



# PREVENT RESIST SUPPORT

## Episode 6: The Importance of Evidence

with Dr. Charlene Senn



University  
of Windsor

Sexual Misconduct Response  
and Prevention Office

### **Prevent Resist Support Podcast**

### **Episode 6: The Importance of Evidence with Dr. Charlene Senn**

Anne Rudzinski: Welcome everyone! I'm Anne Rudzinski and this is Prevent Resist Support - A podcast by the Sexual Misconduct Response and Prevention Office at the University of Windsor

(Introductory music)

Anne: Alright, folks. I've got an exciting episode for you today. Today I get to chat with Dr. Charlene Senn, Professor at the University of Windsor. in the Psychology Department affiliated with the Applied Social Psychology graduate program. She is cross appointed to the Women's & Gender Studies program. She holds the Canadian Institutes of Health Research Canada Research Chair in Sexual Violence. Charlene teaches courses on male violence against women and girls, feminist psychology, and the psychology of women. Charlene describes herself as a feminist social psychologist and her research focus as male violence against women, particularly sexual violence. She has also researched the impact of male-stream pornography on women's lives. And related to this talk, her primary focus in the past 15 years has been on campus-based sexual violence intervention programming, like the Flip the Script with EAAA (™) Program, Enhanced Assess Acknowledge and Act, and she has also researched the Bystander Initiative program on our campus.

So today, we are going to Charlene about the importance of evidence and research in preventing sexual violence on university campuses. So

quickly, before we get into our interview with Charlene, I would like to go over our support resources. If you need support and you're a member of our UWindsor campus community, you can reach out to Dusty at [svsupport@uwindsor.ca](mailto:svsupport@uwindsor.ca), or our comprehensive resource list for both on campus and off campus resources in Windsor, Ontario, through our website [www.uwindsor.ca/sexual-assault/](http://www.uwindsor.ca/sexual-assault/). You can also access support through the Sexual Assault Crisis Centre here in Windsor, at their 24 hour call line - 519- 253- 9667.. If you're not in Windsor, check out the Ontario Coalition of Rape Crisis Centres. Their website is [sexualassaultsupport.ca](http://sexualassaultsupport.ca).

(Transition music)

Anne: Welcome, Charlene! So excited to have you here today.

Dr. Charlene Senn: I am very glad to be here.

Anne: So we are going to chat a bit about the research you have been doing, research and evidence as it relates to campus-based sexual violence prevention. Let's start with why did you decide to have a career in sexual violence research?

Charlene: I think first, like many people, I didn't actually decide this in a formal way early on. It is more like you end up there. So for me it was, you know, I did my bachelor's of science degree in psychology and there was nothing on women in it. I took the very first women studies courses and they fueled my activism, and so I was an activist off campus working primarily in anti-pornography activism, so at that time, working against violence and degradation in images, particularly sexually explicit images, and also in women's health activism. So I was a founding member of a women's health collective, looking at sort of getting more knowledge to women about their bodies and sexuality and so on. And then I got a frontline job at a women's shelter and it was at that time that I sort of found this gap in what we knew. I was hearing lots of stories from women and my own experiences as well told me that they were having a lot of experiences of sexual violence that included pornography, being forced to watch pornography, being forced to enact pornography. And when I went to the library like

another student, there wasn't really anything there so I thought I need to do some of this research. And so I did that research on women's experiences with pornography and the impact of pornography on women for my master's and my PhD. But then I thought it is really important to study men's perpetration and so I did that for a while. And, then I sort of realize that I had gone from a general focus on violence against women and girls to a much more specific focus on sexual violence and so a decade after I had already got my first academic job that's when I first started to realize what I really wanted to, is go further and try to make real change. Like actually try and build the educational interventions rather than just studying this anymore.

Anne: And that is such a great segway into the piece which is that you created the EAAA program, which is sometimes called the Enhanced Assess Acknowledge Act program, or sometimes called the Flip the Script program, and I think the newest language is the Flip the Script with EAAA?

