

Cyberbullying at Canadian Universities: Linking Research, Policy, and Practice

Thinking about Solutions Working Paper #2

Prepared by:

- **Chantal Faucher**, Centre for Education, Law & Society, Simon Fraser University

In collaboration with:

- **Wanda Cassidy**, Associate Professor, Faculty of Education, and Director, Centre for Education, Law & Society, Simon Fraser University
- **Margaret Jackson**, Professor Emerita, School of Criminology, Simon Fraser University
- **Terry Waterhouse**, Chief Safety Officer, Safety & Risk Services, Simon Fraser University
- **Laura MacDonald**, Director of Program & Policy Development, Safety & Risk Services, Simon Fraser University

© Cassidy, Jackson, Faucher, Waterhouse & MacDonald, 2014.

Acknowledgements:

The authors wish to acknowledge the contributions of all of the participants to the working group discussions at the *Cyberbullying at Canadian Universities* symposium, as well as the facilitators and note-takers who diligently recorded the information that is summarized in this report.

Funding for the symposium was provided by Simon Fraser University's Vice President Academic, Safety & Risk Services, Faculty of Education, and Centre for Education, Law & Society.

Funding for the research presented by Cassidy, Jackson, and Faucher was provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, Standard Research Grant ID 401-2011-1800

Executive summary

- This working paper is the second in a series summarizing the working group discussions, which took place at the *Cyberbullying at Canadian Universities: Linking Research, Policy, and Practice* symposium on March 12th, 2014.
- The symposium brought together participants, including students, faculty members, university staff, and administrators/policymakers, from BC and surrounding areas.
- Cyberbullying in universities is a relatively under-researched area and little is known about effective approaches for countering it.
- Legal presentations by Carman Overholt of Overholt Law and Robyn Durling of the B.C. Human Rights Coalition and BullyFreeBC provided participants with background knowledge about the legal framework that exists around cyberbullying, and bullying and harassment more generally, and how it might be applied in the context of universities.
- Symposium participants engaged in dialogue about the solutions to cyberbullying in universities.
- The importance of having a process for policy development and implementation stood out for most participants. The process should begin with establishing a clear definition based on dialogue involving all stakeholders. It should take into account the unique features of the university context. It should be aimed at promoting awareness of the issue, of the policies and procedures, and of the process for development, implementation, and review.
- The role of education was also central to the discussion. We need to link the messages provided at the K-12 level and those at the post-secondary level, promote awareness and “digital citizenship,” and develop curriculum to ensure a smooth transition to university as well as awareness of these issues.
- At a broader level, we must consider the culture within which cyberbullying occurs. Several participants spoke about the need for a “culture of kindness” or cyber-kindness and civility in order to have a more positive focus on behavioural expectations, rather than a series of prohibitions against inappropriate behaviour.
- Participants overwhelmingly wished for a continued dialogue beyond the day and venue of the symposium. Several suggestions were also made in relation to how we might keep this dialogue moving forward.

Introduction

On March 12th, 2014, the *Cyberbullying at Canadian Universities: Linking Research, Policy, and Practice* symposium brought together key stakeholders (university students, faculty, staff, and administrators/policymakers) from post-secondary institutions in BC, Alberta, and the state of Washington for a dialogue on the issue of cyberbullying in post-secondary institutions. This dialogue served several purposes including raising awareness through research presentations, engaging the various stakeholders in understanding the issue and thinking of effective ways to respond to it, and modelling best practices in university collaboration.

This paper is the second in a series documenting the discussions that took place at the symposium and the follow-up that has and will ensue. The first working paper documented the parameters of the issue as discussed by symposium participants in the small discussion groups. In this second paper, we start with some notes on the legal context surrounding the handling of cyberbullying. We then summarize the main ideas that participants brought forth in terms of thinking about solutions to the problem of cyberbullying, bullying, and harassment in post-secondary institutions based on their respective experiences and their roles. These thoughts are divided into four main parts: policy development and process, education, culture of kindness/cyber-kindness and civility, and symposium follow-up. Although these four parts are related and overlap in some respects, this division assists with the organization of ideas.

