



Managing, Researching, and Enabling Respectful Sexual Conduct in Higher Education

19- 20 February 2018

*KANTL – The Royal Academy of Dutch Language and Literature
Ghent, Belgium*

A two-day workshop organised by
ANSER – *Academic Network for Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights Policy*
INSEP – *International Network for Sexual Ethics and Politics*

General Workshop Theme

Campus sexual violence and harassment is endemic. Research shows that 20% of women at one time during their academic career experience sexual assault and that 5% of men undergo unwanted sexual conduct through force or incapacitation.¹ Rape, sexual violence, harassment, stalking, having to endure unwelcomed sexual attentions - all pose a threat to the academic and personal development of students as well of staff. Although considered to be the 'gold-standard' in ethical sexual relations, we are still confronted with an ethical deficit in sexual conduct within institutions that often have the greatest rhetorical commitment to ethical values.

From the late seventies onwards, there has been a growing awareness of a widespread (date-)rape crisis and culture and of workplace sexual harassment. A growing number of Higher Education Institutions have developed strategies, policies and practices to respond to and prevent non-consensual sexual relations. They have focused on finding viable antidotes to: systemic sexual harassment; the staggering prevalence of (often unreported) rape and sexual violence; and problematic sexual behaviour within staff-staff, staff-student and student-student relations. Yet often these responses have been undermined by their relatively secretive and subdued promotion within institutions and the difficulties of policing social and sexual relationships.

How much has really changed? How much impact have these initiatives had on the prevalence of sexual violence and harassment? How far have policy and practice responses been subordinated to issues of institutional reputation and liability? How much have these contributed to enabling a culture of consensual, open and diverse campus sexuality?

It is time to take stock, learn from the past and plan for the future. In this two-day workshop, we'll be looking at the ways these often violent, non-consensual sexual relations have been managed, researched and at what has been and can be done to enable consensual sexual relations in the academy. The goal is to identify and evaluate best practices and strategies, to sketch out a future policy and research agenda and to contribute to the development of a respectful and healthy sexual culture in Higher Education. We bring together researchers, policy makers, academics and students to reflect on the sexual politics of higher education and build a collaborative agenda for more research and for the development of effective policy tools and practice guidance.

We invited proposals for papers addressing the management of, research into, and ways to enable consensual and respectful sexual conduct in the academy.

¹ Matt J. Gray, Christina M. Hassija, and Sarah E. Steinmetz, *Sexual Assault Prevention on College Campuses* (New York: Psychology Press, 2016).

Monday 19 February 2018 - Overview

09:00 - 09:30 REGISTRATION

09:30 - 09:45 WELCOME & INTRO TO THE CONFERENCE

09:45 - 10:45 INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS

- **The Painful Birth of a Policy!**
Freddy Mortier
- **From Researching & Monitoring Sexual Violence to Enabling Respectful Sexual Conduct Management at Ghent University: Policies & practices**
Sara Drieghe & Ines Keygnaert
- **Sensitization Project Yes² = SeX. Involving students in the prevention of sexual violence**
Jill Michiels

10:45 - 11:00 COFFEE BREAK

11:00 - 13:00 MANAGING 1

- **Beyond the 'Sex Bureaucracy': Institutional responses to sexual violence in Higher Education**
Jenny Hoogewerf-McComb
- **Rethinking the Role of Legal and Regulatory Responses to Campus Sexual Violence**
Neil Cobb
- **Sexual Harassment at Higher Education Institutions in Bangladesh: The quest for policy intervention**
Mohammad Mojibur Rahman
- **Developing a Research Agenda and Policy Suggestions for Sexual Conduct in Higher Education in Turkey**
Cenk Özbay & Ayşecan Terzioğlu

13:00 - 14:00 LUNCH BREAK

14:00 - 15:30 MANAGING 2

- **Student Well-being, Services and Contracts: A UK case study**
Anne Chappell, Charlotte Jones and Pam Alldred
- **Training on Supporting Victims of Sexual Violence at University: An example from Panteion University**
Alexandra Zavos
- **How European Universities Balance Student Safety and Well-being Expectations Differently: Findings from the USVreact project**
Pam Alldred

