video2362476708

[Start of recorded material 00:00:00]

Farrah: Hi, everyone we're going to start in a few minutes, it's lovely see you all pop in, my name's Farrah Khan. OK, we're going to start, again my name is Farrah Khan, I'm so excited to see you all here. Welcome to the Using Gender Based Violence Community Risk Assessments to Make Campuses Safer. And of course we're so excited to be here and have this conversation with you. My name is Farrah Khan and I want to just give you a warm welcome to this conversation. I am the Possibility Seed's CEO and I am the on leave executive director of Courage to Act. I'm doing this just because I just want to be around these amazing people today.

So today's training is part of our ongoing national skills share where we feature subject matter experts and conversation about urgent issues, emerging trends and promising practices to address gender-based violence on campus. I'll be in conversation today with Dr. Sandy Jung and Dr. Jesmen Mendoza about the Community Risk Assessment that they created. The toolkit is now freely available for download via The Courage to Act knowledge centre. When you access this tool you'll see a pop-up asking if we can reach out to in a few weeks to ask your feedback. Please say yes because it's so good to know how you feel and how it's working and what gets you excited about this tool.

This work is taking place on and across traditional territories of many Indigenous nations. This land that I'm on is the territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit, Anishinaabe, the Chippewa, the Haudenosaunee and the Wendat peoples and is now home to many diverse First Nations, Inuit and Metis peoples. Toronto is covered by Treaty 13 agreement signed by Mississaugas of the Credit, the William's Treaty signed with multiple Mississaugas and Chippewa bands to peacefully share and care for the resources. This agreement was broken by European settlers. The process of colonization in Canada over the past two centuries has enacted systemic genocide against Indigenous peoples of this land. We see these acts of colonization and genocide continuing today in forced sterilization of Indigenous women, the epidemic of missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls and Two-Spirit people, the overrepresentation of Indigenous children in care, the criminalization of Indigenous people resulting in the overrepresentation in prisons and environmental racism and land theft of Indigenous peoples.

As we come together today to respond to experiences of gender-based violence, we must acknowledge that this is a decolonial struggle, they cannot be separated. Supporting decolonization and Indigenous sovereignty is critical to working towards a culture of consent and accountability. Today we will take action by inviting everyone here to read the calls for justice within reclaiming power and place the final

report of the national inquiry into missing and murdered Indigenous women and girls. If you want to learn how your institution can take these calls to action you can download the worksheet by clicking on the link in the chat.

So Possibility Seeds leads the Courage to Act project. We are a leading social change consultancy dedicated to gender justice, equity and inclusion. We believe safe, equitable workplaces, organizations, and institutions are possible. With over 20 years experience working with community organizations, government, private and public institutions, we care very deeply about our work. And now just a little bit about Courage to Act, and I just want to point out this is our last webinar as Courage to Act. We're sunsetting this part of the project so it's pretty exciting.

So Courage to Act is a multiyear national initiative to address and prevent gender-based violence on postsecondary campuses in Canada. It builds on the key recommendations within Possibility Seeds' vital report Courage to Act, developing a national framework to address and prevent gender-based violence at postsecondary institutions. Our project is the first national collaborative of its kind to bring together over 4,800 stakeholders and 170 experts, advocates and thought leaders from across Canada to address gender-based violence on campus. I want to take a moment to acknowledge our funders. This project is made possible through the generous support and funding through the Department of Women and Gender Equality Federal Government of Canada, now known as WAGE.

Let's talk a little bit about self-care. This work is challenging. As someone who has taken lots of time off to care for myself after working in it for so long, many of us have our own experiences of survivorship and supporting those we love and care about who have been subjected to gender-based violence. A gentle reminder here is to be attentive to our well-being as we engage in difficult conversations. You can visit our self-care section on our skill share website page or visit our self-care room by clicking the link in the chat. And just a note on accessibility and language. You can view the live captions for this interview by clicking on the link in the chat. You can also listen to the session in French by selecting the French language channel using the interpretation menu. At the end of the session, you will find a link to the evaluation form. We're grateful if you take a few minutes to share your feedback as it helps us improve. This is anonymous. Following the session we'll also email you with a copy of the evaluation form and a link to the recording so you can view it again and share it with your networks.

Now let me talk to you about the speakers. Before I introduce you to them, a brief note about the format. You're invited to enter questions in Q&A box throughout the session and we'll pose those to the speakers at the end. We'll try and engage with as many questions as we can in the time together. I'm really excited to introduce our speakers. So we have Dr. Jesmen Mendoza, who is the co-lead of the GBV Community Risk Assessment project and a psychologist at Toronto Metropolitan

University. And we also have Dr. Sandy Jung who's the co-lead of the GBV Community Risk Assessment project and professor and associate Dean of Research at MacEwan University, they're both so fancy. And I'm Farrah Khan, I'm the CEO of Possibility Seeds and I'm on leave from the executive director position at Courage to Act. So let's get this started. Hello, my friends.

Jesmen: Hi Farrah.

Sandy: Hi, Farrah.

Jesmen: Thanks for meeting with us today.

