A Gender-Based and Sexualized Violence Community Risk Assessment Tool for Post-Secondary Settings

POSSIBILITY SEEDS

COURAGETOACT.CA

#IHaveTheCourageToAct

Land Acknowledgement

This work is taking place on and across the traditional territories of many Indigenous nations. We recognize that gender-based violence is one form of violence caused by colonization that is still used today to marginalize and dispossess Indigenous Peoples from their lands and waters. We must centre this truth in our work to address gender-based violence on campuses and in our communities. We commit to continuing to learn and take an anti-colonial inclusive approach in all our work. One way we are honouring this responsibility is by actively incorporating the Calls for Justice within Reclaiming Power and Place: The Final Report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls.

About Possibility Seeds

Courage to Act is a national initiative to address and prevent gender-based violence at Canadian post-secondary institutions. It is led by Possibility Seeds, a social change consultancy dedicated to gender justice, equity, and inclusion. We believe safe, equitable workplaces, organizations and institutions are possible. Learn more about our work at www.possibilityseeds.ca.

We hope this document will be a valuable resource to those seeking to address and prevent campus gender-based violence. As this is an evolving document, it may not capture the full complexity of the subject matter. The information provided does not constitute legal advice, and is not intended to be prescriptive. It should be considered a supplement to existing expertise, experience, and credentials; not a replacement for them.

We encourage readers to seek out training, education, and professional development opportunities in relevant areas to enhance their knowledge and sustained engagement with this work.

Authors: Jesmen Mendoza and Sandy Jung.

Research Assistant: Ruchika Gothoskar.

Contributors: Farrah Khan, Britney De Costa, Anoodth Naushan and Aubrianna Snow.

Community Risk Assessment Panel Advisory Committee: Alyssa Victorino, Amal Elmi, Carla Bertsch, Chris Hackett, Imre Juurlink, Julie Blais, Krystal Lowe, Mary Ann Campbell, Nimrit Basra, Paula Lam, Sarah Wolgemuth, Vanita Clare and Marcia Boniferro.

Graphic Design: Kitty Rodé with design elements from Zoie Haider.

Phase 3 Courage to Act Project Team: Farrah Khan (Executive Director), Anoodth Naushan (Project Director), Maya Kotlarenko (Operations Manager), Emily Allan (Communications Manager), Laura Murray (Project Coordinator), Aubrianna Snow (Stakeholder Relations Specialist), Kitty Rodé (Graphic Designer), Leon K (Web Designer), Noémie Veilleux (Francophone Project Coordinator), Jennifer Flood (Education Lead), Amal Elmi (Response and Support Co-Lead), Britney De Costa (Experiential Learning Project Lead & RIA Co-Lead), Andréanne St-Gelais (Experiential Learning Project Coordinator) and Deb Eerkes (RIA Co-Lead).

To reference this document, please use the following citation:

Jung, S. & Mendoza, J. (2023). *A Gender-Based and Sexualized Violence Community Risk Assessment Tool for Post-Secondary Settings.* Possibility Seeds' Courage to Act: Addressing and Preventing Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions in Canada.

COPYRIGHT © 2023 by Possibility Seeds. SOME RIGHTS RESERVED

A Gender-Based and Sexualized Violence Community Risk Assessment Tool for Post-Secondary Settings by Possibility Seeds is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License.

Possibility Seeds permits the use of this material under specific conditions: This material can be copied and redistributed, in any medium and format, if appropriate attribution is provided. Please credit Possibility Seeds, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. No part of this work can be used for commercial purposes. If you adapt or build upon the material, you may not distribute the modified material for commercial purposes. For permission to use material from this text, please contact Possibility Seeds at operations@possibilityseeds.ca.

CC BY NC SA

Funding Acknowledgement:

A Gender-Based and Sexualized Violence Community Risk Assessment Tool for Post-Secondary Settings, a project by Possibility Seeds, was graciously funded by Women and Gender Equality Canada.

Women and Gender Equality Canada
Femmes et Égalité des genres Canada
Canada

Table of Contents

Introduction **6**
- Why is a community risk assessment tool needed? 6
- How was this Tool developed? 7
- When should a community risk assessment tool be used? 8
- Who should use this Tool and what foundational knowledge should they have? 9

Instructions **12**
- How to Use the Community Risk Assessment Tool 12
- How Not to Use the Community Risk Assessment Tool 17

Descriptions of the Tool's Sections and Risk Factors **20**

Section 1: Factors Related to the Survivor **21**
- Factor 1: Marginalized Identities 21
- Factor 2: Systemic Barriers Encountered by Survivors (Marginalized Experiences) 23

Section 2: Factors Related to the Community **26**
- Factor 3: Institutional Student Life Culture 27
- Factor 4: Post-secondary Living and Learning Climate 29
- Factor 5: Policies and Presence of Gender-Based and/or Sexualized Violence Resources 31

Section 3: Factors Related to the Incidence of Gender-Based and Sexualized Violence **34**
- Factor 6: Involvement of Substances and/or Alcohol 34
- Factor 7: Nature of Relationship Between a Survivor and a Person Who Has Caused Harm 37

Section 4: Factors Related to the Person Who Has Caused Harm **40**
- Factor 8: Oppressive Attitudes, Beliefs and Values About Women 41
- Factor 9: Sexual Preoccupation 42
- Factor 10: Past Perpetration 44
- Factor 11: Impulsivity 45
- Factor 12: Callous Disregard 47
- Factor 13: Controlling and Coercive 49
- Factor 14: Antisociality 52
- Factor 15: Participates in Hypermasculine Culture 54
- Factor 16: Problematic Sexual Expectations and Beliefs 57

References **61**
Appendix A: Worksheet for the Community Risk Assessment Tool **77**
Appendix B: Existing Risk Assessment Tools — Establishing a Rationale for Developing a New Approach to Assess Gender-based and Sexualized Violence Risk **80**
    Defining Risk 80
    Reasons for Developing a Non-Forensic Risk Tool for Gender-based Violence 82
    Why it is Still Important to Review and Deconstruct Existing Risk Tools 87
Appendix C: Employing Consensus Methodology and its Application to the Creation of a Community Based Risk Assessment Tool for PSIs **90**
    Rationale for and Types of Consensus Methodology 90
    Application of the Nominal Approach 91
Appendix D: Case Illustrations of the Tool **93**
    Example A 93
    Example B 97
Appendix E: Further Learning and Resources **101**

Introduction

In 2019, *Possibility Seeds* released its landmark *Courage to Act* report. The report documented a vital conversation about gender-based violence at Canadian post-secondary institutions (PSIs) that took place through 30 national consultations with more than 300 stakeholder participants across more than 60 post-secondary institutions (Khan et al., 2019). In these consultations, survivors, student advocates, administrators, faculty, researchers, staff, community organizers and parents called for transformation on how PSIs should:

- respond to and support those harmed by gender-based violence;
- provide gender-based violence prevention education; and
- investigate, adjudicate and report gender-based violence.

This led to a draft framework that provided 45 recommendations and several calls to action. Among the recommendations was that an evidence-based tool be developed to help post-secondary institutions determine the level of risk that an incident or report of gender-based violence poses to the school community (Khan et al., 2019). In fall 2021, this suggestion became a Research-to-Action project, forming part of the last phase of the overall *Courage to Act* project, which was made possible by funding from Women and Gender Equality Canada. The outcome of that project is this document, a Community Risk Assessment Tool (referenced throughout as the Tool). It includes outlines and definitions of the various clusters of risk factors, case illustrations and examples, and a worksheet to help Tool users organize their thinking about the overall risk posed by gender-based and sexual violence to the school community and to survivors (see Appendix A).

Why is a community risk assessment tool needed?

As the consultations with stakeholder participants revealed, a tool designed specifically for post-secondary settings was both needed and absent. Consultations also identified how existing risk assessment tools were being used to bridge this gap. However, these tools have limited applicability to post-secondary institutions because they:

- don't acknowledge the uniqueness of the post-secondary context (e.g., prosocial environment, learning community, emerging adults);

- don’t address the nuanced experiences of racialized, LGBTQIA2S+ and/or disabled students and staff on campus;
- are narrow and only assess specific forms of gender-based violence;
- are often optimized to assess risk for specific populations;
- are intended to be used by law enforcement and the criminal justice system; and
- rely heavily on criminality to predict risk.

Furthermore, existing risk assessment tools focus on the risk of a similar incident re-occurring or of the same individual reoffending, as opposed to how to protect a post-secondary community in a more holistic way. It may be beneficial to use existing risk assessment tools in a post-secondary community, since they are structured and empirically supported; however, their reliance on criminality fails to acknowledge that post-secondary communities are prosocial environments where many survivors of violence know the person who has caused harm. Also, the person who has caused harm does not typically embody the characteristics of those individuals assessed in criminal justice settings (e.g., prisons, probation or parole offices, forensic mental health hospitals) where such existing risk assessment tools are used.

What post-secondary institutions need is a non-forensic risk tool that considers the unique context of a post-secondary setting, appreciates its prosocial environment, and understands that decisions flow from complaints where risk to the community must be assessed as accurately as possible. For further elaboration on why a community risk assessment tool for post-secondary institutions is needed, please see Appendix B.

How was this Tool developed?

Risk assessment tools fall into two broad categories: **actuarial** and **structured professional judgement**. Actuarial risk assessment tools are developed through statistical modelling that identifies items to be included. However, the challenge in developing this type of tool is that large samples of data are needed. This data should be drawn from sources that are considered high-quality and consistent and should be sampled from across the country over a long period of time (Singh, 2012). In contrast, structured professional judgement tools survey the research literature and draw upon relevant theories to select items for inclusion. Upon review, items selected for inclusion are arranged in groups or scales (Singh, 2012). The difficulty with this approach is that the literature selected may represent the viewpoint of the tool developers only and fail to objectively and comprehensively represent other viewpoints on items that need to be included. The other difficulty with this method is the reliance on the authors of the tool to refine and distill the items to a core set of relevant items.

Acknowledging that finding consistent outcome data on gender-based and sexualized violence at post-secondary institutions over a long period of time would be a difficult (if not impossible) route to take at this time, the authors of this Tool needed to consider the method used in creating structured professional judgement. What followed was both a literature and environmental scan that identified the initial items (i.e., risk factors) to be considered for inclusion. To ensure that refinement of the items selected did not solely rely on the authors and that the Tool would reflect various viewpoints while adopting an interdisciplinary and community-based approach, the initial items considered for inclusion were then submitted to consensus methodology and discussion (see Appendix C for more details). The consensus development discussions took place among panel members from across the country, holding various posts within the post-secondary setting from a variety of institutions. The panel members brought diverse expert perspectives on gender-based and sexualized violence at PSIs. Such consensus development discussions refined and distilled the original items considered for inclusion and ultimately selected the items that would be included in the final version of the Tool.

When should a community risk assessment tool be used?

Complaints of gender-based and sexualized violence at a post-secondary institution that are taken forward are subject to a procedure and/or a process. Quite often, this process entails an intake where a threshold to investigate is either met or not met. If a complaint meets the established threshold, it moves forward to an investigation where the focus is on whether findings can be made with respect to the complaint. Put another way, on a balance of probabilities, did the behaviours complained about occurr or not occur? If a finding is made, discipline is dispensed and can range from a warning letter to expulsion from the post-secondary institution. See Rico and colleagues' (2021) *Supporting the Whole Community: A Roadmap Tool for Working with People Who Have Caused Harm* for more information on a typical process for addressing gender-based and sexualized violence at a PSI.

Making a finding and a decision to provide disciplinary interventions are just a few places where a community risk assessment tool may be used for decision-making at a post-secondary institution. There are other places in a PSI's procedures where decisions may be required. For example, decisions might be made with respect to survivor safety planning, and risk-management decisions may need to be made to protect the post-secondary community as a whole (i.e., community safety planning). Furthermore, as some PSIs may have multiple ongoing cases, decisions may need to be made with respect to prioritization and triage. Also, it is important to recognize that risk is dynamic and not always the same, so a risk tool should be used to reassess if the risk towards the post-secondary community has changed.

Who should use this Tool and what foundational knowledge should they have?

Post-secondary institutions are living/learning communities where a number of stakeholders have a vested (and sometimes separate) interest in properly responding to incidents of gender-based and sexualized violence and supporting those impacted by it. For this reason, this Tool was designed to satisfy various stakeholders and their needs, including peer support workers, sexual violence office staff, counsellors, medical staff, student conduct officers, case management professionals and more. In short, it can be used by any support person at a post-secondary institution charged with responding to and supporting those impacted by gender-based and sexualized violence.

Although this Tool is designed to be accessible for all stakeholders, potential users ought to have a foundational understanding of what gender-based and sexualized violence at post-secondary institutions is.

First, it's important to establish that **post-secondary** includes *any* learning opportunity that might occur after secondary school or high school. This not only includes colleges and universities, but also trade schools, technical institutions, CEGEP and military programs after high school (outside of Canada, post-secondary education is sometimes referred to as "higher education"). Each of these post-secondary settings may have distinct differences. For the purposes of this Tool, our use of "post-secondary" is specific to universities and colleges.

Potential users of this Tool should also have a grounded understanding of what gender-based violence is. **Gender-based violence** is any harmful behaviour that is inflicted upon an individual because of their gender, and is most often experienced by women. The root of these harmful behaviours often lies in power inequalities between men and women, and the harmful and violent behaviour can be organized into four groups:

- **physical**, which involves contact between individuals and often involves force;
- **sexual**, which involves sexual acts and behaviours that are performed without consent;
- **psychological**, where the individual's well-being is threatened and harmed; and
- **economic**, where an individual's autonomy and self-sufficiency is restricted or prevented.

Common forms of gender-based violence are typically seen in dating and partner violence, and users of this Tool are encouraged to familiarize themselves with how gender-based violence can manifest itself in various ways. Throughout this manual, the authors have primarily used **gender-based and sexualized violence** to mean physical violence that is gender-based and/or sexualized in nature; however, sexual, psychological and economic violence that is sexualized in some manner may also occur and can be addressed by this Tool.

Users of this Tool should recognize that there are many ways to refer to individuals who have been subjected to gender-based and sexualized violence. Such individuals are often referred to as victims or survivors. However, Setia and An's (2021) study of the effects of using such terms on the perception of severity of sexual assault highlights the importance of being mindful of what terms are used to refer to those who have been subjected to gender-based and sexualized violence. Additionally, users should be attuned to how individuals subjected to gender-based and sexualized violence would like to be referred to. While debate continues on how and why to use certain terms, for the purpose of this Tool, the term **survivor** denotes all those subjected to gender-based and sexualized violence.

There are also many ways to refer to individuals who have caused gender-based and sexualized violence. Often, terms like **offender** and **perpetrator** are used; however, such terms tend to imply a certain level of criminality and may not be appropriate for a post-secondary setting. Post-secondary institutions may also refer to such individuals as

respondents. The difficulty, however, in using this term is it fails to include those respondents who have caused harm but a student judicial affairs process was not able to substantiate a finding of gender-based and sexualized violence occurring. As such, this Tool uses the term **person/people who have caused harm**.

Users of this Tool should also adopt and be grounded in principles of **trauma-informed practice**, which articulate how processes and procedures should take great care in not retraumatizing survivors. It's also important to understand that various forms of gender-based violence may interlock, intersect and reinforce structural and gender inequalities. Recognizing this means adopting an **intersectional approach** and understanding that some survivors will experience multiple forms of gender-based violence. Users of this Tool should also have some **practical experience** in working with individuals who have caused harm or have admitted to engaging in gender-based and sexualized violence. Further, Tool users should have:

- established skills in listening sensitively to narratives of violence experienced;
- adequate training and experience in interviewing;
- competency in understanding the limits to confidentiality and privacy; and
- navigational knowledge of policies and procedures of the institution where the users are applying the Tool.

Enhanced learning related to the foundational knowledge described above can be obtained through graduate and professional school training, professional development opportunities, extensive review of the relevant literature, consultations with experts in the field, and participating in communities of practice, to name a few. Those who use this Tool, from an aspirational standpoint, should also have a commitment to engaging in gender-based violence work, possess a lifelong learning mindset and continually employ professional humility. For further learning on the italicized domains of foundational knowledge described above, refer to a brief list of resources in Appendix E.

Instructions

How to Use the Community Risk Assessment Tool

Before Using the Tool

Thoroughly review the contents of this manual and gain fluency with them. Prior to scoring any risk factor, descriptions of each section and each risk factor should be read carefully and evidence for the presence of any risk factor should be documented to demonstrate reasons for the score.

Obtain comprehensive information. The interviewing approach and gathering of essential information should be thoughtfully considered and questions should be prepared. Information pertinent to the survivor, person who caused harm, knowledge of institutional resources (including policies and procedures) and circumstances around the individuals involved and the context of the violence should be gathered and reviewed.

Additional uses of the Tool

The Community Risk Assessment Tool was developed for use by frontline staff and administrators at post-secondary institutions who have little to no background in forensic evaluations or risk assessment, but have an understanding of and experience with addressing gender-based and sexualized violence. Therefore, it's essential that Tool users follow the instructions in this chapter, and thoroughly review the Description chapter that follows, which describes the 4 sections and 16 risk factors within the Tool.

Completing the Tool will help you to identify areas in which your post-secondary institution may focus attention and bolster resources to address the harm done and to prevent further incidents. These areas may include strategic education for those who are deemed a higher risk, identification of campus needs, guidance on restorative processes, and focused training for new and existing staff to move away from unstructured clinical judgment and towards evidence-supported approaches. At a broader level, using the Tool can also contribute to an institutional audit of policies, procedures and resources intended to address and reduce gender-based and sexualized violence.

As noted in previous publications (i.e., *Supporting the Whole Campus Community: A Roadmap Tool for Working with People Who Have Caused Harm*; Rico et al., 2021), working with people who have caused harm may take various pathways that may or may not lead to judicial procedures. Some institutions may emphasize strategic education, engage in restorative practices, have multifaceted services for students who have been harmed and/or have harmed others or outsource complaint investigations. Although there may be typical pathways that a specific post-secondary institution takes, various blocks, hurdles, policies and procedures at any given institution may vary these pathways. Regardless of the pathway outlined in the *Roadmap Tool* (Rico et al., 2021), the Community Risk Assessment Tool is intended for use at any of these junctures.

Administration Guidelines

The Community Risk Assessment Tool is administered and scored using this manual, along with the Worksheet (see Appendix A).

Intended application

The Tool is intended for use in post-secondary educational settings where gender-based and/or sexualized violence has been disclosed involving adult students, including emerging adults (i.e., post-secondary students ages 16 and older). There is no upper age limit. Other uses (i.e., non-student staff or faculty, outside of post-secondary institutions) are not supported or recommended.

One of the primary uses of the Tool is to identify areas where gender-based and sexualized violence risk can be managed or mitigated. Identifying risk factors can help with safety planning and in making decisions about accommodations or modifications to protect the survivor.

In addition to this Tool's use on a case-by-case basis to safety plan with the survivor and to make decisions about the person who caused harm, administrators at post-secondary institutions could use the completed Tool to evaluate how they can keep the larger post-secondary community and campus safe. For example, the Tool can help to identify where improvements could be made to bolster institutional resources, address gaps in policies and procedures or implement changes to toxic cultures within learning and non-learning environments.

Fluency with the manual

This manual has three chapters: the Introduction, Instructions and the Description of the Tool's Sections and Risk Factors. The Introduction provides a frame of reference for the

Tool and addresses why the Tool is needed, when it should be used, how it was developed, who should use the Tool and what foundational knowledge users should have. Users are encouraged to thoroughly review this important information. This Instructions chapter provides principles for using the Tool, how to apply it properly in the context of assessing risk for gender-based and sexualized violence, whom the Tool can be used with, how to score the risk factors, and what information should be gathered and how. Finally, the Descriptions of the Tool's Sections and Risk Factors chapter outlines each of the four sections of the Tool. More importantly, each risk factor is described generally, the background literature is reviewed, and some behavioural indicators are provided to assist with identifying the likely presence of the risk factor. Important notes on scoring the item accurately are also provided. Several appendices accompany these main chapters, and are listed as follows:

- Appendix A: Worksheet to help with documentation, which can be completed as part of a case file.
- Appendix B: Overview on why a new approach is needed to assess gender-based and sexualized violence risk.
- Appendix C: Overview on employing consensus methodology to the creation of the Tool.
- Appendix D: Two illustrative case examples to assist with understanding the application of the Tool. These illustrations are not comprehensive by any means, but can help users see how the Tool can be applied and how the Worksheet can be used to document the assessment.
- Appendix E: Further resources to assist with learning on various relevant topics.

