

Courage to Act Webinar - Engaging Men on Campus

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

Anoodth: Hello, everyone, and welcome to the tenth webinar in our series. My name is Anoodth Naushan, Project Manager of Courage to Act. Courage to Act is a two-year national initiative to address and prevent gender-based violence on post-secondary campuses in Canada. It builds on the key recommendations within Possibility Seeds' final report, "Courage to Act: Developing a National Framework to Prevent and Address Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions". Our project is a first national collaborative of its kind to bring together scholars, experts and advocates from across Canada to end gender-based violence on campus. A key feature of our project is a free webinar series where we invite leading voices to discuss key concepts and share promising practices on ending gender-based violence on campus. Supported by CACUSS, these webinars are also a recognised learning opportunity. Attendance at ten or more live webinars will count towards an online certificate.

Our project is made possible through generous support and funding from the Department for Women and Gender Equality, WAGE, Federal Government of Canada.

We begin today's webinar by acknowledging that this work is taking place on and across the traditional territories of many indigenous nations. We recognise that gender-based violence is one form of violence caused by colonisation to marginalise and dispossess indigenous peoples from their lands and the waters. Our project strives to honour this truth as we work towards decolonising this work, and actualising justice for missing, murdered indigenous women and girls across the country. I'd like to pause now and invite everyone to take a deep breath with me. This work can be challenging. Many of us may have our own experience of survivorship and of supporting those we love and care about who've experienced gender-based violence. A gentle reminder to be attentive to our wellbeing as we engage these difficult conversations.

And before I introduce our speakers today, a brief note on the format. Our speakers will present for about 15 minutes, and then invite you to enter questions and comments into the question and answer box, and I will monitor this, and together we will pose these questions to them at the end. The Q&A will happen in the last 10 to 15 minutes of the webinar. At the end of this webinar, you will find a link to the evaluation form. We'd be grateful if you take a few minutes to share your feedback, as it helps us improve. This is anonymous. Following the webinar, I will also email you with a copy of the evaluation form and a link to the recording so that you can review the webinar and share with your networks. We have two wonderful speakers today, and I am happy

to introduce you to them now. So Dr. Emily Colpitts, our first speaker, is a SSHRC Postdoctoral Fellow at McGill University.

Her current research focuses on the relationship between rising anti-feminist and alt-right backlash, and efforts to address violence and promote social justice on Canadian campuses. She's also a member of the collective board at the Toronto Rape Crisis Centre, Multicultural Women Against Rape. Welcome, Emily. And Dr. Jesmen Mendoza has been registered with the College of Psychologists of Ontario since 2008. He's provided counselling and psychotherapy services since 1999 on a range of issues, and in a variety of settings. He is located at Ryerson University, Centre for Student Development and Counselling where he provides therapy to university students, training to psychology practicum students and consultation to faculty and staff on tricky issues. Prior to Ryerson, he has provided services in a number of social service and criminal justice settings, and applies an integrated, inclusive and positive psychology approach to all of the clinical and community work he delivers.

So, as you can see, we have a really wonderful lineup, and I'm excited to turn it over now to our speakers.

Emily: Thanks, Anoodth. So we wanted to start by just providing an overview of the learning outcomes for today's webinar. So today we're hoping to explore promising practices and current gaps in anti-violence work with men on campus, and we're also going to identify key challenges, considerations and future directions for this work. So we've provided a brief agenda of how we plan to do this, and we're going to start with my section, which focuses on engaging men in preventing violence on campus. I'll then turn it over to Jesmen to talk about engaging men on campus via tertiary interventions, before we both conclude with some sort of future directions and a sense of what might be coming next. And then we'll end today's webinar with a question and answer period and a discussion, and we're looking forward to hearing from all of you.

Jesmen: When we think about engaging men on campus I think that there are a variety of different ways we can engage them. And so if we can think of it as a continuum, we can think of it starting with education, and then afterwards campaigns, upstander or bystander programs, and then discussion groups. And then finally, progressive discipline or sanctions. And as Emily was talking about earlier in our agenda slide that we bifurcated our presentation in two, where she'll be talking about the first part, the education, all the way to discussion groups, and then later on I'll be talking about progressive disciplines and sanctions. And this is just a way of helping us organise our thinking today.

Emily: All right, so I've been studying efforts to engage men in anti-violence work for about eight years now, and I initially began looking at this work in South Africa, which I would consider to be a global leader in engaging men. And from there I shifted my attention to focus on efforts to prevent and address sexual violence at Canadian universities, and I recently conducted research on a couple of initiatives that engage male

students specifically. I've also had the opportunity to facilitate public education workshops with young men in fraternities and on sports teams as part of my work with Toronto Rape Crisis Centre. So I have a bit of a toe in both the research and the practice sides of this work. And I'm excited to share some of the things that I've learned, and also to hear your thoughts. Could you advance the slide, please? Thanks.

So if you conduct a search of Canadian university websites you'll find that when it comes to preventing sexualised and gendered violence on campus there are very few initiatives that focus explicitly on men and masculinities. Some universities have held one-off workshops or events on masculinities and violence, and there have also been poster campaigns in the past targeted toward men on campus. But there's very little in terms of core programming. And some universities also facilitate things like their bystander intervention workshops in gender segregated spaces, which could potentially create opportunity for conversations about masculinity, but that's not the focus of these workshops per se. There also may be initiatives happening off the side of someone's desk or led by student or community organisations that don't necessarily make the university website.

