A REVIEW OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND ASSAULT AT UWATERLOO  
Prepared by Skylar Niehaus

PURPOSE  
The purpose of this report is to provide guidance for the advocacy efforts of the Graduate Student Association (GSA-UW) for improving the University of Waterloo’s resources and training programs, as well as improving municipal resources pertaining to sexual violence. This report includes an overview of reported statistics on sexual violence and assault occurring on-campus and within the Region of Waterloo, as well as an overview of current mitigation strategies and resources for survivors. From this overview a detailed analysis is undertaken to identify gaps in mitigation and support efforts. The outcome of this analysis highlights promising strategies and provides recommendations for improved efforts based on research findings pertaining to best practices for addressing sexual violence on university campuses. This report’s final recommendation is for its identified key considerations to be used as a benchmark for facilitating ongoing actions and resource provision.

ISSUE  
Regional Reporting on the Prevalence of Sexual Violence  
Reported statistics on sexual violence within the Region of Waterloo are often difficult to locate and buried in broader data collections. For instance, some of the most up-to-date statistics relating to sexual violence are found within the safe cities profile on Kitchener-Cambridge-Waterloo. This profile displays 224 counts of sexual assault were reported to the police in 2018 (Statistics Canada, 2020). 199 of these counts were from female victims, while 25 were from male victims. The used definition of sexual assault is that which ranges from unwanted sexual touching to sexual violence resulting in serious physical injury or disfigurement to the victim. Thus, the data displayed within this profile does not count all acts of sexual violence such as sexual harassment or stalking, nor does it reflect unreported acts of sexual violence within the Region. Therefore, this data is incomplete for reporting on the prevalence of sexual violence within the Region.

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is another metric that can be used to understand sexual violence within the Region. 345 victims per 100,000 population aged 15 and older reported acts of intimate partner violence to police in Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo in 2018 (Statistics Canada, 2020). This represents a percentage that is 42% higher than Ontario (243) and 7% higher than Canada (323). This indicates that there is a high occurrence of IPV within the Region. Statistics Canada utilizes a definition of IPV that includes violent offences that occur between current and former partners who may or may not live together (Burczycka 2019). These violent offences can take a myriad of forms ranging from emotional and financial abuse to physical and sexual assault (Cotter, 2021). The data captured by IPV thus includes some forms of sexual violence. However, it does not give specific data on the total rate of sexual violence within the Region as it does not count acts of sexual violence that occur between individuals whose relationship falls outside the bounds of current and former partners, nor does it count acts of sexual violence beyond sexual assault. Statistics Canada also records gender-based violence (GBV) for the Region. Just over half of the victims of violent crime in Kitchener–Cambridge–Waterloo were female. Statistics on Regional rates for GBV can be read alongside other data pertaining to sexual violence. However, this still provides an incomplete picture of the prevalence of sexual violence within the Region.

The University of Waterloo’s Reporting on the Prevalence of Sexual Violence  
Since 2018, the University of Waterloo has been providing public reports on the prevalence of sexual violence within its community, through the Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Office (SVPRO). In 2018, 62 counts of sexual violence were reported by students to the university (Cook, 2020). This includes 36 counts of sexual assault, 18 counts of sexual harassment, six counts of other forms of gender-based violence and two counts of undisclosed forms of sexual violence. In 2019, the number of acts of sexual violence experienced by students reported to the university almost doubled to 123 (Cook, 2020). Of the 123 counts, 65 counts were sexual assault, 33 counts were sexual harassment, 15 counts were of other forms of gender-based violence and 10 counts were of undisclosed forms of sexual violence. This data displays an emerging trend in the prevalence of the type of sexual violence students report experiencing. Most students who report, report experiencing sexual assault, followed by sexual harassment (see appendix 1 for a visual overview). This trend was continued in the Spring/Fall 2020,
Winter Term 2021 data the SVPRO has presented. However, the number of reported acts of sexual violence decreased during this timeframe to 54 reports. This decrease can be attributed to COVID-19 impacts (see appendix 2 for a yearly comparison of reports). It should also be noted that the number of survivors who sought direct service provision from SVPRO increased from 2019 to 2020, with roughly 33% being service provisions carried over from the previous year.

