is highly dependent on senior administrative leadership, buy-in and overall championing. These collaborations and relationships can be especially important in terms of augmenting the resources that can be provided by a limited number of full-time, permanent GBV staff. Many staff and faculty allies not only bring valuable knowledge and experience to this work but can also act as opinion leaders and mentors to those in the PSI community. For example, coaches of athletic teams and faculty members — particularly in male-dominated fields or programs — can play an essential role in engaging men in GBV prevention outside of formal interventions.

Content Development & Review

Developing content for a GBV program can be a daunting task as there are many different factors to consider when creating content for a new program. Depending on the length of your program, this can take significant time. Recognizing the various resources that some PSIs have, we recognize that some institutions may choose to develop their own content while other institutions may look to purchase a pre-made module or program. This section will walk through some of the considerations that can be made when choosing to develop or purchase content.

If your PSI is choosing to purchase or create content, some things that you will first need to consider are as follows:

- Who are some of the stakeholders that you would like to be involved in the project? How can you bring their voices into conversations surrounding sourcing or creating GBV related content for your campus?
- What are the needs of your campus regarding GBV or prevention education? What programming or education is currently being offered? What gaps need to be filled?
- What is the ideal method of delivery for the population that you are looking to engage on your campus? Are you looking for an intensive and long-term program, or are you looking more at shorter, workshop-based training?

Identifying stakeholder involvement is an important first step to take throughout this process. If you are developing or purchasing content, you will want to ensure that it meets the needs of the PSI community. Stakeholders will be able to help you identify this as well as provide valuable insight on different considerations you may need to take along the way in order to meet your strategic needs or to better align with campus policies, practices or pre-existing initiatives. Involve stakeholders with academic expertise and practical experience.

Content Development

Creating content for your own campus program is a significant task, but it can be quite a rewarding process. In designing content for your own program, there are several factors that you will need to consider in your development. A non-exhaustive list of some of the considerations that you will need to take is below. However, we also recommend reviewing the sample project plan outlined in Appendix B:

- **What is the overall purpose of your program, what are you trying to accomplish by facilitating this content?**
- **What type of content are you looking to cover in this program or initiative? Cultures of consent, healthy masculinity, upstander training, referrals information, etc.**
- **What format will best allow you to be able to facilitate that content to your audience? Lecture style, workshop, online module, interactive program, etc.**
- **What partners should you involve in the creation? GBV community supports, wellness and health services, academics, peer educators, etc.**
- **Where will this initiative be based out of and is there any funding that can be allocated towards it?**
- **Who will help to support the facilitation of this program? Professional staff, off-campus partners, student peers, etc.**
- **How can this program be built into pre-existing structures within your PSI in order to ensure its longevity and success?**

Content Purchase

When purchasing content, there are many different options. You could purchase content for one-time program delivery, or you could also look to purchase the rights to use certain programs or modules for an extended period of time. You will want to consider how the content is gender- and trans-inclusive, as well as if it was built for youth learning, to ensure you are meeting your programming goals. Luckily there are lots of different options to help meet the needs of your campus. Below we have listed a few different resources that you can refer to when looking into purchasing content for your institution:

- **Cultures of Respect**, an initiative launched by NASPA. Cultures of Respect is an initiative that strives to end Sexualized Violence on campus. In doing this work, Cultures of Respect has pooled together a variety of different programming that is offered on GBV prevention and education. **NextGenMen** is an Ontario-based healthy masculinities program that has a Cards for Masculinity kit that can be purchased as a facilitation tool. Internationally, **Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP)** Strategies, created by Dr. Jackson Katz, is a well-known bystander program.

- Programs such as **Young Men Leading Change** with iCanManifestChange in Ottawa connect with the intersection of gender-based violence and racism. **OHL Onside** and **BC Lions More Than A Bystander** addresses gender-based violence and sports culture. Other general awareness programs include resources from the **White Ribbon Campaign** and the **Moose Hide Campaign**.