Scoring risk factors on the Tool

For each of the 16 risk factors on the Tool, users should review the description, indicators and coding notes. Each risk factor is scored as present or not present (absent), and there's a subcategory of 'some evidence' for cases where there is contradictory information, evidence is available but not strong, and/or the factor is only present in certain circumstances or settings. All 16 risk factors should be assessed.

To score a risk factor as present, ensure there is concrete evidence for the presence of that risk factor. Never score a risk factor as present if you are relying on assumptions or guesses. For instance, a person who has caused harm and engages in multiple one-night stands (e.g., hook-ups) should not automatically be labelled with problematic sexual expectations (Factor 16) unless they endorse views that are actually problematic, such as saying women are meant to gratify their sexual needs. Likewise, a person who has caused harm should not be labelled with callous disregard (Factor 12) unless they express no remorse when women are upset that they do not want to further commit to the relationship.

The Worksheet (Appendix A) should only be used after you have read and gained a strong familiarity with the Introduction, Instructions, and Descriptions chapters. It lists the 16 risk factors grouped into each of the four sections. There is a space to record the presence of the risk factor, as well as a space to record notes that identify the behavioural indicators and evidence for the presence of the risk factor (or information that verifies the absence of the risk factor). This Worksheet can be copied and included in file information for gender-based and sexualized violence cases.

Risk and case formulation

Once all risk factors have been scored on the Tool, users are then encouraged to examine all of the factors together and formulate a judgement of risk based on the user's professional knowledge. Refrain from summing up the number of risk factors present and formulating a judgement in this way. If a user is fairly new to the work, consider scoring the Tool and making a risk and case formulation with another colleague. The resulting formulation based on the combination of factors should then be used to inform interventions that protect the community, create case management strategies and assist decisions that the post-secondary institution needs to make.

Assessment Guidelines

Before you complete the Community Risk Assessment Tool, gather all relevant information. Sources of information should ideally include interviews with the survivor, the person who caused harm, witnesses or those who may have reported the incident, and any others who could provide relevant information to score the risk factors on the Tool. In addition, access and review documentation from other sources (both internal and external to the post-secondary institution) to gain a more complete picture and to corroborate information provided by those who have been interviewed.

Interviews

Interviews should not involve interrogative practices, which can be both harmful and disrespectful to the individual(s) being interviewed. The sole objective of interviewing is to gather information; and therefore, it's important to have a rudimentary understanding of effective and non-confrontational interviewing approaches when assessing for risk.

Documents and records

Collateral information is both necessary and helpful to the assessment process. It's typically gathered through interviews with the survivor(s), witness(es), and other individuals who can provide information pertaining to the gender-based and sexualized violence that has been disclosed. These individuals can also speak to the context of the relationship between the person who has caused harm and the survivor. However, collateral information should also be gathered through a thorough review of any relevant documentation. Such documents may include records from the post-secondary institution where the violence occurred or from other PSIs the person who has caused harm or survivor attended. Past criminal records, any mental health documentation, and other relevant and related records should also be collected. It may be appropriate and necessary to obtain consent to access or request such documentation.

Environmental scan and assessment

Since this is a community-based risk assessment, consider the institutional and learning environment surrounding gender-based and/or sexualized violence. This is especially important given that some risk factors on the Tool involve the assessment of culture and climate at the PSI, as well as the learning environment (e.g., field placements, co-operative education, etc.) and student life environments (e.g., athletic teams, residence, etc.).

Frame of reference

In reporting the assessment of risk using the Tool, it's important to consider the lens through which the assessment was conducted. First, consider and record the sources used to carry out the assessment. An essential part of a thorough and defensible assessment is recording and reporting all sources of information used to complete the assessment. Although an exhaustive review of and access to all sources of information may not always be possible, this potential limitation should be explicitly recognized in the assessment (e.g., noting that some sources may have been helpful but were inaccessible, or individuals were unable or unwilling to participate). You can address this by completing the "Sources of Information" portion of the Worksheet. Second, be aware of how people may interpret your risk assessment. An essential element of a sound assessment is using a trauma-informed lens. How you document and report information could potentially be judged by others in a way that may lead to victim-blaming (e.g., using terms such as victim, vulnerability) or excusing behaviours (e.g., saying the person who has caused harm was ignorant of the policies).

How Not to Use the Community Risk Assessment Tool

The following are ways in which the Community Risk Assessment Tool may be misused. Understanding them can help you to avoid some common pitfalls.

Overinterpreting

Users should only use the Tool for what it was developed to do, which is to assess risk for gender-based and/or sexualized violence in post-secondary institutions. There is often a tendency to think that a risk tool assesses risk for various outcomes. Unfortunately, this over-generalization can be dangerous as it can lead to making decisions based on intuition rather than through an evidence-supported approach.

Predicting

The Tool was developed for community risk assessment and management but does not give the statistical likelihood of whether an incident of gender-based and/or sexualized violence will occur. It cannot definitively predict whether a person who caused harm will commit a future interpersonal violent offence.

Single-factor importance and double-dipping

It's important to understand that the presence of a single risk factor from the Tool isn't enough to deem an individual a significant risk. Cherry-picking factors to conclude that someone is a high risk for violence is not an ethical way to conduct a risk assessment. As noted in the first half of this chapter, one must score all of the 16 risk factors to complete the Tool. As notable as it may be when certain risk factors are present, it's equally telling when other risk factors aren't. Furthermore, it's important to avoid double-dipping, which is when a user identifies a behaviour or statements made by a person who caused harm that relate to more than one risk factor and surreptitiously checks off each one.

Focusing on the source

Users should focus on the presence of the risk factor and not on the source of the risk factor. For example, a person who has caused harm who has a history of engaging in casual sexual encounters (i.e., hook-ups) may have difficulty establishing intimate relationships with women. A user who sees these experiences as problematic and assumes that the person who has caused harm does not respect women may erroneously assume Factor 16 (problematic sexual expectations and beliefs) is present. In another example, a person who has caused harm who lived in an impoverished neighbourhood as a kid and engaged in delinquent behaviours to impress his friends may struggle with making friends in university. It would be erroneous to assume this person is antisocial (Factor 14) and impulsive (Factor 11) without examining his behaviours outside of his youthful behaviour. For example, he may struggle because he is concerned about how people view him rather than having views that support harmful behaviours towards others. In essence, users should assess the presence of the risk factor and its occurrence across the lifespan.

Excusing behaviour

Users should avoid using the presence of any risk factor(s) as an excuse or reason that justifies the perpetration of gender-based and/or sexualized violence. Ableist beliefs are detrimental to the use of the Tool, and therefore, the Tool and the scoring of the risk factors should not be used as an excuse to reduce accountability (for example, his impulsive behaviour, perhaps due to some attention deficit issues, makes it difficult for him to stop himself from acting out this way).

These are only some of the pitfalls users should understand. Although the Tool provides a resource for post-secondary institutions to assess the community for safety and to be proactive in the prevention of further violent incidents, the user must recognize that the Tool does have limitations. These are noted as follows:

- **Post-secondary applications only.** Users should avoid using the Tool outside of the post-secondary education context, as it was not developed for other settings.
- **Risk factors are not exhaustive.** Like all existing published risk tools, we have only touched the surface of risk factors related to the potential for violence. Users should recognize that there may be other factors not accounted for. Likewise, the Tool does not account for protective factors that may lower the likelihood of violence.

- **Needs to be further examined for racially diverse populations.** Much of the existing research on campus sexual violence perpetration has focused on White students (as noted in O'Connor et al., 2021 review of research methodology). Hence, fewer racially diverse populations have been closely examined.
- **Limited to students.** For the purposes of the Tool, "survivor" and "the person who caused harm" are centred solely on students rather than on others in the campus community, such as staff and faculty/instructors.

Descriptions of the Tool's Sections and Risk Factors

This chapter outlines the Community Risk Assessment Tool's scoring instructions. The Tool has 16 risk factors, which are grouped into the following four sections:

1. Factors related to the survivor [2 risk factors]
2. Factors related to the community [3 risk factors]
3. Factors related to the incidence of gender-based and sexualized violence [2 risk factors]
4. Factors related to the person who has caused harm [9 risk factors]

Within each section there are two to nine risk factors. See Appendix A for a Worksheet listing all risk factors, arranged by section.

Section 1: Factors Related to the Survivor

Overview

This section outlines two factors that influence gender-based and sexualized violence: the marginalized identities of those who have been harmed, and the societal and institutional barriers that survivors face.

It is vital to understand that these factors do not cause gender-based and sexualized violence and that the survivor is never to blame. Rather, the factors are indicative of the constellation of issues that the person who has caused harm takes advantage of, capitalizes on, or exploits to commit violence upon the survivor. Knowing what these factors are can also prove useful in determining the risk of gender-based and sexualized violence reoccurring in the broader campus community, as others in the community may have similar, if not identical, experiences to those who have already been victimized.

The factors that are related to the survivor are comprised of the following and make up factors 1 and 2 in the Tool:

1. **Marginalized Identities**
2. **Systemic Barriers Encountered by Survivors (Marginalized Experiences)**

Endorsing any or both of these factors in the Community Risk Assessment Tool would mean having fully understood the experiences of a person harmed by gender-based and/or sexualized violence from an intersectional approach where considerations include, but are not limited to, the survivor's gender, sexual orientation, racial identity, abilities, class and socio-economic status. Such considerations should be contemplated when scoring Section 1.

Factor 1: Marginalized Identities

Definition

A social identity refers to a person's membership within a social group, where that group may possess shared characteristics, language, culture and norms. Membership within these groups may be assigned at birth, self-selected, imposed or perceived by others. The most common social identities are categorized in the literature as the "Big 8." They are: gender identity, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, ability, religion, nationality, and socio-economic status (Allen et al., 2012; Johnson, 2006). The reader is strongly encouraged to fully understand what each of these social identity categories entails and to not conflate them with demographic information or personal characteristics alone.

Within each category, different social identities exist on a continuum where each identity in the same category has been afforded more or less power and privilege in a Western context than another social identity within that category (Crenshaw, 2017). For example, cisgender men have more power and privilege than cisgender women, who have more power and privilege than trans, intersex and non-binary individuals. Those with the least amount of power and privilege (or, said another way, those who are oppressed the most) have a marginalized identity. Further, a person can have membership within multiple social groups and possess multiple and interlocking social identities — some or all of which can be marginalized identities. Some of these marginalized identities may also be intricately linked to personal characteristics that are visible (e.g., race, sex) and invisible (e.g., abilities, sexual orientation).

The literature on sexual violence suggests that post-secondary students with marginalized identities are more often subjected to sexual violence (Burczycka, 2020; Coulter et al., 2017; Dank et al., 2014; Griner et al., 2020; Reuter et al., 2017).

Information about marginalized identities can be gleaned in multiple ways, but the simplest way is to ask survivors how they identify, what identities they think about the most, and how their identities affect them.

Indicators

- Survivor identifies with multiple social identities and those social identities are marginalized, oppressed, persecuted and targeted in Western society.
- Survivor identifies with multiple social identities that have historically been devalued by Western society.
- Person who has caused harm admits to taking advantage of a survivor who possesses social identities that have historically been devalued by Western society.

Coding notes

- The prevalence literature does not highlight the compounding factors and the resulting complexities that emerge for students with marginalized identities. For example, students with marginalized identities may have racist tropes foisted upon them where Francis and colleagues (2019) state that Black women are seen as "exotic" (p. 18), Indigenous women as "animalistic" (p. 16), and Asian women as "passive and compliant" (p. 19). Also in that study, Francis and colleagues (2019) find that "Indigenous, racialized, and gender and sexual minority students and those with mental health challenges" (p. 15) have racial, colonial and sanist stereotypes imposed upon them, making it difficult to seek support, disclose instances of sexualized violence, or feel like they'll be believed upon disclosure because of prevailing racial stereotypes that make them feel as though they're deserving of the harm they endured.

- When considering marginalized identities of survivors at post-secondary institutions, it becomes important to adopt what Hunt (2016) argues, which is to acknowledge that "academic space is not neutral [...] we need to consider the role of educational spaces in settler colonialism" (p. 5). Such acknowledgement would allow the user of the Community Risk Assessment Tool to understand that survivors with marginalized identities may not easily disclose their marginalized identities for fear of not being believed or of being betrayed by the institution. They may also have cultural mistrust towards institutions and societal structures.
- Another consideration in determining whether survivors at post-secondary institutions possess marginalized identities is considering social identities outside of the "Big 8." Consider social identity categories like age, body size, mental health, housing, neurodiversity, first language and citizenship, to name a few. As post-secondary environments are dynamic landscapes for students, so too are students' identifications with social groups.

Factor 2: Systemic Barriers Encountered by Survivors (Marginalized Experiences)

Definition

Systemic barriers are hurdles that persistently disadvantage individuals when it comes to accessing opportunities and/or prevent or decelerate any progress those individuals could make. These types of barriers place negative value on those who cannot overcome them with ease. Systemic barriers to participation in post-secondary student life can range from language and cultural barriers for international students to geographic and financial barriers for commuter students. Other systemic barriers students might face in fully participating in post-secondary student life include cultural expectations for first-generation students and family obligations for students with dependent care responsibilities. Users of the Community Risk Assessment Tool are urged to familiarize themselves with and gain a full understanding of the unique systemic barriers that face post-secondary students.

Students, in general, and moreover, students who have marginalized identities attending post-secondary institutions do so with the societal promises and hopes of achieving upward mobility. However, some survivors (typically those with marginalized identities) may face systemic barriers to participation in post-secondary student life. Students who face these barriers are limited or prevented from engaging in post-secondary student life, which can result in stress and loneliness (Maguire & Morris, 2018). These barriers also isolate affected students, which increases the opportunities for those who cause harm to take advantage of, capitalize on, or exploit them to commit sexual violence. The literature suggests, by concentrating on commuter students, international students, and students who struggle to pay for basic necessities, that students who face systemic barriers are more likely to be targets of sexual violence (Hutcheson, 2020; Jacoby, 1990; Kwong Caputo, 2013; Mellins et al., 2017).

Gathering information about systemic barriers may require spending time with the survivor exploring how they might feel cut off from participating in post-secondary campus life. Some systemic barriers may seem evident (e.g., commuting), while others may need to be carefully discovered (e.g., first-generation post-secondary student with dependent care obligations). Notably, in the forensic literature, barriers to survivor support are found to be a predictor of partner violence, and are seen in the validated risk tool, Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment (Hilton, 2021). Having dependents, having no telephone or means of transportation, experiencing geographical isolation and having substance use problems are circumstances that prevent survivors from accessing supports.

Indicators

- Survivor is a commuter student.
- Survivor is an international student.
- Survivor is a first-generation student (i.e., a student with parents who have not gone to a Canadian post-secondary institution).

- Survivor has dependent care obligations.
- Survivor has family and cultural expectations.
- Survivor has multiple part-time jobs.
- Survivor does not participate in campus events and activities.
- Survivor struggles to pay for school.
- Survivor has been subjected to violence in the past.

Coding notes

- Feelings of isolation from the post-secondary institution and student life underpin this risk factor. This isolation is a result of systemic barriers. You may discover in talking to survivors that they feel isolated because of their personal thoughts about their ability to succeed at a post-secondary institution, for example.
- Be mindful that the indicators noted above represent the possibility that the survivor encounters a systemic barrier, and some of the indicators may represent several systemic barriers. For example, a survivor could disclose that they are a commuter student. Given this, it may be simple enough to endorse Factor 2 under the grounds that this student faces geographic barriers because of the cost of living. However, further exploration may reveal that they do not find the commute stressful but commute because their family expects them to provide care for their younger siblings and their parents do not value participation in campus life. It may be those circumstances that the survivor finds isolating and stressful.
- The presence of Factor 1, Marginalized Identities, does not automatically lead to the presence of Factor 2. Those with marginalized identities may not experience systemic barriers to their post-secondary life. Likewise, those who do not have a marginalized identity may find themselves experiencing systemic barriers. Although there may be a relationship between these factors (e.g., those with marginalized identities tend to experience more systemic barriers), each factor should be assessed separately.

Section 2: Factors Related to the Community

Overview

Whether post-secondary institutions are viewed as communities of scholars (Goodman, 1962), or more recently as learning communities (McMillan & Chavis, 1986), the post-secondary institution as a community implies a collection of people (e.g., faculty, staff and students) who have something in common (i.e., higher education). Communities develop norms, cultures and traditions through various social processes as ways of motivating their members to adopt behaviours and conventions, and PSIs are no different in this regard. Communities can also produce a positive sense of well-being and a sense of belonging for all members. However, communities, including academic communities, are not immune to creating norms, cultures and traditions that harm some of their members by upholding notions of sexism, rape culture and **toxic masculinity**.

Additionally, as social norms have evolved over time, some PSIs may not have progressed in lock-step fashion. Even when PSIs are attempting to progress and have their members adopt social norms that uphold sexual positivity and healthy relationships, this adoption may be uneven across the entire academic community. Consider that post-secondary institutions can be seen as a collection of communities (e.g., graduate students, undergraduate students, athletics, fraternities) where adoption may be slower for specific communities. For this reason, certain pockets within a post-secondary community may have subcultures that create opportunities for people who cause sexual harm to take advantage of other community members; and without policies and resources on gender-based and sexualized violence, harm can continue to reoccur within that community.

There are three factors related to the academic community, which make up factors 3, 4 and 5 in the Tool.

3. **Institutional Student Life Culture**
4. **Post-secondary Living and Learning Climate**
5. **Policies and Presence of Gender-based and/or Sexualized Violence Resources**

Endorsing any or all of these factors implies that the user of the Community Risk Assessment Tool adopts a pro-feminist stance, as well as sociological analysis and understanding of gender-based and sexualized violence. Users who are unfamiliar with this perspective may under-endorse these factors. We encourage users to raise their consciousness with respect to rape culture, toxic masculinity and sexism. Doing so will help you to better identify the presence or absence of these factors. Appendix E has a few resources that can assist users.

Factor 3: Institutional Student Life Culture

Definition

Although an institution may have clearly articulated values in its strategic and academic plans that uphold and encourage the sexual well-being of its students, staff and faculty, subcultures, countercultures or remnants of past cultures that facilitate nonconsensual sex on campuses may still remain. Altogether, this is generally known as institutional culture. For this factor in the Community Risk Assessment Tool, the focus is on the institutional culture that impacts student life.

Examples of institutional student life culture that may facilitate gender-based and sexualized violence on campuses and create or strengthen rape culture and toxic masculinity often lie within particular settings like athletics, fraternities, Greek societies, student clubs and government, and the social practices that are carried out in these student life areas. Research supports how these student life settings have associated cultures (e.g., party culture, hazing rituals) with social practices that facilitate sexual misconduct (Cheever & Eisenberg, 2020; Koss & Gaines, 1993; Moylan & Javorka, 2020; Murnen & Kohlman, 2007; Thompson & Morrison, 2013). Recent media and research also suggest that the use of online technologies, such as social media platforms (Zaleski et al., 2016), chat forums and message boards, and digital gaming communities (Nakamura, 2019), have led to the creation of sub-communities that have subcultures that promote rape culture, toxic masculinity and hate speech that often result in very real offline consequences (Chan, 2023). Users of this Tool are encouraged to keep up-to-date on these various forms of student life cultures, and how they manifest in terms of social practices—both on- and offline.

Indicators

- Consent culture is not promoted during orientation week.
- There is sexualized cheering/chanting during orientation week.

- There are unsanctioned street parties during homecoming.
- Social media accounts (e.g., @CanadianPartyLife) promote a party lifestyle and obnoxious behaviours.
- Female students are sexually objectified over social media.
- There is sexual competition over female students on athletic teams.
- Homophobic and sexualized comments are made on the chat function of an online course.
- There is homophobic cheering/chanting at an athletics game.
- Female professors are sexualized over social media.
- There's a lack of bystander/upstander training for student government representatives.
- Off-campus parties promote a toxic party lifestyle.
- The post-secondary institution has a "party reputation."