BACKGROUND
In March 2015, the Province of Ontario launched It's Never Okay: An Action Plan to Stop Sexual Violence and Harassment. Roughly two years later, the University of Waterloo responded to this Action Plan by implementing a stand-alone policy on sexual violence, Policy 42 – Prevention of, and Response to, Sexual Violence (hereafter referred to as Policy 42); as well as establishing the staff position called Sexual Violence Response Coordinator. Following this, the Director of Sexual Violence Prevention and Response staff position was created in 2019, along with the establishment of a Sexual Violence Task Force. This Task Force was established after the Ministry of Colleges and Universities mandated that each Ontario post-secondary institution implement a Sexual Violence Task Force for the 2019-2020 academic year (see appendix 3 for an overview of the Task Force’s aim). Appendix 4 provides a timeline for depicting the implementation of these measures.

As of 2017 the Region of Waterloo had an unfounded rate of 27% for sexual assault claims (Doolittle, 2017). This unfounded rate represents the percentage of cases that are dismissed by police because the events do not satisfy the threshold for a criminal investigation. It is a university’s role to address sexual violence within its community, including the provision of forms of redress for survivors that occur outside of police reporting and criminal investigation. A part of this is providing less onerous pathways to redress for survivors, including shorter timelines and campus-level remedies such as the removal of the perpetrator from campus residence, temporary bans from certain spaces, and in some cases, expulsion (Students’ Society of McGill University, 2017). Providing these pathways to redress also aligns with the UN Women’s definition of a survivor-centered approach, which seeks to empower survivors by prioritizing their rights, needs and wishes (Ward, 2011).

KEY CONSIDERATIONS
To effectively address sexual violence a university must implement actions against the prevalence of sexual violence and provide useful, supportive, and integrated resources for survivors. The following are best practices, identified to make Canadian universities effective in the implementation of these types of actions and resource provision.

Education and Training
- Education and training on sexual violence is ongoing, stand alone, audience specific and delivered by sexual violence experts (Buss, et al., 2013). Examples of specific audiences include, but is not limited to first year undergraduate students, graduate students, maintenance staff and faculty. This also includes specialized training for those who are more likely to receive disclosures of sexual violence.
- Education and training on sexual violence is updated on a regular basis and is aligned with current literature and best practices, while also being specific to the University's context (Buss, et al., 2013).
- Campus education on sexual violence moves beyond discussions of consent (Buss, et al., 2013). This includes a contextualization of consent within broader power relations, such as settler colonization and anti-Black racism, rather than only focusing on interpersonal communication which can represent sexual violence as a result of miscommunication or lack of knowledge about consent (Colpitts, 2021; Ostridge, 2020).
- Asynchronous, online materials are not the relied upon method for education and training deliverance on sexual violence prevention and related topics (Buss, et al., 2013).
- University courses exist that discuss sexual violence (Buss, et al., 2013).

Reporting and Data Collection
- An office exists that acts as clear contact point for survivors, faculty, and staff. Through this office consistency across different units responding to sexual violence within the university is
maintained through its functioning as a centralized communication hub (Buss, et al., 2013). This office also exists to collect data on university sexual violence and provides yearly public reports (Gabriele & Rowe, 2020; Khan, Rowe, & Bidgood, 2019).

- Data is collected on the utilization and implementation of the university’s stand-alone policy on sexual violence (Rempel et al., 2020). Specifically, the number of reports; number of complaints; number of recorded disclosures segregated by how the disclosure was received (e.g., third party, anonymous, in person, online, etc.); number of reports that reach a conclusion; activities and education undertaken to raise awareness of the policy, rape culture and consent; the types of supports accessed; and the types of accommodations sought and provided.

- The process for a receiver of a disclosure to access support is clearly outlined and easy to find online (Western University, n.d.).

- A process exists to make formal reports about experiences of sexual violence to the university and transparency exists pertaining to what follows when this report it made (Buss, et al., 2013).

- Reporting processes are identified by survivors to be streamlined, uncomplicated and unlikely to re-traumatize (Western University, n.d.).

- The university is committed to holding sexual violence disciplinary processes and support services separate from law enforcement (Roskin-Frazee, 2020; Students’ Society of McGill University, 2017). This includes an emphasis on enabling survivors to choose whether to file police reports.

- Reporting an act of sexual violence to the university does not require an individual to follow through with a formal complaint (Buss, et al., 2013).

- The university clearly articulates that there is no timeline for survivors to report their experience of sexual violence or for them to access support (Khan, Rowe & Bidgood, 2019). This can include a brief statement on the long-term and residual impacts of experiencing sexual violence, which aims to acknowledge the prevalence of delayed reporting and accessing of supports.

