

THE VICTIM'S TRUTH IS THE VICTIM'S TRUTH
CSES RESPONSE TO HATE CRIMES ON CAMPUS AT QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY

Dr. Barbara Perry
Centre on Hate, Bias and Extremism
Ontario Tech University

Irfan Chaudhry
MacEwan University

Report prepared for Risk and Safety Services
Queen's University

August 24, 2021



Executive Summary

Barbara Perry and Irfan Chaudhry were invited to conduct a review of CSES's response to hate crimes and hate incidents. According the Terms of Reference document, "Following recent hate motivated incidents on campus, some equity seeking communities have expressed significant dissatisfaction with the manner in which Campus Security and Emergency Services has responded. In an effort to address these concerns we are implementing a review in order to identify the issues and make recommendations for improvements." Over the period of several months, they reviewed relevant policies, reports and other documentation, and interviewed a number of stakeholders across campus, including staff and students. Interviews were also conducted with a number of CSES staff. The reviewers identified 8 key areas in need of attention:

- 1. Awareness**
- 2. Communication**
- 3. Presence/visibility**
- 4. Trust**
- 5. Response, Follow-up, and Support**
- 6. Reporting and Documenting**
- 7. Recruitment and Hiring**
- 8. Training**

Corresponding to these, a number of recommendations are offered:

1 AWARENESS

1.1 Create a standing committee on hate motivated crimes and incidents at Queen's University.

1.2 Establish clear roles and expectations for CSES when responding to a hate crime or incident.

1.3 Include CSES within EDII work at Queen's University

2 COMMUNICATION

2.1 University wide protocol for reporting, responding to, and recording hate incidents as well as hate crimes.

2.2 Consistent and ongoing updates

2.3 Debriefing

2.4 Further enhance relationship with Kingston Police

3 PRESENCE/VISIBILITY

3.1 Clarity, transparency and public promotion of CSES mandate

3.2 Visibility at campus events, unrelated to security role

3.3 Redesign uniform to be less paramilitary in style

3.4 Revisit the potential for reinventing CSES in the style of those campus services that include Special Constables

4 TRUST

4.1 Expand and resource the Campus Community Engagement working group

4.2 Emphasize and train in empathic communication skills

4.3 Introduce restorative approaches to hate incidents

5 RESPONSE, FOLLOW-UP AND SUPPORT

5.1 Build out an “anti-hate” strategic plan

5.2 Refine and implement Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for responding to hate incidents and hate crimes

5.3 Proactive development of a Safety Plan for groups at higher risk of hate victimization

5.4 Develop a university-wide Bias and Discrimination support guide program for students, faculty, and staff

5.5 Identify Kingston and area resources to which victims of hate crime might also be referred.

6 REPORTING AND DOCUMENTING

6.1 Annual report on hate incidents/hate crime that includes assessment of trends

6.2 Improve current data collection of hate crimes on CSES website

6.3 Further development of online hate and bias reporting tool

7 RECRUITMENT AND HIRING

7.1 Create a hate and bias response community liaison position

7.2 Make obtaining a security license a condition of employment, rather than a condition of applying

7.3 Continue and expand proactive recruitment to broaden the recruitment pool

7.4 Incorporate meaningful EDII questions into the interview process

8 TRAINING

8.1 Embed EDII training into CSES training program

8.2 Increase training on understanding hate crime, hate victimization, and supporting victims of hate

We were asked to conduct a review of the recent history and capacity of Queen's University's Campus Security Office for both preventing and responding to hate crime and hate incidents on campus. Queen's is certainly not alone in seeing a rise in such incidents, as manifestations of hate have grown considerably across the country. And Canadian university campuses have not been immune as similar racial and diversity tensions erupt, reflecting the ongoing public debate on racism and diversity in Canada. CBC and other news outlets reported various hate-incidents in university campuses across Ontario, Quebec and Alberta in 2017. For instance, "alt-right" and neo-Nazi flyers, found at McMaster and York to Anti-Muslim posters insulting Muslims and Sikhs at the universities of Calgary and Alberta. "Make Canada great again" posters, featuring anti-gay and anti-Muslim propaganda, were discovered at McGill University campus in December 2016 (Metro News: December 8, 2016). In fall of 2020, the University of Ottawa say several incidents of racist graffiti across campus (<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/hate-crime-unit-university-of-ottawa-police-1.5779605>). All too frequently, students representing the targeted communities have not been satisfied by the responses of their institutions. In short, there is a common tendency across universities to dismiss hate motivated incidents as "minor" or "trivial," which is certainly not the way they are experienced by those affected directly and indirectly. Universities need to have in place the responses and supports that can help prevent such incidents or at least ensure that they are dealt with appropriately when they occur.

Ervin (2001: 764) points out that "diversity in higher education is a systematic blending of academic programs, recruitment, retention, policies, and curriculum that provide college students with an enriched multicultural environment for learning." However, increasingly diverse campus climates are also sites of conflict between groups. Harassment and violence based on racism, homophobia, and other forms of discrimination run contrary to notions of higher education as the antidote to prejudice and bigotry, yet anecdotal evidence suggests that these behaviors can be found on campuses throughout Canada (B'Nai Brith, 2020).

The often hostile response to the recent shifts in the demographics and cultural orientation of higher education comes as no surprise. Threats to the established racial and gendered order are consistently met with counter mobilization on the part of the traditionally

dominant group(s) (see e.g., Roscigno 1994). In short, contemporary campus hate crime may be tied to a profound sense of dislocation motivated by the perceived “crisis of identity” that has its roots in the civil rights movements of the 1960s and 1970s, and by the “official” policy of multiculturalism (Fleras and Elliott, 2002). Specifically, the increased presence, visibility and activism of non-white, non-European, non-Christian, non-male, non-heterosexual students and faculty may be perceived by some as distinct threats to the long-standing patterns of privilege on campus. One extreme response to this may be elevated levels of violence and harassment of the “other”. Queen’s University acknowledges these patterns, and has thus contracted this review to assess the capacity of CSES to engage with the broader campus community in preventing and responding to hate incidents and hate crime.

Before proceeding, it is important to specify that we are concerned with responses to both hate crimes and hate incidents. The definitions of each follow:

- a) “Hate-motivated crime” refers to a criminal offence committed against a person or property, which is motivated solely, or in part, by the offender’s hate, bias or prejudice based on race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, or similar factor;
- b) “Hate-motivated incident” refers to an incident which involves behaviours that, though motivated by hate or bias against a victims’ race, national or ethnic origin, language, colour, religion, sex, age, mental or physical disability or sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, or similar factor, are not criminal acts. For example, disrespectful/discriminatory or hostile speech.

While CSES has a role to play in responding to both hate crime and hate incidents, it is important to note that hate *crimes* will, in most cases, be reported to Kingston Police. Nonetheless, as first responders, CSES still has a responsibility to secure evidence and ensure the safety and security of victims. As we discuss below, even once a criminal case has been referred to Kingston Police, CSES should be expected to continue to support the campus communities affected by those crimes.

Approach

The review consisted of both archival and qualitative approaches to explore CSES practice in the area of hate incidents/hate crime.