However, I think it's safe to say that Canadian universities are not explicitly focusing on men and masculinities as a priority area for prevention and education in the current moment. And this lack of attention to masculinities is also really reflected in universities' sexual violence policies. So as part of my research, I analyse the sexual violence policies at all of Ontario's public universities, and I find that they generally fall into two categories. So just slightly under half of the policies can be described as identity neutral, which is to say they don't include any mention of gender or of other constructs of identity. And these identity neutral policies might be understood as an attempt to broaden understandings of sexual violence beyond the man as perpetrator woman as victim binary, to make them a bit more inclusive. However, they fail to acknowledge the power relations inherent in sexualised and gendered violence, which then becomes constructed as a depoliticised interpersonal issue.

So then the other policies representing slightly more than half include references to these power relations, and may use language of intersectionality to describe those who face heightened vulnerability to violence. However, none of the sexual violence policies that I reviewed acknowledge the gendered nature of perpetration, despite the fact that cisgender men commit the overwhelming majority of violence. So unless you subscribe to biological essentialist arguments, the gendered nature of perpetration suggests that there's a connection between normative constructions of masculinity and sexualised and gendered violence. So how are we realistically going to prevent violence on campus without addressing masculinities? Now, it's clear, of course, that this work is much broader than the campus context, and ideally should begin from a very young age, but I do still think that there's an opportunity to engage with masculinities in our anti-violence work on campus.

In the time that remains for me this morning I'd like to briefly discuss a number of interrelated challenges and considerations that I suspect are shaping whether and how universities are engaging with men and masculinities in their prevention efforts. And of course this isn't an exhaustive list. The first challenge that I'd like to talk about is getting men in the room. So getting men to participate in anti-violence efforts remains one of the most significant challenges. Sexualised violence is still generally framed as a women's issue, and anti-violence efforts tend to attract those who have experienced violence or are perhaps the most likely to experience violence. And there are definitely certain – there are certainly exceptions, and I've had the pleasure of meeting young men who are very invested in this issue, whether for political reasons or for personal reasons, having themselves experienced violence, or having received a disclosure from someone they care about, for example.

But suffice it to say that this is a challenge that my research participants have consistently identified in this work. Now, there are different strategies for addressing this participation challenge. Although not focused on masculinities, some universities like Concordia and McGill have simply made their sexual violence training mandatory for all of their incoming students. Other universities, like the University of Windsor, have offered incentives for students who participate in their bystander workshops, for example. And then there are examples of targeted recruitment strategies aimed at attracting male students. And that brings us to the question of whether anti-violence work should be targeted toward all men on campus or toward specific groups of men. And if so, which groups of men? So, for example, men's varsity sports teams and fraternities are often identified as priority groups for anti-violence programming, based on the perceived association with hyper masculinity and highly publicised instances of harm.

But it's important to consider whether there are other groups that we might be overlooking when we focus simply on these groups. So one of the campuses that I studied, for example, reportedly has an issue with violence in their e-sports community, which wouldn't necessarily come to mind for me. Related to the challenge of attracting participants is the question of how efforts to engage men in prevention of violence are framed. So research demonstrates that in terms of reduced rates of perpetration, the most effective programs are those that challenge normative constructions of masculinity. However, I've noticed a tendency to try to make anti-violence work more palatable to men to try to avoid alienating potential participants, which often results in reproducing rather than challenging these norms. So this is evident in some of the common messaging that we see in men's anti-violence work.

For example, some campaigns try to flatter men's strength and bravery, and of course construct these as an inherently masculine trait, and frame men as protectors, which ignores the fact that the uneven power relations that put men in a position to offer protection also put them in a position to commit harm. And this is essentially a form of so-called

benevolent sexism. The good guys messaging is also really common. So this might be an effective way of encouraging male participation, but it strategically distances men in the room from men who cause harm, and it doesn't necessarily interrogate how the men in the room might be implicated in the broader power relations that contribute to violence. Other prevention efforts employ man up or real men discourses. And next slide, please. Such as the Real Men Don't Rape campaign. And while this version of the real man doesn't rape, it is still invested in the notion that there's a singular way to be a man and to express and embody masculinity.

And this has the potential, of course, to reproduce trans exclusion and heteronormativity. Next slide, please. I think it's also important to highlight that efforts to prevent violence on campus, especially those that engage with men and masculinities, seem to be engendering backlash. And there are very clear and visible examples of this backlash, such as the Don't Be That Girl counter campaign picture on the slide. As well as targeted harassment and violence against anti-violence activists and practitioners. But I think there are also examples of more subtle backlash that are often masked in depoliticised rhetoric about equality, free speech and due process. And this more subtle backlash serves to sustain the status quo in our institutions. While it might be tempting to dismiss this backlash as a fringe concern or as simply part of the broader context in which our anti-violence efforts are unfolding, I do think that it impacts these efforts at the very least by making folks think twice about whether and how they engage with men in this work. Next slide, please.