Legal context

Two members of the local legal community (Carman Overholt, Q. C., Overholt Law, Robyn Durling, B.C. Human Rights Coalition and BullyFreeBC) gave their time to speak at the symposium in order to assist participants by framing the issue from a legal perspective. Through these two presentations, participants learned about the existing legal framework, which may be called upon in handling some cyberbullying situations as well as bullying and harassment more generally: *Criminal Code of Canada* provisions and Bill C-13 (the *Protecting Canadians from Online Crime Act*), the Nova Scotia *Cyber-Safety Act*, the *Workers Compensation Act* in BC, employment standards and federal OHS legislation, human rights legislation, as well as elements of common law and case law. Some highlights from these presentations included:

- Section 264 of the *Criminal Code* defines the types of unlawful conduct that are considered criminal harassment. This section has been understood to also include threatening or unwanted electronic communication, which meets the definitional criteria of criminal harassment.
- Section 398 of the *Criminal Code* defines defamatory libel, but is rarely used. It is more common to pursue defamation in a civil suit.
- Bill C-13 – *Protecting Canadians from Online Crime Act* – would also include provisions relating to the sharing of “intimate images.”

- Nova Scotia's *Cyber-Safety Act* created the CyberSCAN investigation unit and has provisions to allow cyberbullying prevention orders and protection orders.
- BC's *Workers' Compensation Act* has been expanded to include measures to prevent, report, and investigate workplace bullying and harassment.
- When assessing the legal duties of universities in relation to bullying and harassment between members of the university community, the case law should also be examined (see, for example, *Pridgen v. University of Calgary* ([2012] ABCA 139); *School District No. 44 (North Vancouver) v. Jubran* ([2005] BCCA 201)).
- During the investigation of a complaint, an employer should be mindful of the torts of defamation, false imprisonment, assault and battery, malicious prosecution, negligence, and emotional distress.

Working groups' ideas about solutions to the problem of cyberbullying in universities

During the morning session, symposium participants exchanged ideas about the issue of cyberbullying at university in mixed stakeholder groups in order to gain understanding of the different perspectives brought to bear on this issue. These ideas are summarized in Working Paper #1, which is also available on the www.sfu.ca/bullyingfreecampus website. After lunch, participants were grouped with stakeholders from a similar background to their own in order to discuss solutions to cyberbullying from their own perspective. This paper summarizes the thoughts and suggestions brought forth around solutions by the working group participants. Due to the breadth and volume of suggestions made, some suggestions made in single working groups may not have been included here. Also, it should be noted that the authors do not necessarily endorse all of the suggestions made here. We are merely reflecting the ideas raised during the symposium discussions based on the participants' personal, practical, professional, and academic experiences.

Policy development and process

A substantial aspect of the discussion in most of the working groups was the development of adequate policy around the issues of cyberbullying/bullying and harassment more generally. Some participants acknowledged the existence of policies (some adequate, some not) within their own institutions that targeted such behaviours, while others felt new or better policies were needed. Regardless of their different stakeholder roles on this issue, participants had much to offer in terms of ideas for policy development and process.

- ***Starts with a definition developed through dialogue between key stakeholders***
A key element of the dialogue throughout the day was about the ambiguity surrounding the term cyberbullying. A clear definition is needed. However, the stakeholders emphasized that such a definition should arise from a dialogue

between the key stakeholders at the university, including students, faculty, staff, and administrators. The generational differences are particularly in evidence when it comes to technology-related issues and we are confronted with differing interpretations of what is acceptable. We need clear definitions of what is appropriate online behaviour and what is not and why. A clear definition should be one that works for the university community as a whole and, therefore, needs to arise out of a dialogic process.

- *Clear outline of acceptable and unacceptable behaviours:* In order to provide a clear definition, an explicit statement of the range of acceptable and unacceptable behaviours is needed. There may be behaviours that do not meet the definitional criteria of bullying and harassment, but are inappropriate nonetheless. Bullying is repeated and aggressive and can lead to safety concerns, such as suicidal thoughts. Rude, inappropriate, or mean online behaviour, as well as online course feedback in the form of personal attacks may not constitute cyberbullying, but should also be addressed. It is important to recognize the range of behaviours involved, which may extend into race or gender discrimination, for example, and be considered examples of violence. Stalking should be taken into consideration, as should exclusion. Bullying and cyberbullying are not always overt and exclusionary tactics are not easily defined.
- *Focus on behaviours, not the medium:* As technology is always changing, it may be ill-advised to focus on the technology when devising policy responses. Many participants felt the emphasis should be on the behaviour that is carried out through the use of technology, rather than on the specific type of technology that is used. Participants noted that the cyber-world is not a separate space; it is integrated into our lives and harassment and bullying that occur there are part of our everyday lives and have consequences offline as well as online. Nonetheless, one aspect of online exchanges, which should be taken into account, is the increased likelihood of human errors in interpretation.
- ***Acknowledging context and language***