15:30 - 15:45 COFFEE BREAK

15:45 - 17:15 RESEARCHING 1

- **Learning from Practice: An evaluation of the training models to tackle sexual violence in university settings in the USVreact project**
Marta Luxán, Jokin Azpiazu & Mila Amurrio
- **Outsourcing Sexual Assault Support in UK Universities: An audit of service and Implementation**
Sarah Cooper & Claire A. Dunlop
- **Researching Non-Consensual Sex in Higher Education: Challenges and directions**
Barbara Krahé, Paulina Tomaszewska & Isabell Schuster

Tuesday 20 February 2018 - Overview

09:45 - 10:45 ENABLING 1

- **'Changing the Culture' – A feminist academic activist critique**
Kay Standing and Kym Atkinson
- **Feminist Negotiations of Institutional Violence Prevention Strategies**
Marian Duggan & Sinead Ring

10:45 - 11:00 COFFEE BREAK

11:00 - 13:00 ENABLING 2

- **Preventing Sexual Harassment and Violence at the University of Central Lancashire (UCLAN)**
Khatidja Chantler
- **How Can Universities Talk to Students about Consent? Insights from the development of 'consent conversations' at a UK university**
Kate Hamilton, Jessica Nightingale and Amy Sutherland-Jarvest
- **Cultivating Consent on Campus with Participatory Theatre**
Evan Hastings

13:00 - 14:00 LUNCH BREAK

14:00 - 15:30 ENABLING 3

- **The Possibilities for Consent Education in Schools and Universities**
Pam Alldred & Richard Walker
- **Consent and Beyond Consent**
Paul Reynolds

15:30 - 15:45 COFFEE BREAK

15:45 - 16:30 CLOSING SESSION

MONDAY 19 February 2018 – Abstracts

09:00 - 09:30 REGISTRATION

09:30 - 09:45 WELCOME & INTRO TO THE CONFERENCE

09:45 - 10:45 **INTRODUCTORY PRESENTATIONS**

The Painful Birth of a Policy!

Freddy Mortier – Pro-Vice-Rector, Ghent University – Ghent, Belgium

From Researching & Monitoring Sexual Violence to Enabling Respectful Sexual Conduct Management at Ghent University: Policies & practices

Sara Drieghe – Coordinator UGent Confidential Counsellors – Ghent University – Ghent, Belgium
Ines Keygnaert – ICRH & Team leader Gender & Violence Team, Ghent University – Ghent, Belgium

Sensitization Project Yes² = SeX. Involving students in the prevention of sexual violence

Jill Michiels – vzw ZIJN asbl – Beweging tegen Geweld | Mouvement contre la violence – Brussels, Belgium

Following a large-scaled national study in the Netherlands which suggests that students aged 18 to 25 years are 4 times more vulnerable to become victim of sexual violence, the Belgian Secretary of State for Equal Chances gave the assignment to vzw Zijn to create a national sensitisation project for the prevention of sexual harassment and sexual violence among students in higher education. From August 2016 to June 2017, project **Yes² = SeX** was developed and carried out.

We launched a call for action: we asked students (aged 18 to 25 years) to create their own sensitization campaign in which consent was the central point of focus. The requirements: a positive view on sexuality, a large definition of sexual violence, targeting bystanders and potential offenders. During the development process, students received elaborate information on sexual violence and professional assistance. We received 45 campaigns in total. The best campaign, chosen by a national jury of experts, will be launched nationally in February 2018.

During the creation of all of these campaigns, we experienced what students find important in preventing sexual violence in the student environment. Our key findings are that 1) students stress the idea that 'no means no', whilst consent requires the presence of a 'yes', 2) sexual intimidation and unwanted sexual contact form a widespread 'normalized' problem, 3) the role of bystanders is considered crucial in combatting sexual violence, and 4) at a more societal level, gender norms and the promotion of a 'rape culture' in popular media form an important hurdle in tackling sexual violence.

This project has had an important impact. On the one hand, participating students were thoroughly sensitized, and at the other hand, awareness was raised and the importance of prevention campaigns was put forward at an institutional level.

10:45 - 11:00 COFFEE BREAK

Beyond the 'Sex Bureaucracy': Institutional responses to sexual violence in Higher Education

Jenny Hoogewerf-McComb – Academic Support Office, Durham University, UK

Growing awareness of campus sexual violence has led to escalating demands for higher education institutions to respond to the issue; both in terms of prevention initiatives, and punishment for those found to have assaulted others. Internationally, there is increasing recognition that sexual misconduct in higher education amounts to sexual discrimination against female students and faculty members - a civil rights violation, rather than a private interpersonal dispute.