There are also challenges and considerations related to the fact that this work is happening in the context of the neoliberal university. So there could and possibly should be an entire webinar dedicated to this topic, but briefly the university is invested in anti-violence efforts that are highly visible and easy to quantify and measure. And this lends itself to things like poster campaigns, and the installation of better lighting and safety poles rather than more substantial transformative work around masculinities. Another potential factor informing whether universities choose to invest in this type of work is that there's a serious lack of rigorously evaluated men's anti-violence programming that could be considered an evidence-based approach. Such transformative work is also resource intensive, both in terms of funding and facilitation capacity.

So at universities where one or two staff members are tasked with responding to disclosures, supporting survivors, developing prevention and education programming, often with very little job security and institutional support, the capacity for this type of work may not always exist. Moreover, it takes knowledge, skills and experience to facilitate anti-violence work with men in a good way. In some cases, such as the Manmade program at Western, the university has partnered with Anova, a community based anti-violence organisation that possesses this expertise. However, universities seem to be increasingly invested in bringing anti-violence work in-house, even when this capacity and

expertise do not exist. And while we all wish we had someone like Jesmen on campus who has this expertise, we know that that's simply not reality.

So having briefly outlined some of the overarching challenges and considerations related to this work, I want to conclude my portion of the discussion of prevention with a few ideas of what it might look like to do this work in a good way. To me, preventing sexualised and gendered violence necessitates creating a space for men to challenge their own assumptions and expectations about masculinity and sexuality, and to examine their own implication in the structures and systems that produce and legitimise violence. This is really vulnerable work, and it really requires, again, a skilled facilitator. I think it's also important to differentiate between work that aims to change men's behaviour and work that aims to transform masculine norms. So, for example, research participants have shared with me some of the pressures that they've experienced from their male peers which they perceive to potentially contribute to sexual assault, and I just wanted to share an example with you.

So one participant said to me, "I lived in a house with three guys, and I hated it, because it was nonstop, who's the big man on campus. Whoever had gotten laid recently you could feel it in the house. You could feel where you were at in the power rankings. It was a horrible way to live. Everybody for the most part wants love, wants to have sex. There's nothing wrong with that. It's dangerous when you're in an environment where you're like I actually need this, I need to go home with someone because Johnny brought someone home last night." So whereas a prevention initiative like bystander training might focus on stepping in to prevent a friend from acting on this pressure and assaulting someone who he knows perhaps doesn't have the capacity to consent, for example, a critical masculinity approach would seek to address this pressure itself. I think this work must also be grounded in a feminist analysis of gendered power relations.

It's not lost on me that contemporary men's rights activism emerged from therapeutic explorations of men's pain and the negative implications of traditional gender roles for men. And while this transformative work is deeply personal, it's important not to lose sight of the political and of the structural power imbalances. Further efforts to engage men in preventing violence must be informed by intersectionality. It has to be at the foundation of all of the work that we do. And it's really important to create space to consider men's varied experiences with privilege, oppression and violence. This isn't always the case in existing anti-violence efforts. For example, I've noticed that all too often bystander initiatives rely on white masculinist protection scenarios that assume that folks are equally able to intervene, and fail to address the uneven risk of criminalisation and escalating violence, for example.

I've also noticed that anti-violence efforts often gesture toward inclusion using language of male identified or masculine identified, but I wonder

whether they actually engage with queer and trans masculinities in any meaningful way, and how a conversation might be enriched by doing so. Finally, I think it's important that these efforts don't simply rush to feel-good allyship and active bystanding, but that they create a space for the uncomfortable work of taking accountability. Now, on this note, I want to turn it over to Jesmen.

Jesmen: Thanks, Emily. I think when I think about the range of work that I've provided over the course of my career, it has been about providing accountability, and that's how I've come to this discussion on engaging men on campus via tertiary interventions. So if I can just remind everybody of the continuum that we thought about – and if we can go to the next slide. You'll recall, as Emily was talking about, the various types of preventative measures from education to discussion groups and everything in between. I think the focus of this part of the presentation is more on the progressive discipline and sanctions, and it's in response to those men that we haven't been able to prevent, if you will, some of the toxic masculinities and the expressions that happen on our campus. And invariably do they end up affecting people on our campus and may be subject to a variety of different disciplines at those particular institutions.

And I thought it would be helpful to maybe ground our discussion on this part of the discussion on engaging men on campus with respect to progressive disciplines and sanctions by actually reviewing, if you will, three different policies from across the country from a variety of different institutions. So perhaps we can maybe first go to the first slide of that. And I don't expect you to take in everything here, just to really show you. The first we're going to start on the West Coast is UBC's discipline for non-academic misconduct and their student code of conduct. And when you think about all the different types of disciplinary sanctions that they may face, you can see here at least UBC lists out explicitly what they could be. So they carefully articulate it out, from warnings and reprimands and probation, all the way to suspensions and expulsions. What I want to highlight your attention to is right in the middle, which it says discretionary sanctions, for example work assignments. That's something to think about.

