



Canadian
Association of
Broadcasters

L'Association
canadienne des
radiodiffuseurs

November 29, 2007

Via Epass

M. Robert A. Morin
Secretary General
Canadian Radio-television
and Telecommunications Commission
1 Promenade du Portage
Gatineau, Québec
K1A 0N2

Dear M. Morin:

Re: Broadcasting Public Notice CRTC 2007-89 – *Call for Comments on the Canadian Association of Broadcasters' proposed Equitable Portrayal Code*

1. The Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB) is the national voice of Canada's private broadcasters, representing the vast majority of Canadian programming services, including private radio and television stations, networks, specialty, pay and pay-per-view services. The goal of the CAB is to represent and advance the interests of Canada's private broadcasters in the social, cultural and economic fabric of the country. The CAB is pleased to submit its reply comments to interventions filed in the above-noted proceeding.

Background

2. In July 2007, the CRTC initiated a public proceeding inviting public comment on the CAB's proposed *Equitable Portrayal Code* (BPN CRTC 2007-89). Interested parties were given approximately 3 months to file comments (October 29th).
3. Prior to filing its proposed *Equitable Portrayal Code* (EPC) the CAB, in accordance with the guidelines set out in Public Notice CRTC 1988-13 *Guidelines for Developing Industry-Administered Standards*, solicited feedback from 36 ethnocultural, Aboriginal, disability and other relevant organizations/individuals in the English and French-language markets during April and May 2006. Many of these stakeholder organizations were consulted in the research studies on cultural diversity and persons with

disabilities or were members of the CAB's Outreach Committee for its Persons with Disabilities Report.

4. The CAB received responses from seven organizations and individuals with the majority of the respondents providing positive feedback and commending the CAB for taking the initiative to develop the *Equitable Portrayal Code*. The CAB adopted many of the recommendations received in its consultations and submitted a revised version of the EPC in July 2006.
5. The CAB then filed a revised version of its proposed EPC in March 2007 in response to concerns identified in a CRTC staff letter dated September 29th, 2006.

Summary of Comments from Interventions

6. A total of six interventions were filed in response to BPN CRTC 2007-89 from 6 organizations/individuals (ACTRA, William Sheehan, Canadian Diversity Producers Association, Center for Research Action on Race Relations (CRARR), Evanov Radio Group and Magda de la Torre) identifying the following key concerns:
 - The voluntary nature of the EPC;
 - The lack of penalties or clear dispute resolution mechanisms;
 - The use of the word "unduly" in the EPC; and
 - The need for greater clarification regarding the meaning of terms such as "Degrading Material" (section 7), "Exploitation" (section 8), and "Prevailing Community Standards" section 9(b)

The Proposed EPC will be a Mandatory Condition of Licence

7. As noted above, certain interveners in this proceeding expressed concern regarding the voluntary nature of the CAB's proposed EPC. The CAB notes that currently the CAB's *Sex-Role Portrayal Code* is a mandatory condition of licence for all radio and television licensees. This condition of licence can be suspended by the Commission if the licensee is a member in good standing with the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council (CBSC).
8. Accordingly, given that the CAB is proposing to replace the *Sex-Role Portrayal Code* with the proposed EPC, the CAB submits that it too will be a condition of licence for all radio and television licensees. However, as with the *Sex-Role Portrayal Code* the condition of licence would be suspended where a licensee is a member in good standing with the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council (CBSC).

Adjudication of Complaints

9. The CAB submits that there is no need to include penalty or dispute resolution mechanisms within the proposed EPC given that it will be administered by the CBSC. The CBSC has a long history of dealing with complaints from the public in an open, transparent and equitable manner and is considered to be a leading model for self-

regulation. All complaints from members of the public about content they have seen on television or heard on the radio are either sent directly to the CBSC or are referred by the CRTC to the CBSC (only complaints about egregious broadcasts that may violate the *Broadcasting Act* or its *Regulations* are retained).