Charlene: or Flip the Script with EAAA because it describes the original name, the Enhanced Assess Acknowledge Act, part of the program and the fun, Flip the Script part.

Anne: Amazing. So can you tell me a little bit about what made you want to create that program?

Charlene: Well, at that point where I said I was at that turning point, I reviewed all of the education programs that had been developed and evaluated, went back to the literature and spent four months just reading, looking at all of that research. And I was quite horrified but maybe not completely surprised that really, none of them had positive impacts on sexual violence perpetration. Not a single one. Or on victimization. There were lots of good ideas that had been implemented but when they were evaluated they had no effects or they had effects on attitudes but not on behaviour. Or, if they had positive effects on attitudes, those only lasted sometimes only two months or two weeks, maximum about four months. So very short lived changes and not in all the ways that matter. And so, I could see that there were researchers who were working really hard on trying to find

ways to reduce men's perpetration in particular. To try to develop something that would work, and that was not my expertise. All of or most of my work has focused on women and girls. But in the meantime, girls and women were being sexually assaulted, and my read of what we knew was that both in terms of feminist activism and all of the work that had been feminists for many years in the community, but also the research suggests that we could actually build on what we know now and on some of the new theories that had recently come out at that time to actually help put women in a situation where if they are in contact with a man that tries to sexually coerce or assault them, they actually have strategies or knowledge that could help them in those situations and help undermine that perpetrators advantages. So that was my goal, to make something that, based on that long history of the work of others, both in the community and in academic settings, and so I started that work to develop the program.

Anne: And this program, I don't know if all of our viewers are at UWindsor, but we have been running this program for a few years now at the university. It is so amazing, it is super empowering for women, it is an incredible experience to run the program as a facilitator, which I have done a few times. And I think one of the things that is so interesting about it is the immense amount of work that went into creating it. So it wasn't something that you wrote in a couple weeks, it was something that you spend a lot of time and years even developing and testing to make sure that it worked. So can you tell us a bit about that research behind the programming itself?

Charlene: Yeah. Certainly, it has been a long road to do that. And I even started, I won't talk about this in any detail, but I even started with some studies looking at how, what kinds of messages about this kind of programming would actually be appealing to young women to ensure that we would be able to get them into the research studies. So I basically started with two years of research that wasn't even, I didn't have a program yet, but I wanted to know, for example whether sexuality kinds of topics or sexual assault resistance kind of topics was what was attracting women and how long it could be without being onerous and those kinds of things. So, what I started with, of course,

was the research. And I started that basically spent probably 6 months full time working on finding out all, pulling together all the knowledge that we had and looking at the very best theories of what the obstacles are for women when they are faced by sexual violence that is coming from men they know because this is the fundamental problem that we need to solve in this kind of program, is that girls are taught, from the time they are very small, that sexual assault is something that comes from strangers, and so it is very shocking to experience this from someone you know and perhaps like or even love. So, looking at that research I found that there were Patricia Rozee and Mary Koss had mapped out an idea that they called Assess Acknowledge Act, and they were pulling together these theories and the best empirical research and evidence at that time. But, they had described it in several paragraphs in their journal article. So it was not a program, but it was a synthesis of research and an idea for a program. And so I contacted them and found out that no one had put it into practice yet and I got permission from them to use their idea and that's why that big long name was the first name of the program. I wanted to give them credit for their great idea. And then, I had to map out the program with every element aligning with the theory, which is called cognitive ecological model, and the research evidence. So you have to sort of do a big road map of all the things that would need to be in place, taught, all the activities that would need to be done to provide the knowledge and the skills that are needed and so mapping it out and synthesizing everything we know so that is a big first step. And then I didn't want to reinvent the wheel so, right, if there is something great that already exists don't make your own. Finding out where there were other programs that perhaps didn't work as a whole but they had a really good activity that fit into this model and so I thought you know would potentially work when it was all put together in different ways and got permission where possible or definitely cited their work. And then I worked on any components that were missing. And of course, part of what you're doing there is to make the activities fun, you know this is a very serious topic, but you aren't just going to want to sit there and be talked at, so to make this interactive, and how to pull from the participants, who are all young women with experience in the world, how to pull from them that they already know a lot of these things that we know in the research literature. And to support them to see that

