

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

Date: Thursday, December 17th, 2015

Time: 2:00 p.m. – 3:45 p.m.

Location: 902 Kaneff Tower

Attendance: Janet Morrison, Rob Castle, Elana Shugar, Aldo Altomare, Krista Hunt, Polly MacFarlane, Siraz Chatha, CWTP Representatives, Deb Hansen, Noël Badiou

Regrets: Chenthoori Malankov, Prakash Amarasooriya, Arden Maaliq, Daulton Scott, Rodney John de Roché, Mina Rajabi Paak, Grace Permaul, Catherine Salole, Maureen Armstrong, Jessica Thyriar, Liisa Stephenson

Call to Order

Review Meeting Notes

- No changes required to last the last meeting minutes.

New Business

- No amendments to Bill 132 – It went to second reading.
- The requirements of the Bill will be 6 months after January 15th, or once the Bill is passed, whichever comes first.
- Challenges highlighted (ex. a survivor accessing accommodations through the petitions process)
 - Requires some identifying information in order to record statics.
 - An incident could have happened on/ off campus, while on campus, or before coming to campus.
 - Tracking access points can be difficult
 - Concerns around duplication when recording incidents
- Language of Bill 132 infers that the policy is for students, which has been confirmed.

- There needs to be clarification on what the objective of this Bill is.
 - Assessing the issue of sexual violence on campus versus sexual violence as a societal issue
 - What is the intention behind tracking the number of times students access services
 - Expected uptake on requisite national climate surveys
 - climate surveys can better assess campus climate
- Bill 132 looks at reporting process for students accessing accommodations and support
 - No definition of “appropriate services”
 - Services available to the community (If access is to off campus community resources – would the University need to track this?).
- What would be recorded?
 - Numbers of incidents, complaints, information on incident.
- It is important for the Premier’s Office to get input from the community and institutions as part of a consultative process. Premier’s office a bit concerning moving forward without listening to the community and listening to consultations.
 - Clarification on objectives, application, and potential consequences need to be considered.
- Ontario Government does not have the legislative authority over institutions as the U.S. where funding is provided.
- Bill 132 will help inform our work in the future.
- Recommendations for federal government taking action (Article from METRO):
 1. Bystander intervention
 2. Engagement of senior leaders
 3. Policy and response with transparency and reporting
- Do we know what has happened in other provinces with this legislation?
 - Nova Scotia’s cyber bullying act is being struck down

‘Blue Sky’ Exercise Continued

- The blue sky exercise was reviewed for members who were not able to attend the previous meeting.
- Looking at the potential of up to 13 points of contact for a survivor to retell their story depending on what accommodation or support, affiliations, or access to services/ reporting

- A Navigator position would be a single point of contact and help streamline the process.
- There will always be multiple points of contact for a survivor.
 - Effective training could be expanded over time.
- Survivors need to know a head of disclosing what the process is and what will happen when making a disclosure.
 - There is a difference between disclosure and reporting.
- If an individual comes to a service without providing any information about themselves including if they are a survivor, but may want to access resources or support does this need to be recorded?
 - Yes, this incident would also have to count towards tracking statistics.
 - Do not want to limit the amount of places a survivor can disclose.
- What are the implications of the new legislation for student groups or levied organizations, or other “University services” of reporting or collecting statistics?
 - Will those service groups be expected to collect statistics on the services accessed?
 - Would it be different for sexual assault centres that are run within the university?
- In the interim between now and having the procedures in place, should have options displayed transparently as to what service are provided by each office as well as what to expect while disclosing to each office.
 - UIT and the new community safety website can link to the appropriate content.
- There needs to be a discussion revisited of anonymous reporting, confidentiality and disclosure, and full disclosure involving security and police.
 - Is Security always needed as support and backup (during after-hours)?
 - We do not want to put RLC’s in potentially unsafe circumstances.
 - Would the navigator determine risk and provide input for invoking emergency response/ section 15 that OSCRC facilitates in the necessary circumstances?
 - Very rarely does someone break trespassing on campus when they have been section 15’d.
 - How does one determine risk to the community (from an office, security)?
 - Background check, history of prior offenses.

- Need to find a balance between community aiming to be survivor centric vs. government legislative compliance.
- Medium term – scope of practice
- Long term – Upon graduating will they still have access to York’s on campus services.
 - Would be a bridge to external community resources to receive support.

Next Meeting

- Scheduled for January 15th, 2015 10:30am-12:00pm.