

From Compliance to Community: Therapeutic Communalism as a Transformative Framework for Campus Safety

Amarachukwu Onyinyechi Ijiomah

Abstract: This theoretical paper presents Therapeutic Communalism as a transformative framework for addressing campus sexual harassment, positing it as a necessary evolution beyond bureaucratic, compliance-based institutional models. We argue that prevailing institutional responses to sexual violence constitute an administrative project focused on risk management and procedural adherence that often fails to address the relational and cultural roots of harm. Through critical analysis, we examine how formal reporting systems, policy frameworks, and investigatory committees function as administrative technologies that manage institutional liability while frequently depoliticizing embedded power structures. Within this context, Therapeutic Communalism emerges not as improved procedure but as a paradigm shift toward community ethics and alternative forms of accountability. We identify three paradigmatic shifts facilitated by this framework: (1) from bureaucratic discipline to community accountability practices; (2) from individualization (casting issues as problems of specific predators or victims) to collective responsibility frameworks that address systemic conditions; and (3) from security apparatuses to care networks. Drawing on principles of restorative justice and community psychology, we examine how Therapeutic Communalism addresses not only harassment but also the broader relational health of academic communities characterized by power imbalances and competitive individualism. Through analysis of community-based initiatives, we demonstrate how Therapeutic Communalism constitutes a meaningful alternative to the subject positions offered by administrative systems. The paper concludes that Therapeutic Communalism's potential lies in its capacity to synthesize relational ethics with practical accountability, offering pathways from managed compliance to cultivated community that challenge both bureaucratic alienation and ineffective governance models.

Keywords: Institutional Transformation; Campus Sexual Harassment; Restorative Justice; Community Accountability.

INTRODUCTION: THE ADMINISTRATIVE PARADIGM AND ITS LIMITATIONS

The governance of campus sexual harassment is increasingly characterized by what can be termed an administrative paradigm, a focus on policy development, reporting procedures, and investigative compliance. Institutions of higher learning have developed elaborate systems to address sexual misconduct, often driven by legal requirements and risk management concerns. Yet, despite proliferating policies and procedures, significant challenges persist: underreporting, survivor dissatisfaction, institutional defensiveness, and the frequent recurrence of harm (Nabiebu, et al., 2026; Ekpo & Aloba, 2025).

This paper argues that the limited effectiveness of these administrative approaches stems not from insufficient regulation but from a fundamental mismatch between the nature of the problem and the character of the solution. Sexual harassment is at its core a relational and cultural pathology, it thrives in environments where power is abused, boundaries are violated, and community norms either enable or ignore harmful behavior. Administrative systems, by contrast, are designed to process individual cases, determine policy violations, and assign sanctions. They excel at procedural regularity but struggle with relational repair, cultural change, and community healing.

Therapeutic Communalism is presented here as a necessary alternative framework. Developed from the integration of therapeutic jurisprudence, restorative justice, and community psychology principles, it shifts the primary locus of intervention from administrative procedure to community responsibility. This framework posits that sustainable safety is cultivated rather than regulated, emerging from healthy community norms and practices rather than from policy enforcement alone. It understands harassment not merely as individual misconduct but as indicative of community health, requiring not only case adjudication but cultural transformation.

This analysis proceeds through several interconnected sections. First, we examine the administrative paradigm in detail, analyzing its mechanisms and limitations. Second, we introduce Therapeutic Communalism as a relational alternative, detailing its theoretical foundations and core principles. Third, we trace three paradigmatic shifts that this framework facilitates, moving from compliance to community. Fourth, we examine practical implementations and adaptations of these principles in educational settings. Finally, we discuss implications for institutional transformation, arguing that Therapeutic Communalism offers a pathway beyond procedural compliance toward genuine community safety.

THE ADMINISTRATIVE PARADIGM: PROCEDURES WITHOUT TRANSFORMATION

Contemporary institutional responses to campus sexual harassment are dominated by what can be termed the administrative paradigm. This approach is characterized by several key features: the development of comprehensive policy documents, the establishment of formal reporting channels, the creation of investigatory committees, the implementation of mandatory training programs, and the maintenance of detailed records for compliance purposes. Driven largely by legal requirements and liability concerns, this paradigm treats sexual harassment as primarily a problem of policy violation to be addressed through proper procedure.