Farrah: I'm excited to be here. I think one of the things we should say from the top, I set these two up on a date pretty much to start this project. I was very interested in community risk assessments and I'd already been working with Jesmen and we'd heard about Dr. Sandy Jung, I think everybody knows who you are. But the idea of the two of you working together was so exciting and setting you up and seeing the friendship grow between you two is just beautiful. So I just want to name that at the beginning just how great it is to be here.

Jesmen: Well and Farrah I just have to say you have been a great matchmaker in all of this and Sandy and I constantly talk about how we can't believe what has emerged. And not only just a professional relationship, but I can say kinship with Sandy in all of this. Thank you again, I think we owe a debt to you.

Sandy: I ditto that, every word.

Farrah: So anybody here on the webinar if you need matchmaking services, I'm here for you. OK, so can you tell us why this tool was needed? Because I think lots of people name that they have a tool for this but why is this particular tool so important?

Jesmen: Sandy, do you want me to take this question?

Sandy: Yeah, why don't we kind of go back and forth and then fill in.

Jesmen: Where possible, for sure. Farrah, it all comes back to 2019 when the Courage Act report came out. And it was very clear, articulated in that report that an evidence-based tool needed to be developed and it needed to be developed to help postsecondary institutions determine the level of risk that an incident or a report of gender-based violence poses to a school community. And the resounding feedback from the report revealed that some PSIs didn't have a free and accessible tool that they can use to determine risk of gender-based violence reoccurring in their communities.

The other piece of feedback that was received was that some PSIs really relied on existing tools that were normed on criminal justice settings and/or relied on criminality as a foundation of those tools. And that's

problematic because those tools didn't take into account this third piece of feedback, which is that it didn't incorporate postsecondary institutions or higher education settings and the complete uniqueness of this particular environment. And let's just remind ourselves, that postsecondary institutions are learning communities that have emerging adults and are pro-social environments. So there was really no tool that actually took that into account.

Sandy: Yeah, I'd probably just add that in a lot of different fields, that is not forensic, that is not justice-involved, we often see that, we often see borrowing from the justice field and applying those tools. And that in and of itself has lots of problems just like what Jes has been mentioning here. So our concern is that we needed to think more specific to a community that is more closed, right? It's not the general community, this is very unique in and of itself but also has its own sort of governance structures within that and those are the things we need to consider.

Farrah: I really love that you both were thinking about how do we move these conversations out of the justice sector or I would say the criminal or legal sector because I don't know how much justice it has in it. But it's really important to think about that we don't have to replicate what is out in the other communities inside our institutions. So I want to know more from the both of you, why not just use an existing tool? And you kind of touched upon this because there are tools to access sexual violence and gender-based violence already, so why not just use those tools on our campuses?

Jesmen: I think just to go back a little bit that some of these tools are founded on principles with respect to criminality or don't assume a pro-social environment, in fact they're usually predicated or based on law enforcement settings. And we know that postsecondary institutions are anything but that, right, if anything these are pro-social environments. So one of the, if you will, factors in other tools that they look at is criminal history for example. And I would say the vast majority of students don't have any criminal history. But that doesn't necessarily mean that they can't cause harm, right? And so another viewpoint has to be taken. The other thing to note is that a lot of the research that has occurred out there has specifically looked at individuals who've been criminalized in some way shape or form and have been institutionalized. And the people that we would want to assess in a postsecondary institution don't necessarily have that background. So those are just a few things to mention, I'm sure Sandy might have some follow-up to that.

Sandy: Yeah, I'd also add that it wasn't so much the case that both Jes and I didn't see value in the existing, I mean we're standing on the shoulders of existing research out there that has already been done, developed methodologies that are appropriate for sort of justice-involved development of risk tools. So there's a body of research that's there that we definitely acknowledge. I think the issue is that many of the things that Jes has said, but in addition to them I'm just going to add, just supplement that, with the idea that the way these risk factors are defined

in these existing tools apply really well to a justice-involved group, right? We use terms like repeat offender, those kinds of things.

Yeah, absolutely it might apply to those individuals who have a lengthy criminal record or just have a criminal record. But when we're talking about applying sort of some of these risk factors to a sample that's coming from students or even faculty and staff, which we haven't quite gotten to, we're focusing on students. The problem is that the examples in there don't lend themselves very well. So I mean for instance having negative peer influence is certainly a huge risk factor and with justice-involved persons, but you're not going to see students hanging around with gangs necessarily, right? You're not going to see them hanging around with other individuals who have lengthy criminal records. So what would that look like in a student population? Who would they hang around with that would allow them or endorse some of the kind of misconduct types of behaviours? So we needed something that went beyond the examples that were only applicable in a justice involved sample. So we had to kind of expand beyond that. And that was one of the problems about borrowing from that, right, trying to fit a square peg into a round hole, it just didn't seem to work.

Farrah: I know I've seen some of the risk assessments and gone to some of the trainings, it's really interesting when they're talking about bomb threats to gender-based violence. That's the range of things and those are very different things and very different conversations. I want to kind of bring it to this piece a question to both of you really around concerns. Because we set you up on a date, we introduced you, and I remember you both raising concerns, about just developing that tool, what would that be like, what concerns did you have in developing this tool? Or concerns you still have, which I think you named actually in the tool, you've talked about.

