

R26-010: A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A TIERED, SURVIVOR-CENTERED, SAFETY- FIRST, RESTORATIVE JUSTICE FRAMEWORK FOR ALLEGATIONS OF SERIOUS HARM AND MEMBERSHIP STANDING

*Short title: Restorative Justice and Survivor-Centered
Accountability Resolution*

Submitted by: Kendra C., Meagan E., Jorge R.

Date: 9/6/2026

SYNOPSIS

This resolution establishes a unified, tiered, survivor-centered framework for how Savannah DSA responds to allegations of serious harm and questions of membership standing. It distinguishes ordinary interpersonal conflict from serious allegations and credible ongoing safety risks; establishes procedures for interim safety measures, Community Accountability Committee review, due process, documentation, periodic reconsideration, and restoration of standing; and coordinates those procedures with DSA's existing harassment and grievance process.

PREAMBLE

WHEREAS, Savannah DSA has before it three related resolutions — R26-003, R26-004, and R26-005 — addressing restorative justice, membership standing, and the chapter's response to allegations of sexual and other serious harm; and the chapter's experience applying its existing, unwritten practices to a serious allegation has surfaced a real disagreement among members about how such decisions should be made going forward, and about what role, if any, the Steering Committee should play in taking interim action before a Community Accountability Committee has had the chance to review a matter; and

WHEREAS, restorative justice, as articulated by its foremost modern theorist, is best understood not as a program but as a set of principles for repairing harm, meeting the needs of those affected, and engaging those with a stake in an offense

in collectively deciding how to put things right, rather than as a body of fixed rules dictating a single outcome for every situation; and

WHEREAS, restorative justice in its original and most rigorous form rests on three pillars — addressing harms and needs, encouraging appropriate accountability from the person who caused harm, and engaging the affected parties and community in the resolution — and a policy that satisfies only part of the restorative justice process is not a restorative policy but a partial and unbalanced one; and

WHEREAS, transformative justice, the abolitionist framework developed out of Indigenous practice, Black feminist organizing, and prison-abolitionist movements, extends restorative justice by insisting that any process addressing violence must also examine and change the social conditions that allowed it to occur, and every major transformative-justice framework developed specifically for sexual and child sexual abuse — including generationFIVE's transformative justice model and the Creative Interventions Toolkit — identifies the immediate safety of survivors and the broader community as a precondition for accountability work, not an outcome to be weighed against other interests after the fact; and

WHEREAS, the anti-carceral and transformative justice tradition this chapter draws on does not hold that community accountability can substitute for safety measures, or that an organization must keep the accused member in full participatory standing — including standing to be alone with, mentor, or supervise other members — while an allegation of serious, ongoing danger is unresolved; accountability processes in this tradition are understood as long-term, resource-intensive, and dependent on the good-faith, voluntary participation of the person who caused harm, which is not realistically available while that person is mounting a contested legal defense to a pending felony charge; and

WHEREAS, this chapter also affirms that the criminal legal system has a documented history of disproportionately surveilling, charging, and incarcerating Black and Brown people, poor people, and queer and gender-nonconforming people, and that a criminal charge is an accusation by the state and not a finding of fact — commitments this resolution does not abandon, but which speak to the standard of proof for expulsion or formal discipline, not to whether the chapter may take a narrower, time-limited, reviewable step back from full participation while a serious allegation is pending; and

WHEREAS, this chapter affirms its commitment to believing survivors and to a survivor-centered process — one that listens carefully, takes harm seriously, and works to identify what a survivor most deeply needs — while recognizing that survivor-centered is not the same thing as survivor-led, and that the chapter's

obligation to assess safety and process fairly cannot be delegated entirely to any one individual, survivor or accused; and

WHEREAS, this chapter acknowledges that false reporting is statistically rare and that the primary barrier to accountability is underreporting and institutional failure, not false accusation. At the same time, rare is not nonexistent. We must also acknowledge that the same evidence-based tradition that establishes the rarity of false reports (roughly 2–10% of reports made to authorities; Lisak et al., 2010) also establishes, through the National Registry of Exonerations, that innocent Black people are nearly eight times more likely than innocent white people to be wrongfully convicted of rape, and that Black defendants account for nearly 60% of rape exonerations despite being less than a quarter of rape convictions."