they have this knowledge and this ability within them already, and then to develop that. So I did that, and then you got the program. You got the draft of the program. So, the first thing we did was with my graduate students Stephanie Gee and Kristen Saunders, we offered the program to a few groups of young women. So just with our draft they ran through it and the young women who were participants filled out normal kinds of evaluations, but we did not use that as a major source. We also did focus groups with them and we got their feedback on every unit, and at this time it was the three units Assess Acknowledge Act. And it turned out that they thought that one of the units was entirely redundant. They thought the second unit was the same stuff in the first unit and it's not at all the same stuff, why does it feel that way? On paper it is definitely not, and so we had to think about what they were saying and then we reorganised, reworked everything. We basically rewrote that entire second session. And then we had to run another study and so we did one to test the preliminary effectiveness of that three unit program with pre and post test surveys. And found that, actually in that one we did some random assignment, and we found that the effects did not last, so they were great, we were getting good effects for about 3 months, and then they dropped off. And so realized that actually we need more practice here. It is one thing to learn something and it is another thing to be able to apply it. So we added 30 minutes to every unit. No more content, but more time to apply it to scenarios, practice with material. And then I added in the Relationships and Sexuality Unit, which is my original contribution to the idea, which is that we should not be talking about sexual assault resistance before we talk about what we actually want in sex. But most of us don't have sex education at all or good sex education for sure. We definitely don't talk about women's desire. I based a unit, again not reinventing the wheel, and added that in and put it first because of course sex education should come first before you start talking about sexual assault. And then did another study with about 240 young women where we randomly assigned them to get no program or to get one version, either the three unit or the enhanced with sexuality four unit program and followed them up for 3 and 6 months. And it was very interesting. Again, what we had to do, we interviewed every woman, not me personally but my research assistants, we interviewed every woman that dropped out of the program. So this is always really important for

program development. What went wrong if something went wrong? Maybe they dropped out because they felt they needed to study more for a course, but let's find out. Is there something wrong, is it not working for some women? We also interviewed 20% randomly chosen of the women who completed the whole program to find out their feedback. And not in this time, not just in a group setting where people might feel compelled to agree with other people but could really tell an interviewer what they thought, so we did that as well. And then we really, that's where we really realized that my great idea, which theoretically makes sense of putting sexuality education first, actually for the least sexually experienced young women or women who had been socialized or whose families were religiously or politically conservative and didn't think you should talking about sexually explicit things in a public setting felt very uncomfortable with the sexuality unit being first. They didn't know the facilitators, they didn't know the other women and so we had about a 20% drop out of women from the program after that first session in the Enhanced program. And so those interviews with those young women taught us and made me realize this is a perfect example where theory and the logic would tell you it comes first but actually it can't, it has to come after there is comfort. And so in the next version I put the sexuality unit last and now it ends up being women's favourite unit, even the most conservative and least sexually experienced women enjoy that unit because they have the trust of having been with the other women for those 9 hours before they got there. And the facilitators for all that time. And so that was sort of how we did it. And then I did the full randomized control trial with over 900 young women, where they were randomly assigned to get the program or not and at three different universities, so not just Windsor, to make sure that this goes beyond that any effects we get and that's where we were able to show that dramatic 50% reduction in completed and attempted rape and a large reductions in other forms of sexual violence. And then I think the last thing would be the work on the program never ends. Every year it has to be updated with the latest research, we have to review that and see if the new knowledge changes anything about how the program is offered. For example, this year we did a much more major revision because there's more new research on the experiences of Black women students in North America and their experiences of sexual violence. And so being able to think about that

new research and think about are there ways in which we need to alter small and in larger ways some aspects of the program so that this represents every young woman's experience. So we made those bigger revisions. And of course along the way, also, made sure that it works for lesbian and bisexual women and asexual women, and women of various religions as well, including Muslim women, we did a revision early on before the trial.

