Independent Review of Mount Allison

REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW PANEL FOR MOUNT ALLISON UNIVERSITY
JUNE 30, 2021

OVERVIEW

In late December/early January 2021, the

(D) TRAINING AND EDUCATION

a.

reason, this report will similarly focus on student experiences. Mount Allison's sexual violence policy, however, applies to students, staff and faculty (with the proviso that in the event the sexual violence policy conflicts with the terms of a Collective Agreement, the

CCLISAR

> We believe that the range of available services must be: a) adequate in scope and not overburdened; b) not put too much of the responsibility on survivors to alter their routines or behavior; and c) be coordinated so that survivors do not have to repeat their story over and over. We believe that UBC should implement a one-stop, but not one-size-fits-all, model.[5] (emphasis added)

Consistent with the above emerging best practice for a centralized and one-stop approach to disclosures and reports of sexual violence on campus, from May 2016 to January 2021, Mount Allison University had a designated sexual violence office. This office was referred to under the University's policy as the SHARE Service (Sexual Harassment and Assault Response and Education Service).

CCLISAR

- These overlapping functions contributed significantly to the lack of trust in the SHARE office and in Mount Allison University's response to sexual violence, as articulated in the public criticisms in November 2020 and during the course of the IRP's consultations.

- The blurring of roles also raised concerns about privacy and confidentiality for complainants and respondents. In particular, there were concerns about the unclear relationship and information-sharing between the SHARE and Student Life offices.

- In her educational mandate, the SHARE Advisor was required to develop educational

CCLISAR

The IRP will limit its comments and recommendations to these issues as they relate to the University improving its responses to campus sexual violence. In this regard, the IRP was advised repeatedly in the consultations about the critically important role played by the Indigenous Affairs Co-ordinator in supporting BIPOC students who have experienced sexual violence.

The IRP is concerned about the workload carried by the existing BIPOC staff persons, and the potential for vicarious trauma for the staff persons whom underserved students turn to for support. The IRP emphasizes the importance of ensuring institutionalized practices and structures are in place to support these staff as a matter of prevention and community building (rather than, for example, support being limited to individual referrals to counselling through the Employment Assistance Program).

Finally, the IRP heard that on-campus counselling services were not, or were not perceived to be, accessible or appropriate for BIPOC and LGBTQ2S students. The IRP recognizes the challenges, particularly in a small community like Sackville, in hiring and retaining a staff complement of qualified counsellors who are fully representative of and responsive to a diverse student body. The IRP also recognizes that the counselling staff may well be trained in certain areas. The IRP, however, is reporting on the concerns raised. The recommendations for better meeting the counselling needs of BIPOC and LGBTQ2S students and staff will be discussed in the next section on counselling and wellness.

<u>Recommendations:</u>

1. Mount Allison University retain a knowledge keeper/elder in residence with employment of a minimum of three days a week who will serve as a cultural, spiritual and emotional support provider for those disclosing and/or reporting sexual violence. The elder should be someone who identifies as a woman or two-spirit and who has been selected through a process that includes staff and student consultation and which meets Indigenous Elder recognition and approval processes

students, on the intersection between sexual violence experienced by Indigenous people, colonialism and trauma.

3. Mount Allisonshould follow though with its 2019 commitment to establish a website

CCLISAR

4. In the design of the training, the University should include a plan for evaluating the effectiveness of the mandatory training, identifying areas for ongoing training, and include a requirement that such reviews are conducted every 3 to 5 years and reported to the University community.

b. Mandatory Training of First-Year Students

The literature on campus sexual violence confirms that a significant risk period for sexual violence is the first six weeks of the fall semester (commonly referred to as the 'red zone'), particularly in the context of drinking or other partying associated with orientation events.[13]

The IRP's consultations were consistent with these statistics. Students discussed significant issues of sexual violence in residence and particularly during this 'red zone' period in September and part of October. In particular, we heard about incidents of sexual violence that coincided with an important student event, "Sackvegas", that frequently concludes with parties involving alcohol (whether or not sanctioned by the event). Further, the timing of the event coincides with when orientation and other student leaders are permitted to consume alcohol for the first time following the dry period for safety during orientation.