10. With respect to its complaints process, all formal CBSC decisions are rendered by (one of seven) National or Regional Panels, each composed of 50% public Adjudicators and 50% industry Adjudicators with all decisions posted on the CBSC website. In the event that a CBSC Adjudicating Panel decides that the programming subject to complaint has violated one or more Code provisions, the broadcaster must announce that result on air. Furthermore, the broadcasters must make the announcement twice, once within three days following the release of the decision in prime time for television or peak listening hours for radio, and again within seven days following the release of the decision in the time period in which the offending content was broadcast. It must also write a letter to the complainant(s) within 14 days thereafter indicating that the announcements have been made. The broadcaster then must provide the CBSC with a copy of that letter and with copies of the tapes containing the broadcast announcements.
11. These measures are significant and represent a significant deterrent. More importantly, the Commission has since its inception repeatedly endorsed the adjudication process of the CBSC process as being fulsome and highly effective.
12. Over the last 16 years, the CRTC has often indicated in various contexts that it is quite satisfied with the CBSC. The replies made by the Commission to the CBSC's annual reports are one indication of that satisfaction. For example, the General Secretary of the CRTC, Alan Darling, replied in part as follows when the CBSC filed its 1994-1995 annual report:

“In addition, the Commission is favourably impressed by the well thought out, clear and straightforward decisions the CBSC issued last year. The way in which the decisions are drafted and the approach taken by the CBSC towards the concerns raised by members of the public support its awareness and education initiatives, and contributed a great deal to increasing its credibility among members of the public.”
13. In a speech to the Ontario Association of Broadcasters in April 2005, the Chairman of the CRTC made some specific observations in the period following the CRTC's decision on CHOI-FM, as well as on other controversial issues:

“But in the heated public debate that followed [some of] those [CRTC] decisions [concerning abusive comments], it wasn't mentioned that most complaints related to the content of radio and television broadcasts never have to be dealt with by the Commission at all. This, again, is to your credit as broadcasters, because you, together with the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council [CBSC], operate an effective system of self-regulation with regard to content. I agree with Ronald Cohen, the National Chair of the CBSC, who has said that self-regulation works in Canada because broadcasters 'live in and care about the communities to

which they broadcast, [and] because they believe in the principles and standards that they themselves have created.’ I commend you and the CBSC for continuing to ensure that self-regulation remains strong and credible in Ontario, as it is throughout Canada”.

The role of “unduly” in CBSC jurisprudence

14. As noted in earlier submissions on this issue, the use of the adverb “unduly” is proposed in 8 locations in the EPC. However, the use of “unduly” in industry administered codes is not new. In fact, the adverb “unduly” has been subject to interpretation by the CBSC for nearly 15 years as a result of its inclusion in Clause 2 of the CAB Code of Ethics which provides:

*Recognizing that every person has the right to full and equal recognition and to enjoy certain fundamental rights and freedoms, broadcasters shall ensure that their programming contains no abusive or **unduly** discriminatory material or comment which is based on matters of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability.* [Emphasis added]

15. The language currently applied in all CBSC human rights decisions, namely, that “broadcasters shall ensure that their programming contains no abusive or unduly discriminatory material or comment”, reflects years of jurisprudential reflection by CBSC Adjudicating Panels¹. That reflection was based on the CBSC interpretation of the 1988 version of the CAB Code of Ethics, which read: “broadcasters shall endeavour to ensure, to the best of their ability, that their programming contains no abusive or discriminatory material or comment.”
16. The CBSC recognized, from the earliest days in which it rendered decisions interpreting the human rights clause, that it would not be practical, from an intellectual or policy perspective, for all broadcast statements of a “discriminatory” nature to be prohibited. There were clearly degrees of such material or comment and the wider the net was spread in order to capture every such statement, the greater the potential for unwarranted interference with freedom of expression. Accordingly, the CBSC needed to find equilibrium in the competing societal rights as it stated later in *CHTZ-FM re the Morning Show* (CBSC Decision 92/93-0148, October 26, 1993), “it must balance the right of audiences to receive programming which is free of abusive or discriminatory material [...] with the fundamental right of free speech in Canadian society.”
17. The first attempt by the CBSC to deal with that balancing, *CFOX-FM re the Larry and Willy Show* (CBSC Decision 92/93-0141, August 30, 1993), explained the issue in the following terms:

¹ The language was ultimately adopted in the amended *CAB Code of Ethics* in 2002. Among other things, the 2002 revision eliminated the less mandatory terminology, “broadcasters shall endeavour to ensure, to the best of their ability”, replacing it by the peremptory “shall ensure”.

It is not any reference to "race, national or ethnic origin, religion, age, sex, marital status or physical or mental handicap" but rather those which contain "abusive or discriminatory material or comment" based on the foregoing which will be sanctioned.