As we move eastwards across our country here, if we can get to the next slide, this is the University of Manitoba student discipline bylaw. It's interesting; they take a chart-based approach in terms of listing out the discipline, who could actually authorise that discipline. And very similar in terms of what UBC has to offer, from warnings and reprimands and behavioural contracts, to apologies, restitution, as well as suspension, expulsion. And I think if we were to carefully analyse all the different policies from across Canada they have very similar language, and sometimes you find nuances here and there. And again, what I want to highlight your attention to is right in the middle of this slide where it says imposing developmental disciplinary actions. So, for example, community services and educational activities.

And then as we quickly take a snapshot to the East Coast, and not being too university centric, decided to look at New Brunswick's Community College Student Assessment Policy. And as you can see that they're currently under review at the moment, so perhaps maybe those of our attendees that are out there, they might want to provide feedback with respect to this particular policy. But you'll notice that their discipline states that it should be reasonable and progressive in nature, and can range from a verbal warning to an expulsion. So in contrast to the other two examples, they just give arrays, and are not overly descriptive. And I think that that's something important to consider here, that some policies either go very specific or others go very general. But they do mention student standing, Right? Which in this case is conduct probation or conduct suspension, which is similar to the other policies from UBC, as well as Manitoba, and I would say from across Canada for that matter.

But they also have a referral to their Program to Assist Student Success program, which seems to be a very learning focused program, as well as providing support. So hopefully the question that you might be asking is what's missing in the PSI policies. And so what I wanted to say is that specifically counselling and psychotherapy isn't articulated in any of this, or in this type of engagement. And in fact, when we look across Canada, very little reference does it actually say that counselling and psychotherapy can be a way of engaging men in terms of preventing any gender-based violence or sexual violence. It's usually an afterthought, if it is mentioned. So, for example, it'll say something like progressive sanctions or educational workshops, for example counselling. Or there's no mention at all of this type of support, as we can see from these three examples.

But what is most equivalent to counselling and psychotherapy in terms of what we do find is there's lots of mention of education and training, or a project-based approach, and they typically take the forms of papers and workshops, and use an education lens. And what I want to contrast or at least highlight for everyone attending today is that part on an education lens. That this is in contrast to what's therapeutic. And I think education very much – if I can just simply put it, it is like what did you learn, but therapeutic would mean did anything change. And I would think that at this point in terms of trying to engage men on campus with respect to gender-based violence and sexual violence we would hope that something changes. So if we go to the next slide, what might be – what might counselling be missing in PSI policies? What I would say is that there seems to be a lack or no adoption of a holistic approach.

And when I say a holistic approach I typically mean a psychosocial therapeutic approach, a community-driven approach. And you'll see that from some of the articulations in past policies they tend to focus on education. And that's not to say that education shouldn't be an approach, but I think it needs to be one of many different types of approaches that need to be used when articulating counselling in a PSI policy. Not spelling it out in the policies themselves is also sometimes

problematic. If it's not listed there as counselling and/or psychotherapy, policy readers tend to not actually think of it or consider it as an actual remedy or sanction, or form of discipline. The other piece is kind of what Emily had alluded to, is that there might not necessarily be qualified staff to provide such interventions. And I have to just personally say that I came to this fortuitously. As Anoodth had mentioned in my bio at least that I was firmly situated in the criminal justice system.

And what ended up happening was I needed to round out my training, and did it at a university counselling centre, and did I find a dual interest in both. And I think being able to find those individuals to be able to offer, if you will, a comprehensive, holistic approach, is important to consider. So if we move to the next slide, hopefully you are all asking the question – if counselling was offered as a sanction or form of progressive discipline, what would be offered? And so in my at least read of the entire sector, and as Emily was alluding to earlier in her presentation, there is a dearth of models and approaches with respect to engaging men who have been found to cause harm in post-secondary institutional settings. So, where can we look? This is not necessarily the best place to look, but I would say that this is one place to look in terms of just being able to compare and contrast with what's being offered.

And so I would say perhaps an idea of what could be offered is through the criminal justice system. So if we survey the criminal justice system in terms of their programming responses, for intimate partner violence, which is the way that they would frame it – and I'm wondering if we can go to the next slide too, Anoodth. There is much to be said, but one really good article or report paper to examine is the "Programming Responses for Intimate Partner Violence" by Lisa Heslop, Tim Kelly, Randal David and Katreena Scott, through the Department of Justice Canada in 2016. And what they had noticed with respect to gender-based programming for those in the criminal justice system is that its delivery has been variable across the country, and that it usually takes one of three formats. Psychoeducational, which tends to be the delivery of education principles, and is probably most similar to what we're seeing across post-secondary institutions.

The next is Cognitive Behavioural Therapy, which tends to be the search for [entitled? 00:29:56] beliefs that the individual has and being able to shift them. And then the final, and probably my preference or my bias, is narrative, which has pro-feminist underpinnings, which really is about raising consciousness within the participants. They also take on a group format with complementary individual services, and I would say actually that that's probably the preferred way. Because if I think about accountability, gender-based violence and sexual violence are really social issues and should they be addressed in a social format, like group counselling. Typically they range in 10 to 20 weeks in length, and I think you can all appreciate that for asking students to come to a program that size that is not only time-intensive and labour-intensive, but might even go past the academic year, and that's

a consideration to have. And in these groups they typically have 8 to 12 participants.