- The university permits anonymous and confidential reporting (Magnussen & Shankar, 2019). This frequently includes the existence of an online sexual violence reporting tool that works to decrease barriers to reporting and to increase accuracy of reporting on sexual violence at the University. Examples of this include Red River College: No Wrong Door and the REES program that launched in the fall of 2020 within 11 universities in Manitoba. REES is an online platform that provides choice to survivors by offering increased pathways for reporting that include Anonymous Reporting and Connect to My Campus. Survivors can also choose how much information they share, when and to whom (Lobson, 2020).

**Responsiveness to Intersectional Approaches and Understandings of Sexual Violence**

- University policies, education and responses to sexual violence recognize, explicitly name, and address rape culture as a factor contributing to the high rate of sexual violence often found on university and college campuses (Students’ Society of McGill University, 2017; Ostridge, 2020).

- The university demonstrates a recognition that sexual violence disproportionally targets students with marginalised identities through its policies pertaining to sexual violence, as well as the type of supports it offers to survivors (Roskin-Frazee, 2020). This includes the existence of responsive and targeted supports for distinct groups of the student population, such as but not limited to Indigenous students, international students, students with disability, and students who are LGBTQIA+ and Two-Spirit individuals (Crabb, et al., 2019). Training for university staff should also include cultural competency when responding to disclosures (Roskin-Frazee, 2020).


- The university has implemented measures to actively mitigate against the reproduction of marginalization and privileging of certain voices (Colpitts, 2020). For instance, efforts are taken to counter the centralization of cis, white women’s experiences during data collection on students experiences with accessing campus supports by disaggregated data regarding race, ability, gender identity, gender expression, migration status, and Indigenous identity (Khan, Rowe & Bidgood, 2019).
The university provides specific information for international students that experience sexual violence (Crudington, et al., 2020; Simon Fraser University, n.d.). This includes dispelling the myth that international students will lose their student visa if they disclose an experience of sexual violence. Support for those who have experienced sexual violence is also offered in the top three non-English languages spoken by international students at the university. Additionally, the university provides support for international students impacted by sexual violence by providing information on community supports that can be accessed in languages outside of English.

Committees and working groups addressing sexual violence reflect the diversity of the campus community (Colpitts, 2020).

University Policies

The university demonstrates an understanding of the gendered nature of sexual violence and its intersections with systems of oppressions (Colpitts, 2020; Students’ Society of McGill University, 2017). This is demonstrated through explicit mentions of race, racism, colonialism, ablism, and gender identities other than women within sexual violence policies; as opposed to identity neutral policies that obscure sexual violence as a depoliticised, ahistorical, and interpersonal issue (Ostridge, 2020; Colpitts, 2020; Canadian Federation of Students, 2020; Gabriele & Rowe, 2020).

Policy and procedure do not reproduce a reliance on 'rape myths' (Buss, et al., 2013). Examples of rape myths include but are not limited to narratives that suggest rape results from a mismatch of sexual expectations, insinuations that most sexual assault is stranger rape, and victim blaming tropes about survivors engaging in risky sexual behaviour.

Immunity for student misconduct offences such as underage drinking are ensured for survivors who disclose or report experiences of sexual violence (Marques, 2020). Providing this immunity increases the trust students are likely to have in the Universities ability to actively support them after disclosing an experience of sexual violence, as this immunity demonstrates a commitment to not enact victim-blaming.

Experts on sexual violence, including researchers and community anti-violence organizations are consulted by the university when conducting reviews of policies pertaining to sexual violence (Colpitts, 2020).

Students are regularly consulted on the University's sexual violence policies and practices. These consultations are well-advertised, accessible, include multiple pathways to provide feedback, and do not occur during inconvenient times of the year, for instance during finals (Colpitts, 2020). This also includes student representation on university committees and working groups addressing sexual violence.

A policy review process exists that creates community buy-in by engaging with the community, student body, staff, faculty, and stakeholders (Gabriele & Rowe, 2020). This includes the establishment of a transparent review process; a summarization of the review is publicly available in an accessible language format; and a work plan is developed from the review, including a timeline for policy revisions, approval, and implementation.

The university provides transparent and accessible reporting on the feedback it receives pertaining to sexual violence policies and support (Colpitts, 2020).

