safety

York University Safety Audit

Leading the way to personal and community safety

YORK U
UNIVERSITÉ
UNIVERSITY
redefine THE POSSIBLE.

METRAC
Metropolitan Action Committee on
Violence Against Women and Children

York University Safety Audit:

Leading the Way to

Personal and Community Safety

A partnership between

York University

and

The Metropolitan Action Committee on Violence Against Women and Children

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Introduction

Campus violence has become increasingly common in universities across North America. Consequently, senior administrators at York University have prioritized prevention of violence and crime – recent incidents of sexual assault and hate graffiti at York and on several campuses across Ontario have moved the University to reduce factors that contribute to unsafety and deal with safety risks. York University is committed to improving safety policies and practices and increasing transparency and accountability to its diverse stakeholders.

This final report presents the findings of a Campus Safety Audit Process at York University, facilitated by the Metropolitan Action Committee on Violence Against Women and Children (METRAC) in 2008 and 2009. It is structured into five sections. The first section provides an overview of safety survey results. The second section discusses the social environment at York, including constituents' perception of safety, programs and services related to violence and a document review analysis. The third section focuses on security services and programs, personnel and procedures governing security on campus. The fourth section provides an evaluation of the physical environment at York, and the final section contains conclusions and safety-enhancing recommendations.

A supplementary document to this report, entitled *Final York University Safety Audit Working Papers: Leading the Way to Personal and Community Safety*, contains the full set of data that was collected and analyzed during the audit process.

METRAC's Campus Safety Audit Process

In 1989, METRAC and the Council of Ontario Universities and Colleges worked in partnership to develop a *Campus Safety Audit Guide*. It has since evolved to METRAC's Campus Safety Audit Process and combines principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) and a gender-aware, anti-oppressive and intersectional analysis. It also draws on the social ecological framework, a commonly used public health model that recognizes that health and safety-related behaviours are shaped by multiple levels of influence – individual, group, institutional and community, as well as public policy and societal factors (Langford, 2004; Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center *et al.*, 2009). METRAC's Campus Safety Audit Process diagnoses safety conditions on campus by bringing diverse campus community members together to assess and evaluate physical features and attitudinal and behavioural factors. It also examines the existence and implementation of essential safety policies and practices.

Along with excellent planning, implementation, evaluation and accountability mechanisms, METRAC's Campus Safety Audit Process can result in improvements to the campus environment. It can support a reduction in infrastructural deficiencies and help foster safer, more inclusive spaces for all members of the campus community.

Key campus safety issues

METRAC's Campus Safety Audit Process was developed because many Canadian university and college campuses have unique safety issues and risks. Marginalized constituents are most likely to face violence and crime, yet their safety needs and ideas tend to remain unheard. For instance, women face particular safety concerns. In general, they are more likely to experience sexual violence than men – 89% of sexual

offences reported to police against youth aged 12 to 17 in 2004 were committed against girls. Eight-three percent of sexual offences reported in the same year against individuals aged 18 and over were committed against women. Men were perpetrators in roughly 98% of sexual assault cases (Statistics Canada, 2007). While all women are at risk of sexual violence and other forms of gender-based violence, race, ethnicity, faith, income level, sexual orientation, gender identity, age and ability can serve to increase a woman's vulnerability to violence and reduce her options for support. For example, women with disabilities experience higher rates of violence than other women – 83% of women with disabilities will be sexually abused in their lifetimes (Doherty, 2003).

These realities certainly manifest themselves on campuses. In a national study of gender-based violence on campuses, 28% of women reported being sexually abused in the year prior to the study, while 11% of men reported that they had sexually assaulted a dating partner in the same period (Canadian National Survey, 1998). Another national survey found that 20.2% of female students reported being pressured into sexual activity. Nearly seven percent of female students reported being threatened or physically forced into sexual activity, and another 13.6% reported experiencing an attempt at unwanted intercourse while intoxicated (Canadian Federation of Students, 1999). In a more recent survey, four out of five female undergraduates on Canadian campuses reported being victims of violence in a dating relationship (Statistics Canada, 2006). More than 80% of rapes that occur on university and college campuses are committed by someone the victim knows, and 50% occur on dates – certainly, "stranger rape" is not the only issue on campuses. Many sexual assaults on campuses happen during the first eight weeks of classes, signifying a need for effective prevention during orientation (Department of Justice, 2003). Men's role in sexual assault on campus is also important to consider, as a study found that 20% of male students believed forced sex to be acceptable if one spends money on a date, if one's date is stoned or drunk or if individuals have been dating for a long time (Johnson, 1996).

Discrimination and hate crimes are also key safety concerns on Canadian campuses. Educational facilities have been identified as the second most likely place for hate crimes to occur (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2006; Toronto Police Service, 2007). Within three weeks of September 11, 2001, the Canadian Race Relations Foundation found that Muslim students at a university in Quebec reported higher incidents of harassment and threats. Similar reports were made on campuses across the country (Mock, 2003). Three out of four lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, queer and questioning students reported feeling unsafe at school due to homophobic and transphobic bullying. The survey also reveals that these students encountered multiple obstacles to support and assistance (Egale Canada Human Rights Trust, 2007). Certainly, hate and discrimination on campus connect to broader problems in Canadian society – both police-reported and self-reported victimization surveys have found race and ethnicity to be the most common motivating factor for hate crimes (Statistics Canada, 2008).

METRAC's Campus Safety Audit Process takes these key safety issues into consideration with the goal of building strong campus safety for everyone, including those who tend to be subject to higher levels of marginalization and violence.

Campus Safety Audit Process at York University

In February 2008, President of York University Dr. Mamdouh Shoukri created a University Safety Audit Committee (USAC), chaired by Professor Livy Visano. USAC was given a mandate to oversee a safety audit of York's campuses to improve safety policies, procedures and operations. After conducting an open

public bidding process, USAC selected METRAC to undertake a third-party audit. METRAC was tasked with two objectives:

- to facilitate a participatory, inclusive process and conduct a multi-disciplinary, integrated and holistic safety audit of York's two main campuses and various satellite locations; and
- to recommend changes to the physical and cultural environment of York to make it safer for community members and to lead to improvements in the short, medium and long-term, while reducing opportunities for multiple forms of violence and crime.

York University's context

York currently has a population of 50,776 students, 2,448 faculty members and 2,297 full-time support staff. Enrolment of female students has peaked at 61%, with women as the majority of registrants in all three levels of degree-seeking programs. More than 3,236 international students attend the University from 150 different countries (York University, 2007).

As referenced throughout this report, York University has a number of programs, policies, procedures and services that address safety. They include the following.

- York Security Services, which is staffed on a 24-hour, seven-days-a-week basis. Security services utilizes closed circuit television cameras, 322 emergency telephones, 121 "intrusion alarms" for all residence exterior doors, electronic access alarm monitoring and automated report and Dispatch Logging Systems.
- The University has goSAFE, walkSAFE and Van Go programs as well as a cycling patrol team. These student-run patrol and escort programs include 50 to 55 members.
- A Property Watch program is in place with a staff of 22 people. They are responsible for patrolling campus buildings, including residences. They also liaise with students, faculty and staff.
- Offices on campus include the Office of the Ombudsperson, the Office of Student Conduct and Dispute Resolution, the Counselling and Development Centre, Trans Bisexual Lesbian Gays Allies at York, the Sexual Assault Survivors Support Line and the Centre for Women and Trans People.
- Several policies address human rights, including one on sexual harassment and hate propaganda. A policy on racism also exists.
- A Senate policy on the Removal of Gender-Biased Language commits to eliminating unnecessary gender references from official Senate documents.
- While the University does not have a policy on principles and goals of academic freedom, such a policy is set out for faculty members through their union.

York University has already directed resources to meet the safety needs of its diverse community members. While these initiatives have been essential to sustaining safety on campus, the task is far from complete. METRAC's Campus Safety Audit Process at York University is a significant step in the direction of better addressing root causes of unsafety.

Scope of York's Campus Safety Audit

METRAC's team audited four interrelated dimensions of York University's environment to analyze safety strengths and opportunities for improvement.

1. Physical features and infrastructure: building design and layout, landscaping and planting, maintenance, lighting, signage, sightlines, secluded areas, accessible routes, access enhancements and graffiti.

2. Security provisions: safety patrols, emergency phones, cameras, escort programs, mirrors, reporting mechanisms, security protocols, threat and risk assessments tools, protected spaces and critical incident systems.

3. Social dynamics: perceptions, experiences, attitudes and behaviours and social relations between groups.

4. Institutional policies and programs: University policies and operational protocols for setting standards to enhance personal and community safety with respect to fostering non-violence and addressing discrimination and harassment on campus. They include the availability and utilization of a full range of resources and structured supports to prevent and respond to violence on campus and to promote safety at York.

York's Campus Safety Audit principles

The analysis and recommendations contained in this report flow from guiding principles that were established at the start of the audit and later refined and expanded to reflect major findings.

*   Safety is a fundamental right: all members of the campus community have the right to study, work and live in safety and dignity, without fear, threat or experience of violence.
*   York University-centric: solutions to address campus safety must be designed to work within the York University context, taking into account demographics, strengths and greatest needs.
*   Gender-aware analysis: violence on campuses and in society has a disproportionate and differential impact on women. As such, a gender-aware analysis must be utilized in solutions to create a safer campus.
*   Equity: equity is integral to safety. Individuals can be targeted for violence because of their identities and the social groups they belong to. Safety outcomes must take into account the relationship between safety, the individual and intersections of identify factors such as race and skin colour, ability, immigration status, gender identity, sexual orientation, social class, age, ethnicity and faith.
*   Prevention-focused: interventions must be applied to ensure that causal and resiliency factors of violence are addressed – solutions cannot be exclusively response-driven, nor can they focus on crime alone. Education increases awareness, develops prevention skills and mobilizes people to act to reduce risks and resist violence.
*   Leadership: although all constituents contribute to safety, campus leadership holds particular responsibility to lead the way in reducing and preventing violence. Decision-makers hold a high degree of power and resources. They must utilize their assets in a responsible manner to ensure everyone's safety needs are met, including that of the University's most vulnerable constituents.

- Community- centric: violence occurs within the context of the campus community. Individuals and groups, including students, faculty and staff, have a crucial role in solutions to achieve safety. Community ideas and perspectives are essential to effective planning, implementation and evaluation of safety initiatives, as well as to successfully changing attitudes and behaviours that can lead to violence.
- Comprehensive: safety solutions must address multiple types of violence and cover the full spectrum of interventions to prevent violence, identify risks, intervene early, hold offenders accountable and support and protect victims when violence occurs.
- System-wide collaboration: most safety concerns are multifaceted and issues are inextricably linked to each other. Viable solutions must integrate and harmonize individual and institutional contributions to safety at various levels – University governance, administration, educational faculties, unions and student organizations and federations. Partnerships across all functions, operations and campuses are required as everyone must positively contribute to safety. Senior administrators, students, staff and faculty must work together synergistically and respond to safety concerns in a holistic manner.
- Accessible programming and supports: everyone affected by violence should have access to differentiated programs and services. This will ensure that safety supports are equitable and inclusive of everyone on campus, including vulnerable community members.
- Research-based: solutions must be grounded in evidence and research. Attention must be dedicated to community and institutional experiences, promising practices and community voices, including the voices of women and groups that are most at risk of experiencing violence.
- Transparency and accountability: it is of crucial importance to plan, monitor, evaluate and communicate safety audit results and outcomes – what is working, what has been achieved and what needs to be done. This transparency and accountability, based upon community experience and knowledge, allows for ongoing improvement to the quality and range of safety policies, practices and programming.

York's Campus Safety Audit methodology

METRAC's team utilized a participatory action research model rooted in the diverse voices and perspectives of students, staff and faculty (Kemmis and McTaggart, 2003).[1] METRAC's approach engages community members, including those with an increased risk of victimization, to define their own safety needs and solutions. It is based upon a tradition of valuing the lived realities of individuals, who are "experts of their own experience" and experts of their own sense of safety (Klein, 1983; Fonow and Cook, 1991; Smith, 1999; Whitman, 2008). Qualitative methods were used to collect and analyze data, in partnership with individuals and groups who are impacted by social inequities based on gender, race, age, disability, ethnicity, faith, sexual orientation and income level. As such, diverse women, men and transpeople had the opportunity to voice their experiences and share their perceptions of campus safety.

By employing a range of qualitative methods, METRAC's team assessed how safe different community members feel on campus, what safety concerns are important to them and how to improve the overall climate of safety on campus. METRAC drew upon quantitative methods to triangulate results by using mixed methods, which highlighted and strengthened data stemming from the audit process. This

---

[1] Participatory research has distinct traits: shared ownership, community-based analysis of social problems and a focus on community action. In the context of the audit, these traits translate into recognition that spaces are often created and maintained in ways that do not suit safety needs of all people. METRAC's safety audit thus provides a rare opportunity for women and other marginalized groups to share safety concerns, have a voice in institutional safety planning, and get involved in building solutions.

approach has a number of advantages. It can impart thoroughness in the research and convey researchers' intentions (Cresswell *et al.*, 2003). Techniques utilized in the audit process included an internal review of 50 York documents; an external literature review of promising practices; a comparative examination of safety practices at three other North American universities; two online surveys; 36 focus groups; nine stakeholder interviews; two town hall meetings; two site tours of York campuses; and 14 consultative meetings with USAC members. One thousand and seven hundred individuals participated in research activities, which occurred between September 2008 and May 2009.

Case studies

METRAC's team examined safety processes, programs, policies and work of three other universities that are of comparable size and scope to York. This case study information has been used to contextualize the findings and recommendations that have arisen during York's Campus Safety Audit Process.

i. University of British Columbia

The University of British Columbia's student-run Alma Mater Society operates a number of safety-related offices and programs. Highlights include the following.

- A compliment of 100 security staff is in place. Security runs a 24-hour dispatch, Transit Link Shuttle, patrol vehicles and bike patrols and Safe Walk/Safe Cycle Program. Campus emergency phones are available.
- A Sexual Assault Centre offers third-party reporting as a unique practice. Counselling Services and a Wellness Centre are also available.
- A Safety Program for Workplace Conduct and Violence Prevention is in place. It offers a guidebook to support each department in developing their own workplace violence prevention plans and programs.
- The University's statement on discrimination and harassment includes sexual harassment. It clarifies that sexual harassment can occur between individuals of the same or different status or gender, which allows for a fuller range of discriminatory or harassing incidents to be categorized as such.
- All policies are linked to academic freedom.
- The Booking of University Space Policy is connected to other policies such as the Serving and Consumption of Alcohol at University Events policy to ensure that academic freedom, principles of expression and safety and security are not compromised.

ii. Carleton University

Located in Ottawa, Carleton University has undertaken regular safety audits over the last 20 years. The following are highlights of Carleton's security and safety work.

- The Department of University Safety, a unit of the Finance and Administration Division, oversees matters of security.
- Patrol Services consists of four uniformed patrol teams. A foot patrol escort service is also offered.
- A number of security officers have been sworn in as Peace Officers by the Ottawa Police Service. They are designated as Special Constables and hold a limited law enforcement role on campus.