The most fascinating thing about the programming responses in the criminal justice system is that they tend to take a one-size-shoe-fits-all approach. And, in fact, a lot of research for the last two decades have actually suggested that it's not so much which program works for this issue of gender-based violence and intimate partner violence but rather for which person does which approach make sense. And it's unfortunate that we're at a state in terms of delivery in our criminal justice system that it is just a one-shoe-fit – size-fits-all approach. The other is the topics addressed, and that they typically are limited to these ones that are listed here, which are understanding abuse; looking at the impact on victims and survivors, which also includes children; emotional regulation skills and problem-solving. And so there's probably much more to address, and I'll talk a little bit about that at my next slide.

But in terms of accountability to victims, survivors and children, and system integration, they are usually a partner contact component, and usually there is coordination with the system at large. And the reason why that's important is that we know that those that engage in gender-based violence will typically co-opt the system or use the system to their advantage. And the way to best actually address that is through system integration. So hopefully that then you might be thinking there's lots missing in the criminal justice system response, and I would agree with all of you, and that these are certainly my observations. And this is not an exhaustive list of them, but I would say that there's a lack of an explicit statement on being survivor-centred. And I would say that that's really important. At least when I have done this work clinically in the past, what I've always kept in mind is what would the survivor want me to say, or how would they want me to account.

The person that's partaking in this type of program, how would they need to be accounted for their use of gender-based violence? The other is an equity analysis and lens, as well as considerations around intersectionality. I think quite often these programs take a very narrow approach in terms of understanding how to address gender-based violence, and do not pick up some of the cultural nuances or multiply oppressed nuances that do occur. If we can also get down to the next point, Anoodth, as well, is trauma-informed. I think quite often we would be remiss in thinking that the people that are in this type of system, as well as men on our campus that have been found to cause harm, don't have a trauma history. Typically they do, and I think it would be important to make sure that such a response is trauma-informed. And then next, holistic framework, and I'll go to the next one too, individually tailored.

That there needs to be room for some discussion for specific issues for the individuals that are partaking in such a criminal justice response or programming. There also tends to be a lack of discussion on a focus on

healthy conflict skills. And as far as I'm concerned, when I talk to anyone that will talk to me on these issues, what I typically say is that conflict is actually healthy for relationships. It helps us get to the truth. But there's a difference between healthy conflict, high conflict, abuse, assault. And what we really want to do is get to having good healthy conflict skills. And I would say that this topic is rarely – or not rarely but if I can characterise it as not often discussed enough in such programs. There's also not enough focus on a healthy sexuality discussion in terms of what does healthy sexuality look like. And then the last two I would say is how to take responsibility, substantive responsibility taking, in contributing factors such as alcohol, drugs, and family of origin.

And what I would also say too is that what's threaded through all of this is the idea of masculinities, and emphasise – emphasis, rather, on the plurality of it all. That there are many ways of being able to express masculinity, and not just one way, as Emily had alluded to earlier in her part of the presentation. So then hopefully you're also asking the question of what is an ideal approach at a post-secondary institution. And I would say all of the previous lenses and topics that have been discussed in the past two slides would be that, and I would also focus in on the last part, which is focus on healthy conflict skills and healthy sexuality. But I would also say that in a PSI it needs to be youth culture focused, and be part of the times, if you will. And so when there are discussions around the Me Too movement, that figures into the discussion. Anything in terms of how social media is used needs to be threaded into the therapeutic conversations.

I would also add, too, that an ideal system would be flexibility in delivery, so such as being able to offer things virtually, like what we're doing today, and being able to tailor them to individual needs. And then the last part is testing. That all of these ideas need to be tested to see if they're truly effective in being able to actually change people's behaviours, as well as change people's minds, as well as learn at the same time. Hopefully this is all asking the question of what's next, which is located on our next slide. And I would say that perhaps maybe the first place would be political advocacy.

And I think that those policies that are under review, wherever you might be located across our country here, I would say that in terms of political advocacy, showing up to these policy discussions and policy reviews would be helpful. The next piece is call to action, and I'm also going to – Emily, feel free to jump in to where you would like to speak. I would say motivate researchers, right? Around you. If you know of any researchers, please get them interested in these topics, because I think that this is how we have traction and movement.

Emily: Yeah, I think a lot of these points are aimed at something that we've both highlighted, which is the dearth of evidence-based approaches. And so one of the things that we'd like to see moving ahead is actual investment in building the evidence base. So rigorously evaluating programs that exist, and trying to figure out what is working, both in

terms of prevention and in terms of response. And so we've come up with a few different suggestions here, whether it's funding for a CRC on this topic, connection grants, and thinking about working in multi-sectoral partnerships with policymakers, with community partners, with student activists, of course, and thinking through what this work could and should look like.

And – oh, we wanted to also highlight that our Engaging Men Community of Practice as part of Courage to Act is working on developing a best practices toolkit. So that'll be released, I think, over the winter, and they'll be hosting a tool sharing session publicly to discuss that, so that's something to keep an eye out for as well.