The IRP acknowledges that the Sexual Violence Prevention Working Group has made recommendations for education and training. The IRP's recommendations below are intended to complement (and not override) any recommendations made by the Working Group. The IRP acknowledges the importance of institutions developing education and training programs that meet their own specific needs and circumstances.

<u>Recommendations</u>:

To address the common but extremely serious problem of sexual violence involving first-year students in the first six to eight weeks of school, the IRP recommends that:

1. All first-year students complete an online training module prior to commencing their studies and/or residence at the University. The mandatory online training should be followed with mandatory in-person workshops in the first and second semesters. For the first semester, the training should occur in the first three weeks of school, the

[13] See for example Senn, Charlene Y, et al, "Sexual Violence in the lives of first-year university women in Canada: no improvements in the 21st century" (2014) 14:135 BMC Women's Health 135

completion of which is a pre-condition to remaining in residence and/or enrolment in winter courses, including training on consent (including in cases involving intoxicated/incapacitated complainants), healthy relationships, bystander intervention, and education related to the intersecting impacts of colonialism, racism and homophobia. It is equally important that students receive thorough and repeated education regarding the University's sexual violence policy, including how and where to make a complaint or disclosure, available accommodations and immediate measures under the policy, and information on what further supports and services are available. This education should be complemented by a communication plan to ensure that new members of the Mount Allison community have multiple and different opportunities to learn about the University's response to sexualized violence.

2. Safe options for attendance at these mandatory training sessions be made available for those who identify as survivors, to avoid re-traumatization or triggering.

3. If in the first year of the mandatory training the hiring of internal educational experts in the sexual violence office is not completed, the training should be delivered co-delivered by skilled external experts alongside the sexual violence office staff, in order to build capacity.

4. Staff in the sexual violence office be trained on the policy by a lawyer with expertise in sexual violence, sexual assault law, gender equality and administrative law/procedural fairness. This training may be covered by the mandatory training of all faculty and staff.

5. The University simultaneously develop an plan for evaluating the effectiveness of the training every 3 to 5 years

c. Improved Training and Support for Students in Leadership Positions in Residence

Another area of concern that the IRP heard expressed repeatedly in the consultations is related to the responsibilities imposed on, and concerns about the inadequate training for, residence assistants (RAs) and other students who support their peers in residence (such as house executives and academic mentors).

In general, consultation participants who had acted as RAs and others who had lived in residence, expressed serious concern that young students who served in these roles (sometimes as young as 19) were not equipped in terms of life experience or training, to respond appropriately to disclosures or reports of sexual violence or to deal with high-risk situations late at night in the residences (or the aftermath of these situations). We heard comments such as "sexual violence has to be external to the RAs". We also heard that training was limited and that there was no or limited follow-up training. We were told that there was no manual or checklist for RAs to easily access. It was clear from our consultations that not all individuals who had served as RAs had a competent understanding of the University's sexual violence policy or where to direct a student who had experienced sexualized violence.

The IRP recognizes that RAs are a necessary and important part of running a residence and that disclosures to these young students/staff are inevitable. The IRP recommends that the University enhance the supports and training for RAs and other responsible students.

<u>Recommendations</u>

understanding sexual violence, consent, resistance, healthy relationships and bystander training and the University policy, with a specific focus on interactions and contexts that arise in university sport and the relationship between sports based gender hierarchies and the cultural norms that contribute to the perpetuation of sexualized violence

2. For the next two years, training on sexual violence be delivered by a third-party contractor expert in delivering training to sports teams.

3. The training occur in the fall, with follow-up training scheduled for early in the winter term.

4. Options or accommodations for attending the training be available for those students who identify as survivors or intergenerational survivors.

e. Resilience and Mental Health Training and Support for Faculty and Staff

As discussed above, the risk of burnout and vicarious trauma is significant for persons who are exposed to disclosures and reports of sexual violence. Not only are burnout and vicarious trauma unhealthy for the University staff in question, they can also lead to an unhealthy work environment with direct impacts on survivors and the university community generally.