Participants also spoke about the need for policy development to occur within an understanding of the university context, with its unique aspects, values, language, and priorities.

 - *Situating policy development in the broader context of university:* In order to get at this problem in a more comprehensive way, we cannot soft-sell it and we must consider the language used to address the issue of cyberbullying. We need to develop a specific language around this issue that is reflective of its reality and impacts. By having supportive services and processes, we can address a range of university issues.

- *Freedom of expression and academic freedom:* These are fundamental values in the university context, in particular, but should be clearly delineated. What specifically do these freedoms allow? We should not assume them to be all-encompassing. The limits of these freedoms should be specified for the university audience.
 - *Privacy:* Privacy rights will also become increasingly contentious and should be outlined for members of the university community. What are the expectations for privacy in terms of computers and technology? How are these expectations conveyed to the university community?
 - *Role of the university in relation to cyberbullying:* Universities must acknowledge their role and responsibilities with respect to this issue. Although the impact of cyberbullying is difficult to quantify, the potential impacts on the university community must be addressed.
- ***Raising awareness***
- Participants felt there was a great need for raising awareness and dialogue around cyberbullying that is occurring and its impacts, as well as universities' policies and procedures in place to deal with it or that are needed in order to deal with it more effectively.
- *Awareness of the issue:* The issue of cyberbullying requires increased visibility within institutions, starting from institutional heads openly acknowledging the need to address cyberbullying/bullying and harassment within their institutions. Such pronouncements are believed to generate open discussion on this topic, create a safe space for reporting said problems, and open the dialogue to a wide range of stakeholders on how policy affects or effects procedure. Students need to be made aware of the issue from early on in their education, even at orientation, and reminded throughout their time in university to be mindful of their conduct (online as well as offline) and its impacts. Faculty, staff, and administrators also require similar awareness raising opportunities, however, the venues through which these might occur are not as readily apparent.
 - *Awareness of the existing policies:* It is imperative for all members of the university community to have knowledge of and access to the relevant policies. Online access to policies is deemed essential. Although passive awareness of policies is assured through "I agree" buttons for accessing particular university resources, such as email or Internet service, such agreement clearly does not denote a thorough understanding of the policies. Further, several participants referenced the notion of the "road map" to suggest that readers also require a guide to the policies and to determine which policies are appropriate in particular cases. The lack of familiarity with policy appears to cut across all stakeholder groups to

varying degrees. Again, awareness for all groups needs on-going attention on paper and in practice.

- *Awareness of the process (dialogue):* The policy process involves (or should involve) on-going dialogue throughout the development, implementation, and follow-up/review phases. Two places may have the same policy, but the way that is brought to life through implementation may be different. Dialogue allows the different stakeholders to be involved in shaping and re-shaping the policy to reflect current realities, experiences, and interventions.
 - *Comparison to plagiarism:* A student in a focus group for the study on cyberbullying at the university level made a comparison between awareness of plagiarism that exists at university and awareness of cyberbullying, which would be needed. From early on in university, students are made aware about plagiarism, what it entails, the “grey areas,” how to avoid it, the resources that are available to help students with this issue, etc. The topic is raised in most courses. Students know about the existing policies on this matter. The student from the focus group suggested that a parallel approach should be taken to cyberbullying/ bullying. The analogy to plagiarism resonated with symposium participants, many of whom took up this theme in their discussion of how awareness of cyberbullying, its impacts, consequences, and related policies should be promoted.
- ***Clarity and transparency of policies and procedures***
- The need for clarity in the policies and transparency in the procedures was repeatedly emphasized in many groups’ discussions. Beyond clarity in the definition of what exactly is considered cyberbullying as noted above, the need for clarity was broader.
- *Clarity:* In addition to having a clear definition of cyberbullying to work with, participants felt that the policy should also clearly define consequences, individual roles, and institutional jurisdiction. Having clear statements of what appropriate conduct is and what the consequences are would create safer spaces. It would also allow administrators to take action when needed. There need to be clear links between policies and procedures and unity across the campus community in the implementation of those policies and procedures.
 - *Communication:* Having clear policies and procedures is of little import if no one is aware of their existence. The involvement of all stakeholders in the policy development phase needs to be extended throughout implementation and follow-up. Policies should be communicated often and be easily accessible to all members of the university community. In particular, the policies and supporting resources should be easy to locate