Jesmen: You'll notice also, too, that some of the suggestions that we make are indeed research oriented, and we think the reason why we've centred ourselves around some of those ideas is because at the end of the day a PSI is focused on knowledge creation and research, and scholarship. And I think that speaking the language of the institution is helpful in being able to kind of, if you will, create a movement of change with respect to engaging men on campus. So ... So I think that takes us to the end of the didactic part of our presentation, and that leads us to questions and discussions. And perhaps, Anoodth, you can guide us through this piece.

Anoodth: Great, thank you, Emily and Jesmen. And now I'd like to invite our attendees to share any questions and comments, and you can do so by typing these into the Q&A box at the bottom of your screen. Okay. So Emily and Jesmen, we have a couple of questions already for you. And so the first one is: who do you think, Jesmen, can deliver this work, and what kind of training might they need?

Jesmen: I think at least in terms of the tertiary interventions and preventions that I was talking about earlier, it does need to be someone that is aware of both sectors, right? In terms of knowledge of gender-based violence, sexual violence, misconduct, as well as someone that is deeply interested in campus post-secondary work. And I think you need someone with dual interest, and I think it's hard to find those individuals sometimes. I think you can find one or the other, but you truly need someone that has an interest in both. And I wonder if at the end of the day it is about fostering interest in the training pipeline. And I wonder if we go back to our institutions that train clinicians and educators to take an interest in both. So that's kind of what I'm thinking about, Anoodth, in terms of who can be poised to be able to deliver this type of work, at least on the tertiary side of things.

Anoodth: Great, thank you, Jesmen. And the next question is directed to you, Emily. Because you'd outlined some criteria, and folks were wondering if you could please provide an example of the critical masculinities program that meets some of the criteria that you had outlined.

Emily: Thank you, yeah. So I don't know that there's a program that meets all of those criteria, but there is one program that I mentioned in my

presentation, which is the Manmade program at Western University, which was created by Dr. Annalise Trudell, from Anova, which is a community-based anti-violence organisation in London. And so Manmade is facilitated at both Western and Fanshawe College by folks who are trained by Anova, which addresses this issue of skilled facilitation. It brings men together – it's very interesting, because it brings men together who are mandated to take the program after they've violated the sexual violence policy. So it is in part an education piece for those who have committed harm. But men were also invited to participate in it voluntarily; I think they get a co-curricular record for participating, so it is a sort of interesting hybrid program that brings together men from various points along that spectrum that we had included in the earlier slide.

So far as I know, it's a four-week program with a focus on masculinities, consent and sexuality, and it also includes, I think, a final week on taking accountability. So it does address some of those core topics, and it is grounded in a feminist analysis of gendered power relations coming out of that community-based organisation and the orientation of that organisation. But that being said, I think there is, as far as I know, some room for improvement around the intersectionality piece of the program. I think four weeks is very short to go into the depth maybe required to do some of these explorations, so there's potential to expand on that, maybe into six weeks or something like that.

And we need to scale it up and get more men involved, and perhaps try to recruit more participants, particularly from those who are taking it voluntarily for co-curricular record. And to my knowledge the program has not yet been rigorously evaluated to determine its impact, and so there's also a need to do that, to be able to say that it's in fact an evidence-based approach. But to me that's one example of a program that seems promising or at least headed in the right direction in terms of meeting those criteria. Thank you.

Anoodth: Great, thank you, Emily. And so our next question is if you could also share any specific ways to get men to show up to voluntary programming without diluting the messaging, to make it a bit more palatable. And perhaps if you could share an example of a successful group on a Canadian campus and maybe what their promo strategy was.

Emily: Yeah, that's a tough question, I think, just because there aren't necessarily – there isn't necessarily a lot of this work that is happening. At least not that I have access to, as someone who's external to different institutions. But I do think in terms of framing this what I've seen is a shift away from explicit focus on sexual violence and consent, and topics like that, toward more of a conversation about bigger questions about different pressures men are facing, men's mental health, things like that, using that sort of therapeutic framing as a way of getting men into the space.

I think that there are, as I mentioned, some particular risks around that type of framing in terms of focusing too intensely on the personal and losing sight of the political. But as long as the facilitators are really intentional about keeping that balance, I think that that can be a potential way of easing into these topics and having those productive conversations. In terms of a particular effort on campus, I'm not sure. I have seen some really good promotional materials around the Men's Circle program at UBC, which is actually run by the Student Union Sexual Assault Centre. So that's one that I would recommend checking out.

Jesmen: Emily, I just wanted to say that at Ryerson we had tried a staged approach, right? Meaning we would very much encourage student male leaders to take up programming like this, like the ones that you described, first, and then eventually asking them to, if you will, "recruit" others into similar programs, so long as that they had found it useful. So I do wonder if that might be an approach as well in terms of being able to recruit men or get men into preventative programs like the ones that you discussed.

Emily: Yes, certainly, and there are plenty of examples of targeted recruitment, which I mentioned but didn't specify, but I know that some universities have tried to do the heavy recruitment with the football team, for example, to try to get those visible male leaders on campus to engage, in the hopes that that will encourage other students to engage as well, yeah.

Jesmen: Right.