Recommendations:

(E) POLICY AND PROCEDURE REFORM

The Mount Allison University Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Policy 1006 was first approved on May 17, 2016 and has been revised twice since, first in July 2020 and then, in January 2021, to implement interim changes to address the concerns raised by community members in November 2020. The interim changes have been in place pending the release of the IRP's report.

The University's current Sexual Violence Policy has some strengths but also a number of significant weaknesses, which, as discussed at the outset of this report, contributed significantly to the climate of mistrust of the SHARE office.

The strengths of the existing policy include its recognition at various stages of the complaint process of the rights and interests of complainants as well as respondents. For example, the policy confirms the rights of both the complainant and respondent to receive an unredacted copy of the report of an investigation into a complaint, as well as a copy of the written

that the entire policy be reviewed and revised, including for example the purpose and limitations sections (which contain provisions not related to purpose or limitations) and

1) Centralized office to receive disclosures and reports

As discussed in section A of this report, all disclosures[15] and reports of sexual violence should be processed through a centralized sexual violence office at Mount Allison University with dedicated staff providing information, resources and support to survivors/complainants.

Students or staff may be supported in the process by a person other than a sexual violence staff person (e.g by an elder, a trusted staff member, or even a representative of a partner agency should Mount Allison develop and maintain such partnerships). However, the intake forms and process must still be processed through the centralized office.

The January 2021 interim update to the sexual violence policy and procedure to permit students to disclose/report to an external agency (Crossroads for Women, or an internal acting facilitator. For survivors, the role of these persons was to explain the options and support them in navigating the option they choose. A separate facilitator assist respondents. The IRP has been advised in these consultations that the role of facilitators as a resource for both complainants and respondents has generally been a success to date. The IRP's view is that any such success confirms the need to ensure that resource persons for each party have discrete and clear roles under the policy. The IRP was also advised that in practice, very few students accessed Crossroads for the purpose of disclosing or initiating a process under the University policy. The IRP draws no conclusions from this information, although recognizes that Covid-19 and the reduction of in-person classes and interactions (including Crossroads reducing its physical presence on campus) may have played a role.

The reliance on facilitators and an external agency to receive disclosures and reports under the interim policy represented an appropriate transition from the previous policy under which the SHARE Advisor was responsible for multiple, conflicting roles.

<u>Recommendations</u>:

Going forward, however, the process for disclosures and reports of sexual violence, and support for survivors in navigating the University's policy and procedures, should be returned to a renewed, renamed, specialized and properly staffed sexual violence office at the University.

[15] "Disclosures" refers to disclosures to the University to obtain an institutional response, such as an accommodation.

On the other hand, while the value of a centralized office systemically tracking sexual violence on campus was recognized, there are disadvantages to a mandatory approach. In particular, concern was expressed in the consultations that survivors would simply not disclose to anyone if the confidence of the trusted recipient was breached by a mandatory duty under the policy to disclose information to others, even if in de-identified form. Another concern involved the difficulty of clearly identifying when a staff or faculty member would have a duty to provide information to the sexual violence office. For these and other reasons, until more research is done on mandatory tracking of disclosures in this way, the IRP has not recommended that Mount Allison University adopt this approach.

The IRP does, however, strongly encourage Mount Allison to ensure that its policy is clear, including in its definition of terms, that sharing of information with a trusted person is not a "Disclosure" or "Report" under the policy that triggers an institutional response.

3) Clear information on resources for respondents

A procedurally fair and trauma

4) Scope of the policy - removal of limitation period

Current best practices with respect to legal and institutional responses to sexualized violence recognize that unlike other experiences of harmful conduct, those who experience sexualized violence often delay reporting for a variety of reasons related to systemic barriers to reporting, and the stigma and shame sometimes imposed upon survivors. It is for the most part inappropriate to impose limitation periods for reports of sexualized violence. This is why several jurisdictions have removed limitation periods in the context of civil law and why many PSIs' sexual violence policies do not contain a limitation period.[17]

The University's current policy refers in two places to a form of limitation period for reports of sexual violence, although the limitation period appears to be a guideline rather than a hard rule.