Jesmen: I think our single largest concern was time. I remember when you had brought it up to me and I thought OK, how do you go about making an evidence-based community risk assessment tool? It was like we need lots and lots and lots of data over a period of time. And to go about doing that, that's classically known as an actuarial method of creating a risk assessment tool. And that's really just a number of statistical modelling techniques put together to analyze all this data to figure out which factors go into the tool. So you need large samples of data that are drawn from multiple sources that are considered high quality and consistent. The difficulty is that we don't have 20 years, there are people that are going to be harmed in that 20 years and so we don't have the time.

So we thought of a second approach which is a structured professional judgment, and sometimes we just call them SPJs, which really what it does is it looks specifically at the literature. And draws upon relevant theories to look at items for inclusion in a risk assessment tool. But the problem with that is it only looks at one specific perspective. And usually, it's an academic or scholarly perspective. And for it to be a true community risk assessment tool, we really needed to take a community-based approach. And so what we did was we took the

structured professional judgment method and then improved upon it and used what's called consensus methodology.

And Farrah, I just have to say the most magical things happened there, right? We drew people from across the country to join these panel advisories. And when I look at the attendees, and I know that some of them are on here, so I have to tell all the people that participated in the panels on behalf of Sandy and myself, thank you for participating. And the magical thing that occurred is that we entered into what's called consensus development. So we surveyed the literature with our research assistant, Ruchika and from there, asked the panel advisories to come to consensus on certain factors or help come to consensus on certain factors. So it whittled away the 21 factors down to 16 and then transformed them and we saw four natural groupings. And so we can say that this wasn't just informed by research, it was informed by the community in a very structured way where consensus was met.

And the beautiful part is this, is that the first set of meetings, there is a bit of suspicion because it was like, "Are you really going to listen to what we have to say?" And our commitment to all of them was, "Yes because we're here to find a tool that works and a tool that represents each perspective." And it'd be interesting to see how we all kind of came together and we would debate things with the purpose of coming to concensus. And I think what we ended up coming up with is factors that are much more robust and rigorous than we ever thought of, that's the magical part. And the beautiful part too is that towards the end of these consensual developmental discussions, both panels have said to us, "Wow, I feel like there's a community of practice here." And that was a wonderful side benefit to all of that. So this is just a long way of saying that we took a traditional approach, or one of the traditional approaches, and improved upon it and added a community lens that made this tool not only just robust and we believe rigorous, but we believe comprehensive.

Sandy: Yeah, I'm going to reiterate that. Time was a big one, I always say this every time we – you have these conversations with little kids about, "What would be your super power?" Freeze time [laughs], if we could freeze time we could do this all, right? But the reality is we don't have all the time in the world so that was certainly a huge concern. What I'd also add to it is, more supplementing what Jes is saying in that I'll be honest with you, I've always hesitated to develop the tool.

If you look at any of my research it's always been focused on how do we improve things, how do we apply it, can we conduct some field studies to make sure it's actually being used in the proper way, I've always avoided that. Because there's a whole body of research out there and a number of excellent tools out there that can be improved in a lot of ways, making sure that it's not biased, it can apply in certain settings. So that's always been sort of my research, I've avoided it like the plague. So when you invited me to do this I was sort of like, OK well first I don't know who Jes is so I'm looking forward to figuring this out. But the second thing is

oh my god, developing a tool, wow this is going to be interesting and let's see how that first conversation goes.

And I'm so grateful because Jes had a completely realistic, very practical perspective, which I'm very practical if you know me to figure out how to do these things and what's realistic. So it was critical that we made sure that we knew what the limits were going to be and what we were going to develop, right? We weren't going to do this robust 10-year plan that we would love to have but we have two years to do this. The second thing I always found really interesting as well is the way we had done this, and keep in mind I'm new to consensus methodology. So Jes has been an awesome instructor in providing a lot of that background and understanding that methodology. But my world is broken into those two groups that Jes mentioned, these actuarial approaches or SPJs, structured professional judgment.

And so the way oftentimes things are developed is that there is such a focus on looking at only one perspective, right? So in the world of justice-involved kind of research, it's very focused on the researcher's perspective and the development or identifying variables that we think are going to be relevant and so we often focus on that. I'd probably say in other realms there's a huge emphasis on only looking at for example victims' perspectives and only looking at the perspectives of stakeholders who are involved in a particular incident. And so for me, the big thing was balancing those two things.

And I think me and Jes had found and struck a balance in trying to make sure we include both of them because of course coming from that researcher side I want to make sure we have researchers on these advisory panels. But we made sure that we had that breadth as well involving stakeholders. So to me, those are the big ones is making sure we struck that balance and that was a big concern that I felt we were able to address fairly well. And I'm glad Jes brought up our research assistant Ruchika because oh my god, trying to plan cross country [laughs], organizing these meetings, I don't think me and Jes could do it. So we're so grateful that she had sorted through all that and all the different time zones, my gosh, we are a very large country. So it was amazing to be able to have that involvement from so many different people.