Coding notes

- Paying attention to the social practices of the post-secondary institution's members (e.g., students, staff and faculty) can assist users of this Tool in determining what the institutional culture is.
- PSIs may have student subcommunities that subscribe to cultural norms that make toxic masculinity and rape culture more likely. Examples of such cultural norms would be bro culture (i.e., a modernized version of an "old boys club"); party culture; and a "work hard, play hard" mentality. Similarly, such toxic cultures may be manifested by a lack of responsibility by the institution with regard to alcohol use at campus events.
- Unsanctioned off-campus events that are largely dominated by post-secondary students and have elements of toxic masculinity and rape culture should be considered in your scoring.
- An institution's response to incidents may be considered when reporting procedures are not independent or there is a notable degree of permissiveness in the institution's response or tone.

Factor 4: Post-secondary Living and Learning Climate

Definition

Post-secondary Living and Learning Climate refers to the presence of a negative or toxic climate in specific academic settings. Power differentials which can lead to an abuse of power are inherent in specific academic settings where the focus is on student living and/or learning. Examples of academic settings where an abuse of power can occur and result in a climate that facilitates gender-based and sexualized violence include:

- experiential learning sites where the focus is on work-integrated learning (e.g., practicums, clinical placements, co-ops, apprenticeships, service learning, internships, entrepreneurship);
- instructor-led field trips;
- case competitions; and
- laboratories/incubators.

It is important to note that these types of academic settings are not automatically or necessarily toxic. Rather, it is those specific academic settings where an abuse of power does occur that leave a vacuum for toxic masculinity and rape culture to emerge. The result is a living and learning climate that facilitates gender-based and sexualized violence. This factor reminds us that student life and its corresponding communities and cultures is only one side of a post-secondary institution's community and overarching culture. Another side is the living and learning climate.

A review by Moylan and Javorka (2020) suggests that certain academic settings may indeed be conducive to greater incidents of sexual assault. This was echoed in various Canadian studies where students and coordinators were surveyed on whether they perceived, witnessed, or were the recipient of harassment and/or sexual harassment (Lynch, 2010; Newhook, 2016; Phillips et al., 2019; University of Alberta's Students Union, 2020). Further, student living areas on campus (i.e., residences) are also living and learning settings that should be considered as places where an abuse of power that facilitates gender-based and sexualized violence can occur. Stotzer and MacCartney (2016) have studied how students living on campus have a greater likelihood of experiencing sexual assaults. Users of the Tool are advised to familiarize themselves with their post-secondary institution's various living and learning settings where an abuse of power could potentially occur.

Indicators

- Whisper networks (i.e., informal passing of information to share information about certain people who are reported to sexually harass or abuse others, particularly in a workplace) are present, which persuade students to avoid applying to certain experiential learning sites.
- The PSI lacks policies and procedures to discuss student complaints with a co-operative education site.
- Co-op/placement/practicum site has no articulated policy on responding to complaints of gender-based and sexualized violence by a student.
- There is continued use of a practicum site despite student complaints.
- Field placement coordinator continually needs to address student departures from the same placement site.
- There is a field trip known by students to have a "party vibe."
- Reports of residence advisors ignoring alcohol-fuelled events hosted within the residence hall floor/wing/unit.
- Residence hall has a reputation on social media for sexualized violence.
- A person who has caused harm was not relocated to another residence hall.

Coding notes

- PSIs in North America have been moving towards experiential learning and education. As the move towards this type of education continues, it means recognizing that living and learning climates where an abuse of power can occur have also changed. Abuse of power where gender-based and sexualized violence can occur doesn't only happen behind closed doors of an instructor's office hours or in a traditional lab. Such sexual harm can also take place in other learning environments that have power dynamics and are sanctioned by the post-secondary institution, whether external or internal to the institution itself. Recognizing that living and learning occur in these places can make the user of the Tool more attuned to scoring this factor appropriately.
- A living and learning setting that has a climate that facilitates sexualized violence (e.g., a toxic placement site) and is external to the PSI may have a long-term

partnership arrangement with the institution. Be aware that some PSIs may believe that they have little influence over these external living and learning settings, short of ending their arrangements.

- Users should also pay attention to the industry or sector that the student's living and learning site is situated within. Research has suggested that some industries and sectors may either uphold values like toxic competitiveness or have remnants of hypermasculine culture and cronyism (e.g., technology, business, commerce, law, engineering) and there may be a greater likelihood of gender-based and sexualized violence occurring towards students (Phillips et al., 2019; Lynch, 2010; Newhood, 2016, University of Alberta's Students Union, 2020).
- Other industries and sectors where there is an increased likelihood of violence occurring towards students are those that have a public-facing component to the learning experience and are typically found in legal and regulatory health practica/internships (e.g., medicine, health) (Phillips et al., 2019; University of Alberta's Students Union, 2020). In these settings, violence may not only be enacted by supervisors and preceptors, but also by patients and clients (e.g., student nurses facing sexual harassment from a patient).

Factor 5: Policies and Presence of Gender-Based and/or Sexualized Violence Resources

Definition

The first criterion in this factor pertains to the existence of policies that address gender-based and sexualized violence. It's important to remember that PSIs are not only governed by legislation and statutes, but also the policies and plans developed through collegial governance bodies (e.g., senate, academic councils, governing council, board of governors). Most PSIs develop academic plans for a set period (e.g., five years) that lay out their strategic direction and academic mission. Those same collegial governance bodies may also approve the creation and maintenance of policies that govern the way the institution, as well as its community members (e.g., student, staff and faculty) ought to operate and behave. In essence, these policies (or the absence of these policies) can shape the PSI community and support survivors of gender-based and sexualized violence (Krivoshey et al., 2013; Lee & Wong, 2019).

The second criterion in this factor pertains to the existence and availability of resources and the presence of staff who support the post-secondary community, both of which specifically address gender-based and sexualized violence. With respect to this criteria, we must remember that gender-based and sexualized violence policies can dictate the creation of codes of conduct for various community segments (e.g., codes of conduct for varsity sports teams) and therefore highlight how gender-based and sexualized violence is responded to on a post-secondary institution's campus. Policies can also create procedures to respond to complaints of violence that initiate investigations and dispense discipline (e.g., sexual violence policies, discrimination policies, student codes of non-academic misconduct). Those policies may also give force to the creation and maintenance of offices, resources and programs for community members and charge those support offices to educate the entire community on positive sexuality and consent awareness, and to offer support to those who have been harmed by sexualized violence. Those offices that are well-supported and well-resourced may be effective in responding to gender-based and sexualized violence on campus and mitigating any future harm. Conversely, policies that fail to enunciate what was described above can increase the risk of gender-based and sexualized violence on campus.

Although limited literature has examined the association between the presence of policies and procedures and the prevalence of campus violence, recent research suggests that there is a negative relationship, meaning that such policies are likely related to lower rates of violence (DeLong et al., 2018). Furthermore, it is generally agreed that the absence of such policies would create reduced safety at post-secondary campuses for gender-based and sexualized violence (Butler et al., 2019; Patel & Roesch, 2018).

Indicators

- There is an absence of consent training during orientation week.
- There is no upstander/bystander training for students, staff and faculty.
- Codes of conduct are not articulated for communities within a post-secondary institution that are known to have a student life culture that still upholds rape culture and toxic masculinity (e.g., some sports teams, fraternities and student clubs).

- There is no dedicated office or support person offering support to survivors of sexualized harm.
- Staff of sexual violence offices and stakeholders are not invited or meaningfully consulted for reviews of policies that address sexualized violence at the PSI.
- There is continual burnout or high turnover of staff at sexual violence offices.
- Whisper networks are present because survivors can't rely on the post-secondary institution to protect them.

Coding notes

The absence of policies and resources (e.g., dedicated staff or sexual violence specialists) is a clear reason to endorse this factor in a community risk assessment. However, even when policies and resources exist at a post-secondary institution, Factor 5 may still be endorsed in cases where the procedures that flow from these policies are seen as ineffective or do not truly address the gender-based and sexualized harm endured by survivors who have made a complaint.

Section 3: Factors Related to the Incidence of Gender-Based and Sexualized Violence

Overview

The characteristics of the incident of gender-based and sexualized violence in question do not necessarily, on their own, create harm. Rather, these characteristics may indicate higher risk of harm occurring in the future.

The two risk factors with respect to the incidence of gender-based and sexualized violence, which make up risk factors 6 and 7 in the Tool, are:

6. **Involvement of Substances and/or Alcohol**
7. **Nature of Relationship Between a Survivor and a Person Who Has Caused Harm**

When considering risk factors under Section 3, it is more important to determine whether the risk factor was present during the incident than to understand what led to the risk factor being present. To understand why there is less emphasis on the latter, we need to recognize that there are various pathways that lead to the presence, involvement or occurrence of the risk factors outlined in Section 3. For example, an incident of sexualized violence may involve a person who has caused harm who also struggles with their use of alcohol, while another incident may involve the use of Rohypnol (a drug that causes drowsiness and has been used to perpetrate sexual assault) to facilitate sexualized violence. Both may give rise to future sexual harm but they are the product of two different processes. Users of the Tool are encouraged to focus specifically on whether the risk factors in this section are present, involved or occurred in relation to the gender-based and sexualized violence being assessed.

Factor 6: Involvement of Substances and/or Alcohol

Definition

The involvement of substances and/or alcohol in the violent incident raises concerns about the risk of further perpetration. When the use of substances and/or alcohol facilitates violent behaviour, the individual who perpetrated the violence typically plays an active role in using these substances to incapacitate the survivor. If the individual who perpetrated violence demonstrates dependency on illicit and non-illicit substances, difficulties are often observed by others, including problematic behaviours, issues with school, work, and interpersonal functioning, as well as challenges stabilizing emotions (e.g., outbursts, quick to anger). Individuals who engage in substance abuse sometimes recognize that they rely on substances to cope with stressors in their lives, have difficulty stopping their use of substances and alcohol, and/or spend an inordinate amount of time trying to obtain drugs or alcohol.

In traditional forensic literature, substance use problems are a moderate predictor of criminal and violent behaviour. They are part of the **Central 8** risk factors (i.e., risk factors found to predict general criminal behaviours; Bonta & Andrews, 2017), and are a risk factor for severe sexual violence (Abbey et al., 1998; Koss et al., 1987; Norris, Nurius, & Graham, 1999). It's not surprising then, that empirical studies with post-secondary students have revealed similar patterns (Mellins et al., 2017) and that alcohol consumption including use during post-secondary events has been associated with sexual assaults on campuses (Abbey et al., 2001, 2014; Steele et al., 2020). Relatedly, substance abuse (Carr & VanDeusen, 2002, 2004) has been shown to increase:

- alcohol consumption during sexual encounters (Abbey et al., 2002; Abbey & McAuslan, 2004),
- binge drinking (Humphrey & Kahn, 2000; Mellins et al., 2017),
- attendance at bars and parties that involved alcohol (Testa & Cleveland, 2017), and
- perpetration of sexual assaults (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004) and partner violence by individuals who abused substances (Schumacher et al., 2001) over those who did not.

In addition, marijuana use was also noted in another study (Humphrey & Kahn, 2000) to be related to sexual violence. Further, a number of researchers have consistently reported that at least 50% of sexual assaults against women on campuses involved the use of alcohol or other drugs by the perpetrator, survivor or both (Abbey et al., 2002; Fisher et al., 2000; Krebs et al., 2009; Testa & Parks, 1996). Other researchers have found that sexual assault perpetrators report trying to get women drunk to obtain sex and that they perceive women who are drinking as being sexually available (Kanin, 1985; Mosher & Anderson, 1986, Zawacki et al., 2003). Abbey et al. (1996) found that perpetrators who reported drinking during the assault held stronger beliefs that alcohol increased sexuality than sober perpetrators did. Interestingly, an older study demonstrated how nicotine could be a predictor of sexual aggression severity (Koss & Gaines, 1993); however, a later study showed that neither nicotine, caffeine use, nor merely ingesting alcohol, was related to sexual assault (Humphrey & Kahn, 2000). In conclusion, despite some conflicting and varied scholarship, the literature seems to strongly suggest that the use of substances and alcohol makes sexual assaults more likely.

Indicators

- Alcohol and/or other substances were used before or as the gender-based or sexualized violence occurred.
- Alcohol and/or other substances were used while attending an event where these substances were present and possibly promoted.
- The person who caused harm has admitted to struggling with alcohol and/or substance dependency, increasing the likelihood that alcohol/substances were used prior to the sexual violence occurring.

Coding notes

- If the survivor reports memory loss or unclear memories about the sexual violence they experienced, consider asking questions about alcohol/substance use and sensitively asking if the survivor was drugged with substances like Rohypnol (more commonly known as "roofies").
- Lawyer et al. (2010) stated that "drug-related sexual assaults on college campuses are more frequent than are forcible assaults and are most frequently preceded by voluntary alcohol consumption" (p. 453). If alcohol was involved hours before the assault, consider asking whether drugs were later used.
- Survivors and people who have caused harm may not be immediately forthcoming about their use of drugs and substances. Try to adopt a non-shaming tone and approach when asking questions about alcohol and substance use.

Factor 7: Nature of Relationship Between a Survivor and a Person Who Has Caused Harm

Definition

Generally speaking, the relationship between a survivor and the person who has caused harm is characterized as impaired or harmful in nature. When the interpersonal relationship is an intimate partner situation (i.e., dating, cohabitating or married; past or current partners) there may be a consistent presence of dissatisfaction and conflict, and the relationship may be hostile, uncaring and neglectful. Such relationships may also be wrought with coercive controlling behaviours, frequent arguments, threats and violence, and in the case of ex-partners, may include stalking and harassment. If the relationship is not a partner relationship, (e.g., friends, acquaintances or hook-ups) dissatisfaction and conflict related to unrealistic or unwanted expectations and objectification and/or disrespect towards the survivor may be present. Hence, a problematic relationship, whether it is an intimate partner or non-partner relationship, is considered a risk factor.

A handful of studies have found existing relationships with a partner may increase the chance for violent behaviour because the person who has caused harm may carry a false sense of entitlement (e.g., “she owes me”) (Hanson et al., 2007; Helmus et al., 2013). Further, higher levels of prior consensual sexual activity with the survivor and misperceiving the woman’s sexual intentions for a longer period were also associated with greater likelihood of sexual assault (Abbey et al., 2001). A 2018 Statistics Canada report on sexual assault found that in three-quarters of incidents reported, perpetrators of sexual assaults were known to the survivors (Cotter & Savage, 2019). The general literature on sexual violence suggests that the nature of the relationship between a survivor and a person who has caused harm is an important consideration when evaluating risk.

With respect to sexual assaults on post-secondary campuses, both Canadian and American statistics confirm that an overwhelming majority (from 80 to 90 percent of survivors) knew the person who caused harm (CFS-Ontario, 2015; National Institute of Justice, 2018). An earlier study also identified how the person who has caused harm and was known by the survivor would typically be a friend, classmate/fellow student, dating partner/spouse, ex-dating partner/ex-spouse or an acquaintance (Krebs, Barrick, Lindquist, Crosby, Boyd & Bogan, 2007). Additionally, many instances of intimate partner violence have been reported and associated with on-campus sexualized violence (Profitt & Ross, 2017).

The nature of sexual relationships amongst emerging adults on post-secondary campuses is dynamic, and studies have suggested that non-committed and casual sexual relationships (i.e., “hook-ups”) create risk for sexual violence as well (Flack et al., 2016; Steele et al., 2022). These studies suggest what the general literature on sexual violence has also found, which is how familiarity between the survivor and the person who has caused harm facilitates the opportunity for harm to occur. What’s unique about sexualized violence at post-secondary institutions is that such harm may occur in the context of intimate relationships or casual and non-committed relationships. Older research has shown that intimate partner relationships wrought with conflict that are deemed non-egalitarian tend to have higher rates of violence (Coleman & Straus, 1986) and more recently, a meta-analysis suggested that relationship dissatisfaction, emotional abuse, accusations of infidelity and patterns of demand/withdrawal seen in relationships were more associated with partner abuse against women (Spencer et al., 2019).

Indicators

- The person who caused harm harassed or stalked the survivor.
- There were patterns of coercive and controlling behaviours by the person who caused harm against their partner (intimate relationship).
- The person who caused harm mistreated a casual sex partner.
- Threats or violence were present in the relationship.
- The person who caused harm showed disregard and disrespect towards the survivor.
- Patterns of arguments, accusations and/or put-downs against an intimate or casual sexual partner were evident in the relationship.
- A power differential is evident in the relationship and unwanted by the survivor (i.e., survivor wants more of an egalitarian relationship).

Coding notes

- Hook-up culture is a current phenomenon among emerging adults where the promise of a romantic relationship is not necessarily desired after a sexual encounter. The sexual encounter can range from kissing to sexual intercourse. The rise of hook-up culture among students may be due in part to changing social norms around sexual positivity and the growing normativity of such relationships in popular culture (Garcia et al., 2012). This factor is not related to the presence of hook-up behaviour. It is only present if the hook-up relationship is toxic, disrespectful or involves objectification.

- Inasmuch as hook-up culture is a way for emerging adults to express sexual positivity, the research also reveals that participation may result in sexualized violence (Flack et al., 2016). Keep in mind that not all hook-ups result in sexualized violence. That said, some types of hook-ups are seen as riskier than others. As noted in the above indicators, hook-ups with acquaintances who are not friends, and hook-ups with former romantic partners pose more risk for sexual violence (Flack et al., 2016). Other types of hook-ups (i.e., friends hooking up for the first time, friends who have hooked up previously, and anonymous sexual partners) were not found to pose more risk for sexualized violence.

Section 4: Factors Related to the Person Who Has Caused Harm

Overview

Section 4 includes a set of factors that relate to the individual who has caused harm. These factors are about characteristics that are associated with increased risk for further misconduct related to gender-based and/or sexualized violence.

The presence of these factors should be considered in the context of the recently reported incident and may be inferred from the individual's behaviour, as well as from self-reports and collateral reports from others who have witnessed the behaviour of the individual or who know them. Single instances reflecting these factors may be considered; however, greater weight should be placed on patterns of consistent behaviours or tendencies.

These factors relate to behaviours, attitudes, beliefs, values and thinking that emerge because of past experiences. In some cases, these past experiences may appear as oppressive attitudes (see Factor 8), sexual preoccupation (see Factor 9), carrying out inappropriate sexual behaviours (see Factor 10), or engaging in controlling and sexually coercive behaviours in intimate relationships (see Factor 13).

Child abuse experiences are not a risk factor on their own; however, if an individual who has experienced childhood abuse has a consistent and pervasive perspective that leads to problematic sexual experiences, such as feeling entitled to sex in an intimate relationship, it would be considered a risk factor (see Factor 16).

Regardless of the source, it is the manifestation of these behaviours that is important to examine and assess in this section. In other words, to conduct a valid and evidence-based assessment of risk, focus on the presence of these factors (i.e., *what* factors exist and are reflected in the individual being assessed) and not on the source of these factors (i.e., *why* these factors emerged or developed).

Section 4 comprises nine factors, which make up factors 8 through 16 of the Tool:

8. **Oppressive Attitudes, Beliefs and Values about Women**
9. **Sexual Preoccupation**
10. **Past Perpetration**

11. **Impulsivity**
12. **Callous Disregard**
13. **Controlling and Coercive**
14. **Antisociality**
15. **Participates in Hypermasculine Culture**
16. **Problematic Sexual Expectations and Beliefs**

Factor 8: Oppressive Attitudes, Beliefs and Values About Women

Definition

Oppressive attitudes, beliefs and values about women and gender minorities may show up in the form of misogynistic values, feelings of hostility towards women, endorsement of sexually aggressive behaviours, subscription to rape myths and belief in racial tropes about women. These types of beliefs and values about women may lead a person to objectify and depersonalize women and survivors. Furthermore, these perspectives are often used as a way to wrongly justify and excuse past inappropriate and abusive behaviours, including coercive sex, harassment and the use of violence or force.

Entrenched oppressive attitudes, beliefs and values about women and gender minorities are seen in a variety of ways across various settings. However, in prosocial environments like post-secondary settings, explicitly exhibiting such views may be less likely. Therefore, sources of information gathered by the assessor should include a variety of observations of behaviours and reporting of behaviours by others. Additionally, the assessor should consider whether persons who have caused harm have trivialized harmful actions or associate with groups or social networks that endorse such behaviours.