18. A couple of years later, in *CITV-TV re "You Paid for It!" (Arts Funding)* (CBSC Decision 95/96-0091, December 16, 1997), the CBSC stated in slightly different terms:

It is important to note that the human rights provision does not prohibit mere references, where pertinent, to matters of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, sex, marital status, physical or mental handicap or sexual orientation. [Emphasis added]

19. In the language of the day, it pointed to the earlier CFOX-FM decision and explained that it was essential that an "abusive or hateful element" be present for a finding of breach. And then, in *CFTO-TV re "Tom Clark's Canada"* (CBSC Decision 97/98-0009, February 26, 1998), the CBSC summarized the evolution of its interpretation of Clause 2 and established the interpretation of "abusive or discriminatory comment" in the following terms:

In the over 120 decisions of the CBSC, the Council has dealt with the issue of discriminatory comment on numerous occasions. Indeed, the "human rights" clause of the CAB Code of Ethics is one of the most interpreted provisions of all in the Codes administered by the CBSC. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Council's approach in dealing with complaints about discriminatory comment has become fine-tuned.

Early on, the Council recognized that Clause 2 of the CAB Code of Ethics requires a weighing of competing values. [...] The application of this balancing act in various CBSC decisions evolved into an "abusiveness criterion"; i.e. the establishment of a "test" whereby a comment must not merely be discriminatory to constitute a breach of Clause 2, it must be abusively so.

20. By 2002, while the CAB was in the process of amending its Code of Ethics, it was determined that, although the principle of the qualified test was sound, it would be better to use "unduly" rather than "abusively" as the qualifying adverb. Thus, "abusive", which more closely resembled the language in the "abusive comment" provisions of the CRTC-administered Regulations, was preserved in a more appropriate role and "unduly" was imported to assist in dealing with the principle that it is not just any reference to an identifiable group that will be in breach of the human rights clause.

Defining the Extent of the Protection

21. It goes without saying that there is no precise way of defining the comments that will fall afoul of the proscription of the human rights clause and those that will not. As provided in *CKTF-FM re Voix d'Accès* (CBSC Decision 93/94-0213, December 6, 1995), "It would be unreasonable to expect that the airwaves be pure, antiseptic and flawless. Society is not. Nor are individuals in their dealings with one another." For example, in *CHFI-FM re the Don Daynard Show* (CBSC Decision 94/95-0145, March 26, 1996), the Panel was called upon to assess a Jewish mother's light bulb joke, which, while undeniably "ethnically pointed, was neither demeaning nor abusive," in the assessment of the Panel.

The key part of the Panel's conclusion and the barometer for such evaluations since that time was that the comment "poked fun but did not bludgeon. It tickled but was not nasty."

22. Ultimately, the CHFI-FM test has been applied dozens of times by the CBSC and has become an indicator for Panels to apply in assessing whether humorous comments crossed the boundary of acceptability. In the CKTF-FM decision, the Panel also pointed out that, in the area of comedic remarks,

There are those which are sanctionable and those which, even if tasteless or painful to some, are not. [...] Nonetheless, the airwaves are a special and privileged place and those who occupy that territory are expected to play a more restrained and respectful social role.

What may constitute the limits of acceptability in each challenged case will need to be appreciated in its context. Certain cases will clearly fall on one side or the other of the boundary. Others will lie uncomfortably on the line.

23. While the CAB recognizes that not every individual will agree with the conclusions of every single CBSC determination, the foregoing principles are the basis for the highly developed jurisprudence, which the CAB believes has done a thorough job in protecting the rights of identifiable groups on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability over the course of almost 15 years, while not interfering unduly with Canadian freedom of expression.

Clarification of Terms

24. The CAB submits that there is no need to provide further explanation of the meaning of terms such as "Degrading Material" (section 7) and "Exploitation" (section 8) since both terms are not only well defined in the English language but are also used in the *Sex-Role Portrayal Code* and have been subject to adjudication for years without any need for further explanation as to their meaning.
25. The CAB also notes that specific language was used in Article 4 (Stereotyping) of the proposed EPC in recognition of the fact that not all stereotyping is negative per se. Article 4 of the proposed EPC prohibits "unduly negative stereotypical material or comment" not stereotyping in general. In contrast, "Degrading Material" and "Exploitation" both deal exclusively with negative portrayals and will be adjudicated in accordance with the standards set out in Articles 7 and 8 of the proposed EPC.
26. With respect to the term "Prevailing Community Standards" (section 9(b)) the CAB notes that this term continues to evolve along with Canadians' social and cultural values and as such should not be subject to a strict definition since it risks losing its relevancy over time. Furthermore, the CAB notes that Canadian legal jurisprudence makes frequent use of the term "community standards" in its application and interpretation of legislation and common law principles without identifying a strict definition of the term.