Section 4 of the policy, "Limitations", encourages survivors to disclose as soon as possible after an incident and states that "Generally, complaints may be accepted up to a year after an incident, recognizing that it is the nature of sexual violence that a survivor may take much longer to feel safe or ready to disclose."

Some University documents, such as one of the SHARE office complaint forms, also include reference to a limitation period. This form should be revised.

Recommendations

The IRP recommends that language with respect to a specific limitation period be removed from the policy and that it be removed from any complaint forms or other documents created by the sexual violence office. The year deadline is arbitrary and is inconsistent with the policy's own recognition that survivors may need significant time before they are ready to disclose or report.

Instead, the policy should contain more general language that encourages survivors to report as soon as possible, recognizing that the decision to report can take time, and confirming that in some cases, the passage of time may prevent the University from investigating or taking action.

5) Anonymous reports

During the course of the consultations, the IRP heard questions asked, and a request for clarification around, whether reports of sexual violence can be made to the University on an anonymous basis.

The University's policy is currently silent on this issue. There was also confusion about the difference between a confidential disclosure by a survivor (whether to a trusted faculty member or to the sexual violence office for accommodation and support) and an anonymous report.

Anonymous reports generally refer to reports received by an institution where the provider of the report cannot be identified, for example by email, voicemail or letter without attribution or by the attendance of a person at the office who will not provide their name. Third Party reports generally refer to reports by an identified bystander or other individual who provides information about an incident(s) of sexual violence, whether with or without the knowledge or consent of the survivor.

Anonymous and third party reports are very difficult for universities to address. There may be a lack of sufficient information on which a university can investigate or respond, and an investigation may traumatize or detrimentally impact the agency of the survivor, who may

In a relatively small school of approximately 2500 students, there was also concern to deans or senior faculty being first-level decision-makers, since students felt this would unnecessarily divulge personal information about them and make attending classes difficult.

Having regard to these factors, the IRP recommends that the best solution given the constraints and reality on the ground at Mount Allison, is for the VP International and Student Affairs to make most of the decisions, at least for the next few years. This approach can be reassessed, if necessary, at the next policy review.

We appreciate this may place an additional administrative burden on the person in this position. However, the VP International and St4 Tm 0 g 0lr maknC.(ount1)9( )] TJ 12 vfa2nET Q87

Recommendations

CCLISAR

informed, accountable and procedurally fair process that has the potential to meet the goals of protecting the educational/living/working safety and flourishing of complainants, protecting the procedural fairness rights of respondents, and in some or possibly many cases, avoid putting both parties through an investigation.

Recommendations:

Specifically, the IRP recommends that:

1. When a disclosure is made, the complainant be advised of the option for immediate measures and the process and criteria by which such measures may be imposed; the IRP notes that in almost all cases, imposing immediate measures on the respondent will require disclosing the complainant's name and allegations to the respondent, to which a complainant will need to be notified and consent.

2. The Mount Allison Sexual Assault Response Team (SART) function as a risk assessment team, comprised of a representative from the sexual violence office, the director of Student Wellness, where appropriate other representatives from Academic Support and Accessibility, and the Vice President International and Student Affairs or their delegate.

3. The complainant be given an opportunity to share her/their health, safety and living/education needs and concerns with the Sexual Assault Response Team and/or make submissions to the administrator who will be determining immediate measures. The respondent will similarly be provided this opportunity either before the immediate measure is imposed, or after in a request to the VP Student Affairs to review the decision to impose immediate measures as set out in recommendation #7 below.

4. The VP International and Student Affairs or their delegate be the decision maker that determines immediate measures. (The imposition of immediate measures may be

significant for a respondent student. The decision should be made by a senior member of the administration).