Anne: I just think that is so amazing. And I think one of the really cool things is that when you bring Flip the Script on your campus you're not just getting a 12 hour workshop, you are getting all this research and all this thought and it is really carefully and thoughtful scaffolded program with all these pieces that have been so carefully examined and thought about and I think that is really incredible and I really love that you said don't reinvent the wheel because I think a lot of folks think that it's easy to write a program, but the amount of money you would spend creating your own program would be quite a bit compared to just bringing in something that is already so carefully test. So, I always like to think about that piece, the sheer amount of work that went into it.

Charlene: And how often our ideas about what we need to put in it are shown to be wrong, right, like in my early versions. I mean it made perfect sense to me and then we find out that it is not viewed that way from the participant point of view and you have to change it.

Anne: Yes, amazing. And so one of the things I would like to talk about is there's this tension around research and evidence-based programming and the ways that it is implemented on campus. So there seems to be two schools of thought here. One, where we prioritize programs that have been backed by research evidence, meaning that we have some data that show there is efficacy in the program. And then there's another school of thought that we really need to have fluidity and need to be able to adapt these programs based on current topics, campus climate, things that are coming up, you know from students and so I think you have touched on the fact that there is a way to shift things and change them as needed in a research and evidence based way, so can you talk about that a little bit and can you tell us about why it is so

important that we use research and evidence based programming on campus?

Charlene: Yeah. I mean, the evidence based programming is, sometimes people think that it has no flexibility or that it came from one place so it cannot possibly be good on another campus. But almost all evidence based programming and certainly this Flip the Script EAAA is it has to be modified on every campus that it is on in minor ways so that it feels relevant to participants. So things like, you bring the statistics into the program that are based on that community or that province or country, right? You would never present American stats to Canadian students, that would not feel very relevant. It would feel like a whole bunch of our textbooks that we read. And the street names in the scenarios have to fit. So there are those kinds of things that are minor modifications that are adaptations to evidence based programming. So what sometimes is being talked about as adaptations, the kind of adaptations that are wanted are to be able to take chunks of an evidence based program and eliminate them or add things in or all of those kinds of things. And the problem with that of course is that if you remove content or activities or you add other ones in then there's no, we don't know at all that the program, even an evidence based one would still be effective without evaluating that change. But in terms of the kinds of programming which is evolving and that therefore is dealing with issues as they are arising from students. So students say that they would like to learn more about this particular topic. That's really great for getting interest and awareness. That is doing education, it is really important. But, it's virtually impossible for it to actually be prevention. People would be surprised to know that the theory and evidence that underlies an effective program actually has not been changed, there is no difference in the findings 30 years later. So we often presume that new things come, there is a new issue, and it is going to radically change what we should be doing for sexual violence prevention, but often the changes are very surface. They're not actually the deeper things that get in the way, for example, of us seeing sexual violence when it's present or helping us to overcome emotional obstacles to the fact that we liked the person and how they are betraying our trust. Those kinds of things. And so these things are actually fairly stable. We just have not, sometimes we get new research that nuances

something, but there isn't that kind of fluctuation in the causes of sexual violence or what we need to do to overcome it or to change attitudes or behaviours. And so I think there's, we risk always, that basically we are doing awareness building and that is a good thing but that is not prevention. And if we think we are doing prevention when we are doing those things then we are not doing something that could actually make a difference. So that is part of the problem. Also is that where we are making one choice we are often turning our back on something else and that is a problem if what we are turning our back on is what we know actually works.