The mechanisms of this paradigm are familiar across educational institutions. Typically, a designated office (often a Title IX office or its equivalent) receives complaints, conducts investigations, determines whether policies have been violated, and recommends sanctions. These processes emphasize procedural fairness, evidence collection, and documentation. Simultaneously, institutions implement preventative measures such as mandatory training for students and staff, awareness campaigns, and

the dissemination of policy information. On their surface, these systems appear rational, orderly, and comprehensive.

However, significant and persistent limitations plague this administrative approach. First, the reporting gap remains profound. Research consistently indicates that only a small fraction of sexual harassment incidents are reported through formal channels. Survivors cite numerous reasons for this reluctance: fear of retaliation, distrust of institutional processes, concern about not being believed, desire to avoid re-traumatizing investigations, and worry about academic or professional consequences. The administrative system's promise of protection through procedure often fails to overcome these very real concerns.

Second, the investigative process itself can cause additional harm. Survivors frequently describe formal reporting as a secondary trauma—an adversarial process where their experiences are scrutinized, their credibility questioned, and their personal lives examined. The legalistic framework, with its emphasis on evidence standards and burden of proof, can feel alienating and retraumatizing to those seeking understanding and safety rather than legal victory.

Third, administrative systems tend to individualize what are often systemic problems. By focusing on specific incidents and identifiable perpetrators, these systems can obscure the broader cultural and environmental factors that enable harassment: power imbalances between faculty and students, departmental cultures that tolerate inappropriate behavior, institutional priorities that protect reputation over safety, and social norms that normalize boundary violations. Punishing individual offenders while leaving these enabling conditions unchanged offers limited protection against future harm.

Fourth, the compliance orientation of these systems can lead to what has been termed “checkbox safety”, institutions focusing on demonstrating procedural compliance rather than ensuring genuine safety. When the primary measures of success are numbers of trainings delivered, policies updated, or cases processed, rather than actual reductions in harm or improvements in campus climate, the system's goals become distorted. Institutions may prioritize managing liability over cultivating wellbeing.

Finally, administrative systems often struggle with outcomes that satisfy anyone involved. Sanctions may feel insufficient to survivors seeking meaningful accountability, while simultaneously appearing overly punitive to those accused. The binary determinations (responsible/not responsible) typical of these processes fail to capture the complexity of harm and the possibilities for repair. Neither punishment nor exoneration necessarily leads to healing, changed behavior, or improved community safety.

These limitations suggest that the administrative paradigm, while necessary for certain functions, is insufficient as the primary approach to addressing campus sexual harassment. Its procedural focus cannot adequately address the relational, cultural, and systemic dimensions of the problem. It is against this backdrop that Therapeutic Communalism emerges as a complementary and transformative alternative.

THERAPEUTIC COMMUNALISM: A RELATIONAL ALTERNATIVE

Therapeutic Communalism represents a paradigm shift in how educational communities understand and address sexual harassment. Rather than viewing harassment primarily through the lens of policy violation, this framework understands it as a rupture in the relational fabric of the community, a harm that affects not only individuals but the social ecosystem in which they learn and work. Prevention and response, therefore, require not only procedural correctness but relational repair, cultural change, and community cultivation.

The theoretical foundations of Therapeutic Communalism are deliberately interdisciplinary. From restorative justice comes the understanding that harm disrupts relationships and that meaningful accountability requires addressing the needs created by harm, the obligations resulting from harm, and the causes of harm. Restorative processes focus on healing rather than punishment, on dialogue rather than adjudication, and on repairing relationships rather than assigning blame. From therapeutic jurisprudence comes the insight that legal and administrative processes have psychological and social impacts that can be either therapeutic or anti-therapeutic. Designing processes with wellbeing in mind is not secondary but central to justice. From community psychology comes the emphasis on prevention through community strengthening, on addressing problems at systemic rather than only individual levels, and on building collective efficacy for safety and wellbeing.

Three core principles distinguish Therapeutic Communalism as a framework for addressing campus sexual harassment:

Principle 1: Safety as a Collective Condition

Therapeutic Communalism rejects the notion that safety is primarily an individual responsibility or a state achieved through proper policy adherence. Instead, it posits that safety is a collective condition produced and maintained through everyday communal practices. This shifts institutional questions from “Do we have the right policies?” to “What kind of community are we building?” and from “Did this person violate policy?” to “What does this incident reveal about our community health?” Safety becomes less about compliance and more about culture, less about individual risk management and more about collective wellbeing.