Jesmen: And just to add that those people that were on the panel advisory were students, both undergrad and graduate students, administrators, as Sandy was talking about, researchers and frontline staff. And I just have to say that the frontline staff spoke a lot about the victim survivor experience and brought that to the conversation. And we paid attention, to each perspective in addition to what the literature and the scholarship were saying on gender-based violence occurring at postsecondary institutions.

Farrah: And that was one of the questions actually in the Q&A is who was on the panels. And we know that it was a big mix of folks that had done work with students, folks that had been in a movement, also people that are doing the work with people who've caused harm, as well as people who

work with survivors, people who identify as survivors themselves. So it's a really big mix of folks and researchers, of course, Sandy but yeah so making sure there was a mix.

I want to kind of move into – because I think we answered just a little bit of some of the considerations that you had and the panel itself and community advisory, which is really important to all Courage to Act projects – one of the things that is a cornerstone too has been bringing in people that are doing the work in the field to give us feedback to make sure we're accountable and we're doing project work that is actually useable to the community. So I want to go on to just talking about the risk assessment tool itself, how is this different from other existing tools and what's included in it?

Sandy: I'll dive into this one [laughs]. So I'd say that what's a tool and I think we'll share that in a second, but I think what was different about this tool was, we already mentioned a few things, one is the way we developed it is quite different. As we described, typically in justice-involved world, these two different kinds of traditional ways there's more than that, I want to emphasize that part of it, but I mean typically you hear these terms in my world as actuarial. So this is developed through statistical modelling that identifies certain items that should be included.

Statistically, we figure out which ones sort of rise to the top and which one basically becomes the best predictors for future behaviour. Usually, this relies on very large samples, so large samples of data that are drawn from sources that are considered either high quality or highly detailed and consistent. Most of it though is reliant on oftentimes criminal records. So we have to keep in mind there are unreported offences. These are typically sampled, if we're looking at most of the tools that exist out there especially ones that are related to sexual violence, it's interesting, they're mostly developed in Canada. One of my colleagues said to me a number of years ago, she said that, "It's interesting how most of these tools are developed in either Northern US or in Canada." So the coldest places possible [laughs], I don't know why. You don't see a lot coming from Florida and from California. So it's interesting how that sort of emerged but many of these tools have been normed with very large samples usually in Canada or again, northern states.

The second type of tool is the structured professional judgment. And these are tools that are based on surveying the research literature. Often reliant on single-factor studies, so basically looking at whether a factor can differentiate between someone who's offended and someone who has not offended. So it often relies on things like relevant theories that exist to select those items in order for them to be included and then organized into groups and scales.

So even though much of the literature has noted that actuarial tools tend to be better than structured professional judgment, the challenge is collecting data across the country with agreed-upon ways of how we're going to look at the outcomes, right? How do we measure whether or not

something is the outcome that we were trying to predict or trying to differentiate? So it becomes a little bit more challenging if we're thinking about developing a tool for postsecondary institutions, especially if we're thinking that we're trying to do this within a very small span of time.

But also trying to follow up students across a lengthy period of time is really near impossible to try to do that within a couple of years, to try to figure that out. And the reason why I say that is because keep in mind, we can look at documentation within an institution, a university, a college, but that student leaves and so how do we document their behaviour past that point? So it becomes a lot more challenging to do, it's not completely undoable but it is something that requires a lot more time to be able to do. So we knew that in order for us to actually develop a tool we would have to lean more towards structured professional judgments, they're a little bit easier, a little bit quicker to develop.

But there is a tendency to be over-reliant on researchers. So if we think about, I'm going to use the quotation mark because I remember it being called this once, being an "expert" [laughs] in this field, it was more of a derogatory term, that you're telling us what we need to do. And that becomes a little over-reliant on, and I'll use that derogatory term what was used with me, experts [laughs]. You think you know better than we do kind of thing. So we needed to think beyond just developing a tool that used an SPJ approach, so we had to kind of supplement that with something that was much more rigorous and included other stakeholders. And so I'm going to leave actually Jes to talk about this because as soon as we start getting into methodology, normally I can talk endlessly about it but this is something that I think Jes brings in that lens that really made this a much more rigorous process.

Jesmen: We kind of spoke to the idea of how we needed to get to consensus. And there was a structured format, I think sometimes we think that consensus methodology is really about a series of focus groups, it is somewhat that and a little bit more. It is getting people from across different sectors, from all these different stakelderships, if you will, that of course includes students, survivors, student judicial affairs' folks so forth and so on as we've talked about earlier. And then going through, if you will, a round-robin approach of hearing everyone's perspective and then discussing. And I can tell you that some of these factors then would transform into different factors or much more concrete factors, which then made it more unique for this particular setting.

And so earlier Sandy was talking about peer norms for example so yes, the average student might not be joining gangs, but some of those factors turned into things like participating in hypermasculine culture for example. What's also unique about this particular tool is that it not only just focuses on the person who's caused harm, it looks at issues related to the institution. And in fact, one of the administrators that served on one of our panels had indicated to us that this risk assessment tool could also be used as an institutional audit and doubles as such in some ways.