online. There should be on-going dialogue in classrooms starting on the first day to set behavioural expectations. When students are involved in determining the rules of behaviour, they will be more likely to adhere to these codes of conduct.

- *Steps to be taken:* When someone is experiencing cyberbullying or bullying or harassment in university, there should be a clear path to where/who they need to go to file a complaint, what evidence is needed, what the complaint entails, what to do if the person doing the bullying is the professor or the TA, what will happen after the complaint is made, etc. Cyberbullying cases should be mapped out to demonstrate examples of when complaints exist and what happens next. This item also ties into the ease of access to resources and interventions mentioned above.
- *Problems with confidentiality and anonymity:* The desire of some targets of cyberbullying to make anonymous complaints and the obligation of counsellors to respect confidentiality are in conflict with the need for greater transparency surrounding the handling of cyberbullying cases. On the one hand, greater transparency would enhance awareness about cyberbullying and policies to deal with it. Anonymous reporting makes it difficult to respond and to follow up, as well as raising concerns about fabrication. On the other hand, under-reporting of cyberbullying is already a problem for several reasons as outlined in our first Working Paper on the issue, so it would be unfortunate to further hamper the willingness of those targeted by cyberbullying to come forward. Having anonymous reports does allow for some level of awareness of the issue as it affects the institution, specific areas, specific groups, etc. This tension needs to be resolved through dialogue and addressed in policy.
- ***Policy implementation and supportive resources***

The adoption of a clear policy should not be seen as an end point, but rather as part of an on-going policy cycle where the processes of communicating, implementing, and supporting the policy are as important as the process for establishing the policy in the first place. Implementation across various departments, funding issues, and the range of conflicts to be addressed are among the chief concerns raised. Bringing policies to life requires a great deal of effort on several fronts.
- *Support systems and roles of students:* Having a range of supports in place to support students and involving students as well as the university community more generally in providing those supports was strongly advocated among the various groups at the symposium.
 - *Peer-to-peer support, Peer mentorships:* The peer-to-peer approach included several methods for capitalizing on the influence of peers. Peer-to-peer support networks are deemed important for creating

a sense of community for students at the university and enhancing their sense of belonging. In many universities, students are spread out across several campuses and feel alienated and unsupported. Creating a positive online community may help students feel connected. Many symposium participants touted peer mentorships as particularly promising. Cyberbullying research suggests that students are more likely to turn to their friends for help when they are being cyberbullied than to anyone working in an official capacity at the university. Channelling that tendency and utilizing it to help students navigate the resources available to them may be a fruitful approach. Further, working with students to create peer-to-peer contracts that reflect the type of environment everyone would like to be part of is also an example of using the influence of peers to hold each other accountable for their behaviour. This process requires awareness and dialogue as well as outreach to more vulnerable groups.

- *Mentorship, Role modelling:* The top-down approach to mentorship and role modelling was also brought up as a way of eliminating cyberbullying. The Ethics of Care approach gives people specific ways to support others using education and role modelling. Faculty have a large responsibility in facilitating appropriate discussion amongst students and modelling the change they want to see. Healthy role modelling is one of the best ways to guide behaviour. Ombudspersons spoke about starting from the rules and respect, but also about giving students the words to use to communicate about these issues. The barriers of Western culture were also discussed, especially with respect to international students, and the role that a mentor figure could play in helping new students and international students transition and adapt to university.
- *Vulnerabilities and risk – Behaviour Intervention Teams:* Some of the symposium participants spoke of Behaviour Intervention Teams at their respective institutions. These teams are called upon to act in proactive as well as reactive instances. When credible threats are assessed, they can serve to gather information, assess the risk, move the complaint to a higher authority if necessary, and offer mediation services to resolve conflict situations. However, these teams can also be proactive in promoting the development of resilience in individuals to be able to better cope when they are confronted with behaviours such as cyberbullying. They can also help to develop a sense of personal responsibility among all involved (responsibilities of witnesses, targets, perpetrators), as well as enhancing self-awareness, self-regulation, accountability, problem-solving skills, etc.

