

Edited RIA Video

[Start of recorded material 00:00:00]

Anoodth Naushan: Hi, everyone, and a very warm welcome to Introduction to Foundational Standards for Campus Gender-Based Violence Complaints training. I am so excited to welcome you into the space today. My name is Anoodth Naushan, and I'm project manager of Courage to Act. Today's training is part of our national skill share series, where we feature subject matter experts in conversation about urgent issues, emerging trends, and promising practices and strategies to better address and prevent gender-based violence on campus.

Our presenters today are brilliant, and they're the authors of the toolkit, A Comprehensive Guide to Gender-based Violence Complaints, upon which this training is based. Please note that their guide is now freely available to download via the Courage to Act knowledge centre, so please download a copy, read it, share it with your network, share it with everyone, because it's a really good read and I know I learned a lot from reading it, so please visit our knowledge centre and take a look.

Before we begin, a very quick note on language and accessibility. Attendees can view live captions for this session by clicking on the link in the chat box. You can also listen to the session in French by selecting the French language channel using the interpretation menu. Today's session is also being recorded, and it will be available on our website, along with a transcript.

Possibility Seeds leads the Courage to Act project. We are a Canadian social purpose enterprise specializing in project management and policy development. We work alongside our clients to create, collect, and cultivate gender justice. Our team has over 20 years of broad experience working with communities, governments, labour organizations, public and private institutions. Courage to Act is a multi-year national initiative to address and prevent gender-based violence and post-secondary institutions in Canada.

It builds on key recommendations within Possibility Seeds' vital report Courage to Act: Developing a National Framework to Address and Prevent Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary institutions. Our project is the first national collaborative of its kind to bring together over 170 experts and advocates across Canada to address gender-based violence on campus.

I also want to take a moment to acknowledge our funders. Our project is made possible through generous support and funding

from the Department for Women and Gender Equality
Wage from the Federal Government of Canada.

I will begin today's session 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 just one form of colonization to marginalize and dispossess Indigenous peoples from their lands and their waters. Our project really strives to honour this truth as we work toward decolonizing this work in meaningful ways and actualizing justice for missing and murdered women and girls across the country.

And I want to pause, because this work can be very challenging. Many of us, we have our own experience of survivorship, and of supporting those we love and care about who've experienced gender-based violence. So, gentle reminder here, to be attentive to our wellbeing as we engage in these difficult conversations. You can actually visit the self care section of our skill share page by clicking on the self care room via the link in the chat.

Before I introduce our speakers today, a very brief note on the format. You're invited to enter any questions into the Q&A box throughout the session, and we'll pose these questions to our presenters at the end of the webinar. The Q&A will happen in the last 40 minutes, and we'll try to engage with as many questions as we can in the time that we have together.

At the end of the session, you'll find a link to an evaluation form. We'd be really grateful if you take a few moments to share, to fill it out, and let us know what you think. It helps us improve. And this is anonymous. Following the session, we'll also Email you a copy of the evaluation form, and a link to the comprehensive guide.

I'm really excited now to introduce you to our speakers today. Deb Eerkes is the sexual violence response coordinator at the University of Alberta, and co-lead of the Courage to Act Reporting, Investigations, and Adjudications Working Group. Britney De Costa leads the gender-based violence and experiential learning project for Courage to Act, and is also co-lead of the Courage to Act Reporting, Investigations, and Adjudication Working Group. We also have Zanab Jafry, who is the founder of Bettering.ca and co-author of the guide, and a consultant for Courage to Act. She builds interventions for mitigating, addressing, and preventing sexual violence. I'm really excited now to turn it over to our speakers.

Deb Eerkes:

Thank you so much, Anoodth, and thank you also for all of you, for showing up, and it's great to see you. We are very much looking forward to this. Today, we plan to lay the base for all of

our future trainings. Our aim is to review principles behind what we're calling the three foundational standards for gender-based violence complaints: procedural fairness, trauma-informed practice, and harm reduction.

Then, we'll take some time at the end to talk about how they fit together and how they reinforce each other, for a complaints process that is both more thorough, and more humane. We should have plenty of time for Q&A at the end of the presentation.

Just a reminder that everything we'll be speaking about today, including the resources that we reference, terms we use, and detailed descriptions of the three foundational standards are available in section one of the guide, which you can find on the national skill share page of the Courage to Act website.

So, I want to start by situating the working context of the Canadian post-secondary institutional world. Campus gender-based violence complaints exist in the nexus of federal and provincial laws on human rights, privacy, occupational health, intersecting post-secondary policies and procedures, collective agreements, rights and responsibilities documents, codes of conduct, and institutional commitment statements, for example, to equity, diversity and inclusion.

At times, these elements exist in tension, but we can't let our compliance with one mean that we are ignoring another. None of it is optional, which is why it's so complex. It kind of reminds me of Martha Nussbaum's metaphor of a spider sitting in the middle of its web, able to feel and respond to any tug in any part of the complicated structure. That's what we have to do.

As a starting point, we really need to recalibrate our thinking about the purpose of campus gender-based violence complaints, and recognize that campus complaint processes are not about punishing undesirable behaviour. That's not our job, and it does very little to aid in the fight against gender-based violence, or to provide a safe working, learning, or living environment.

Across the country, in our zeal to be seen as taking sexual and gender-based violence seriously, we've lost sight of our purpose. Instead of mimicking the criminal and legal system, we need to keep our educational mission squarely in view and take down the barriers that stand in the way of our academic community members' full participation. Barriers like gender-based violence. That is our job.

So you'll see on this slide some of the differences between campus complaints and the criminal system, and what I want to emphasize here is that when we go too far in emulating the criminal system and its goals, we erect barriers to survivors

coming forward and introduce risk to institutions. We need to stay in our lane when we use formal complaints processes to address gender-based violence, and that means ensuring that our policies, procedures, and practices are firmly grounded in administrative, not criminal, law.

So moving into the first foundational standard, I'm gonna try and describe procedural fairness in a way that makes sense for our context. Procedural fairness, also known as natural justice, which is a term from English law, or due process, from American law, or some people say procedural justice, describes the protections required when an agency is authorized by statute to make a decision that affects an individual's rights, privileges, or interests.

Despite what many of us have learned about procedural fairness, and the way I learned it was as a fixed list of rights for respondents. It's made up of two fundamental rights, a fair hearing, and impartiality.

Beginning with the right to a hearing, it's important to note that a hearing can take many forms. It could consist of written document exchanges, or virtual, online, or telephone meetings, or round table discussions, asynchronous, in person, individual meetings, or a synchronous adversarial style hearing, or a combination of any of these modes. Whatever form the hearing takes, it must provide a reasonable opportunity to submit whatever information the parties believe is important for the decision-maker to know.