Principle 2: Accountability as Relational Repair

Where administrative systems focus on determining responsibility for policy violations and assigning appropriate sanctions, Therapeutic Communalism emphasizes accountability as a process of understanding harm, addressing its impacts, and repairing relationships. This does not eliminate the need for consequences but frames them within a broader context of repair and learning. Accountability becomes less about punishment and more about responsibility, less about sanctioning individuals and more about healing communities.

Principle 3: Process as Integral to Outcome

Therapeutic Communalism insists that how communities address harm is as important as what outcomes they reach. Processes that are retraumatizing, alienating, or disrespectful undermine healing regardless of their results. Designing processes that are respectful, participatory, and empowering is therefore not a secondary concern but a primary ethical commitment. The experience of the process becomes part of the healing or harm.

These principles translate into practical approaches that differ significantly from administrative models. Community circles replace or supplement investigative committees, bringing together affected parties and community members to discuss harm, needs, and repair. Restorative conferences offer alternatives to disciplinary hearings, focusing on dialogue and agreement rather than determination and sanction. Climate assessments look beyond incident reports to understand patterns, norms, and systemic factors. Prevention focuses not only on individual training but on community norm-setting, relationship-building, and environmental design.

Importantly, Therapeutic Communalism does not propose eliminating administrative systems but transforming their role and supplementing them with community-based approaches. Formal procedures remain necessary for certain situations, particularly those involving serious violence or intractable disputes. However, they become one option among several rather than the default response. The goal is to create multiple pathways for addressing harm, with community-based restorative options serving as the preferred approach for many situations, particularly those involving community members who wish to repair relationships and remain in community together.

This framework represents a significant departure from the individualistic assumptions underlying many current approaches. Rather than viewing students and staff as either potential victims or perpetrators needing regulation, it sees them as community members capable of and responsible for creating safety together. Rather than positioning the institution as a neutral administrator of rules, it recognizes the institution's role in shaping culture and relationships. And rather than treating safety as a problem to be managed, it approaches it as a community condition to be cultivated.

THREE PARADIGMATIC SHIFTS

The implementation of Therapeutic Communalism facilitates three fundamental shifts in how educational communities address sexual harassment. These shifts represent not merely procedural changes but transformations in understanding, approach, and objective.

Shift One: From Bureaucratic Discipline to Community Accountability

Administrative systems for addressing sexual harassment typically operate through bureaucratic disciplinary procedures. These processes emphasize formal complaints, evidence collection, investigative findings, and institutional sanctions. They are conducted by designated officials, follow established protocols, and result in formal determinations. While providing procedural regularity, these processes often feel

alienating to participants, reduce complex human experiences to legal categories, and position the institution as an external adjudicator rather than a community seeking healing.

Therapeutic Communalism shifts toward community accountability processes. These processes, which can take various forms including circles, conferences, and dialogues, involve community members in addressing harm. Rather than a small group of officials making determinations behind closed doors, these processes bring together affected parties, support people, and relevant community members to discuss what happened, who was affected, what needs must be addressed, and how repair might occur. The focus is less on establishing policy violations and more on understanding harm and its impacts; less on assigning blame and more on taking responsibility; less on institutional sanction and more on community repair.

This shift addresses several limitations of bureaucratic approaches. It reduces the reporting gap by providing options that many community members find more accessible and less daunting than formal complaints. It minimizes retraumatization by creating processes that emphasize listening, validation, and agency rather than cross-examination and skepticism. It addresses the systemic nature of problems by involving community members who can identify and change enabling conditions. And it creates more meaningful accountability by focusing on understanding impacts and making repair rather than simply receiving punishment.

Community accountability does not eliminate the need for formal procedures in certain cases (Nabiebu & Ekpo, 2025a; Nabiebu & Ekpo, 2025b; Ekpo, 2025). Serious violence, power imbalances that prevent voluntary participation, or situations where safety requires separation may still require administrative action. However, by making community processes the preferred option for many situations, institutions can address harm more effectively while building community capacity for prevention and repair.

Shift Two: From Individualization to Collective Responsibility

Administrative systems tend to individualize sexual harassment, to treat it as a problem of specific individuals (either predators who must be punished or victims who must be protected). This individualization is reflected in training that emphasizes individual risk recognition, policies that focus on individual misconduct, and processes that investigate individual incidents. While individual responsibility is certainly important, exclusive focus on the individual level obscures the communal and systemic dimensions of harassment.