- The Rape Aggression Defence Program is a free nine to 12-hour course offered to students, staff and faculty. It provides participants with realistic self-defence tactics.
- The Department of Equity Services provides a 16-hour Allies in Equity course that teaches skills in human rights. A Men Against Violence course is also available.
- The Human Rights Policy articulates a guiding framework and contains policies on Educational Equity, Employment Equity, Ethno-cultural Relations, Gender Equity, Sexual Orientation Equality and Sexual Harassment.

iii. University of Washington

Founded in 1861, University of Washington is a public research university located in Seattle, Washington in the United States of America. It is the largest university in the north-western United States and one of the oldest universities on the west coast. Highlights of its safety work include the following.

- The University of Washington Police Department has commissioned 55 officers on campus. They serve in the Detective Unit, Bicycle Patrol and Explosives Detection Canine Unit. They also engage in residence patrol and escort services. An Incident Prevention Team patrols fraternities and sororities. The police department has a Crime Victim Advocate to support victims, families and witnesses through physical, emotional and financial recovery.
- The Student Code of Conduct is linked to the Washington State Legislature's website.
- By law, the University is required to produce an annual security report, crime logs and crime statistics.
- The Violence Prevention and Response Program acts as the central point of communication and coordinates violence mitigation activities across the University. It includes multiple departments as partners.
- A Special Ombudsperson's Office exists to address sexual harassment, in addition to numerous offices for diverse communities. All offices employ a systemic approach to security and safety.
- A significant number of policies address safety and security issues, including Codes of Conduct, the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Policy and the Workplace Violence Policy. Policies are highly detailed and address all levels of the University population. A Sexual Assault Response Commitment aims to support survivors of sexual violence as they approach the police.
- All policies are linked to the University's policy on Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

Section 1: Online Safety Survey Results

This section summarizes results of the online safety survey conducted by METRAC's team during the Campus Safety Audit Process.

Respondent characteristics

Of the 516 safety surveys that were collected, the majority were completed by students (299 or 57.9% of all surveys) – this includes undergraduate, graduate, part-time and full-time students, as well as teaching assistants. One hundred and seventy-seven surveys were completed by staff, including full-time, part-time and contract staff (34.3% of all surveys). In addition, full-time, part-time and contract faculty completed 33 surveys (6.4% of all surveys). Seven surveys were completed by other individuals, such as alumni, volunteers and retirees (1.4% of all surveys).

The majority of survey respondents identified as female (78.7%). Twenty percent of respondents identified as male and 1.4% identified as trans. Age groups represented by respondents range from young people under the age of 20 to individuals over 65 years of age.

Three hundred and thirty-one survey respondents identified as members of equity-seeking groups. The vast majority of respondents selected "gender" as the equity-seeking factor in their identities (71.6%). Almost a quarter (24.8%) of respondents identified as "racial minorities" and 19.9% self-identified as "ethnic minorities". Fifty respondents identified as "sexual minorities" (15.1%) while 14.8% identified as "religious minorities". The same amount identified as having a low economic status (14.8%). Thirty-five respondents (10.6%) identified as "persons with disabilities". Twenty-three persons (6.9%) identified "gender identity" as their equity-seeking status and five respondents (1.5%) identified as "Aboriginal persons".

Time of day

Survey participants were asked about the time of day they frequent York University. Of 511 respondents who answered the question, 90.4% identified being on campus between 8:00 and 11:59 in the morning; 88.5% identified being on campus between 12:00 and 3:59 in the afternoon; 84.1% identified being on campus between 4:00 and 7:59 in the evening; and 25.3% identified being on campus between 8:00 and 11:59 at night. Only 16.6% reported frequenting the campus between 12:00 and 3:59 in the early morning. Nearly fifteen percent reported frequenting the campus between 4:00 and 7:59 in the morning (14.9%).

The majority of student respondents (93.6%) indentified being on campus during the afternoon, compared to 87.9 % of faculty and 79.1% of staff. Ninety-three percent of students reported being on campus in the evening, compared to 90.9% of faculty and 69.6% of staff. Eighty-six percent of students, compared to 93.9% of faculty and 97.2% of staff, reporting being on campus in the morning. Notably, students reported more presence at the University during the night (69.7%), compared to 54.5% of faculty and 21% of staff.

Campus safety

i. Aspects of a safe campus

The survey asked participants, "What does a safe campus mean to you?" In total, 438 (84.9%) of survey participants answered this question by articulating their own definitions. Roughly 40.9% of respondents referred to freedom of movement around the University at all hours of the day without fear of physical, verbal or sexual attack. An additional 31.7% expressed that a safe campus should have a visible and effective security service. A quarter of other respondents (25.1%) described safety features of the physical environment such as adequate lighting, emergency phones and site maintenance. Some respondents (21.2%) indicated that a safe campus is dependent upon campus culture, and it must be one where oppression does not exist; where accessibility to all spaces for people with disabilities and/or freedom from harassment, discrimination and intimidation exists; where violence prevention initiatives and measures are valued; and where there is a sense of community and meaningful support for students who experience unsafe situations.

Respondents appeared to analyze safety ideals based on a definition of safety that encompasses fundamental freedoms and civil liberties, institutional policies and the psychological and mental dimensions of their daily lives. Their answers point to specific manifestations of violence on campus, including gender-based violence such as sexual assault and harassment. Their definitions seem to place safety within the context of community law enforcement, environmental and infrastructural elements and an inclusive campus culture. They also appear to recognize how discriminatory attitudes can influence how one experiences safety on campus. Finally, their definitions emphasize prevention, equity and community cohesion and support as critical aspects of a safe campus.

This understanding of campus safety is consistent with conceptual frameworks drawn from literature. The United Nations' 1993 *Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women* makes it clear that violence and fear of violence and harassment limit the mobility of women and girls and restrict their work and educational choices. In literature about primary prevention strategies on campus, the role of security officers and activities directed to improve the physical environment are considered essential. These include sufficient lighting; accessible parking lots; telephones; escort services; removal of objects that obscure sightlines and create hiding places; and increased security patrols and security staffing (Roark, 1987). A fact sheet on campus safety published by the National Association of School Personnel Administrators refers to "building a sense of community" to reduce anonymity and strengthen relationships among students, faculty and staff and the broader community (Keeling, 2000).

ii. Feelings about campus safety

The survey asked respondents: "On a scale of one to 10, do you feel safe at York University? (one indicates feeling very unsafe; 10 indicate feeling very safe)". Students had the highest response rate to this question (298 or 99.7% of students surveyed), followed closely by staff (176 or 99.4% of staff surveyed). The number of faculty members answering this question was lowest of the three constituency groups (33% of faculty surveyed). Results indicate the following.

- Of the total survey respondents, 230 or 44.7% expressed feeling safe on campus.
- Two-thirds of staff respondents (64.8%) expressed feeling "safe" to "very safe" at York, compared to 33.9% of students and 39.4% of faculty respondents.

- Almost a third of student respondents (29.2%) expressed feeling "somewhat safe" compared to 21% of staff members and 27.3% of faculty respondents.
- Over a third of student respondents (36.9%) reported feeling "unsafe" to "very unsafe" on campus compared to 14.2% staff and 33.3% faculty respondents.

Survey results further reveal that staff and students are more likely to feel safe when they are on campus in the daytime, traffic is high, visibility is clear and isolation in a surrounding area is lessened. Respondent comments suggest that staff members who work during the daytime may have greater access to security services and may feel safer as a result. On the flipside, those reported feeling unsafe expressed concerns about inadequate security services; low lighting in the evening; isolation of certain buildings and external areas; sexual assault; and access, equity and inclusion.

Results suggest that, although York University is considered a safe campus for many respondents, room remains for improvement and perceived threats to safety must be addressed. Security enhancements at night should be a particular focus, although violence can occur at any time of the day. Best practices based on METRAC's audit principles indicate a need for special attention to lighting and security patrols at night, which can increase feelings of safety, decrease fear and reduce opportunities for violence and crime. Since York is a 24-hour facility, action to reduce fear and potentially dangerous situations is a pressing need.

Top personal safety concerns

The top three personal safety concerns of survey respondents are as follows.

1. Potential for experiencing physical harm: overall, 40% of respondents reported the potential for experiencing physical harm as their top personal safety concern. Half of all faculty members (51.7%) expressed concern about the potential for physical harm. By comparison, 45% of students rated the same issue as one of top importance.

2. Effectiveness of security services: effectiveness of security services was second on the list, cited by 37% of survey respondents. One-third of students (34.1%) and 36.9% of staff cited this issue respectively, while 55.2% of faculty members raised this concern.

3. Physical maintenance, campus design and isolation: the third most frequently mentioned personal safety concern ranked to two closely related issues, both factors of the physical environment. Physical maintenance and campus design and isolation were mentioned by almost the same number of respondents in all constituencies. About one-third of survey respondents cited these two inter-related issues as their third personal safety concern.

Community safety concerns and issues

Five key community safety concerns and issues were identified through analysis of online survey findings.

1. Systemic oppression: the safety issue respondents mentioned most frequently is systemic oppression. It was listed as a personal and community safety issue, and one aspect of a safe campus. Systemic

oppression topped the list of community safety concerns with 31.6% of participants citing it as their primary community safety priority. However, breaking this statistic down by constituent reveals that a higher percentage of students (45.6%) and faculty members (41.7%) and a lower number of staff (9.2%) cited systemic oppression as a safety concern. Examples of systemic oppression provided by respondents refer to incidents experienced in their campus daily routines. This finding suggests that structural discrimination is a pervasive yet implicitly accepted reality (Gultang, 1969; Farmer and Paul, 2004).[2]

2. <u>Community relations:</u> 23.6% of students cited community relations as a safety concern. Specifically, they noted contradictions between formal values of civility and equity embraced by York and a lack of tangible respect for diversity amongst students in daily interactions. Students reported a general sense that population density and diversity on campus have negatively impacted relationships – that is, with growing diversity amongst constituents, some survey respondents expressed increasing difficulties for community members to interact in meaningful, mutually respectful ways.

3. <u>Safety programs:</u> the majority of survey participants reported awareness of the goSAFE service (83.6%), Security Foot Patrol (65.3%), Security Vehicle Patrol (60.2%), closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras (61.5%) and the walkSAFE service (60%). Respondents reported less awareness of the Lights Out Program (9.7%), Community Resource Officers (11.5%), Emergency Warden Program (14.2%) and the Why Work Alone Program (14.2%). Of the 26 services listed on the survey, only eight were known by the majority of participants.

4. <u>Safety alerts:</u> York uses safety alerts to notify campus users about urgent concerns. Of the 499 survey participants who responded to this question, 78% reported awareness of alerts. However, of the respondents who were aware of alerts, a little more than half (54%) reported that they believe the alerts are timely.

5. <u>E-mail as the preferred means of communication:</u> survey participants were asked for a preferred method to be alerted about urgent campus safety concerns. Examples included text messages, website, in-class announcements, direct communication from front-line service providers, and posters. The majority of respondents (65.7%) indicated a preference for email messages, 39.7% indicated a preference for posters, 27.7% indicated a preference for text messages and 25.1% indicated a preference for website announcements.

Ideas for improvement

The last survey question asked respondents to share what results they would like from the Campus Safety Audit Process. Responses included the following most frequently-cited improvements and changes.

---

[2] Systemic oppression is any action, whether it be verbal, physical, or based in policy, practice or programs, that contributes to unequal and discriminatory power relations based on factor such as sexism, racism, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, ableism, heterosexism, ageism and classism. The typical outcome of systemic oppression is fear, social exclusion, isolation, victimization and a tolerance of violence. As such, systemic oppression can be a significant threat to safety and can reduce a sense of being included in campus life. Additionally, structural violence describes a system of dominance that creates power imbalances in personal relationships, social structures and institutions. Domination can be based on identity factors such as race, class, sexual orientation, disability, gender and/or differences that are used to assign less value to an individual or group. Inequitable educational structures can result in unequal life chances between people.

1. Improvements to security services (45.6%).

2. Upgrades to physical safety features on campus, such as lighting and emergency phones (30.9%).

3. Improvements to safety-related policies, programs, support systems and reporting (20.9%).

4. Increased outreach, awareness and education campaigns on campus safety (20.2%).

5. Improved personal and community safety for women and other marginalized communities (19.1%).

6. Implementation of recommendations in the audit in a timely, transparent manner (18.1%)

Section 2: Assessment of the Social Environment at York

Campus safety is determined by the social dynamics of a university in addition to the physical environment and security features. York University, as the third largest University in the country, is neither unique nor immune to safety problems. Many forms of unsafety can be experienced by campus constituents. Sexual violence, for instance, can inflict physical and mental harm upon victims and breed fear amongst entire campus communities. Acts of hate and discrimination can impact targeted individuals and groups and create a sense of fear, intimidation and mistrust within the community at large (African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2005). Together, these violations can impede academic success and undermine institutional commitments to providing access to education in a safe, equitable environment.

As defined by METRAC, safety is a broad concept. It encompasses not only freedom from physical, mental, psychological, and sexual violence, but freedom from fear. Additionally, safety includes a feeling of belonging and acceptance. While all members of society are at risk of violence, women and other marginalized groups are more vulnerable to becoming victims of violent acts. Ensuring that the social environment at York is one where students, staff and faculty feel safe is a crucial step towards fostering inclusive learning and working spaces. Moreover, recognizing that women and other marginalized groups have different experiences of safety and taking steps to address these issues through programs and policies can foster a safer campus climate. This section focuses on perceptions and experiences of campus constituents and their individual and community safety concerns, as well as York University's response to safety issues through programs and policies.

This section highlights the socio-cultural context at York. It presents strengths and assets of the social environment as well as opportunities for improvement, together with an analysis of themes emerging from the data. METRAC's audit team examined the forms of violence experienced or perceived by participants as threats, as well as participants' specific safety concerns at both a personal and community level. Direct and indirect consequences of violence and the threat of violence were considered, and constituents' ideas for change were identified. Safety programs at York were examined, including services provided to students, staff and faculty members. Program strengths, gaps and barriers were explored. An analysis of institutional policy responses to safety on campus was conducted, including a critical review of policies and procedures to reduce risks of violence and enhance safety. In many ways, York's policies and procedures determine how individual acts of violence are defined, reported, investigated, managed and sanctioned. Strong accountability mechanisms can help prevent future acts of violence and ensure that present-day acts are adequately dealt with.

Areas of strength

Audit results demonstrate that York University is considered a relatively safe campus for most participants, particularly staff and faculty. It is seen as less safe amongst students. Audit participants were asked to define how safe they feel on campus on a scale of one to 10, one defined as "very unsafe" and ten defined as "very safe". Forty-five percent identified feeling "very safe" and 26.3% of participants reported feeling "somewhat safe". Nearly one-third (29%) of participants reported feeling "unsafe".