Marketing & Advertising

Marketing and advertising are integral parts of the program planning process. Building a comprehensive strategy to market your sexualized and GBV programming on campus will play a large role in how your program is received and the number of participants you have. You will need to understand early the internal PSI communication partners, including the PSI Communications Office and Student Association Communications team. This section provides some key considerations for promoting your programming.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS:

- **Who are your primary and secondary target audiences? This will determine how and where you try to reach them.**
- **What do you want the look and feel of your marketing and advertising strategy to be? Provocative and attention-grabbing? Accessible and friendly? Fun and playful? Institutional? Or something else altogether?**
- **Ensure that you are accurately representing the program. Bait and switch strategies that promise one thing, and deliver another, do not tend to lead to invested participants.**
- **Student projects in marketing and advertising programs can also be a good source of branding, with student input and course credit.**
- **Be clear in your advertising on where people can go to register or get more information. The harder to find the information, the lower the participation is likely to be.**
- **How will you engage staff and faculty, whether through departmental leadership or union alignment?**
- **Are you creating new promotion channels (i.e. through social media), or will the program be a partnership with departments and associations?**

Things to consider when looking at targeted advertising for specific PSI clubs, groups or associations:

- What are you trying to achieve in your targeted advertisements? Are you trying to engage a group of people to be facilitators for the content, or are you trying to engage a specific group of faculty, staff or students at your PSI to attend this programming?

- Are there groups on your campus that are involved in similar work and may want to participate in your programming?

- Who is the voice of your advertising? What platforms are you using to reach your audience?

Program Evaluation, Assessment, Review

This section will explore some of the strategic benefits that come along with building out an assessment and evaluation strategy with your program. As mentioned earlier in this Framework, assessment and program evaluation, if done properly, can provide you with some important information about how your work is being perceived and what gaps may still exist. Equally, some of this data can also be used to show the reach, results or outcomes of your program or efforts in order to help sustain the initiative for a longer period of time.

Thinking about program evaluation and assessment early on in your project can ensure you are able to meet all of your assessment needs. In order for your assessment to answer some of the questions that you have, or be used for specific purposes, you will need to spend time early on thinking about what your assessment should look like. Some key considerations that you may choose to look at in your assessment design are as follows:

- How can you build evaluation and assessment into the beginning conversations of your program design? What facilitated activities will you use in your program? Do these activities match the outcomes that you are hoping to achieve? What are innovative, creative, and engaging ways to gather feedback from participants?

- What information are you looking to gather, and how will this information be used moving forward? Are you looking to count the number of people you are reaching to measure how widely your message is spreading, gather testimonials for further promotion, or are you looking for data on learning outcomes, participant satisfaction, etc.? Depending on the question you have, your methods for collection will change significantly.

- Is there a way to incorporate trauma-informed or survivor-centric evaluation practices into your assessment? Is your assessment accessible?

Consider how your evaluation design reflects the overall sensitivities in your programming. Evaluation strategies need to echo and reflect the same level of care with respect to being trauma-informed and survivor-centred. Evaluation can be an area where sensitivity to the participants is not well done. Because evaluation designs are not often considered at the time of program development, sometimes important sensitivities can be overlooked. For example, it can happen that a participant receives a post programming survey that asks about GBSV in a triggering or upsetting manner because the people designing the evaluation are not in sync with the people developing the programming.

Qualitative & Quantitative Evaluation

When thinking about assessment, one thing that you will want to consider early on is what type of assessment you would like to collect. Are you looking for your assessment to be largely qualitative or quantitative? Each of these methods can provide you with slightly different information. For example:

Qualitative evaluations look to gather information that can be easily translated into numbers. These types of evaluations are used to compare things to one another, typically use a numbered scale and may look to evaluate something like a person's understanding of consent both before entering the program and after leaving. That way, evaluators are able to draw a comparison of the knowledge gained through the program by seeing an understanding of subject matter articulated through a five-point scale.

Qualitative evaluations, on the other hand, look to dig a bit deeper into things that cannot be measured by a number. These types of evaluations will often look at the participant to reflect on their understanding of a subject or their experience in order for the facilitator to gain more insight into some of the larger takeaways from the program. To give an example, instead of asking about the participant's understanding of consent, a quantitative question may instead ask the participant to reflect on what their most important takeaway from this program was.

An important thing to consider when choosing your method of evaluation is that they both had different strengths and weaknesses associated with them. With that being said, they can both be used together in order to paint a more clear picture and to be able to tell more of a story of the experiences and learning that was associated with your programming. When looking at different forms of assessment, don't be afraid to use both qualitative and quantitative methods. It can often provide you with a more clear picture of what is going on.