The second right, impartiality, refers to an unbiased process and an unbiased decision maker. These rights can be broken down into specific elements or practices to ensure that they're respected. For example, when we consider the right to a hearing, in order to be heard, a participant must have the sense of the elements of the case, and they have to be given reasonable opportunity to provide their perspective on what happened.

Going even deeper into how we might ensure the basic rights are met, reasonable disclosure means that those affected by the decision understand the process that they are getting into, they have a sense of the evidence related to the allegations, they understand the potential consequences associated with the allegations, and they are given sufficient time to consider and prepare their response.

Relating to the right to respond, those affected by the decisions have participatory rights, including the right to know and respond to information counter to their relative accounts. They are entitled to a timely decision, and this is especially important in light of the academic year and the student lifecycle, and limited employment contracts.

One of the benefits of using administrative law as opposed to a criminal approach is that matters can, or at least should, be resolved in a much shorter time. Those affected are also entitled to understand the reasons behind the decision, both on whether or not there was a policy violation, and on the outcome.

Moving to the right to unbiased decision-maker, all decision-makers at all levels, including investigators, need to be independent and conflict-free. Being conflict-free means decision-makers have no stake in the outcome of the complaint. For example, they have no conflicting business or financial relationships. They don't stand to gain, personally, professionally, or academically, as a result of the decision going one way or the other, and they approach the matter with an open mind, steering clear of any presumptions or pre-judgements, especially those that benefit one party over the other.

Rather, they're required to base all decisions on careful analysis of the evidence before them. It also means that the decision-maker gives due consideration to the circumstances and evidence without relying on myths and stereotypes. That means, they understand the social context of gender-based violence and its intersections with systemic oppression, and how these things might apply to the complainant, the respondent, and the witnesses.

It also means that they've challenged and abandoned myths, assumptions, and stereotypes that we know have plagued both the criminal system and our own complaints processes and they recognize the signs and symptoms of trauma for what they are, not mistaking them for dishonesty or spite.

Finally, an unbiased decision-maker has to be free from institutional pressure to make a particular decision and interference in procedural and other matters. There can be no pressure, for example, to interview or not interview certain witnesses, to give more or less weight to certain evidence, or to minimize or exaggerate one perspective over the other.

We're all aware, too, that when a decision-maker or process appears to be unbiased, whether or not it actually is, there is an erosion of trust in the validity of the process and the institution. That means, an independent and unbiased decision maker must also be seen that way.

You might notice on this slide that I didn't include an appeal on this chart. An appeal is actually not a right of procedural fairness, but it is smart practice for post-secondaries to make one available. It allows us to correct any mistakes internally before the final step of judicial review. This is less costly, less labour-intensive, and far more timely, and it works to build trust in institutional

processes and reduce harm to the parties, if it's done in a fair, and trauma-informed way, and available to both the respondent and the complainant.

I want to underscore that both the respondent and the complainant are affected by decisions in a complaint. Those of us who work in complaints processes have always understood that potential outcomes for respondents, like discipline, or dismissal from the institution, along with all the cascading effects for their career path or earning power, means that they are entitled to procedural fairness. But what we've left out of the equation are the effects on complainants.

We know that survivors of gender-based violence experience academic impacts, toxic workplaces, and mental and physical health challenges, which also bring cascading effects on their career path and their earning power.

The 2019 Hale v UBCO decision highlights the potential effect on complainants of having to navigate frequent encounters with the alleged source of their trauma, mainly the respondent. Going through a complaints process can exacerbate these effects, and we know that a decision of no responsibility can very often lead to the complainant feeling as though they have no choice but to abandon their studies or work and leave the institution or be subjected to continuing trauma.

Given that both parties are affected by these decisions, procedural fairness rights are required for both the respondent and the complainant. So what I've just presented here can be considered sort of the minimum requirements for procedural fairness. Your post-secondary policies need to reflect these, but they may very well go further, in which case you must follow your policy.

I mention judicial review as the recourse available for parties who believe they didn't get a fair hearing. Rather than reviewing a decision itself, courts technically review our procedures and whether we followed them. Most often, if we've not provided sufficient procedural fairness, the courts send the matter back to us to be addressed appropriately, so when we're designing our systems and using our complain processes, it's useful to understand how the courts might decide what constitutes a fair process.

Baker v Canada is a supreme court decision from 1999. That, 23 years later, remains the authoritative case on procedural fairness. Very briefly, Mavis Baker was facing deportation from Canada, which meant that she would be separated from her Canadian-born dependent children. She requested an exemption, but the immigration officer decided that there were insufficient grounds to warrant an exemption in her case. The matter went to a limited

judicial review, and then the court of appeal, and ultimately, the supreme court of Canada.

One of the issues at stake was the claim that Baker did not receive procedural fairness. Baker argued that she was entitled to an in-person interview with the decision-maker, and that the immigration officers' disparaging remarks about her mental illness and the number of children she had indicated bias.

The supreme court ultimately allowed the appeal on the basis that the decision was found to be influenced by bias and stereotypes, and that it did not demonstrate a reasonable use of discretion. Lucky for us, the decision also provided instructive information about elements of procedural fairness which would apply to any administrative decision made, including our own.

Madame Justice Dubé laid out five guiding principles for courts to assess procedural fairness. The general idea is that procedural fairness has to be considered in context, and the answer to the question about how much fairness is due is often, frustratingly, it depends. I'm going to go through the five Baker principles and attempt to articulate how they apply in our environment, in the post-secondary environment.

The first principle says that the more serious the consequences for parties to a decision, the more fairness measures need to be in place. So, we know that gender-based violence are among the most serious and complex we deal with, and many assume that calls for criminal-like procedures. Interestingly, although Baker was facing extremely severe consequences including deportation and separation from her children, the court decided that an in-person oral hearing was not required.

In Baker, we learn that the more we adopt these trial-like procedures, the higher the standard to which we will be held by the courts. In other words, it might just be as problematic to overdo procedural measures as to neglect them. It risks setting the bar higher than it needs to be in the case of the judicial review, while at the same time creating a costly, time-consuming process that in fact violates the right to a timely decision.

Of course, insufficient procedural fairness risks decisions being made without all of the relevant information, having it overturned on judicial review, and sacrificing fairness for the sake of convenience, especially when choosing our procedures. This is a really important principle to keep in mind. It's better to go back to those fundamental rights – what needs to be done in order to ensure the right to be heard and the right to impartiality in this context?

The second principle reminds us that all authority to do pretty much anything flows down from our enabling statutes, so I'm most familiar with post-secondary learning act in Alberta, and I'll use that as an example. In Alberta, we're given the authority through the PSLA to discipline students, subject to an appeal to the board. That means that even though procedural fairness doesn't guarantee the right to an appeal, the student conduct processes in Alberta do.

Importantly, again, when designing procedures, where the statute is silent, there is plenty of room to choose procedures that work within an institution's specific context. Of course, you'll also be guided by that regulatory environment, the laws, policies, collective agreements, all of the other applicable things, but the statute is the starting point.