When broken down by constituent groups, 64.8% of staff reported feeling most safe on campus. Thirty-seven percent of students reported feeling "unsafe" and 29.2% reported feeling "somewhat safe". Faculty

members were almost evenly divided across all three categories – 33.3% of faculty reported feeling "unsafe", 27.3% reported feeling "somewhat safe" and 39.4% reported feeling "safe". The survey revealed that staff members are more likely to feel safe when they are on campus during the daytime when people traffic is high, visibility is clear and the surrounding area is less isolated. Comments provided by respondents suggest that staff working during the daytime have greater access to security services and may feel safer as a result.

York has established programs and services to support safety needs of students, staff and faculty on campus. They range from the recently restructured Centre for Human Rights, to the Office of the Ombudsperson, to direct and indirect programs and essential services, including the Office of Student Conduct and Dispute Resolution and Safe House Program; Student Community and Leadership Development; Centre for the Support of Teaching; and York Student Housing Services and Residence Life. In July 2009, York's previous counselling and disability units were restructured and merged with the new Counselling and Disability Services Unit, which operates the Counselling and Development Centre. In addition to these, a number of targeted programs exist for vulnerable and equity-seeking groups, including the Sexual Assault Survivors Support Line; Aboriginal Student Services; the Centre for Women and Trans People; Trans Bisexual Lesbian Gays Allies at York; ACCESS York; and ABLE YORK. Other safety-related programs and services are offered through Security Services and Facilities Services, as discussed in more detail in section three and four of this report.

At a foundational level, York has a variety of policies that set standards for institutional safety. These policies focus on human rights, including one on sexual harassment and hate propaganda and religious observance. A policy on racism exists, as well as a Senate policy on the removal of gender-biased language in Senate documents. The Temporary Use of Space Policy sets out rules and procedures for individuals and organizations booking space at the University.

Opportunities for improvement

i. Perception of institutional responses to violence

Keeping community members informed of progress with respect to campus safety is a useful approach. A better flow of information from the institution and regular updates on the handling and prevention of violent, hate-based and criminal incidents may help alleviate fears amongst community members. In contrast, sluggish information about prevention and action can leave room for sensationalized media portrayals of safety problems. It can perpetuate transmission of information by word-of-mouth, which can contribute to rumours and inaccuracies. The University should provide alternative sources of information and exercise greater influence on the flow and quality of that information for everyone on campus, including women and other vulnerable groups. In this way, increased information can strengthen the institution's accountability to the campus community.

Local media, York's *Excalibur* community newspaper and CHRY can serve as effective portals for safety-related information. Information can also be provided on notice boards in residence hallways, a special York webpage and e-newsletters.

ii. Hate speech

Although York has established Hate Propaganda Guidelines, they do not include a clear definition of hate speech. Guidelines can benefit from the inclusion of examples of what constitutes "hate propaganda" and "academic discussion and hate incidents", and information about complaints and routes of recourse should also be included. In the absence of more clarity, the Hate Propaganda Guidelines could be subject to abuse and used to quash legitimate academic discussions by those who oppose popular and mainstream discourses. The guidelines should also be amended to expressly state their application to students, staff, faculty members and visitors to the University.

Balancing academic freedom with other democratic freedoms is always a challenge, especially in an environment where individuals and groups can hold strong opposing viewpoints. Academic freedom for students should be of equal value to academic freedom for other University community members. While York's students participate heavily in academic life, their academic freedom is not explicitly recognized by any University policy. This stands in contrast to the experience of professors and teaching assistants, who are covered by collective agreement provisions that outline their academic freedoms.

York must develop a broad policy on freedom of speech in the context of other essential rights and freedoms, including freedom of movement and a right to a learning environment that is free of violence and discrimination. As such, the policy should make clear links to the right York community members have to safety and a discrimination-free campus, and it must address hate and biased speech. This policy will afford students, staff and faculty greater clarity and parameters about what is required and expected of them.

Ignoring rights of others and denying one's own rights are key ingredients in the proliferation of oppression and the suppression of diverse views. Some audit findings suggest an existence of engrained practices of entitlement and superiority, which are woven into the fabric of campus life. York must carefully balance rights and needs of its community members and address conflicts that can arise in an environment of free ideas and opinions. The University must support room for ideas and opinions that may be considered disturbing and offensive, at the same time maintaining a sense of acceptance and respect as everyone on campus is entitled to dignity, equity and fair treatment.

iii. Fear of physical harm

As already mentioned in this report, women are disproportionately impacted by sexual assault and the fear it generates. Higher rates of sexual violence and fear are a manifestation of the discrimination women face in our broader society – threat of sexual violence is rooted in social inequalities between men and women, and it can serve as a barrier to women's higher education and employment opportunities. While women share a common form of discrimination, they are a diverse group and can experience violence and fear differently, based on identity factors such as sexual orientation, gender orientation, ability, race and religion.

Reducing the threat and risk of sexual and physical violence on campus requires concerted effort to engage all members of York's community. For instance, issues of dominant masculinity and gender roles must be addressed, and the active participation of men as allies and agents of non-violent change must be sought out. Increasing men's involvement is a violence reduction strategy advanced by the United Nations Population Fund to promote gender equality and end gender-based violence. Similarly, literature about

campus violence points a need to enlist men to change destructive elements of "masculine culture" and help campus communities understand how this culture is maintained and challenged (Kilmartin, 2001; Funk, 2006).

The secondary victimization that occurs when a community is exposed to sexual assault and rape can be addressed through increased social supports (Ruch and Chandler, 1983; Sales *et al.*, 1984; Roark, 1987; African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2005). York must establish appropriate programs and promote them widely so students, staff and faculty dealing with residual and cumulative impacts of sexual violence can be better informed of their rights and options for support. The University must convey a sense of urgency in addressing the issue. It must engage in campus-wide promotion of programs and services to reduce fear and anxiety, particularly that experienced by women.

Evidence on promising practices on campus suggests that a "threat assessment" of occurrence times and geographic distribution of reported incidents can assist in the management of violence and crime. Results derived from such an assessment can support effective planning and allocation of security resources. Results can also be used to educate community members about violence and crime trends on campus (O'Neill *et al.*, 2008; Langford, 2004; Crowe, 2000; Keith and Bassi, 2010).

It is important that York University fosters a non-violent, non-threatening learning and working environment. METRAC's team could not identify a faculty or staff code of conduct during the audit. The University of California's Berkeley Campus employs a progressive model code of conduct for faculty that protects academic freedom, self-governance and professional rights and responsibilities. At a minimum, York should create a comprehensive community safety and non-violence policy to outline standards of behaviours for faculty, staff and students. It will help York's community members understand their role in preventing violence and maintaining a safe campus climate. To bring the policy to life, faculty, staff and students should be trained to recognize inappropriate behaviours, body language, risk factors and warning signs of violence, crime, harassment and discrimination (Smith and Flynn, 2007). They should be provided with practical tools to help prevent and handle threatening situations with colleagues and peers in and outside of the classroom.

vi. Systemic bias and discrimination

In the Campus Safety Audit Process, some student respondents expressed concerns about courses that were taught from a Eurocentric perspective. They spoke to the invisibility of historical contributions of diverse communities in course materials and readings. Consequently, some student respondents expressed a sense of powerless to challenge this reality and a fear about reprisals in their grades. Some participants expressed concerns about apparent dismissals and denials of incidents of racism by the institution; a lack of in-class accommodation for students observing religious rites; and acts of intimidation of students by faculty members. Some students expressed disappointment and powerlessness in light of unchallenged homophobic comments in classroom settings.

Other concerns were voiced about violence against women. Some respondents expressed that the tone and content of sexual assault alerts issued by the University seems to place responsibility on women to prevent sexual assaults. They spoke to a concurrent lack of focus on perpetrators as well as on men's responsibilities to support an end to sexual violence. Some students were critical of a lack of prevention education geared towards men on campus.

Some faculty members also expressed concerns about a lack of equity and inclusive practices in certain courses. They spoke to safety issues experienced by students who identify as trans-people, students with disabilities and students with "intersecting marginalities" (Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women, 2006).[3] Some faculty members expressed that these students tend to get overlooked by their colleagues. They shared instances where faculty members who attempted to incorporate equity issues into course curricula experienced reprisals and hostility – for example, where students provided unfair evaluations or issued direct complaints to senior administrators.

Although York is considered one of the most progressive universities in Canada, it is not immune to the problem of bias and discrimination. As indicated in audit findings, bias and discrimination can create and contribute to an unsafe campus environment, especially for marginalized students. Incidents of bias and discrimination are not confined to individual thoughts, attitudes and behaviours – they can manifest themselves in organizational structures and campus culture as well (African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2005). A proactive approach to safety requires a response to systemic forms of bias and discrimination that can act to isolate and exclude students, staff and faculty from the full benefits of the University system. York must work to reduce and eliminate bias and discrimination across the institution, including sexism, racism, and heterosexism.

York is well-positioned to foster inclusion, as education is an easily available tool to prevent of discrimination and violence. Many courses are already taught by faculty members who have a deep interest in and commitment to social justice and equity. These faculty members are highly skilled in analyzing topics related to bias, discrimination and violence, including issues of gender, race, sexuality, disability and hate. The University has a broad pool of experts to which it can turn to develop a comprehensive equity and violence-prevention education strategy for orientation and training of students, staff and faculty members across all departments. York's Centre for Human Rights can play a significant role in the development of an ongoing training program – it is critical that the university demonstrate leadership in building human rights and safety. A larger role remains for Security Services to create a safety strategy, build coordinated programs and develop a new model to deliver community-based services.

v. Sense of community

As a progressive University, community members look to the institution to play a leadership role in prevention, intervention and development of policy, programs and resources that address safety, sexual violence and hate-motivated acts on campus. Strong communities can mobilize against violence and crime better than communities with weak bonds – concerted initiatives to build the capacity and assets of communities are of great value (UN-Habitat, 2007; Bernard, 2007; Green and Haines, 2002; Jack, 2004). In working to strengthen the bonds of community, York can help fulfill its responsibilities to foster safety and reduce isolation and exclusion experienced by marginalized individuals. The designation of "safe spaces" for diverse students, particularly those who are marginalized, is an excellent starting point to foster face-to-face connections and social networking opportunities. Safe spaces can facilitate dialogues across different student groups, which in themselves contribute to positive change on campus. Without access to safe spaces, marginalized students will likely continue to have "outsider" status on campus.

---

[3] Intersecting marginalities recognize the multiple forces working together and interacting to reinforce conditions of inequality and social exclusion. In this view, each person occupies many different social locations. "Social locations" are categories that prescribe attributes and denote power differentials and include such categories as: race, gender, age, sexual orientation, ability, faith, class etc.

Audit participants expressed an expectation that safety-enhancing leadership be provided by University decision-makers and administrators. However, participants also expressed a need to define safety issues based on their lived experiences and contribute to solutions themselves – many respondents expressed a desire to help develop safety strategies and participate in initiatives to prevent and reduce violence. As already noted, safety and positive community relations should be fostered by everyone. Equitable and empowering community relationships must be integrated into all facets of campus life, including interactions between community members in the exchange and receipt of services, balancing of ideological differences in classrooms and communicating information about violent incidents. A clear communications plan would help improve relationships between York community members. A review of the University's mass notification system must be included in activities encompassed in the communications plan and more high-tech means of informing members of emergency issues should be explored. The content of alerts and bulletins should be reviewed to ensure enough useful information is provided and that community members most at risk of violence and discrimination are not made to feel more insecure or blamed as a result of the communication process.

vi. Programs and services

Effective programs and services can mitigate risks and impacts of violence upon students, staff and faculty members. A continuum of programming allows for a balanced base of services that range from prevention and education, early interventions and risk assessments to crisis services, protective supports and offender programs.

Although the University has the capacity to offer many programs and services, audit findings suggest that students do not always know about them – survey results demonstrate that students have the lowest awareness levels of all three constituent groups. York must include extensive outreach in its communication plan in order to inform community members of the range of support programs available to them. Outreach strategies should be consistent with health promotion practices that remove access and equity barriers to information. Planning should focus on identifying the most effective ways to reach diverse students, and it is essential to centre communication efforts in the areas that students frequent on campus. Peer student outreach workers should be enlisted to help raise student awareness of services. It is important to consult with community members themselves, including the Security Advisory Council, in the process of developing appropriate, relevant communication strategies.

York has demonstrated commitment to violence and crime prevention through risk reduction efforts. These include lighting programs; campus patrols; locking system upgrades; the Property Watch Program and Why Work Alone Program; safety escort programs; and self-defence classes. Despite the importance of these measures, prevention programs must focus on the different forms of violence that can occur on campus and recognize the role of factors such as sexism, racism, ableism, homophobia, transphobia, anti-Semitism and anti-Muslim discrimination. These factors play a significant role in the individual and group experience. For instance, prevention programs must account for gender differences in victim-offender rates and address violence perpetrated by strangers, friends, acquaintances and intimate partners. Programs must target potential perpetrators and bystanders to address the complex nature and contributing factors of sexual assault (Langford, 2004). In general, York must adopt an intersectional approach to violence prevention to best address risks described by audit participants. An intersectional approach will build upon the social capital of York and support a safer campus environment where everyone can participate in the benefits of University life.

A drawback to safety programs and services currently in place is their lack of prevention education. Prevention activities on campus appear to be sporadic and driven by students. Although student participation is desirable, violence prevention and safety promotion should be incorporated as part of the broader proactive work of the University. York should lead efforts and direct significant resources toward community education and training about common forms of violence and crime on campus. Students, staff and faculty members must be equipped with skills and knowledge to help prevent violent situations and be aware of resources when violence occurs (School Community Safety Advisory Panel, 2008). Skill development provides campus users with tools and techniques to negotiate their participation at the University and feel safer in the process.

Prevention education must reach everyone so all community members are informed of their individual and collective rights to safety and how they can help reduce violence on campus. A successful prevention programs will provide participants with information and opportunities to practice skills in a range of areas, including: roots and consequences of violence and discrimination; healthy, equal relationships; non-violent communication and problem-solving; relevant policies and practices; where to get help, support and resources; sexual assault, hate crimes and the law; power dynamics, including positive and negative exercises of power; supporting prevention of violence on campus and how to support peers who are at risk of violence or have experienced violence.

York must also institute early intervention programming to identify threats to safety and manage risk factors for violence. A Security Safety Assessment Tool is currently applied to determine potential threats before the booking of campus space is authorized. Within the larger institution, the role of the existing threat assessment and risk management team could be broadened to conduct annual "threat and risk assessments" that employ a gender-based analysis and intersectional framework. Many factors play into safety problems on campuses, including the existence of inequalities, dynamics of gender and race and structural issues such as campus size, location and population density. York must establish a mechanism to identify, assess, act on and communicate these diverse risk and threat factors.