- Scoping exercise/literature review on campus hate crime and interventions
- Environmental scan – Kingston and area hate crime; media reporting on Queen’s incidents
- A review of employment equity data (e.g. DEAP, QEAP), security reports, emails (where available) and meeting notes for relevant incidents on campus over the last three years.
- Interviews with stakeholders across campus, for a total of 26 individuals (see Appendix 1).
- Review of university policies, procedures, guidelines and processes that span the following areas:
 - Response to hate based incidents
 - Safety education, prevention and outreach
 - Equity, Diversity, Inclusion and Indigeneity
 - Crime prevention and response
 - Risk and threat response and prevention
 - Critical incident/emergency response
 - Investigative duties on campus
 - Communication and systems infrastructure
 - Safety planning, pre and post-incident support
- Review of relevant case files
- Review of training records, plans and programs for all CSES staff

Context: Chown Hall and Four Directions

It is generally understood by most of those we interviewed that a key impetus for this review was the CSES response to a series of hate motivated incidents occurring between 2017 and 2021, including those at Chown Hall and Four Directions. For context, we have pieced together a timeline reflecting this cluster of incidents occurring within a fairly tight period.

Timeline of reported hate incidents, 2017-2021

Year	Month	Type of Incident
2017	January	Graffiti (swastika)
	September	Anti-gay graffiti
	November	Graffiti (swastika)
2018	October	Antisemitic note
	November	Graffiti (swastika)
	November	Graffiti (swastika)
2019	January	Anti-Black graffiti
	May	Hate speech
	September	Anti-Black graffiti/posters
	October	Anti-gay graffiti
	October	Xenophobic graffiti
	October	Chown Hall (flags stolen, hateful note left)
2020	June	Xenophobic comments on survey
	June	Four Directions flags torn
	July	Four Directions teepee torn
	July	Screw in tire of Four Directions Director's vehicle
	August	Window broken at Four Directions
	September	Hateful email sent to Four Directions
	November	Man kicking at door of Four Directions
2021	February	Racist Zoom bombing

	April	Anti-gay hate speech
--	-------	----------------------

The timeline is crucial for understanding some of the concerns raised about the way in which CSES reacts to hate motivated incidents. The experience of so many symbolically significant incidents occurring in a compact stretch of time can be deeply disturbing and frightening for affected communities. Keep in mind, too, that this likely represents the tip of the iceberg, as hate incidents are dramatically under-reported – likely not more than 25% of all such incidents are reported (Wolff and Cokely, 2007). That many of the incidents are at the lower end of the spectrum (e.g., graffiti) does not diminish their impact, as the “normativity” of these kinds of message crimes means that they have powerful effects across the targeted communities. Some in our interviews described a sense, among students and staff, of being “under siege,” leaving them fearful and hypervigilant. This is not uncommon among frequently targeted communities (Perry and Alvi, 2011). It appears that CSES did not take into account that this represented, for many, a linked series of events that were cumulative in their impact. There was a general sense that staff failed to fully understand the impact of this succession of events for members of the targeted communities.

There were widespread concerns specifically about CSES handling of the Chown Hall incident, and the many incidents affecting Four Directions in the latter half of 2020. While these challenges are discussed at various points throughout the report, the crux of the matter is that, among those we interviewed, the perception was that CSES did not fully understand their significance for targeted communities, nor did they provide the immediate or long term support that communities needed. It was also thought by many that CSES did not learn from one incident to the next how their response might be lacking and how they could enhance their efforts in this regard. These elements are further explored below, organized by eight broad themes: 1) Awareness; 2) Communication; 3) Presence/visibility; 4) Trust; 5) Response, Follow-up, and Support; 6) Reporting and Documenting; 7) Recruitment and Hiring; and 8) Training. We offer a series of recommendations following from each of these concerns.

1. Awareness

A major theme that emerged from our interviews was the overall perception that CSES, and Queen's administration, do not have the broader awareness or context to understand the impact of hate motivated crimes and incidents on the community. This sentiment can be articulated in a number of ways. First, there is a significant gap in understanding across the University in what constitutes a hate crime, and what constitutes an act motivated by hate, but not meeting the legal threshold for being classified a crime (commonly referred to as a hate motivated incident). As noted above, a hate crime is typically defined as a criminal act against a person or property that is motivated by a real or perceived hate or bias against the victim's race, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation or disability. In our interviews, we found "hate crimes" and "hate incidents" being used interchangeably. This resulted in an inconsistent understanding of the issue, as well as placing a higher level of expectation for law enforcement intervention. This also created a tension between responding to hate crimes or hate incidents and compliance with the University's Freedom of Speech Policy or the guarantee of Academic Freedom.

Second, a number of interviewees mentioned Queen's being very "euro-centric" in its operations. This observation, echoed a number of times in our interviews, highlighted the desire for a broader cultural shift at Queen's to act on its commitment to Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, and Indigeneity (EDII). In the context of our interviews, this was brought up to highlight how an EDII lens will help support an awareness and appreciation for the impact hate crimes and incidents have on equity deserving groups at the student, staff, and faculty level. As one interviewee highlights,

There has been a pattern of seeing these incidents as just incidents and not as something that permeates the university. For example, if you're having two, three racially motivated incidents every single year, that should be indicating to something and this is something that has been discussed in the kind of culture that's at Queen's and that's been discussed in the five different reports on race and diversity and inclusion on the campus.

Related to the above, there was reference to previous work that Queen's University has done on race relations on campus. This includes the most recent work from the Principal's Implementation Committee on Racism, Diversity, and Inclusion (PICRDI). Previous anti-racism work was mentioned a few times during our interviews, and appears to be a site for consideration in the context of this review. A number of interviewees mentioned that there is a general lack of awareness around EDII at Queen's, and within CSES specifically. As a result, there is a perception that there might be limited capacity within CSES to recognize and acknowledge an incident as being motivated by hate – either real or perceived. As one interviewee mentions, "there is a lack of awareness on the impact of hate and bias motivation from security services. You can investigate and still validate an experience of the victim and/or the survivor." Indeed, it is not immediately evident that this has been an issue that has been central to the "business" of CSES. During the course of our review, we were provided with the agendas of four CSES supervisors' meetings, none of which included any consideration of EDII issues or hate incidents.

The desire for a more victim centered approach as it relates to understanding the impact of hate motivated crimes and incidents, and how this connects to the broader context of hate crime and incident victimization was something a number of interviewees had highlighted. Consider the following two quotes:

I mean we've had some really big incidents and we've had some smaller incidents. I think recognizing what constitutes a hate activity, action, behavior I think is not clear in security. I mean we are often the ones the who say this is racism, this is – and again I get that they take a neutral stance to some extent from an investigative stand point.

It's important, I think, that they understand that the victim's truth is the victim's truth and if they perceive it as unsafe and untenable and they feel at risk, then that's how the situation needs to be treated. Whether you feel like it's that kind of situation or not, if that person feels that way and it's their truth so we have to honor and respect that.