This factor has consistently been shown to be a contributor to gender-based and sexualized violence in many studies examining post-secondary contexts (Abbey & McAuslan, 2004; Dadgardoust et al., 2022; Humphrey & Kahn, 2000; Malamuth et al., 2021; Thompson et al., 2013, 2015; Thompson & Morrison, 2013; Yescavage, 1999). Individuals who have perpetrated sexual violence on campuses more often view interpersonal violence as an acceptable way of dealing with conflict (DeGue & DiLillo, 2004). These findings are also consistent with what has been found in other non-forensic settings, such as the military (Stander et al., 2018) and are congruous with the forensic literature that outlines “offence-supportive attitudes” (i.e., cognitive distortions, pro-criminal attitudes, attitudes supportive of sexual assault) as predictive of sexual reoffending (Mann et al., 2010).

Indicators

The individual who has caused harm:

- carries misogynistic values (i.e., anti-women views),
- expresses hostility towards women,
- endorses the use of sexually aggressive behaviours,
- endorses rape myths (e.g., “she was asking for it”),
- endorses racial tropes about women (e.g., derogative, racialized).

Coding notes

Avoid scoring this factor based on the *sources* of these behaviours and attitudes. Although past adverse childhood experiences may lead to inappropriate behaviours or attitudes expressed in adulthood, child abuse experiences are not a risk factor on their own. It is the manifestations of these behaviours that are important to examine and assess in this section. In other words, focus on the presence of these factors (i.e., *what* factors exist and are reflected in the individual being assessed) and not on the source of these factors (i.e., *why* these factors emerged or developed).

Although the person who caused harm may not explicitly make oppressive statements to the interviewer, a pattern of adoption or endorsement may reflect underlying oppressive beliefs. For example, a person who has caused harm may say, "It's not my place to challenge my friend when he was being a douchebag to his girlfriend" or endorse “bros before hoes” as a code of conduct or listens often to misogynistic social influencers.

Factor 9: Sexual Preoccupation

Definition

Factor 9 refers to the consistent tendency of the person who caused the harm to show sexual preoccupation, which is an abnormally intense interest in sex that dominates psychological functioning. Difficulty regulating sexual behaviours can take multiple forms, such as using sex to cope with negative emotions, ruminating about sexual acts in general or with a particular individual, or spending an inordinate amount of time focused on sex-related behaviours. Often this preoccupation interferes with work, school and interpersonal functioning.

This factor has consistently been shown to have a strong relationship with sexual offending behaviour. Studies have shown that obsessive and/or addictive thoughts or behaviours, as well as addiction to pornography use is associated with perpetration in post-secondary students. More specifically, frequent exposure to pornography (Carr & VanDeusen, 2002, 2004; Thompson & Morrison, 2013; Thompson et al., 2015; Vega & Malamuth, 2007) and sexual compulsivity is more prevalent among those who have perpetrated sexually inappropriate behaviours (Thompson et al., 2015). In the forensic literature, a strong predictor of sexual recidivism is sexual preoccupation (Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2004), or abnormally intense interest in sex that dominates psychological functioning (Mann et al., 2010). As such, preoccupation with sex ought to be considered a risk factor in assessing the risk of a person causing future sexual harm.

Indicators

The person who has caused harm:

- spends a lot of time accessing, finding and using sexually exploitative materials;
- spends a lot of time with sexual self-gratification behaviours (e.g., masturbation, sexual hook-ups);
- relies on or frequently uses sex-related behaviours when experiencing negative emotions or stress;
- has sex-related behaviours that have interfered with functioning (e.g., missing classes, late for work, spending less time socially than before).

Coding notes

- Investigating sexual preoccupation involves asking personal questions of a sexual nature. It is expected that the assessor be familiar and comfortable with talking about sexual practices, interests and preferences.
- Similarly, the assessor should be aware that individuals being assessed may have never been asked such personal questions before. Therefore, the assessor should be sensitive to the personal nature of the interview.

Factor 10: Past Perpetration

Definition

Any past incidents of violence should be considered, as they are indicators of future gender-based and/or sexualized violence perpetration. Past incidents can take multiple forms, such as any criminal history, allegations, claims of sexual misconduct and/or interpersonal violence and so on. This factor refers to a broad definition of past perpetration that includes any gender-based or sexualized violence, which can take a number of forms, such as assault, physical restraint, rape, unwanted touching and forcible confinement. In addition, non-contact gender-based and/or sexualized violence should be considered. For instance, gender-based violence may include cyber aggression, threats, harassment, humiliation, intimidation, coercively controlling behaviours and economic control. Meanwhile, sexualized violence may include sexting, recording and/or sharing of images and video, sexually coercive behaviours and sexual harassment. Non-direct forms of abuse should also be considered, such as threats to harm family members, animals, or other individuals in the survivor's social network, as well as threats to jeopardize the survivor's immigration status, work or school standing, position, or performance, or to damage their personal property.

Several studies that have examined previous perpetration of verbal, physical or sexual aggression have shown it to be a significant factor (Gidycz et al., 2007; Loh et al., 2005; White & Smith, 2004), and in one meta-analytic study that examined eight different factors, past perpetration emerged as the strongest predictor (Steele et al., 2020). Common in the field of forensic psychology, criminal histories for violent and sexual behaviour are one of the strongest predictors of future violent and sexual reoffending (Hanson, 2009; Quinsey et al., 2006) and are a consistent factor in most existing risk tools (see Hogan & Olver, 2019).

Indicators

The person who has caused harm has a history of:

- assaulting others, including the survivor;
- sexually assaulting or abusing others, including the survivor;
- harming animals, family, friends or property in the context of intimate partner conflict;

- making verbal threats (direct or veiled) to harm the survivor or their animals, family or friends;
- making direct threats to hurt others, including the survivor or past partners;
- making indirect threats (e.g., to send photos or information to others).

Coding notes

- Assessment of this factor should rely on a variety of sources of information. These are not limited to formal criminal histories or school records, but may include observations of behaviours and/or reports of behaviours from the survivor, post-secondary staff, or others acquainted with the individual.
- Formal documentation, such as criminal records, may not be accessible in an assessment; so self-reports, past reports to the institution (e.g., student conduct records) and survivor/witness reporting may be relied upon for this information.

Factor 11: Impulsivity

Definition

Factor 11 refers to a history of engaging in behaviours without concern for or thought of the consequences. There may be various reasons for the individual's impulsivity; however, it is the manifestation of this behaviour that is of concern. The presence of this factor means that the individual acts without planning or behaves on the "spur of the moment." Some may view impulsive individuals as taking unnecessary risks, being irresponsible or being thoughtless, but the key issue that must be considered to score this factor is the consistent lack of forethought, regardless of whether the person takes responsibility for their actions or performs such behaviours to satisfy a need for stimulation (i.e., risk-taking tendencies).

In the forensic literature, impulsivity is a component of antisocial personality, which is known for its association with criminal behaviour and various forms of violent behaviours. Such behaviours may include abrupt changes of plans; moving suddenly to a new place or new city; breaking up with a partner unexpectedly; quitting employment without notice; or dropping out of classes, their program or school entirely. Although not necessarily related to sexualized behaviour, this risk factor may contribute to a person's inability to self-regulate their sexual behaviour. In post-secondary settings, dropping a course or out of school entirely, without consideration, may be an indication that this factor is present. A pattern of this behaviour should be evident in other parts of the individual's life as well. For example, other instances demonstrating evidence of a pattern of impulsivity may include breaking off relationships, shirking responsibilities or performing risky tasks without appropriate skills.

Existing literature has shown that general sensation-seeking behaviours or markers of impulsivity (Thompson et al., 2015; van Brunt et al., 2015) are remarkable risk factors for consideration. The forensic literature has a great deal of evidence suggesting that traits comprising the personality disorder of psychopathy are concerning and are related to violence recidivism. One of those traits on a measure of psychopathic traits called the Psychopathy Checklist–Revised (PCL-R; Hare, 2003) is impulsivity. Impulsivity is already embedded as a risk factor in many risk assessment tools because it distinguishes between those who re-offend violently from those who do not (Edwards et al., 2003; Moffit et al., 2002; Prentky et al., 1995; Stanford et al., 2002). Impulsivity is also considered a basic risk factor for sexual and intimate partner violence on campuses because it shows an inability to regulate certain behaviours such as aggression (Plutchik & Van Pragg, 1997; Webster & Jackson, 1997). Impulsivity as a risk factor for violence is also often associated with alcohol and/or drug use, which can exacerbate impulsive behaviours (Cadet et al., 2014; Hamberger & Hastings, 1991; Schafer et al., 2004). Whiteside and Lynam (2001) also note that sensation-seeking behaviour (i.e., tendency to engage in exciting and arousing activities) is a key aspect of impulsivity (Deckman & DeWall, 2011). Sensation-seeking behaviour is linked to risky sexual behaviour, with many scholars documenting the relationship between risky sexual behaviours and impulsive sensation-seeking via frequent alcohol-induced sexual encounters (Cooper, 1994), less condom use (Donohew et al., 2000; Robbins & Bryan, 2004), and earlier sexual initiation (Kahn et al., 2002) amongst other risky sexual behaviours (Zapolski et al., 2009; Zuckerman, 2007). The most common manifestation of impulsive behaviour is negative and positive urgency, wherein a person's actions are dictated by a negative or positive emotional state (Cyders & Smith, 2008). This may manifest on campuses in the form of students celebrating a sporting victory or the end of the semester with increased alcohol consumption to further enhance their mood (Cooper et al., 2000), or it may look like students being eager to download online dating apps to engage in casual sex after being rejected by a potential partner (Deckman & DeWall, 2011).

Indicators

The person who has caused harm has:

- abruptly dropped out of courses,
- abruptly dropped out of their program or school,
- broken up with an intimate partner without notice or reason,
- quit jobs suddenly and without warning,
- moved often from place to place,
- often changed their plans unexpectedly,
- made quick decisions without considering the consequences.

Coding notes

- Evaluating this factor will often rely on the self-report of the person who caused harm, or on reports from the survivor, friends or acquaintances, or professors and post-secondary staff.
- A single instance of impulsivity should be interpreted with caution. Sustained or prolonged patterns of impulsivity provide a stronger demonstration that this risk factor is present.
- During evaluation of impulsive behaviours it is important to assess the individual's explanation for their behaviour. If it is without cause or reasonable explanation, then there is a stronger likelihood that this is a risk factor that should be scored as present.

Factor 12: Callous Disregard

Definition

Factor 12 refers to a consistent tendency to disregard or not attend to the feelings, safety or integrity of others. At best, such individuals are self-interested. At worst, they can be viewed as callous, impersonal and selfish. Their lack of empathy aligns with a view that others are meant to be manipulated. Although there may be some overlap between traits of callous disregard and narcissism, the latter is not required to consider the characteristics reflected in this factor. This factor could be exemplified by an individual's lack of emotions towards others (e.g., blunted, does not express emotions or react to others' distress) and moral dysfunction (e.g., unable to see wrongness in their behaviour) (Vasconcelos et al., 2021).

Forensic research identifies that callousness and lack of remorse form part of the psychopathic trait spectrum, and there is much evidence that psychopathy is associated with increased likelihood of future violent behaviour (see PCL-R, Hare, 2003; Hare, 2002; also, Aebi et al., 2022; Kimonis et al., 2016; Mann et al., 2010; Piquero, 2017). Within the campus context, a few researchers have suggested similar associations (van Brunt et al., 2015), with a handful of studies reporting significant differences among post-secondary students who perpetrated sexual violence compared to those who did not (Abbey & McAuslan, 2004; DeGue & DiLillo, 2004; Hudson-Flege et al., 2020). DeGue and DiLillo (2004) further found that men who engaged in sexually coercive behaviours were more likely to display psychopathic traits than those who did not engage in sexual coercion. Such research suggests that a person who has caused harm and has a callous attitude towards others should be considered a risk factor.

Indicators

The person who has caused harm:

- shows blunted affect or lack of guilt for the harm they caused to the survivor;
- is unable to or refuses to see how their behaviour caused harm to the survivor;
- makes statements that dismiss or downplay the harm to the survivor;
- places blame or externalizes responsibility onto the survivor (e.g., “She deserved it;” “She had it coming;” “She has no one to blame but herself.”);
- shows no concern for the feelings of others, including the survivor or post-secondary officials (e.g., “Why do I care what other people think?”);
- exhibits predatory-like behaviour (e.g., chooses early weeks of the academic year to target younger and less-informed students, such as freshmen or international students);
- has repeatedly targeted survivors who may appear more vulnerable (e.g., seeking survivors with past victimizations).

Coding notes

Much of the evidence to assess this factor will likely come from interviews and other documented quotes of the individual's statements to others (e.g., reported to a response coordinator, security, etc.). Direct quotes (i.e., the individual's exact words) are important to document as they will give voice to the expression of callous disregard. A collection of examples should be used to assess this factor's presence.

What may be notable to consider are any patterns that demonstrate consistent predatory behaviour on those who are perceived to be of lower social status and/or power. For instance, older or more senior students preying on younger students, such as those who are in their freshman year and are not yet acclimatized or who are less experienced and knowledgeable about policies and sexual violence supports at an institution.

Factor 13: Controlling and Coercive

Definition

Factor 13 refers to an individual who perpetrates gender-based violence demonstrating a pervasive pattern of control and coercion over the survivor. Such behaviours are often "invisible," unless one closely observes the individual's behaviour over a period of time or the pattern is recognized by the survivor. These behaviours are often described as coercive control (Dutton & Goodman, 2005; Hamberger et al., 2017), and there are multiple expressions. One pattern is controlling the finances of the survivor in order to prevent them from gaining or maintaining their financial independence (e.g., examining how they spend their money). Another pattern is controlling the relationships between the survivor and others or even themselves (e.g., checking their phone; listening in on their conversations; giving the silent treatment). Isolating the survivor from a support system or from their own freedom and autonomy are just some ways coercive and controlling behaviour manifests. A third pattern involves an individual manipulating the survivor's well-being — for example, through gaslighting, which involves making the survivor question themselves and lose trust in their own perceptions and judgments. This is achieved through the abusive partner's repeated undermining and imposed distortion of the survivor's reality. A survivor's well-being may also be manipulated by the person who has caused harm through putdowns, direct threats to cause harm, or indirect threats to inflict harm on themselves or on the survivor's pets, friends or family members.

It is important to recognize that the general method used to sexually assault a survivor can vary, but in a campus context, coercive tactics are more likely to occur. Research suggests that patterns of grooming survivors or using threats and ultimatums may be an early sign of controlling and coercive behaviour in post-secondary settings (van Brunt et al., 2015). One study examined the person who caused harm's use of coercive tactics and found that students who endorsed more rape-supportive and antisocial thinking reported using more coercive and aggressive tactics (Dadgardoust et al., 2022). In the partner violence literature, many of these behaviours are reflective of risk for further violence and harm (Hilton et al., 2022). Some individuals are targeted more frequently for various reasons (see Ptacek, 1999, for more on "social entrapment," where certain individuals — undocumented women, women of colour — are more susceptible to control because of their prior disempowerment by systemic oppression). For instance, a recent study by McKay White and Fjellner (2022) examined the presence of economic abuse in partner-abusive relationships and found that this was more likely in relationships when the survivor has a lower income (e.g., < 30K).

Indicators

- Limiting a partner's access to money or preventing them from going to work or classes to reduce their independence.
- Isolating the survivor from a support system, such as family, friends or co-workers, through various means (e.g., limiting access to transportation, preventing them from leaving home, sharing private information to harm survivor's relationships with others, preventing them from attending classes or campus events).
- Undermining and distorting a survivor's reality by denying facts, the situation around them or their feelings and needs (i.e., gaslighting).
- Threatening to harm themself.
- Threatening to hurt the survivor's friend, family, child or pet.
- Checking to see where the survivor has been or who they have been seeing (e.g., checking emails or text messages, constantly texting or calling to check on the survivor and their whereabouts, placing GPS or airtags on the survivor's car or in their bag, looking through the survivor's purse).

Coding notes

- Single instances should be considered with caution. Patterns of coercively controlling behaviours over time should be weighted more strongly.
- The post-secondary environment and ever-changing youth culture can sometimes bring about new behaviours and social practices, which may include new tactics for coercing and controlling others. A recent example to be aware of is **technology-facilitated sexual violence** or **TFSV**. Broadly, TFSV includes, but is not limited to, "online sexual harassment, image-based sexual exploitation, cyberstalking, gender- and sexuality-based harassment, and sexual assault and/or coercion" (Zhong et al., 2020). TSFV includes situations where "victim-survivors of intimate partner violence are tracked by their abusive partners who use technology to monitor their movements and communication" (Dunn, 2020). When survivors know that they are being monitored, it creates a menacing atmosphere where they feel coerced and controlled.
- Another common instance of TFSV, for the purpose of sexual exploitation and thus control, is the creation and dissemination of "deepfakes" — an artificial intelligence technique that maps out the details of a person's face and superimposes it onto the body of another person in a hyper-realistic video (Chesney & Citron, 2019; Thomasen & Dunn, 2021). This form of TFSV ultimately allows the person creating the video to depict anyone doing anything, including performing sexual acts or appearing nude. The threat of disseminating such images can become a tool for the person who has caused harm to coerce and control the survivor. A recent report via Deeptrace Labs found that "96% of all deepfake videos were pornographic and nonconsensual videos made of women" (Ajder et al., 2019; Thomasen & Dunn, 2021).
- Note that when threats of self-harm or harm to the survivor are made to prevent the survivor from associating with others or leaving the person who has caused harm, and are purposely intended to manipulate the survivor, they may be deemed coercively controlling behaviours.

Factor 14: Antisociality

Definition

Factor 14 refers to a pattern of antisocial behaviours that typically result in personal or social harm, and in more extreme cases lead to legal or other consequences. A pattern would imply that the behaviours are pervasive (i.e., occur more than once, with some regularity) and consistent (i.e., generally occur in more than one setting or context). Antisociality is characterized by not only showing a disregard for the safety of others, but by irresponsible behaviours that may lead to breaking the law. These behaviours have the potential to lead to criminal behaviour, or not following rules, processes and procedures in more prosocial settings, like post-secondary institutions.

Antisociality is often, unfortunately, confused with "asociality." The latter refers to not wanting to be social and avoiding social interactions. Meanwhile, antisociality can be better defined as "anti-society" and refers to behaviours that oppose social order and social rules of conduct. Again, those with antisocial personality patterns tend to break rules and social conventions (e.g., skip appointments, shoplift goods) and violate societal norms (e.g., take advantage of vulnerable people, lie about themselves). They are usually irresponsible in their behaviours towards family, friends and colleagues and may feel no obligation towards them. They may choose to take risks and behave impulsively without regard for their own safety or the safety of others and are less likely to plan ahead or to consider the consequences of their actions.

In the forensic literature, the presence of antisociality is one of the strongest predictors of future criminal behaviour, including violent and sexually violent outcomes (Bonta et al., 2017; Hanson, 2009; Hilton & Radatz, 2018). Although antisociality may appear less relevant in post-secondary settings than in the criminal justice system, a few studies have noted markers of antisociality that may be worthy of consideration. For instance, adolescent delinquency has consistently been found to be associated with sexual misconduct behaviours on campuses (Abbey & McAuslan, 2004; DeGue & DiLillo, 2004; Steele et al., 2020). Furthermore, in two studies by Zinzow and Thompson (2015a, 2015b), more of those who engaged in forcible acts had antisocial traits — which were defined by low levels of empathy, conning and superficial charm, pervasive anger, impulsivity, and sexual compulsivity — compared to those who engaged in verbally coercive acts. Outside of campus research, delinquency and misconduct were also found to be associated with sexual assault behaviours in a military sample (Stander et al., 2018).

As the research demonstrates, antisociality may be less frequently seen among the general population, including post-secondary students, given the expectation that people in general are more prosocial in their nature when compared to those involved with the criminal justice system. However, the indicators below provide examples of how antisociality may manifest among a post-secondary community population.

Indicators

The person who had caused harm has a history of:

- rule violations,
- academic misconduct,
- consistent academic integrity issues,
- non-academic misconduct behaviours.