Third, the more important the decision is to the lives of those affected and the greater its impact on them, the more stringent the procedural protections need to be. Without a doubt, the impact of gender-based violence decisions is serious. It can potentially result in severing the relationship between the individual and the institution and affect a person's career path and earning potential. The need for procedural protections is indeed very high.

At the same time, though, the impact is attenuated by the fact that most decisions are confidential, no public record is created. Post-secondaries don't have the authority to award civil or monetary damages, or to incarcerate anyone, and there's no threat of losing one's freedom. Even in the most severe cases, an individual typically has the opportunity to attend another institution or seek meaningful employment elsewhere.

All of this means that the jeopardy that individuals face in a campus process is not nearly as great as what might come with criminal charges, and replicating criminal-type procedures is both unnecessary and ill-advised. It's in this principle that we get a real sense of the need for procedural fairness for both parties. We owe procedural fairness to the complainant as well, given that the impact of a decision can be equally serious for them, including separation from the institution and all of the effects from that.

For example, a person who's been subjected to gender-based violence may subsequently be subjected to unacceptable proximity to the person who committed the violation. The impact of having to continue working with or attending classes with or living in the same residence as the individual who caused them harm may be considerable, making their working, learning, or living environment toxic or unsafe.

We are legally obligated to provide a safe, harassment-free environment, but when thinking about impact, we also need to

remember the diversity of our populations and recognize that the impact will be different for different individuals, depending on their social locations and intersecting identities. The choice of procedures should take into account how power and privilege operate with respect to gender, race, ability, sexual identity and expression, class, religion, and other social locations, in order to level the playing field.

Finally, in Baker, the court also considered the impact of the decision on her children, even though they weren't parties to the case. For us, this means that we might have to also consider the impact on the wider community when they are affected by a decision in a gender-based violence complaint. While community members may not have all of the rights accorded to parties of the complaint, the impact on the community might need to be considered in any decision.

The fourth principle says that a person's legitimate expectations matter. When our policies specify a procedure, for example, we can't deviate from that procedure, even though it might be allowable under basic procedural fairness. Parties can form legitimate expectations from multiple sources, maybe what they hear from a post-secondary official. It might be typical practices, even if they're not codified in procedure. They might expect what they see in information documents, websites, and other sources.

For example, if an investigator tells a respondent, don't worry, I've never seen them dismiss a person for this – even though they may be trying to reassure the respondent and be trying to remove some of the stress of the complaint process, they might also be creating legitimate expectation without realizing it.

The fifth principle has to do with deference to the institution, a recognition by the courts that the people who write policies and make decisions under those policies are in fact the experts, and know best what procedures are appropriate in these circumstances, so that's both good news, and a heavy responsibility for us.

It means, we have to be experts. We have to be knowledgeable, trained, and focused on the right things. I'm going to circle back to my early statements, and reiterate that our purpose in providing a complaints process for gender-based violence is equity. To dismantle the barriers that stand in the way of our academic community members' full participation in campus activities. As long as our procedures and processes reflect that, and keep that goal in sight, the courts will continue to recognize us as the experts. When we drift over into punitive goals and criminal-like procedures, we're no longer driving in our own lane.

Finally, from a more recent supreme court decision – the courts will show deference, but not blind faith, in administrative decision makers. Vavilov states that the appropriate standard to judge fairness in an administrative decision is not whether or not a decision was correct, but whether it was reasonable.

Vavilov underscores the necessity for flexibility and discretion in that the reasonableness standard acknowledges that there's rarely one right answer like there might be, for example, when you're applying or interpreting a law. Instead, the courts will assess whether the decision falls within a reasonable range. In post-secondary institutions, it's important to articulate the orientation towards equity and the educational mission to demonstrate the reasonableness for the decision. Clear reasons fully explained are both procedurally fair and mitigate the risk to the institution, and as you'll hear from Britney and Zanab, clarity in reasoning is also trauma-informed, and a harm-reduction measure.

With that, I'm going to hand it over to Britney to talk about the second standard, the principles of trauma-informed practice.

Britney De Costa:

Thanks so much, Deb, and yes, clear reasons is just one example, and hopefully by the end of today's session, you'll also see what is necessary for procedural fairness is supported or reinforced by trauma-informed practice and harm reduction, and vice versa.

Before we get into the principles of trauma-informed practice, we should talk about what it means when we say "trauma-informed practice" and importantly, what this means in the context of institutional complaints processes.

At a very high level, a trauma-informed approach is an approach to processes, procedures, and service provision, that understands and responds to the impacts of trauma. This is a fairly straightforward approach, but what does it actually mean when we apply it in the context of complaints processes?

In our context, understanding and responding to the impacts of trauma is not the same thing as treating trauma. This is an important distinction and boundary to set for yourself and the folks you work with, otherwise you risk harming those involved in the process. We are not qualified to treat trauma, and complaints processes are absolutely not the space to attempt to do so.

Instead, when we say understand and respond to the impacts of trauma, we mean that you should be able to recognize the traumatic nature and effects of the incident of gender-based violence, which includes the traumatic nature and effects of responses to the incident and even the traumatic nature and effects of the complaints process as a whole within the relevant

individual social, cultural, historical, and institutional context. And, being able to use this knowledge to inform your policies, procedures, and how you engage in your role, whether that be in intake, investigations, or decision-making.

If a trauma-informed approach means understanding and responding to the impacts of trauma by recognizing trauma and using this knowledge to inform your work, then we also need to take another step back and talk about what we mean when we say “trauma”.

We can understand trauma based on its three elements: one, feelings of overwhelm or upset, such as fear, horror, or terror, combined with a loss of control, whether that be a real loss of control or perceived loss of control, and a threat to security, or survival. Importantly, negative feelings including grief, anxiety, frustration, distress, overwhelm, or upset, on their own, do not constitute trauma. These feelings must be accompanied by a real or perceived loss of control and the threat to security and survival.

Trauma is also not something you can see, because it’s not always outwardly visible or obvious, despite the ways we often depict or understand it. Trauma is also not a universal set of responses to gender-based violence.

While gender-based violence is often an experience of trauma, and in some instances is an especially traumatic experience due to the sexualized nature and fear of injury or death that often accompanies it, not everyone who experiences gender-based violence will experience trauma, display behaviours we might commonly attribute to a trauma response, or experience and respond to trauma in the same way.

If trauma is not always obvious or a universal response, how are we supposed to understand and recognize it? Building on the work of many experts, practitioners, and scholars of trauma and trauma-informed approaches, we recommend taking an expansive view of trauma to frame your understanding, as this will help capture the range of subjectivities and experiences that influence whether a person will consider an experience to be traumatic and how trauma may or may not manifest.