A victim-centred approach to hate crime operates on at least two levels that:

- 1) Understand and acknowledge the impact of hate-motivated crimes on individual victims; and,

2) Understand and acknowledge the impact of hate-motivated crimes on the community as a whole (McDonald and Hogue, 2007: 32).

Awareness and understanding of how hate crimes affect “others” in our midst allows service providers to implement services that are appropriate to localized dynamics. The key to effective delivery of victim services is sensitivity to the cultural needs of the victim’s community, in a way that empowers victims and potential victims. From the perspective of targeted communities, the paramount need in this context is for someone to listen, someone they feel confident in calling upon when in crisis. They are simply asking that they have access to service providers that will listen and acknowledge the pain of ongoing targeting. For many victims, this provides the opportunity they need to have their experiences validated, but also to simply ease their anxiety by speaking about it. Jim Hill’s (2009: 47) widely used manual for Canadian victim services providers includes explicit reference to this:

NGOs involved in interviewing victims should take into account that one of the victim’s biggest fears is that he or she will not be believed . . . NGO staff — as well as police officers and others — can respond to victim accounts by saying that they are sorry about what happened. This validates the victim’s feelings without pre-judging the results of further investigation and reassures the victim that he or she is valued as a person.

Such an approach can go a long way in making victims feel as if they are respected. Moreover, being able to talk through their experience can be empowering as it gives them the opportunity to be reflective about it and thus understand it. At the very least, it can be cathartic.

Recommendations:

1.1 Create a standing committee on hate motivated crimes and incidents at Queen’s University.

This group will review and be informed on all reported hate motivated crimes and incidents, and will also be a central space to provide guidance on responding to hate motivated crimes and incidents (see LePeau et al., 2016). This includes incidents that occur online (such as Zoom

Bombing). The committee should be drawn from across the campus community, to include students and staff from frequently targeted communities.

1.2 Establish clear roles and expectations for CSES when responding to a hate crime or incident.

This includes setting perimeters on the role of CSES, as well as other stakeholders (such as Residence, 4 Directions, and/or the Office of Human Rights) during and after a reported hate crime or hate incident.

1.3 Include CSES within EDII work at Queen's University

Having CSES actively involved in EDII work will ensure that University initiatives are also permeating within CSES. Opportunities of involvement could include CSES as part of current EDII working groups or committees to ensure there is continuity and consistency with this work at the operational level for CSES. For example, an online reporting mechanism for hate incidents is currently being developed, but CSES is not part of that conversation. This is a significant gap.

2. Communication

Many of the challenges identified in our interviews are in some way related to communication strategies and patterns. In the context of hate incidents, this was not a problem for CSES alone, but one that resonated across the campus. There was a general sense that information about hate incidents was not consistently shared among relevant offices. As noted elsewhere, CSES is not always, or perhaps even usually, the first point of contact for staff or students looking to report an incident. They are as likely to connect with Residence dons, with the Human Rights office, or with someone in their academic unit. However, it does not appear that there is a standard protocol for handling such complaints across units. One respondent described an “ad hoc” response, such that “we don’t have a ability to respond in a coordinated manner. . . . literally our response is they get on a reply all email and just like free for all it over a reply all email. Everyone of significance is on an email chain, and keep people up to date that way.” Moreover, those interviewed thought it unlikely that most incidents that fell short of

criminal misconduct made their way to CSES at all. As a result, there is no opportunity for CSES to support investigations, nor is there any systematic way to report or record hate incidents centrally. One interviewee suggested that the university should consider establishing a hate incident/crime protocol similar to that already in place around sexual assault, a protocol that outlines who should be informed of reports, and provides for “wrap-around” services for victims.

Where CSES took primary responsibility for managing hate incidents, it seems that there is widespread dissatisfaction with the way that affected individuals, offices or groups are kept informed of progress. In short, those we interviewed were strikingly consistent in their observation that neither medium nor long term follow-up could be counted on, in spite of the fact that CSES staff indicated that they do try to maintain contact with affected stakeholders. One participant noted an exception in one case where a CSES staff member was, on a nearly daily basis, “updating me on where things were at and why they were delayed or why they weren’t.” As this comment suggests, aside from the regularity of the communication, the content was equally important. When cases are not progressing, people want to know why. In the absence of any concrete advancement, fulsome feedback on what is being done, what obstacles are being faced, what challenges are emerging can ensure communities that their experiences are taken seriously and that they are being investigated.

A final point raised by at least four participants was less about follow-up than about debriefing once a case is “closed” whether by CSES or Kingston Police. This highlights the need for reciprocal dialogue. It is not just that individuals want to be kept in the loop in terms of progress; they also want the opportunity to share their experience of the response with CSES, to provide feedback on what worked and what did not. In short, they suggest a conversation about lessons learned in each case in the interests of enhancing the response to subsequent incidents. The importance of this was stressed by several respondents, including one who said that “in each instance there was a failure to learn from the previous incident and put in place mechanism, processes, policies that change the outcome of the next example or the next incident.” A constructive dialogue among CSES and relevant stakeholders would help to identify and overcome limitations noted along the way.

One of the factors that contributes to the above weakness with respect to hate crimes (as opposed to hate incidents) is what was seen by many participants as a lack of a fully collaborative relationship with Kingston Police. This was noted by the external review of CSES in 2017, that is, the need to establish a more formal and constructive relationship with Kingston Police. It is not readily apparent that this has been established. Once a report is filed with Kingston Police, CSES appears to be locked out of cooperation and information sharing. CSES staff indicated that they frequently reach out to Kingston Police for updates on how cases are progressing, but often receive little or no response. This relationship offers up an array of subsequent challenges with respect to CSES's ability to keep the campus community informed of progress and outcomes. It also appears to hinder Kingston Police response to hate crimes, as many interviewees – including CSES staff – indicated that they felt KP trivialized reports coming from Queen's and even from CSES. Alternatively and indeed preferably,

if campus security had like a really strong relationship with KPS, when campus security calls and says like you need to attend this incident, KPS just attends because they know that this is important to the institution or to the relationship with campus security.

Recommendations:

2.1 University wide protocol for reporting, responding to, and recording hate incidents as well as hate crimes.

In the interests of coordinating awareness of and responses to hate incidents, a formal set of guidelines on protocol and reporting should be developed.

2.2 Consistent and ongoing updates

Stakeholders need to be kept up to date on how investigations are proceeding on a regular basis, even weekly in the case of especially significant incidents. Updates should be provided to any and all individuals, groups or units that are affected.

2.3 Debriefing

Follow-up on hate crime and hate incidents should include a dialogue with all relevant stakeholders at the conclusion of cases. This is an opportunity to inform the community about

the outcome, but also for reflecting upon how it was managed by CSES and other campus offices.

2.4 Further enhance relationship with Kingston Police

CSES has made great effort in building rapport with Kingston Police. As with all external stakeholder relationships, ongoing relationship building can help strengthen these connections. Communication with Kingston Police should be ongoing in the interests of furthering a stronger connection between them, Queens University, and CSES specifically. This is intended to ensure that KP also takes reports of hate crime seriously, and that the feedback loop is kept open.