Anoodth: Great, thank you. And our next question is from [Robin], and Robin was wondering if you were hopeful that we might be able to shift our racist and sexist legal system to one that's more equity-based, survivor-centric and trauma-informed. So a system that's more responsive to social problems. And if you're hopeful, how?

Jesmen: That's a really great question. [Laughs]. I think that there's lots to say. Could you just rephrase the question again?

Anoodth: Yeah. Absolutely. And it's a big question too, right? So the question was in what ways are we hopeful that we might be able to shift our legal system that can be racist and sexist to one that's more equity-based, survivor-centric, trauma-informed.

Jesmen: Yes. Thank you. The immediate thought that I have is the idea of not only just having a just or human rights services centred – or human rights based campus, or ... I think to myself that we need to insert the idea of care. Right? That we are a caring and just campus community. And that's how I think we get away from an adversarial idea of dealing with some of these issues, or a legalistic way of dealing with some of these issues. And I think that if we think about being able to centralise care into the heart of all of our campuses, I wonder where we would start to go. I know that – if I can reference Pierre Elliott Trudeau, he had

talked about having a just society, and in some ways, what we're discussing today is having a just campus.

And if we can make parallels to that, then perhaps we need a caring and just campus, and a caring and just society. So, after all, where do people learn how to be citizens? You know. It's typically at a post-secondary institution – it's one of many places, but this is typically one place. And if we can centralise that, perhaps it will have a domino effect. So those are my thoughts. I don't know, Emily, if you have any ideas in terms of this broader question of being able to shift and make movements away from a legalistic idea of how to approach these issues.

Emily: Yeah, that's a big question for me. I mean, working with survivors at Toronto Rape Crisis Centre, I see how often the criminal justice system fails survivors, and I'm very conscious of that. And I'm also a bit wary when I see the default direction that campus anti-violence or campus sanctions – when it defaults to punitive approaches. I'm a bit concerned about that. But I also have some questions and concerns about transformative and restorative justice practices and how those – what the possibilities are for implementing those in the campus context where we know that those are often deeply rooted in community, and in racialized communities and queer communities, and require some sort of relationship for that work to happen in a good way. And so there's a question of whether or not or what the particular challenges are around trying to institutionalise these types of practices.

And I was at Dalhousie doing my Master's during the dentistry scandal, and the way that that was handled, sort of a very non-consensual, restorative justice, so-called restorative justice process, right? So I'm a bit sceptical about that. And I think that that – and you can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think that this possibility for restorative and transformative justice is something that one of our Communities of Practice at Courage to Act is also focusing on and developing some recommendations around. So that should be forthcoming as well, I think.

Jesmen: I think – Emily, I would just add that theoretically in terms of restorative justice it makes sense. I think how it is practically delivered requires really seasoned and skilled individuals. Because if not done well, it ends up – it can become quite disastrous for people, and re-traumatize individuals. And not just, if you will, survivors, but I would also say for people on the other side of the equation, meaning those that have been found to cause harm, that it can be traumatising in that respect. But I would say that it would probably triply impact survivors even more so if restorative measures aren't done well.

Emily: Yeah, I absolutely agree. This is work that is really important, and another area where I'd like to see more research, more creative thinking. But it – you're absolutely right that it needs to be done really intentionally and in a really good way with skilled facilitators.

Jesmen: Right.

Anoodth: Yeah, Emily and Jesmen, may I jump in, then? Because there are a couple of questions, actually, about restorative justice, and folks are wondering if you have any examples of PSIs that used a more restorative justice model for response programs.

Jesmen: I can't say I know – I mean, I ... I'm aware of more American based approaches to bringing people together after someone has been sanctioned, but it has taken – again, what I've learned from at least my survey of it, is that a skilled facilitator is needed. I'm – Emily, I'm not aware of a campus that does restorative work where they bring both sides together, and perhaps maybe our attendees might know more than us. Maybe the crowd wisdom out there might know. But I'm not exactly clear. Perhaps you might know of any efforts out there.

Emily: I think there's certainly been conversations about it, and I don't doubt at all that this work is happening on campus in smaller pockets. I don't know of institutionalised approaches, aside from the Dalhousie approach, which, again, I think is not a very good example of doing this work in a good way. And there's plenty of material on what went wrong with that process if you want to read up on that a little bit more. I know that a few years ago at Ryerson, actually, Farrah Khan hosted – I think it was a two-day symposium on this topic bringing together folks from PSIs and also from community organisations who were engaged in some sort of restorative and transformative justice approaches to talk about these very questions and that was a really productive space.

In terms of whether campuses are implementing this, I'm not entirely sure. I focus a little bit more on policy and on prevention, on that side of things, rather than on responses, so it's entirely possible – and like you said, it's possible that someone here in the webinar can shed some light on whether those efforts are happening. But I'm not 100 percent sure myself.

Anoodth: Thank you, Emily and Jesmen. So our next question, Jesmen, was: how do you account for students unwilling to attend counselling when you assign it as a sanction? Oh, Jesmen, you might be on mute.