5. The University policy should clearly set out the criteria for imposing immediate measures on a respondent student. Generally, such criteria would include:

   - To protect the safety, security or academic or employment well-being of the complainant or other member of the Mount Allison community
   - To address any risk posed by the respondent to the safety of the complainant and/or university community
   - To maintain confidentiality and/or the integrity of a Mount Allison University investigation or anticipated investigation
   - To discourage or prevent retaliation
   - To minimize disruption to the learning, residence or working environment at Mount Allison University
   - To maintain and build community trust and confidence in Mount Allison University and its responses to sexualized violence
   - To maintain and promote a campus environment in which sexual violence is not tolerated

   The criteria may also include:

   - The wishes and needs communicated by the complainant
   - The views of the respondent, if available, including any consent to immediate measures
   - The nature and seriousness of the alleged conduct
   - The impact of the conduct on the complainant and/or on the Mount Allison community
   - The impact of the proposed measures on the respondent, and
   - Whether the respondent is in a position of trust or authority

6. To ensure procedural fairness, the respondent student must be given an opportunity to make submissions on the imposition of immediate measures, either before they are imposed or after, depending on the case and the urgency of the needs of the complainant and/or the University community.

7.

CCLISAR

Recommendations:

The IRP's recommendation is that the person who is interviewing witnesses first-hand, should make the finding on a balance of probabilities as to whether the sexual violence policy has been breached, as well as making the findings of credibility and fact.

In addition, given the challenges of identifying appropriate decision-makers at the University, if the decision-maker on breach were to be, for example, the VP International and Student Affairs, there would be a risk that the person would be perceived to be making too many closely related decisions under the Policy and the fairness and independence of the process compromised (or perceived to be compromised).

The IRP notes, however, that at some institutions a senior administrator is given authority to review the investigator's report and seek further information before accepting the report, so as to address cases where the investigator, for example, misunderstands the policy, misses context specific to the institution or otherwise submits a report with substantial gaps. Mount Allison may consider building this flexibility into its revised policy. For example, adding language to allow for the following

- The VP Student Affairs may seek further information or clarification from the Investigator before accepting the Investigator's Report; and

- Any additional information or clarifications relevant to the Investigation provided to the VP Student Affairs by the Investigator, or any additional findings, shall be communicated to the parties in writing by the Investigator and, where appropriate, the parties shall be given an opportunity to respond.

In terms of who should conduct the investigation, during the interim period since January 2021, and with a view to building trust, Mount Allison committed to retaining external investigators for all sexual violence reports. While the reliance on external investigators for all investigations during the interim period was a sound decision and approach, in the IRP's view, it is not necessary for all sexual violence complaints to be investigated externally on a permanent basis moving forward. Further, it is important for Mount Allison to continue to build capacity internally for sexual violence investigations.

The IRP recommends that for the next two years, Mount Allison continue to hire external investigators to investigate all reports of sexual assault. The concerns raised by consultation

CCLISAR

investigation report, it must be remembered that this can be upsetting and destabilizing to both parties. It is recommended that the report not be delivered by email, but that students be required to attend in-person to receive it with their Mount Allison designated support person or another person of their choice. The staff person providing the student(s) the report should be prepared to answer questions about the content of the report, the

pulse of the forms of sexual violence reported at the University and to have some oversight over consistency in decision-making.

To address the potential administrative load on the VP, however, Mount Allison could consider in its policy review permitting the VP to assign a delegate to make the decision for certain forms of misconduct short of sexual assault, such as, to use one example, a case involving misogynist graffiti in a residence dorm.

The current Mount Allison policy does not provide any criteria for determining corrective action. The IRP recommends that the revised policy provide some direction to the decision maker in this regard.

(non-academic)", while the Student Code of Conduct provides that incidents of sexual misconduct "are not adjudicated under the Student Code of Conduct…" (s.6.1).

The IRP recommends that the reference to the Student Code of Conduct in the sexual violence policy be removed, and that in both the sexual violence policy and the Student Code of Conduct there are terms that confirm that for incidents involving sexual violence, the sexual violence policy take precedence, and the incidents will be determined entirely under the sexual violence policy.