3. Presence/visibility

We were interested in getting a sense of how CSES was perceived across the campus, and especially what community members felt about their presence on campus. The general response we got was that they were very low profile, and typically visible only when there was trouble or when there was an emergency. Few could recall seeing CSES personnel attend campus events simply to show solidarity with the community, or indeed with marginalized communities specifically. Two female students did note that they felt safer moving about on campus at night if they saw a Security staff member patrolling. Paradoxically, however, one of them also acknowledged that for many Black students, especially, the presence of Security personnel could be intimidating, and evoke concerns about hyper-surveillance. Others, both staff and students, reiterated the potential for intimidation, with particular emphasis on the recent redesign of CSES uniforms. While CSES staff welcomed the new uniform code as a welcome step toward professionalization, this was not the reaction of many interviewees. Rather it presents a much more “aggressive” or “intimidating” paramilitary posture that does little to break down barriers between security and the community, or to enhance their approachability. On the contrary, it has the potential to inspire fear and anxiety among racialized individuals in particular. It is thought to resemble too closely police uniforms, which are connected, for many communities, to a history of over-policing and hyper-surveillance. As with other trends, it is thought that CSES has failed to understand the broader context in which they operate. That is, in this instance, they were not attuned to the broader concerns about

what “the uniform” represents in terms of over- and under-policing of marginalized communities.

Moreover, the change in uniform seems to have done little to overcome another source of confusion about CSES, that is, the difficulty of distinguishing among the different levels of security on campus. In addition to CSES, private security is also contracted for some events and tasks. So, too, do the AMS Student Constables offer security at the campus pubs, and for some campus events. There is little awareness among the campus community about how roles are differentiated across these entities. In a related manner, there was limited knowledge or understanding of the relationship between CSES and Kingston Police, particularly in terms of how the two might collaborate on cases involving hate incidents. It was unclear to most at what point incidents were “turned over” to city police, and what role CSES played in investigations after that point. Moreover, the assumption held by some was that the relationship between CSES and city police was not particularly strong, and that Kingston Police were not likely to engage with CSES in the course of their investigations. This was confirmed by CSES staff who indicated that it was challenging to make contact or elicit information from city police.

This confusion about relative responsibilities is connected to some lack of clarity about the mandate of CSES. Students generally see CSES as primarily concerned with policing infractions. Many staff members characterized CSES as responsible for “floors and doors,” implying that they did not see CSES as an investigative body. They occupy an ill-defined liminal space, wherein they are more than “security guards” but not quite peace officers either. As one participant noted, “they’re sort of more, what is it they say, about keys and locks and stuff, that’s kind of their jam more so and not the expertise in safety and security.”

Recommendations:

3.1 Clarity, transparency and public promotion of CSES mandate.

CSES should engage with stakeholders across campus, including students and student groups, with the explicit intent of informing the community about their mandate, and about their role, responsibility and boundaries around hate incidents and hate crimes.

3.2 Visibility at campus events, unrelated to security role

Informal attendance at campus events is intended to demonstrate a commitment to community engagement outside of their official capacity. It can also provide opportunities for staff to learn more about the experiences and challenges of marginalized groups.

3.3 Redesign uniform to be less paramilitary in style.

This was noted by several interviewees to be a crucial area for change. The new uniform is thought to be intimidating for some communities.

3.4 Revisit the potential for reinventing CSES in the style of those campus services that include Special Constables.

This was recommended, with a strong rationale, in the 2017 review of CSES. Such a transition is in keeping with most large Canadian universities, and would serve to provide a clearer framework for CSES operations.

4. Trust

It is clear from our observations that there is widespread lack of trust in the ability of CSES to fully understand and respond to hate incidents on campus. This is not unique to the campus. As the Black Lives Matter and similar movements have demonstrated, there is a deep distrust of any form of law enforcement, especially among marginalized communities. Specific to CSES, one participant stated that "I think definitely there is mistrust that comes from there beyond just being a police service or a campus police service." Yet, the police-community relationship is often recognized as one of the key prerequisites for effective policing of hate incidents and hate crime (Perry and Samuels-Wortley, forthcoming). As Mason et al. (2017, p.171) observed in their Australian study, whatever the organizational commitment to managing hate crime, "it doesn't really translate unless there is a really deep dive into the community" (Mason et al., 2017 p.171). As noted earlier, the consensus across campus seems to be that CSES has not recognized the need for this "deep dive," leaving them without a solid foundation for an informed response to hate incidents. Consequently, as many of those we interviewed observed, "the relationship is broken." We should be clear at the outset that, for

the most part, “the mistrust is not necessarily in that we will be harmed by them but rather mistrust that we will not be taken seriously.”

So people were just not feeling trustworthy of the police or security services. I know that the staff at Four Directions were feeling like they really only could depend on each other and to provide support for the students and I think the students were feeling largely that they only had the support of Four Directions as well.

This relates back to earlier comments about the perception that CSES staff don’t fully comprehend the significance and impacts of hate incidents for targeted individuals and communities. One interviewee observed that

In the few incidents that I have worked with students, I think the feeling is that campus security doesn’t understand racism and colonialism and how it intersects with their experience and that they wouldn’t be understood or taken seriously and I think that that has been a challenge.

The work of CSES in responding to hate crime will be enhanced and enabled only when trust is restored across campus. This will demand much higher visibility and contact across campus. One participant suggested, for example,

I think that I would start with Yellow House and Queens University International Center and the women’s center and really try to get in there and build relationships before an incident happens, because I think even demonstrating that to our Indigenous community would be beneficial to role model.

CSES staff that we interviewed all highlighted the emphasis that the new Director, Todd Zimmerman, has placed on community contacts since his appointment. For example, they are encouraged to attend campus events informally, and to engage staff and students in casual conversation at events and during patrols. However, it is evident that staff are not following through on this, given that most of our respondents have had very little informal contact with CSES; nor could most recollect having seen CSES staff at campus events simply as participants or learners. In 2019, CSES established a working group on Campus Community Engagement, which as yet has no formal terms of reference. Moreover, it does not appear that those outside of CSES are aware of the committee.

Every staff member at CSES has a role to play in overcoming the trust deficit noted above. Previously, we stressed the need for a victim-centred response to hate incidents.

However, this must be contextualized in a broader effort to enhance a “human-centred” approach to all interactions with the Queen’s community. As noted in one interview,

It’s not very human-centred, it’s not very empathetic. That’s the word I’m looking for. It’s not a very empathetic place or service or space, because I think it’s about – sometimes they get focused, to a certain extent on the process rather than actually on helping support folks through what they’re dealing with.

The “human touch” was something thought to be lacking to some extent. However, there was also the recognition that some staff members are especially adept at providing empathetic and compassionate approach to their work with community members. There were staff members who did garner the respect and trust of those we interviewed. One person was singled out by several participants as someone who did think outside the box, and who was recognized for his respectful and consistent approach to community outreach. He was said to have “walked the talk,” and to have earned trust because “when he says the thing is going to get done, he does the thing.” This is a model to follow consistently.