WHEREAS, this chapter further affirms that accountability processes must guard against a “politics of innocence” that extends more care and rigor to allegations involving culturally sympathetic victims than to others, and that the safeguard against that risk is a single, consistently applied process with documented reasoning — not the absence of any process for taking safety-driven interim action; and

WHEREAS, this chapter affirms that national survey data show that sexual violence itself falls disproportionately on many marginalized communities. LGBTQ+ people generally, and transgender and nonbinary people in particular report sexual assault at close to twice the rate of the cisgender population; people with disabilities face sexual violence at roughly three times the rate of people without disabilities; and Indigenous and Black women face similarly elevated lifetime rates. A chapter policy addressing sexual violence must be built with these disparities in mind, both because our own membership includes people from these communities and because a process inattentive to these dynamics risks reproducing, inside the chapter, the same marginalization survivors already face outside it; and

WHEREAS, this chapter affirms that economic security — housing, a living wage, paid leave, and accessible childcare — is itself a form of survivor support, because economic dependence on an abuser is among the strongest predictors of a survivor remaining in an unsafe situation; and

WHEREAS, a policy that is silent on how the chapter distinguishes ordinary interpersonal conflict from allegations presenting a credible, ongoing safety risk leaves the Steering Committee to make that judgment ad hoc, under pressure, and without clear standards — precisely the situation this chapter recently experienced — and a written, membership-adopted framework serves due process, consistency, and transparency better than case-by-case improvisation, however careful;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that Savannah DSA adopts the following as the Savannah DSA Restorative Justice, Membership Standing, and Survivor-Centered Accountability Policy, which shall serve as the chapter's unified policy on these matters:

Section 1: Definitions

These definitions are provided so that chapter members can apply this policy consistently and can evaluate the chapter's decisions against a common standard, rather than against each member's individual understanding of these terms.

- (a) Restorative justice** is a philosophy and process, not a program, that involves those with a stake in an offense in collectively identifying and addressing the harms, needs, and obligations arising from it, with the goal of healing and putting things as right as possible. It rests on three pillars: repairing harm and meeting needs, holding the person who caused harm to appropriate accountability, and engaging affected parties and the community in the resolution (Howard Zehr, *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*, 2002; Zehr Institute for Restorative Justice).
- (b) Transformative justice** is an abolitionist extension of restorative justice, developed through Indigenous practice, Black feminist organizing, and prison-abolition movements, which addresses not only a specific incident of harm but the social conditions — patriarchy, racism, and economic precarity among them — that produce and sustain violence. Organizations such as generationFIVE and Creative Interventions developed transformative justice specifically in response to child sexual abuse and interpersonal violence, as an alternative to both criminal prosecution and organizational silence (generationFIVE, *Toward Transformative Justice*, 2007, and *Ending Child Sexual Abuse: A Transformative Justice Handbook*, 2017; Creative Interventions Toolkit: *A Practical Guide to Stop Interpersonal Violence*).
- (c) Survivor-centered (or victim-centered)** describes an approach in which a survivor's safety, wishes, and overall well-being is central in how a process is designed and carried out, and services or decisions are shaped around each survivor's stated needs — but the responsibility for defining the ultimate institutional response is not placed on the survivor alone (U.S. Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime, *A Victim-Centered Approach*; Youth Collaboratory, *Survivor-Centered and Survivor-Led Practices*).
- (d) Survivor-led** describes a distinct approach in which survivors are equipped and empowered to direct and lead a process or movement themselves, incorporating their voice, experience, and expertise into the leadership of the response, not only its design (Lloyd, 2008; Youth Collaboratory, *Survivor-Centered and Survivor-Led Practices*). A

survivor-led approach can be appropriate in movement organizing and peer support, but the distinction matters for chapter governance: an organization cannot delegate a chapter safety determination to any one member, including a survivor, without abandoning its own responsibility to the rest of the membership.

- (e) **Chapter approach** Savannah DSA adopts a survivor-centered approach, as distinguished from a survivor-led approach, for the reasons above, and as distinguished from what R26-005 correctly identifies as “hostile solidarity” — community empathy for a survivor that hardens into collective punitivity untethered from what the survivor or the situation actually requires.