14) Appeals

The existing Mount Allison policy provides that the "decision" (presumably both breach and corrective action) "may be appealed by either party to the Vice-President responsible for the

- For greater clarity, subject to the limited review/appeal rights above, the IRP's recommendation is that nde novoappeal (fresh adjudication) be available in sexual violence cases involving students.

- Theappeal should be to a panel, rather than one person.

- The VP Student Affairs is an appropriate person to sit on an appeal panel, however the IRP at this time is recommending that the VP Student Affairs determine corrective action at first instance, which means other senior faculty or staff need to be assigned to the appeal panel.

- For the next two years, the panel should be comprised of three persons, being a composition of senior administrator or faculty members and/or a lawyer who has not otherwise provided advice to the University on the case and who has expertise in sexual violence, sexual assault law, gender equality and administrative law/procedural fairness. A lawyer is recommended in cases where the appeal is on the basis of procedural unfairness. The University may wish to use legal counsel who are not part of the firm that provide general counsel advice to the University.

- The review/appeal may be in writing only or, at the request of a party, the panel may also convene an oral hearing. If the panel convenes an oral hearing upon the respondent's request, the complainant should not be compelled to make submissions. If the complainant chooses to make submissions, necessary supports and aids should be offered to her to facilitate her participation (e.g. she should be permitted to make her submissions virtually rather than be required to be in the physical presence of the respondent).

15) Timelines

The Mount Allison sexual violence policy provides that "Typically, the investigation and report will be concluded within (30) working days of the appointment of an investigator."

<u>Recommendations:</u>

The IRP recommends that the University's revised policy continue to include timelines for each stage of the process: review of immediate measures, investigation, submission on

corrective action, timeline to file an appeal, timeline for release of appeal decision after hearing of appeal.

It is acknowledged that it is difficult to impose strict timelines in sexual violence policies, particularly for the investigation and report, since each investigation is unique and may require more or less intensive work in terms of interviewing witnesses and collection of documents.

Nevertheless, it is important that, like the current policy, the revised policy

b. Collection and publication of data

The Mount Allison policy requires that “annual statistics on reported incidents of sexual violence on campus” be maintained for the purposes of community education and legislated

There is no easy solution to this conundrum. One approach that may improve matters,

The IRP encourages Mount Allison as part of its policy review, to consider addressing faculty student sexual relationships in its sexual violence policy as a matter of emerging best practice. A very strict and clear policy (as in the example set out below) can achieve fulsome protection of students while leaving limited space for non-exploitative relationships that must be disclosed to the university. (A concern with outright bans is that they can have the effect of targeting sexual minorities.).

A sample policy approach is attached at Schedule E. The sample policy prohibits any potentially exploitative relationships, discourages all faculty student relationships, and

SCHEDULE A

Content Available on Mount Allison University [Website

https://mta.ca/Community/Governance_and_admin/Sexual_violence_prevention_action_plans/CCLISAR/CCLISAR/

Following a search process, the University selected the Canadian Centre for Legal Innovation in Sexual Assault Response (CCLISAR) to conduct a comprehensive review of our sexual violence policies, procedures, practices and resources.

Group, staff of the University departments that respond to sexual violence, faculty members, and unions.

We will also ensure that interested individuals, whether students, staff, or faculty, will have an opportunity to speak with us. Lucrèce O'Neal (loneal@mta.ca

SAMPLE AREAS AND QUESTIONS ON WHICH WE WILL BE SEEKING THE INPUT THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY MEMBERS CONSULTED

Dynamics of sexual violence at Mount Allison

- We are interested in hearing your perspectives on the what/where/by whom of sexual violence on campus (e.g. dynamics in residence or at certain events).

Barriers to Disclosure or Reporting that relate to institutional policies, procedures, structuresat MtA

- We recognize that there are many barriers to disclosing or reporting sexual violence in our society. We would like to hear about any specific barriers to report related to the MtA policy, procedure, or institutional structures or responses.