Coding notes

- Not to be confused with "a-social," antisociality refers to being "anti-society." This includes being defiant to rules and etiquette expected in civilized and prosocial society, such as respect for authority, respecting others, and respecting laws and rules.
- If there is concern that the behaviour is contextual (e.g., the person only engages in these behaviours when hanging around a couple of childhood friends), further assessment of whether there are other instances of antisocial patterns of behaviour will be needed.
- It's important to note that an individual may present well in a single instance (e.g., may appear engaging, cooperative, charming), and therefore antisocial features may be missed. Try to get more information from various sources to determine if this factor is present (i.e., interviews with others who are acquainted with the individual being assessed).
- Antisociality is related to antisocial personality disorder, which is a formal psychiatric diagnosis characterized by past criminal behaviour, juvenile delinquency and

anti-authority behaviours (see diagnostic criteria in American Psychiatric Association, 2013).

- You may find that an individual has a history of physical altercations and demonstrates an anti-authority attitude. In such cases, there may be concern about redundancy between Factors 10 (past perpetration) and 14 (antisociality), but it would be important to note the presence of both factors.
- Although some individuals are part of specific communities, such as involuntary celibates (incels) that promote antisocial behaviours, assessors should fully assess the presence of these antisocial features in the individual before making assumptions.

Factor 15: Participates in Hypermasculine Culture

Definition

Peer influence plays a role in criminal and antisocial behaviours. Specifically, when peer norms that support gender-based and sexualized violence are present and influential, this risk factor is considered relevant for a person who has caused harm. It is particularly concerning when the individual participates in a problematic culture of hypermasculine beliefs, practices and behaviours. Hypermasculinity refers to exaggerated or overemphasized masculine behaviour or traits that impact expectations of how boys and men should conform in society. Terms such as “man up,” “boys don’t cry,” and “macho” are often associated with hypermasculine beliefs and attitudes. Current campus lingo may refer to these hypermasculine beliefs and attitudes as toxic masculinity.

Problematic cultures of hypermasculinity are encouraged via systems of hegemonic masculinity. Connell and Messerschmidt (2005) define hegemonic masculinity as the societal practices that normalize the privileging of men in a dominant position without merit, subsequently justifying women being placed in subordinate roles. Hegemonic masculinity is often linked to the socialization of boys and young men (Edwards & Jones, 2009; Harper & Harris, 2009; Kimmel, 2008; Tillapaugh & McGowan, 2019), ultimately leading to men who attend post-secondary institutions being drawn toward policies, structures and socialized cultural practices and rituals that encourage these same standards of hegemonic masculinity, reinforcing masculinity as a lever to obtain experience to be used as a tool of dominance and power (Tillapaugh, 2023). Furthermore, scholars focused on the impacts of hegemonic masculinities (see Edwards & Jones, 2009; Kimmel, 2008; Messerschmidt, 2019; Radimer & Rowan-Kenyon, 2019; Scott-Samuel et al., 2009; Tillapaugh & McGowan, 2019) have argued that “the socialization of hegemonic masculinity is internalized, reinforced, and enforced through peer-to-peer relationships and cultural practices within various student cultures/organizations/spaces on campus” (Tillapaugh, 2023). In fact, the growing hateful socio-political rhetoric surrounding gender, masculinity and sexuality have made it such that hegemonic masculinity has grown even more toxic. The “traditional notions of being a man — that is, a narrow and constraining understanding...characterized by dominance, aggression, strength, and sexual conquest” (Grant & MacDonald, 2020) are being embraced and embodied to a greater extent, to the notable detriment of women and others who are structurally marginalized. This is particularly dangerous as men embroiled in this set of beliefs often end up enacting acts of targeted violence, as they perceive themselves as being tasked with working to return society to its “proper” order (Connell & Messerschmidt, 2005; Grant & MacDonald, 2020). Knowing this, active participation in hypermasculine culture (not just the mere presence of hypermasculine culture) is an important risk factor to consider in the perpetration of gender-based and sexualized violence.

Relatedly in the forensic literature, pro-criminal peers, which is one of the Central 8 risk factors identified by Bonta and Andrews (2017), are deemed a psychologically meaningful risk factor predictive of general criminal behaviours, including violence, and other research has found that this risk factor is predictive of sexual reoffending behaviours (Mann et al., 2010). One could argue that pro-criminal peers may be less likely in a campus setting, given the relatively prosocial atmosphere. However, “pro-criminal” could easily be substituted with “peer norms that endorse rape culture” or “peer norms that advocate gender-based abuse and violence.” Although many sources of these peer norms are suggested in the literature, the participation of the individual in settings that are characterized by hypermasculine culture is the main concern. Some of these settings may include, but are not limited to, post-secondary sports and athletic departments and team organizations, on-and off-campus fraternities, clubs and student groups, and specific residence settings, buildings or associations.

Several studies and a meta-analysis have also noted that peer norms that support sexual violence are associated with increased perpetration of sexual violence and sexually coercive behaviours (Abbey et al., 2001; Humphrey & Kahn, 2000; Steele et al., 2020;

Thompson & Morrison, 2013; Thompson et al., 2013, 2015). Related to these findings is that a greater interest or involvement in fraternities was shown to be associated with perpetration in another study (Seabrook et al., 2018). This finding was also replicated in a meta-analytic study by Steele et al. (2020). Additionally, research studying how alcohol and party culture that exists on campuses facilitates the perpetration of sexually inappropriate behaviours in athletics and fraternities also highlights how sports and/or fraternity culture should be considered a risk factor for sexual harm occurring at a post-secondary institution (Moylan & Javorka, 2020).

Indicators

The person who has caused harm:

- participates in fraternity initiations, such as hazing;
- does not see problems with fraternity initiations, such as hazing;
- carries a “must-win-at-all-costs” attitude in their athletic sportsmanship;
- engages in and/or reinforces the objectification of women with peers (e.g., rating women, humiliating, catcalling).

Coding notes

- In addition to assessing the *presence of hypermasculine culture* in the settings and groups that the individual associates with, it’s important to examine the expectations of these settings and groups. For instance, how are violations handled? Are processes fair and just? Are individuals held accountable for inappropriate behaviours? Are there guidelines or policies, such as a code of conduct, in place? Examine the organization or department’s behaviour to assess whether there is proper leadership and messaging surrounding inappropriate or abusive behaviours.
- Understanding and reviewing how past violations have been addressed may be part of evaluating the culture in hypermasculine settings in which the individual participates.
- It may be important to examine whether there are special privileges that negate bad behaviour in these settings. For instance, in some sports and athletic settings, there may be practices that allow special privileges to be given to some athletes

regardless of their inappropriate behaviour within or outside of their post-secondary institutional setting.

- Hypermasculine culture may also include the use of substances (alcohol or rape drugs) as part of the context of partying.

Factor 16: Problematic Sexual Expectations and Beliefs

Definition

The final factor in this Tool refers to problematic sexual expectations and beliefs with respect to relationships and sexual intimacy. Regardless of whether these expectations and beliefs are due to having difficulties forming relationships, lacking interpersonal skills, or engaging in hook-up culture, the main premise behind this risk factor is that the expectations and beliefs of the individual can cause harm to others and/or themselves. When an individual carries problematic sexual expectations (e.g., *If she was okay with taking her clothes off, that means she's consenting to sex too*) and beliefs (e.g., *I paid for everything on our date, so now she owes me sex*), it may lead to inappropriate sexual behaviours, sexually coercive behaviours, gender-based violence or sexually abusive harm to others. Meanwhile, when it comes to harming themselves, a person's problematic sexual expectations and beliefs may lead to sexual self-regulation problems and may interfere with everyday functioning.

An individual's expectations related to how sex will unfold become problematic when such notions are rigid and unrealistic (e.g., when expectations are about not needing consent, or about how consent given for one type of sexual behaviour automatically means the person is consenting to other sexual behaviours now or in the future). Those who perpetrate sexual assault may report expecting that once a sexual act starts, the other party should finish the act to completion. Similarly, while some hook-up experiences may begin consensual, not all encounters end that way. People who have caused harm are often people whom the survivor trusts, including classmates, friends and/or sexual partners (Flack et al., 2016). This trust is taken advantage of by the person who causes harm, who often feels justified by their expectations. Furthermore, as the relationship between the person who caused harm and the survivor becomes more intimate, the perception of the situation becomes less serious, cementing an assumed level of consent that may give way to more harm (Flack et al., 2016).

There are many non-normative, harmful, and firm ideas about sex and sexual intimacy that lead to problematic beliefs. Individuals who think that they *must* have their sexual needs met are one troubling example. This same example can also have troubling effects on someone who does not have an intimate partner. Such a belief can lead to frustration and has the potential to contribute to the risk of sexual violence. A contemporary manifestation of this is involuntary celibates, otherwise known as incels. This group is characterized by their misogynistic beliefs, whereby they blame women and society for their lack of romantic success. It is important to note that members of groups like incels can still have consensual intimate relationships. It is possessing the belief of sexual entitlement that is problematic in these examples. Another way in which entitlement may lead to sexualized violence is when beliefs about the way a woman dresses or behaves influence the individual's belief about consent. In general, problematic sexual beliefs tend to be ideas that uphold rape culture.

There is support in the research for how the sexual expectation of entitlement can act as a risk factor for sexual violence or as a factor that differentiates those who sexually offend from those who do not (e.g., Hanson et al., 1994; Milner & Webster, 2005). Within the campus sexual violence literature, general entitlement is associated with perpetration (Tyler et al., 2017), and it has been suggested that sexual positivity can be helpful in addressing campus sexual violence (Harris, 2020; Hovick & Silver, 2019). There is also support for how problematic sexual beliefs regarding consent are related to rape myth acceptance, victim blaming and past non-consensual experiences (Hills et al., 2020; Fenner, 2017; Kilimnik, & Humphreys, 2018; Rollero et al., 2023). Additionally, research has focused on how meaningful consent education may prevent gender-based violence among post-secondary-age students (Beres, 2019; Flood, 2006; Ortiz, 2019; Zapp et al., 2018). With respect to the *incel* literature, although there is no apparent explanation for why some *incels* engage in violent acts, there is some evidence to suggest that *incels* in some forums openly endorse misogynistic and aggressive views (see Sparks et al., 2022, for further discussion).

Indicators

The person who has caused harm:

- expresses sexual entitlement (e.g., “I must have my needs met;” “It's her duty to fulfill my needs.”);

- blames women or individuals (because of their gender) for their own perceived lack of intimacy success;
- does not feel the need to ask for consent;
- reports persistently feeling lonely, feeling a lack of belonging or a lack of connection with others, despite having interactions with people in the workplace, social circles and other settings;
- feels a lack of intimacy with those of the gender they're attracted to;
- shows an inability to maintain relationships.

Coding notes

- This factor differs from oppressive attitudes (Factor 8) in that it focuses on sexual expectations and beliefs (like sexual entitlement) and on problematic notions about consent.
- In the example of *incels*, if an individual does not carry these problematic sexual expectations, but participates with others who identify as *incels* — whether online or in-person — they may meet the criteria for Factor 15 (participation in hypermasculine culture). If they endorse these sexual expectations and possibly other oppressive attitudes, beliefs and values, then Factors 16 and 8, respectively, should be considered.
- Tool users should be mindful when persons who have caused harm use their problematic beliefs to justify their actions and try to seek confirmation from you. Failing to recognize this behaviour can lead Tool users to collude with the person and ignore that this factor may be present.
- This factor is not assessing the individual's interpersonal skills, although difficulties picking up intimacy cues, like flirting, may be present. A person may have poor social and interpersonal skills without carrying problematic sexual expectations, and alternatively, a person may have good interpersonal skills but have problematic sexual expectations.
- It's important not to be puritanical or judgmental about sexual practices when assessing this factor. For instance, hooking up or having casual sex should not be assessed as a risk factor. However, if the individual carries expectations that the

other person should automatically consent to sex or sexual acts or should engage in hook-up culture when they don’t want to, then these expectations should be assessed.

References

Abbey, A. (2002). Alcohol-related sexual assault: a common problem among college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol,* 14, 118-128.

Abbey, A. & McAuslan, P. (2004). A longitudinal examination of male college students' perpetration of sexual assault. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* 72(5), 747-756.

Abbey, A., McAuslan, P., & Ross, L. T. (1998). Sexual assault perpetration by college men: The role of alcohol, misperception of sexual intent, and sexual beliefs and experiences. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology,* 17(2), 167-195.

Abbey, A., Ross, L. T., McDuffie, D., & McAuslan, P. (1996). Alcohol and dating risk factors for sexual assault among college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly,* 20(1), 147-169.

Abbey, A., Wegner, R., Woerner, J., Pegram, S. E., & Pierce, J. (2014). Review of survey and experimental research that examines the relationship between alcohol consumption and men's sexual aggression perpetration. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse,* 15(4), 265-282.

Abbey, A., Zawacki, T., Buck, P. O., Clinton, A. M., & McAuslan, P. (2001). Alcohol and sexual assault. *Alcohol Research & Health,* 25(1), 43-51.

Aebi, M., Haynes, M., Bessler, C., & Hasler, G. (2022). Associations of interpersonal trust with juvenile offending/conduct disorder, callous-unemotional traits, and criminal recidivism. *Scientific Reports,* 12(1), 1-10.

Ajder, H., Patrini, G., Cavalli, F., & Cullen, L. (2019). *The state of deep fakes: Landscape, threats, and impact.* Deeptrace Labs.

Allen, E., Hubain, B., Hunt, C., Lucero, S., & Stewart, S. (2012, May 9-11). *Race matters: Implementing racial identity development theories into the classroom.* [Conference session]. Annual Diversity Summit, University of Denver, Denver, CO.

Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, S. J. (2000). *Level of Service/Case Management Inventory: LS/CMI.* Multi-Health Systems.

Beres, M. (2020). Perspectives of rape-prevention educators on the role of consent in sexual violence prevention. *Sex Education,* 20(2), 227-238.

Bloom, H., Eisen, R. S., Pollock, N., & Webster, C. D. (2000). *WRA-20, workplace risk assessment: A guide for evaluating violence potential, version 1.* Workplace Calm.

Boer, D. P., Hart, S. D., Kropp, P. R., & Webster, C. D. (1997). *Manual for the Sexual Violence Risk–20: Professional guidelines for assessing risk of sexual violence.* The Mental Health, Law, & Policy Institute.

Bonta, J. & Andrews, D. A. (2017). *The psychology of criminal conduct.* Taylor & Francis.

Burczycka, M. (2020). *Students' experiences of unwanted sexualized behaviours and sexual assault at postsecondary schools in the Canadian provinces, 2019.* Canadian Centre for Justice and Community Safety Statistics: Statistics Canada.

Butler, L. C., Lee, H., & Fisher, B. S. (2019). Less safe in the ivory tower: Campus sexual assault policy in the Trump administration. *Victims & Offenders,* 14(8), 979-996.

Canadian Federation of Students-Ontario. (2015). *Sexual Violence on Campus.* [Fact sheet].

Carr, J. L. & VanDeusen, K. M. (2002). The relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence in college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 17(6), 630-646.

Carr, J. L. & VanDeusen, K. M. (2004). Risk factors for male sexual aggression on college campuses. *Journal of Family Violence,* 19, 279-289.

Chan, E. (2023). Technology-facilitated gender-based violence, hate speech, and terrorism: A risk assessment on the rise of the incel rebellion in Canada. *Violence Against Women,* 29(9), 1687–1718.

Cheever, J. & Eisenberg, M. E. (2022). Team sports and sexual violence: Examining perpetration by and victimization of adolescent males and females. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 37(1-2), 400-422.

Chesney, R. & Citron, D. (2019). Deep fakes: A looming challenge for privacy, democracy, and national security. *California Law Review,* 107, 1753–1819.

Coleman, D. H. & Straus, M. A. (1986). Marital power, conflict, and violence in a nationally representative sample of American couples. *Violence and Victims,* 1(2), 141–157.

Connell, R. W. & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society,* 19(6), 829-859.

Cooper, M. L. (1994). Motivations for alcohol use among adolescents: Development and validation of a four-factor model. *Psychological Assessment,* 6(2), 117–128.

Cooper, M. L., Agocha, V. B., & Sheldon, M. S. (2000). A motivational perspective on risky behaviors: The role of personality and affect regulatory processes. *Journal of Personality,* 68(6), 1059-1088.

Cotter, A. & Savage, L. (2019). *Gender-based violence and unwanted sexual behaviour in Canada, 2018: Initial findings from the Survey of Safety in Public and Private Spaces.* Statistics Canada.

Coulter, R. W. S., Mair, C., Miller, E., Blosnich, J. R., Matthews, D. D., & McCauley, H. L. (2017). Prevalence of past-year sexual assault victimization among undergraduate students: Exploring differences by and intersections of gender identity, sexual identity, and race/ethnicity. *Prevention Science*, 18(6), 726–736.

Crenshaw, K. W. (2017). *On intersectionality: Essential writings.* The New Press.

Cyders, M. A. & Smith, G. T. (2008). Emotion-based dispositions to rash action: positive and negative urgency. *Psychological Bulletin,* 134(6), 807–828.

Dadgardoust, L., Palermo, A. M., Harkins, L., Abracen, J., & Looman, J. (2022). Comparing distorted cognitions among university students and individuals convicted of sexual offences. *Journal of Sexual Aggression,* 28(3), 348-360.

Dalkey, N. C. (1969). An experimental study of group opinion. *Futures,* 1(5), 408-426.

Dank, M., Lachman, P., Zweig, J. M., & Yahner, J. (2014). Dating violence experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence,* 43(5), 846-857.

Deckman, T. & DeWall, C. N. (2011). Negative urgency and risky sexual behaviors: A clarification of the relationship between impulsivity and risky sexual behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 51(5), 674-678.

DeGue, S. & DiLillo, D. (2004). Understanding perpetrators of non-physical sexual coercion: Characteristics of those who cross the line. *Violence and Victims,* 19, 673-688.

DeLong, S. M., Graham, L. M., Magee, E. P., Treves-Kagan, S., Gray, C. L., McClay, A. M., Zarnick, S. M., Kupper, L. L., Macy, R. J., Ashley, O. S., Pettifor, A., Moracco, K. E., & Martin, S. L. (2018). Starting the conversation: Are campus sexual assault policies related to the prevalence of campus sexual assault? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 33(21), 3315–3343.

Donohew, L., Zimmerman, R., Cupp, P. S., Novak, S., Colon, S., & Abell, R. (2000). Sensation seeking, impulsive decision-making, and risky sex: Implications for risk-taking and design of interventions. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 28(6), 1079-1091.

Douglas, K. S. & Belfrage, H. (2015). The structured professional judgment approach to violence risk assessment and management: Why it is useful, how to use it, and its empirical support. In C. A. Pietz & C. A. Mattson (Eds.), *Violent offenders: Understanding and assessment* (pp. 360–383). Oxford University Press.

Dunn S. (2020). *Technology-facilitated gender-based violence: An overview.* Centre for International Governance Innovation: Supporting a Safer Internet.

Dutton, M. A. & Goodman, L. A. (2005). Coercion in intimate partner violence: Toward a new conceptualization. *Sex Roles,* 52, 743-756.

Edwards, D. W., Scott, C. L., Yarvis, R. M., Paizis, C. L., & Panizzon, M. S. (2003). Impulsiveness, impulsive aggression, personality disorder, and spousal violence. *Violence and Victims,* 18(1), 3-14.

Edwards, K. E. & Jones, S. R. (2009). "Putting my man face on": A grounded theory of college men's gender identity development. *Journal of College Student Development,* 50, 210–228.

Fenner, L. (2017). Sexual consent as a scientific subject: A literature review. *American Journal of Sexuality Education,* 12(4), 451-471.

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women* (Report No. NCJ 182369). Bureau of Justice Statistics, US Department of Justice.

Flack Jr, W. F., Hansen, B. E., Hopper, A. B., Bryant, L. A., Lang, K. W., Massa, A. A., & Whalen, J. E. (2016). Some types of hookups may be riskier than others for campus sexual assault. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy,* 8(4), 413.

Flood, M. (2006). Changing men: Best practice in sexual violence education. *Women Against Violence: An Australian Feminist Journal,* 18, 26-36.

Francis, M., Giesbrecht, J., Henry, K., & Turgeon, J. (2019). Reimagining gender and sexual violence education from the margins to the centre. *Feral Feminisms: Critical Interventions in Rape Culture,* 11(8), 13-29.

Garcia, J. R., Reiber, C., Massey, S. G., & Merriwether, A. M. (2012). Sexual hookup culture: A review. *Review of General Psychology,* 16(2), 161-176.