- *Finding the balance between educative and disciplinary approaches:* The differing perspectives brought to bear on this issue by the symposium participants highlighted the need for a range of approaches and responses. On the one hand, clear policies that outline unwanted behaviours and consequences of engaging in such are needed. On the other hand, the policies that dictate responses to cyberbullying/bullying and harassment can be cold and impersonal and make the situation worse instead of better. With that in mind, several participants advocated for approaches that were less focused on discipline and more focused on relationship management and community building. These approaches favour education, role modelling, empathy, tolerance, caring, and civility. The restorative justice model has also had some success in institutions where the organizational climate is accepting of restorative justice principles and where individuals are willing to engage in such processes in meaningful ways.
- *Empowering “bystanders”:* Bystanders can play a number of important roles in cyberbullying situations from calming down a situation, to calling someone out for bad behaviour, to offering support to targets of cyberbullying, to third party reporting. In order for bystanders to be involved in any of those capacities, they need to feel empowered to do so. Social media campaigns for all members of the university community appear to be popular methods for conveying that information. Programs for bystanders should help them to understand the impact of bystanders and facilitate feelings of safety when defending others or themselves online.
- *Training and support for faculty and staff:* Most faculty and staff do not have training that assists them with offering support or conflict management to students or colleagues, yet they may often be called upon to play such roles. The reflex in such instances may be to shuffle the person seeking help over to counsellors or other authorities because the faculty member or staff member feel uncomfortable or do not have the expertise to address the issues. Education and training for the entire community would be a positive measure. One university participant mentioned a “policy in play” program where new faculty must successfully complete a harassment module before commencing with their teaching/institutional employment. Another university participant reported that their institution holds an annual conference for student advisors to discuss the issues with which they are dealing and to report on national trends, which has been very successful. Another participant noted that it would be good to have a greater number of conflict management contacts, i.e., go-to people in each office who have had some training on university resources, policies, and conflict resolution. Having such a person in the workplace might avoid many situations escalating into grievances due to poor handling of the initial issue. Many

institutions do have resource guides for students, but few have an equivalent for faculty and/or staff.

Education

The role of education in preventing and remediating cyberbullying/ bullying and harassment issues was highlighted throughout the day. There are undoubtedly a number of ways in which increased and more effective education on the issue can assist all stakeholders.

- ***Link to K-12***
Participants clearly recognized that education around the issue of cyberbullying needs to begin well in advance of arrival in the post-secondary environment. Lessons on cyber-kindness, empathy, self-esteem, civility, etc. are (and should be) part of the K-12 curriculum. Educative approaches in post-secondary may draw from successful approaches in the K-12 context and reinforce the value of the lessons learned. Post-secondary education on this issue should therefore focus on reinforcement and outreach.
- ***Transition from secondary school to university***
At the same time, it is recognized that the transition from secondary school to post-secondary brings along with it a new set of assumptions, expectations, and adaptations. In some cases, the social norms are quite different. Educative approaches to assist students with this transition are important. Requiring and supporting professional behaviour and effective communication in these environments is also a key. Professors and instructors have a role to play in setting the tone right from the first classes. Administrators must recognize the problems posed by mandatory courses taught by only one or few professors.
- ***“Digital citizenship”***
Since most people have access to digital forms of communication and these tools are part of the everyday in university, we often operate on the assumption that people know how to utilize these tools effectively. This faulty assumption leads to misunderstandings and causes us to ignore the work that needs to be done in this realm. A social media etiquette training program should be adapted for all new student orientations, new employees, and new faculty and cover areas such as:
 - respectful communication;
 - netiquette;
 - standards of communication at the university level;
 - understanding privacy in social media;
 - the difference between critical feedback and personal attacks;
 - misperceptions which may arise due to lack of paralinguistic cues (e.g. “tone”);
 - perpetuity of online postings and messages;

- the construction of self online.