And I think going forward that might be something to kind of consider in terms of how to use this tool or transforming it in such a way that it can be used as an institutional audit. Because something that we do ask users of this tool to look at is to evaluate what are the institutional policies, practices, procedures and do they provide proper and adequate support? And even if an institution says that they offer proper and adequate support, we know that whisper networks exist out there amongst students, right? And so we ask users to consider that, right?

It's not just enough to be performative and check off the list that, "We have an institution on sexual and gender-based violence," it's like is it actually effective, it is actually working, does it meet the needs of the students? And if not, then that becomes a risk area and that's concerning and that's something that not only just administrators need to look at, researchers need to look at, gender justice advocates need to look at, frontline staff need to look at. And we need to come together and find a better solution than just writing up a policy. So those are some of the unique parts of this tool and I would encourage of course everyone on this call to look at the tool itself and study it. And when I say study, it is a rather large document and it is a bit of a labour of love, but I will say that everything in that document in the tool itself has been studied and reviewed countless times over by all the different people that we've talked about so far.

Sandy: Yeah, I'm just going to quickly add too, I think one thing you asked was what is this tool. You notice that the title of this launch is gender-based and sexualized violence. Often times we use the term campus sexual violence and it's very specific. But this is a tool that is broader than that, and that's why we need to bring a lot of people to the table because if we just look at the research on sexual violence, it's very narrow, it's very discreet. This tool is intended to actually assess for different kinds of risk factors that broaden that. So we're talking about partner violence, we're talking about gender-directed types of violence and we're talking about sexual violence as well, so it is much more broader. The way we're defining violence here is not isolated to physical contact.

And I see in the justice-involved world when we say sexual violence, we actually do include things like technology-facilitated sexual violence or other forms of violence such as – especially when we're talking about child abuse, when we're talking about exploitation of children through these kind of different materials. So here we're also talking about a broader kind of version of violence because as we know there are a lot of things that are not necessarily going to lead to hospitalization, but we know the traumatization of that act is huge. So I just want to highlight that although I've already mentioned that our tool is a structured professional judgment tool, it is intended to look at the broader outcome of those things. And that's the literature that we really focused on and narrowed down in the conversations we had through those advisory panels.

Farrah:	My brain is moving so quickly from the conversation that you two just popped in. One thing I want to name is, Jesmen it was so powerful to hear you talk about going beyond the policy of institutions around commitments to addressing gender equality and gender justice, to looking at hyper-masculinity and the ways in which students are brought into the institution, the conversations that are happening, policy and practice is not enough. It's like overarching commitment and rarely do we see even in equity departments discussions around gender justice, discussions around gender equity, it's missing from a lot of the conversation. So thank you for naming that as a risk factor and it's something that institutions need to look at, we can't just do it individually, it's something that's overarching.
	And Sandy, it thrills me to no end to know that this tool touches upon not just sexual violence but gender-based violence. There's been so many times as someone who has worked in this field for over 20 years where I've seen people miss the opportunity to ask the right questions. And then survivors are left twisting in the wind because you didn't ask them – people treat it like an episodic thing, they're like, "You were sexually assaulted this one time" and not realizing. "Was that your partner, are you being stalked, is there a long-term history, are there other things happening?" So when we do that, it sets up the survivor to not get the adequate care they deserve. So thank you to both of you for even doing that big piece of it because it's so exciting to know that it could push a conversation in a different way, in a better way for survivors. Jesmen, I know you want to jump in.
Jesmen:	I just want to say in addition to this tool not only being a community risk assessment and possibly an institutional audit, it is a discussion tool for those that use it that then could bring it to administrators and other people within the postsecondary institutional community. And talk about some of the shortcomings that might be occurring that are actually failing to prevent gender-based violence from occurring. And I can't highlight enough what you've just spoke about in terms of how the other risk assessment tools that exist out there really take narrow and discreet ways of defining gender-based violence so much so that as you said it excludes other forms and it excludes the context of how people are being harmed or who's doing the harming for that matter.
	And that's problematic because as you said if we don't see the full context then how can people get the true support that they need and how can we make programmatic choices on our campuses accordingly? In fact, what we end up doing is actually hiving off some of that understanding and are really doing everybody a disservice and no wonder we're adding to this idea of institutional betrayal, right? So we're hoping that this tool again not only is a community risk assessment and institutional audit of sorts, but also provides a discussion forum to say, "Hey, how can we do better according to the domains that have been set out by this tool?

Farrah: Yeah, I really hope that it does start conversations and make people think more about they're operating on their campuses. I think many people have been taught under that sexualized violence conversation and then missed a whole amount of harm that happens. And we know that from the research, people between the ages of 16 to 24 are more likely than any other age group to be subjected to intimate partner violence yet it's left out of the conversation on campus. So this hopefully will push it forward. We're going to do about 10 more minutes of discussion and then we're going to move to questions from the audience because there's some really great questions. So if you have a question now's the time to pop it into the Q&A so that we can get ready for it. So Sandy and Jesmen, could you tell me something about, for you, what was the most interesting thing you learned from developing this tool for PSIs and did anything surprise you?