This suggests the need for training and practice even more fundamental than DEI training. It suggests that staff should be provided the opportunity to hone their “people skills” through regular (as opposed to one off) workshops or training sessions focusing on community and individual engagement – and in fact that they are hired with these “soft” skills in mind.

Another suggested a strategy very much in line with Queen’s efforts toward indigenizing the campus: a justice circle. This is a challenging but potentially impactful approach to healing fractured relationships between CSES and other members of the campus community:

Well what comes to mind for me is like a justice circle, which we do in our community here where we have people on both sides, not make it that kind of a division, but we have the people who were affected by the situation – in this situation we could have (affected individuals and communities) and security talking about that situation and how it made each of them feel and put it right out there so that they can respond to each other in a supportive and safe environment. That’s a facilitated conversation, but it puts it right out on the table for everybody to hear and address.

This suggestion highlights the potential of restorative approaches to healing the relationship between CSES and the communities they serve. It is also worth considering

the value of restorative processes more broadly in the context of hate incidents. Ongoing work by Mark Walters (e.g., Kayali and Walters, 2021; Walters and Hoyle, 2012) suggests that this model can have positive outcomes for victims in some contexts. In particular, many of the harms associated with hate incidents might be mitigated by engaging the victim and offender in a safe, mediated conversation. Levels of fear, anxiety and anger, for example, can be seen to decrease after these interventions (Walters and Hoyle, 2012). However, the restorative justice model goes beyond victim-offender mediation, to promote involvement of the victim, the offender, and the community in the justice process. In particular, restorative justice interventions help to restore victims' and communities' losses by holding offenders accountable for their actions by making them repair the physical and emotional harm they have caused. Such interventions also focus on changing the behavioral patterns of offenders so that they become productive and responsible citizens. The restorative justice model places emphasis on everyone affected by the crime—the community and the victim as well as the offender—to ensure that each gains tangible benefits from their interaction with the criminal justice system.

Recommendations:

4.1 Expand and resource the Campus Community Engagement working group

The role of this committee would be to engage regularly and meaningfully with students, staff and offices across campus, and to allow for consistent awareness of relevant campus events (see Recommendation #3.2).

4.2 Emphasize and train in empathic communication skills.

Hiring should be done with an eye toward the communication skills of candidates. This should be followed up with training around trauma- and victim-centred interviewing. This should also include training on inclusive language, which is perhaps embedded in anti-oppression training as it is currently offered.

4.3 Introduce restorative approaches to hate incidents.

CSES can partner with other offices on campus to develop restorative justice approaches in the case of hate crimes and incidents. Even if cases are handed over to Kingston Police, the potential remains to engage affected parties in strategies intended to heal the harms done.

5. Response, Follow-up, and Support

One of the most prominent areas of consideration which came through our interviews was CSES's response, follow-up and support related to hate incidents and crime. This particular area generated a substantial amount of reflection from our interviews. One of the major challenges identified was the current ad-hoc nature of responding to hate, where some suggested that the current process makes it feel like the onus to address the issue is on the impacted community. Due to recent events, many interviewees reflected on the added burden placed on staff within 4 Directions to address the hate, while still trying to grieve and process being the targets of hate. As one interviewee mentions,

In those incidents, there seems to be a pattern of unpreparedness and a reaction rather than being proactive and creating spaces and also creating structures that allow for when these incidents happen, for people to be held accountable, for students to feel safe, for those who experience this to feel safe.

Many interviewees strongly felt that CSES and other areas of the University need a stronger victim-centric approach when responding to incidents and crimes motivated by hate. There was a desire to be more proactive, rather than reactive. The external report on CSES noted in 2017 that CSES was a passive, rather than active partner in security planning. That perception has not changed among respondents, with one stating that "If you say to me, this is not going to happen again in the future and this is what I'm going to do to make sure that it doesn't happen again, then I'll be like, okay, you know what? That sounds good to me and if I don't like it then I'll tell you what's missing." Examples of being proactive included having safety plans already in place for groups who may be the target of hate or having a response plan to ensure there is appropriate follow-up supports provided to the Queen's community. There also seems to be some confusion as to who ultimately "owns" any response and follow-up support to those impacted by hate, and as a result of this confusion, the current response is inadequate.

One thing the reviewers found through this process was a clear disconnect between how CSES sees their role when responding to hate motivated offenses and how the campus community sees their role. In situations such as Chown Hall or the reported events at 4 Directions, there was a general assumption that CSES would be the lead. However, this was not perceived to be the case by many. This disconnect is what is ultimately contributing to many of the challenges highlighted in this report. CSES, for example, view their role as documenting the occurrence, referring affected parties to support, and reporting relevant updates to internal and external (namely Kingston Police Service) partners. Those outside of CSES also see that as part of their role, but have an added expectation of CSES serving a liaison role with the various areas across campus who have been impacted by the hate to also provide continuity, safety planning, and follow-up. This perceived disconnect is a point of frustration for many, resulting in a number of our interviewees feeling dissatisfied with CSES's ability to respond to hate incidents and crime. Part of this might be due to a lack of awareness regarding the scope of control of CSES. As CSES tends to be complaint driven, there might be a challenge in seeing themselves through a broader lens. As one member from CSES explains,

Our sort of support with people is more short term than it is long term. So we collect information and we try to get the proper supports [through referral] in place and then we kind of back away.

In contrast, many of those we interviewed expect longer term support and feedback from CSES.

A larger part of this issue may also stem from what some perceive as an inability for CSES to know how to adequately respond. Many of the interviewees highlighted a desire for CSES to build on their customer service approach and provide further considerations when a traditional security response might not be appropriate. There was a consistent desire for a clear response to hate incidents which are human centered. As one interviewee mentions,

I would like to see more of a proactive effort from campus security. Provide us options and a space for understanding, rather than defaulting to "nothing can be done". The legal perimeter should not be threshold for a response (or lack thereof).

This is an important point to reflect on. As CSES does not have the purview to involve themselves in criminal code matters, the opportunity exists for there to be "outside the box" thinking as it relates to responding to and supporting those impacted by hate. A number of

interviewees identified having positive experiences with CSES with regards to mental health supports and suicide prevention, so there is a proven ability for the group to be able to provide adequate support for certain situations. Being able to evolve and provide a similar layer of support for victims of hate is something the University community would welcome. As one interviewee highlights,

Queen's University needs to set a standard that there is always something we can do. We should not default to other agencies as a barrier or limit. The message from security (and other areas) seems to be that "we can't" rather than "what else can we do"?

Finally, it is important to remember that Queen's is embedded in the wider community of Kingston. The university should not feel that it is the only space in which students – or faculty and staff – can find support. There are a number of community based organizations to which individuals might also be referred. These should also be identified and called upon when needed. Indeed, proactive engagement would mean that they are positioned to facilitate those supports for members of the Queen's community.

Recommendations:

5.1 Build out an "anti-hate" strategic plan

This will ensure a methodical approach to preventing and responding to hate crime. It should include concrete strategies, accountability measures and timelines, and should not be restricted to CSES's role alone.