Alternatives to Traditional Evaluations

Programming designed to engage men on campus can be quite challenging to evaluate. Evaluation of these programs should be constructed as part of the development process. This would fall in line with the goals and outcomes of the program and the respective needs of the PSI. As noted in the previous sections, both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods can be quite effective in understanding the experiences of participants, facilitators, and other campus members. This is a very traditional approach to program evaluation or outcome evaluation.

There are other evaluative methods that might be considered by PSIs that may not be captured by the more traditional research methods (pre/post evaluations, session evaluations, focus groups, etc.). Organizations like the Canadian Association of College and University Student Services offer different assessment options. Often, programs that are designed to engage men within the PSI environment have an impact or outcome that was perhaps not foreseen or anticipated by programming staff. In this case, capturing this kind of information can be quite valuable when attempting to articulate the importance of such programming. This section highlights a couple of examples of ways of thinking about non-traditional evaluative aspects related to engaging men on campus programming.

Relationships

Programming designed to engage men on campus is inherently about relationships. The hope is that young men are learning ways to be better within their relationships. Running programming to engage men on campus is also about relationships. Usually, one department is tasked with the goal of creating and implementing programming. In order to be successful, this department must create relationships with other PSI departments in an effort to reach as many men as possible. Over time, those tasked with facilitating programming to engage men on campus will build a network of relationships that will enhance the delivery of the programs. One way to consider this from an evaluation perspective is to consider the number of relationships that are built as part of the process of delivering programming on campus. Tracking the number of new contacts, allies or male faculty members that become involved with the programming on an annual basis is an excellent way to describe the reach of the programming, or how embedded the programming is at a particular PSI. The same can be said for off-campus relationships. Many PSI's who have engaging men programs may also build relationships with services off campus. Tracking these kinds of relationships is an excellent way to measure PSI and community-based relationships. PSIs are encouraged to think of building programs to engage men as creating a network of allies who can support the work both on and off campus.

360 Evaluations

While not dissimilar to other methods of evaluation, there is merit to consider the use of 360 evaluations to understand the impact or importance of engaging men programming at individual PSI's. 360 evaluations are traditionally used within the private sector to evaluate specific aspects of performance within organizations. In these evaluation methods, feedback is sought from all corners of the organization regarding the performance of one aspect of the organization. In the case of engaging men programming, it is useful to think about it as part of the overall work that is being done to address GBV at PSIs. Therefore, inherent in this model is that other parts of the PSI community have 'a stake' in the work being done by the engaging men programming team.

A 360 evaluation seeks feedback and input from all stakeholders at individual PSI's. This is an excellent opportunity to consider if the programming is meeting the needs of the PSI stakeholders, and the community at large. An evaluation such as this takes time and requires experienced facilitators who can deliver information to the programming team. Facilitators or evaluators from outside the PSI are best suited as they are not likely to be biased by the information.

A 360 evaluation can be used to improve programming and to ensure that the work of engaging men is located within the most appropriate departments at the PSI. It also builds in a sense of accountability for those conducting the work. It may also result in an ongoing commitment from the PSI as the programming is perceived as part of a larger movement toward improving the student experience.

Empowerment Evaluation

Frequently, evaluation is carried out by a third party who is separate from the programming. This can create an effect where the evaluation is perceived as top-down. With an empowerment evaluation approach, the people developing the programs decide the best way to evaluate their work. If the people doing the work are invested in evaluating their own strategies, they will be more likely to look to those results, whatever they indicate, as reliable and useful and may be more willing to act on the findings and recommendations.

Arts-Based Evaluation

Arts-based evaluation is an alternative and accessible approach. There are many ways to engage program participants using art (e.g., collage, photography) to reflect on the impact and outcomes of programs. At its best, this approach can translate complex responses to programming and help contextualize participants' experiences, and foster new ideas about program outcomes.