Section 2: Guiding Principles

- (a) **Believing survivors.** Savannah DSA affirms that we stand with and believe survivors of sexual assault and other harm.
- (b) **Safety is a precondition, not a balancing factor.** Consistent with the transformative-justice sources cited in Section 1(b), the chapter treats the safety of survivors, other members, and the broader community — including any minors present at chapter or member activities — as a threshold requirement that must be met before, not after, an accountability process can meaningfully begin.
- (c) **Accountability requires good-faith, voluntary participation.** Restorative and transformative justice processes cannot be imposed on a person who disputes the allegation against them, particularly while that person is engaged in an adversarial criminal defense. The chapter distinguishes between (i) a restorative or transformative accountability process, which requires the accused member's genuine participation and is not available in every case, and (ii) a membership standing determination, which is a narrower, time-limited governance question the chapter can and must answer regardless of whether an accountability process is possible.
- (d) **Presumption of innocence governs guilt, not chapter safety judgments.** A pending criminal charge is an accusation, not a finding of fact, and this chapter will not treat a charge alone as grounds for expulsion or formal discipline. But the chapter is not a court, is not bound by the criminal standard of proof, and may conclude — based on its own good-faith review of the available information — that a member's continued full participation poses an unacceptable risk to others, without thereby adjudicating guilt.
- (e) **Equal rigor for all parties.** Every step in this policy — for allegations involving any party, regardless of race, gender, class, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability or how sympathetic a victim or accused member may appear — must be applied consistently and documented in a way that is reviewable by the Steering Committee and, where applicable, the membership.

Section 3: Scope and Applicability

This section defines when a matter proceeds under this policy and when it instead proceeds under the DSA Unified Grievance Policy (UGP). The two processes ask different questions — the UGP investigates and adjudicates allegations of harassment and related personal misconduct within DSA's jurisdiction; this policy addresses the narrower, separate question of a member's chapter participation and standing — and getting the right matter to the right process is itself part of treating everyone involved fairly.

- (a) When this policy applies.** This policy applies whenever the chapter must determine whether a member's participation or standing should be restricted because of an allegation of serious harm, including: (i) any matter in which a member is subject to pending criminal charges or prior criminal conviction for conduct constituting a felony-level or otherwise serious offense against a person, regardless of when or where the underlying conduct is alleged to have occurred, whether before or during the member's participation in the chapter, and regardless of whether the person harmed is a chapter member; and (ii) any allegation of serious harm presenting a credible, ongoing safety risk under Section 4 that does not fall within the scope of the UGP as described in (b).
- (b) When this policy does not apply.** This policy does not apply, and a matter instead proceeds under the UGP through the chapter's Harassment/Grievance Officer (HGO), where the allegation involves harassment or other prohibited personal conduct between members and falls within the jurisdiction defined by the UGP and Bylaws Article XII. A CAC process under this policy is never a substitute for reporting UGP-eligible conduct to the HGO, and does not relieve any member of that separate reporting option. The UGP's own Alternative Dispute Resolution provisions remain the appropriate track for harassment complaints where both parties agree and the HGO finds no risk of further harm; those are separate from the CAC process created here.
- (c) Concurrent matters.** Where an allegation could plausibly fall under both this policy and the UGP — for example, pending criminal charges arising from conduct that also involved another chapter member in a chapter setting — the Steering Committee shall consult the HGO as provided in Section 8(c) to determine the appropriate process. The UGP takes precedence as to investigation and adjudication of the underlying allegation, while this policy continues to govern the narrower question of interim participation and membership standing.

Section 4: Tiered Response Framework

The chapter's response to an allegation of harm depends on its severity and on whether it presents a credible, ongoing safety risk. This tiering exists so that the chapter neither overreacts to low-stakes interpersonal conflict nor underreacts to allegations of serious, potentially violent, offenses.

Tier 1: Interpersonal Conflict and Lower-Severity Harm

Consistent with Section 3.5.6 of the Members Handbook, the chapter's default response to interpersonal conflict is dialogue, mediation, or comradely correction before any formal action is considered. This tier is not available where the allegation involves the kind of violence described in Tier 3.

Tier 2: Serious Allegations Without an Ongoing Safety Risk

Where an allegation is serious but does not present a credible, ongoing risk to the safety of members — for example, a past incident with no continuing danger, or a dispute where all parties agree to engage — the chapter proceeds directly to the Community Accountability Committee process described in Section 4, without any interim restriction on participation.