Understanding of the Policies and Procedures

- Is there a good understanding by students, staff, or faculty of the Sexual Violence Policy and Procedure? If there is a lack of knowledge, confusion, or misunderstandings, why is this the case and how can this best be corrected?

Sanctions/Remedies

- What should be the range of appropriate sanctions/remedies for sexual violence?
- What are community members' views on the remedy or measures for respondents of residence transfer, counselling or education, and alcohol prohibition, in cases involving student-on-student sexual violence?
- A challenge for all universities is the institution's obligation under privacy laws to maintain confidentiality of identities of the parties and any measures imposed on respondents. These legal obligations may prevent universities from making public the outcomes in sexual violence cases and from identifyiome( )-173(c)9(nR(c)3(a)9(ses.912 0 >

Scope of review

This review will assess the implementation of the University's sexual violence policy and

with the IRP. The University will manage the scheduling and coordination of the consultation meetings.

The opportu

CCLISAR

SCHEDULE B

Recommendations from the Sexual Violence Prevention Working Group for the Sexual Violence Prevention and Support Coordinator position

March 15, 2021

We envision this position as one focused on both support for survivors of sexual violence and education for the campus community around sexual violence. This position must be a permanent full-time position. As this position will be a key support person for survivors of sexual violence, the person in this position should not be involved in conducting investigations

We would expect the person in this position to engage in the following activities:

- Actively collaborate with students and student groups
- Actively collaborate with staff and faculty with expertise in this area
- Work with community partners around town
- Solicit regular feedback from student population
- Engage in consultation with and receive support from a small panel university SVP advisory committee

For the support portion of this position, we expect this role will involve providing survivor focussed support. This may include:

- Attending meetings with survivor as a support person if the survivor wishes it
- Being the first point of contact for disclosures
    - Note that there should also be additional people who are trained to receive disclosures
- Provide appropriate referrals to internal/external resources
- Can advocate for survivor for action or accommodation requests

Education and Work Experience

- Postsecondary degree in a field related (Strongly recommended/required)
- Formal or infor7 3W* n BT Tm mo1 r Q q (>id1 364.13ab34(da-3(7 3W* n BT Tm mo)6(1 r

To appropriately support this position, the SVPWG is also recommending the following funding and supports be made available for this position

- Competitive salary to attract a highly qualified individual
- Funding for professional development that must be spent every 2 years (i.e. mandatory ongoing professional development)
- Funding for educational campaigns & training on campus (and other resources)
- Funding for peer support
- Position cannot be isolated – many things need to be done in relation to this work
    - As previously noted, for education and outreach to be effective, person needs to be well-known and connected on campus
    - Person needs to be well supported in their role by the institution
- Safe neutral spot for person to work in. This person must have their own office. It should be somewhere that people can easily pop in, so not in the Wellness Centre.
- Holiday/sick day/vacation coverage
    - The role needs support for taking time off and a clear plan for coverage
-

S

STAFF AND FACULTY TRAINING

Content for Staff & Faculty

- A good starting place would be to assess staff and faculty knowledge of sexual violence and harassment to find out the level of understanding
- Training on responding to disclosures
    - Faculty can grant accommodation (does not need to go through Wellness Ctr or Meighen Ctr, but it can if student wishes it). Education for faculty on how fair and equitable are not the same thing
    - Confidentiality
    - Comprehensive list of campus resources
    - How to respond with sensitivity
    - Appropriate boundaries during/after disclosure
- Trauma-informed training for anyone who might receive disclosures
    - Understanding the types of responses to sexual trauma
    - Understanding the unpredictability of trauma responses
- Create a "Responding to Sexual Violence Best Practices Protocol" (similar to Concussion Protocol) developed in collaboration with faculty experts
- Create a best practices document for teaching and dealing with sexual violence related issues
    - Use of content warnings
    - How to appropriately frame the conversation
    - Allowing for alternatives when students are not able to be in class for sexual violence material
    - How to assess if you are qualified to have difficult discussions around sexual violence that respect student safety
    - Resources & training for handling sexual violence discussions (e.g., Dos and Don'ts)
- Training on appropriate professional boundaries with students and other staff
- Training for all security staff (including student staff) on appropriate sexual violence protocols
- Training on how to identify sexual harassment and other sexually inappropriate behavior

- To ensure confidentiality, requests to faculty for accommodation should come from Meighen Centre or Wellness Ctr (not the SVP person).
- Provide training and written information for faculty at orientation and staff during onboarding or during mandatory workplace harassment training. Training should be developed in collaboration with SVP Coordinator and HR. There should also be regular updates and refreshers.