5.2 Refine and implement Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) for responding to hate incidents and hate crimes

A draft SOP was shared for the purposes of the review. We have read the work in progress and shared our suggestions for refinement. We have also shared some strong examples of police SOPs, and encourage CSES to engage with those services for guidance.

5.3 Proactive development of a Safety Plan for groups at higher risk of hate victimization

In the interest of timely support and transparent expectations, a safety plan would help ensure that information is shared in a coordinated effort to ensure students, staff, and faculty are aware of what to do or who to call in the event their community is impacted by hate. This would also help clarify the role of CSES, as well as other Queen's University units, when addressing hate crime and incidents.

5.4 Develop a university-wide Bias and Discrimination support guide program for students, faculty, and staff

To ensure there is coordinated awareness on how to respond to reports of hate and bias at Queen's University, it is recommended that a Bias and Discrimination support guide program be implemented. Similar to Sexual Violence Support Guide training available at many Canadian University's, a Bias and Discrimination support guide program would equip members of the University community to respond to reports of hate and discrimination in a human centered way, that takes into account considerations for supporting victims of hate crime and incidents.

5.5 Identify Kingston and area resources to which victims of hate crime might also be referred.

There is an array of community based organizations in Kingston that can also provide support and guidance to individuals affected by hate crime and hate incidents. CSES should identify and engage with these groups and provide contacts to victims when needed. In most communities, there has been a recent growth in the availability of services for equity seeking groups. It is perhaps timely to conduct an inventory of Kingston and area resources. However, the services should also be screened to ensure that they have the capacity to support victims of hate crime.

6. Reporting and Documenting

For an individual student to face this thing and go to campus security, there's not necessarily mechanism in place or ways that a student would even know how to advocate for that. Not only because there's a sense of oh, this is minor or seen as minor or even as not knowing if this is in the purview of campus security.

One of the consistent challenges a number of our interviewees reflected on revolved around the obstacles related to reporting and documenting hate crimes and incidents in a uniform manner. One of the main reasons this was identified as a challenge was due to the fact that many times, CSES might not be the first place students, staff, or faculty members report these offenses to. Indigenous and BIPOC students, in particular, were more likely to report to offices with which they had already built a rapport – such as 4 Directions, the Human Rights Office, or Residence. While important that students be able to report to places they trust, it is just as important to ensure that the relevant areas at the University are also made aware to ensure appropriate awareness, follow-up and follow through when a hate motivated offense is reported. CSES is one of those offices that should be informed.

Further to the above, there was a general perception that documenting these types of crimes and incidents needs to be stronger. Part of the reason for this was systems related, in that the current incident management software is out of date and not appropriate for reporting generally. This is something that CSES has acknowledged in a broader scope, and work is currently underway to ensure an updated reporting software allows for appropriate coding and notifications for hate related crimes and incidents. This effort should also help in providing clear and consistent data for daily, monthly, and annual reporting purposes. Additionally, CSES will also need to ensure that all team members are appropriately trained to document and record hate motivated crimes and incidents. As one interviewee mentions,

Like when it comes to these things [hate motivated offenses], you don't have anything to go back to, to look at and say, okay. It's hard to measure the effectiveness of campus security in certain areas if you lack the data or there are clear blind spots in terms of the ways incidents have been dealt with.

This is exacerbated by the inconsistency in recording hate crimes/incidents. Some of the cases that we reviewed were identified as graffiti, for example, with no way to flag them as potentially hate motivated. This is now the standard approach in law enforcement coding.

Another challenge of reporting, as identified by the interviews, was the potential for it to be overwhelming – especially if the weight is placed on the direct victim of hate to be aware of what to report and to whom. Although interviewees indicated that they might report

directly to peers or other trusted offices on campus, there was still hesitation, as some felt that current processes make it difficult to report and document hate motivated crimes and incidents. The Human Rights Office was provided as one example where students felt it might be overwhelming to report to, especially if a formal interview was required. As one student mentioned “it feels like an onerous process to put back on the shoulders of BIPOC students”. Additionally, students expressed further concern of potential ramifications for reporting, as there was worry that they might be impacted in a negative way. One way to mitigate this risk might be to provide a third-party anonymous reporting tool that can give the University community comfort in reporting hate motivated offenses in a confidential way.

Recommendations:

6.1 Annual report on hate incidents/hate crime that includes assessment of trends

This public report will be an integral part of building transparency and trust with the Queen’s community. The data can help support the work of the Standing Committee (see recommendation 1.1) and will also provide a consistent assessment of the climate of hate at the University. The report should also include assessment of progress toward implementing recommendations.

6.2 Improve current data collection of hate crimes on CSES website

The current reporting on the CSES website captures hate crime as it relates to the Canadian Criminal Code categories. However, the current set-up does not permit the appropriate documenting and reporting of a hate incident. In the new reporting system, it is strongly recommended to have categories within the system that capture hate motivation, and both hate crimes and hate incidents. This will support clear reporting and will provide the required data for the annual report on hate incidents and crime.

6.3 Further development of online hate and bias reporting tool

Work is currently underway to build a platform for the Queen’s community to report hate and bias motivated crimes and incidents online. It is encouraging to see this project is underway,

and as it evolves, it will be important to ensure that there is proper awareness and training provided to those who will be administering the tool. CSES should be involved in this conversation. Things to consider include (but are not limited to): How will reports be validated? Who will be responsible for the platform? How will information be shared, and with whom? All staff who will be working with the tool will require intensive training on its use.

7. Recruitment and Hiring

One other topic which interviewees highlighted as an area for further consideration is the recruitment and hiring for positions within CSES. There is a decided lack of visible diversity within the ranks of Security Services, and its staff do not reflect the community they serve. Moreover, the lack of historically excluded community members at the practitioner level also means that, long term, there will be no diversity at higher levels of the unit.

There is a clear need to enhance recruitment of applicants from a variety of backgrounds. Currently, CSES relies on human resources to support recruitment and hiring practices and do not engage outside of what is offered through human resources to share job opportunities within the service. This demands a broader targeted recruitment drive. One participant suggested a more proactive on-campus recruitment drive whereby offices like the International Centre, and student organizations are actively engaged in recruiting from within. The same can be said for external recruitment. Additionally, most roles within CSES require any potential applicant to already possess a provincial security guard license, which might also limit the pool of potential applicants.

Another aspect regarding hiring and recruitment relates to the interview process and incorporating EDII related questions within the interview. Currently, questions which are included are fairly general, without much emphasis placed on having candidates provide demonstrated examples or experience within the context of EDII. Having specific questions on this topic will help assess suitability for any role within CSES and its alignment with the inclusive excellence goals of Queen's University.

Finally, it became quite clear through the interview and review process that a dedicated resource that can specialize in supporting and following-up on hate motivated incidents and

crime is needed. Currently, there is no centralized position, area or department that takes ownership on these types of occurrences and their follow-up.

Recommendations:

7.1 Create a hate and bias response community liaison position

This position can be the central place for hate motivated crimes and incidents to be situated to ensure there is appropriate follow-up, follow-through, and support options provided for individuals and communities impacted by hate.