An expansive view requires knowledge of the emotional, psychological, and physiological responses to trauma, an understanding of how trauma responses are shaped by social, cultural, institutional, and historical contexts, an understanding of how trauma responses are shaped by a person’s past experiences, world views, and position in society, as well as power consciousness.

You're probably familiar with or may have heard of a neurobiological perspective when talking about trauma. This is arguably the most common approach to understanding trauma, and is the way we understand how trauma shapes a person's behaviour and memory.

Without going into too much detail, when a person experiences trauma, there are both conscious and unconscious effects. On a conscious level, a traumatic event can trigger feelings of fear and anxiety that can have lasting psychological impacts. At the subconscious level, when a person experiences a traumatic event, their defense circuitry is activated and the brain releases a flood of chemicals and hormones that triggers the body's fight, flight, or freeze response.

Because the defense circuitry dominates brain function when activated, and triggers automatic responses, a person does not have conscious control of what these responses will be.

The stress hormones that are released when the defense circuitry is activated also impair the brain's pre-frontal cortex, which is the part of the brain that's in charge of executive functioning, managing reason, logic, problem-solving, planning, and, importantly, memory. In chapter two of our guide, introduction to trauma-informed practices, we go into more detail about what this looks like, but the main takeaway here is that a person's behaviour and their memory are impacted by the brain and body's response to a traumatic event.

We recognize, however, that a neurobiological perspective, while necessary to understand the psychological and physiological impacts of trauma at a fundamental level, must be supplemented by a broader framework, otherwise we'll have an incomplete understanding, we risk pathologizing and individualizing what may be better understood as structural violence, and we limit our ability to understand the human rights components at play.

This broader framework includes an understanding that how a person responds and experiences trauma is shaped by their previous experiences of gender-based violence, a history of trauma, and/or childhood gender-based violence, abuse, or neglect. While you likely will not have this information about the people involved in the complaints process, nor should you seek it out as it's not relevant to the complaint at hand, it is important to understand that each person will have their own life experiences that will shape how they experience and respond to trauma and ultimately their experience throughout the complaints process.

Similarly, how a person experiences and responds to a traumatic event is shaped by broader contexts, including the social, cultural, historical, and institutional contexts. This requires attention to the

ongoing systemic oppression upheld by our institutions and inflicted upon individuals and communities, in particular, the systemic and structural violence inflicted on Black, Indigenous, and disabled women. This can be understood by applying a race, gender, and disability analysis, and understanding the systemic and structural violence at play.

This goes hand in hand with the final piece of the framework for understanding trauma and trauma responses, which is power consciousness. Power consciousness is necessary to understanding the social, cultural, historical, and institutional context, and I think this is introduced really clearly in this quote from Dr. Natalie Clark, whose work has helped me better understand trauma through an intersectional and holistic lens, and has helped me to challenge the narrow colonial perspectives on trauma-informed practice that we often hear most dominantly.

Dr. Clark says that the definitions of trauma and the meanings we make of it are historically constructed and defined and are shaped by the intersection of structural factors, including our access to power and our experiences of repression. This is a quote from her article, *Shock and Awe: Trauma in the New Colonial Frontier*, that's cited in chapter two of our guide if you're looking for that reference.

So when we take an expansive view of trauma that brings together the neurobiological perspective, individual experiences and worldview, social, cultural, historical, and institutional contexts, and power consciousness, we're better able to understand and recognize trauma, which, as we know, is an integral part of trauma-informed practice.

What does this all mean in the context of institutional complaints processes? We can think about this by looking at the two overarching principles for trauma-informed complaints processes. Our first principle is that knowledge of trauma and its impacts must be integrated into all policies, procedures, and practices, to support procedural fairness, allow for evidence to be collected in a fair and impartial manner, which ultimately allows for fair and just outcomes.

As an example, I want to take us back to the right to impartiality that Deb walked us through earlier. Meeting this right means being conflict-free, which includes giving due consideration to the circumstances and the evidence without relying on myths or stereotypes.

This is where a trauma-informed approach comes in. When we can recognize the signs and symptoms of trauma and how someone will experience trauma in the broader context, we can challenge myths and stereotypes like, why didn't they fight back?

Why can't they remember? Why aren't they displaying the emotions that I expect them to? We can look at the circumstances and the evidence more accurately.

Taking a trauma-informed approach not only supports impartiality, it also allows you to collect the most reliable and comprehensive information from involved parties and witnesses. For example, an investigator who applies trauma-informed practices to their interviews, which is something we'll explore in a little more detail in our deep dive series coming up, will be better able to elicit the more accurate and complete information from those they are interviewing.

Before moving on to the next principle, we want to address two misconceptions about trauma-informed practice, and its relationship to procedural fairness. The first is the belief that if we take a trauma-informed approach in the complaints process, we are favouring one party, typically understood to be the complainant, over the other. This misconception is rooted in a misunderstanding of what a trauma-informed approach is, who it applies to, and how it works in a complaints process.

When we talk about a trauma-informed approach, we are talking about an approach that applies at all stages of the process, and to everyone involved, including the complainant, respondent, witnesses, investigators, decision-makers, and anyone else working in the space.

The second point we want to clarify is that integrating knowledge of trauma into policies, procedures, and practices does not imply that the existence of trauma is evidence of an incident. This is important to highlight for many reasons, but the one I'll reiterate here is that every person experiences trauma differently, and every person displays signs of trauma differently based on a wide range of factors, as well as our own biases and worldviews.

The existence of trauma or what we perceive to be trauma is not evidence that an incident of GBV has occurred. Just as the absence of trauma, or what we perceive to be the absence of trauma, is not evidence that an incident of GBV has not occurred. We are using our understanding and recognition of trauma to guide how we approach the process and never for a determination of fact.

The second principle of trauma-informed practice in the context of complaints processes is that knowledge of trauma and its impacts must be integrated into all policies, procedures, and practices to avoid re-traumatization and mitigate harm to any person engaged in the complaint process. An important strategy to meeting this principle is to approach every interaction as if trauma is present, recognizing that everyone may be coming to

the process with their own histories of trauma, and knowing that everyone will display, or will not display, trauma symptoms differently.

This creates a safer process, allows involved parties to participate more fully in the process, and protects against discriminatory treatment to ensure human rights protections are upheld. For example, in some cases, traumatic experiences can manifest as PTSD or cPTSD, both of which are recognized mental health disabilities. So, persons with PTSD and cPTSD are protected against discrimination related to their disability.

When we understand trauma and its impacts, we can create processes and environments that work to avoid anticipated triggers and to respond to unanticipated triggers in a way that supports safety and reduces harm, but doesn't attempt to treat trauma. To tie this back to procedural fairness, I'll use the example of legitimate expectations.

As Deb explained, a person's legitimate expectations matter, when it comes to assessing procedural fairness. Legitimate expectations also matter when it comes to protecting against re-traumatization, and what Zanab will talk about a little more in the context of harm reduction, sanctuary trauma.