Situations in which this might be especially useful:

- As a "non-threatening" way to foster conversations and share insights and experiences on topics that are currently emotionally fraught and where there is a legacy of trauma and alienation
- When collaborating with and across survivor, student, faculty and administrative divides
- When participants may struggle with communication or literacy

Evaluation vs Research

Research and evaluation can have similar strategies and methodologies, but it is important to be aware of the differences and the ways that they may overlap. A robust evaluation strategy can evolve into an activity that needs to be cleared by your research ethics board. It is wise to consult with the ethics board of your PSI.

Leveraging Your Data

When leveraged properly, assessment data can be very formative. It can help you to make improvements to your program, share successes, show learning, and justify the need of the program. In order to be able to pull some of this information, we have included some considerations for you to take into account when reviewing your assessment data:

- How are you able to measure any form of program 'success' from your assessment? Are you looking to show the percentage of participants whose content knowledge has increased through this session? Are you looking to ask bench-marking questions that other similar programs or institutions may ask?
- Have you built in opportunities to identify gaps that you have within your program? Was there content that participants are not picking up on? Are there common questions that the participants left the program with?
- Is this program part of a strategic mandate on your campus? How can you ensure that you are pulling information that could speak to if this program is meeting the goals of that mandate?
- Overall, what are your large takeaways from this program? How does it serve the needs on your campus? What further work should be done? What further resources do you need to continue this work or to improve your impacts and reach?

Final Thoughts

In this document, we have summarized the key considerations for PSIs looking to engage men in the prevention of sexualized and gender-based violence. While our original intention was to establish a set of best practices that PSIs could use to inform their programming in this area, we learned that this is still an emerging field with few tried and true best practices. Our environmental and literature reviews indicate that this work will look differently depending on the PSI size, context, resources, stakeholders, political culture, etc. Although programming will be varied in approach, we can still ground our initiatives in the careful consideration of key factors that, taken together, can inform efforts to engage men in sexualized and gender-based violence prevention. We hope that we have outlined the important foundational pieces that individual PSIs will explore and carefully consider when assembling their own unique programming structure. The strategies described here are intended as a starting point for each PSI to iteratively and thoughtfully approach this work.

We must continue to share our successes and failures in this area so that we can build toward a more well-established set of promising practices and fill the gaps that exist with respect to empirically tested approaches. Part of this process will involve spending more time on careful, deliberate planning and relationship-building work designed to secure the resources and support necessary for successful, comprehensive and longer-term programming. It will also require more time on formal evaluation and assessment of initiatives so that we can learn from our experience and, hopefully, communicate this learning to others for all of our benefit.

References

Benoit, C., Shumka, L., Phillips, R., Kennedy, M.C., & Belle-Isle, L. (2015). *Issue Brief: Sexualized Violence Against Women in Canada*. Federal-Provincial-Territorial Senior Officials for Status of Women Canada. https://cfc-swc.gc.ca/svawc-vcsfc/issue-brief-en.pdf

Biggs, J. (2014). *Aligning teaching for constructing learning*. The Higher Education Academy. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/John-Biggs-3/publication/255583992_Aligning_Teaching_for_Constructing_Learning/links/5406ffe70cf2bba34c1e8153/Aligning-Teaching-for-Constructing-Learning.pdf

Canadian Mental Health Association Ontario. (2020). *Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans & queer identified people and mental health*. https://ontario.cmha.ca/documents/lesbian-gay-bisexual-trans-queer-identified-people-and-mental-health/

Conroy, S., & Cotter, A. (2017). *Self-reported sexual assault in Canada, 2014*. Statistics Canada. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2017001/article/14842-eng.pdf

Cotter, A, & Savage, L. (2019). *Gender-based violence and unwanted sexual behaviour in Canada, 2018: Initial findings from the survey of safety in public and private spaces*. Statistics Canada. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/catalogue/85-002-X201900100017

SADV Treatment Centres. (2020). *Supporting transpersons experiencing violence*. https://www.sadvtreatmentcentres.ca/assets/resource_library/public/Supporting%20Trans%20Persons%20Experiencing%20Violence.png

Recommended Reading List

Allen, C., Carlson, J., Casey, E., Tolman, R., & Leek, C. (2019). Examining Men's Perceptions of GBV Prevention Programming Content. *Violence Against Women, 25*(5), 614–632.