7.2 Make obtaining a security license a condition of employment, rather than a condition of applying

Providing this flexibility will likely increase the applicant pool and will also establish an opportunity for CSES to invest in future leaders within the organization to support retention and promotion efforts.

7.3 Continue and expand proactive recruitment to broaden the recruitment pool

In addition to efforts within HR, broader advertisement of positions within CSES will help ensure there is a diverse pool of applicants to select from. Connecting with different indigenous and equity serving organizations in and around the Kingston area could support this endeavor.

7.4 Incorporate meaningful EDII questions into the interview process

Ensuring EDII questions are incorporated into interview questions for CSES positions will provide an opportunity to explore a candidate's awareness and understanding of EDII that can equip hiring managers in assessing suitability for the role. EDII questions could explore familiarity with Indigenous awareness, cultural competence, unconscious bias, etc.

8. Training

Training is limited in its impact to begin with, unless people come into the session with a willingness to learn and apply the teachings.

Another area our interviews generated a significant amount of consideration was the opportunity to enhance and build on current EDII training that CSES, as well as other areas of the University have access to. This is something that CSES is well aware of, and in fact, have committed time and resources under the direction of the current Director of Security Services to ensure staff within security services have access to professional development and training opportunities. This is important to acknowledge, as there is an elevated expectation from the Queen's community that CSES (as well as all areas of the University) have a basic understanding of how colonization, for example, continues to impact the Indigenous community, and how those impacts can reverberate on campus. By being aware of these types of considerations, there is belief that this training can improve the service delivered by CSES, and other areas of the campus, a finding echoed quite loudly by one of our interview participants:

I definitely encourage more training in terms of more culturally sensitive, equity and very anti-racist, anti-oppressive lens in the kind of training that they have in order for people to understand that although it is not a physical violence, it is still violence. And it still effects our safety.

While training won't be the magic panacea to address some of the broader systemic issues within a post-secondary environment, there is an opportunity to significantly enhance current offerings and options related to EDII training that can help support a positive culture shift at the University. As one interviewee highlights, for training to be effective, you need the right "context, mindset, and content". Moreover, it needs to be ongoing rather than a "one off."

Currently, offerings related to equity and inclusion are quite limited and appear to be optional in nature (outside of EDII training that is compliance or employment focused). Additionally, there is no specific training related to understanding hate crime (or incidents), supporting victims of hate, or other similar offerings which could help support CSES and other staff in adequately understanding the issue to ensure there is a proper response. While the Human Rights Office does provide a number of EDII related trainings and workshops, many of them might need further amendments to make it applicable to the operational setting of a campus security department. This assessment was made after reviewing the following courses:

- *Call it Out anti-Racism training*

- Comment: fairly high level and provides an overview of the Ontario Human Rights Act. Provides very general information related to racism and racial discrimination.
- *Conversations on Decolonization:*
 - Comment: very informative and contains good content. In its current form, it might not be applicable to non-instructional contexts at the University
- *Human Rights 101*
 - Comment: this module provides appropriate context, however, might require some updates to reflect current day realities. There is also a heavy focus on accommodation and an employer's responsibility (AODA), so at times, is very compliance focused.
- *Human Rights Are Not Cancelled*
 - Comment: This PSA is helpful to ensure the Queen's community is aware that the Human Rights Office is still available, however, due to its length (5 mins), it serves more as a statement rather than a training offering.
- *What a Pandemic Teaches Us About Racism (I) and (II)*
 - Comment: Provides a good foundation for understanding racism. This can be further developed for security services and be a standalone training module.
- *Introduction to Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion*
 - Comment: Provides good content, however, the online delivery might not be as effective. Offering synchronous (in-person or virtual) sessions would be preferred method. There is too much content included in this for an online module, so a separate series might be more effective.
- *Unconscious Bias*
 - Comment: Further content needed to enhance what is currently there and make module applicable and interactive. Consider adding content related to micro-aggressions.
- *Working Together: Building an Inclusive Queen's Community*

- Comment: This training provides some good foundational knowledge and should be established as a mandatory course for all staff and faculty. Offerings should also be available in person, to supplement the online module.

Additionally, CSES needs to further enhance the EDII training plan for all staff members. While one CSES operations document titled “Queen’s University Campus Security and Emergency Services Training Plan for Security Supervisors” provides a robust outline (broken down into 15 modules) for Security Supervisors, the plan currently houses EDII training in the last module, alongside safety training and cyber security training. Creating a standalone module for EDII and including content related to understanding hate crime and incidents would be a preferable approach. First, it highlights the centrality of EDII issues for security services. It will also help build foundational EDII knowledge within CSES, and ensure all staff have similar awareness levels related to EDII and its connection to hate, bias, and discrimination. This will also help enhance training sessions provided by CSES. For example, CSES are invited to provide a presentation to Residence Don’s on an annual basis. Under its current format, CSES provides a general overview of safety and a process orientation for them to understand. What could supplement this training is specific information and guidelines on how CSES advises to manage hate crimes or incidents, as well as informing the Don’s on the process that CSES follows to ensure there is appropriate knowledge and expectations shared with the group.

Recommendations:

8.1 Embed EDII training into CSES training program

EDII focused training that is embedded within the overall training program for CSES will establish this content as a standard and baseline for all staff to have. In its current form, training is very operational focused without much attention to building emotional intelligence. EDII trainings can be supplemented and enhanced by ensuring CSES staff have an opportunity to build knowledge and practice related to Indigeneity, anti-oppression, anti-racism, inclusive communication and other EDII related content. EDII training should be incorporated as a separate module in any training plan to ensure it is part of a broad and robust training program for CSES.

8.2 Increase training on understanding hate crime, hate victimization, and supporting victims of hate

There is a current gap in access to this knowledge. Providing education on this topic will provide baseline awareness and understanding of hate crime, hate crime victimization, and other related topics which can help support a more victim centered approach when responding to reports of hate. This training should be available and accessible for members of CSES, as well as the Human Rights Office, Residence, and 4 Directions¹. Police services in Peel Region, York Region and Toronto have agreed to support CSES in enhancing their understanding of hate crime. Note, too, that York Regional Police will be holding a hate crime conference in September, 2021. We can facilitate contact so that CSES members can attend. Importantly, as one participant noted, “It’s not a one-time presentation. It’s a continuous piece, because you always walk away learning something.”

Concluding Thoughts: Institutional Responsibility

It is important to note that CSES is not alone in its failure to effectively serve the community. It was widely recognized that the context for the recent spate of hate incidents and hate crimes is embedded in the culture of the university. This was a sentiment expressed by a substantial number of those we interviewed. For example,

We’ve been talking about how do we make change? Really we talked about the change is systemic. It’s the whole system at Queen’s University. It’s the whole history of the university. We’re a very white, very privileged institution.