Yet, while there is consensus that we must do something to address sexual violence on campus, views differ on what that should be and how to achieve it. Campus rape adjudication policies have been variously criticised as 'bureaucratic sex creep', as 'carceral feminism goes to college', overly modelled on criminal justice approaches, and as part of a neoliberal 'institutional economy' which prioritises university reputational and financial concerns over justice.

In contrast, in my talk I will explore a more favourable view of institutional management of sexual misconduct in higher education. Exploring international best practices in campus sexual violence investigation and adjudication, I will consider how university policies have the potential to remedy the inadequacies victim-survivors face in the conventional criminal, civil and restorative justice systems.

Rather than an intrusive, inflexible 'sex bureaucracy', I will argue that campus sexual violence adjudication offers the possibility of what Profs McGlynn and Westmarland describe as 'kaleidoscopic justice' - a supple, multi-layered and victim-centred approach to sexual harm. I will also suggest that by prioritising the needs, wishes and civil rights of the individual victim-survivor, higher education sexual violence work can operate as a form of resistance against the neoliberal academy.

Rethinking the Role of Legal and Regulatory Responses to Campus Sexual Violence

Neil Cobb – School of Law, University of Manchester, UK

For several decades the United States has led the global response to campus sexual violence (CSV). Significantly the U.S. response is dominated by Title IX of the federal Education Amendment Act. This civil rights statute treats institutional failures to address CSV by universities and other higher education institutions (HEIs) in receipt of federal funding as a form of sex discrimination. In turn Title IX offers a host of legal and regulatory remedies to government agencies and affected individuals to hold HEIs to account. This developing legal and regulatory framework has led undoubtedly to the rapid scaling-up of the response to CSV in the U.S. Moreover, in jurisdictions with less established responses to CSV, similar legal and regulatory responses have also been mooted in recent years. For instance, in the UK, legal action under the Human Rights Act and Equality Act has been proposed to push forward the agenda to end CSV. The aim of this paper is to ask: what role can and should these legal and regulatory responses play in holding HEIs to account for CSV? As legal and regulatory regimes emerge across multiple jurisdictions, new questions arise about the suitability of these strategies in bringing about a truly victim/survivor-centred model of social change in relation to CSV. Drawing from feminist and critical thinking which have historically questioned the potential of law and regulation to secure meaningful gender and social justice, the paper argues that these strategies must be approached with caution. On one hand, they can bring important political attention to CSV, and can help to enforce minimum standards of response to CSV across HEIs; on the other, the 'top down' bureaucratic forms of accountability and justice they represent may also be encouraging a more problematic turn away from more radical, transformative and participatory responses to the problem of CSV.

Sexual Harassment at Higher Education Institutions in Bangladesh: The quest for policy intervention

Mohammad Mojibur Rahman – Institute of Education and Research, University of Dhaka, Bangladesh

In recent years, Bangladesh has observed an increased number of incidents of sexual violence at its higher educational institutions, which has become a big concern. Therefore, this paper will explore the incidents of sexual violence at the University of Dhaka, a public university in Bangladesh to build awareness and to formulate a policy for the Institute of Education and Research (IER) of the University of Dhaka. This paper will be based on research carried out as part of the Titular (Martha Farrell) Fellowship 2016 provided by the Association of Commonwealth Universities (ACU). Mixed method approach has been used by applying both qualitative and quantitative data collection techniques. Data has been collected from former and current students, academic and non-academic staffs, gender specialists, human right activists and the members of University Grant Commission (UGC) of Bangladesh. The focus of the study to investigate into the process of executing the incidents of sexual violence. Data reveal that, as of now, there is no sexual violence policy in the higher educational institutions in Bangladesh. However, the authorities of the higher educational institutes always resolve sexual harassment or exploitation complaints in a very traditional way. Data also show that though incidents of sexual violence are increasing alarmingly at higher educational institutions, many of them are not reported by the victims because of socio-cultural and political reasons. Safety and security of the victims, lack of awareness among the stakeholders and extreme punishment for any incident are some other reasons for not reporting the episodes. The respondents emphasized on absence of guidelines and institutional policy and, therefore, urged for a policy guideline and its proper implementation to combat sexual harassment incidents on university campuses. Derived from empirical data, a draft policy guideline has been formulated includes definition of terms, scopes, ethical issues, ways of making and resolving the complaints etc. The draft has been submitted to the authority of IER for the consideration and this could be adapted for other higher education institutes in Bangladesh. Thus, sexual violence could be prevented on campuses across the country.