Gidycz, C. A., Warkentin, J. B., & Orchowski, L. M. (2007). Predictors of perpetration of verbal, physical, and sexual violence: A prospective analysis of college men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity,* 8(2), 79.

Goodman, P. (1962). *The community of scholars.* Penguin Random House.

Grant, J. & MacDonald, F. (2020). The "alt-right", toxic masculinity and violence. In F. MacDonald, & A. Z. Dobrowolsky (Eds.), *Turbulent Times, Transformational Possibilities* (pp. 368-388). University of Toronto Press.

Griner, S. B., Vamos, C. A., Thompson, E. L., Logan, R., Vázquez-Otero, C., & Daley, E. M. (2020). The intersection of gender identity and violence: Victimization experienced by transgender college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 35(23-24), 5704-5725.

Haag, A. M., Boyes, A., Cheng, J., MacNeil, A., & Wirove, R. (2016). An introduction to the issues of cross-cultural assessment inspired by Ewert v Canada. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management,* 3(2), 65–75.

Hamberger, L. K. & Hastings, J. E. (1991). Personality correlates of men who batter and nonviolent men: Some continuities and discontinuities. *Journal of Family Violence,* 6, 131-147.

Hamberger, L. K., Larsen, S. E., & Lehrner, A. (2017). Coercive control in intimate partner violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior,* 37, 1-11.

Hanson, R. K. (2009). The psychological assessment of risk for crime and violence. *Canadian Psychology,* 50(3), 172–182.

Hanson, R. K. & Bussiere, M. T. (1998). Predicting relapse: A meta-analysis of sexual offender recidivism studies. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology,* 66(2), 348.

Hanson, R. K., Gizzarelli, R., & Scott, H. (1994). The attitudes of incest offenders: Sexual entitlement and acceptance of sex with children. *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 21(2), 187-202.

Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Letourneau, E., Helmus, L. M., & Thornton, D. (2018). Reductions in risk based on time offense free in the community: Once a sex offender, not always a sex offender. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law,* 24(1), 48-63.

Hanson, R. K., Harris, A. J. R., Scott, T.-L., & Helmus, L. (2007). *Assessing the risk of sexual offenders on community supervision: The Dynamic Supervision Project* (Corrections Research User Report No. 2007-05). Public Safety Canada.

Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2004). *Predictors of sexual recidivism: An updated meta-analysis* (Corrections User Report No. 2004-02). Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness Canada.

Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2009). The accuracy of recidivism risk assessments for sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of 118 prediction studies. *Psychological Assessment,* 21(1), 1–21.

Hare, R. D. (2002). Psychopathy and risk for recidivism and violence. In N.S. Grey, J.M. Laing, & L. Noaks (Eds.), *Criminal Justice, Mental Health, and the Politics of Risk* (pp. 27-47). Routledge.

Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Hare Psychopathy Checklist-Revised, 2nd edition.* Multi-Health Systems.

Harper, S. R. & Harris, F. III. (2010). *College men and masculinities: Theory, research, and implications for practice.* Jossey-Bass/Wiley.

Harris, A., Phenix, A., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2003). *Static 99: Coding rules revised 2003.* Solicitor General Canada.

Harris, K. L., McFarlane, M., & Wieskamp, V. (2020). The promise and peril of agency as motion: A feminist new materialist approach to sexual violence and sexual harassment. *Organization,* 27(5), 660-679.

Hart, S. D., Kropp, P. R., Laws, D. R., Klaver, J., Logan, C., & Watt, K. A. (2003). *The Risk for Sexual Violence Protocol (RSVP): Structured professional guidelines for assessing risk of sexual violence.* Mental Health, Law, and Policy Institute, Simon Fraser University.

Hegel, J., Pelletier, K. D., & Olver, M. E. (2022). Predictive properties of the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment (ODARA) in a northern Canadian prairie sample. *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 49(3), 411-431.

Helmus, L., Hanson, R. K., Babchishin, K. M., & Mann, R. E. (2013). Attitudes supportive of sexual offending predict recidivism: A meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse,* 14(1), 34-53.

Helmus, L. M. (2018). Sex offender risk assessment: Where are we and where are we going? *Current Psychiatry Reports,* 20(6), Article 46.

Hills, P. J., Pleva, M., Seib, E., & Cole, T. (2021). Understanding how university students use perceptions of consent, wantedness, and pleasure in labeling rape. *Archives of Sexual Behavior,* 50, 247-262.

Hilton, N. Z. (2021). *Domestic violence risk assessment: Tools for effective prediction and management* (2nd ed.). American Psychological Association.

Hilton, N. Z. & Radatz, D. L. (2018). The criminogenic and non-criminogenic treatment needs of intimate partner violence offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology,* 62(11), 3247-3259.

Hilton, N. Z., Eke, A. W., Kim, S., & Ham, E. (2023). Coercive control in police reports of intimate partner violence: Conceptual definition and association with recidivism. *Psychology of Violence,* 13(4), 277–285.

Hogan, N. R. & Olver, M. E. (2019). Static and dynamic assessment of violence risk among discharged forensic patients. *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 46(7), 923-938.

Hovick, S. R. & Silver, N. (2019). "Consent is sexy": A poster campaign using sex-positive images and messages to increase dyadic sexual communication. *Journal of American College Health,* 67(8), 817-824.

Hudson-Flege, M. D., Grover, H. M., Meçe, M. H., Ramos, A. K., & Thompson, M. P. (2020). Empathy as a moderator of sexual violence perpetration risk factors among college men. *Journal of American College Health,* 68(2), 139-147.

Humphrey, S. E. & Kahn, A. S. (2000). Fraternities, athletic teams, and rape: Importance of identification with a risky group. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 15(12), 1313-1322.

Hunt, S. (2016, September 30-October 1). *Decolonizing the roots of rape culture: Reflections on consent, sexual violence and university campuses.* Presented at the conference, The Power of Our Collective Voices: Changing the Conversation on Sexual Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions, Vancouver, BC.

Hutcheson, S. (2020). Sexual violence, representation, and racialized identities: Implications for International Students. *Education & Law Journal,* 29(2), 191-221.

James, D. & Warren-Forward, H. (2015). Research methods for formal consensus development. *Nurse Researcher,* 22(3), 35–40.

Johnson, A. G. (2006). *Power, privilege and difference* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Jones, J. & Hunter, D. (1995). Consensus methods for medical and health services research. *British Medical Journal,* 311(7001), 376-380.

Jung, S. & Thomas, M. L. (2022). A compendium of risk and needs tools for assessing male youths at-risk to and/or who have engaged in sexually abusive behaviors. *Sexual Offending: Theory, Research, and Prevention,* 17, 1-28.

Kanin, E. J. (1985). Date rapists: Differential sexual socialization and relative deprivation. *Archives of Sexual Behavior,* 14, 219-231.

Khan, F., Rowe, C. J., & Bidgood, R. (2019). *Courage to Act: Developing a National Framework to Address and Prevent Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions in Canada.* Possibility Seeds.

Kilimnik, C. D. & Humphreys, T. P. (2018). Understanding sexual consent and nonconsensual sexual experiences in undergraduate women: The role of identification and rape myth acceptance. *Canadian Journal of Human Sexuality,* 27(3), 195-206.

Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men.* HarperCollins Publishers.

Kimonis, E. R., Kennealy, P. J., & Goulter, N. (2016). Does the self-report inventory of callous-unemotional traits predict recidivism? *Psychological Assessment,* 28(12), 1616.

Koss, M. P. & Gaines, J. A. (1993). The prediction of sexual aggression by alcohol use, athletic participation, and fraternity affiliation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 8(1), 94-108.

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology,* 55(2), 162.

Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. F., & Martin, S. L. (2007). *The campus sexual assault (CSA) study* (NCJRS Document No. 221153). National Institute of Justice.

Krebs, C. P., Lindquist, C. H., Warner, T. D., Fisher, B. S., & Martin, S. L. (2009). The differential risk factors of physically forced and alcohol-or other drug-enabled sexual assault among university women. *Violence and Victims,* 24(3), 302-321.

Krivoshey, M. S., Adkins, R., Hayes, R., Nemeth, J. M., & Klein, E. G. (2013). Sexual assault reporting procedures at Ohio colleges. *Journal of American College Health,* 61(3), 142-147.

Kropp, P. R., Hart, S. D., Webster, C. W., & Eaves, D. (1995). *Manual for the spousal assault risk assessment guide* (2nd ed.). British Columbia Institute on Family Violence.

Kwong Caputo, J.J. (2013). *Undergraduate research and metropolitan commuter university student involvement: Exploring the narratives of five female undergraduate students* (Paper No. 1006). [Doctoral dissertation, Portland State University]. PDX Scholar Dissertations and Theses.

Lawyer, S., Resnick, H., Bakanic, V., Burkett, T., & Kilpatrick, D. (2010). Forcible, drug-facilitated, and incapacitated rape and sexual assault among undergraduate women. *Journal of American College Health,* 58(5), 453–460.

Lee, C. & Wong, J. S. (2019). A safe place to learn? Examining sexual assault policies at Canadian public universities. *Studies in Higher Education,* 44(3), 432-445.

Loh, C., Gidycz, C.A., Lobo, T.R., & Luthra, R. (2005). A prospective analysis of sexual assault perpetration: Risk factors related to perpetrator characteristics. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 20, 1325–1348.

Maguire, D. & Morris, D. (2018). *Homeward Bound: Defining, understanding and aiding 'commuter students.'* Higher Education Policy Institute.

Malamuth, N. M., Lamade, R. V., Koss, M. P., Lopez, E., Seaman, C., & Prentky, R. (2021). Factors predictive of sexual violence: Testing the four pillars of the Confluence Model in a large diverse sample of college men. *Aggressive Behavior,* 47(4), 405-420.

Mann, R. E., Hanson, R. K., & Thornton, D. (2010). Assessing risk for sexual recidivism: Some proposals on the nature of psychologically meaningful risk factors. *Sexual Abuse,* 22(2), 191-217.

McGowan, B. L., Tillapaugh, D., & Harris, F. III (2019). Considerations of student development in men and masculinities work. In D. Tillapaugh & B. L. McGowan (Eds.), *Men and masculinities: Theoretical foundations and promising practices for supporting college men's development* (pp. 38–56). Stylus.

McKay White, R. & Fjellner, D. (2022). The prevalence of economic abuse among intimate partners in Alberta. *SAGE Open,* 12(1), 1-13.

McMillan, D. W. & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of Community Psychology,* 14(1), 6-23.

Mellins, C. A., Walsh, K., Sarvet, A. L., Wall, M., Gilbert, L., Santelli, J. S., & Hirsch, J. S. (2017). Sexual assault incidents among college undergraduates: Prevalence and factors associated with risk. *PLoS One,* 12(11), 1-23.

Messerschmidt, J. W. (2019). The salience of hegemonic masculinity. *Men and Masculinities,* 22(1), 85–91.

Miller, S. L. & Brodsky, S. L. (2011). Risky business: addressing the consequences of predicting violence. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law,* 39(3), 396–401.

Mills, J. F., Kroner, D. G., & Morgan, R. D. (2011). *Clinician's guide to violence risk assessment.* Guilford Press.

Milner, R. J. & Webster, S. D. (2005). Identifying schemas in child molesters, rapists, and violent offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment,* 17, 425-439.

Mosher, D. L. & Anderson, R. D. (1986). Macho personality, sexual aggression, and reactions to guided imagery of realistic rape. *Journal of Research in Personality,* 20(1), 77-94.

Moylan, C. A. & Javorka, M. (2020). Widening the lens: An ecological review of campus sexual assault. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse,* 21(1), 179-192.

Murnen, S. K. & Kohlman, M. H. (2007). Athletic participation, fraternity membership, and sexual aggression among college men: A meta-analytic review. *Sex Roles,* 57, 145-157.

Nakamura, L. (2019). Gender and race in the gaming world. In Graham, M., & Dutton, W. H. (Eds.). *Society and the internet: How networks of information and communication are changing our lives* (pp. 127-145). Oxford University Press.

National Institute of Justice. (2018). *Most Victims Know Their Attacker* [Fact sheet]. https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/most-victims-know-their-attacker

Norris, J., Nurius, P. S., & Graham, T. L. (1999). When a date changes from fun to dangerous: Factors affecting women's ability to distinguish. *Violence Against Women,* 5(3), 230-250.

O'Connor, K. W., Drouin, M., & Niedermeyer, T. (2021). How do age, sex, political orientation, religiosity, and sexism affect perceptions of sex assault/harassment allegations? *Sexuality & Culture,* 25(5), 1605-1619.

Olver, M. E., Sowden, J. N., Kingston, D. A., Nicholaichuk, T. P., Gordon, A., Beggs Christofferson, S. M., & Wong, S. C. P. (2018). Predictive accuracy of violence risk scale–sexual offender version risk and change scores in treated Canadian Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse,* 30(3), 254–275.

Ortiz, R. (2019). Explicit, voluntary, and conscious: assessment of the importance of adopting an affirmative consent definition for sexual assault prevention programming on college campuses. *Journal of Health Communication,* 24(9), 728-735.

Patel, U. & Roesch, R. (2018). Campus sexual assault: examination of policy and research. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research,* 10(2), 103-111.

Phenix, A., Helmus, L., & Hanson, R. K. (2016). *Static-99R & Static-2002R evaluators' workbook.* Solicitor General Canada.

Piquero, R.A. (2017). "No remorse, no repent": Linking lack of remorse to criminal offending in a sample of serious adolescent offenders. *Justice Quarterly,* 34(2), 350-376.

Prentky, R. A., Knight, R. A., Lee, A. F., & Cerce, D. D. (1995). Predictive validity of lifestyle impulsivity for rapists. *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 22(2), 106-128.

Ptacek, J. (1999). *Battered women in the courtroom: The power of judicial responses.* Northeastern University Press.

Quinsey, V. L., Harris, G. T., Rice, M. E., & Cormier, C. A. (2006). *Violent offenders: Appraising and managing risk.* American Psychological Association.

Quinsey, V. L., Jones, G. B., Book, A. S., & Barr, K. N. (2006). The dynamic prediction of antisocial behavior among forensic psychiatric patients: A prospective field study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 21(12), 1539-1565.

Radimer, S. & Rowan-Kenyon, H. (2019). Undergraduate men's alcohol consumption: Masculine norms, ethnic identity, and social dominance orientation. *Journal of College Student Development,* 60(1), 1-16.

Reuter, T. R., Newcomb, M. E., Whitton, S. W., & Mustanski, B. (2017). Intimate partner violence victimization in LGBT young adults: Demographic differences and associations with health behaviors. *Psychology of Violence,* 7(1), 101–109.

Rico, K., Mendoza, J., Anderson, L., Robertson, L., Wolgemuth, S., Cook, A., Avelar, C., Hagen, E., & Rentschler, C. (2021). *Supporting the whole campus community: Working with people who have caused harm.* Possibility Seeds' Courage to Act: Addressing and Preventing Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions in Canada.

Robbins, R. N. & Bryan, A. (2004). Relationships between future orientation, impulsive sensation seeking, and risk behavior among adjudicated adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Research,* 19(4), 428-445.

Rollero, C., Moyano, N., & Roccato, M. (2023). The role of sexual consent and past non-consensual sexual experiences on rape supportive attitudes in a heterosexual community sample. *Sexuality & Culture,* 27, 1-17.

Schafer, J., Caetano, R., & Cunradi, C. B. (2004). A path model of risk factors for intimate partner violence among couples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 19(2), 127-142.

Schumacher, J. A., Feldbau-Kohn, S., Slep, A. M. S., & Heyman, R. E. (2001). Risk factors for male-to-female partner physical abuse. *Aggression and Violent Behavior,* 6(2-3), 281-352.

Scott-Samuel, A., Stanistreet, D., & Crawshaw, P. (2009). Hegemonic masculinity, structural violence and health inequities. *Critical Public Health,* 19(3–4), 287–292.

Seabrook, R. C., Ward, L. M., & Giaccardi, S. (2018). Why is fraternity membership associated with sexual assault? Exploring the roles of conformity to masculine norms, pressure to uphold masculinity, and objectification of women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity,* 19(1), 3.

Setia, A. & An, S. (2022). Victim vs. survivor: the effect of labels and consensual sexual behaviour on observers' perceptions of sexual assault. *Journal of Sexual Aggression,* 28(1), 103-118.

Singh, J. P. (2012). The history, development, and testing of forensic assessment tools. In E. L. Grigorenko (Ed.), *Handbook of juvenile forensic psychology and psychiatry* (pp. 215–226). Springer.

Spencer, C. M., Stith, S. M., & Cafferky, B. (2019). Risk markers for physical intimate partner violence victimization: A meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior,* 44, 8–17.

Stander, V. A., Thomsen, C. J., Merrill, L. L., & Milner, J. S. (2018). Longitudinal prediction of sexual harassment and sexual assault by male enlisted Navy personnel. *Military Psychology,* 30(3), 229-239.

Steele, B., Martin, M., Yakubovich, A., Humphreys, D. K., & Nye, E. (2022). Risk and protective factors for men's sexual violence against women at higher education institutions: A systematic and meta-analytic review of the longitudinal evidence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse,* 23(3), 716-732.

Steele, D. W., Becker, S. J., Danko, K. J., Balk, E. M., Adam, G. P., Saldanha, I. J., & Trikalinos, T. A. (2020). Brief behavioral interventions for substance use in adolescents: a meta-analysis. *Pediatrics,* 146(4), 1-11.

Stotzer, R. L. & MacCartney, D. (2016). The role of institutional factors on on-campus reported rape prevalence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 31(16), 2687-2707.

Testa, M. & Cleveland, M. J. (2017). Does alcohol contribute to college men's sexual assault perpetration? Between- and within-person effects over five semesters. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs,* 78(1), 5-13.

Testa, M. & Cleveland, M. J. (2017). It depends on how you look at it: The role of alcohol in men's sexual aggression perpetration. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs,* 78(1), 18-19.

Testa, M. & Parks, K. A. (1996). The role of women's alcohol consumption in sexual victimization. *Aggression and Violent Behavior,* 1(3), 217-234.

Thomasen, K. & Dunn, S. (2021). Reasonable expectations of privacy in an era of drones and deepfakes: Expanding the Supreme Court of Canada's decision in R v Jarvis. In J. Bailey, A. Flynn, & N. Henry (Eds.), *The Emerald International Handbook of Technology-Facilitated Violence and Abuse* (pp. 555-576). Emerald Publishing Limited.

Thompson, M. P. & Morrison, D. J. (2013). Prospective predictors of technology-based sexual coercion by college males. *Psychology of Violence,* 3(3), 233–246.

Thompson, M. P., Kingree, J. B., Zinzow, H., & Swartout, K. (2015). Time-varying risk factors and sexual aggression perpetration among male college students. *Journal of Adolescent Health,* 57(6), 637-642.

Thompson, M. P., Swartout, K. M., & Koss, M. P. (2013). Trajectories and predictors of sexually aggressive behaviors during emerging adulthood. *Psychology of Violence,* 3(3), 247–259.

Tillapaugh, D. (2023). Individual and systemic impacts of hegemonic masculinity on college men sexual violence peer educators. *Journal of College Student Development,* 64(2), 123-139.

Tyler, K. A., Schmitz, R. M., & Adams, S. A. (2017). Alcohol expectancy, drinking behavior, and sexual victimization among female and male college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 32(15), 2298-2322.

Van Brunt, B., Murphy, A., & O'toole, M. E. (2015). The dirty dozen: Twelve risk factors for sexual violence on college campuses (DD-12). *Violence and Gender,* 2(3), 145-160.

van der Put, C. E., Gubbels, J., & Assink, M. (2019). Predicting domestic violence: A meta-analysis on the predictive validity of risk assessment tools. *Aggression and Violent Behavior,* 47, 100–116.

Vasconcelos, M., Viding, E., Sebastian, C. L., Faria, S., Almeida, P. R., Gonçalves, Ó. F., & Seara-Cardoso, A. (2021). Callous-unemotional traits moderate anticipated guilt and wrongness judgments to everyday moral transgressions in adolescents. *Frontiers in Psychiatry,* 12, 1-11.

Vega, V. & Malamuth, N.M. (2007). Predicting sexual aggression: The role of pornography in the context of general and specific risk factors. *Aggressive Behavior,* 33, 104–117.