Restorative justice is offered and clearly outlined within university policy and procedures (Buss et al., 2013).

University Responses to Sexual Violence

Reputation and risk management do not take precedence over safety, information gathering and prevention (Buss, et al., 2013). A risk management approach to sexual violence occurs when a survivor is responded to as if they are a problem to manage, instead of responded to as if they are a member of the community who deserves to be supported.

Campus alerts are screened by sexual violence experts to ensure these alerts provide sufficient information to safeguard the campus while respecting the confidentiality and anonymity of the survivor and are void of perpetuating victim blaming (Broten & Milloy, 2013)

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO GSA COUNCIL

Recommendation: Increase access and awareness of Policy 42.
The University of Waterloo’s Sexual Violence Response Protocol and Procedures re: Policy 42, is a useful, survivor-centric, and informative policy (see appendix 5 for an overview). However, the policy is also inaccessible in terms of location and comprehension. Policy 42 is difficult to locate through the University’s website. This aspect of inaccessibility should be addressed to increase awareness and transparency of the policy. Increased awareness and transparency can increase survivors’ likelihood of reporting instances of sexual violence to the University. This aids in increasing the accuracy of sexual violence statistics on-campus and helps to make campus a safer environment. Increased awareness of the policy can also aid in conveying the University’s commitment to addressing acts of sexual violence. A direct link to this policy should also be included on all University webpages that discuss sexual violence and/or consent.

The second mode of inaccessibility is comprehension. While it is fundamental that the policy is written as a policy, it is also imperative that the policy can be understood by everyone who is a part of the university community. As such, this policy should be explained in plain language on the SVPRO website. Additional accessibility specifically for international students should also be sought. This includes making Policy 42 available in different languages, as well as ensuring the SVPRO website offers information on how to access resources in different languages (Council of Ontario Universities, 2020).

**Recommendation:** Collect data on how many university courses discuss sexual violence.

An important precursor for survivors to be able to name acts of sexual violence as sexual violence is having taken a class in which sexual violence is discussed (Buss et al., 2013). The ability to name and identify an experience as sexual violence decreases the likelihood of a survivor experiencing shame, internalizing the event and subsequently increases their ability to seek support, as well as report. The University of Waterloo should facilitate the inclusion of discussions about sexual violence in a variety of course offerings. This variation should occur across faculties and level of course offering. To aid the facilitation of this, the University should begin collecting data on how many courses discuss sexual violence within course content, as well as how this topic is discussed to ensure myths about sexual violence are not perpetuated. From this data collection SVPRO could work with professors in faculties with a low level of course offerings that discuss sexual violence. The SVPRO could also facilitate classroom discussions in courses that do not include discussions about sexual violence, specifically courses within faculties that have a low rate of discussion about sexual violence.

**Recommendation:** Advocate for permanent funding to be allocated for the two additional SVPRO positions that were added in 2021 on a contract basis.

As of April 2021, two positions were added to the Sexual Violence and Prevention Office (Cook, 2021). These positions include The Sexual Violence Project Coordinator and the Planning and Program Evaluation Specialist. These staff position increase the capacity of the Sexual Violence and Prevention Office. However, this increase in capacity may be short-term as both positions represent contract roles that are predicated on an adjusted Campus Safety Grant.

**Recommendation:** Work to provide more information about counsellors’ ability to specifically counsel individuals who have experienced sexual violence.

There are currently no listed counselling services specifically for those who have experienced sexual violence. There is also no information about counsellors’ abilities to work with students who have experienced sexual violence, despite including counselling services as an increased measure the University has taken to respond to sexual violence (HEI, n.d).

**Recommendation:** Remove the Message from the Provost listed on the UW Police website under “Sexual Assault”.

The Message from the Provost is over six years old and is uninformative about the University’s current response to sexual violence. This page utilizes the term “sexual assault” instead of the more encompassing term “sexual violence.” It also conveys an anti-survivor centric rhetoric through more forceful language, which may dissuade individuals from disclosing.
Recommendation: Seek to implement mandatory, audience-specific training on sexual violence prevention and support that is provided by the SVPRO, and provided in an engaging format, either in real-time or in-person.