Such teachings should be reinforced and modelled through policy, tools, resources, and behaviour of all members of the university community inside and outside of the physical and digital classrooms.

- ***Information and awareness campaigns***

The lack of awareness around the issue of cyberbullying (e.g. definition, elements, jurisdiction, boundaries, assessment) and how to approach it (e.g. policies, resources, tools) have been repeatedly emphasized. Participants felt that raising awareness was probably the single most important next step to be taken. They believed that cyberbullying should be included as part of a larger national anti-bullying campaign. It was suggested that messages need to be reflective of the audience being targeted both in terms of language and medium used. A road map to promote the online visibility of policies would also enhance awareness.

- ***Curriculum development***

Several suggestions were made in terms of adapting existing curriculum to include coverage of cyberbullying and related issues as well as developing new curriculum in the area. It would be fairly easy to add a statement at the end of every course outline on the topic of respectful behaviour. Such a statement would be similar to what is already done around plagiarism in many institutions. Positive wording such as: “This course encourages critical appraisal of ideas within a dialogue of respect towards others,” could convey the message without being overly onerous. Instructors should also be encouraged to raise the issue of appropriate and respectful language in classes and online at the start of each course, so that the parameters are clear.

On a broader level, some groups referenced the need for the development of a new course taught across all university units. One group suggested a “Professional Interpersonal Relationships” mandatory course set up by various universities for all faculties (equivalent of a Writing Quantitative Breadth or WQB Requirement), in which discussion of harassment and professional workplace relationships are thoroughly covered. Another group suggested designing a credited course, required for all first-year undergraduate students, which would introduce them to Academic Life. This course would be a seminar (discussion focused) and include topics such as library research, writing academic papers, research ethics, plagiarism, bullying/cyberbullying and respectful behaviours.

Culture of kindness/cyber-kindness and civility

Beyond the discussion around cyberbullying and how to define it, prevent it, react to it, etc. was also a deeper and more positive discussion around what kind of individuals we want to be, what kind of relationships, communities, and institutions

we want to have. The terminology around the “culture of kindness” was quite consistently used across several groups. In that context, the role of technology can be considered also in terms of what it can contribute. The notion of “cyber-kindness” was suggested by the researchers as a means of shifting from using technology to engage in harmful behaviours such as cyberbullying to promoting kind and caring relationships, and to demonstrating empathy and respect.

- ***Role modeling, respect, empathy***

We must consider the social responsibility of each member of the university community in modelling appropriate behaviour, kindness, civility, respect, empathy, and placing value on the behaviour that we want to see. In educational contexts, this responsibility may mean having respectful classrooms where divergent views are welcomed, establishing respect ranging from gender diversity to ethnicity from Day 1, involving students as well as faculty in creating expectations together, reminding ourselves of them throughout the course, and monitoring ourselves in that regard. More generally, these aspects may require some training for members of the university community in how to confront someone in a confident and respectful way, while setting boundaries.

- ***“Kind” workplace, bullying-free zone***

The need to promote an open and honest working environment for all who spend their time at the university (in any number of capacities) was also emphasized. Ensuring a “kind” or bullying-free workplace means that all persons who carry out their daily activities in the workplace are covered by the institutional policies, whether or not they are considered “employees” or “students” of the university.

- ***Relationships, community building***

Participants also recognized that bullying and harassment may often arise out of situations where individuals feel isolated, unwelcomed, and/or disconnected. As such, creating small caring communities, within the large institutions that are universities, and fostering a sense of connectedness are important. How do we create community, belonging, and a sense of social responsibility? Instead of a punitive approach, what is needed is a community that holds its members and itself accountable for what we do and what we do not do. Community building is needed in order to achieve community standards that have an impact on people’s behaviours.

Symposium follow-up

It was repeatedly expressed throughout the day at various moments, as well as in the participant feedback forms, that the symposium should not be an end in itself, but rather the beginning of an on-going dialogue that could inform the changes that are needed ahead.