27. Furthermore, the CAB has developed a number of industry diversity initiatives for educational purposes such as *Recommended Guidelines on Language and Terminology – Persons with Disabilities: A Manual for News Professionals and Glossary* which can provide guidance in evaluating and adjudicating complaints under Section 9(b). The CAB believes this type of initiative is more responsive to change since it can be developed and/or revised more quickly than industry codes.

Additional Comments

28. A number of interveners suggested changes or edits to the language used in the “General Principles” section of the proposed EPC. The CAB has incorporated a number of these comments which are reflected in track changes in the attached revised version of the proposed EPC.

Conclusion

29. As stated in earlier correspondence, the CAB is confident that its revised *Equitable Portrayal Code* addresses the research findings of the Task Force Report and the CAB Persons with Disabilities Report relating to stereotyping and negative/inaccurate portrayal
30. The CAB thanks the Commission for the opportunity to provide reply comments in this proceeding.

Sincerely,



Pierre-Louis Smith
Vice-President, Policy and
Chief Regulatory Officer

Encl.

***** End of Document *****

Revised Final – November 2007

Canadian Association of Broadcasters'

Equitable Portrayal Code

**Administered by the
Canadian Broadcast Standards Council**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page No.</u>
INTRODUCTION	3
BACKGROUND	3
STATEMENT OF INTENT	4
GENERAL PRINCIPLES	4
CODE APPLICATION AND ADMINISTRATION	5
THE CODE	5
1. Equitable Portrayal.....	5
2. Human Rights	5
3. Negative Portrayal	6
4. Stereotyping.....	6
5. Stigmatization and Victimization	6
6. Derision of Myths, Traditions or Practices	6
7. Degrading Material.....	6
8. Exploitation	6
9. Language and Terminology	6
10. Contextual Considerations.....	7

Introduction

This Code, which replaces the *Canadian Association of Broadcasters ("CAB") Sex-Role Portrayal Code*, has been created to ensure the equitable portrayal of all persons in television and radio programming. Canada's private broadcasters recognize the cumulative societal effect of negative portrayal and, by creating this *Equitable Portrayal Code* ("Code"), establish common standards to prevent such portrayal.

The CAB solicited input on the Code from 36 public stakeholder organizations representing ethnocultural, Aboriginal, and disability groups in the English- and French-language markets.

The *CAB Equitable Portrayal Code* reflects the responsibilities of licensees, under the *Broadcasting Act*, to ensure that their programming and broadcast services achieve the highest standards, and demonstrates the private broadcasters' commitment to the equitable portrayal of all persons in their programming.

Background

In July 2004, the Canadian Association of Broadcasters endorsed the recommendations included in *Reflecting Canadians – Best Practices for Cultural Diversity in Private Television*, the report of the Task Force for Cultural Diversity on Television ("Task Force Report"). A key recommendation was that the CAB review its industry codes for the purpose of determining whether they addressed concerns identified in the Task Force's research findings regarding the reflection and portrayal of ethnocultural and Aboriginal groups. The Task Force Report was followed by a report commissioned by the CAB, *The Presence, Portrayal and Participation of Persons with Disabilities in Television Programming* ("CAB Persons with Disabilities Report"), which was released in September 2005. The CAB Persons with Disabilities Report also noted a lack of industry reference points or standards concerning the depiction and portrayal of persons with disabilities and called for a review of existing codes to address this concern.

The CAB was guided by the research findings in both the Task Force Report and in the CAB Persons with Disabilities Report relating to reflection and portrayal in developing this Code.

Specifically, the Task Force report, and in particular the Phase IV Focus Group research, identified the following areas of concern with respect to achieving the fair and accurate portrayal of ethnocultural and Aboriginal groups:

- Stereotyping;
- Negative and Inaccurate Portrayal; and
- Unbalanced Portrayal in Newscasts.

The CAB Persons with Disabilities Report, and in particular Part III of the Research Report, identified similar concerns regarding the reflection and portrayal of persons with disabilities focusing primarily on inaccurate or stereotypical portrayals in dramatic and news and information programming and concerns regarding the victimization of persons with disabilities in programming.