Findings from the Final Report: The Response to Sexual Violence at Ontario University Campuses indicate that education and training ‘shortcuts’ such as online modules are not suitable for providing information on sexual violence. Instead, education and training ought to be overseen by sexual violence experts. The University of Waterloo provides education and training on sexual violence from sexual violence experts through programming offered by the SVPRO. However, this programming is not mandatory for university employees or students. The mandatory training all university employees are required to complete is delivered in an online format, including the section that provides information on workplace sexual violence, sexual harassment, and Policy 42.

To provide more effective training and education on sexual violence and the University’s policies, the SVPRO should provide real-time education to all incoming university employees and students. The University should also consider requiring employees to attend workshops on sexual violence every two years to maintain an up-to-date and accurate level of knowledge on sexual violence, responding to sexual violence and University policies relating to sexual violence. This would allow for the University to implement a “No Wrong Door” approach such as the one Red River College has adopted. Providing an approach like this requires many individuals within the university community to adequately understand sexual violence. This includes the ability to demystify harmful narratives about sexual violence and provide safe, informed, and effective support to survivors who disclose experiences of sexual violence.

Recommendation: Collect data on survivors’ experiences accessing university offered resources.

Universities within Ontario tend to have a lot of resources available on paper, yet in experience survivors find these resources ineffective (Buss et al., 2013). Ineffectiveness stems from many avenues including inaccessibility, understaffing, a lack of knowledge about available resources, as well as uncoordinated or siloed approaches to counseling, accommodation, and redress. This ineffectiveness often accumulates into a bureaucratic nightmare for a survivor who may experience lengthy and unpredictable wait times, as well as university staff members who are ill-equipped to respond to disclosures of sexual violence. To support the implementation of accessible, useful, and supportive resources, data should be collected on survivors’ experiences with accessing and using university resources. This data should be used to ensure that survivors within the University of Waterloo community are not subject to insufficient support, but are instead met with resources that provide effective, targeted, and integrated support. Best practices for data collection should be followed, including anonymized responses and the utilization of aggregate data.

Recommendation: Support the continued existence of the robust forms of campus events that discuss sexual violence.

Campus events that discuss sexual violence are numerous and provide both education and increase awareness about sexual violence. For instance, the event, The Bridge: Honouring the Lives of Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women, Girls, and Two Spirit People, provides awareness about the increased impact sexual violence has on Indigenous Women, Girls, and Two Spirit People in relation to the ongoing impacts of settler colonialism. The SVPRO has also consistently offered a self-defence workshop that operates within a feminist, anti-racist, anti-oppression framework. Sexual assault resistance and self-defence programs have been found to increase women, non-binary, trans and gender non-conforming individuals’ ability to recognize and resist sexual violence (Senn, et al., 2018). However, they are most effective when they actively don’t perpetuate tropes of victim blaming and instead emphasize that the goal of violence prevention is to eliminate sexual violence perpetration. These two campus events exemplify the active ways events can contribute to a university campus that is responsive to both education about and prevention of sexual violence.

Conclusion: Utilize the key considerations within this report as a benchmark for facilitating ongoing actions and resource provision.

The recommendations listed in this report should be read as a starting point for increasing active mitigation and support efforts pertaining to sexual violence. Responding to the prevalence of sexual violence must be viewed as an ongoing task. The best practices identified within the key considerations
section should be utilized to facilitate ongoing actions and resource provision within the University of Waterloo. These best practices can stand as a benchmark to measure future University responses. They can also act as a starting place for the creation of innovative programs that address sexual violence on-campus. Appendix 5 provides an overview of which best practices are/are not currently employed at the University of Waterloo.
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Appendix 1. Comparison of the Portion of Type of Sexual Violence Reported to the Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Office in 2018, 2019 and 2020

Yearly Proportion of Type of Violence Reported

2018

2019
- Sexual Assault
- Sexual Harrassment
- Other forms of Gender Based Violence
- Undisclosed

2020

Sources: Cook 2020; Cook 2021
Appendix 2. Number of Reports of Sexual Violence Segregated by Type of Sexual Violence Received by the Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Office in 2018, 2019 and 2020

Sources: Cook 2020; Cook 2021
Appendix 3. UWaterloo's Task Force on Sexual Violence’s Aims

Support the implementation of a sexual violence prevention framework on campus

Champion work being done to address sexual violence on campus

Identify collaboration opportunities with other campus groups pertaining to sexual violence prevention and support

Support the work of the Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Office (SVPRO)

Make recommendations for allocating funding pertaining to sexual violence prevention and support

Promote education and training services for sexual violence prevention and support