Anne: Yeah. And I think one of the things is that you're also doing some large scale adaptations on the program around content for younger girls. We always get that comment in our work, you know why don't you do this in high schools and that is something you are working and you are also looking at adaptations for transgender folks, and to bring to programming online. So can you tell us a little bit about that work that you are doing?

Charlene: Yeah. So my confession to the people that are listening is that I've always known, based on all of the research and my own experience, that 50% of all the rapes that women experience happen by the time we are 18. We cannot ignore that adolescent period because it is extremely high risk, 14-24, a lot of the sexual violence occurring to us in our teens. But I knew that all of this work of developing and researching the programming to prove its effectiveness was going to be easier for me if young women could consent for themselves. So I purposely made the decision to do the research first in the youngest women in university who are at highest risk in university. And to wait until later to do the research with girls where we need parental consent and girls' consent also. And so that was a deliberate strategy for that first decade of research. And I did, from the beginning, I did a couple of small studies where I tried the program out with younger girls, but 16 and older and got great responses. But also showed me that it was, like all of these things, these adaptations you can't just go oh I will change a few scenarios and we will just make them not bars because 14 year olds can go into bars without false IDs, so let's just change that. Well, we need to really look at the developmental stage. So, all of these studies for

adaptations are minimum 5 year studies of work and development. So yes, we have currently done 2 years of studies with girls 14-18 and looking at their experiences and their social and dating relationships and we now have an adapted version of the program and we are just waiting for COVID to be over so that we can do the whole randomized control trial with girls in Ontario to test sort of how the effects and the work with the younger. And trans women have always been included in the university program, but there was not a research base to make any of the content specific to trans women at that time in terms of trans women students. So yes, with another colleague Sarah Peitzmeier at the University of Michigan, we have been doing research over the last year two to try and create that research base for the experiences of trans students or students under the broader trans umbrella and to figure out if it is a good idea to adapt Flip the Script EAAA for those students or not. And we are at the point where it is pretty clear, yes, we could adapt the program, but it will have to be different in some key ways. Particularly, because there will be a mixture of trans students in the room so we would need to make sure it could work for everyone basically based on the knowledge we have so far. And the online EAAA is a very complicated thing that we started the adaption before COVID. We are still not sure that it will work because of the safety and privacy and the wonderfulness of the in-person small group experience of talking about these things together. We are not sure how all of this will translate in this online environment where you might not be free to talk about this in your home environment or to explore the same ideas and will it feel as comforting so we are also doing that work. And again, that is with Sarah Peitzmeier at the University of Michigan. And I should have said that the girls study is being done, the co-principal investigator on that is Sara Crann, who has been leading that work.

Anne: I have met Sara a few times and she is awesome.

Charlene: She is

Anne: I am glad we got that shout out in there to Sara. One of the things that I would love to talk a little bit about is idea that lots of folks have opinions on how we should prevent sexual violence on campus or how we should teach about sexual violence on campus and I feel like you

probably have some wonderful insights on that piece of things. What would you like to tell us about the opinions folks have about how to tackle this program on campuses?