One of the defining elements of an experience of trauma is a loss of control, and not having clear expectations can trigger those same feelings as a result of the uncertainty or incongruity between the person's uninformed expectations and the actual process and/or outcomes. Creating legitimate expectations is also a way to protect against sanctuary trauma, which in this context can be understood as when those who have been subjected to GBV approach representatives of the institution in search of support, guidance, and remedies, but are met with a response that fails to adequately meet their needs or becomes an additional source of trauma.

This principle applies to everyone involved in the complaints process, so for a complainant, this looks like actively working against re-traumatization, accommodating their physical, psychological, and emotional needs, recognizing that they may be re-traumatized due to systemic oppression, anticipating policies and practices, and recognizing the survivor's autonomy and expertise in their own needs.

For respondents this looks like, recognizing those who have caused harm may have been harmed themselves as they may be experiencing trauma as a result of systemic oppression; and therefore may be navigating the process with their own experiences of trauma.

Hi, folks. Apologies, I just got kicked out. Sorry about that. So while taking a trauma-informed approach is critical to protecting against re-traumatization, it's equally important to recognize that we can't eliminate all forms of harm from these processes.

I'm going to pass it over to Zanab to talk about harm reduction, and hopefully not get kicked out again!

Zanab Jafry:

Thanks so much, Britney. Yes, so the the third foundational principle we wanna talk about is harm reduction. The term "harm reduction" has its origins in the context of drug-related harm, and is used by practitioners who work with people that are substance users.

This ideology called harm reduction recognizes that substance use is a part of our world, and instead of aiming to remove substances from our society, which is idyllic and unrealistic, it aims to reduce substance-related harm. Examples of this can be seen in clean needle programs, where users are provided with clean needles in the hopes of reducing overdoses and infections.

Since then, however, harm reduction as a term has been broadly applied to different fields of study, including the world of gender-based violence advocacy and support. In our guide, we are using the plain language definition of the term, where harm refers to any negative impact that occurs as a result of the investigation, and reduction refers to, simply, our efforts to reduce it.

A concept that might make it easier to understand what kind of harm we're trying to reduce is a concept called inevitable harm. Next slide please. Inevitable harm is harm that cannot be prevented via trauma-informed care processes. So, we're talking about situations that we can't really plan for, and situations that may deteriorate or get worse even if we do plan for them.

You wanna think about things like unforeseen circumstances that come up so often during investigations, for example, unforeseen delays, you can't reach a witness, you can't reach a respondent, or in worst case scenarios when there's some reprisal against the complainant, or perhaps confidentiality is breached, and all of these things aside, is the harm of simply discussing the incident itself and the harm of bringing a case forward.

Regardless of how well-thought-out our processes are, this is a really difficult thing to discuss, and to share, and there will no doubt be negative impacts felt across the board that are inevitable and difficult to plan for. Next slide.

So, our responsibility in those scenarios that are unforeseen, that are difficult to plan for, and difficult to prevent, is not to absolve

ourselves of the responsibility by saying, well, you know, this is an unforeseen circumstance out of my control, therefore I have no responsibility – rather it's to recognize the harm as it arises, fast, and to deploy measures to reduce harm.

It might be useful at this point to differentiate between trauma-informed care and harm reduction. So, trauma-informed care and harm reduction sound similar, and that's because in its most ideal conditions, trauma-informed care is the method of harm reduction. It reduces harm by compensating for the effects of trauma, and when deployed correctly throughout an investigation, it will prevent harm, because it will compensate for the effects of trauma throughout an investigation.

Harm reduction, on the other hand, mitigates harm as it arises. So, the way we can differentiate between these two concepts is by thinking of trauma-informed care as harm prevention, so preventing harm before it occurs, and harm reduction as harm mitigation, so mitigating the harm that occurs – harm that we haven't planned for, or harm that arises in unforeseen circumstances.

Trauma-informed care prevents harm by compensating for trauma impacts, and harm reduction mitigates inevitable harm that we can't or haven't been able to plan for.

In our guide, we offer strategies at each step of the process to address inevitable harm as it arises, and examples of how to mitigate that harm as it arises.

So, for example, at the intake stage, we may – we may in our best intentions have trauma-informed practitioners, have a trauma-informed process, but there may be a retraumatization that still occurs. Our responsibility would be to act after the fact, recognizing that harm has occurred and utilizing our resources to reduce the retraumatization as much as possible. In the investigation stage, we may employ mechanisms of flexibility, or different platforms for people to provide feedback if harm has occurred in the trauma-informed platform that we've been using.

During, delivering bad news during the period of decision-making, if there is bad news that needs to be delivered, we may employ harm reduction strategies by delivering that bad news with care and during the appeals process, we may employ interim measures or solutions during the time that it takes to deliver an appeal process, so those are all mechanisms of harm reduction that we might employ throughout the complaints process.

The first principle that we want to talk about when it comes to harm reduction during the complaints process is tackling institutional betrayal and sanctuary trauma during GBV

investigations. Institutional betrayal occurs when a complainant raises a complaint, goes to a trusted administrator, and initiates the complaint, and the institution fails to deliver a responsible and appropriate response. This leads to complainants feeling betrayed because they did everything they were supposed to, but the institution did not.

This can also lead to a similar phenomenon known as sanctuary trauma. Sanctuary trauma happens when people are harmed in the very places they are meant to be safe and taken care of.

Now, there's been a debate about this for a little while now, and the root of the debate is the following question: are institutions sanctuaries? Our answer is the following. While the primary function of an institution is not necessarily to support people affected by gender-based violence, or provide access to services related to mental health, an institution cannot simultaneously present itself as a safe space by offering these services or writing gender-based violence policies without assuming responsibility of ensuring the wellbeing of the people who use them.

This, along with the fact that complainants who trigger institutional gender-based violence processes do so in order to receive help from trusted administrators means that sanctuary trauma as a concept can be understood to apply in the complaints context as well.

When we're applying harm reduction mechanisms, one principle that we want to employ is to reduce – is to tackle retraumatization and to reduce sanctuary trauma wherever possible.

Principle two is to promote accountability throughout the process. We know that, generally speaking, a complaints process seeks a sanction or remedy for harm that has been caused, but the question that we have is, do these complaints processes lead to feelings of accountability, behaviour change, or prevention of future harm on the part of the respondent?

We know that punitive measures are not synonymous with accountability. This is because you can sanction someone, they can serve that sanction, and still cause harm once their sanction has been completed. If they disagree with the sanction, and don't take accountability for their actions, they could serve the entire sanction, whether this is a suspension or expulsion, and experience no development or behaviour change as a result of the complaints process.