Prevention research shows that integrated or coordinated programs are more effective than programs that exist in silos, and campus programs must maintain consistency in messaging, philosophy and service provision (Langford, 2004). Violence and crime are multifaceted phenomena and efforts to address them must be coordinated, collective and extend beyond the functional realm of single programmatic efforts. Synergistic programming helps improve effectiveness of all initiatives to address and prevent violence. York must build upon existing services and programs, maximizing their utility, efficiency and effectiveness and fostering cooperation amongst service providers. Programs should have an equitable impact on the community – effort should be made to reduce gaps in service provision, enhance accessibility and meet the needs and assets of different groups in a culturally appropriate manner.

vii. Policies and procedures

Policies can help establish institutional norms and values that allow for proactive, consistent safety practices. Some policies have been written to build safety on campus but more work remains. The Campus Safety Audit Process reveals that sexual and physical violence and hate incidents are a serious concern to campus users. At the very least, they reduce the safety, autonomy and equality rights of women and targeted groups. They function to undermine well-being and community connection amongst all campus users. Creation of new policies and a careful revision of current York policies must be undertaken to improve institutional standards. While policies are an integral element of a safe campus environment, they must also be accompanied by clear procedures that are promoted and enforced (Langford, 2004).

Clear, concise policies and procedures with widely-understood definitions of relevant issues – including rape, stalking, cyber-violence, intimate relationship violence, dating violence, sexual assault, harassment, hate crimes, hate incidents and equity – can be a powerful prevention strategy (Roark, 1987). The creation of a community safety policy that articulates the university's position on violence is a starting point to strengthen safety and accountability. It should make explicit reference to violence against women and sexual violence, hate-motivated violence, structural violence and systemic discrimination.

To address systemic discrimination in course curricula, research, representation and pedagogies, policies must be developed and revised in alignment with the *Ontario Human Rights Code.* The development process for access and equity policies requires commitment to systemic change amongst university leadership and senior management. An "access and equity framework" should be created by the Human Rights Centre in partnership with deans, vice-presidents, program managers and directors as well as faculty, staff and students themselves.

As already mentioned, training and orientation is necessary for policies and procedures to come alive – training must identify risk factors, warning signs and should highlight early reporting of incidents and threats. Safety trainings must be given to new and existing staff, students and faculty members, and they must be updated annually (Smith and Flynn, 2007).

viii. Pub Night and substance use

Several audit participants, students and staff alike, expressed concern about alcohol use, Pub Nights and physical and sexual violence and harassment on campus. Some women respondents recounted experiences of harassment during Frosh Week and on Pub Nights, both of which tend to involve drinking. Alcohol use on Pub Nights may place women at increased risk of physical and sexual violence and harassment and may place male students at higher risk of physical assault. An added concern was expressed by some participants about the diversion of already scarce security resources to monitor activities on Pub Nights.

While the roots of violence are multiple and no one factor can be singled out, alcohol and use of other substances can increase risks of violence. In one of numerous studies conducted on the issue, alcohol and other drugs were found to be a factor in student-perpetrated violence and crime. Alcohol and drug use were identified in 13% incidents of ethnic harassment; 46% of incidents of theft involving force or threat of force; 51% of incidents of threats of physical assault; 64% of incidents of physical assaults; 71% of incidents of forced sexual touching; and 79% of incidents of rape (Presley *et al.*, 1997).

Perpetrators commonly rationalize and excuse their violent behaviour by referencing the influence of alcohol (Roark, 1987). York should revisit its Pub Night program and conduct a risk and threat assessment of alcohol-related incidents on campus. Such an assessment would reveal if pub hours should to be maintained, reduced, if stricter limitations on alcohol consumption should be applied or if the university should deem itself an alcohol-free space. Development of a substance-use policy should be undertaken and referenced in newly-developed codes of conduct. In this manner, those who consume substances on campus will better understand expectations applied to them and will better recognize connections between substances and sexual assault, sexual harassment and other forms of violence.

Section 3: Assessment of Security Services at York

Security is a recurring theme in safety audit findings. It is cited as a personal safety concern in survey data – 25% of participants responded to that category, and 29.2% of those participants reported that "security service" is their second highest community safety concern. Students, staff and faculty members place priority on access to security services and programs as they play a crucial role in reducing risk and fear of violence and managing violent situations.

METRAC's team examined York Security Services' (YSS) policies, practices and programs for their effectiveness in minimizing risks. Key security documents were reviewed and audit participants were probed for awareness, access and assessment of various security programs and services. Two focus groups and phone interviews were held with security staff and a stakeholder interview with security managers was conducted.[4]

Areas of strength

The audit team began assessment of YSS by taking stock of strengths and recognizing the accomplishments of the department over the past 50 years. They include the following.

- YSS has a mix of community security programs, including the Student Security Program; Security Foot Patrol; Security Vehicle Patrol; Toronto Police Services Patrol; Parking Control Program; Emergency Response Program; Emergency Preparedness Program; goSAFE and WalkSAFE; Residence Patrol; Property Watch Program; Campus Relations Initiative; Access Control Program; Emergency Medical Response Program; Closed Circuit Television cameras; emergency telephones; security emergency number; Why Work Alone Program and Working Alone Program; Blue Light Initiative; Emergency Response Warden Program; and the Lights Out Program.
- YSS has a basic set of Standard Operating Procedures to guide its operations, such as the compilation of security incidents statistics, sending out bulletins and alerts, conducting training and emergency preparedness.
- In principle, YSS has a promising model of operations grounded in community-based values, which supports relationship-building with campus groups, responds to groups' safety needs and connects security service provision with the community.
- YSS has established a Security Advisory Council. It has the potential to become a diverse body of students, faculty, staff and significant others. There is promise for sub-committees to provide meaningful input on issues related to women and safety and have these issues acted upon by security services.

Almost one in three (31.7%) audit participants reported a belief that a visible and effective security services is vital to safety. Many students reported a belief that YSS has an important role in strengthening campus security through partnerships with the broader community and promotion of joint safety ventures. When asked what they would do if they or someone they knew had a safety issue on campus, the majority of participants (64.4%) replied that they would report the issue to YSS. METRAC received

---

[4] Because of the low turnout of security staff in the focus groups, METRAC arranged for alternate forms of participation for security staff members including the phone interviews.

positive feedback from student groups who had worked with security to organize events. In addition, staff at both York campuses and graduate students spoke positively about experiences with security services.

Opportunities for improvement

Nearly half of survey participants (45.6%) indicated a desire for improvements to YSS. Tremendous opportunity exists for York to transform relationships between YSS and community members – a window is open to promote reform and innovation in security programming and practices and to strengthen the capacity of the service to reduce risks and enhance safety on campus.

i. Review the current security model

While it appears that YSS has informally adopted community-based principles, no written service delivery framework was identified that clearly articulates delivery of community-based security services. A formal service delivery framework must be developed with input from security staff and community members. It should clarify and communicate YSS's commitment to working from a community-based model and should provide a reference point to ensure principles are incorporated into program planning, implementation and evaluation. This framework is particularly important in a context of frequent attrition of security staff, as institutional knowledge is easily lost. A written framework will provide community members some assurance that security services operates in a consistent manner.

Audit findings suggest that security programs tend to operate in silos. Collaboration with stakeholders is essential to community-based security services – it is important that security staff know about other campus services to which they can refer individuals for further support. Security staff must be in constant dialogue with community members. They must hear concerns of the people they serve and spend time engaging individuals and groups in problem-solving. This collaboration between YSS and community members fits well with community security approaches and crime prevention models, as well as York's interdisciplinary approach to learning.

YSS must infuse a community safety component into its work, striking a balance between the need for community safety and the provision of security services. Development of a Community Safety Program will provide new staff who can work alongside existing security staff and community members. The Community Safety Program's staff can also work with the Security Advisory Council and facilitate the coordination and collaboration of activities; conduct outreach to community members and to the media; facilitate communication and input from a wide cross-section of students, staff and faculty, and assist with policy development and implementation of prevention activities. The Program can support coordination of interdepartmental prevention programs and integrated departmental safety plans with measurable targets and outcomes that will contribute to the broader Community Safety Program.

ii. Use of Force Response Model

During the audit process, students, staff and faculty members voiced concerns about YSS's Use of Force Response Model. It is derived from the province of Ontario's "use of force" model and reflects the level of protective equipment and training provided to security officers. It is based on an "assess-plan-act" logic and considers:

- situational factors, such as location, weather and number of suspects;
- impact factors, including the security officer's abilities and experience; and
- behavioural factors, such as the likelihood of physical response and active and passive forms of resistance.

Under YSS's Use of Force Response Model, security officers select the most reasonable response option and disengage when confronted with situations that move beyond initial stages of active resistance (Ontario Police Training Video Alliance, 1998).

It is clear that many York community members view the Use of Force Response Model as a "non-intervention policy". During the audit, participants described it as a measure that stops York's security officers from intervening in situations of conflict, violence and crime. METRAC's team was unable to review the model as it was not included in YSS's Standard Operating Procedures. However, information about the model was gleaned from a 2004 *Excalibur* article and consultations with students, staff and faculty members (Palter, 2004). Community members believe that the Use of Force Response Model only allows security officers to observe and report security incidents as opposed to intervening physically – they can only intervene verbally and/or call the police. Security staff members themselves reported disempowerment and low morale as a result of the "non-intervention policy". Some described their role as being a "professional witness" as they are only allowed to assess and report incidents.

Evidence suggests that the most successful responses to campus safety are balanced or mixed and tailored to the particular circumstances of the university. As discussed above, they include a combination of policy and prevention approaches; early risk and threat assessments; comprehensive non-violent interventions and enforcements; post-incident follow-up and support services; and safety planning and evaluation (Smith and Flynn, 2007; Langford, 2004; African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2005; Keith and Bassi, 2010).

Whereas the Use of Force Response Model focuses on safety for security staff and individuals when violence occurs, a non-violence policy would focus upon achieving safety and security by means other than violence. A non-violence policy is rooted in philosophical ideas within labour, peace, environmental, civil rights and eastern and women's movements and has been employed in various forms around the world (UN-Habitat, 2007). It requires active participation of all members of York's community, including students, staff, faculty members, visitors and community partners. Non-violence is an important philosophy to integrate into safety education efforts, both curricular and extra-curricular (UN-Habitat, 2007; Smith and Flynn, 2007; Langford, 2004; African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2005; Keith and Bassi, 2010).

A non-violence policy must clearly and visibly state that all acts and threats of violence will be taken seriously and investigated, and will result in progressive sanctions. It should prohibit weapons on campus, in vehicles; and at campus events. Clear examples of violent acts, language and gestures considered threatening must be included, as well as examples of hate and bias-motivated violence and discrimination based on identity factors such as gender, race, sexual orientation, class, faith and ability. It must cover the continuum of violence and delineate rights and responsibilities of students. The policy should include a commitment to creating non-violent spaces and activities, including classrooms, debates, protests, demonstrations and social events. UN-Habitat, 2007; Smith and Flynn, 2007; Langford, 2004; African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2005).

iii. Non-York community members on campus

During audit activities, staff expressed concerns that non-York community members appear to be entering the campus to commit criminal activities. Added to this is a perception that knowledge of the "non-intervention policy" or Use of Force Response Model is widespread on campus and that individuals outside York's community are aware of the policy and may be enticed to commit criminal activities on campus with little fear of consequences. Similarly, many audit participants expressed reluctance to report violent or unsafe incidents to YSS, for fear of their inaction.

In addition to low morale amongst security staff, the "non-intervention policy" or Use of Force Response Model has created a deep sense of insecurity amongst students and faculty. It appears that women students in particular have paid the price for it. Feeling responsible for their own safety, women student respondents discussed the various ways they attempt to manage security for themselves, such as going to lengths to modify work and study schedules and refraining from classes that take place after six o'clock in the evening. Needless to say, it is problematic to expect women students to shoulder the responsibility for their own safety by sacrificing earnings, risking employment and restricting access to night courses.

A report on the roots of youth violence in Ontario highlights the important role universities play in building non-violent capacities of local neighbourhoods. Aside from continuing outreach and engagement efforts in surrounding communities, York University could partner with the local municipality to address longer-term security needs and conduct research and projects to support safety-enhancing community engagement.

At a higher level, York University must protect its campuses through territorial reinforcement and organized surveillance in the built and natural environment. It must work to deter criminal activity by non-York members in isolated areas, especially after dark. York must increase surveillance by YSS night patrols and enhance lighting and landscaping to improve campus visibility. The University must combine policy, partnerships and memorandum of agreements with non-York facilities operated by external housing agents and other educational institutions on its campuses. Safety standards for use of campus space must be developed, including protocols for dealing with violations of those standards. Coordination and communication of information between YSS and York's programs and departments must be improved to overcome distance and isolation. Concerted efforts must be undertaken to shift attitudes and responses to sexual assault and harassment on campus.

iv. Security Advisory Council

York's Security Advisory Council (SAC) advises and makes recommendations to the Vice President, Finance and Administration and the Department of Security Services on personal safety and security, including security policies, procedures and services. The SAC has a large membership that includes various stakeholder groups – administration, students, staff, faculty, unions, marginalized groups and security staff. Meetings are held twice per semester and the chair, who must complete an annual report for the Vice President, is appointed annually. The SAC includes three standing committees that examine security matters related to women and safety, anti-discrimination and campus safety. It encourages community participation and, in particular, student participation. It welcomes volunteers to work within standing committees.

In principle, the SAC is a promising model for engaging community participation in safety efforts. However, the audit revealed deficiencies in its structure and function. Restructuring is required to achieve

a more inclusive membership that reflects the diversity of York's community. Processes for conducting meetings must be made more equitable and democratic so students' safety needs and ideas will be heard. These changes will strengthen the role of the SAC and foster better relations between York members and YSS as they work to prevent and reduce violence and crime.

v. Staffing, training and development

METRAC's team received substantial feedback from respondents concerning a perception of inadequate staffing in YSS. Low morale and a need for increased capacity training, professionalism, staff support and supervision should be examined with a keen eye to strengthen YSS's ability to deliver effective services. Ongoing training for staff is particularly important, especially intersectional anti-oppression training. It will better equip security staff to work with and respond to the complex, diverse safety needs of York community members.

vi. Security officer complement

The audit revealed that a full complement of security staff consists of 24 Security Officers, 22 Property Watch Officers (PWO) and five Campus Relations Officers. However, only five security officers are on duty per shift on the Keele campus, three of which are relegated to patrol duty. At the Glendon campus, only two Security Officers are on duty and they work 12-hour shifts.

Data retrieved from the Ontario Association of College and University Security Administrators demonstrates that the security-personnel-to-student ratio at York is 1,457 to one (0.69). That ratio ranks eight of 12 universities – ahead of Guelph University (1,700 to one), Western University (1,570 to one), Queen's University (1,529 to one) and the University of Toronto (1,460 to one). However, York's ranking of 0. 69 is lower than that of Ryerson University's, which sits at 2.04. While no agreed-upon student-to-security-officer ratio exists nationally or internationally, this comparative data provides a context within which York can assess its security staffing levels. It should be noted that Ryerson University is located in the downtown Toronto core and is not as physically isolated as York's campuses, yet it has a larger ratio of security officers to students.

In the course of audit interviews, security staff expressed low morale and satisfaction as a result of limited resources and response procedures. Many stated that their patrolling activities were limited due to a low number of security staff. The low staffing complement contributes to two key problems.