All training for students, faculty, and staff should be informed by appropriate practices and frameworks (i.e. frameworks that are anti-racist, anti-colonial, trans inclusive, queer positive; that attend to relations of power). Collaboration with relevant staff and student groups is critical to ensure culturally appropriate and inclusive training.

MANDATORY TRAINING FOR ALL MTA STUDENTS AND EMPLOYEES

Concordia and other Quebec universities have implemented mandatory training for all people on campus. We spoke to representatives from Concordia, so are using them as our specific example. They offer the training online and in person. They used a staged rollout over multiple years, beginning with students. During the initial rollout year with students, the sexual violence prevention team sought feedback and revised content. Faculty were consulted and were brought into mandatory training only after it had been pilot-tested on students.

We thought the Concordia approach was well thought out and a good model for Mount Allison. However, we thought it best that the training initially be online only to facilitate a quick rollout among students. Concordia will provide access to their training content as an example. The platform is available for use at other universities.

Considerations for Mandatory Training( )-143(in)5(f)-4(or)-3(ma)8(t)-4(io)7(n)-4( )-143(f)5(or)-3( )-143

Funding

- In order toaddress diverse groups and increase capacity on campus, we need to have ongoing funding with a designated budget for external trainers. External training is necessary for staff to get training as well as bring external educators to campus for student educational events.
- It is important that there be ongoing funding for educational resources and programs on sexual violence.

Additional Resources to Consult

- Local resources such as Southeast Sexual Assault Centre (SESAC) Sexual Violence New Brunswick, Westmoreland Albert Violence Prevention Network
- MAVEN Peer Education Network https://www.macewan.ca/wcm/CampusLife/SexualViolencePreventionEducationResponse/OSVPE_MAVEN_CALL
- Behind Closed Doors Training
- Bystander Intervention Training
- American List of Sexual Violence Programs on University Campuses and the level of evidence to support their efficacy https://cultureofrespect.org/programs-and-tools/matrix/

SCHEDULE D

SAMPLE POLICY LANGUAGE

Third party and Anonymous reporting

1.1 Where a person witnesses or has reasonable concerns about an incident(s) of sexual violence, they may submit written or oral information to the sexual violence office.

1.2 A "third party report" is where information about an incident of sexual violence is shared by an identifiable person who is not the survivor/person who directly experienced the sexual violence. Where the information relates to an identifiable or identified survivor, the consent of that survivor should be sought before the information is provided to the University.

1.3 An "anonymous report" is where information about an incident of sexual violence is shared in a form that is anonymous, for example when the sexual violence office receives a written submission with no name attached to it, or a person attends the Office but will not disclose their name. An anonymous report may be made by a survivor or a third party.

1.4 The University may be unable to investigate an anonymous or third party report due to lack of information or out of respect for the individual impacted by the sexual violence who has decided not to come forward.

1.5 Examples of where the University may initiate its own investigation following one or more third party or anonymous reports includes where there is social media or other evidence documenting sexual violence and/or where persons witnessed sexual violence against a person who was incapacitated, unconscious or asleep. Where there are multiple disclosures and one or more persons has made a formal

release of the identity or identities of the survivor(s)), such as targeted education and training, and/or increased campus security or monitoring of specified locations or events.

ge -4( )36(tr)84p 0.0licvW* n BT /Fl TJ as t

SCHEDULE E

Sample Policy Language

Sexual Relationships between Teaching Staff and Students

Sexual relations between a student and a member of the Teaching Staff are prohibited when the staff member:

i. Is in a position of academic authority over the student