Our perspective on the matter is that this kind of complaints process, where the sanction is only concerned with punitive measures and violation of policy, is an incomplete and flawed process. Therefore, in contrast to punitive measures that may not

in fact rectify harm or deter future harm, we propose that institutions apply the following measures of accountability for both the individual and the institution.

This begins by creating a complaints process that fosters interpersonal accountability. We define interpersonal accountability as the willingness to accept responsibility for one's actions, and a behavioural commitment to refrain from causing similar harm in the future. And then institutional accountability, a complaints process should also foster institutional accountability. We define institutional accountability as an administrative responsibility to prevent harm before it occurs, accommodate involved parties after it occurs, address institutional gaps that enable harm, and design an action plan with benchmarks to remedy gaps and foster cultural change.

We recommend applying harm reduction principles with the intention of promoting interpersonal and institutional accountability and move away from individual accountability that views behaviour and responsibility as individual matters with less regard for those affected, and often results in sanctions against a person who has been found in violation of policy versus causing harm to another individual or members of the community.

Next slide. The final principle for harm reduction and applying harm reduction during a complaints process indicates that harm reduction should be employed to maintain the integrity of the investigation. An investigation is only as effective as the quality of the information received by the witnesses, respondents, and complainants.

As Britney has described, trauma can severely impair the ability of the involved parties to participate to their fullest extent, however when a process can account for the impacts of trauma for involved parties, it enhances the overall quality of the investigation as participants are better able to fulfill their roles as contributors of important information.

Compensating for impacts of trauma and tailoring investigations in a way that predicts or expects effects of trauma delivers a better process overall. Further, recognizing other harmful elements of the complaints process and taking steps to mitigate them reduces the potential for judicial review, human rights complaints, civil action, or other complaints to external entities.

This is better understood if we look at the roles of complainants, respondents, and witnesses. They are the investigation. They are the providers of information that build out the report that an investigator submits to a decision-maker. If the quality of this information is impaired, the investigation is impaired. When testimony is collected and harm is experienced by involved

parties, and the harm isn't mitigated, it affects the quality of the investigation, it affects the quality of the report, and even the quality of the decision.

It has future consequences for mitigating risk for the entire community that is affected by the investigation, and so harm reduction should be also employed to maintain the integrity of the investigative process at hand.

Where the quality of an investigation could be defined as the degree to which information is adequately collected and assessed, we can understand that the quality is compromised when trauma is left unaccounted for. An investigation that takes these things into consideration will be of higher quality, the results of the investigation will be of higher quality, and the entire process will be enhanced.

Putting this all together, we can see that if we implement harm reduction as harm arises throughout the entire process, so when the complaint is received to when it's investigated, it enhances the investigative process, reduces the amount of appeals that might occur as a result of the process, and enhances the investigative for all of the involved parties.

Deb Eerkes:

I guess I should unmute. Thank you, that was excellent, thank you Zanab and Britney. We wanted to now try and bring it all together to make our point that these three foundational standards actually work in tandem with each other instead of against each other.

So having reviewed the three standards in detail, we want to bring it all together. The reason we felt it was important to write this guide and provide this training was to debunk two myths. One, that procedural fairness is only for respondents and trauma-informed practice is only for complainants, and two, that the two principles somehow exist in tension or opposition to each other.

In fact, the three foundational standards not only apply to both the complainant and the respondent, but they actually work together and reinforce each other for a stronger and more humane complaints process. Let me illustrate this by highlighting some of the commonalities between the standards.

All three of the foundational standards emphasize transparency, which is necessary for procedural fairness in the form of reasonable disclosure, clear policies and procedures, and the requirement for written reasons. It's also a necessary element of self-determination, autonomy, and informed consent, all of which are trauma-informed. And transparency also works toward building trust, thereby reducing harm to all involved.

All three foundational standards require that we avoid myths, misconceptions, prejudgements, and stereotypes. You'll recall that I mention flexibility as a key feature of administrative law, and a necessary element of procedural fairness, but it also reduces harm by recognizing that trauma can affect people in different ways, and allowing survivors to weigh in on decisions about how their complaint will be handled.

Communication is critical to reasonable disclosure and the right to respond – two key elements of procedural fairness. A trauma-informed approach that reduces harm includes making sure that the lines of communication remain open for complainants and respondents throughout the process, both in that they're informed of what's happening in their case, and that they know who to contact when needed.

Finally, all three of the foundational standards mitigate institutional risk, and used together, they create the conditions for parties to participate fully and provide the best quality information, leading to better decisions. They reduce the chance of legal action, and increase the chance of being successful should it occur, support both complainants and respondents through the complaint, and work toward equal access to campus life, and are conducive to a more humane experience.

That translates into greater trust in the complaints process and the people involved in it, which leads to more openness and ability or willingness to engage in the process, better retention of our students and employees, a safer working, learning, and/or living environment, and campus processes that are fair for all parties.

Zanab Jafry:

Britney, you're muted.

Britney De Costa:

Thank you so much, my apologies. So, we're just going to take a step back now and look at the big picture, now that we have the basic understanding of what each of the foundational standards are and we've touched on how they overlap and the commonalities between them.

But, we also need to understand the foundation on which each of these standards is built, and the structure that ties them together to create these human-centred, comprehensive, complaints processes.

The way we've conceptualized this is by defining the matrix within which the foundational standards develop. Each of the three foundational standards – procedural fairness, trauma-informed practice, and harm reduction – exist in a matrix of human rights and equity. This means that none of the foundational standards can fully exist without the others.

We can't have procedural fairness without trauma-informed practice or harm reduction, and we won't actually meet any of these standards unless we are also meeting our human rights and equity standards. Zanab and Deb did a great job of showing you how these all fit together, but we're going to reiterate one more time with some examples of how they work together.

Deb Eerkes: Yeah, so, I'll give an example of when we provide procedural fairness for the complainant as well as the respondent, that is trauma-informed, in that when we provide information and allow the complaint – the complainant – voice and choice in the process, they feel a sense of control. It also reduces harm because it recognizes the impact on the complainant of being treated as though they are incidental to the process, or that they don't matter.

Britney De Costa: And similarly, trauma-informed practice is procedurally fair in that, for example, it allows the evidence to be collected and assessed more completely and accurately by factoring in the impact of trauma on memory and behaviour, which ultimately allows for a fairer decisions and outcomes, and we know as Zanab said, trauma-informed practices are designed to prevent retraumatization, which in and of itself is an example of harm reduction.

Zanab Jafry: And to put it all together, reducing harm for the people participating in these investigations enhances the investigation itself. Involved parties to a complaint are providers of testimony, and when we reduce harm in the environment that they're providing testimony, we enhance the investigation and enhance procedural fairness of the process taking place.

Everything we've talked about today is in section 1 of our comprehensive guide to campus gender-based violence complaints, which includes chapters on each of the three standards, along with a discussion of human rights and equity. The rest of the guide offers strategies and recommendations, and raises important, unsettled questions in a way that shows how these standards are dependent on one another.