Developing a Research Agenda and Policy Suggestions for Sexual Conduct in Higher Education in Turkey

Cenk Özbay – Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences, Sabanci University, Turkey

Ayşecan Terzioğlu – Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences, Sabanci University, Turkey

Alongside its traditionally sex-negative and conservative culture, people in Turkey have been experiencing systematic political pressure to further Islamize the public domain, boost gender inequality, and demonize bodily, erotic and sexual expressions and communications. Universities as well as their constellated dormitories, housings, student lifestyles, nightlife and sexual cultures are among the constant targets of Islamist politicians as they come to represent youth, freedom, agency, and dissidence.

On the other hand, forms of unwanted sexual conduct, harassment and especially sexual experiences between structurally more powerful and powerless sides are extremely common at Turkish higher education institutions. When they encounter such cases, university administrations confront the dilemma of adopting a more interventionist strategy or favoring a more liberated attitude in facing voids in law.

In this context, we plan to develop a research agenda that would help us grasping the dimensions and the impact of the violent, non-consensual or unethical sexual encounters. We will present five cases from a public and a private university. The cases from the public university include three female graduate students accusing one male research assistant with sexual abuse; a female undergraduate student accusing a male undergraduate student by taking her nude photos during sexual intercourse and then use them against her; and a transgender student accusing a male security officer by consciously not recognizing their gender identity. The cases from the private university is about a male undergraduate student's "rape attempt" of one of his female classmates,

where he got the minimum penalty and the case is told to be kept secret by the Dean, and a traumatic break-up between a female undergraduate student and her “conservative” boyfriend who assumed that her consent to have sex with him was a proof of her readiness to accept his marriage proposal, which followed their “first time”.

In our presentation, we will discuss the meaning and significance of researching about sexual conduct in higher education in the current Turkish context, through these case studies, and defining the possible boundaries of preventive policies.

13:00 - 14:00 LUNCH BREAK

14:00 - 15:30 **MANAGING 2**

Pam Alldred and Alison Phipps: Fitting Staff to Respond to Sexual Violence Disclosures

This symposium highlights some of the findings from a large European (EU co-funded) project (USVreact/eu) about the provision of training for staff on first response to sexual violence disclosure by students. Each of the papers considers the lessons learned during the two years about trying to ensure that university staff who happen to be, or are in role prepared to be, first responders to disclosures are able to respond supportively and appropriately to any student. The project involved training being delivered and piloted in six countries and can reflect on the distinct challenges offered in each context. All teams were informed by feminist critiques of ‘victim blaming’ around sexual violence and of the judgementality and culpability that can be implied in certain forms of questioning in the name of ‘support’. However, in each geopolitical, cultural and institutional context the nuances of these and the challenges of delivering and embedding this education or training for staff are distinct. The papers describe the focus and design of their respective interventions, what they understand (at this stage) of its success, and explore some of the potential explanations for these. The project overall offers materials that can be used and adapted to different contexts for staff training, and some reflections on how fit staff are or could be to act as first responders to disclosures of sexual harassment, violence or abuse.

Student Well-being, Services and Contracts: A UK case study

Anne Chappell – Department of Education, Brunel University, London, UK

Charlotte Jones – Department of Clinical Sciences, Brunel University, London, UK

Pam Alldred – Department of Clinical Sciences, Brunel University, London, UK

This paper examines one of the UK institutional case studies. It explores the challenges for delivering and then for embedding the intervention in a university in spite of huge amounts of initial support and no explicit resistance to be seen anywhere. In some ways, this case study might have been expected to be the least problematic since the university was coordinating the project, had the largest funding of all partners, and some key staff across the university understood and supported the project from the proposal stage. However, the challenges that arose might point to tensions in cultural framing of culpability and blame and to wider processes at play in the UK HE sector today. Processes beyond the sector of contracting out and the professionalization of parts of the voluntary sector create contradictions in practice for embedding such interventions.