Increase awareness of sexual violence

Champion work being done to address sexual violence on campus
### Appendix 4: Timeline for Broad University Measures Implemented in Ontario and at UWaterloo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>UWaterloo creates Policy 42 – Prevention of, and Response to, Sexual Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>UWaterloo creates the staff position, Sexual Violence Response Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>UWaterloo creates the Sexual Violence Prevention and Response Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>UWaterloo creates the staff position, Director of Sexual Violence Prevention and Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Ministry of Colleges and Universities mandates each Ontario post-secondary institution to implement a Sexual Violence Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>UWaterloo establishes a Sexual Violence Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy 42</td>
<td>Provides information on the reporting process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explains the difference between disclosures and complaints pertaining to reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Makes a commitment to publicly report the number of disclosures and complaints the University receives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides information on supports and accommodations available to students who have experienced sexual violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is survivor-centric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides information on alternative dispute-resolutions that an individual may choose to pursue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6. Overview of Key Considerations and UWaterloo’s Accordance with Identified Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Best Practices Review of Sexual Violence Supports and Mitigation Efforts at the University of Waterloo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education and Training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training on sexual violence is ongoing, stand alone, audience specific and delivered by sexual violence experts (Buss, et al., 2013). Examples of specific audiences include, but is not limited to first year undergraduate students, graduate students, maintenance staff and faculty. This also includes specialized training for those who are more likely to receive disclosures of sexual violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training on sexual violence is updated on a regular basis and is aligned with current literature and best practices, while also being specific to the University's context (Buss, et al., 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus education on sexual violence moves beyond discussions of consent (Buss, et al., 2013). This includes a contextualization of consent within broader power relations, such as settler colonization and anti-Black racism, rather than only focusing on interpersonal communication which can represent sexual violence as a result of miscommunication or lack of knowledge about consent (Colpitts, 2021; Ostridge, 2020).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asynchronous, online materials are not the relied upon method for education and training deliverance on sexual violence prevention and related topics (Buss, et al., 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University courses exist that discuss sexual violence (Buss, et al., 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reporting and Data Collection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An office exists that acts as clear contact point for survivors, faculty, and staff. Through this office consistency across different units responding to sexual violence within the university is maintained through its functioning as a centralized communication hub (Buss, et al., 2013). This office also exists to collect data on university sexual violence and provides yearly public reports (Gabriele &amp; Rowe, 2020; Khan, Rowe, &amp; Bidgood, 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data is collected on the utilization and implementation of the university’s stand-alone policy on sexual violence (Rempel et al., 2020). Specifically, the number of reports; number of complaints; number of recorded disclosures segregated by how the disclosure was received (e.g., third party, anonymous, in person, online, etc.); number of reports that reach a conclusion; activities and education undertaken to raise awareness of the policy, rape culture and consent; the types of supports accessed; and the types of accommodations sought and provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process for a receiver of a disclosure to access support is clearly outlined and easy to find online (Western University, n.d.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A process exists to make formal reports about experiences of sexual violence to the university and transparency exists pertaining to what follows when this report it made (Buss, et al., 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting processes are identified by survivors to be streamlined, uncomplicated and unlikely to re-traumatize (Western University, n.d.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The university is committed to holding sexual violence disciplinary processes and support services separate from law enforcement (Roskin-Frazee, 2020; Students’ Society of McGill University, 2017). This includes an emphasis on enabling survivors to choose whether to file police reports. | Yes |

Reporting an act of sexual violence to the university does not require an individual to follow through with a formal complaint (Buss, et al., 2013). | Yes |

The university clearly articulates that there is no timeline for survivors to report their experience of sexual violence or for them to access support (Khan, Rowe & Bidgood, 2019). This can include a brief statement on the long-term and residual impacts of experiencing sexual violence, which aims to acknowledge the prevalence of delayed reporting and accessing of supports. | No |

The university permits anonymous and confidential reporting (Magnussen & Shankar, 2019). This frequently includes the existence of an online sexual violence reporting tool that works to decrease barriers to reporting and to increase accuracy of reporting on sexual violence at the University. Examples of this include Red River College: No Wrong Door and the REES program that launched in the fall of 2020 within 11 universities in Manitoba. REES is an online platform that provides choice to survivors by offering increased pathways for reporting that include Anonymous Reporting and Connect to My Campus. Survivors can also choose how much information they share, when and to whom (Lobson, 2020). | No |