Jesmen: Yes. Thank you. I think that this is when it matters as to who is referring the person to counselling. And that at least at our institution when that happens there is great care taken to the referral. So there's usually a consultation with me in advance, simply because it allows us to individualise the topics and tailor the topics accordingly. Because not everything might need to be discussed with the individual, or there might even be a need to highlight a particular topic amongst many topics that I would have a standard discussion with students on. That would then coded into the student's behavioural contract, and then the student case manager or the conduct officer would make the referral accordingly to me. And it almost very much mirrors in the criminal justice system a probation officer making a referral to a counselling agency or some type of support agency.

I almost count into fact that there's going to be reluctance and resistance from the very beginning, and then this is where I rely on my skills of engagement at that point. And typically I like to start off the discussion first about healthy relationships or healthy sexuality, and then work my way backwards, because I think that that is a much more easier frame to work with than talking about, "Well, tell me what you have done that brought you in front of me," at that point. I also like to be immediate with people, recognising that they have been, if you will, mandated or ordered. You know. And I think to not recognise that can feel quite awkward for the individual and I would also say for the therapist, right? And so it's really working with the reluctance and the resistance that the student might have. And, in fact, once you actually explore what's underneath the reluctance and resistance, it is usually some false misconception about how the process is supposed to be.

And that's where I really get to provide proper education in terms of how this can actually benefit them. And what's really surprising – or actually it's not, it's no longer surprising to me – is that although they may be asked to address a number of issues, quite often do they come back and say, "Can I come back and see you to talk about this other issue that I have?" And it's like of course you can. And I think that that's the point, is that when we use these tertiary interventions and counselling that I've been talking about, and we get to the heart of the matter, people start to discover that there's goodness in terms of this type of intervention. And I think, again, that it takes a bit of training to be able to skillfully engage people in these meaningful conversations, and at the end of the day, that's what they are, they're meaningful conversations.

Anoodth: Thank you, Jesmen. And then another question that's a little related. So folks have found that counsellors at PSIs themselves have been reluctant to take on clients who are mandated. Can you speak to why this is, and how we might address this?

Jesmen: I think a lot has to do with training and appetite. Appetite that the counsellors want to address this issue, and training. Being able to offer, if you will – I know today is more of a webinar, but perhaps even more training like this where we substantively talk about how do you hold people accountable, how do you make accountability statements, which I would say are different from apology statements. How can you meaningfully take responsibility? And sometimes there are no contact conditions between people, so then how do you take responsibility in those cases? What are – how can you recount and account for the events without necessarily blaming, minimising any of their actions?

Which I think is really important, and so – and I don't think that this is a skill set for counsellors that comes easy, because it's not present in their training. And I can tell you that I've had to actively search that out, as opposed to it being presented, so... So, yes, so let me just repeat that I think the appetite of a counselling centre or a counsellor that's willing to take on this work, and much needed training. I've had to borrow from the criminal justice system and then interpret it into a

campus community so that it makes sense for the community that I serve.

Anoodth: Thank you, Jesmen. And are there perhaps papers, toolkits or resources that counsellors on campus might draw on for their clinical interventions with students, particularly for those who engage in sexual harm?

Jesmen: I think that there is – and perhaps maybe this is some of the stuff that we might have in a corresponding blogpost that we would be able to put out there. But I would say that the working group of Courage to Act is working on some best practice guidelines with respect to offering support for men that have been found to cause harm. And so I would say to look out for that in the New Year, I think, when that gets released. And it would be a values-based approach, because I think we can get lost in the technologies of how to deliver this type of support, and I think what needs to guide it is actually principles. And so you will find that report from the working group in the New Year.

[Long Pause]

Jesmen: Anoodth, did we lose you?

Anoodth: Oh, sorry, I think I was on mute. Sorry, Jesmen. Our next question was from the students, actually, and they were wondering what kind of conversations men might be able to have with their peers to help address and prevent sexual violence?

Emily: Yeah, that's such an important question, and I think really is at the heart of prevention work. We know in terms of promising practices that peer facilitation, skilled peer – sorry, skilled peer facilitation, is often a really useful model and is often a bit more approachable than having somebody who's older come in and facilitate this work. So when we have skilled peer facilitators that can be really important. And it's also important that these conversations are happening in casual settings outside of programming.

In terms of the how-to's I think taking some of these key questions around the campaigns that we see on campus and maybe starting a critical conversation about what sort of messages those campaigns have in terms of masculinities or in terms of harm, and trying to get at some of these bigger questions, questions about these pressures that men are facing, that might potentially contribute to the perpetration of sexual violence, for example. So trying to start to have those questions – or those conversations, I think, with our friends, is a really important place to start.

Anoodth: Okay, wonderful. So we've had a really good discussion today, and I know that there are lots more questions in the comments and the Q&A box, but perhaps this is something, Emily and Jesmen, that we can focus on and help answer in some upcoming blog posts of Courage to Act. But Emily and Jesmen, thank you so very much for sharing your



www.couragetoact.ca

time and your expertise with us today. We've learnt a lot. And the recording will be available on our website in a few days. I also want to thank our participants for joining us today, and for sharing with us. We appreciate and take inspiration from your commitment to addressing and preventing gender-based violence on campus. And we feel very lucky to be able to work alongside each and every one of you. So, thank you again, everyone, and a kind reminder to please complete the evaluation forms, and we will see you at the next webinar on Friday, November 20th. Thank you.

Emily: Thank you.