Training on Supporting Victims of Sexual Violence at University: An example from Panteion University

Alexandra Zavos – Centre for Gender Studies, Panteion University, Athens, Greece

This paper discusses the experience of setting up, for the first time, a training programme on supporting victims of sexual violence at university, at one of the leading public Social and Political Science Institutions in Greece, Panteion University. It reflects on the experience and the processes required in this particular context.

The issue of sexual violence at university has, so far, not been the object of specific institutional policies or interventions either at Panteion, or at other Greek universities. The training programme introduced at Panteion University aimed to address this vacuum. Delivered over a period of six months to members of the university community, including members of staff and administration, as well as students, the training focused on raising overall awareness on the issue, discussing possible strategies for supporting victims, as well as facilitating the development of grassroots level responses that can feed into new institutional policies. Moreover, the links between sexual violence at university and gender based violence more generally were further explored, contributing to a broader understanding and evaluation of institutional academic culture in Greece. This framing of the issue as a feminist one, in a context without any student support services or any on-going training courses for staff once in post, and where the programme was delivered by and in the Gender Studies Centre, creates an activist feel to this intervention that appears to contrast with the three UK partners' experiences.

How European Universities Balance Student Safety and Well-being Expectations Differently: Findings from the USVreact project

Pam Alldred – Department of Clinical Sciences, Brunel University, London, UK

On reflection, as the project ends, what can we learn from over 25 universities that piloted the intervention for staff on first responding to sexual violence disclosures? Each team sought to educate rather than merely train staff, to incorporate feminist insights from research and from practice in supporting women survivors, and to promote culture change as well as the development of practice and policy, but the meanings of these varied with context. Each case study is located in a different institutional context, although some are in the same country and some are in the same region (and language group). What do the different experiences tell us about the cultural political of sexual violence in different parts of Europe? What do the case studies tell us about how universities in different parts of Europe operate in relation to student well-being? Discourses of risk and reputation operate differently in advanced neoliberal settings like the UK, and baselines of welfare provision and responsabilisation operate differently for those countries further south or in deeper conditions of austerity. Consumerist understandings of the student, a legalistic framing of sexual violence and reliance on (or concern to avoid) litigious approaches to social justice are all part of the problem. We expected nuances in cultural norms of flirtation and seduction, and variation in student 'hook up' culture, and are interested to see how much what is expected of universities is found to vary. This difference produces interventions more activist or institutional in flavour.

15:30 - 15:45 COFFEE BREAK

Learning from Practice: An evaluation of the training models to tackle sexual violence in university settings in the USVreact project

Marta Luxán – Department of Sociology II, University of the Basque Country, Leioa, Spain

Jokin Azpiazu – Department of Sociology II, University of the Basque Country, Leioa, Spain

Mila Amurrio – Department of Sociology & Social Work, University of the Basque Country, Leioa, Spain

Universities Supporting Victims of Sexual Violence (USVreact) is an ongoing project funded by the European Commission, in which several universities from seven different countries have been developing training models to tackle sexual violence in campus settings. All through the process of developing and delivering training data has been gathered by the team to evaluate the program, and has been contrasted with the data collected by all the rest of the partners in the project. This data consists in post-training surveys filled by participants in the trainings (mostly admin staff that deals with students in an everyday basis and may respond to disclosures of SV), field notes by trainers, in-depth interviews with trainers and trainees alike and data produced during the training sessions.

This paper drafts on the conclusions extracted from this cross-evaluation of the training. Particularly we will focus in the balance between different levels of previous knowledge of the attendants and how to deal with it and very specially in the resistance shown by the participants to some of the contents of the training sessions and how those resistances were dealt with during the sessions by the trainers. We will connect these elements of the analysis with the context and present situation in Higher Education in Europe and particularly in the Basque Country and Spain. Similarly, we will draw some lines of comprehension between the aforementioned elements and wider processes of reactionary resistance against feminist politics and the neo-liberal turn in Higher Education. Finally, we will reflect on the learnings these conclusions can provide in the ongoing process of re-elaborating the university pathways against gender-related violence in the University of the Basque Country in which the research team is as well involved, hoping it can provide ideas that can prove useful in several contexts.