- ***On-going dialogue – creating a networks of participants***
 The need for on-going dialogue within and between universities, involving all key stakeholders (i.e. students, faculty, staff, and administrators/ policymakers) stands out as a key element in the process for moving forward. Several participants suggested the creation of a participants’ network as a means for on-going dialogue between those present at the symposium and others interested in the same issues. The network could serve as a platform to address policy changes with specific institutional or governmental policymakers. Individuals from the network could pull a team (or teams) together for collaboration, continuation of the dialogue begun at the symposium, and with an aim of implementing results of the dialogue. More dialogue around policies and best practices would be most helpful. Many groups also reported that another symposium in one year would enable such a continued dialogue, as well as an assessment of progress made within that time.

- ***Outreach in community and K-12***
 Participants also suggested that the dialogue be expanded to include those working in the community and with K-12 populations. For example, reaching out to community groups (e.g., LGBTQA) about how cyberbullying impacts certain groups would allow for better understanding and more suitably targeted approaches. K-12 educators need the skills and knowledge to handle these situations. Pulling them into this conversation should help them in their work with children and to provide support or prevention. Participants wondered whether awareness of cyberbullying and the element of online spaces are part of the curriculum. It was mentioned that there is an unfortunate “conscious refusal” in some schools to increase their awareness because the whole system has to be sensitive every time something happens between students, which creates a lot of work for them.

- ***Dissemination of symposium proceedings and recommendations, website***
 Participants also wished to see the conference proceedings and recommendations made available to all interested parties. It was with this objective in mind that the symposium organizers arranged to have volunteer note-takers record the key points of the working group discussions. Such a wealth of information should not be lost at the end of the day. This working paper and the previous one summarize the notes that were submitted by the note-takers at each table. By making them available online via a permanent website (www.sfu.ca/bullyingfreecampus), the organizers wish to ensure that the on-going dialogue is supported by as much information as possible and that each participant/stakeholder at the symposium can return to their institution armed with this information. Further, the website will be maintained on a continuous basis with additional resources posted as they become available. The website can serve as a means of connecting and sharing between the participants and with other stakeholders.

- ***Development of research agenda***

The research presented at the symposium raised as many questions as it answered. Therefore, we need to develop a research agenda that will continue to inform the policy and practice in this area. Online issues of harassment, and the online environment in general, evolve rapidly. The research needs to keep pace with this constant change.

Conclusion

The symposium brought together key stakeholders from universities and the community for this dialogue on cyberbullying at the post-secondary level. These individuals are uniquely positioned to be able to inform the work on solutions to this problem. This second working paper summarized the key elements of the discussions about solutions to cyberbullying in universities from the various perspectives that the stakeholders brought to bear on the issue. The solution elements suggested by participants included:

- Establishing a clear and transparent process for policy development and implementation, which would:
 - include a clear definition of cyberbullying/bullying;
 - take into account the unique aspects of the university environment;
 - raise awareness of the issue, the policies, procedures, and process; and
 - be provided with supportive resources for implementation;
- Recognizing the central role of education in addressing this issue by:
 - linking with the K-12 sector and ensuring a smoother transition from secondary to post-secondary;
 - enhancing awareness of “digital citizenship” and cyberbullying;
 - developing curriculum around these issues;
- Promoting a culture of kindness/cyber-kindness and civility; and
- Ensuring that the dialogue begun at the symposium can be on-going between key stakeholders on this issue.

Our first working paper summarized the parameters of the issue of cyberbullying in universities, i.e. the nature of the problem as it has been experienced by the symposium participants. This second working paper summarized the dialogue on the matter of solutions to the issue as it was outlined in the first paper. It is the hope of the organizing committee that these two papers serve to inform and maintain the dialogue surrounding this topic.

As part of our commitment to this on-going dialogue, we invite symposium participants, as well as any other stakeholders on this issue, to submit ideas, publications, programs, “best practices,” or any other type of resource that they deem could be useful for others who are concerned with cyberbullying/bullying and/or harassment in universities to www.sfu.ca/bullyingfreecampus .

References

Legislation and case law

School District No. 44 (North Vancouver) v. Jubran ([2005] BCCA 201)

Pridgen v. University of Calgary ([2012] ABCA 139)