This Code is designed to complement the research conducted and the initiatives undertaken by Canada's private broadcasters and other industry stakeholders in the area of diversity, and the general principles contained in the other CAB and industry codes referenced in Appendix A, namely, the *Radio Television News Directors Association ("RTNDA") Code of (Journalistic) Ethics*, the Advertising Standards Canada *Gender Portrayal Guidelines for Advertising* and the *Canadian Code of Advertising Standards*.

This *CAB Equitable Portrayal Code* is the response of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters to concerns identified in the Task Force Report and the CAB Persons with Disabilities Report regarding depiction and portrayal. It will be administered by the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council.

Statement of Intent

It is the intent of this Code that broadcasters shall ~~strive to present~~ equitable portrayal. This Code is intended to ~~overcome~~ unduly negative portrayal and stereotyping in broadcast programming, including commercial messages, based on matters of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability.

Deleted: encourage

Deleted: assist in

Deleted: ing

General Principles

- [a] The objective of equitable reflection of identifiable groups is well recognized by broadcasters, who consider that the portrayal of such groups shall be comparable to, and reflective of, their actual social and professional achievements, education, contributions, interests and activities.
- [b] Television and radio programming shall strive to present all identifiable groups in various social and occupational roles, at home and at work outside the home.
- [c] Nothing in this Code should be interpreted as censoring the depiction of healthy sexuality; however, broadcasters shall avoid and eliminate the depiction of gratuitous harm toward individuals in a sexual context, as well as the promotion of sexual hatred and degradation.
- [d] Broadcasters and the public should also refer to the *CAB Voluntary Code Regarding Violence in Television Programming*, which contains provisions prohibiting programming that sanctions, promotes or glamorizes violence against identifiable groups; and the *RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics* and certain clauses of the *CAB Code of Ethics*, which deal with news and public affairs programming.
- [e] Broadcasters shall evaluate individual programs within the context of their overall schedule, on the one hand, and broadcast services and other media available within their market, on the other, to ensure a varied approach to programming content that reflects the equitable portrayal of identifiable groups.

Deleted: gender-related

- [f] Assessment of a station's performance in relation to program development, acquisition and scheduling should take into account the station's overall schedule and record on the issue of the portrayal of individuals or groups on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability.
- [g] Any appreciation of portrayal in television and radio programming is assessed in the fictional or non-fictional context of a program, feature, character, dialogue, voice-over or visual interpretation. Taking into consideration the societal, educational and entertainment purposes of program creation, it is recognized that balance in portrayal within a specific or individual program is not always possible or even desirable.
- [h] No code can reasonably anticipate every circumstance of negative portrayal. Consequently, the CAB expects all such circumstances to be dealt with in accordance with the spirit and intent, as well as the wording, of this Code.

Code Application and Administration

Application of this Code is the responsibility of the individual licensee. Complaints and inquiries should be addressed to and dealt with by the broadcaster involved.

Complaints not resolved between the complainant and the broadcaster will be referred to the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council, which is charged with the administration of this Code and the process which that entails.

To create awareness of this Code, the CAB will work with the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council, which will distribute copies to interested parties, post the Code on its website in the CBSC's wide range of Aboriginal and ethnocultural languages, and encourage broadcasters to broadcast relevant public service announcements.

The Code

1. *Equitable Portrayal*

Television and radio programming shall respect the principle of equitable portrayal of all individuals.

2. *Human Rights*

Recognizing that every person has the right to the full enjoyment of certain fundamental rights and freedoms, broadcasters shall ensure that their programming contains no abusive or unduly discriminatory material or comment which is based on matters of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability.

3. Negative Portrayal

In an effort to ensure appropriate depictions of all individuals and groups, broadcasters shall refrain from airing unduly negative portrayals of persons with respect to race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability. Negative portrayal can take many different forms, including (but not limited to) stereotyping, stigmatization and victimization, derision of myths, traditions or practices, degrading material, and exploitation.

4. Stereotyping

Recognizing that stereotyping is a form of generalization that is frequently simplistic, belittling, hurtful or prejudicial, while being unreflective of the complexity of the group being stereotyped, broadcasters shall ensure that their programming contains no unduly negative stereotypical material or comment which is based on matters of race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability.

5. Stigmatization and Victimization

Recognizing that members of certain of the following identifiable groups face particular portrayal issues, broadcasters shall ensure that their programming does not stigmatize or victimize individuals or groups on the basis of their race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability.

6. Derision of Myths, Traditions or Practices

Broadcasters shall avoid the airing of content that has the effect of unduly deriding the myths, traditions or practices of groups on the basis of their race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability.