Outsourcing Sexual Assault Support in UK Universities: An audit of service and implementation

Sarah Cooper – Department of Politics, University of Exeter, UK

Claire A. Dunlop – Department of Politics, University of Exeter, UK

Containing rape legislation in England and Wales, the Sexual Offences Act 2003 is often criticised for failing the victims of sexual assault due to its poorly defined legislative intentions. Rates of attrition at multiple points of the criminal justice system, including the courts and police station, offer stark statistics in support of this. In addition, on its own, such a top-down legislative instrument cannot provide a comprehensive regulation for the crime and institutions vary in their provision of supporting services. Implementation and interpretation of the legislation is especially varied in UK universities. This sector is especially important, of course, due to their large and vulnerable populations, and the management of complaints of sexual assault are a critical part of ensuring adequate justice and protection of victims. We collate data from twenty-six top-performing UK universities in order to consider the instruments in place for students. The existence and visibility of support services varies drastically but a common theme runs throughout; the majority of universities outsource these responsibilities and instead assume duty only for signposting adjacent help. This 'flagging up' of services, and level of access for students (including waiting times), therefore becomes crucial in the experience of reporting sexual assault for a student.

Researching Non-Consensual Sex in Higher Education: Challenges and directions

Barbara Krahe – Department of Psychology, University of Potsdam, Germany

Paulina Tomaszewska – Department of Psychology, University of Potsdam, Germany

Isabell Schuster – Department of Psychology, University of Potsdam, Germany

This presentation will outline a research agenda for the promotion of high-quality studies addressing non-consensual sex in higher education. The following elements of such an agenda and the challenges involved will be discussed:

- (1) *State of the evidence*: What do we know so far about the problem of non-consensual sexual experiences in higher education and what are the limitations?
- (2) *Need for definitional clarity*: What types of behaviors and experiences should be covered by the term of “non-consensual sex”?
- (3) *Need for an inclusive approach*: Who should be studied and in what role?
- (4) *Methodology*: How should non-consensual sex be measured and how do different methodological decisions affect the emerging evidence?
- (5) *Conceptualizing risk and vulnerability factors*: How should we proceed to identify factors linked to individual and situational differences in the likelihood of non-consensual sex? What language should we use to conceptualize differences in the probability of victimization and perpetration?
- (6) *Ethical issues*: What are important ethical boundaries to consider in studying sexual victimization and sexual aggression perpetration?
- (7) *Non-consensual sex in academia from a cross-cultural perspective*: How similar or dissimilar are rates and patterns of non-consensual sex in higher education institutions in different countries? How can knowledge about specific cultural norms and practices help to explain non-consensual sex in different countries?

The implications of these topics for the progress of researching respectful sexual conduct in higher education will be discussed.

09:45 - 10:45 **ENABLING 1**

‘Changing the Culture’ – A feminist academic activist critique

Kay Standing – Centre for the Study of Crime, Criminalisation and Social Exclusion, Liverpool John Moores University, UK

Kym Atkinson – Centre for the Study of Crime, Criminalisation and Social Exclusion, Liverpool John Moores University, UK

The Universities UK Taskforce (2016) report, ‘Changing the Culture’ on violence against women, harassment and hate crime has been seen as a turning point in UK universities responses to sexual violence (Richardson and Beer, 2017). Institutional changes have occurred as a response to grassroots feminist activism and resistance to gender based violence, focusing on sexual violence, harassment and ‘lad culture’ in universities (Cobb and Godden-Rasul, 2017; Lewis, Marine and Kenny, 2016). However, the paper will argue the neoliberal marketization of higher education in the UK creates an environment where GBV is normalised, and feminist voices and activism are marginalised and silenced. Based on interviews with academics we argue awareness of GBV amongst staff is limited and providing support for victim/survivors on campus often falls to feminist activist academics. When initiatives for change, led by institutional management, are limited to protecting the ‘reputation’ of the university, it furthermore falls on feminist activist academics to challenge not only sexual violence, but also the reactive and uncritical responses offered by institutions. We contend that national, institutional and individual responses to sexual violence must be rooted in feminist understandings and must analyse the broader issue of sexism, its intersections with further structural issues such as race and class and the ways in which this plays out within the neoliberal institution to the detriment of students and staff.