Berkowitz, A., Burkhart, B. & Bourg, S. (1994, Spring). Research on College Men and Rape. New Directions for Student Services, 65, 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1002/ss.37119946503

Brush, L., & Miller E. (2019). Trouble in Paradigm: "Gender Transformative" Programming in Violence Prevention. *Violence Against Women 25*(14), 1635–1656.

Carlson, J., Leek, C., Casey, E., Tolman, R., & Allen, C. (2019). What's in a Name? A Synthesis of "Allyship" Elements from Academic and Activist Literature. *Journal of Family Violence 35*(2), 1–10. http://search.proquest.com/docview/2267279248/

Carmody, M., Evans, S., Krogh, C., Flood, M., Heenan, M., & Ovenden, G. (2009). *Framing best practice: National Standards for the primary prevention of sexual assault through education*. National Association of Services Against Sexual Violence, University of Western Sydney.

Casey, E., Allen, C., Tolman, R., Carlson, J. & Leek, C. Walking the Walk or Just Talk?: A Global Examination of Men's Intentions to Take Violence Preventative Action. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma 28*(9), 1038–1056. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10926771.2018.1446480

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2014). Preventing sexual violence on college campuses: Lessons from research and practice. https://www.notalone.gov/schools/

Clear, E. & DeGue, S. (2016). Multi-College Bystander Intervention Evaluation for Violence Prevention. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine 50*(3), 295–302.

Coker, A.L., Davidov, D., Bush, H. & Clear, E. (2020). Mentoring Multi-College Bystander Efficacy Evaluation – an Approach to Growing the Next Generation of Gender-Based Interpersonal Violence Intervention and Prevention (VIP) Researchers. *Journal of Family Violence 35*(4), 575–587.

Coker, A.L., Bush, H. M., Fisher, B.S., Swan, S.C., Williams, C.M., Dills, J., Fowler, D., & Payne, G. (2016). *Sexual Violence on Campus: Strategies for Prevention*. National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Edwards, K., Shea, H. & Barboza Barela, A.R. (2018). *Comprehensive Sexual Violence Prevention Education*. New Directions for Student Services, 161, 47-58.

Exner-Cortens, D., & Nina Cummings, N. (2017). Bystander-Based Sexual Violence Prevention With College Athletes: A Pilot Randomized Trial. *Journal of interpersonal violence 36*(1-2), NP188-NP211. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0886260517733279

Haskell, L. (2011). *Key Best Practices for Effective Sexual Violence Public Education Campaigns: A summary*. Ontario Women's Directorate.

Hibberd, A. (2018). Sexual Violence at Canadian Universities: Activism, Institutional Responses, and Strategies for Change. *Canadian Journal of Sociology 43*(2), 219-221. https://libproxy.wlu.ca/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.wlu.ca/docview/2083617994?accountid=15090

Jaffray, B. (2010). *Experiences of violent victimization and unwanted sexual behaviours among gay, lesbian, bisexual and other sexual minority people, and the transgender population, in Canada, 2018*. Statistics Canada. https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2020001/article/00009-eng.htm

Jaime, M.C.D., McCauley, H.L., Tancredi, D.J., Nettiksimmons, J., Decker, M.R., Silverman, J.G., O'Connor, B., Stetkevich, N., & Miller, E. (2015). Athletic coaches as violence prevention advocates. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(7), 1090–1111.

Johnson, H. & MacKay, J. (2011). *Building prevention: Sexual violence, youth, and drinking*. Crime Prevention Ottawa.

Kafonek, K, & Richards, T. (2017). An Examination of Strategies for the Prevention of Gender-Based Violence at Four-Year Institutions of Higher Education. *Journal of School Violence: Any Safer in the Ivory Tower? An Examination of Contemporary Policies and Practices Aimed at Sexual Violence on Campus, 16*(3), 271–285. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15388220.2017.1318576

Khan, F., Rowe, C.J., & Bidgood, R. (2019). *Courage to Act: Developing a National Framework to Address and Prevent Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions in Canada*. Possibility Seeds. https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5d482d9fd8b74f0001c02192/t/5ff87e2cd88d0c4f5730cca1/1610120778285/EN_Courage+to+Act+Report.pdf

Kroshus, E., Paskus, T., & Bell, L. (2018). Coach Expectations About Off-Field Conduct and Bystander Intervention by U.S. College Football Players to Prevent Inappropriate Sexual Behavior. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 33*(2), 293–315.