Sandy: I'll let Jes think he looks like he's in deep thought right now [laughs]. I learned a lot. I was a clinician for a number of years before coming into an academic role but it's amazing once you get into that silo you think like an academic and you think like a researcher. And it's so easy to forget about the voices that we need to listen to. That being said, I think my goal was also to balance out with the researcher side of things, so for me I learned a lot from the group that we brought in as part of that advisory committee, advisory panel.

I knew the voices from the research side, but even then I learned a lot from them. It was wonderful to hear their perspectives on these things and also just to make sure that I kind of calibrate accordingly as well. But I found it incredibly valuable to understand from student's perspectives, from administrator's perspectives because for me again I mentioned at the beginning, very practical. I want to make sure I'm producing something with Jes that's practical, that can be used. And I know the biggest thing is buy-in, if anything I've learned from working in criminal justice, with law enforcement and so on just making sure that there's a buy-in. If there's no buy-in then no one's going to use it and no one's going to apply it, no one's going to see value in it and no one is going to use something that is more evidence-based than say the DIY kind of approach, the do-it-yourself intuitive approaches we often see.

So how do you bring buy-in to that unless you have their voices sort of laid in there, embedded in what we've developed? And I think that's the thing I'd probably say I learned a lot from is learning from that perspective, having that in my ear constantly. I know that in my field there is often the academic side of things and research-y side of things that doesn't really tie in as well when we're talking about service providers who are working with victims. And I find that making sure that we always keep that voice in balance. I think it's vice versa as well, right? We need to also keep in mind the researcher side of things, understanding the side that is science-based but I think having both of them are valuable. So this is a really good reminder to maybe re-evaluate a lot of the research that I do to make sure that we include that, so that's something I certainly picked up from this.

Jesmen: I just want to say what I picked up from all of this is being really reminded of that feminist mantra of "the personal is political." Because in some ways the discussions, the consensus development discussions, reminded me how passionate and diligent everyone was talking from their perspective. And I was reminded that each perspective is valuable and I don't think that I didn't know that but I think it's a great reminder. Every time I stepped into these discussions, how people were bringing something valuable to the conversation and again got us to really think through these risk factors and the implications that they have.

I think also too what I've taken away, or what has been confirmed for me, is that we have much more in common regardless of where we're located in the postsecondary landscape. And that is something that is just nice to reaffirm. I think I've always known that we have lots in common with everyone because after all, we're looking for a safer campus community at the end of the day and a great learning experience for all our students that come to our respective institutions. So that's really what I'm taking away is really confirmation of our commonalities in terms of trying to reach this goal of ending gender-based violence at our respective institutions.

Farrah: I'd love to end it at our institutions and everywhere, I think that would be the great goal. But I really appreciate that the tool talks about just the systemic factors that just stop us from that, right, so many things. We saw just last week so many attacks against trans people and thinking about trans students and just know that we're talking about risk factors, risk factors transphobia, risk factors homophobia, there are so many things that are risk factors for people to be safe on campus. I want to ask two more questions before we get to – I want to just know for you what was the most resounding voiced by those on the advisory panels, something that really resounded for you that you learned from the advisory panel with this?

Jesmen: I think something that I heard from frontline staff was very much feeling heard and being valued and respected. Which also at the same time saddened me because it told me that they weren't having that same feeling at their respective institutions. And it wasn't just for those coupled individuals, it seems to be across the sector, quite across the country. So that was something resounding that we heard that their participation in the creation of this tool meant that they felt responded to and heard as well as the people that they served that those impacted by the harm that they've received.

I think one of my favourite moments, I think probably Sandy can attest to this too, is some of the researchers had discussed how this project changed their practical approach and I know Sandy has just spoken to that. But it was so great to hear that it's like, "This really changes the way I see my research." And so much so that kind of headed towards more practical scholarship and communicating that with their students that are learning about how to research this particular topic at postsecondary institutions. And then just the ideas that came from the administrators that

also started on the panel, in fact, it was the administrators that brought up this idea that this tool could also double as an institutional audit.

But I think to me, and I think also to Sandy, what was really important was the students, right, feeling that they weren't just there to checkmark off their participation, that they weren't tokens in all of this. They really expressed feelings of being equal to everyone in the discussions. And that something I strive for at least when I'm talking to students participating in projects like this, is that really hearing them. Not just listening to what they say but deeply trying to understand what they have to offer and understanding that their experience is as valuable as anyone else around the panel.

Sandy: Yeah, I'd probably add that it's interesting from a researcher's perspective and it changed mine as well is we go down a pathway because we learned how to do things in a certain way. And trying to broaden the way we see things, it's very difficult, we don't like change right, human beings just don't like change. So trying to think outside of that box is really hard. So to hear that from especially one of the researchers on our panel I never thought of it that way, this is a different way of thinking.

And honestly, I had to change my way of thinking because I already mentioned before that the outcomes that we usually see in criminal justice is this siloed approach of sexual violence, it's separate from partner violence, it's separate from course of control or separate from general violence. Because we look at these outcomes because we're measuring them, we're operationalizing them. But we think only in that mindset and then we realize, wait a second, it's all just violence. [laughs] But how do we encompass that, how do we think about it in a way that makes sense, it's meaningful? And so for me to change and transform my thinking from these siloed approaches to a gender-based violence kind of approach, and looking at that outcome was very different because I'm thinking now in terms of the traumatic effect it has on the individuals involved. And I'm also thinking of that general kind of behaviour coming from the individual who caused harm. And that's the thing that really had to think outside the box for me, so that was really key.