Charlene: I'll probably have a few ideas. One of the things that I have seen is that homegrown programs, the programs that we sort of think that were put together just within a short while and try and offer it on our campus, they're based on people's ideas usually that have not been tested. And sometimes people's ideas of what the causes of sexual violence are are wrong. So, for example, people have believed that really sexual assault, particularly acquaintance sexual assault, is caused by miscommunication. And if we could just, and so this is not me saying this this is someone else saying this, if we could just get women to be more clear about what they want and we could, right, we could just tell men on campus that they need to listen to what women are saying, they just need to listen more, and if we can solve that miscommunication problem then we have solved acquaintance sexual violence, particularly among heterosexual students. And the research on that is quite complicated in some ways and not in others and it basically suggests that this is not the cause of acquaintance sexual violence. That men not understanding that women are saying no is not the problem because they do and ignore it. Men that are perpetrating are purposefully ignoring the no or any of the other cues and that in fact men are perfectly capable of, just like women are and everyone of every gender, actually recognizing quite subtle nonverbal cues as well as verbal cues as not interested, no way, never, or not now. All of those things are recognized. So if you started with that idea, which a lot of people would support, oh yeah it is just about miscommunication really that's the problem, then all of your efforts are wrong. And you could do a whole lot of things all day long that people would probably enjoy because it fits stereotypes and you might have a lot of fun doing it, but you are actually reinforcing a really misguided view that actually harms survivors and potentially lets perpetrators off the hook. And right you could make the situation a lot worse. That's an idea of what, you know, where the cause is wrong. Sometimes it is about what would actually work to change people's behaviour. And so you know you hear the kind of thing we just tell people that they shouldn't perpetrate, they just shouldn't do it, well we know that if that was going to work that would

have happened a long time ago, it does not work. And even when our ideas are really good ones, they do not always work the way we think they will. And in fact, there is a history of evaluations that shows that sometimes really good ideas actually create backlash effects and can make the problem worse or have no effect. We've only got limited time and resources, we need to actually do the things that we know work. Or if we have a brand new idea, we need to do a little study, and it doesn't have to be expensive or a million dollar randomized control trial like some of the stuff I do. It can be smaller than that. To just see if we are actually doing what we think we are doing with it. And it can't be based just on if people are having fun or are satisfied with what they heard or if they think they learned something. We need to study what they learned. So that's, you know, in terms of those, about just opinions of what might work, we need to be based more. We know a lot more than what people think we know and so finding that out is a good idea.

Anne: I think that's so important because I think there's just, it is a much more complicated problem that people think it is...

Charlene: It is.

Anne: ... And it's one that folks have been trying to tackle for quite a long time and there's, you know, a wealth of research there.

Charlene: I guess the other thing I'd just say is that whenever we think that there's one solution we can just be sure that we are wrong because there is no one solution. First of all we know that target, the best prevention is targeted prevention, that means we need to do a lot of different things and we need a comprehensive plan. So I am saying, you know, this program that I developed really works for women across sexual identities and across backgrounds and demographics, but it's only one piece of the solution. It is not the whole solution. And we need to also be doing those other evidence based things like bystander programs, which don't change victimization and perpetration in the short run at all, but what they change is bystander attitudes and willingness to intervene and bystander behaviours which change the culture on a longer timeline, and therefore, are going to contribute to ending the problem of sexual violence in the long run, for example. And

consent education, again. The lack of knowledge about the consent laws is not what causes sexual violence, and we know that it makes no difference, but talking about consent is great sex education. So it is not sexual violence prevention, but it raises awareness and it gives us good tools to talk about sexuality which is really really important. So that's part of it too. But no one thing can work alone.

Anne: Although I will say is that I do miss Flip the Script this year and I can't wait until we get back to it. We are really feeling the, you know, the feels about not having that running this year because of COVID. So hopefully we get back to Flip the Script soon. One thing I am so excited to hear your thoughts on is the idea of the death of expertise. I have read a few articles about the death of expertise, and it feels like because sexual violence is a social issue and its one that lots of people know about and has been really discussed quite a bit in the media over the last few years, it feels like expertise and data are regarded with less importance than they used to be and that folks have their own opinions about sexual violence and there's almost like this church of opinion of like we have to respect everyone's opinions but there are facts and there are data and there is research. And so, are you feeling this in your work and do you have any thoughts about it?