The impact of institutional neglect is also evident in the slow progress made toward the implementation of related recommendations from successive reports on systemic discrimination at Queen’s. Since 2004, there have been 8 EDII related reports/plans, including Annual Progress Reports from the Principal’s Implementation Committee on Racism, Diversity and Inclusion (PICRDI). The 2017 PICRDI report observed that “although some original

¹ The following resources provide further information on what types of education and training can support adequate responses to hate crime and hate incident victimization: <https://tacklinghate.org/training-modules/>

https://www.oacp.ca/en/current-issues/resources/Hate%20Crime%20Report_October%202020.pdf

recommendations had been carried out, the majority had not. Furthermore, where some positive progress had been made, these advancements had not resulted in the systemic, institution-wide changes needed to sustain these efforts.” The review committee identified a number of key barriers to progress in the area of diversity and inclusivity, each of which also has implications for both the commission of hate incidents and the response to them. In particular, we would draw attention to: the lack of prioritization of EDII issues; under-resourcing of the Human Rights and Equity office; lack of accountability; and the reluctance of historically excluded groups to attend Queen’s.

Subsequent progress reports in 2018, 2019, and 2020 are largely acritical catalogues of progress made in the area since the initial 2017 report, making no mention of continuing barriers. Ironically, the last two were published during the time period when the rash of incidents listed at the beginning of this report were occurring. Yet no mention is made of those. If change is to be made, these progress reports must also identify and highlight ongoing areas of weakness. It is clear from our discussions with students and staff across campus that it continues to be an unwelcoming and indeed threatening space for some communities. Failure to openly acknowledge this in annual accounts of the EDII landscape on campus contributes to the widespread sense that hate incidents are minimized and their impacts discounted.

References

- B'Nai Brith (2020). *2019 Audit of anti-Semitic incidents*. Toronto: B'Nai Brith.
- Ervin, K. (2001). Multiculturalism, Diversity, And African American College Students: Receptive, Yet Skeptical? *Journal Of Black Studies*, 31(6): 764-776.
- Fleras, A., and Elliott, J. (2002). *Engaging Diversity: Multiculturalism in Canada*. Toronto: Nelson Thomson Learning.
- Hill, J. (2009). *Working with Victims of Crime: A Manual Applying Research to Clinical Practice*. Department of Justice: Ottawa. <http://canada.justice.gc.ca/eng/pi/pcvi-cpcv/pub/research/hill.pdf>
- Kayali, L., & Walters, M. A. (2021). Responding to hate incidents on university campuses: benefits and barriers to establishing a restorative justice programme. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 24(1): 64-84.
- LePeau, L. A., Morgan, D. L., Zimmerman, H. B., Snipes, J. T., & Marcotte, B. A. (2016). Connecting to get things done: A conceptual model of the process used to respond to bias incidents. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 9(2): 113-132.
- Mason, G., Maher, J., McCulloch, J., Pickering, S., Wickes, R., & McKay, C. (2017). *Policing hate crime: Understanding communities and prejudice*. Taylor & Francis
- McDonald, S., and Hogue, A. (2007). *An Exploration of the Needs of Victims of Hate Crime*. Ottawa: Department of Justice.
- Perry, B., and Alvi, S. (2011). "We are all vulnerable:" The in terrorem effects of hate crime. *International Review of Victimology*, 18(1): 57-72.
- Perry, B., and Samuels-Wortley, K. (forthcoming). "We're not where we should be:" Enhancing Law Enforcement Responses to Hate Crime. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*.

Roscigno, V. (1994). Social Movement struggle and race, gender, class inequality. *Race, Sex and Class*, 2(1): 109-126.

Walters, M., and Hoyle, C. 2012. Exploring the Everyday World of Hate Victimization Through Community Mediation. *International Review of Victimology*, 18(1): 7-24.

Wolff, K. B. and C. L. Cokely (2007). "To protect and to serve?" An exploration of police conduct in relation to the gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender community. *Sexuality and Culture: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly*, 1(2): 1-23.

Appendix 1 - Interviews

- Deputy Provost (Academic Operations and Inclusion), Teri Shearer
- AVP (Human Rights, Equity and Inclusion), Stephanie Simpson
- AVP (Indigenous Initiatives and Reconciliation), Kanonhsyonne Janice Hill
- AVP and Dean of Student Affairs, Ann Tierney
- Assistant Dean Student Life and Learning, Corinna Fitzgerald
- Assistant Dean, Support Services and Community Engagement, Lindsay Winger
- Inclusion and Anti-Racism Advisor, Lavie Williams
- Human Rights Advisor, Nilani Loganathan
- Director, Queen's University International Centre, Sultan Almajji
- Director, Four Directions Indigenous Student Centre, Kandice Baptiste
- Executive Director, Risk and Safety Services, Kim Murphy
- Director, CSES, Todd Zimmerman
- Manager, CSES, Security Operations, Joel Keenleyside
- Manager, CSES, Security Risk and Training, Murray Skeggs
- Supervisor, CSES, Randy Baxter
- Supervisor, CSES, Merideth Smith
- Supervisor, CSES, Tammy Aristilde
- Residence staff
 - Kate Murray
 - Becky Shillington
 - Molly Raffan
 - Genevieve Meloche
- Student organizations
 - Queens Black Academic Society
 - Queens Native Students Association (x2)
 - Queens University Muslims Students Association
 - Queens Society of Graduate and Professional Students

Appendix 2 - timeline

TIMELINE	PROJECT ACTIVITY
March 22	Project start
April 19	Complete document review
April 19 to June 7	Interviews; transcription; analysis
June 7 to July 9	Data review and draft report development
July 21	Draft to Queen's University for review and feedback
August 10/August 20	Feedback received from Queen's
August 24	Final report delivered

Appendix 3 - Reviewers:

Barbara Perry is a Professor in the Faculty of Social Science and Humanities at Ontario Tech University, and the Director of the Centre on Hate, Bias and Extremism. She has written extensively on social justice generally, and hate crime specifically. She has also published in the area of Native American victimization and social control, including one book entitled *The Silent Victims: Native American Victims of Hate Crime*, and *Policing Race and Place: Under- and Over-enforcement in Indian Country*. She was the General Editor of a five volume set on hate crime (Praeger), and editor of *Volume 3: Victims of Hate Crime* of that set. She has also published in the area of campus hate crime, and recently completed a pilot study of law enforcement responses to hate crime in Ontario. Dr. Perry continues to work in the area of hate crime, and has made substantial contributions to the limited scholarship on hate crime in Canada, including work on anti-Muslim violence, hate crime against LGBTQ communities, the community impacts of hate crime, and right-wing extremism in Canada. She is regularly called upon by policy makers, practitioners, and local, national and international media as an expert on hate crime and right-wing extremism.

Irfan Chaudhry has been working in the area of equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) since 2011. He currently works as Director, Office of Human Rights, Diversity, and Equity at MacEwan University and in this capacity, he leads the development of human rights, diversity, and equity initiatives within the institution. He has held numerous roles within the EDI space including project leadership positions with the City of Edmonton's Racism Free Edmonton project and the Edmonton Local Immigration Partnership; advisory positions with the Edmonton Police Service Chief of Police Diversity Recruitment Committee and Chief of Police Community Advisory Committee; the Alberta Hate Crimes Committee, as well as committee roles with Public Safety Canada's Expert Committee on Countering Radicalization to Violence. He also developed StopHateAB.ca, a third-party hate incident reporting tool.