I won't talk about the individual feedback that we've gotten because Jes had to test it a lot, and brought up a lot of that. But I'd say generally what was interesting is that each person was sort of this cog in this decision-making process and there was not one of them that we did not need, right? It was important for every one of those voices to be in there but it was amazing how much humility people came in with. Everyone felt like, "I don't know why I need to be here because you've already got so and so." And we're like, "No, no I don't think you realize the lens that you're bringing in." Honestly, I didn't think I even appreciated it until probably after we started these meetings and I was like oh my god, this is a different lens, this is different – I'm in my own silo, I didn't realize that until you hear someone else's perspective.   So that was incredibly valuable for us to develop the tool.

Farrah: That is my favourite part of Courage to Act is the collaborativeness, the bringing together of people who oftentimes don't get to be seen as experts on their campus, but are brilliant and have so much information and are experts, but too often shied away from that. I think we're going to go to all the questions, there are a lot of questions so I'm going to say thank you to the audience because there's a lot of great questions. Jesmen, Sandy you can see them in the chat, I've put them there for you. So, if you want to merge some of them together I'll give you a moment to read them.

One of the things that I appreciated from one of the questions and I may just start us off with that and then we can get into some of the ones you're interested, in was a couple of questions around inclusion of same-sex, trans, queer people in these. Because often times as we know the conversation on anything to do with gender-based violence is very much focused on cis and heterosexual relationships. So is that something you thought about when you were creating this? I know we talked about our own sexualities before we started this conversation just today, but where were you in that conversation, how did you think of that in developing this tool?

Sandy: Yeah, so I'm going to just make a quick comment, I think Jes can expand on this much more, we haven't talked about the specific items, we're leaving that for the release of the tool so that everyone can take a look at the manual itself. But a couple of the items really focused on marginalized experiences and marginalized identities. And so we have included very specific forms of concern that we see as important in evaluating the overall community risk. But also useful for the institution to actually see that if this is something that is very prevalent in all of the incidents that have happened across their institution, this is a concern for your institution, right?

So we wanted to make sure that there were two parts to it, one was an issue within this incident but also outside of that, so we do have some items that are very focused on that. The one thing I probably say is that we didn't separate looking at the ways one identifies and looking at the racial components to it, we didn't tease those apart. Could we do that, absolutely but we also want to make sure it was an inclusive tool as well. Because the more specific you make it the more you're going to go, doesn't apply, doesn't apply as opposed to thinking about the broader meaning behind what we mean by a marginalized experience. As opposed to the person's identity is something that is maybe being targeted by someone else, and that's not what we want to do. We really want to be very sensitive to that so there is a component that's very much focused on the meaningfulness of that marginalized experience that the person identifies with. Jes, did you want to add to that?

Jesmen: Yeah, I was just going to add that the tool itself clearly defines it in terms of these particular factors that Sandy's naming and marginalized identity and barriers that are encountered by survivors. Sometimes we've called that marginalized experiences and that these two things are often

components, or not components, but rather people who have caused harm will sometimes take advantage of. But I think something that came across in our panel discussions as well as in our research about all of this is that to try to segment off in terms of all the different types of identities starts to take away from an intersectional approach. And I think that this is why we've adopted a more wholesome, holistic approach to understanding how a person might be marginalized and then be taken advantage of because of that. And so hence we've got again these two factors marginalized identities and systemic barriers encountered by survivors. Again these are two factors that are related to the survivor and that may pose risks that again the institution ought to look at and examine.

Farrah: Thank you so much both of you. I think the conversation around intersectionality is so important with this. I know and I want to remind us all that this is the beginning of this tool. And it's really important to get feedback from the community as we move forward with it and how to strengthen it. And also not to criminalize communities too, there's such a place when we've seen some of risk assessment tools, I remember working on one about forced marriage. And there was a place of just like, if they're South Asian, that's a risk factor. So there's also the piece that goes that way that can be very dangerous and racist.

Jesmen: Can I just add to that is that I think it's for that exact reason why we didn't want to segment people's identities that way, right? And that this tool challenges users to look holistically at the person that you're trying to assist. And think about again their identity and aspects of their identity in a wholesome intersectional way, as opposed to segmenting them off and taking a menu approach to mitigating their risk. Because after all, humans aren't a menu or segmented into all these different things, we're holistic individuals, so thanks for raising that or featuring it that way.

Farrah: There's been some great questions around just like what's next, where can I get this tool? So I'm going to give it back to you for five more minutes. So the tool's available on the Courage to Act website, you can go on our section on the Knowledge Centre and it'll also be there. It'll also be in the Possibility Seeds' website that's launching soon that's really exciting, or relaunching. The other thing to know is that this tool is for PSIs, it's created for PSIs and so there's been lots of questions of, can I take this tool and run with it other ways? It's specifically for PSIs and we ask that that's what it's used for at this time.