Tier 3: Allegations Presenting a Credible, Ongoing Safety Risk

An allegation is treated as Tier 3 where it involves conduct such as sexual assault, child sexual abuse, other serious physical or sexual violence, or comparably severe harm, and where the circumstances — including the nature of the allegation, and the ongoing risk to members, especially minors, of continued full participation by the accused — raise a credible question of whether an interim restriction on participation is warranted pending further process. Any broader restriction on a member's participation is decided through the expedited Community Accountability Committee process below, not by the Steering Committee acting alone; the Steering Committee's own authority under this tier is limited to the narrow, short-term emergency measures described in (i).

Tier 3 determinations are governed by the following procedure:

- (i) Narrow emergency safety measures.** Nothing in this policy prevents the Steering Committee from taking immediate, narrowly tailored, time-limited measures to protect the physical safety of members at specific chapter events — for example, adjusting who staffs or attends a given event — while a Tier 3 matter is pending. Any such measure must be reviewed by the full Steering Committee within fourteen (14) days and does not, by itself, restrict a member's general standing or participation.
- (ii) Expedited referral to the Community Accountability Committee.** Upon learning of a Tier 3-level allegation, the Steering Committee shall convene a Community Accountability Committee (CAC) under Section 4 on an expedited basis, normally within seven (7) days, to consider whether a broader interim restriction on the member's participation is warranted. Any question of whether to restrict a member's participation beyond the narrow measures in (i) is decided through this CAC process, not by the Steering Committee alone.
- (iii) Expedited CAC recommendation.** For a Tier 3 matter, the CAC shall deliver a written interim recommendation to the Steering Committee within twenty-one (21) days of being convened, addressing only the narrow question of interim participation pending resolution of the underlying matter. This expedited recommendation does not

replace the fuller Section 4 process, which continues on its normal timeline and may result in a different final recommendation.

- (iv) Available resources, not a fixed requirement.** In reaching its recommendation, the CAC and Steering Committee should draw on whatever resources are reasonably available to the chapter — which may include the National Grievance Officer structure, District or regional leadership, publicly available court records, and legal guidance where accessible — but the process does not depend on the chapter having, or being able to obtain, its own legal counsel, since chapters will not always have that access.
- (v) Not a finding of guilt.** Any interim restriction adopted under this section is explicitly not a disciplinary finding, does not require the procedural showing set out in Bylaws Article III, Section 4, and does not by itself constitute expulsion.
- (vi) Documentation.** The CAC and Steering Committee shall document, in writing, the basis for any Tier 3 interim recommendation and decision, including the information reviewed and the reasoning applied, sufficient to allow later review under Section 2(e).
- (vii) Notice.** The Steering Committee shall report any Tier 3 interim measure to the general membership, in a manner that protects the privacy and safety of all parties, at the next regularly scheduled General Meeting.
- (viii) Periodic reconsideration.** An interim measure under this section shall be reconsidered by the CAC and Steering Committee at least every ninety (90) days, or promptly upon a material development in the underlying matter (such as dismissal of charges, a plea, or a conviction), and shall be lifted if the basis for it no longer holds.
- (ix) No presumption of extension.** An interim measure does not automatically continue after the underlying criminal matter is resolved. Any further restriction on a member's standing after resolution of the criminal matter must proceed through the full Community Accountability Committee process in Section 4 or through the formal disciplinary process in Bylaws Article III, Section 4.
- (x) Notice, response, and non-inference.** Before the CAC delivers an interim recommendation under (iii), the accused member shall receive written notice of the measure under consideration and its factual basis, with an opportunity to respond in writing or through a representative. Because statements made in a chapter process may be discoverable in a pending criminal case, silence or non-participation shall not be treated as evidence of guilt, as non-cooperation, or as grounds for restriction. Any interim measure must be the least restrictive sufficient to address the identified risk, and the documentation under (vi) must explain why lesser measures would not suffice."
- (xi) Restoration and repair.** If charges are dismissed, the member is acquitted, or the CAC or Steering Committee concludes the safety basis no longer holds, the chapter shall promptly restore the member's full standing and announce the restoration through the same channels, with the same prominence, as the original notice under (vii). The

chapter shall also offer the member a restorative process addressing any harm caused by the interim measure itself. Restoration is not contingent on participation in any accountability process the member has declined under Section 2(c)."