Cobb, N. and Godden-Rasul, N. (2017) Campus Feminisms: A Conversation with Jess Lishak, Women’s Officer, University of Manchester Students’ Union, 2014-2016. *Feminist Legal Studies*, April 2017, pp. 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10691-017-9344-1>

Lewis, R., Marine, S. and Kenney, K. (2016) “I get together with my friends and try to change it”: Young feminist students resist ‘laddism’, ‘rape culture’ and ‘everyday sexism’ *Journal of Gender Studies*, 1-17

Richardson, D. and Beer, J. (2017) ‘Letters - Universities’ drive to tackle sexual harassment’ *The Guardian*, [online]. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/mar/07/universities-drive-to-tackle-sex-harassment> [Accessed: 02/08/17]

Universities UK (2016) *Changing the Culture: Report of the Universities UK Taskforce examining violence against women, harassment and hate crime affecting university students*. London: Universities UK

Feminist Negotiations of Institutional Violence Prevention Strategies

Marian Duggan – School of Social Policy, Sociology and Social Research, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK

Sinead Ring – Kent Law School, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK

In this paper, the two authors reflect on their work to have sexual and domestic violence among/towards students recognised, responded to and reduced in a UK university. Over the past three years, they have sought to embed a feminist approach to designing and developing University policies and practices in relation to this area where previously there was little to no resources available. While a wider, national recognition of campus-based victimisation has prompted Universities to address their (lack of) provision to student victims and/or perpetrators, there is a more pressing need to ensure that such measures are not merely tokenistic exercises on behalf of the academy. The authors’ involvement in these initiatives have been driven by their inherent feminist ethos to make a meaningful change with respect to individual, institutional and socio-cultural attitudes. As a result of their socio-legal teaching, research and activity into sexual and gender-based violence, they are part of a growing network of scholars who are acutely aware of the need for Universities to address these problems ‘in-house’. Drawing on the range of initiatives adopted,

and challenges faced, the authors indicate the inherent tensions evident when navigating issues of gender, harm, risk and responsibility in an institutional context.

10:45 - 11:00 COFFEE BREAK

11:00 - 13:00 **ENABLING 2**

Preventing Sexual Harassment and Violence at the University of Central Lancashire (UCLAN)

Khatidja Chantler – School of Social Work, Care and Community, University of Central Lancashire, Preston, UK

The Universities UK Taskforce published its report on tackling sexual harassment and hate crime in UK universities in 2016 (UUK, 2016). The report identifies five key components for change, including prevention which is the subject of this paper. Fenton et al (2014) have developed a bystander intervention toolkit based on their evidence review.

A number of universities are now using the toolkit in the UK, but there is little published data about which student populations the intervention works for. At UCLAN, we are beginning a pilot study with diverse student populations to evaluate its relevance and utility for different student groups. Fenton et al (2014) stress the importance of embedding the intervention within the curricula and early indications from other universities are that integrating the programme within credit bearing modules is likely to increase participation and engagement. In this pilot project, three schools (social work, medicine and sport) that reflect diversity and where professional practice is key are included.

This pilot bystander initiative also dovetails with a large scale internationally funded research study (SSHRC, Canada), led by Shariff (McGill) and on which I am a co-applicant. The findings from the UCLAN pilot will provide relevant data to the wider study. The pilot bystander evaluation methods include a pre intervention questionnaire and a post intervention questionnaire 4-6 months later based on social norms theory. These results will also be compared to a whole population UCLAN student baseline survey (as part of SSHRC study) to be conducted in 2017/18 which will also be repeated in 2021 to gauge changes in prevention, disclosure and reporting of sexual violence. Interviews with students, academic staff and senior management will also be conducted as part of the international study.

How Can Universities Talk to Students about Consent? Insights from the development of 'Consent Conversations' at a UK University

Kate Hamilton – Student Transitions and Support Office, University of Sheffield, UK

Jessica Nightingale – University Secretary's Office, University of Sheffield, UK

Amy Sutherland-Jarvest – University Secretary's Office, University of Sheffield, UK

This paper presents a case-study of lessons learnt from the development and delivery of Consent Conversations at the University of Sheffield. Consent Conversations were developed for first-year students in recognition that students arrive on campus with differing understandings of sexual consent; partly dictated by their own sexual experiences, but also influenced by the culture around them. The initiative was piloted in response to growing awareness of the problems of sexual violence, victim blaming and rape myths and an increase in reports of sexual violence from within the student body.

In 2017/18, 580 Consent Conversations will take place in the first semester, delivered by student-leaders to groups of up-to 15 first-year students, in University Accommodation. In the previous two years (including the pilot), 2,700 students have participated in a conversation. Students participate in a guided discussion, which centres around three diverse scenarios which raise questions about where consent was and wasn't given.