Therapeutic Communalism shifts toward collective responsibility. This means recognizing that harassment occurs within communities and that communities have responsibility for creating conditions that prevent harm and for addressing harm when it occurs. Collective responsibility operates at multiple levels: the responsibility of community members to speak up about concerning behavior, to support those who are harmed, and to participate in repair; the responsibility of leaders to model respectful behavior, to address problematic norms, and to allocate resources for prevention and

response; and the responsibility of the institution as a whole to examine and transform its culture, structures, and practices.

This shift manifests in several practical changes. Prevention efforts focus less on training individuals to avoid being victims or perpetrators and more on building community norms of respect, consent, and accountability. Response processes involve community members not as neutral investigators but as stakeholders in repair. Climate work addresses patterns and systems rather than only individual incidents. And leadership understands its role as cultivating community health rather than only managing individual cases.

Collective responsibility does not mean blaming communities for harm or absolving individuals of accountability (Ironbar, et al., 2025). Rather, it means recognizing that individuals act within social contexts and that changing those contexts is essential for preventing harm. It means acknowledging that everyone has a role in creating safety and that addressing harm requires communal as well as individual responses.

Shift Three: From Security Apparatuses to Care Networks

Administrative approaches often create what can be termed security apparatuses: systems designed to detect, report, investigate, and sanction misconduct. These include reporting hotlines, investigatory offices, disciplinary committees, and monitoring mechanisms. While providing important functions, these apparatuses can feel impersonal, intimidating, and focused more on institutional protection than community wellbeing. Their primary relationship with community members is often as potential reporters, complainants, or subjects of investigation.

Therapeutic Communalism shifts toward care networks: interconnected relationships and systems focused on support, prevention, and early intervention. These networks include peer support systems, mentoring relationships, community norms groups, early response teams, and restorative facilitators. Rather than waiting for formal complaints, these networks work proactively to create cultures of respect and care, to address concerning behavior before it escalates, and to provide support that prevents isolation and vulnerability.

This shift represents a fundamental reorientation from managing harm to cultivating health, from reacting to incidents to building protective communities, from institutional control to community empowerment. Care networks operate on principles of relationship rather than procedure, prevention rather than punishment, and support rather than surveillance.

Practical implementations of this shift include peer support programs that connect experienced students with newcomers, mentoring systems that create protective relationships between junior and senior community members, norm-setting processes that engage community members in developing standards of conduct, and early response teams that address concerning behavior through conversation and support rather than only through formal discipline.

These care networks complement but operate differently from security apparatuses. They are relational rather than bureaucratic, proactive rather than reactive, and focused

on wellbeing rather than compliance. By building these networks alongside necessary formal systems, institutions can create more comprehensive, humane, and effective approaches to safety.

PRACTICAL IMPLEMENTATIONS AND ADAPTATIONS

The principles of Therapeutic Communalism are being implemented in various forms across educational institutions. While no institution has fully realized this framework, numerous initiatives demonstrate its practical possibilities and adaptations.

Community Accountability Processes

Several institutions have implemented restorative justice programs as alternatives or supplements to disciplinary procedures for sexual misconduct cases. These programs typically involve trained facilitators who bring together affected parties and relevant community members to discuss harm, impacts, and repair. Participation is voluntary, and the focus is on dialogue, understanding, and agreement rather than on establishing guilt and assigning punishment. Evaluations of these programs show high participant satisfaction, greater perception of fairness by both parties, and reduced recidivism compared to traditional adjudication.

These processes are particularly valuable for situations where community members wish to repair relationships and continue in community together. They offer pathways to accountability that feel more meaningful and transformative than punitive sanctions alone. They also build community capacity for addressing conflict and harm, creating skills and norms that prevent future problems.

Climate and Norm-Setting Initiatives

Many institutions are moving beyond individual-focused training to community-based norm-setting processes. These initiatives engage students, faculty, and staff in developing shared standards of conduct, creating opportunities for dialogue about values and expectations, and building collective commitment to respectful community. Examples include departmental climate committees, classroom contract processes, residence hall community agreements, and campus-wide dialogues about consent and respect.

These initiatives recognize that sustainable change requires shifting culture and norms, not just informing individuals about policies. They create opportunities for community members to take ownership of their environment and to develop shared expectations. They also provide mechanisms for addressing problematic norms before they manifest in specific incidents of harm.