**Responsiveness to Intersectionality**

University policies, education and responses to sexual violence recognize, explicitly name, and address rape culture as a factor contributing to the high rate of sexual violence often found on university and college campuses (Students' Society of McGill University, 2017; Ostridge, 2020). | No |

The university demonstrates a recognition that sexual violence disproportionally targets students with marginalised identities through its policies pertaining to sexual violence, as well as the type of supports it offers to survivors (Roskin-Frazee, 2020). This includes the existence of responsive and targeted supports for distinct groups of the student population, such as but not limited to Indigenous students, international students, students with disability, and students who are LGBTQIA+ and Two-Spirit individuals (Crabb, et al., 2019). Training for university staff should also include cultural competency when responding to disclosures (Roskin-Frazee, 2020). | No |


The university has implemented measures to actively mitigate against the reproduction of marginalization and privileging of certain voices (Colpitts, 2020). For instance, efforts are taken to counter the centralization of cis, white women’s experiences during data collection on students experiences with accessing campus supports by disaggregated data regarding race, ability, gender identity, gender expression, migration status, and Indigenous identity (Khan, Rowe & Bidgood, 2019). | No |
The university provides specific information for international students that experience sexual violence (Crudington, et al., 2020; Simon Fraser University, n.d.). This includes dispelling the myth that international students will lose their student visa if they disclose an experience of sexual violence. Support for those who have experienced sexual violence is also offered in the top three non-English languages spoken by international students at the university. Additionally, the university provides support for international students impacted by sexual violence by providing information on community supports that can be accessed in languages outside of English.

| Committees and working groups addressing sexual violence reflect the diversity of the campus community (Colpitts, 2020). | Yes |

### University Policies

The university demonstrates an understanding of the gendered nature of sexual violence and its intersections with systems of oppressions (Colpitts, 2020; Students' Society of McGill University, 2017). This is demonstrated through explicit mentions of race, racism, colonialism, ablism, and gender identities other than women within sexual violence policies; as opposed to identity neutral policies that obscure sexual violence as a depoliticised, ahistorical, and interpersonal issue (Ostridge, 2020; Colpitts, 2020; Canadian Federation of Students, 2020; Gabriele & Rowe, 2020).

| Policy and procedure do not reproduce a reliance on 'rape myths' (Buss, et al., 2013). Examples of rape myths include but are not limited to narratives that suggest rape results from a mismatch of sexual expectations, insinuations that most sexual assault is stranger rape, and victim blaming tropes about survivors engaging in risky sexual behaviour. | Yes |

| Immunity for student misconduct offences such as underage drinking are ensured for survivors who disclose or report experiences of sexual violence (Marques, 2020). Providing this immunity increases the trust students are likely to have in the Universities ability to actively support them after disclosing an experience of sexual violence, as this immunity demonstrates a commitment to not enact victim-blaming. | Yes |

| Experts on sexual violence, including researchers and community anti-violence organizations are consulted by the university when conducting reviews of policies pertaining to sexual violence (Colpitts, 2020). | Unknown |

| Students are regularly consulted on the University's sexual violence policies and practices. These consultations are well-advertised, accessible, include multiple pathways to provide feedback, and do not occur during inconvenient times of the year, for instance during finals (Colpitts, 2020). This also includes student representation on university committees and working groups addressing sexual violence. | Yes |

| A policy review process exists that creates community buy-in by engaging with the community, student body, staff, faculty, and stakeholders (Gabriele & Rowe, 2020). This includes the establishment of a transparent review process; a summarization of the review is publicly available in an accessible language format; and a work plan is developed from the review, including a timeline for policy revisions, approval, and implementation. | No |

| The university provides transparent and accessible reporting on the feedback it receives pertaining to sexual violence policies and support (Colpitts, 2020). | No |
Restorative justice is offered and clearly outlined within university policy and procedures (Buss et al., 2013).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Responses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reputation and risk management do not take precedence over safety, information gathering and prevention (Buss, et al., 2013). A risk management approach to sexual violence occurs when a survivor is responded to as if they are a problem to manage, instead of responded to as if they are a member of the community who deserves to be supported.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus alerts are screened by sexual violence experts to ensure these alerts provide sufficient information to safeguard the campus while respecting the confidentiality and anonymity of the survivor and are void of perpetuating victim blaming (Broten &amp; Milloy, 2013)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>