We've put together a deep dive series that builds on section 3 of the guide, with each session looking at a separate step in the complaints process, from intake through to adjudication and appeal, and explores strategies for procedural fairness, trauma-informed practice, and harm reduction, specific to each step.

These sessions will be a great place to come learn how you can apply these strategies in your roles and at your institutions, meet others to build your network, and think through some of the barriers and challenges you face.

We're also offering a very special deep dive session specifically on harm reduction that will encompass the entire complaints

process through a harm reduction lens. This is an important foundational session for anyone working in these spaces and will be held at the beginning of March. We recommend everyone attend the first deep dive into harm reduction session, and then join us for the deep dives that are specific to your role in order to get the most out of the series.

With that in mind, we'd love to get a sense of who's interested in attending the deep dive series. You can register for these sessions on the Courage to Act national skill share series page.

- Britney De Costa: Just waiting for some – we have a few more responses coming in. Cool.
- Zanab Jafry: There should be a poll... okay, great.
- Britney De Costa: There we go. Looks like we're going to have some great attendance, so thanks everyone. We're really looking forward to it.
- Deb Eerkes: I want to just say, too, the guide isn't just for practitioners within a complaints process. We wrote it having in mind survivors, wondering how things work, people who support people through the process, advisors, people who fund processes, people who are supporting respondents – all of these folks can benefit from looking at the things that we've got in the guide. People who write policies, people who enact them. It's comprehensive in so many ways, I guess.
- Zanab Jafry: It's also a good place to start for student leaders, who are so often the ones developing policies on their campuses, so for places where policies remain under-developed or perhaps in a period of policy review, I think these sessions could be a good resource for these students who are going back to their institutions and saying, look, this is what's happening, so certainly for student leaders as well who want to attend these sessions.
- Anoodth Naushan: Alright, wonderful! Thank you so much, Deb, Zanab, and Britney, thank you for sharing with us. So now I'd like to open the floor to any questions that folks have. You can put in your questions using the Q&A box at the bottom.
- I think we've got a first question. Great, and it's about participation in the deep dive series – thank you everyone for letting us know that there are a few technical issues. Don't worry, we'll get them sorted right after this webinar, so you should be able to register for them shortly, and in a few moments, I'll put the direct Zoom link as well into the chat so you can register as well.

Alright, so I think we've got a couple of other questions coming through, which is wonderful. Zanab, I think the first question is for you. It's, what would you say to people that make the argument that PSIs are not sanctuaries, or that addressing gender-based violence in a trauma-informed way isn't their job or responsibility?

Zanab Jafry:

For sure. So, my response to this is that institutions cannot invite students to live at the institution and to work within the institution without ensuring that it is a safe place for them to do so.

Institutions also cannot accept resources to discuss gender-based violence, the study of gender-based violence prevention, the development of those policies, without making sure that they're holding up to their end of the bargain. Institutions across Ontario are provided with funds from the provincial government to ensure that their offices are fully funded, and that they're developing policies and protocols to prevent gender-based violence.

They can't do both of those things and then turn around and say that they are not sanctuaries and that this is not their role. It became their role when we invited students to come live, study, and work at our institutions, so we have to ensure that those places are safe for them to do so – aside from the fact that there's provincial legislation making it very clear that in working environments, sexual harassment cannot occur and must be addressed, there is the fact that students depend on their institutions in a way that they wouldn't in other places.

Students depend on their institutions for financial support, for example, they depend on their institution for academic support, housing support, and other resources, so there is a very dependent relationship between a student and an institution. And so, it is our responsibility to make sure that no harm is caused in a trusted environment. A student trusts, students trust us to make sure that they have housing, they have sustenance, that they have academic support, so when that trust is violated, it is on us to rectify that harm.

In short, while institutions are academic entities and the responsibility is to offer classes and professional development, and to get them to their next goal of acquiring a job and graduating, etc., it's also a different relationship in that students are highly dependent on institutions, so the trust that's there has to be maintained.

Anoodth Naushan:

Thanks so much, Zanab. Alright, so we've got a couple of other questions. The next question is, I think for you, Deb. It says, how can we manage all of this in small or under-resourced institutions?

Deb Eerkes: Yeah, that's a good question. One of the mandates for us when we wrote the guide was to make sure that it could apply to any institution across Canada, of any kind, of any size, at any location. So, you know, as you read through the strategies, it does look very um... intimidating, I would say, but what the I think saving grace is, is that flexibility.

We are allowed to be flexible in how we provide procedural fairness, depending on our context, we can take into account resources within the institution, and that's one way that we both accommodate our students, but also accommodate our own shrinking budgets or lack of resources.

That's one way. But I think it's also possible to partner with other institutions, partner with other community organizations, so things that you can't necessarily provide yourself, you might be able to connect students to other areas or connect yourself to other areas, to build that capacity.

I think, yes, it looks very difficult, and we'll never be perfect at it. None of us. Making the effort – like, a genuine, real effort – actually, goes a long way toward meeting these goals as well. I think that's important to know, too. You don't have to be perfect, but you do have to try.

Anoodth Naushan: Thanks so much, Deb. Alright, we've got another question from Lyndsay. And the question is, you've aptly named the toolkit, it's very comprehensive, so thank you so much for this incredible work. This question is, about working with various partners on campus involved in the adjudication and decision-making of gender-based violence processes, where this decision-making is just a small part of their overall role.

So, they're super-busy folks, so while I think they should attend sessions like this and read all of the toolkits, it can be a little difficult to ensure that all the right folks are seeing these resources, and engaging with them appropriately. What advice do you have to share these resources and get buy in from all the right folks on campus?

Deb Eerkes: An excellent question, and I think that we also would rely on you folks to share out what you think is helpful for other people. We are doing our best to provide the training in a way that is accessible to people. We're not taking up that – the time that people don't have.

At the same time, even at my own institution, there are decision-makers who think I don't have time for this, I'm not going to do it, so how do we then support this in our own institutions – and maybe that's by making yourself an expert.

One of the things that we wanted out of the guide was to say, you know, we're not the experts. We never started out as experts. We did a bunch of research, and we pulled it all together, but now if you are in a position in your institution to be able to use these resources and take the training, then you can be a resource for those folks in your institution who can't.

Even just sending an Email with a clip saying hey, this might really interest you, this is really specific to what you do, or you know, those kinds of things are helpful. Rather than just saying, everybody, you need to read the whole guide. We know how unrealistic that is.

Any steps that we can take to just get the word out, keep the conversation going, and create experts across the country I think is very helpful.

Zanab Jafry:

I hope it's okay if I just jump into that. I think it's also realistic to look at bottom lines sometimes. For us, myself, Deb, who is now in this role, Britney, who is now working at Courage to Act, and most of you who I assume are administrators who are supporting people who have been affected by sexual violence, the bottom line is obviously to make sure that the complainants, the people who are harmed, are receiving care in a way that's trauma-informed, in a way that's respectful, in a way that's very humane.