1. Delayed response: allocation of adequate numbers of officers is vitally important to the delivery of prompt, high-quality security services. Understaffing can result in negative consequences for students, staff and faculty. It can create long wait times for security calls to get answered, which may leave community members to handle incidents by themselves. Respondents in audit focus groups and interviews recounted several incidents where YSS arrived anywhere from 20 minutes to three hours after a call. In situations of crisis, response time often dictates a successful or failed outcome of an unsafe situation.

2. Lack of follow-up: staffing shortages can reduce availability for follow-up after incidents are reported. Some audit participants expressed concerns about a lack of follow-up after incidents of harassment, intimidation and crimes were reported. A common sentiment expressed amongst participants is that, due to the lack of follow-up, reporting to YSS is often viewed as futile. Achieving successful follow-up

is crucial to ensuring community members receive support after they report, whether the support be legal, medical, counselling or otherwise.

Besides the need to hire additional security staff and place additional staff on shifts, security services must revise and update protocols to demonstrate minimum and maximum response times. This will help maintain standards for handling incoming calls of reported incidents.

vii. Staff training and development

Effective security services have the capacity to support increased staff knowledge and skill building to ensure competency and accountability in a democratic, immensely diverse context. YSS must continue staff education and training on a broad range of subjects related to daily security operations and emerging violence and crime issues on campus. Greater emphasis should be placed on education about sexual assault; different forms of harassment; anti-racism and anti-oppression theory and practice; anti-sexism education; equity; intersectional identities and discrimination; non-violent security interventions; human rights legislation; hate crimes and hate incidents; use of force and alternatives to force; community development and engagement; and community-based security provision. Other key topics identified by security staff and security users should be incorporated into future orientation and refresher training plans.

viii. Awareness of security programs and services

As mentioned, York has created a number of initiatives designed to build safety for its members, including accompaniment programs, physical security features, communication bulletins, patrols, security-related policies and various other services. Although the University has an impressive array of programs and services, community members appear to know little about them. A safety outreach and education campaign is required to better promote awareness. A concerted process of informing members of safety programs and services will send a clear message that personal and community safety is a priority and that York is continuously, proactively seeking ways to improve safety.

A coordinated and comprehensive "safety strategy" should be considered. It should be based on principles of community-centric service delivery and should include clear communication and information-sharing with community members. The plan should include regular risk and threat assessment and procedures conducted by a critical response team.

Section 4: Assessment of the Physical Environment at York

The physical environment of a university campus presents opportunities for recognizing, responding to and reducing risks of violence and crime. York University has directed effort and resources toward enhancements of natural surroundings and the built environment. However, there is room to improve existing and new infrastructure through effective planning, design and management.

As mentioned before, root causes of crime and violence are complicated and cannot be relegated to any one social or physical feature of an environment. For instance, improving the physical features to reduce stranger sexual assaults cannot entirely eliminate the problem of sexual violence on campus – most gender-based violence occurs in private spaces between people who know each other. However, lighting, accessibility, isolation, signage, landscape and maintenance issues can impact proliferation of some forms of violence and crime as well as the fear individuals experience in a space (UN-Habitat, 2007).

This section examines six interrelated features of York's physical environment audited by METRAC, namely, lighting, signage, sightlines, isolation, maintenance and accessibility. Findings for each feature are presented with an analysis of data with respect to planning, design and management.

Lighting

Areas of strength

A large number of lights are maintained by the university – 5,800 exterior lights exist on the Keele campus alone, with approximately 200 to 300 of them expired at any given moment. York administers programs to improve and maintain outdoor and indoor lighting. This includes a weekly goSAFE audit to check and replace expired lights, with priority given to emergency blue lights. Emergency lights are tested annually to verify the integrity of the system. The Lights Out Program encourages York members to report any burnt out interior or exterior lights. Most recently, York maintenance has decided to work towards a target of having only 100 expired lights at any given moment.

Opportunities for improvement

Lighting has considerable impact on a person's sense of safety to the extent that it can discourage aggression, reduce fear of assault and invite people traffic. Adequate lighting is critical for a person to see and be seen.

METRAC's team became aware of inadequate lighting on both campuses during audit consultations. The cost of lighting can be prohibitive and financial constraints can limit improvements to lighting on campus. However, inadequate lighting is a major source of dissatisfaction for campus constituents, in particular, for women constituents. Evidence suggests that revisiting problematic areas to install lighting and reduce fears that people experience in them can be less costly in the long-term, even if it is disruptive and expensive in the short-term. It is thus all the more crucial to evaluate possible violence and crime problems in the design process for a new area or building, including lighting problems (UN-Habitat, 2007).

Lack of awareness about existing programs to replace expired lights can be counterproductive. The Lights Out Program is excellent but for the most part, audit participants did not know about it. Low awareness could be due to the fact that the program is promoted solely through YSS's website.

Those who develop plans for new buildings and areas must consider lighting and visibility issues in the design process. With respect to planning and design of the new York subway line, the University must partner with the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) to conduct CPTED audits. Audits must employ a gender-sensitive and intersectional analysis and they must be carried out in consultation with women and groups most at risk of violence. Aesthetic value is not the only consideration in physical design – attention must be placed upon preventing violence and crime and reducing fear. For example, the process of planning for a social work or women's studies building must incorporate potential impacts of design on women's safety as these programs tend to attract female students and staff. Safety for marginalized women, such as women with disabilities, must be especially considered as they are more vulnerable to experiencing violence. Consultation with diverse women is critical in the planning and development stage of construction as women space users have the best insight on their own safety needs.

Concerns about lighting are also related to the type of fixtures utilized on campus. An aging infrastructure can present challenges and may require upgrades to comply with current standards. Improved illumination must be addressed at three levels:

- replacing burned out and expired lights;
- installing brighter white lights in existing fixtures; and
- erecting new lights.

Ideally, lighting in buildings and surrounding areas should be sufficiently luminescent to allow one to see a person's face 15 metres away. White source lighting is preferable.

Signage

Clear signs and maps can reduce fear, anxiety and confusion in a space. They should be easy to find and read for all constituents, including those with vision disabilities and those who are learning English. Signs and maps should incorporate words, symbols and arrows to show direction. Buildings should be numbered and their names posted next to entrances. Inside each building, a map or directory should be posted to show where a space user can go. Maps or directories should be placed by elevators and stairwells.

Clear emergency signs must help campus users understand security protocols. Easy-to-understand directions for where to go, who to call, and how to access emergency exits can make a difference in emergencies and can help alleviate fears. As is the case with normal signage, emergency signs should be easy to find and read, and emergency maps should use words, symbols and arrows.

Signs can also be used to express ownership of a space and can reinforce territorial boundaries for sprawling spaces, the likes of university campuses.

Areas of strength

A new exterior and interior signage program was developed in collaboration with a number of departments to make way-finding on York's campuses more effective and to present a bright, consistent image. York has also established universal signage standards, which were developed to establish a distinct, professional graphic image.

Opportunities for improvement

Audit findings indicate that maps and signs at York are generally adequate but require more detail and definition to assist visitors and new community members. The Kinsmen Building on the Keele campus in particular was identified as having poor signage – a majority of respondents (89.1%) referred to its lack of emergency signage. In the safety literature, buildings like Kinsmen are referred to as a "design disadvantagement" as its design unintentionally creates opportunities for violence and crime (Coleman, 1990).

York University has an onus to address safety problems posed by the design of the Kinsmen Building, especially since the building is accessed by many female students, staff and faculty. Its improvement with respect to lighting, regular signage and emergency signage must be a priority.

Clear signage can strengthen definition of York's borders by announcing the intended purposes and users of any ambiguous spaces at Keele and Glendon campuses.

Sightlines

A clear sightline allows for an unobstructed view of objects and people in the path ahead. Space users tend to avoid areas where their sightlines are blocked by features such as sharp corners, walls or garbage dumps, as those features create places where an attacker could hide. Good sightlines are connected to good maintenance and lighting – safer spaces and passageways are clear, well-lit and free of excess obstructions and debris.

Areas of strength

During York's Campus Safety Audit Process, METRAC's team noted the existence of corner mirrors in some stairwells and residence building laundry rooms.

Opportunities for improvement

The placement of mirrors is inconsistent across residences and other buildings, a concern expressed by audit participants. They articulated a need for more security mirrors in corridors, hallway corners and areas with obstructions.

Overgrown vegetation and limited landscaping and maintenance at Keele and Glendon campuses were also noted as safety concerns. A variety of trees and bushes are in need of trimming, and some lights and signs were blocked by overgrown foliage. Maintenance to keep sightlines clear is important in its own right and supplements effective lighting and signage.

Isolation

Even though York is home to many students, faculty and staff, the layout of its campuses and their locations outside of urban cores can create a sense of isolation, acutely felt by space users at night. The Keele campus is flanked by overgrown forested areas to the west and east. Parking lots are located primarily in the north and south of the campus. The majority of buildings are located in the centre. The Glendon campus, although smaller than the Keele campus, also includes overgrown forested areas that surround almost all of the main buildings. A few parking lots are located in the northern area of the campus.

Areas of strength

York has initiated two streams of emergency phone programs with outdoor and indoor capability to address isolation.

1. Blue Light Initiative: emergency telephones are located in parking lots, residence lobbies, some building entrances and in all elevators and laundry rooms. Outdoor emergency telephones are equipped with a blue light for visibility. Security staff can be alerted by emergency Blue Light telephones or by calling free from any campus pay telephone – space users can ask for immediate assistance to deal with medical emergencies, vehicle breakdowns or personal safety risks.

    Calls to 911 and the Student Escort Service are free from campus pay telephones. To use an emergency Blue Light telephone, callers press call button and are directly connected to the Security Control Centre. The location of the phone is displayed to the security officer who answers the call. If the caller uses an emergency telephone that has closed circuit television coverage, YSS can observe what is occurring around the phone.

2. Indoor campus safety phones: indoor campus safety phones were installed in all Keele and Glendon campuses buildings, an initiative launched in spring 2009. Indoor safety phones are typically located on the floors of every building, in entrance foyers, in elevator lobbies or in main corridors. They are identifiable, visible from a distance and equipped with two direct lines. By pressing the red "Push for Help" button, a caller is connected directly to the Security Control Centre. The second line connects the user to goSAFE. During operating hours, a campus user can arrange to meet a goSAFE escort at a bus stop, vehicle or another pick-up destination.

Opportunities for improvement

Audit findings demonstrate that physical isolation is a problem. Survey and focus group respondents expressed fears about isolation and a lack of security in certain locations and buildings. Desolate areas can increase space users' anxiety and sense of unsafety. Not knowing if one will be seen or heard if threatened or assaulted contributes to fear. In the absence of security measures to reduce isolation, people who work, live and study on campus are at an increased risk of victimization.

Strategic planning about isolation is required to reduce fear, vulnerability and opportunities for violence and crime. Surveys, focus groups and site tours pointed to the inadequacy of emergency measures to reduce isolation on campus. Emergency phones are lacking, especially in buildings such as the Kinsmen Building, Vari Hall and Student Centre. Where they do exist, they are not always in functioning order and

do not always operate according to details set out by the Blue Light Initiative or Indoor Campus Safety Phones Program. For anti-isolation measures to be effective, phones must be visible, functional and operate as part of a larger system strictly dictated by program guidelines. To start, community members must be made aware of the location of these phones and must be given direction on how to use them in emergency situations.

Maintenance

Proper maintenance of security systems can support a university's capacity to prevent and deal with unsafe situations. Well-maintained spaces and lighting can increase opportunities for surveillance and reduce incidents of violence. Excellent maintenance ensures adequate lighting, functioning emergency systems and clear and unobstructed sightlines – all of which affects space users' sense of safety. At York, maintenance of campus grounds is handled by Campus Services and Business Operations.

Areas of strength

Many survey and focus group participants expressed satisfaction with maintenance.

- 66% believed that building and areas are well-maintained in terms of lighting, litter and telephones.
- 81.5% do not believe that there is garbage, vandalism, graffiti, broken windows or other issues that make buildings or areas appear unsafe or threatening.
- 81.4% do not notice any hate or discriminatory graffiti.

Opportunities for improvement

A concern about consistency in campus maintenance emerged from audit findings. Focus groups and site tours revealed areas in need of upkeep, including stairs at the Glendon campus. Findings refer to a need for more timely removal of broken fixtures, garbage bags that block emergency exits, snow and ice and other obstructions.

A compelling issue in audit findings is the existence of hate and discriminatory graffiti and a need for their timely removal. While the majority of audit participants did not report it as an issue, almost 20% of audit respondents did. A sense of desensitization may impact space users' perceptions of hate and discriminatory graffiti, and when one is not on the receiving end of this targeting, less thought and concern may be dedicated to the problem. Nonetheless, racist, homophobic and sexist graffiti and writing heavily affect the safety of targeted space users and their sense of inclusion. Hateful commentary left for public viewing can create a perception of affirmation and tacit approval. The University must send a clear and ongoing message to students, staff and faculty about its policy on hateful and discriminatory speech. It must be visible and made known to all community members.

Accessibility

Accessible spaces allow users to move about freely. They reduce individual vulnerability to entrapment and violence. They also help reduce social and physical barriers for children, seniors, Deaf community members and people with a range of disabilities.

Full inclusion and the absence of barriers is a key element of safety. It enables freedom of movement, whether in emergency or non-emergency situations. It requires wheelchair and elevator access to buildings, washrooms, classrooms, dorms and offices. In outdoor areas, paths, sidewalks, ramps and parking lots must be paved and include clear signage that points to accessible entrances. Access to teletypewriters (TTYs and TDDs) is essential, as well as Braille on indoor signage and elevators. Importantly, on-campus safety programs must be equipped to support people with disabilities and accessible to them.

Ontario's first accessibility standard, the customer service standard, came into effect on January 1, 2008. It outlines what public sector organizations including universities must do to make goods and services more accessible to people with disabilities. Legal requirements are set out in two Ontario Regulations under the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005*. Most businesses and organizations that provide goods and services to Ontarians were required to comply with the standards by January 1, 2010.

Areas of strength

York University has instituted an Ontario Disabilities Act Accessibility Plan. It outlines annual accessibility goals and objectives, timelines for achieving them, progress to date and the individual or division responsible for implementation. Progress reports summarize achievements in the plan. While the accessibility plan does not provide a detailed timeline, it contains a projected year of completion.

The university has initiated a number of policies and programs to ensure accessibility for students with disabilities. The Senate at York has a Policy Regarding Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities. It states that the University "shall make reasonable and appropriate accommodations and adaptations in order to promote the ability of students with disabilities to fulfill the academic requirements of their programs". It also states that disabilities are "those conditions so designated under the Code and will in any event include physical, medical, learning, and psychiatric disabilities".

Instructors and faculty members are encouraged to use universal design in course planning, design and delivery to meet a range of learning needs. The Faculty Resource Guide explains the ways that educators can teach to meet learning styles of all students. An Assistive Technology Lab further supports students with learning disabilities, and the Counselling and Disability Centre provides counselling services, learning skill supports and disability services for students with learning, mental health, physical, sensory and medical disabilities.