We see this as phase one, we're going to be applying for some funding to continue the conversation with this and move it forward. I know people have been asking about training and other ways. You can contact Courage to Act for more information on individualized plans around that but this is the tool that's being released at this time. One of the things that Jesmen and Sandy, I want to ask you something that was brought up in some of the questions, if I have no training in gender-based violence, no training in sexualized violence, can I just go ahead and start leading with this tool and start using it? Who's this tool for and what are some of the caveats of this tool?

Jesmen: Do you want to start off first, Sandy?

Sandy: Why don't you go ahead and I'll add to it, I feel like I've been married to that section for so long [laughs].

Jesmen: I was going to say aspirationally it is individuals who have a commitment to gender-based violence work, right? Which means one has to have a foundational understanding of gender-based and sexualized violence at postsecondary institutions. You can't just know postsecondary institutions and how it works or gender-based and sexualized violence, it's how these two intersect at a postsecondary institution. And to our colleagues in the States that I know that are attending this webinar, to higher education settings as well, that that is fundamental. Certainly, in the tool itself, we have some further learnings that people can look at but the other thing is how to work with people who've caused harm as well as respondents at postsecondary institutions. That becomes important, so understanding how to work with reluctance and resistance.

            Having good interviewing skills, right, and that's not something that you can kind of take in a course, it is a deep study of sorts. I think though if one has a commitment to gender-based violence work at postsecondary institutions this is a tool that you can use to help you in your work. The other I did notice kind of, when can you use this tool, I think I saw in the chat as well. And I would say usually it's when decisions need to be made but really it can be used at any time when there are questions about community safety and security. And so if there are questions that are arising around, "Hey, how's the community managing or feeling," it's time to use that tool.

Sandy: Yeah, the one thing I'm just going to add to that is when we think about people using this tool we wanted to make sure it was accessible by everyone. And so we wanted to make sure that everyone in the community within the college and universities are able to use this. But we also want to make it really clear that having that background like what Jes was talking about is really key. To me the big thing is becoming very familiar with the manual, don't just rip out the worksheet and just start scoring someone [laughs], really know the items. And if anyone knows me about using risk tools, and I think most of my students have heard me say this, read the manual. Read the manual over and over again, right? Because that's what you refer to, you shouldn't be writing to one of us first about how to actually rate someone on this one item. You should make sure that you've read that and then if you have questions because you have a very unique situation then you seek the consultation but you should really understand the manual really well.

Farrah: My gosh, you sound like my partner. My partner's always like, "Farrah, did you read the manual first before asking me this question?" I want to say congratulations to the two of you. It's a huge gift, this tool and I really appreciate the caveats with it. And I think that's what all the Courage to Act tools – even we sometimes get emails being like, "It's really long this document, can you just give me the top five things and

I'll run with it?" And I think it's a good reminder to read about it and that this is a community of practice, this conversation. And these conversations are ongoing, this work is ongoing. I really hope that we get the funding to continue this work ,it's so important so please fill out our evaluation form. It means so much.

I also want to thank – I know that there are people that are from the community that were on your panel, and were helping to create this tool so thank you for being here and thank you for making it to the finish line with us. I want to thank, because this is our last webinar for this part of Courage to Act, I want to thank all the background folks that are doing the work, you don't see their faces, some people like Anoodth, Aubrianna, Laura who used to do the background stuff, Maya, so good and so many amazing things, Andreanne as well. It's been so important to have these conversations with all of you and to have the support of the Courage to Act staff and I really want to name that.

I just want to say again a big thank you to Jesmen and Sandy from Courage to Act's Community Risk Assessment project team. The toolkit is available for download via the Courage to Act knowledge centre. I want to thank Ruchika, the Community Risk Assessment research assistant for her support on this project. A gratitude to the panel advisory panel members for input on risk factors, we couldn't have done this without them. I want to thank Anoodth and Britney De Costa, Anoodth Naushan and Britney De Costa for their input on the manual sections. And lastly I want to thank all of you attendees. This is Courage to Act's last webinar as I've said. It's been a privilege and a joy to learn among and beside you and build this movement of change together.

All webinars, skill shares and tools can be found on the Courage to Act website and later on this week on our brand-new Possibility Seeds website. This means as the Courage to Act project sunsets you can still keep in touch and create change together via Possibility Seeds. And again thank you so, so much, it's the best break. Also, it was really exciting to see folks across North America, Howard University represented, nice to see you, nice to see folks from across the country as well. CJ Rowe is here as well who was one of the first people that created Courage to Act with me. It's really nice to see everyone.

And again thank you to Dr. Jesmen and Dr. Sandy for your brilliance. And I want to say how powerful it is to have a tool created by racialized people that is grounded in intersectionality, care and justice. So thank you for your work and thank you for your dedication to this conversation. A reminder the tool is available, it's not for commercial use, we want to see you use it on your campus. If you have questions, read first then ask questions as Sandy said. And hopefully, if there's anyone from the Canadian government on here we're applying for grants so please give us lots of money. OK, thanks everyone, have a great day, bye.

[End of recorded material 01:02:21]

- 19 -