Peer Support and Protection Networks

Student-led initiatives often create informal but effective networks of support and protection. These include peer mentoring programs, buddy systems for vulnerable situations, shared awareness about concerning behavior, and collective responses to potential harm. While operating outside formal institutional structures, these networks

provide crucial protection, especially for students who may distrust administrative systems.

Institutions can support these networks by providing training, resources, and recognition. They can also create formal peer support positions, integrate peer education into orientation and ongoing programming, and develop systems that connect informal networks with appropriate institutional resources when needed.

Integrated Response Systems

Some institutions are developing integrated systems that combine administrative, restorative, and support functions. These systems provide multiple entry points and pathways for addressing concerns, from informal conversations to formal complaints, from supportive measures to accountability processes. They emphasize early intervention, coordinated response, and comprehensive support.

Key features of integrated systems include centralized coordination with decentralized implementation, multiple options tailored to different situations and preferences, connections between formal and informal processes, and ongoing evaluation and adaptation. These systems recognize that no single approach works for all situations and that effective response requires flexibility, coordination, and community involvement.

CHALLENGES AND RESISTANCE

Implementing Therapeutic Communalism faces significant challenges and resistance. Institutional inertia favors familiar administrative approaches over relational alternatives. Legal concerns about liability, due process, and compliance create caution about innovative approaches. Resource constraints limit capacity for labor-intensive community processes. And cultural resistance comes from those accustomed to or benefiting from existing systems.

Specific challenges include:

- **Procedural Concerns:** How to ensure fairness, consistency, and appropriate process in community-based approaches.
- **Power Imbalances:** How to address situations where voluntary participation may be compromised by unequal power.
- **Serious Harm:** How to determine when community processes are appropriate and when formal disciplinary action is necessary.
- **Scalability:** How to implement resource-intensive processes across large institutions.
- **Evaluation:** How to measure effectiveness of approaches focused on relational outcomes rather than procedural metrics.

Addressing these challenges requires careful design, adequate resources, appropriate safeguards, and ongoing evaluation. It also requires cultural shift within institutions – from viewing compliance as the primary goal to valuing community health, from privileging procedural regularity to prioritizing relational repair, from managing risk to

cultivating wellbeing.

IMPLICATIONS FOR INSTITUTIONAL TRANSFORMATION

The adoption of Therapeutic Communalism has significant implications for how educational institutions understand and pursue safety. It requires rethinking assumptions, reallocating resources, redesigning processes, and reevaluating success.

Policy Implications

Institutions must develop policies that enable and support community-based approaches alongside formal procedures. This includes creating options for restorative processes, providing resources for community initiatives, training staff in restorative practices, and developing guidelines for when different approaches are appropriate. Policies should emphasize multiple pathways, community involvement, and holistic support.

Resource Implications

Implementing Therapeutic Communalism requires investing in community capacity rather than only in administrative apparatus. This includes funding for facilitator training, support for peer programs, time for community processes, and evaluation of relational outcomes. Resources must shift from solely supporting investigators and adjudicators to also supporting facilitators, coordinators, and community builders.

Training Implications

Training must expand beyond policy information and reporting procedures to include skills in restorative practices, community facilitation, conflict transformation, and trauma-informed response. Students, faculty, and staff all need opportunities to develop capacities for creating and maintaining healthy community.

Evaluation Implications

Success measures must include relational and cultural indicators alongside procedural ones. Climate surveys, community feedback, participation rates, and qualitative assessments become as important as case processing statistics. Institutions must value and measure community health, not just compliance.

Cultural Implications

Ultimately, adopting Therapeutic Communalism requires cultural transformation – from viewing safety as an administrative problem to understanding it as a community condition, from positioning the institution as an external regulator to recognizing it as part of the community, from focusing on individual cases to cultivating collective wellbeing.

CONCLUSION: TOWARD COMMUNITY-CENTERED SAFETY

Therapeutic Communalism offers a necessary evolution in how educational communities address sexual harassment. By shifting focus from bureaucratic compliance

to community cultivation, from individual cases to collective responsibility, and from security apparatuses to care networks, this framework addresses limitations of prevailing administrative approaches while offering pathways to more meaningful safety.

This shift is not merely procedural but paradigmatic. It requires rethinking fundamental assumptions about the nature of harm, the purpose of accountability, and the meaning of safety. It challenges institutions to value relational outcomes alongside procedural ones, to invest in community capacity alongside administrative capacity, and to measure community health alongside compliance metrics.