For the institution, they may have a different bottom line, and sometimes it's okay to engage that interest as well. An institution may not be the most well-read or vested in trauma-informed care, but they are interested in reducing the number of appeals that they're getting or prolonging the processes past the deadline. Making the argument that all of these things are connected is really intentional.

We want institutions to know that being trauma-informed care doesn't just benefit the complainant and the respondent even, it also benefits the institution, because when procedural fairness is enhanced, there's fewer appeals, there's fewer reasons to ask for revisions, it reduces the timelines, and makes the process more manageable for everybody, including the institution.

Anoodth Naushan:

That's really thoughtful, thanks Zanab. So, I have another question, and it's about trauma-informed practice, so maybe Britney if you want to take this one. The question is, how does trauma-informed practice apply to respondents?

Britney De Costa:

That's a really good question, because we do talk about how trauma-informed practice isn't fully trauma-informed unless it's applied to everyone involved in the complaints process, but we do often take a narrow view that it only applies to complainants

much like um, we take a narrow view that procedural view only applies to respondents, when in reality, that's not the case.

One of the things that I like to come back to is the need to approach every interaction as if trauma is present, because we know that a person's history or experiences and systemic oppression all factors into how a person will experience and respond to trauma, and ultimately their ability to participate fully in the process.

So, if we consider a respondent that is Black or Indigenous or otherwise from a community who faces structural violence or systemic oppression from our institutions, we need to think about the fact that even though we're aiming for processes that don't replicate the criminal system, we're still operating within a colonial and inherently harmful process.

In this environment, a respondent is at risk of being re-traumatized by the process or the system. By engaging in an interview with things like trauma-informed interviewing, safe interviewing techniques, and in our investigations deep dive series we get into this in a little more detail, and when you do so approaching as if trauma is present, you can apply these techniques and care into the interview with a respondent that will allow you to collect more accurate and complete information, and also ensure that they aren't triggered in the process to prevent harm and to ensure that they're able to participate fully, which is necessary for procedural fairness.

The way I think about it is that trauma-informed practices really apply in many of the same ways to respondents as they do to complainants, it's just a different sort of entry point for looking at it.

Anoodth Naushan: Thanks so much, Britney, for that great answer. I guess I'll put their follow-up question as well. The question is, how do you give procedural fairness to complainants when your policy doesn't allow it?

Deb Eerkes: I guess I will take that one. Yeah – my own policy doesn't recognize complainants as requiring procedural fairness, and I want to start with the concept that procedural fairness is not a finite resource. It doesn't take away from one if you give it to the other. That's a really important point. Giving procedural fairness or allowing procedural fairness for a complainant doesn't take any of it away from the respondent.

But if your policy does not allow, for example, the complainant to be a party to the complaint, and treats them as a witness only, there are still things you can do in terms of communication, transparency, trauma-informed practice, all of those things –

many of those – your policy is going to be silent on. So you can engage those harm reduction measures, you can be trauma-informed, and a lot of those look like procedural fairness as well, even if your policy doesn't say that a complainant is a party who is entitled to procedural fairness.

Anoodth Naushan: Thank you for that, Deb. So we have a few other questions, and the next question is around if you have any advice or practices or policies for students when they're assigned to a work placement and they face and experience gender-based violence and other forms of abuse. Britney, because your experiential learning research project lead, that might be a question for you.

BCD: Yeah, I figure I'll jump in, but feel free Deb and Zanab if you want to add to this, but, yeah at this point we don't have any practice or policy recommendations, we know that this is a really important issue, that this happens a lot, but we... it's very, there's a lack of attention to this issue, and there hasn't been much research into it, which is why Courage to Act started an experiential learning research project, a research to action project, with the goal of developing recommendations and tools to support staff and students and institutions protect against gender-based violence in experiential learning or work placements.

This research project just started; there's a blog on our website that talks through why we're doing it and what the project's going to look like, and next week actually, I'll plug, if you are someone who works in experiential learning spaces, we're hosting a design jam where we're going to talk through some of the different areas that we need to focus on in this research so we can target it appropriately.

Then, the next phase is actually doing that primary research and getting some of that information, and using what we learned to develop some hopefully policy recommendations or legislative recommendations as well as tools to support you in this work. So – very long-winded way I guess to say, we don't currently, but the goal of the experiential learning project is to come up with those. So stay tuned, and if you're interested in being part of this project or contributing in some way, you can Email me, I can put my Email in the chat, but you can also check out our webpage and... but you can Email me and we can get in touch.

Anoodth Naushan: Amazing, thanks, Britney. Yeah, we're really excited about the design jam next week and the work to come from the experiential learning sexual harassment in experiential learning project. Our next question for our speakers is, do you have a recommendation of a source or document that offers a concise term or definition for gender-based violence?

Zanab Jafry: The Courage to Act report, which brought us here today, has a very expansive definition of gender-based violence, and you can find it for free on the Courage to Act website. That's the one that I would suggest. No bias here, of course!

Anoodth Naushan: Thanks, Zanab, and I might add, too, that Courage to Act has published a pretty comprehensive glossary as well, that will be helpful for folks working in the sector, and you can find that on the Courage to Act knowledge centre, so along with the report that Zanab mentioned, a comprehensive yet succinct glossary.

Alright, so I think we've got time for a couple more questions, so please feel free to type in your questions in the chat or the Q&A box. And Deb, Zanab, and Britney, while we're waiting for folks to include their questions, is there anything in particular that you want to share or add to the conversation today?

Britney De Costa: I just want to thank everyone for coming to this. I know it's a lot of information, but I think ultimately it will be a really good foundation, and hopefully we'll see you at our deep dive series.

Deb Eerkes: I will add to that that we're offering this session three more times, in addition to having the recording on the website. We would very much appreciate your feedback so we can make sure that if there's anything we missed or didn't put enough emphasis on or didn't clarify enough, we would like to hear from you! So that we can improve it the next three times.

Anoodth Naushan: Alright, so I think those are all the questions that I see in the Q&A box and the chat. I think we might be done a little bit earlier today, so, we'll wrap up, then, and just a big thank you to all of you. Deb, Britney, and Zanab, thank you so much for sharing your knowledge and experience, expertise with us today, and their guide, everyone, is available for download via the Courage to Act knowledge centre.

And I want to thank everyone for joining us today and sharing with us today. Attendees, we really appreciate and take inspiration from your commitment to addressing and preventing gender-based violence on your campus, and we feel very, very lucky to be able to work alongside each and every one of you, so thank you for joining us, and we're going to put the evaluation in the link the chat, and we hope that you'll take a moment to fill that out.

Alright, and thanks so much, everyone, take good care.

[End of recorded material 01:28:15]