Legislative Assembly of Ontario. (2015). Select Committee on Sexual Violence and Harassment (41st Parliament, 1st Session). [Interim Report]. https://www.ola.org/sites/default/files/node-files/committee/report/pdf/2015/2015-12/report-1-EN-SCSVH%20Final%20Report%20English.pdf

Minerson, T., Carolo, H., Dinner, T., Jones, C. (2011). *Issue Brief: Engaging Men and Boys to Reduce and Prevent Gender-Based Violence. Status of Women Canada*. https://www.whiteribbon.ca/uploads/1/1/3/2/113222347/wrc_swc_issuebrief.pdf

Peacock, D., & Barker, G. (2014). Working with Men and Boys to Prevent Gender-Based Violence: Principles, Lessons Learned, and Ways Forward. *Men and Masculinities, 17*(5) 578–599. http://search.proquest.com/docview/1700674225/

Sharoni, S., Klocke, B., Lewis, R., & Marine, S.B. (2019). Faculty Confronting Gender-Based Violence on Campus: Opportunities and Challenges. *Violence Against Women 25*(11), 1352–1369.

Storer, H., Casey, E., Carlson, J., Edleson, J., & Tolman, R. (2016). Primary Prevention Is? A Global Perspective on How Organizations Engaging Men in Preventing Gender-Based Violence Conceptualize and Operationalize Their Work. *Violence Against Women, 22*(2), 249–268.

Tolman, R., Casey, E.A., Allen, C.T., Calrson, J., Leek, C., & Storer, H.L. (2019). A Global Exploratory Analysis of Men Participating in Gender-Based Violence Prevention. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 34*(16), 3438–3465.

Women and Gender Equality Canada. (2019). *Calling Men and Boys In - What We Heard: Report from the Roundtables on Engaging Men and Boys to Advance Gender Equality*. Status of Women Canada. https://cfc-swc.gc.ca/abu-ans/wwad-cqnf/men-boys-hommes-garcons/Men_Boys.pdf

Appendix A - Interview Guide for Consultations

Engaging Men/Masculinities Programming Consultation Guide for CoP

GUIDING QUESTIONS:

- Can you tell us a bit about the initiatives and/or programs that you (your group/unit) offer that directly or indirectly engage men in gender-based violence prevention (GBVP)? Do you partner with anyone in this work? What does that partnership look like?
- What was the most surprising or unanticipated thing that happened while putting this initiative/program together? What campus resource, department, or individual helped you the most, and how?
- Are there other types of programming offered within your community or at your institution that are similarly engaging men in GBVP? Are these ongoing opportunities or one-offs? For example, credit courses, co-curricular programs, clubs, pop up discussions at events, etc.
- Is the programming you offer or that your institution offers voluntary or mandatory? What are your thoughts on which is most effective when engaging men in GBVP?
- What are the expectations for men who enroll or engage in this kind of programming? Are there follow up opportunities for these men?
- What kinds of program formats have you tried to engage men in GBVP (e.g., campaigns, one-time workshops, training series, immersive semi-structured learning, and/or unstructured support groups)? Which do you feel are the most valuable and/or promising for engaging men? Have your ideas changed over time?
- How would you recommend promoting and recruiting men into this type of programming? Do you have advice on practices to avoid?
- In your experience, what components/approaches are key to maximizing the effectiveness of programming aimed at this issue? Have your expectations about what is effective changed over time and with experience?

- What kind of program assessment have you done? Do you have any recommendations on how to best measure outcomes & successes? What does success in engaging men in programming look like from your perspective?

- What has been the role of senior administration in supporting the engagement of men on campus? Has there been funding and staffing provided for these projects? What, in general, has institutional support looked like for engaging men?

- Do you feel that male staff and faculty are engaged on this issue? Why or why not? Is this important from your perspective? What would positive engagement from them look like from your perspective?

- Are there specific parts of the student body and/or the university campus that have been more actively engaged in programming aimed at men than others? For example, student club and/or course unions, athletic teams, specific faculties or departments? Do you have a way of determining this?

- If you could recommend three things to another university/college that are just starting a program, what would you say?