Charlene: Because I don't do social media at all as a purposeful decision, I am not as exposed to all of the things that you are talking about, but obviously I absorb them in other kinds of media that I do read and do engage in. And I do see this idea that every opinion is equal or that it has the same value as being a problem, which does not mean that every person who has an idea does not have the same value. You know, every person has value. But, so for me what is important is that we both broaden and narrow this idea that we have about who has expertise. On the one hand I am saying we need to broaden expertise because I am sure there are many people listening who have this idea that only people with PhDs can have the good ideas about prevention. That's just bogus, right? That's not true. And there's lots of people with PhDs whose opinions on a topic like this are totally baseless. They have no value. So I think we need to broaden what we think as expertise, and then we need to narrow it as well. So this is about the death of expertise, that is a bad idea. It is a bad idea to get rid of expertise. So for

example, what I am talking about is working in any field gives us knowledge and experience. Experiencing something ourselves gives us knowledge. Someone who has degrees has some particular knowledge and experiences. But having knowledge or experience in one area does not necessarily give us expertise in another. And so, for example, my experiences as a survivor of sexual and physical violence gives me an insider view of those issues. And so I have been able to use those long before I had any degrees to call **bullshit** on some views of victims or survivors and on the issue of sexual violence. So it is a type of expertise that comes from personal experience. But it didn't give me the expertise in what works in prevention. And my frontline experience working with other women in an assaulted women's shelter gave me more knowledge and experience than my own experiences, right. It broadened my knowledge and experience and showed me that not all survivors have the same views or experience. And it developed my own expertise further so that my opinions were more informed than my own experiences alone, for example. And of course, we are all reading and talking to other people and attending workshops and that's giving us more knowledge and experience. But I still didn't have the expertise of what works in prevention until I knew that research inside out. Until I could really evaluate the kinds of claims that were being made about what would work and what wouldn't. And that did not come with a degree, which is actually probably unnecessary, it came with a particular kind of training about how to read a research article, but you don't need a PhD to do that. And it came with a particular kind of experience and application of work and so on. And that's where that particular expertise came. And it doesn't mean that somebody else couldn't arrive at it from a different place, but I guess what I am trying to say, is that we need to acknowledge that expertise can come from lots of different kinds of experience, but that we only really have expertise on prevention work if we actually understand the important aspects of prevention, which is not the same as knowing anything about sexual violence or about social change or about something like sexuality or something else.

Anne: That was such a beautiful and thoughtful answer so thank you so much for laying that out. I think that touched on all the things that I wanted to ask you as follow ups to that piece and I think that's just, you know,

so wonderful to think about expertise in a way that is more broad than just academia, but to also think about where does the expertise come from and how are we growing ur knowledge in an area, and you know that work can come from different perspectives or different routes. So that is so wonderful. I have one last question for you, which is just what is one takeaway that you would like to leave us with?

Charlene: I think, I actually had a lot of trouble, you were going to ask me this question and I had trouble coming up with an answer. But I think it would be that easy is almost never the answer. The thing that is really easy to do is almost never that answer and that we need to invest real time and considerable resources to do this work in the way that it really needs to be done. But we can do that while we're all engaged in it and we are having fun as part. That is also part of this work. And that we can disagree with each other and have those really engaged conversations that are informed and help move us all forward.

Anne: I love that. Thank you so much for spending time with me today chatting about this. I am so excited to have you here. I am so excited for folks to listen to this episode. So thank you so much, Charlene

Charlene: Thank you very much. It was a lot of fun.

(Transition music)

Anne: So that was our chat with Charlene. I always love talking with her and you know I think it is so incredible to have Charlene on our campus. It is so cool that Flip the Script was developed here. It is just a really excellent program and I'm so grateful every time I get the chance to talk to Charlene about it. If you need support and you're a member of our UWindsor campus community, you can reach out to Dusty at [svsupport@uwindsor.ca](mailto:svsupport@uwindsor.ca). If you're not in Windsor, check out the Ontario Coalition of Rape Crisis Centres. Their website is [sexualassaultsupport.ca](http://sexualassaultsupport.ca).

Remember to like and subscribe, that always helps us out. And thank you so much for listening today!