The practical implementations emerging across institutions demonstrate both the feasibility and the promise of this approach. Community accountability processes, climate initiatives, peer networks, and integrated systems show that alternatives exist and can be effective. While challenges remain, the growing recognition of administrative limitations creates opportunity for transformation.

Ultimately, Therapeutic Communalism represents more than a new set of programs or procedures. It embodies a different vision of what educational communities can be—spaces where safety emerges from relationship rather than regulation, where accountability means repair rather than punishment, and where community members are active creators of their environment rather than passive subjects of institutional management.

For institutions willing to undertake this transformation, the potential rewards are significant: not only reduced harm but increased trust, not only procedural compliance but community wellbeing, not only managed risk but cultivated safety. In an era of growing recognition that current approaches are insufficient, Therapeutic Communalism offers a pathway forward—from compliance to community, from procedure to relationship, from managed safety to cultivated belonging.

REFERENCES

- Braithwaite, J. (2002). *Restorative justice and responsive regulation*. Oxford University Press.
- Campbell, R., & Wasco, S. M. (2005). Understanding rape and sexual assault: 20 years of progress and future directions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(1), 127-131.
- Daly, K. (2006). Restorative justice and sexual assault: An archival study of court and conference cases. *British Journal of Criminology, 46*(2), 334-356.
- Ekpo, M. E. (2025). Governing Through Algorithms: Ethical and Legal Implications of Technological Governance. *AMCU*.
- Ekpo, M., & Aloba, E. Nigerian Companies and the Prohibition on Political Donations: A Paradigmatic Shift as a Panacea for Compliance. *International Journal of Advanced Engineering, Management and Science, 4*(12), 268277.
- Freyd, J. J. (1997). Violations of power, adaptive blindness, and betrayal trauma theory. *Feminism & Psychology, 7*(1), 22-32.
- Ironbar, V. E., Ekwok, L. N., Ekpo, M. E., Ekpang, J. E., Oгри, E. U., Oko, B. A., ... & Achu, R. A. (2025). Utilization of Digital Resources for Learning by Students with Intellectual Disabilities in Southern Nigeria. *Journal of Intellectual Disability-Diagnosis and Treatment, 13*(2), 237-253.

- Karp, D. R., & Sacks, C. (2014). Student conduct, restorative justice, and student development: Findings from the STARR project: A student accountability and restorative research project. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 17(2), 154-172.
- Koss, M. P. (2014). The RESTORE program of restorative justice for sex crimes: Vision, process, and outcomes. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(9), 1623-1660.
- Llewellyn, J. J., Archibald, B. P., Clairmont, D., & Crocker, D. (2013). Imagining success for a restorative approach to justice: Implications for measurement and evaluation. *Dalhousie Law Journal*, 36(2), 281-316.
- Nabiebu, M., & Ekpo, M. E. (2025). From Litigation to Arbitration? An Empirical Analysis of Dispute Resolution Trends in Nigeria's Oil and Gas Sector Post-Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021. *Alkebulan: A Journal of West and East African Studies*, 5(2), 109-118.
- Nabiebu, M., & Ekpo, M. E. (2025). The Legal And Regulatory Imperative For A Shared Telecommunications And Power Infrastructure Model In Nigeria's Oil And Gas Sector. *Journal of Rare Ideas*, 4(1), 1-11.
- Nabiebu, M., Agube, N., & Ekpo, M. E. (2026). Reconciling International Climate Law and the Energy Charter Treaty through Integrative Interpretation in Arbitration. *Law and Social Justice in Society*, 1(1), 1-13.
- Pranis, K. (2005). *The little book of circle processes: A new/old approach to peacemaking*. Good Books.
- Prilleltensky, I. (2012). Wellness as fairness. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 49(1-2), 1-21.
- Senn, C. Y. (2018). *What works to reduce sexual harassment and assault in post-secondary education: A rapid evidence assessment* [Technical report]. University of Windsor.
- Tronto, J. C. (1993). *Moral boundaries: A political argument for an ethic of care*. Routledge.
- Wexler, D. B., & Winick, B. J. (Eds.). (1996). *Law in a therapeutic key: Developments in therapeutic jurisprudence*. Carolina Academic Press.
- Zehr, H. (2015). *The little book of restorative justice: Revised and updated*. Good Books.