Section 5: Community Accountability Committee Selection and Composition

For Tier 2 matters, and for any Tier 3 matter following the criminal matter's resolution or as a parallel track where appropriate, the chapter shall convene a Community Accountability Committee (CAC) before any further disciplinary action is considered.

- (a) Selection authority.** The chapter's Harassment and Grievance Officer (HGO) shall select the members of each CAC convened under this policy, given the HGO's training in handling sensitive allegations. If the chapter has no sitting HGO, or the HGO is unavailable or has a conflict of interest under (c), selection authority passes to the Steering Committee, in the following order, moving to the next officer only if the prior officer is unavailable or has a conflict of interest: (i) the chapter Co-Chairs, acting jointly; (ii) the Secretary; (iii) the Treasurer; (iv) the Membership Coordinator; (v) any other Steering Committee officer, in the order established by the chapter's officer succession under the Bylaws. Whoever holds selection authority for a given matter shall be recorded under Section 7(a).
- (b) Composition.** The Steering Committee shall convene a CAC of no fewer than three (3) members, reflecting the, diversity of the chapter, including at least one member with experience or training in restorative or transformative justice, conflict mediation, or comparable practice, and one member who is the same race, gender, or sexual orientation of the accused and the person harmed
- (c) Screening for conflicts of interest; self-recusal.** This section adopts the same conflict-of-interest standard used in the DSA Unified Grievance Policy: a conflict of interest means being unable to take part in the matter without a predetermined judgment or opinion, and merely having some prior awareness of the circumstances does not, by itself, create a conflict. Consistent with that policy's requirement that chapter HGOs and Steering Committee members recuse themselves from any matter in which they have a conflict of interest, or in which one is likely to arise, each prospective or sitting CAC member must screen themselves against that standard before accepting appointment and on an ongoing basis thereafter, and must self-recuse where it is met — including, for example, where they are a close family member, romantic or sexual partner, roommate, or direct supervisor or subordinate of the accused or the person harmed; have a significant financial relationship with either party; have direct personal knowledge of the underlying incident such that they would be a witness rather than a reviewer; have previously served as an advocate, representative, or support person for either party in this or a related matter; or have publicly taken a position on the specific allegation before appointment. A member who becomes aware of a conflict after

appointment must disclose it immediately and recuse themselves, and the selecting authority under (a) shall appoint a replacement consistent with (b). As under the Unified Grievance Policy, failing to disclose a known conflict or failing to recuse is treated as a serious violation in its own right, not a minor technicality

Section 6: Community Accountability Committee Process

(a) Survivor-centered listening framework. The CAC shall listen carefully and without judgment to those who have experienced harm, giving full weight to their accounts as its starting point, while distinguishing — in collaboration with those harmed, wherever possible — between the immediate outcomes a survivor may articulate and the underlying needs for safety, accountability, dignity, and closure those outcomes express. This is a survivor-centered inquiry, not a survivor-led one: the CAC does not simply ratify whichever outcome is requested, nor does it substitute its own judgment for a survivor's stated safety needs. Consistent with (d) below, the CAC engages with a survivor's account only through channels the survivor has chosen, not through contact it initiates.

(b) Full contextual inquiry. The CAC shall, with respect for all parties' safety and privacy, seek to understand the circumstances of the allegation through direct conversation with involved parties and affected community members, recognizing that the chapter is not a court and lacks subpoena power or access to non-public evidence.

(c) No direct contact with the person harmed. The CAC shall not initiate contact with the person harmed by the alleged conduct. CAC members are not trained victim advocates, and direct outreach from the chapter carries a real risk of retraumatizing the person harmed regardless of intent. Where criminal charges are pending, an unsolicited approach from chapter representatives could also risk violating a no-contact order or other condition of the case, or otherwise complicate the legal proceeding, even where no such risk is intended. Any account, need, or wish the CAC considers from the person harmed must reach the CAC through a channel the survivor has affirmatively chosen — for example, the survivor coming forward on their own initiative, or through an HGO, advocate, or other support person of the survivor's own choosing — and never through outreach the CAC or Steering Committee initiates.