Scenarios include: effect of substances on the ability to give consent, controlling and coercive behaviour and implied consent. Discussions are supplemented by information on legal definitions,

bystander intervention and support services. In 2017/18, Consent Conversations will be supported by a University-wide bystander awareness campaign entitled ACT – Ask Care Tell.

Findings from a recent survey into student experiences of sexual harassment/sexual violence and evaluation data from Consent Conversations have sought to understand the impact of the conversations on student's understandings of sex, consent and relationships. Analysis of the data has shown that students who attended Consent Conversations demonstrated greater awareness of issues surrounding sexual violence, improved knowledge of support services and a high likelihood to demonstrate bystander behaviours. This paper will explore and discuss methods of delivering consent education and draw out lessons learnt from the development and implementation of Consent Conversations at the University of Sheffield.

Cultivating Consent on Campus with Participatory Theatre

Evan Hastings – Shadow Liberation – Bangalore, India

Shadow Liberation is an ongoing project that employs elements of Forum Theatre, Shadow Theatre, and Drama Therapy to invite dialogue about Sexual Violence, Gender Inequality and Oppression. In this article I discuss Shadow Liberation's approach to Forum Theatre, a participatory form of theatre in which the audience is invited onstage to replace a character and try out a different approach to the problem depicted in the play (Boal, 1979). This artistic dialogue offers no quick fix solutions but rather places faith in the emerging ethics of the community to creatively address the problem.

Shadow Liberation started in 2011 at Srishti Institute of Art, Design and Technology in Bangalore, India, as a participatory shadow theatre ensemble with a rotating membership of 18-22 year old college students. The primary audiences for Shadow Liberation performance dialogues are urban Indian college students.

The process of turning true stories into scenes that depict childhood sexual abuse, rape, and domestic violence, requires sensitivity and finesse. Realistic reenactments of traumatic events can be emotionally torturous, for the performers and the spectators. The use of shadows allows us to create abstract representations of traumatic events that are visually lush, without being emotionally overwhelming. This layer of abstraction invites audience members to project their own meaning or experience onto the scene, while keeping their critical thoughts engaged with how to transform the situation.

Attuning to the heart of these shared stories, and the emotional landscape where they unfold, is essential to the process of healing.

If the shadows are the heart space, then downstage live action is the head space. This is where we craft more realistic, practical and concrete conflicts into more traditional Forum Theatre Anti-models. By placing prominent opportunities for bystander intervention downstage with live actors, makes the scene more approachable for spectators.

13:00 - 14:00 LUNCH BREAK

14:00 - 15:30 **ENABLING 3**

The Possibilities for Consent Education in Schools and Universities

Pam Aildred – Department of Clinical Sciences, Brunel University, London, UK

Richard Walker – Brunel University London, UK

The rush of 'quick fix' responses in the UK that were prompted by the Universities UK 2016 report and recommendations is resulting in consent education workshops delivered in universities that are informed by a legalistic understanding of consent. This is necessary but not sufficient. Given the feminist and post-colonial critiques of the legal subject, and the empirical data that stretches from feminist research a quarter of a century ago to recent findings, we need to understand 'sexual consent' much more broadly and locate sexual decision making in immediate, local and cultural

structures of power and meaning. This argument is not new in sex and relationship education, usually framed as school-based. Only its application with university student populations is new. In fact, there are at least two areas of existing practice and research that could (and should) inform sexual educational work in universities.

The first is sex and relationship education research (and to a lesser degree perhaps, practice) and the second is youth work practice (and to a lesser degree, research) around sexualities education. This paper examines what can we learn from the sex education literature and the pedagogic practices in informal education for work with students in HE (Alldred) and experience of Students' Union consent education (Walker). It builds on research on training to support practitioners to tackle gender-related violence in young people's lives that will be used to reflect on definitional issues, starting points for learning and how we embed and sustain good practice in pressured and underfunded contexts. How might what we know from sexualities education (or SBSE) inform work with students? What is known about what interventions work for whom? How are the politics of power embedded in sexualities education to create criticality yet commitment around consent?

Consent and Beyond Consent

Paul Reynolds – Department of Social Sciences, Edge Hill University, UK

15:30 - 15:45 COFFEE BREAK

15:45 - 16:30 CLOSING SESSION