Wagner, S. A., Vogt, S., & Kabst, R. (2016). How IT and social change facilitates public participation: a stakeholder-oriented approach. *Government Information Quarterly,* 33(3), 435-443.

Webster, C. D. & Jackson, M. A. (Eds.). (1997). *Impulsivity: theory, assessment, and treatment.* Guilford Press.

White, J. W. & Smith, P. H. (2004). Sexual assault perpetration and reperpetration: From adolescence to young adulthood. *Criminal Justice and Behavior,* 31(2), 182-202.

White, S. G. & Meloy, J. R. (2010). *The WAVR-21: A structured professional guide for the workplace assessment of violence risk* (2nd ed.). Specialized Training Services, Inc.

Whiteside, S. P. & Lynam, D. R. (2001). The five factor model and impulsivity: Using a structural model of personality to understand impulsivity. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 30(4), 669-689.

Women and Gender Equality Canada. (2021). *What is gender-based violence?* Government of Canada. https://women-gender-equality.canada.ca/en/gender-based-violence/about-gender-based-violence.html

Yescavage, K. (1999). Teaching women a lesson: Sexually aggressive and sexually nonaggressive men's perceptions of acquaintance and date rape. *Violence Against Women,* 5(7), 796-812.

Zaleski, K. L., Gundersen, K. K., Baes, J., Estupinian, E., & Vergara, A. (2016). Exploring rape culture in social media forums. *Computers in Human Behavior,* 63, 922–927.

Zapolski, T. C., Cyders, M. A., & Smith, G. T. (2009). Positive urgency predicts illegal drug use and risky sexual behavior. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors,* 23(2), 348.

Zapp, D., Buelow, R., Soutiea, L., Berkowitz, A., & DeJong, W. (2021). Exploring the potential campus-level impact of online universal sexual assault prevention education. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,* 36(5-6), 2324-2345.

Zawacki, T., Abbey, A., Buck, P. O., McAuslan, P., & Clinton-Sherrod, A. M. (2003). Perpetrators of alcohol-involved sexual assaults: How do they differ from other sexual assault perpetrators and nonperpetrators? *Aggressive Behavior,* 29(4), 366-380.

Zhong, L. R., Kebbell, M. R., & Webster, J. L. (2020). An exploratory study of technology-facilitated sexual violence in online romantic interactions: Can the internet's toxic disinhibition exacerbate sexual aggression? *Computers in Human Behavior,* 108, 106-314.

Zinzow, H. M. & Thompson, M. (2015). A longitudinal study of risk factors for repeated sexual coercion and assault in US college men. *Archives of Sexual Behavior,* 44, 213-222.

Zinzow, H. M. & Thompson, M. (2015). Factors associated with use of verbally coercive, incapacitated, and forcible sexual assault tactics in a longitudinal study of college men. *Aggressive Behavior,* 41(1), 34-43.

Zuckerman, M. (2007). Sensation seeking and risk. In M. Zuckerman, *Sensation seeking and risky behavior* (pp. 51–72). American Psychological Association.

Appendix A: Worksheet for the Community Risk Assessment Tool

Community Risk Assessment Tool: Worksheet

Note: P = Present | ? = Some evidence | NP = Absent

Case identification information

Sources of information

Note sources used to complete the Community Risk Assessment Tool Worksheet (e.g., interview with survivor, interview with co-op learning director, interview with person who caused harm, review of co-curricular records, review of academic misconduct file). Also note sources that could NOT be included (e.g., interview with person who caused harm, review of criminal record known to exist, counselling notes from the university's counselling centre).

Person(s) who completed assessment and dates of completion

Provide name, title and any credentials.

Risk and Case Formulation

After examining all of the factors together and based on your professional knowledge, provide your estimation of risk and what this might mean for interventions that need to occur, case management strategies that need to be taken or decisions that need to be made

Community Risk Assessment Tool: Worksheet

Note: P = Present | ? = Some evidence | NP = Absent

Factor	P, ?, NP	Rationale for scoring
Factors Related to the Survivor		
1. Marginalized identities		
2. Systemic barriers encountered by survivors (marginalized experiences)		
Factors Related to the Community		
3. Institutional student life culture		
4. Post-secondary living and learning climate		
5. Policies and presence of gender-based and/or sexualized violence resources		
Factors Related to the Incidence of Gender-based and Sexualized Violence		
6. Involvement of substances and/or alcohol		
7. Nature of relationship between a survivor and a person who has caused harm		

Note: P = Present | ? = Some evidence | NP = Absent

Factor	P, ?, NP	Rationale for scoring
Factors Related to the Person Who Has Caused Harm		
8. Oppressive attitudes, beliefs and values about women		
9. Sexual preoccupation		
10. Past perpetration		
11. Impulsivity		
12. Callous disregard		
13. Controlling and coercive		
14. Antisociality		
15. Participates in hypermasculine culture		
16. Problematic sexual expectations and beliefs		

Appendix B: Existing Risk Assessment Tools — Establishing a Rationale for Developing a New Approach to Assess Gender-based and Sexualized Violence Risk

The current project aims to develop a community risk assessment tool designed for post-secondary institutional (PSI) settings to assess the risk for gender-based and sexualized violence. In light of the enormous scientific research in the field of violence risk assessment, it was necessary to comprehensively review existing risk tools, both published and unpublished, for their applicability in PSIs. Our survey of the literature revealed that many tools have strong empirical support for their ability to predict violence, intimate partner violence and sexual reoffending behaviours among individuals who are involved with the law. However, we found limited use in the application of these tools in civil, non-forensic, non-correctional contexts (such as PSIs) to specifically assess risk for gender-based and sexualized violence.

This appendix provides a condensed overview of how risk is broadly defined and why existing tools validated for prediction of violence may not be sufficient to serve as community risk tools in a PSI setting interested in predicting gender-based and sexualized violence.

Defining Risk

Risk is generally defined as the possibility that an event will occur in the future. These events could include human behaviour, naturally occurring events, harm that may be done to us, or any other event that can be divided into two alternatives — either the event will happen, or it will not.

There are many ways to further delineate risk. For instance, risk may be described in the form of probability, such as the probability of precipitation in weather prediction; or categorical classifications that rank an individual’s risk as low, moderate and high (and perhaps, very high) found commonly in the insurance industry when determining premiums for young drivers. We are already exposed to these various forms of risk communication in our everyday lives.

The communication of risk, whether we use probability, categorical classifications, or some other metric such as evaluation, relies on knowing factors that may increase or decrease risk of that event occurring. These “risk factors” are associated with the behaviour or event of interest, and risk evaluations rely on them. The scholarship in the field of forensic risk assessment strongly recommends that an evaluation of an individual’s likelihood of reoffending should be carried out using a structured tool or measure that comprises risk factors (Hanson, 2009). In contrast, unstructured approaches to risk assessment (i.e., no tool used to assess risk, but rather experience or intuitively formed ideas of what constitutes risk) are universally recognized as unacceptable practices (Helmus, 2018) and rarely take into account risk factors that are supported by research.

By extension, assessing and evaluating risk creates an opportunity to reduce harmful behaviours. This notion is founded upon the overarching principles of risk, need and responsivity (RNR; Bonta & Andrews, 2017). According to these principles, directing more services in the forms of treatment and supervision to individuals who are at a higher risk to violently re-offend (risk principle), targeting interventions and monitoring criminogenic needs (i.e., risk factors associated with criminal behaviour) (need principle), and tailoring interventions to suit the individual (responsivity principle) are necessary to make the greatest reductions in future harmful behaviour. Hence, scholars agree that employing a risk assessment tool is necessary to address the risk principle.

In addition to adherence to the RNR principles, reliance on a structured approach to assessment substantially reduces subjectivity and avoids intuitive approaches, which are often easily influenced by our biases, attitudes, and sometimes inaccurate beliefs (see Miller & Brodsky, 2011, for discussion). In the context of a PSI setting, decisions need to be made to keep the community and survivors safe while also upholding procedural fairness to respondents who face a judicial affairs process. To fairly balance these interests, it’s important to employ a structured, reliable and — most importantly — unbiased approach to assessing the risk a respondent may pose to the campus community. Adopting such an approach ensures that decisions are not made in regard to the safety and security of the community and the respondent who may have caused harm, in an arbitrary fashion.

Reasons for Developing a Non-Forensic Risk Tool for Gender-based Violence

According to our review of existing and published risk assessment tools, they can be grouped into three kinds where sexual violence, intimate partner violence, and general violent and non-violent outcomes are predicted. Most of these tools are intended for use with justice-involved adults and have been researched primarily with men who have perpetrated violence. Rather than review each tool's composition, advantages and limitations, the following provides an overview of reasons why there was a need to develop a non-forensic risk tool to assess risk for gender-based and sexualized violence in the PSI context.

Current risk tools define gender-based and sexualized violence in narrow and distinct terms, in gendered ways, and exclude the impact of such behaviours on the community where it occurs.

Broadly speaking, gender-based and sexualized forms of violence are harmful acts that are directed at individuals based on their gender. They are rooted in gender inequality and may manifest in many different behaviours (e.g., sexual violence, dating violence, intimate partner violence) that lie on a spectrum and sometimes overlap with one another (Women and Gender Equality Canada, 2021). Some of these behaviours may involve direct physical contact and others could be deemed psychological abuse or indirect violence (e.g., coercively controlling behaviours, sexual harassment and other forms of sexual misconduct).

In criminal justice or forensic settings, gender-based and sexualized violence is often defined in specific and separate ways, such as sexual violence, intimate partner violence, general violence, or even child exploitation that may involve physical contact or online harm. Since the current forensic literature does not typically use a gender-based lens of perpetration, it may be challenging to employ existing tools to assess and prevent gender-based and sexualized violence.

Second, existing definitions of gender in these forensic or criminal justice contexts adopt a binary approach (i.e., male or female) and fail to accept how gender lies on a continuum. Current tools are developed for use with men (e.g., only applied to male sex offenders and exclude female or gender diverse offenders) or use binary definitions within some of the items (e.g., on the Static-99R, there is an item on whether sexual offence was against a male; Harris et al., 2003).

Third, the individual who has caused harm is typically the identified target of concern in a risk assessment, but given that the current project is focused on a community risk assessment, community factors are also relevant here. Hence, risk factors, which are typically individual-focused, should include the contextual setting and factors that increase the level of risk the individual may pose in the community. Some potential institutional factors may relate to the culture of that institution, such as whether the cultural environment tends to condone or ignore coercive controlling behaviours, carry patriarchal or machismo attitudes, endorse rape myths and/or minimize mental health difficulties. Thus, community risk assessment, as defined in the goals for this project, pertains to both a broad definition of behaviours and a narrow contextual scope, which current risk assessment tools are ill-equipped to address.

Existing tools rely on antisociality as a risk factor

The best predictor of future behaviour is past behaviour (e.g., Hanson & Bussière, 1998). Consistent with that view is the inclusion of past criminal behaviour or antisocial behaviours and patterns in all current risk assessment tools available (e.g., Static-99R; ODARA, Hilton, 2021; SARA, Kropp et al., 1995; LS/CMI, Andrews et al., 2000). In the forensic field, reliance on these markers of antisociality makes sense. Criminal behaviour and past violence are likely markers for increased risk, and much of the research suggests they are the strongest risk factors for assessing criminal risk (Bonta & Andrews, 2017). However, in the PSI context, it is important to highlight that we are predicting people’s likelihood of carrying out harmful behaviours among people who may be mostly prosocial (i.e., do not have criminal records) relative to justice-involved individuals.

One can argue that students may have committed crimes that have gone undetected. However, we can only rely on what is reported and what is documented through the criminal justice system. In light of this difference between members of the PSI community and justice-involved individuals, existing tools’ heavy reliance on multiple items that pertain to past criminal behaviour would likely lead to underestimating overall risk.

Known risk factors tend to focus on criminality and do not take into account how we can assess relatively prosocial individuals

Related to the previous point, non-forensic communities or civil settings are likely to be prosocial, while individuals in justice-involved communities are more likely to have a criminal record, to have served time in a prison, or to have been arrested multiple times. Given most civil settings where a violence risk assessment may be conducted, it's likely the individual is employed and/or regularly attending a post-secondary institution. Furthermore, there is perhaps a decrease in likelihood that these individuals have significant illicit drug abuse problems, lack of prosocial supports, and rely on government assistance for their accommodations and basic needs. Hence, it's important to recognize that risk factors beyond criminal history and criminal lifestyle should be considered since many of the persons who cause harm in PSIs are relatively prosocial individuals compared to justice-involved individuals.

Current risk tools apply only to white men with criminal records

The majority of current forensic tools that are used to assess risk for sexual violence and intimate partner violence are applicable to male perpetrators only. For example, all current sexual violence risk tools are only designed for use with men (e.g., Static-99R; Static-2002R, Phenix et al., 2016; SORAG, Quinsey et al., 2015) or have not been validated with a sample of women (e.g., SVR-20, Boer et al., 1997; RSVP, Hart et al., 2003).

Furthermore, a requirement of existing tools is that the person being assessed has been arrested, charged and/or convicted of a criminal offence. In some cases, an arrest for a specific violent crime, such as a sexual offence or an offence against an intimate partner is required. Likewise, all risk tools for sexual offending that are intended for adults require that the person has some criminal involvement that led to a sexual offending charge(s). Although not always a requirement, even tools developed for youth were designed for use in a criminal justice context. Given that most individuals who have been accused of a sexually abusive act in a PSI setting have yet to be found guilty or sanctioned by the criminal justice system, most persons who cause harm are not likely eligible to be assessed using any of these instruments.

Additionally, existing tools were not developed with cultural considerations. Recently, attention was drawn to whether risk tools were valid for use with persons of Aboriginal descent in the Ewert v Canada (2015) case. Jeffrey G. Ewert, an Aboriginal offender, made a legal challenge pertaining to the use of various psychological risk assessment tools, which were perceived to have had a substantially unfavourable impact on him due to an alleged cultural bias (Haag et al., 2016). After the fact, many tool developers began publishing their research and, in a few cases, evaluating data on whether their tools were biased. Although a few tools have been shown not to be biased (e.g., Static-99R showed no difference between Aboriginal and white offenders), only a handful of tools have been examined thus far (e.g., VRS-SO, Olver et al., 2018; ORADV, Hegel et al., 2022). Risk tools used in PSI settings should consider the breadth of cultural differences that exist on campuses and among the student body.

Existing tools do not consider the developmental stage of PSI persons who cause harm

The majority of risk assessment instruments are intended for assessing adults. A number of tools designed for justice-involved youth are available (i.e., defined as youth or young adults between ages 12 to 18); however, the empirical support for these tools is much more limited (see Jung & Thomas, 2022). These tools are often separated in terms of the way they are developed and used, similar to how risk tools for adults are categorized (e.g., actuarial vs. structured professional judgment), but most, if not all of these tools primarily assess sexual, violent or general criminal risk. Currently, there are no dating violence or intimate partner violence risk tools for youth.

Applying risk assessment in PSIs where we have “emerging adults,” who straddle the youth/adult divide, means that existing tools may not be appropriate when they artificially separate PSI students into youth and adults based on chronological age. A community risk tool for PSI settings should consider the developmental stage that the PSI students are at and consider developmental changes common among emerging adults. Such a tool should not divide people based on a legal age cut-off but instead should consider the emancipation of individuals after long being dependents.

Current tools are validated through statistical analyses that require measurable outcomes and normative data

The field of risk assessment and management has classified risk tools in various ways. These include how they were developed (e.g., actuarial vs. structured professional judgement) and in what time period they were developed (e.g., 1st generation, 2nd generation, etc.) (Hanson, 2009). Generally, actuarial and structured professional judgement (SPJ) approaches are supported by the empirical literature. For delineation on the differences between these types of risk assessment tools, refer to Mills et al. (2011) exploration of these differences. Generally, actuarial tools are instruments that comprise historical or static risk factors and have “a structured scoring method and associate a statistical or probabilistic statement with the resulting score” (p. 3). Structured professional judgement (SPJ) is a scheme that identifies the presence of specific risk factors, and based on the number of risk factors present, the assessor makes a judgement regarding the level of risk the assessed individual poses (often in the form of low, moderate or high). Some tools have a structured approach that is quantified, similar to actuarial tools, but are what some call “4th generation” tools that include dynamic risk factors that can change over time. Although there is some debate on whether actuarial or SPJ (or even hybrid tools in the 4th generation) are better, it appears that actuarial tools seem to consistently come out on top in terms of predictive validity in their ability to discriminate between those who re-offend and those who do not (e.g., van der Put, 2019; Hanson & Morton-Bourgon, 2009).

For this review, it is important to note that statistical examinations of how well a tool predicts or discriminates rely on certain data needed to carry out these analyses. Such a need lies in recording outcome data in the form of recidivism, or reoffending behaviour. However, in the context of PSIs and given the broad view and definition of gender-based and sexualized violence mentioned earlier (i.e., various harmful acts that are gendered and perpetuate inequality), collecting such data would prove difficult. Gender-based and sexualized violence may not lead to disclosures to sexual violence prevention offices on campuses. Gender-based and sexualized violent behaviours may then be less likely to be documented. Therefore, any outcome data collected may show deflated rates of behaviour that do not truly reflect what’s happening on PSI campuses. Furthermore, documentation of any disclosures will be unlikely to be recorded in a student’s record and therefore outcomes for individuals will not be accessible to examine (i.e., whether a person who has caused harm has committed other offences on or off campus). Additionally, students who cause harm stay in the PSI community for a limited time and collecting the outcome data, like recidivism, needed to perform statistical examinations of how well a tool predicts may not even be possible.

In light of this absent and hard-to-obtain data, we will need another way to develop a tool that is not statistically designed to establish probabilities, but instead relies on single factors associated with the likelihood of gender-based and sexualized violence occurring.

Measuring outcomes, such as recidivism or sexual misconduct behaviour after a disclosure, and collecting and using these measures to develop normative data (e.g., a baseline of risk scores to examine discrimination of those who engage in gender-based and sexualized violence and those who do not) is not realistic. Therefore, the standard of tool evaluation used in forensic settings is not achievable in a PSI setting at the current time.

Tools designed for non-forensic settings are exploratory and lack sufficient empirical support for their risk items

Beyond the criminal justice context, there are a few non-forensic tools commercially available. Although intended to assess violence in civil settings such as the workplace, these tools have yet to be empirically studied to conclude they validly predict the outcomes for which they were designed. For instance, the WAVR (White & Meloy, 2010) and the WRA-20 (Bloom et al., 2000) are used to assess workplace risk and are commercially available. The WRA-20 focuses exclusively on environmental and situational variables that are presumed to operate in a wide array of workplaces. The tool uses a 0, 1, and 2 scoring system for the "benchmarking" of violence risks within organizations. At an individual level, the same developers produced the 20-item ERA-20 which assesses the individual employee and is designed for use by mental health professionals. For each of these tools, developers purport the risk factors included are known or postulated to relate to unacceptable conduct and violence in workplaces, schools, the military and other such organizations. However, the problem with these tools is that they often include variables that are not validated in the forensic literature. Furthermore, they do not have validity in the general psychiatric literature, such as depression and suicidality, extreme job attachment, or paranoia (e.g., WAVR). For each of these measures, overall accuracy and reliability as predictive instruments remain unknown.

Why it is Still Important to Review and Deconstruct Existing Risk Tools

Despite the limitations of using an existing forensic or non-forensic risk assessment tool in the PSI setting, the body of literature over the past 50 years has provided us with a solid start for developing something that is relevant and applicable in the PSI context. When it comes to how a community risk assessment tool may look and be structured, what types of risk factors should be considered, and which factors could be relevant, the forensic psychological field can contribute many ideas that would benefit universities, colleges and trade schools in ensuring gender-based and sexualized violence risk is appropriately and accurately assessed.

One way community risk assessment may be approached has to do with how it's developed. There are two common approaches when developing risk tools, structured professional judgment (SPJ) and an actuarial assessment. SPJ tools are developed by choosing factors that have been empirically or theoretically shown to be related to an outcome, such as violent offending (Douglas & Belfrage, 2015), and single studies usually test a single factor to see if it can differentiate between someone who is violent and someone who is not. SPJ tools also allow for clinician input during the risk assessment process. Actuarial tools are often developed by examining a number of factors at the same time, and finding ones that best differentiate between those who are violent and those who are not. Development in examining these factors takes much time and research. Given the time limits of the project and limited research available from PSI settings, an SPJ approach to development became an obvious choice.