Appendix B - Engaging Men Project Plan Outline

[Tentative Program Title - Creatively name your project to appeal to men]

[Insert date here]

1. Project Background and Description

[In this section of your project plan you want to include the following:]

- Why are you designing a program or initiative aimed specifically at engaging men?
- What is the context for this work?
- What kind of program are you envisioning? (e.g., an in-person, 3-hour workshop for male-identified folks, or a 6-week intensive program that is open to anyone, but with the goal of recruiting 50% men?)

2. Project Scope

[In this section include information about who the project is aimed at, for what reason and purpose. You could begin by responding to the following:]

- Is this a campaign aimed at awareness or is it seeking to educate?
- What do you want the project to do?
- Who is it aimed at? Students, staff and/or faculty? If students, all students, or specific groups of students (e.g., athletes)?
- Project budget including planning, guest facilitators (if required), design and printing of materials, rental of space, refreshments, office supplies, etc.

3. High-Level Learning Outcomes:

[In this section, include what you hope to achieve and/or what you want the participants to walk away knowing. For example:]

- Understanding gender and gender scripts
- Understanding the link between sex, gender and racialized scripts
- Link between gender scripts and sexualized violence
- Defining and understanding sexualized and gender-based violence
- Socio-cultural roots of the problem
- Who are most impacted – data and trends
- Impact of how sexualized and GBV impacts survivors
- Unpacking consent
- Common myths
- Bystander intervention

4. Deliverables

[Include what is needed to achieve this project. Requires a detailed breakdown. For example:]

- Learning outcomes
- Assessment strategy
- Workshop content and delivery manual
- Marketing strategy to recruit participants
- Hire and train peer facilitators
- Year one progress report

5. Evaluation Strategy

[Include how you plan to evaluate the short- and long-term efficacy and reach of the program. For example:]

- Post-satisfaction survey
- Pre- and post-assessment surveys to measure knowledge & beliefs
- Are there ways to assess the effects of the program what are both learning opportunities and assessment indicators? (For example, having the participants define the topics or key terms in writing in there on word throughout the activity)
- Have you defined your specific goals and objectives of your program in the planning stage, and have considered ways those goals and objective could be measured?

6. Project Partners

[In this section, include all the PSI and community partners you need to get the project off the ground and ensure its success. For example, which unit, department or group has specialized knowledge or skills necessary to ensure the project is successful? Some specific examples might include:]

- Curriculum designer
- Content experts
- Communication and marketing strategists
- Funding partners

7. Project Stakeholders

[Include a list of individuals, groups, or units you need to work with at the outset to ensure the overall uptake/success of the project. For example:]

- Student advocacy group(s) - [insert Name(s)]
- Student union(s) - [insert Name(s)]
- Athletics department - [insert Name(s)]
- Student engagement team - [insert Name(s)]

- Equity and Human Rights Office - [insert Name(s)]
- Faculty of Engineering
- Vice President's office

8. Project Leadership, Accountabilities & Roles

[Include those responsible for the project and who have clearly identified roles to play beyond consultation. For example:]

- Project Lead - [insert Name(s)]
- Content Co-developers & Experts - [insert Name(s)]
- Content Researcher and Writer - [insert Name(s)]
- Learning Strategist - [insert Name(s)]
- Administrative Support - [insert Name(s)]
- Project Coordination - [insert Name(s)]
- Program Facilitators - [insert Name(s)]
- Program Promotion and Marketing - [insert Name(s)]
- Program Evaluation - [insert Name(s)]

9. Project Timeline

Date	Milestone	Description of Activity
01/15/2022	Project Plan Approval	Discuss and approve project plan including determining resourcing.
01/16/2022	Content Development	Create workshop training manual - review with learning strategist, especially in terms of interactive components.
03/01/2022	Finalize Content Review	Have content reviewed by partners and revised as appropriate.
03/15/2022	Focus Group(s)	Hold pilot workshops with key campus stakeholders.
04/07/2022	Final Revision and Implementation	Incorporate final changes, finalize formatting, work with partners to implement.

08/15/2022	Initial Project Evaluation	
08/15/2023	Secondary Project Evaluation	

10. Approval and Authority to Proceed

[Insert here who is ultimately responsible for the program and its implementation]

Name	Title	Signature	Date