Access York is an Advisory Committee for persons with disabilities. Its role is to advocate for equity and inclusion on disability issues for those who work and study at the University.

Opportunities for improvement

Audit participants identified key areas such as washrooms, elevators and entranceways that remain inaccessible to people with disabilities. They noted poor ramp structures, difficult-to-read signage and heavy and difficult-to-open doors. Participants also vocalized a need for policies, procedures, programs and services to take into account the safety needs of people with disabilities. They identified a need for self-defence classes to be inclusive of students with disabilities.

The audit process confirmed that accessibility is a major component of safety on campus. Numerous studies have demonstrated that people with disabilities, especially women with disabilities, are at a greater risk of physical and sexual assault (Disabled Women's Network Ontario, n.d.). For example, women with developmental disabilities are 4 to 10 times more likely to be sexually assaulted (Springtide Resources, n.d.). A lack of accessible spaces and security protocols, as well as programs and services that incorporate needs of people with disabilities, impedes the University's inclusivity. In effect, people with disabilities are only partially integrated into York's community – it increases their marginalization and can cause them to experience greater levels of unsafety.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Through the METRAC team, York University has completed a participatory and inclusive Campus Safety Audit of its two main campuses. It speaks to the University's commitment to create a safer space to live, work and learn.

Drawing from interviews, focus groups, surveys, consultation meetings, submissions and research conducted during the audit, recommendations about safety changes have been developed. They are all grounded in evidence and designed to prevent and reduce all forms of violence on campus. Some are large and far-reaching and some are small and specific. Some are time-limited and others must be implemented in an ongoing manner.

Building safety necessitates long-term commitment, leadership and responsibility from the top and bottom. It is a collaborative process that involves incremental change; equitable sharing of resources to actualize systems and processes for planning; and implementing and evaluating safety interventions. It requires a fundamental shift in personal and institutional values as well as a sharing of power to create a culture of non-violence, safety and respect.

Recommendations are organized by themes arising from preceding sections of the report. Each recommendation includes a timeline for implementation:

- short-term (1 -2 years);
- medium-term (2-5 years); and
- long-term (5 years or more)

Social environment recommendations

Promising practices	York University	Recommendations	Proposed timeline
• High-level leadership: successful prevention programs to address campus violence and crime are backed by high-level leadership, well defined structures and processes, accountability, and the allocation of resources to sustain campus-wide safety initiatives. (Langford, 2004; UN-Habitat, 2007; Roark, 1987; African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2005; Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center *et al.*, 2009). • Collaboration and staffing: effective violence prevention strategies require multiple partnerships across sectors and community members to come together in a strategic, coordinated way. Dedicated staffing can also help to coordinate activities, facilitate communication between diverse stakeholders and help the implementation of safety initiatives	• Senior administrators have expressed commitment to building and sustaining a safe and inclusive campus. • 18.1% of survey respondents cited implementation of recommendations in a timely manner by York administrators as an important outcome of the audit. • York has numerous programs, policies and security measures to support community safety but there are gaps and areas for improvement, in specific, violence against women, hate incidents and systemic oppression. • 20.9% of survey respondents would like to see improvements with respect to policies, programs, support systems and reporting. • York has several policies in place to address sexual harassment, hate propaganda, racism, religious observances	1.1. The president should issue a statement that describes York's commitment to achieving a safe campus and outlines action steps to address violence against women, hate incidents and systemic inequities.	Upon release of this report and at the beginning of every semester
		1.2. The university should continue to allocate eight million dollars to support physical security and prevention of violence and crime on campus.	Ongoing
		1.3. Priority should be given to finding new funding or reallocating existing resources to enhance primary, secondary and tertiary prevention of violence on campus with specific budgets to target violence against women, hate incidents and systemic discrimination.[5]	Ongoing
		1.4. Senior administrators should form an interdisciplinary Management Safety Committee (MSC) to oversee development and implementation of departmental safety action plans, programs, policies and procedures recommended in the audit.	Within 1 month and ongoing
		1.5. Establish processes that include performance indicators to monitor progress and assess the effectiveness of policies, programs and practices.	Within 1 year

---

[5] Primary prevention refers to interventions before violence occurs by removing causes or preventing development of risk factors. Secondary prevention involves identifying risk factors and taking necessary actions before violence occurs. Tertiary prevention refers to treatment or rehabilitation after violence has occurred to minimize its impact and to prevent repeated occurrences (Chamberlain, 2008).

(Langford, 2004; African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2005; UN-Habitat, 2007; Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center *et al.*, 2009; Benard, 2007). • Community engagement: opportunities for social networks and partnerships exist and are sustained for communities so they can collaborate and build and develop skills and solutions to tackle violence on campus (Benard, 2007; Bowen *et al.*, 2004; Green and Haines, 2002; Jack, 2004). • Organizational policies and practices: clear, concise policies and procedures are created, widely disseminated and known to facilitate a shared understanding of safety priorities and consistent standards against which responses and supports for women and groups affected by violence can be measured (Langford, 2004; UN-Habitat, 2007; Roark, 1987; African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2005; Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center *et al.*, 2009). • Programs: community programs are in place to	and equity for persons with disabilities, to name a few. Policy statements are not broadly accessible, nor are they linked to actual practice and training. • York has no policy and procedure to address sexual assault. • York has no policy and procedure to address cyber-violence. • York has a comprehensive Student Code of Conduct. It is overly broad and may be subject to abuse from persons filing a complaint, even if their safety was not at risk and they were not harmed. Similarly, "any person" can file a complaint and this may create an avenue for external lobbyists to interfere with internal activities. • There is a Sexual Assault Survivors Support Line and the Centre for Women and Trans People Preventing violence on campus requires a concentrated focus on women. • Equity and anti-violence perspectives are part of the training offered to some students (e.g. Dons,	1.6. The MSC should establish a partnership between York and the City of Toronto to engage the University community in violence prevention activities through social development, which are outlined in the Toronto Community Safety Plan and the Neighbourhood Action Plan for Jane and Finch.	Within 6 months and ongoing
		1.7. The University Safety Audit Committee (USAC) should be dissolved as its work is complete.	Within 1 month
		1.8. A Community Safety Council (CSC) should be established to replace the Security Advisory Council in order to strengthen the community's role in contributing to planning, monitoring and evaluating safety programs, policies and practices on campus.	Within 3 months
		1.9. The CSC should include and utilize the vast experience and ideas of community members, including students, faculty and staff, unions and federations, administrators, student clubs, campus programs, local businesses, police, security officers, Jane and Finch agencies, community members, local councillors, representatives from housing cooperatives on campus and Residence Life. This group should include women, men and transpeople of diverse ages, races, sexual orientations, abilities, income levels, ethnicities and faiths who have knowledge of gender-based violence, hate issues and systemic inequality.	Within 3 months

address various levels of violence risks by removing the root causes of violence, reducing the risks for violence or minimizing the impact of violence after it has occurred and working to prevent it from occurring (Chamberlain, 2008; Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center *et al.*, 2009; Langford, 2004; Roark, 1987; Cohen *et al.*, 2006; Pollard *et al.*, 1999). • Training and community education: training and education opportunities are provided through multiple channels to reach students, faculty, staff and broader communities for the purpose of giving appropriate information and developing the skills to advance prevention efforts and successful outcomes across York's campuses and in surrounding communities (Langford, 2004; UN-Habitat, 2007; Roark, 1987; African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2005; Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center *et al.*, 2009). • Communication: the environment conveys messages to change	Residence Life Coordinators and Managers and some Teaching Assistants). • Currently, Postering Guidelines and the Poster and Banner Placement Guidelines for student elections contain no information on content of posters and images. Audit respondents reported sexist, misogynistic and racist materials posted around York. • Equity training is not offered to all staff members. The Presidential Task Force on Student Life, Learning and Community has recommended that York institute this training. • Increased funding for the Centre for Women and Trans People is needed, as well as for the Trans, Bisexual, Lesbian Gay Alliance (TBLGay) at York. Audit respondents reported that these services provided safe spaces. • Requests for a more secure office location for the TBLGay Alliance and Black Students Association have not yet been met. • Guidelines about safety alerts are	1.10. The Sexual Assault Survivors Support Line (SASSL) and Centre for Women and Trans People, in partnership with the Counselling and Development Centre, should be funded to provide a continuum of culturally relevant programs (e.g. individual and crisis counselling, support groups, workshops) for women dealing with gender-based violence, hate and harassment.	Within 1 year and ongoing
		1.11. An Audit Implementation Committee (AIC) should be created as a sub-committee of the CSC to liaise with the MSC and monitor implementation of audit recommendations. This Committee should include former members of USAC and new members of the CSC.	Within 4 months to 5 years
		1.12. The MSC should create a comprehensive Violence Prevention Policy to target and address violence against women, hate incidents and systemic discrimination.	Within 6 months
		1.13. The MSC, in consultation with members of the CSC, should establish formal violence prevention policies and procedures on how to identify, prevent and respond to physical assault, sexual assault, rape, stalking, intimate relationship violence, cyber-violence, harassment and hate incidents.	Within 1-2 years
		1.14. Students, faculty and staff should receive training on York's policies and procedures to identify, prevent and respond to perceived and actual risks of physical assault,	Within 1-2 years and ongoing

		sexual assault, rape, stalking, intimate relationship violence, cyber-violence, harassment and hate incidents.	
social norms about violence, influence bystanders and foster buy-in for prevention strategies and priorities (Langford, 2004; UN-Habitat, 2007; Roark, 1987; African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2005; Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center *et al.*, 2009).	contained in the Standard and Operating Procedures, but they are not communicated with community members. They do not include a gender analysis.	1.15. All violence prevention policies should be promoted in clear language on an accessible webpage for easy reference.	Within 1 year and ongoing
• Evaluation and data collection: evaluation is institutionalized to determine whether efforts should be continued, improved, expanded, revised or curtailed. It highlights ways to increase the effectiveness of safety activities and demonstrates accountability to stakeholders. Quality data should inform the evaluation process (Langford, 2004; UN-Habitat, 2007; African Canadian Legal Clinic, 2005; Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center *et al.*, 2009).	• Security Services' mission statement is to "partner with the community in order to create a campus environment that is safe for, and perceived as safe by students, faculty, staff and visitors to York." No written statement exists that includes anti-violence and non-discrimination.	1.16. The Student Code of Conduct should be reviewed and revised to emphasize students' rights and responsibilities and include specific mention of cyber-violence.	Within 1-2 years
		1.17. The Student Code of Conduct should be reviewed to address potential abuses through unfounded complaints. • The complaint form should include a warning that unfounded or frivolous complaints constitute a breach of the code and may result in dismissal of the complaint and/or sanctions against the complainant. • A standing test should be developed to help adjudicators identify frivolous complaints.	Within 6 months
	• 81.4% of respondents reported they had not noticed hate or discriminatory graffiti. For those who did report noticing it, they identified the Student Centre and Vari Hall as key sites. Half of these persons said the graffiti was not removed within 24 hours. • York's Graffiti Removal Policy must detail a protocol for instances where graffiti is reported to or found by security services. If graffiti is hate-based, security should secure the scene until the police arrive and take a report of the incident.	1.18. Adjudicators for Disciplinary Tribunals should be trained on dynamics of violence against women and hate incidents.	Within 3-5 years
• Education, equity and inclusion: research suggests that exposure to diverse people, cultures and ideas promotes complex thinking. It allows for challenge to prevailing assumptions and prejudices, and it pushes individuals to think in		1.19. The Senate Policy on Religious Observances should be reviewed and revised to cover faculty and staff and highlight students' right to accommodation by faculty during classroom hours. A provision should be added to designate spaces for religious/spiritual practices to	Within 1-2 years

new ways about questions for which they thought they had clear and definitive answers (Antonio *et al.*, 2004). • Inclusive education is central to the achievement of high-quality education for all learners and to the development of more inclusive societies (UNESCO, 2008).	Upon completion of an investigation, a Security Control Room officer should contact Facilities Services and request that the graffiti be removed immediately.	reduce physical risks and fire hazards in stairwells.	
		1.20. The Sexual Harassment Policy, Policy Concerning Racism and Hate Propaganda Guidelines should be reviewed and revised to include rights and responsibilities of students, staff and faculty and provide clear definitions and procedures for identifying, preventing and responding to situations involving hate, harassment and discrimination.	Within 1-2 years
		1.21. The Physical Accessibility of University Facilities Policy should be reviewed and revised with attention paid to emergency and safety requirements for students and faculty with physical disabilities.	Within 1-2 years
		1.22. Policies and guidelines for advertising, posters, images and promotional materials should be reviewed and amended to foster environments free of hate and discriminatory speech. Students, faculty and staff must receive orientation and continuous training to these policies and procedures.	Within 1-2 years
		1.23. Community Relations Officers should work to build the appropriate safety programs in partnership with Jane and Finch neighbourhood agencies, schools, the local councillor and community members, faculties and student organizations so safety efforts can have deeper impact campus-wide and in the surrounding community.	Within 1-3 years
		1.24. MSC should dedicate resources and increase	Within 3 years

		investments to multi-purpose spaces for students, particularly to promote recreational activities and foster dialogue between diverse groups at various times of the day.	
		1.25. The Positive Space Program should be expanded campus-wide to foster inclusive spaces for people of all sexual orientations and gender identities.	Within 2 years
		1.26. York should increase in-kind resources (e.g. meeting space, equipment, office supplies) to promote and generate interest in programming activities to build and support existing student-led programs.	Within 3 years
		1.27. Continue to offer free self-defence classes, inclusive of women with disabilities and trans individuals, to foster safety for women and transpeople (e.g. Wen-Do, Rape Aggression Defence techniques).	Ongoing
		1.28. The CSC, in partnership with the relevant faculty members, should develop an educational program for men with a focus on prevention of violence against women and other vulnerable groups. It should be led by men, for men.	Within 2 years
		1.29. Community Relations Officers, in partnership with SASSL and other relevant groups, should develop a university-endorsed "prevent rape" campaign launched for beginning of the academic year.	Within 1 year and ongoing
		1.30. Equity Studies or Women's Studies courses should be a mandatory	Within 3-5 years and ongoing

		element of receiving an undergraduate degree at York.	
		1.31. The Centre for Human Rights, in partnership with the Centre in Support of Teaching, should develop and deliver training and workshops for faculty and teaching assistants about sexual assault and harassment on campus.	Within 2 years and ongoing
		1.32. Community Relations Officers, in partnership with the School of Women's Studies, SASSL and other relevant groups, should develop a campaign to encourage students to program SASSL's and security services' number into their cell phones.	Within 1 year and ongoing
		1.33. Deans, faculty members and unions should develop an agreement to schedule courses and class locations with student composition in mind. For example, core women's studies and social work courses should not be offered exclusively in the evening and in isolated locations (i.e. move classes to Vari Hall and central buildings).	Within 1 year and ongoing
		1.34. The MSC, in partnership with the CSC, should conduct a review of student-funded programs to revise the formula and increase funding for violence-prevention student-led programs through university grants.	Within 3 years and ongoing
		1.35. In partnership with Residence Life, York should institute safety programming in undergraduate and graduate residences, with attention paid to violence against women and hate incidents.	Within 3-5 years and ongoing
		1.36. The Centre for Human	Within 2 years