Another way we can borrow from the existing literature is the move toward assessing dynamic (or changeable) variables. This move is encouraging given our understanding that risk is not fixed but dynamic in nature (Hanson et al., 2018). Following the commitment of PSIs to responsibly being involved in the rehabilitation of respondents who have been found to have committed gender-based and sexualized violence, the development of a risk tool for use in PSIs should examine risk factors that can be measured in a way that demonstrates their changeable nature.

As the previous subsection highlights, the specific factors that should be included should be less focused on antisocial behaviours and correlates. The current slate of dynamic risk tools include many variables that may be considered relevant to PSIs, such as sexual attitudes and/or cognitive distortions, emotional control/dysregulation, sexual dysregulation, problem-solving abilities, impulsivity and intimacy deficits. These should be further examined in the context of PSI settings for their relevancy to sexually inappropriate behaviours. A few of these non-criminal risk factors are seen in adult-designed risk tools (e.g., sexual preoccupation, sexual interests and attitudes). Also, some youth tools include developmentally defined items (e.g., SPJ tools designed for youth) that better reflect the stage of life for emerging adults. For instance, family and environmental functioning (from ERASOR 2.0 and GAIN), responsivity to guidance and support or internal motivation for change (from J-SOAP-II, PROFESOR), and relationship with peers (from J-SOAP-II, SAVRY, YLS/CMI 2.0) are just some examples of developmentally defined items (see Jung & Thomas, 2022, for an overview of these tools). These are factors that should be considered in PSI settings with emerging adults, who are only recently emancipated youth. Although these existing tools may not be easily employed, the composition of risk factors may be worth borrowing.

Conclusion

The purpose of this appendix was to provide a summary of our review of the existing risk assessment tools from forensic and non-forensic contexts, and to examine how feasible it would be to adopt them and how they would apply in PSI settings. There are many limitations with existing tools, but it's clear that we can learn from the ways these tools have been developed, shaped and composed in order to effectively develop a meaningful and relevant tool that would help reliably assess gender-based and sexualized violence risk in PSIs and their corresponding campus communities.

Appendix C: Employing Consensus Methodology and its Application to the Creation of a Community Based Risk Assessment Tool for PSIs

Typically, a risk assessment tool is developed by systematically surveying the literature, examining its rigour and then deciding upon factors to be tested for their correlation with the event of harm to be predicted. Iterative statistical analyses are then performed to determine which factors would be included in a risk assessment tool and subsequent research confirms those quantitative analyses. Additionally, the body of research may also yield conflicting scientific information and time may be needed to reconcile these discrepancies. Such a process can take years, if not decades. The challenge in creating a risk assessment tool for gender-based and sexualized violence, that is also specific to post-secondary institutions, is that much quantitative research is still needed to confirm that a factor should indeed be considered a risk factor, and post-secondary institutions need a tool now to address what some gender justice advocates would call an epidemic (Khan et al., 2019).

For fields of inquiry where a lack of traditional research exists — or where the field is relatively new or is constantly evolving and traditional research can't keep up with the pace — other methodologies have to be applied to create a risk assessment tool. Such is the case for creating a risk assessment tool for gender-based and sexualized violence that is specific to post-secondary institutions.

Rationale for and Types of Consensus Methodology

Where there is a lack of traditional research and evidence to create risk assessment tools, and there is a need to create such tools in a robust and rigorous fashion, consensus methodology should be employed. There are three recognized methods: Nominal, Consensus Development, and Delphi Method. All three are expert-driven methodologies that are typically employed in fields like health care, policy studies and technology. Expert selection is a critical element in all forms of consensus methodology because the experts' knowledge of the subject matter provides insight and perspective that quantitative methods might not be able to ascertain, and it is their expertise as well as group consensus that helps refine the selection of items to be included in the tool, policy or guideline being created (Dalkey, 1969; Jones & Hunter, 1995). All three methodologies are also considered to be partly quantitative methods as they measure agreement (i.e., consensus) amongst experts in the field, while also qualitatively searching for development on consensus when experts may initially disagree.

All three methods find consensus by examining a number of best practice statements where the recruited experts discuss whether such statements would be included in the tool, policy or guideline being developed. Where there is a high majority agreement on a practice, that best practice is accepted into the guideline, framework or tool. Subsequent rounds of discussion are then used to explore the points of disagreement and find points of consensus within these differences. This is sometimes known as consensus development. When more consensus is found on a practice, after some consensus development discussion, again that practice statement is accepted (or not) into the tool, policy or guideline. Where there is disagreement, such divergences are saved for discussion in future meeting rounds. Typically, the total number of rounds in which agreement can be found can range from a minimum of three to as many as five.

The first two methods mentioned (i.e., Nominal and Consensus Development) occur face-to-face and can be costly and time- and labour-intensive if bringing in experts from around the country. However, with the rise and popularity of video conferencing technology, adapted methods of the Nominal and Consensus Development are more feasible. Both methods also require researchers to be skilled facilitators in responding to group dynamics while trying to achieve consensus, otherwise, the discussions may stall, be dominated by certain individuals or never reach enough consensus. In contrast, the Delphi method can be done via anonymous questionnaires and may be easier to implement and not easily subject to unhelpful group dynamics (Wagner et al., 2016). The disadvantage of the Delphi method is, however, its inability to capitalize on experts building upon each other's ideas, in contrast to the Nominal and Consensus Development methods.

Application of the Nominal Approach

The specific method selected for this project was the Nominal approach. Two advisory panels were created, composed of a wide range of post-secondary institutional stakeholders, such as students, researchers, faculty and staff, who were identified as experts in gender-based and sexualized harm. The Nominal approach was chosen over the Consensus Development and Delphi method because it prioritized the opinions of those who might end up using the Tool or those who could be directly impacted by it (James &

Warren-Forward, 2015) and would have the advantage of panel advisory members being able to build upon each other's ideas. Ultimately, this consensus method was chosen because it encouraged contributions from a number of experts who possess multiple lenses, with varied lived experiences, allowing for a wider breadth of feedback and discussion on the risk factors being considered for inclusion.

The members of the advisory panels were surveyed before their first meeting about the appropriateness statement (in our case, a risk factor proposed to be useful in predicting gender-based and sexualized harm in post-secondary institutions). They were provided with scientific information and literature in support of inclusion in the final Tool. The advisory panels' answers to the survey were collected and tabulated. Later, the results were revealed to them in aggregate form for them to discuss at the first panel meeting. At the first meeting and every subsequent meeting, the advisory panels participated in structured group discussions that minimized unhelpful group dynamics, where consensus was sought on risk factors where no majority agreement was found.

After a structured discussion occurred on a particular risk factor where agreement was originally not found, there were open discussions that allowed consensus development amongst the panels with the assistance of the researchers. These discussions would lead to the risk factor being eliminated, reformulated or further contextualized, allowing agreement to occur. To confirm those development discussions, agreement was then sought to measure the strength of agreement amongst the panel members. If the strength of the agreement did not reach consensus levels determined by the researchers prior to the first meeting, consensus development discussions would continue in an open format. If consensus was reached, the next risk factor would be discussed and the method repeated. These discussions occurred over the span of six months leading to 16 risk factors being identified for inclusion in the final version of the Community Risk Assessment Tool.

Appendix D: Case Illustrations of the Tool

The following provides illustrations of how the Community Risk Assessment Tool may be applied and used. **These are by no means prototypical scenarios, as reported cases will vary across institutions and campuses. They are for illustrative purposes only.**

Example A

Carolyn attends office hours to discuss her course progress and discloses that she experienced sexual violence while staying in her campus residence. The professor contacts the Campus Violence Response Team, and a member of the team interviews Carolyn.

In the interview, Carolyn shares that she moved from another province to attend university. During the first few weeks of class, there were many on- and off-campus parties. Carolyn first met John at one of these parties, and over the course of the semester, they would walk to classes together, get coffee after classes, and study together. Carolyn was not interested in a romantic relationship, and she let John know this early on. One night, John and Carolyn were watching a movie in Carolyn's room. At some point, John leaned over and tried to kiss Carolyn. She pushed him away and said she didn't think of him that way. John tried to kiss her again and fondled her breasts over her sweater. She pushed him away again and told him to leave. Since the incident, Carolyn has been having a hard time concentrating in her classes and has noticed a negative effect on her grades. She no longer wants to live in a campus residence. John has been texting Carolyn, and his texts seem to accuse her of leading him on.

In his interview, John tells the Campus Violence Response Team that he was overwhelmed when he got to university since he had so much freedom for the first time. He lived in a campus residence and was around young women a lot more than when he was in high school. John attended parties in the first few weeks of classes and drank alcohol for the first time at these parties, which is where he met Carolyn. He thought she was pretty and really nice. John admits that Carolyn said she was not interested in a romantic relationship but thought she would change her mind since they spent so much time together.

Questions to Consider

- Are there any other reports of misconduct by John?
- Are there university policies and services to address gender-based and sexualized violence?
- How and when is information about programs and services about campus violence and safety shared with students?
- Would John or Carolyn be considered marginalized individuals (neurodivergent, racialized, bisexual, disabled, etc.)?
- Are John or Carolyn part of on- or off-campus groups (e.g., fraternities, sororities, sports teams)?
- What is the reputation of the post-secondary institution when it comes to freshman week?

Completed Community Risk Tool Worksheet for Example A

Note: P = Present | ? = Some evidence | NP = Absent

Factor	P, ?, NP	Rationale for scoring
Factors Related to the Survivor		
1. Marginalized identities	NP	Both Carolyn and John are described as white and come from middle-class families and upbringings.
2. Systemic barriers encountered by survivors (marginalized experiences)	NP	Carolyn had a lot of responsibility caregiving for a sister with autism (home is out of province). She was also sexually molested by an uncle during high school. These do not inhibit access to opportunities in her post-secondary life.
Factors Related to the Community		
3. Institutional student life culture	NP	Not really known for being a party school or infamous for any remarkable incidents.
4. Post-secondary living and learning climate	?	Not all residences have bad reputations for partying, but the unit Carolyn lives in is known to have resident advisors who are more permissive than others. It's important to query further.
5. Policies and presence of gender-based and/or sexualized violence resources	NP	The institution has existing policies and a Campus Violence Response Team.
Factors Related to the Incidence of Gender-based and Sexualized Violence		
6. Involvement of substances and/or alcohol	NP	Carolyn and John drank together in the past, but during this incident, both were drinking pop and neither was intoxicated with alcohol or other substances.
7. Nature of relationship between a survivor and a person who has caused harm	NP	John was remorseful about the incident. Carolyn said John always treated her well before this incident.

Factor	P, ?, NP	Rationale for scoring
Factors Related to the Person Who Has Caused Harm		
8. Oppressive attitudes, beliefs and values about women	NP	None noted. John's comments about the survivor and women in his life in general were consistently respectful.
9. Sexual preoccupation	NP	John didn't report engaging in sexual behaviours more excessively than what he thought normal. He said he doesn't like porn.
10. Past perpetration	NP	There were no previous reports, criminal record or academic misconduct at the university or in high school.
11. Impulsivity	NP	None noted. In fact, John was thoughtful in his planning and voiced concern for consequences for behaviours that he didn't put a lot of thought into.
12. Callous disregard	NP	No evidence to suggest a lack of concern and disrespect of others.
13. Controlling and coercive	NP	None noted by Carolyn. No previous serious relationships noted to further examine.
14. Antisociality	NP	No evidence of past criminal behaviour or oppositional behaviours. Generally respectful and gets along with instructors, employers, parents.
15. Participates in hypermasculine culture	NP	Not part of any groups at school (e.g., frats, sports, clubs, etc.). Nothing notable in high school.
16. Problematic sexual expectations and beliefs	NP	None noted. John voiced hope that Carolyn would change her mind, but seemingly believed their closeness would lead to a romantic relationship.

Example B

Late on Friday afternoon, Gwen was working in the chemistry lab on her thesis research. She is in her 2nd year of the graduate Chemistry program, and often works late because she feels she needs to ‘catch up’ since she completed her undergraduate studies in Ghana. While working in the lab, she left to go to the bathroom and saw a guy sitting in a chair in the corridor. She knew she had to pass him to get to the bathroom, so tried to go around him but he got up as soon as she got close to him. She walked really close to the wall to get as far away from him as possible. When she came out of the bathroom, she didn’t see him there anymore. When she turned the corner of the hallway to the lab, he was standing there looking at a poster on the wall. Again, she tried to walk around him, but she felt him turning towards her, so she walked faster to get back to the lab. He followed really closely, and even though she tried to get in before he got to her, she was scared and couldn’t get her key card into the slot fast enough. He came up close and grabbed her hips from behind, so she felt him pressing against her butt. She finally got the door open and slammed the door shut to lock it. After 30 minutes or so, she looked into the hallway and didn’t see him there anymore. She left the lab to go to her locker to get her cell phone and call security, but she heard shuffling inside one of the offices and knocked on a professor’s door to ask for help instead.

The professor called security. They found James, who matched Gwen’s description and ended up being the person who perpetrated the assault. Security documented that James is a 4th-year student in anthropology and a member of the university men’s varsity basketball team. He was hanging out and having some beer with his friends at the campus pub like they always do after practice. He went up to see if they’d posted his grade for one of his classes. His friend dared him to grope one of the women at the pub, but he couldn’t do it and they bugged him about it, so he thought he’d try it on a nice-looking girl he saw in the hall to prove he could. He thought she’d take it as a joke and didn’t think it’d be a big deal. He told security “It’s not like I need to pick up some random girl” and went on to say he has lots of girls who want to go out with him. It was obvious he was from the team since he was wearing his varsity jacket, so he thought she was probably impressed by that.

Questions to Consider

- Would Gwen or James be considered marginalized individuals? Does Gwen face any systemic barriers to her academic work?
- Are there university policies and services to address gender-based and sexualized violence?
- Does James have a record of academic misconduct?
- What do others say about James' behaviour (e.g., employers, coaches, instructors)?
- What is James' behaviour like on the varsity team?
- What types of sexual behaviours does James engage in and how frequently?
- Is the athletic team that James is part of known for party behaviour, hazing rituals, objectification of women?

Completed Community Risk Tool Worksheet for Example B

Note: P = Present | ? = Some evidence | NP = Absent

Factor	P, ?, NP	Rationale for scoring
Factors Related to the Survivor		
1. Marginalized identities	P	Gwen is an international student from Ghana who started her graduate program less than a year ago. English is her second language and she has formed a few friendships from her supervisor's lab.
2. Systemic barriers encountered by survivors (marginalized experiences)	P	Gwen has a notable accent, lives about a 45 min bus ride from campus, and shares accommodations with three other international students.
Factors Related to the Community		
3. Institutional student life culture	?	The university is not really known for party culture. Investigations are done by campus security, but no clear reporting procedures for sexual violence are in place.
4. Post-secondary living and learning climate	NP	None noted. Lives with uncle/aunt off-campus and not enrolled in learning opportunities (e.g., co-op, practicums).
5. Policies and presence of gender-based and/or sexualized violence resources	P	Lack of resources. No dedicated sexual violence office staff, despite having sexual violence policy in place. Carceral approach to reporting.
Factors Related to the Incidence of Gender-based and Sexualized Violence		
6. Involvement of substances and/or alcohol	P	James was described by Gwen as smelling of liquor. James said he'd had a few beers over the past hour.
7. Nature of relationship between a survivor and a person who has caused harm	NP	Beyond the assault, James and Gwen have no prior history together and no expectations that were inherently problematic. James' views are better captured in the next section.

Factor	P, ?, NP	Rationale for scoring
Factors Related to the Person Who Has Caused Harm		
8. Oppressive attitudes, beliefs and values about women	NP	Arrogant/defensive about being able to access women sexually. Does not really carry hostility or misogynistic views about women.
9. Sexual preoccupation	P	Spends a couple of hours a day online viewing porn but denies engaging in excessive self-gratification activities. Occasional casual sex and always looking. No girlfriend.
10. Past perpetration	NP	James has no notable academic misconduct issues related to perpetration or any criminal record.
11. Impulsivity	?	Generally, plans ahead and thinks about consequences; but admits when drinking with friends, he makes stupid decisions and takes dares.
12. Callous disregard	NP	Acknowledged feeling bad that he scared Gwen and did not think how being alone with a stranger would scare her, especially so late at night.
13. Controlling and coercive	NP	Met with James' friends (one whom he dated before), and no evidence suggesting coercive and controlling patterns.
14. Antisociality	?	Been "talked to" about cheating on a biology exam. No other academic integrity issues on his record. No criminal history. Employer said he was reliable.
15. Participates in hypermasculine culture	P	Team is not known widely for misogyny, but James hangs out with 3–4 teammates known to promote non-consensual behaviours towards women.
16. Problematic sexual expectations and beliefs	?	Does not usually act out boldly with women. Admits he felt more confident wearing his varsity jacket and drinking. Should query other intimate relationships.

Appendix E: Further Learning and Resources

The following are further resources on the corresponding topics noted and italicized in the introduction. The resources listed below are not an exhaustive list but serve as a good springboard for further learning on each topic.

Gender-based violence

- European Institute for Gender Equality. (2023). *Gender-based violence.* https://eige.europa.eu/gender-based-violence.

Working with respondents and people who have caused harm

- Mendoza, J. (2023). *Self-Audit tool for practitioners who work with people who have caused harm.* Possibility Seeds' Courage to Act: Addressing and Preventing Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions in Canada. https://www.couragetoact.ca/knowledgecentre.
- Mendoza, J. (2023). *Promising practice guidelines when working with respondents going through a post-secondary complaints processes.* Possibility Seeds' Courage to Act: Addressing and Preventing Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions in Canada. https://www.couragetoact.ca/knowledgecentre.

Trauma-informed practice

- Berardi, A.A. & Morton, B. M. (n.d.). Chapter 5: Trauma-informed response best practices. In *Trauma-Informed School Practices.* Retrieved May 27, 2021, from https://pressbooks.pub/traumainformedschoolpractices/chapter/chapter-5/.
- Sexual Assault Demonstration Initiative. (2013). *Building cultures of care: A guide for sexual assault services programs.* The National Sexual Assault Coalition Resource Sharing Project and National Sexual Violence Resource Center. https://www.nsvrc.org/sites/default/files/publications_nsvrc_guides_building-cultures-of-care.pdf.

Intersectional approach

- Ontario Human Rights Commission. (2002). *An introduction to the intersectional approach.* https://www.ohrc.on.ca/en/intersectional-approach-discrimination-addressing-multiple-grounds-human-rights-claims/introduction-intersectional-approach.

Competence in understanding the limits to confidentiality and privacy

- Javorka, M., & Campbell, R. (2019). Advocacy services for college victims of sexual assault: navigating complicated confidentiality concerns. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation,* 20(3), 304–323.
- Mendoza, J. (2023). *Guidelines on confidentiality and reporting: Checklist tool for campus gender-based violence service and support agreements.* Possibility Seeds' Courage to Act: Addressing and Preventing Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions in Canada. https://www.couragetoact.ca/knowledgecentre.

Navigational knowledge of post-secondary institutional policies and procedures

- Rico, K., Mendoza, J., Anderson, L., Robertson, L., Wolgemuth, S., Cook, A., Avelar, C., Hagen, E., & Rentschler, C. (2021). *Supporting the whole campus community: Working with people who have caused harm.* Possibility Seeds' Courage to Act: Addressing and Preventing Gender-Based Violence at Post-Secondary Institutions in Canada. https://www.couragetoact.ca/knowledgecentre.
- Quinlan, E., Quinlan, A., Fogel, C., & Taylor, G. (Eds.). (2017). *Sexual violence at Canadian universities: Activism, institutional responses, and strategies for change.* Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Toxic masculinity

- Flood, M. (2022, September 21). *'Toxic masculinity': What does it mean, where did it come from – and is the term useful or harmful?* The Conversation. https://theconversation.com/toxic-masculinity-what-does-it-mean-where-did-it-come-from-and-is-the-term-useful-or-harmful-18929.
- TED. (2018, January 3). Why I'm done trying to be "man enough" | Justin Baldoni [Video]. YouTube. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cetg4gu0oQQ.

- Thompson, E. H., Jr., & Bennett, K. M. (2017). Masculinity ideologies. In R. F. Levant & Y. J. Wong (Eds.), *The psychology of men and masculinities* (pp. 45–74). American Psychological Association.