

**York University**  
**Sexual Assault Awareness, Prevention, and Response Policy Working Group**  
**Meeting Notes**

---

**Date:** Wednesday, November 18th, 2015

**Time:** 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.

**Location:** 902 Kaneff Tower

---

**Attendance:** Rob Castle, Elana Shugar, Catherine Salole, Aldo Altomare, Jessica Thyriar, Krista Hunt, Polly MacFarlane, Noël Badiou, Maureen Armstrong, Siraz Chatha, Mina Rajabi Paak, Liisa Stephenson

**Regrets:** Janet Morrison, Deb Hansen, Rodney John de Roché, Chenthoori Malankov, CWTP Representative, Arden Maaliq, Daulton Scott, Grace Permaul.

---

### **Call to Order**

- CNN's The Hunting Ground airs Sunday.

### **Review of Meeting Notes**

- Working Group members will submit changes to meeting minutes.

### **Community Safety Council (CSC) Working Group Recommendations to the President**

- Training & Education CSC Working Group name has been changed to Safety Education and Training Working Group.
- There was a discussion of the CSC Working Group's recommendations to the President and what this working group can take on to avoid overlap.
  - Each year new recommendations are made, while there are many that have been completed, we want to ensure recommendations from previous years and their progress is updated.

- Recommendations related to sexual violence tend to be within the scope of this working group more so than the CSC Working Group.
- The recommendations to the President are normally monitored through the Safety Audit Standing Committee which oversees the progress of METRAC recommendations, and has continued with monitoring the process of the CSC recommendations.
- Some recommendations will be complete once the Sexual Assault Procedures have been finalized.
  - Once we have procedures finalized, we will turn our focus to Training & Education.
- There is also an overlap in membership between this working group and the other CSC Working Group.

## **New Business**

- Bill 132 had its first reading.
- Some key items noticed about the Bill:
- Issue # 1 – There is a need to clarify language.
  - It is required that all universities have a sexual violence policy. Can the policy be extended beyond students (Is it exclusive to students or does it include faculty and staff?) Did it intend to make the exclusion?
- Issue #2 – What information do we provide reports to the Ministry on?
- Who will be classifying what form of sexual violence an incident is considered? Survivor, University, or the province?
- The reporting requirement to the Ministry is such that all requests and use of accommodations and support services is reporting to the university, what constitutes a support service?
  - What mechanisms exist to avoid duplication of reporting?
  - What incidents do we include in reporting?

- An incident that happened before being at the university?
  - What is the incident did not occur on campus?
- Issue #3 - The regulations within a university has been determined by the university.
  - Will there be a full guideline for the processes that we must follow? How to get student input? How we provide trainings?
- Issue #4 - How is sexual violence defined?
  - Sexual violence describes a continuum of violence. It may not be the language that is commonly understood.
  - Concept does not align with criminal code provisions.
  - It is important to have common definitions of the forms of sexual violence in order to report on them.
- Is the province overstepping jurisdiction by enacting the criminal code?
  - Even solely for the purpose of reporting and creating policy.
- Clear we have to have a policy on sexual violence, sexual harassment and sexual assault.
  - Does the policy and procedures need to be for all forms of sexual violence? Can there be separate procedures for particular forms?
  - Eg. Most universities have s harassment policy distinct from sexual violence policy.

### **Blue Sky Exercise**

- Looking at the ideal processes and procedures that could exist without talking about the current offices and positions that exist at York.
- Survivor could have multiple ways of knowing what will happen when they disclose.
  1. Website
  2. Anonymous online reporting (information for reporting)
    - Eg. Using case #'s to create profiles not using names
    - Consistent form between offices that includes supports and services accessed
      - Web-based form/ system that would help track supports (eg. Type form)

3. Third Party Reporting
  4. Confidential places on campus for reporting.
  5. Ongoing training for first responders
- Benefits of survivor knowing what will happen before they disclose
    - Balancing survivor-centric and reporting process
    - Gives multiple options with multiple entry points to support
  - Language:
    - Reporting vs. accessing information vs. disclosure
    - Are disclosures or accessing information considered part of the reporting process?
    - Hub & spoke model for support (eg. Navigator).
  - Security Control Centre – “Are you aware of these other options?”
    - Community safety?
  - Principles:
    - Survivor driven
    - Communication can happen between clouds and may or may not include navigator
    - Supported by common database held by navigator
    - # of clouds increases over time?
    - Survivor enters the system at any point the goal is to connect them/ their information to the navigator
    - Navigator cloud – Natural point of contact, landing cloud.
      - 24/7 – RLC’s
      - Moat accommodations and access to services would be from 9-5
      - Confidential – navigator should have capacity to keep cases confidential if everyone is being led to the navigator
      - Ensuring survivor has support/ resources

- Autonomy & ability to make decisions
- Someone in the middle to make sure nothing falls through the cracks eg. Ensure timely response