(d) Consultation with outside expertise. The CAC may consult the National DSA Grievance Council, outside restorative or transformative justice practitioners, or other subject-matter experts for guidance on process or best practice, and may invite a non-voting advisor under Section 5(b) where composition criteria cannot otherwise be met. Any such consultation is advisory only. The National Grievance Council and any third-party expert or advisor have no authority to make, veto, or otherwise bind the CAC's or Steering Committee's decisions, which remain solely within the chapter's own process under this policy.

(e) Attending to differential treatment. The CAC shall document whether its process extended equal care and procedural seriousness regardless of the parties' race, gender, class, sexual orientation, gender identity, disability or other identities, consistent with Section 2(e).

(f) Written recommendation. The CAC shall deliver a written recommendation to the Steering Committee within sixty (60) days, which may include no action, voluntary mediation, a mutual accountability agreement, continuation or modification of any Tier 3 interim measure, referral to external restorative or transformative justice resources, material support for the person harmed, or referral to the formal disciplinary process.

(g) Membership approval. Any CAC recommendation that restricts a member's participation on a non-interim, ongoing basis must be approved by a majority vote of the general membership at the next General Meeting, consistent with the Bylaws' due-process requirements.

Section 7: Documentation and Recordkeeping

Careful, consistent recordkeeping protects everyone involved: it lets the chapter show that Section 2(e)'s promise of equal rigor was actually kept, gives a future CAC or Steering Committee the context it needs, and limits sensitive information to those who genuinely need it.

(a) Appointment records. For each CAC convened under this policy, the selecting authority shall document, in writing: the date of appointment; the names of the members appointed and the selecting authority under Section 5(a); confirmation that the composition criteria in Section 5(b) were considered and, if not fully met, the reasoning required by that section; and confirmation that each member was screened for conflicts of interest under Section 5(c).

(b) Case records. The Steering Committee shall maintain a confidential record for each matter handled under this policy, including: the date the allegation or charge came to the chapter's attention; the nature of the allegation, described in general terms sufficient for institutional memory without gratuitous detail; the tier classification under Section 4 and the reasoning for it; any interim measures imposed, their basis, and the dates of periodic reconsideration; the CAC's composition and any recusals; the CAC's written recommendation; the Steering Committee's and, where applicable, the membership's decisions; and the matter's final resolution.

(c) Standards for documentation. Records under this section shall be written factually and neutrally — what was alleged, what information was reviewed, what process was followed, and what was decided and why — and shall avoid speculation, editorializing, or conclusions about criminal guilt beyond the chapter's own limited safety determination under Section 2(d). Records shall identify the person harmed and

the accused only to the extent necessary and shall not include unrelated personal details.

(d) Storage and access. All records under this section shall be stored on a secure, access-restricted chapter drive or system maintained by the Steering Committee, and shall not be stored on general chapter shared drives, in ordinary email threads, or on messaging platforms accessible to the general membership. Access shall be limited to the Steering Committee and, as needed for a specific matter, the assigned CAC members and the HGO, and access shall be logged.

(e) Retention. Records shall be retained for at least five (5) years from the date a matter is closed, or longer if needed for an ongoing legal proceeding or national DSA process, after which the Steering Committee may archive or dispose of them consistent with the chapter's general recordkeeping practices. The chapter may adjust this retention period by amending this policy under Section 11.

Section 8: Relationship to the National Harassment and Grievance Policy

- (a) No supersession.** Nothing in this policy supersedes or replaces the [National DSA Harassment and Grievance Policy \(Resolution 33\)](#) or the role of chapter Harassment and Grievance Officers (HGOs) under Article XII of the Bylaws and Section 3.5.5 of the Members Handbook.
- (b) Scope.** Where an allegation falls within the scope of the HGP, it shall be processed through the HGO in accordance with national policy. The CAC and any Tier 3 interim measure address only the question of chapter participation and membership standing, not the investigation or adjudication of the underlying allegation.
- (c) Coordination.** Where both the HGP and this policy may apply, the Steering Committee shall consult the HGO to determine the appropriate process and avoid duplication or conflict. The HGP takes precedence in matters within its scope.