		Rights should, in partnership with the Equity Committee, diverse students, faculty and unions, develop a policy on equity and inclusive education at York.	
		1.37. Each department and faculty should be given support, training and directions for implementing equity and inclusive education practices.	Within 2 years
		1.38. The President should communicate progress to campus constituents in an annual report.	Within 1 year and ongoing
		1.39. Conduct a University climate survey on campus for students, faculty and staff at the end of five years.	Within 5 years

Security services recommendations

Promising practices	York University	Recommendations	Proposed timeline
• There are no firm standards for campus security staffing levels. The research suggests that campus size, location, trends in crime and local needs should determine staffing levels (O'Neill *et al.*, 2008). • Security officers are trained in various intervention techniques for responding to different types and levels of violence. • Security officers are trained in non-crisis intervention practice, violence against women and sexual assault, equity, access, intersectionality, and inclusion. • Hourly patrols are conducted in all areas accessed by campus users. Patrols are carried out frequently during all hours of the day for operations that are open to the public on a 24 hour basis. • Emergency phones or security intercoms are directly connected to security services and placed along paths, walkways, and sidewalks between buildings, in elevators and washrooms. • Security cameras are	• Five security officers are on duty at Keele campus, and three security officers are stationed at Glendon campus. Community members expressed concerns that security staffing levels are inadequate, which create threats to safety and reduces staff morale. • York Security Services (YSS) has a "non-intervention policy" and staff are trained in these methods, including Verbal Judo©. • YSS has limited staffing capacity to conduct patrols. • Emergency telephones are located in parking lots, laundry rooms, and lobbies of some buildings. A map of all emergency Blue Light telephones and new proposed locations exists. • Audit participants reported that some emergency phones are non-functioning, confusing to operate and sometimes inadequate. • Emergency telephones are located in elevators.	2.1. Security staffing levels should be increased to improve campus patrols, night time coverage, response time to calls and coverage at special events (e.g. Pub Nights).	Within 6 months to 2 years
		2.2. Satellite security hubs and mobile stations should be established across campus to increase surveillance of isolated areas.	Within 2-5 years
		2.3. Security officers should be trained in issues related to gender-based violence, equity and inclusion practices in their work. This training should be ongoing and monitored for impact.	Within 2-5 years
		2.4. A review of the "non-intervention policy"/Use of Force Response model for effectiveness should be undertaken in consultation with students, faculty and staff.	Within 1-2 years
		2.5. In consultation with community members, explore options for developing a security services model that balances community development with enforcement needs.	Within 2-5 years
		2.6. Mixed-gender and multi-ethnic security teams should be utilized to reflect the diversity of campus constituents.	Within 2-5 years
		2.7. The Kinsmen building and surrounding area should be targeted for security patrols, and the installation of security phones in and around the building.	Within 1-2 years
		2.8. YSS should advocate for TTC to change route 196 to	Within 1 year

installed in areas identified by campus users as producing feelings of isolation and which may not always be subject to regular hourly patrolling. • Security officers are stationed at doors to buildings frequented by unidentified people, such as residences and athletic centres. • Establishment of a "Walksafe" and/or "Ridesafe" program on campus with wait times of 15 minutes at most. Operating hours of the program should match the times of operation for the library, bookstore, evening office hours and night classes. All waiting locations should be situated in highly visible areas, with no obstructed sightlines, enhanced lighting, adequate signage including route schedule, and emergency phone access. • Campus Alerts- In its report on the Virginia Tech killings, IACLEA recommends that colleges and universities use multiple means of communicating with members during emergencies and sharing information about incidents, both high and low tech methods.	• More than 400 closed circuit televisions cameras (CCTVs) are installed across campuses. Two staff members monitor these per shift. Concerns were about the effectiveness of CCTV systems. • A Property Watch Program (PWP) is offered by YSS. PWP officers are stationed in residences after hours when student porters are off-duty. They monitor buildings and support residence staff. PWP officers are also placed at entrances to other buildings on campus. • York offers the VAN Go, goSAFE, walkSAFE and Why Work Alone services as well as the PWP. However, respondents report that wait times can be too long (e.g. up to 45 minutes). A need for mixed gender teams was raised. • Security alerts and bulletins are issued electronically and posted these on the YSS webpage, along with a weekly incident log. A public address system will be implemented. • An ERP and TAT are in place. • York has an LCD	provide full service stops along Murray Ross Parkway, Cooke Road, and Pond Road at all times, not just during rush hour. This service should be enhanced to provide late night special request stops for women.	
		2.9. Protocols for maintenance orders to be conducted in resident apartments should be reviewed in consultation with students, in order to protect the privacy and safety of students. Maintenance workers should be screened and trained on violence and harassment prevention.	Within 1 year
		2.10. Emergency phones should be standardized in colour, unit and instructions. Each phone should look the same across campus and instructions and site locations should be in a large print, accessible format.	Within 2 - 5 years
		2.11. Mailroom doors in campus apartment buildings should be locked to prevent entrapment and hiding spots.	Within 1 year
		2.12. CCTVs should be adequately staffed by licensed officers. Cameras should be reviewed for effectiveness and placed in areas with greatest risk and threats (e.g. parking lots, entry and exit points, collection booths). They must have high-visibility lighting and adequate film storage systems for investigative purposes.	Within 2-5 years
		2.13. Dispatchers for goSafe should be better trained to know pick up locations.	Within 1 year and ongoing
		2.14. The Property Watch Program should be evaluated to ensure it is effective in	Within 1-2 years

• Universities must have an Emergency Response Plan (ERP). It should include names, positions and contact information of persons to be notified in the event of a large-scale emergency. It should be reviewed at least every two years and updated as necessary. It should describe persons and entities to be contacted and the actions to be taken in response to various emergencies (O'Neill *et al.*, 2008).	alerting system, postering capability and web site notification capability.	meeting the safety needs of campus members. PWP officers should be trained to assume more security-related duties.	
		2.15. Property Watch officers, porters and Residence Life Dons should have their roles clarified and coordinated to maximize efficiencies, while enhancing safety in residences.	Within 2-5 years
		2.16. Routes and boundaries for the goSAFE and walkSAFE Programs should be expanded in response to the needs of community members. Larger vehicles should be used for goSAFE to increase their capacity and reduce wait times. Vans must be accessible for people with disabilities.	Within 1-5 years
• Universities must have a multidisciplinary Threat Assessment Team (TAT). It should be a standing group to assess and respond to risks by identifying, assessing, understanding, acting upon and communicating them to the MSC and other community partners. It should plan a course of action to deal with safety problems and forward recommendations to the MSC. The TAT should consist of persons representing the university administration, security, mental health services, faculty, student services, legal counsel and human resources (O'Neill *et al.*, 2008).		2.17. YSS in consultation with community members should investigate options for setting up a Community Watch Program on campus, to increase surveillance.	Within 1-2 years
		2.18. goSAFE stops must be well lit and equipped with emergency phones.	Within 1-2 years
		2.19. goSAFE schedules should be posted at stops with wait times of 15 minutes or less.	Within 1-2 years
		2.20. goSAFE and walkSAFE staff should be trained to understand the roots of women's fear of crime and their safety needs. Staff must be screened prior to hiring.	Within 1-2 years
		2.21. walkSAFE staff should be escort students in mixed-gender pairs – one man and one woman.	Within 1 year or less
• Universities must invest		2.22. The frequency of security patrols across campus should be increased in strategic areas.	Within 2-5 years

in mass notification systems. It is vital that a university is able to communicate quickly and effectively with its entire community in the event of an emergency to notify people about the situation, relay critical information and share the action to be taken. Initial messages should be provided in a timely manner and updated as more information becomes known. Multiple means of delivering information should be in place. Communication methods range from low-tech alarms and sirens to high-tech electronic text alerts and digital message boards (O'Neill *et al.*, 2008).		2.23. Implement multiple ways of sharing information about security incidents and emergency situations, such as email, text messaging, and LCD screens following consultation with the campus community on the best methods of communication.	Within 2-5 years
		2.24. The ERP should be reviewed at least every two years to keep it current.	Ongoing
		2.25. To be prepared for emergency situations, the University must engage students, faculty and staff in emergency preparedness exercises on a regular basis.	Within 1 year and ongoing
		2.26. YSS must conduct regular training on the ERP and practice emergency plans in partnership with local police, students, staff and faculty.	Within 1 year and ongoing
		2.27. York must continue to maintain a multidisciplinary team to assess and respond to threats and incidents of violence and harassment as they arise.	Ongoing
		2.28. YSS, in partnership with CSC, must conduct annual CPTED risk and safety assessments, with specific attention on areas of risk in relation to sexual violence, hate incidents and harassment.	Within 1 year and ongoing
		2.29. YSS must continue to build and enhance York's mass alert notification system to achieve e-mail and text messaging capability to communicate emergencies and campus-wide alerts.	Within 2 years

		2.30. YSS must orient and train students, faculty and staff about York's mass notification and alert systems. Training must clarify roles and responsibilities of students, staff and faculty in emergencies.	Within 2 years
		2.31. In partnership with the police and YSS, defensible space should be created with clear definition, differentiation and separation of public, private and semi-private spaces so that all spaces are clearly defined and adequately protected in terms of use and ownership.	Within 5 years
		2.32. Why Work Alone and Working Alone Programs should be synchronized for efficiency.	Within 1 year

Physical environment recommendations

i. Lighting

Promising practices	York University	Recommendations	Proposed timeline
• All external campus lighting is uniform and sufficiently luminescent so a face can be identified from at least 15 metres away. Light should be white. • Light fixtures are placed frequently throughout areas accessible to campus users. • There is 24-hour illumination of outdoor paths, signs, sidewalks, walkways, parking lots, bicycle racks, backs and sides of buildings, and exit and entranceways and emergency doors. • Path lighting should enable people to see and be seen by others. • Artificial lighting to illuminate outdoor spaces should turn on automatically when daylight decreases to maintain the 15-metre standard. Lighting should stay on throughout the night. • Lights in public washrooms are operated by key access. • Immediate replacement of burnt-out, expired or broken lights are achieved. A protocol and contact information is posted on light	• Lighting in outdoor areas is inconsistent. Sodium lighting with yellow light rendition and low-grade lighting is used in outdoor parking areas and pedestrian walkways. • Lack of uniformity in the placement of lights produces pockets and areas of darkness. • 51.9% of participants reported areas that are poorly lit. • York has instituted key-operated light switches in some washrooms. • A Lights Out Program has significantly reduced burnt-out and broken lights, particularly on the Keele Campus. However, only 9.7% of respondents knew of this program. • goSAFE staff conduct weekly checks of outdoor campus lighting.	3.1. Review and strengthen the multi-year lighting program to incorporate environmentally friendly white light. The program should focus on: • creating well-lit common pathways to targeted buildings on campus; • reducing darkness of the perimeter of the Keele campus and lower Glendon campus; • addressing light deficiencies in and around the Kinsmen Building; and • improving lighting in the vicinity of the Observatory, in consultation with Observatory staff and campus users who frequent the area at night.	Within 1-5 years
		3.2. Conduct annual CPTED audits of exterior lighting as part of the multi-year lighting plan.	Within 2-5 years
		3.3. Develop clear processes and procedures to solicit feedback from campus users, including annual Campus Safety Audit walkabouts. This should be a standing agenda item for the Community Safety Council.	Within 1-2 years
		3.4. Install lights that automatically turn on at dusk and turn off at dawn to illuminate outdoor areas such as parking lots, walkways and sidewalks.	Within 5 years
		3.5. Dedicate funding and resources within Facilities	Within 5 years

		Services to upgrade outdoor lighting at Keele and Glendon campuses.	
		3.6. Continue to replace switch-operated lights with key-operated lights in washrooms.	Within 3-5 years
fixtures for space users to report maintenance issues.		3.7. Continue regular, timely maintenance of lights to reach target of only 100 burned out lights per week or better.	Within 1-2 years
		3.8. Develop a corporate standard for interior lighting (e.g. for buildings, hallways, stairways, exits). Audit interior lighting as part of the multi-year lighting plan.	Within 3-5 years

ii. Signage

Promising practices	York University	Recommendations	Proposed timeline
• Signs follow a corporate standard (e.g. contrast, universal colours, embossed lettering, simple symbols). Indoor signs are posted 750 to 1350 millimetres and can be clearly read from 120 metres away (Canadian Standards Association, 2001). • Campus signs follow a corporate standard, even within different buildings. • Outdoor signage identifies university buildings. • Indoor signage describes the layout and operating hours of each floor and building and the location of washrooms.	• York's Signage Program began in 2002 and is intended to produce colour-coordinated, user-friendly signage. • Future audits should assess the uniformity of font size and readability of signs. • 58.5% of respondents stated that maps and signs at York are adequate, but responses varied by location. Concerns were raised about the user-friendliness of signs for visitors. • Participants reported small signage combined with low lighting on the Keele campus made it	3.9. In consultation with community members, continue to identify and replace outdated, inaccurate and vandalized signs. Access community input with respect to readability and usefulness of signs. Review in annual audits, informed by persons with disabilities and using an intersectional and gender lens.	Within 2-5 years
		3.10. Install directional signage in the area around the Kinsmen Building.	Within 1-2 years
		3.11. Continue to implement the signage program.	Within 1-5 years
		3.12. Audit signage and ensure foliage and lighting levels do not obscure the readability of signs.	Within 1-5 years
		3.13. Install a consistent directional signage system in each building and on each floor. It include a directory of services; accessible and non-	Within 2-5 years