7. Degrading Material

Broadcasters shall avoid the airing of degrading material, whether reflected in words, sounds, images or by other means, which are based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability.

8. Exploitation

- a) Broadcasters shall refrain from the airing of programming that exploits women, men or children.
- b) Broadcasters shall refrain from the sexualisation of children in programming.

9. Language and Terminology

Broadcasters shall be sensitive to, and avoid, the usage of derogatory or inappropriate language or terminology in references to individuals or groups based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental

disability.

- a) Equality of the sexes must be recognized and reinforced through the proper use of language and terminology. Broadcasters shall employ language of a non-sexist nature in their programming, by avoiding, whenever possible, expressions which relate to only one gender.
- b) It is understood that language and terminology evolve over time. Some language and terminology may be inappropriate when used with respect to identifiable groups on the basis of their race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, age, gender, sexual orientation, marital status or physical or mental disability. Broadcasters shall remain vigilant with respect to the evolving appropriateness or inappropriateness of particular words and phrases, keeping in mind prevailing community standards.

10. Contextual Considerations

Broadcasts may fairly include material that would otherwise appear to breach one of the foregoing provisions in the following contextual circumstances:

- a) Legitimate artistic usage: Individuals who are themselves bigoted or intolerant may be part of a fictional or non-fictional program, provided that the program is not itself abusive or unduly discriminatory;
- b) Comedic, humorous or satirical usage: Although the comedic, humorous or satirical intention or nature of programming is not an absolute defence with respect to the proscriptions of this Code, it is understood that some comedic, humorous or satirical content, although discriminatory or stereotypical, may be light and relatively inoffensive, rather than abusive or unduly discriminatory;
- c) Intellectual treatment: Programming apparently for academic, artistic, humanitarian, journalistic, scientific or research purposes, or otherwise in the public interest, may be broadcast, provided that it: is not abusive or unduly discriminatory; does not incite contempt for, or severely ridicule, an enumerated group; and is not likely to incite or perpetuate hatred against an enumerated group.

APPENDIX A

The following is intended to provide readers with a non-exhaustive list of research undertaken, as well as reference material and tools private broadcasters and related industry stakeholders have developed or applied, in the area of diversity that may provide additional guidance in achieving the equitable portrayal of all groups in television and radio programming:

Industry Codes

- CAB Code of Ethics – www.cbsc.ca
- RTNDA Code of (Journalistic) Ethics – www.cbsc.ca
- CAB Code Regarding Violence in Television Programming – www.cbsc.ca
- Canadian Code of Advertising Standards - www.adstandards.com
- Advertising Standards Canada Gender Portrayal Guidelines for Advertising – www.adstandards.com

Industry Research and Resources

- *Reflecting Canadians: Best Practices for Cultural Diversity in Private Television*, Final Report of Task Force for Cultural Diversity on Television, 2004 – www.cab-acr.ca/diversityinbroadcasting
- *The Presence, Portrayal and Participation of Persons with Disabilities in Television Programming*, Final Report by Canadian Association of Broadcasters, 2005 - www.cab-acr.ca/diversityinbroadcasting
- *Framework: Employment in Canadian Screen-Based Media - a National Profile*, Women in Film and Television - Toronto, 2004 - www.wift.com
- *Advancing the Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities*, Human Resources and Social Development Canada, 2004 – www.hrsdc.gc.ca
- *Media Stereotyping - Media Awareness Network* - <http://www.media-awareness.ca/english/issues/stereotyping/index.cfm>

Industry Initiatives and Tools

- *Recommended Guidelines on Language and Terminology – Persons with Disabilities: A Manual for News Professionals*, Canadian Association of Broadcasters, 2006 - www.cab-acr.ca/diversityinbroadcasting
- *Employment Opportunities in the Canadian Broadcasting and Affiliated Production Sector*, Canadian Association of Broadcasters, 2006 - www.cab-acr.ca/diversityinbroadcasting
- *Diversity Online*, CHUM Limited - diversity.chumtv.com
Diversity Online is a free online database providing all media with unprecedented, direct access to over 300 dynamic and articulate subject experts representing diverse communities from every province and territory, including aboriginal peoples, visible minorities, women, gay and lesbian people, youth and people with disabilities.
- *Everyone's Story – Reflecting Canada's Diversity: A User Guide for Electronic Journalists* – RTNDA The Association of Electronic Journalists, 2007 – www.rtndacanada.com