Section 9: Survivor Support and Economic Justice

Recognizing that economic dependence on an abuser is among the strongest predictors of a survivor remaining in an unsafe situation, Savannah DSA commits to advocating for guaranteed housing, a living wage, paid leave for survivors seeking medical care or relocation, and accessible childcare, and affirms that this material advocacy is itself a form of believing and supporting survivors. The chapter further commits to ensuring that any survivor involved in a chapter process has access to confidential, trauma-informed support and is protected from retaliation.

Section 10: Training and Political Education

The chapter will provide annual training for Steering Committee members, HGOs, volunteer leadership, and any interested members covering: the distinction between restorative and

transformative justice; the distinction between survivor-centered and survivor-led approaches; how to assess whether an allegation meets the Tier 3 safety threshold in Section 3; the risks of hostile solidarity and of a “politics of innocence”; the specific bias around how “dangerousness” is perceived; the disproportionate impact of sexual violence on LGBTQ+ members, disabled members, and members of color; and the history of criminalization of marginalized organizers. The chapter will host or promote at least one educational event per year addressing these topics, drawing on the resources listed in Section 9.

Section 11: Effective Date

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this policy shall take effect immediately upon adoption, and be filed in the Record of Decisions and chapter archive. This resolution renders pending resolutions R26-003, R26-004, and R26-005 as moot.

Section 12: Additional Resources

These sources informed the definitions and framework above and are offered for members who want to read further. They are not equally aligned with every provision of this policy — members are encouraged to read critically and form their own views.

1. [Howard Zehr, *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*](#) (Good Books, 2002) — the foundational modern statement of restorative justice's principles and three pillars.
2. [Zehr Institute for Restorative Justice, “What is Restorative Justice?”](#), [zehr-institute.org](#) — an accessible overview and further reading list.
3. [generationFIVE, *Toward Transformative Justice: A Liberatory Approach to Child Sexual Abuse and Other Forms of Intimate and Community Violence*](#) (2007), and [Ending Child Sexual Abuse: A Transformative Justice Handbook](#) (2017) — the primary abolitionist framework for addressing child sexual abuse without the criminal legal system, including its treatment of safety and community intervention.
4. [Creative Interventions, *Creative Interventions Toolkit: A Practical Guide to Stop Interpersonal Violence*](#), available via [TransformHarm.org](#) — practical guidance on community-based intervention, with an explicit safety-first orientation.
5. Mariame Kaba and Shira Hassan, *Fumbling Towards Repair: A Workbook for Community Accountability Facilitators* — on the voluntary, consent-based nature of accountability processes.
6. INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, Community Accountability Working Group materials, available via [Critical Resistance, “Addressing Harm, Accountability and Healing”](#) — on community accountability within progressive and radical people-of-color organizing.

7. Youth Collaboratory, “Survivor-Centered and Survivor-Led Practices,” youthcollaboratory.org — the source for the survivor-centered/survivor-led distinction used in Section 1.
8. [U.S. Department of Justice, Office for Victims of Crime, “A Victim-Centered Approach”](https://www.ovc.ojp.gov), ovc.ojp.gov — a federal government articulation of the victim-centered approach.
9. [TransformHarm.org](https://transformharm.org) — a curated hub of transformative justice essays, toolkits, and case studies, including several addressing sexual violence directly.
10. [Abolitionist Futures, Transformative Justice reading list](https://abolitionistfutures.com), abolitionistfutures.com — a structured, annotated set of core and supplementary readings, including Bay Area Transformative Justice Collective and Leah Lakshmi Piepzna-Samarasinha's *Beyond Survival*.
11. [National Sexual Violence Resource Center \(NSVRC\)](https://www.nsvrc.org) and [Human Rights Campaign](https://www.humanrights.org) [“Understanding Intimate Partner Violence in the LGBTQ+ Community”](https://www.humanrights.org/documents/2014/12/understanding-intimate-partner-violence-in-the-lgbtq-community) statistical overviews of sexual violence among LGBTQ+ people and transgender and nonbinary people specifically — supporting Section 9's preamble finding on disparate impact.
12. [CDC National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey](https://www.cdc.gov/nisvs), and Disability Justice resource compilations on sexual violence against people with disabilities — supporting the same preamble finding as to disabled survivors.
13. [Interview with Tarana Burke, founder of #MeToo Movement](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...)
14. [What is Transformative Justice?](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...), Created by Project Nia and the Barnard Center for Research on Women. Video produced by Mariame Kaba, Dean Spade, and Hope Dector.