• Outdoor signs indicate the presence of emergency phones, intercoms, alarms, exits, safety protocols and other safeguards.	difficult to identify buildings. Overgrown foliage also hindered the readability of signs. • 67.1% of respondents said signs and maps to indicate where to access help during an emergency is inadequate. Emergency procedures were not posted in classrooms during initial site tours, although some were erected by May 2009.	accessible entranceways; directional signs to services, elevators and washrooms; room numbers; and information for emergency assistance.	
		3.14. Install signs to indicate hours of operation in all buildings.	Within 2-5 years
		3.15. Ensure that key areas such as security services are identified on directional signage.	Within 1-2 years
		3.16. Install display signs for how to contact security in case of an emergency, in all washrooms.	Within 1-2 years
		3.17. Install floor plans on each floor and provide directions to stairwells and emergency exits in residences.	Within 1-2 years
		3.18. Replace the security services sign at the reporting window in the William Small Centre.	Within 1-2 years
		3.19. Install Emergency Procedures signs in all classrooms.	Within 2-5 years
		3.20. Install standardized emergency assistance signs in buildings and departments. They should provide details of what a person can do when they feel threatened in cases of assault or other emergencies.	Within 2-5 years
		3.21. Install clear signs that can be easily spotted in panic situations to indicate where safety measures or escape routes exist (e.g. emergency phone locations, emergency exits).	Within 2-5 years

iii. Sightlines

Promising practices	York University	Recommendations	Proposed timeline
• Security mirrors are installed in hallway corners, corridors and alleyways where one cannot see ahead. • Security mirrors are installed where there is an obstruction interrupting a line of sight within 25 metres or where an area where someone can hide is created. • Bushes and shrubs are thinned out to enhance visibility and readability of signs, allow lights to work effectively and eliminate hiding places. • Bushes and shrubs are trimmed to a minimum height and the bottom of trees cleared so that a person using a wheelchair can see clearly around an outdoor area at eye level – 750 to 1350 millimetres from the ground (Canadian Standards Association, 2001).	• During site tours, mirrors were noted in the corners of stairwells and laundry rooms of some residence buildings, but it was not consistent. • Participants identified a need for more security mirrors. • Overgrown vegetation and limited landscaping is an issue on both campuses. Participants spoke of a need for better maintenance of foliage, trees and bushes.	3.22. Install safety mirrors in all areas where there is: • a turn where one cannot see ahead; and • an obstruction that interrupts a line of sight within 25 metres or creates an area where someone can hide.	Within 1-2 years
		3.23. Review landscaping plans with to improve sightlines and eliminate hiding places.	Within 2-5 years
		3.24. Conduct regular audits to ensure that foliage is properly maintained. Audits must use an intersectional and gendered lens and document findings.	Within 1-2 years

iv. Maintenance

Promising practices	York University	Recommendations	Proposed timeline
• Broken windows are replaced quickly and	• Most respondents expressed satisfaction	3.25. Continue with a high standard of property maintenance.	Within 1-2 years

		3.26. Continue to remove garbage in high-traffic areas frequently so these areas are maintained throughout the day and evenings.	Within 1-2 years
other signs of vandalism are immediately addressed.	with maintenance.		
• Garbage and litter are cleared at regular intervals.	• 66% of respondents stated that buildings are well-maintained with regards to lighting and litter.		

v. Accessibility

Promising practices	York University	Recommendations	Proposed timeline
• Wheelchair access is available for all buildings, washrooms, building floors, classrooms, dorm rooms and offices. • Elevator access is available in all buildings. • Paths, sidewalks, ramps and parking lots are paved and maintained. • Snow and ice are promptly removed from paved surfaces in high-traffic areas. • On-campus safety programs are accessible to people with disabilities.	• Respondents reported that a number of buildings and washrooms remain inaccessible, particularly in older buildings. • A number of buildings and washrooms are inaccessible. • Outdoor spaces are rendered inaccessible due to obstructions and maintenance issues. • VanGO, a mobility service initiative, is designed to assist students and staff with disabilities get around campus. It is operational from 8:00 in the morning to 10:00 at night, Monday to Friday. After hours, this service is offered by goSAFE.	3.27. Carry-out accessibility audits of buildings to determine which are not fully accessible and create a university-wide Accessibility Plan for access conversion. Ensure stakeholders are involved in designing, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the plan.	Within 5 years or more
		3.28. Follow-up on the accessibility plan with safety audits using an intersectional and gendered lens.	Within 2-5 years
		3.29. Ensure that Grounds, Fleet and Waste Management clear snow and ice from high-traffic spaces. Consider putting in place procedures for users to report areas in need of maintenance.	Within 1-2 years
		3.30. Review safety programs to ensure they are accessible for people with disabilities. Ensure Counselling and Disabilities Services, the Access York Advisory Committee and other stakeholders are included in the review.	Within 2-5 years

References

African Canadian Legal Clinic. (2005). *Responding to Anti-Black Hate Crimes.* Toronto: African Canadian Legal Clinic.

Antonio, A.L., Chang, M.J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D.A., Levin, S., & Milem, J.F. (2004). *Effects of Racial Diversity on Complex Thinking in College Students.* Psychological Science, 15(8), pp. 507-510.

Benard, B. (2007). The Hope of Prevention: Individual, Family, and Community Resilience. In L. Cohen, V. Chavez, & S. Chehimi (Eds.) *Prevention is Primary: Strategies for Community Well-being* (pp.63-89). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Canadian Federation of Students. (1999). *Fact sheet: No Means No – Facts About Date Rape/Drug Rape.* Vol. 6, No. 2. Retrieved at: http://www.cfs-fcee.ca/html/english/research/factsheets/fs-6%282%29-nmn.pdf

Canadian Panel on Violence Against Women. (1993). *Changing the Landscape: Ending Violence – Achieving Equality.* Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women. (2002a). *Women's Experience of Racism: How Race and Gender Interact.* Retrieved at: http://www.criawicref.ca/factSheets/race gender_e.htm

Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women. (2002b). *Factsheet on Violence Against Women and Girls.* Retrieved at http://www.criaw-icref.ca/ViolenceagainstWomenandGirls

Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women. (2006). *Intersectional Feminist Frameworks. An Emerging Vision.* Retrieved at http://www.criaw-icref.ca/indexFrame_e.htm

Canadian Standards Association. (2001). *Barrier-Free Design.* Toronto: Canadian Standards Association.

Carr, J.L. (2005). *American College Health Association Campus Violence White Paper.* Baltimore: American College Health Association.

Chamberlain, L. (2008). *A Prevention Primer for Domestic Violence: Terminology, Tools, and the Public Health Approach.* Retrieved at http://new.vawnet.org/category/Main_Doc.php?docid=1313

Chevalier Minow, J. (2009). Sorority Participation and Sexual Assault Risk. In *Violence Against Women, 15*(7), pp. 835-851.

Cohen, L. & Chehimi, S. (2007). Beyond Brochures: the Imperative for Primary Prevention. In L. Cohen, V. Chavez & S. Chehimi (Eds.) *Prevention is primary. Strategies for Community Well-being* (pp.3-23). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Creswell, J.W., Plano Clark, V.L., Gutman, M.L. & Handson, W.E. (2003). Advanced Mixed Methods Research Designs. In A. Tashakkori and C. Teddlie (Eds.) *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research* (pp. 209-240). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Crowe, T. D. (2000). *Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design.* Boston: Butterworth-Heineman.

Disabled Women's Network Ontario (n.d.). *Fact Sheets on Women with Disabilities.* Retrieved at http://dawn.thot.net/fact.html

DeKeseredy, W. & Kelly, K. (1993). The Incidence and Prevalence of Woman Abuse in Canadian University and College Dating Relationships. In *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 18(2), pp. 137-157.

Dekeseredy, W. & Schwartz, M. (1998). *Woman Abuse on Campus: Results from the Canadian National Survey.* Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage Publications.

Department of Justice. (2003). *Dating Violence.* Retrieved at: http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/fv-vf/facts-info/dati-freq.html

Doherty, D. (2003). *Health Effects of Family Violence: Overview Paper.* Retrieved at: http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/ncfv-cnivf/familyviolence/pdfs/fv-healtheffects_e.pdf

Domestic Violence Advisory Council. (2009). *Transforming our Communities: Report from the Domestic Violence Advisory Council for the Minister Responsible for Women's Issues.* Retrieved at: http://www.citizenship.gov.on.ca/owd/english/resources/publications/dvac/dvac_report.shtml

Drolet, D. (2009). Universities not Facing up to Race Issues, Say Scholars. In *University Affairs*. Retrieved at: http://www.universityaffairs.ca/universities-not-facing-up-to-race-issues.aspx

Dworkin, A. (1993). *Letter from a war zone: Writings 1976-1989.* New York: Lawrence Hill Books.

Egale Canada Human Rights Trust. (2007). Youth Speak Up about Homophobia and Transphobia: The First National Climate Survey on Homophobia in Canadian Schools. Retrieved at: http://www.galyic.org.uk/docs/canadianreport.pdf

Farmer, P. (2004). *Pathologies of Power: Health, Human Rights, and the New War on the Poor.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fonow, M. M. & Cook, J. A. (1991). *Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship as Lived Research.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Graffunder, C.M., Noonan, R.K., Cox, P., & Wheaton, J. (2004). Through a Public Health Lens. Preventing Violence against Women: An Update from the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Journal of Women's Health,* 13 (1), pp. 5-14.

Gultang, J. (1969). Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research,* 6, pp. 167-191.

Hate Crimes Working Group. (2007). *Addressing Hate Crimes in Ontario: Final Report of the Hate Crimes Community Working Group to the Attorney General and the Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services.* Retrieved at: http://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/english/about/pubs/hatecrimes/HCCWG_full.pdf

Health Canada. (1998). *Abuse in Lesbian Relationships: Information and Resources.* Ottawa: Health Canada.

Henry, F. & Tator, C. (2006). *The Colour of Democracy: Racism in Canadian Society*. Toronto: Nelson Education Ltd.

Hill Collins, P. (1990). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Jiwani, Y. (2002). *Mapping Violence: A Work in Progress*. Retrieved at: http://www.harbour.sfu.ca/freda/articles/fvpi.htm

Johnson, H. (1996). *Dangerous Domains: Violence against Women in Canada*. Toronto: Neilson Canada.

Keeling, R. (2000). *NASPA Factsheet: Violence and the Campus Community*. Washington D.C.: NASPA – Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education.

Keith N. A. & Goldie, B. (2010). *Preventing Workplace Violence,* Toronto: Canada Law Book.

Kemmis, S. & McTaggart, R. (2003). Participatory Action Research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.) *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Kilmartin, C. (2001). *Sexual Assault in Context: Teaching College Men about Gender*. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publications, Inc.

Klein, R. D. (1983) How Do We Do What We Want to Do: Thoughts About Feminist Methodology. In R.D. Klein & G. Bowles (Eds.) *Theories of Women's Studies*. Boston: Routledge.

Langford, L. (2004). *Preventing Violence and Promoting Safety in Higher Education Settings – Overview of a Comprehensive Approach*. Newton, MA: The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention, Education Development Center, Inc.

Luke, K. (2009). Sexual Violence Prevention and Technologies of Gender Among Heavy-Drinking College Women. *Social Service Review,* 83(1), pp. 79-109.

McGregor, S. L.T. (2003). *Critical Discourse Analysis – a Primer*. Retrieved at: http://www.kon.org/archives/forum/15-1/mcgregorcda.html

McMurty, R. & Curling, A. (2008). *The Review of the Roots of Youth Violence*. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Mock, K. (2003). *Recognizing and Reacting to Hate Crime in Canada Today*. Toronto: Canadian Race Relations Foundation.

Montell, F. (1999). Focus Group Interviews: A New Feminist Method Source. *National Women's Studies Association Journal,* 11(1), pp. 44-71.

O'Neill, D., Fox, J.A., Depue, R., & Englander, E. (2008). *Campus Violence Prevention and Response: Best Practices for Massachusetts Higher Education*. Massachusetts: Applied Risk Management.

Palter, S. (2004). Why York's Security is Powerless to Help. Retrieved at: http://excal.on.ca/cms2/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=5037&Itemid=111

Presley, C.A., Meilman, P.W., & Cashin, J.R. (1997). Weapon Carrying and Substance Abuse Among College Students. *Journal of American College Health*, 46 (1), pp. 3-8.

Razack, S. (1999). *Looking White People in the Eye*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Roark, M. L. (1987). Preventing Violence on College Campuses. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 65(7), pp. 367-371.

Ruch, L.O. & Chandler, S.M. (1983). Sexual Assault Trauma During the Acute Phase: An Exploratory Model and Multivariate Analysis. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 24(2), pp. 174-185.

Sales, E., Baum, M., & Shore, B. (1984) Victim Readjustment Following Assault. *Journal of Social Issues*, 40(1), pp. 5-27.

School Community Safety Advisory Panel. (2008). *The Road to Health: A Final Report on School Safety*. Toronto: School Community Safety Advisory Panel.

Shepard, M. (2008). *Mobilizing Communities to Prevent Domestic Violence*. Retrieved at: http://www.vawnet.org

Smith, D.A. & Flynn, R.S. (2007). *College and University Campus Violence – Understanding the Risk*. Retrieved at: http://www.pwiusa.com

Smith, L. T. (1999). *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. New York: Palgrave.

Sobsey, D. (2000). Faces of Violence against Women with Developmental Disabilities. In *Impact*, 13(3), pp. 2-3, 25.

Statistics Canada. (2006). *Measuring Violence Against Women: Statistical Trends*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.

Statistics Canada. (2007). *Measuring Violence Against Women: Statistical Trends*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.

Statistics Canada. (2008). *Measuring Violence Against Women: Statistical Trends*. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.

Stimpson, L. & Best, M. (1991). *Courage Above All: Sexual Assault Against Women with Disabilities*. Toronto: Disabled Women's Network Canada.

Tator, C. (2009). *The Weight of Whiteness in the Canadian University*. Retrieved at: http://docs.google.com/gview?a=v&q=cache%3Ax3RqNdPLyeUJ%3Awww.fedcan.ca%2Fenglish%2Fpdf%2Fabout%2FMarch2009Speaker-Tator.pdf+Racism+in+the+Canadian+University%3A+Demanding+Social+Justice%2C+Inclusion%2C+and+Equity&hl=en&gl=ca&sig=AFQjCNF2gxoxfjDbEpxOvDytA3xiIYsG3g&pli=1

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (2008). *Inclusive Education: The Way of the Future*. Retrieved at: http://www.ibe.unesco.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Policy_Dialogue/48th_ICE/ICE_FINAL_REPORT_eng.pdf

United Nations General Assembly. (1994). *Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women, General Assembly Resolution 48/104 of 20 December 1993*. Retrieved at: http://www.unhchr.ch/huridocda/ huridoca.nsf/(symbol)/a.res.48.104.en

United Nations Human Settlements Program (UN-Habitat). (2007). *Enhancing Urban Safety and Security*. London: Earthscan.

United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA). (2009). *Addressing Gender-based Violence: UNFPA Strategy and Framework for Action*. Retrieved at: http://www.unfpa.org/webdav/site/global/shared/documents/ publications/2009/2009_add_gen_vio.pdf

University of California, Berkeley. (n.d.) *Faculty Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures for the Berkeley Campus*. Retrieved at: http://apo.chance.berkeley.edu/faculty_misconduct_015.pdf

Southern California Injury Prevention Research Center, UCLA School of Public Health, Prevention Institute, & Harvard School of Public Health. (2009). *Overview of the UNITY RoadMap: A Framework for Effective and Sustainable Efforts*. Retrieved at: http://www.preventioninstitute.org/component/jlibrary/ article/id-30/127.html

Whizman, C., Shaw, M., Andrew, C., & Travers, K. (2009). The Effectiveness of Women's Safety Audits. *Security Journal,* 22(3), pp. 205-218.

York University. (2003). *Planning, Budget and Accountability Report 2002-2003*. Retrieved at: http://www. yorku.ca/vpfa/documents/PBA_2002-2003pp148-166.pdf

Websites

www.yorku.ca
www.2.carleton.ca
www.washington.edu
www.ubc.ca