

Anonymous reporting mechanisms summary of types of issue and where these occur
Press coverage of events and issues at Harper Adams
Staff survey data linked to experiences of culture, discrimination
Data correlations based on demographics and activity

Sector rese
practice, plans and strategies

4. Findings and recommendations:

- 4.1** In undertaking this review, we read relevant documentation and data reported to us by the University, interviewed staff and students, drew on our own experience of working in the sector, and reviewed relevant published sector information (see Appendix 2). Our recommendations are made on the basis of our work at Harper Adams and our knowledge of the sector in general. We would like to thank all of the staff and students who gave their time to talk to us, and for the frank and balanced way in which they approached the review. We would particularly like to acknowledge the work undertaken by Kate Baker, Simone Clarke and Liam Davies in supporting this review, as well as their leadership in the implementation of the Respect policy.
- 4.2** The University and the Union have, to their credit, recognised the issues that need to be addressed, and have put time, effort and leadership into dealing with them. We were impressed by the extent to which, even during the period over which the review took place, progress was being made against the annual action plan, and recommendations that we had in mind after the first round of meetings had been overtaken by myriad actions taken by the University. Nonetheless, our impression is that Harper Adams has a larger gap between where it currently is and where it would like to be in respect of this agenda, than the university sector in general. Much has been done, but much remains to be done. While poor behaviour will arise in any community, we were shocked by some of the examples cited to us, and by aspects of the culture of the University that they illustrated. Nonetheless, given pressure on staff time and resources, and other priorities, we believe that the pace of change is

behaviour in bars has been lax, and standards and expectations have not been clear. From our discussion with the staff responsible, and our review of the procedures and a summary of cases we are satisfied that allegations of breach of disciplinary regulations are now being handled properly, so this is another area of significant progress. Both the University and the Union are setting clear standards of behaviour. Examples of unacceptable behaviour that are not dealt with properly can of course be powerful stories that pass from one generation of staff and students to the next and influence some of the less positive institutional cultures, and we were told about incidents that may have taken place some time ago. In that context we **Recommend** that the University publishes anonymised outcomes of disciplinary investigations, so that staff and students can see that unacceptable behaviour both on and off campus is dealt with appropriately **(R4)**.

4.5 reporting tool, and this is a positive development. From our discussions, awareness of the tool is limited although recent evidence shows that this is growing and there is some way to go in convincing staff and students that it can be used without fear of reprisals. We **Recommend** that the University acts to publicise the process to both staff and students and the Board should receive annual reports on its use **(R5)**.

4.6 Many universities now have mandatory periodic training for staff on issues such as Respect. Harper Adams does not have any such provision. Given relatively low levels of staff turnover, the initial induction process for staff cannot be enough to discharge this responsibility. We **Recommend** that a target is set for all staff to be trained and for training to be repeated, say, every three years. We were told more than once that some staff do not have the skills to deal with unacceptable behaviour in the classroom and on campus and this should be addressed in training. **(R6)**

4.7 Harper Adams University has the potential to lead the development of the sectors of the economy in which it offers education and research. During our discussions we heard that the University is embracing this opportunity, but has some way to go. Some of the tensions that have been apparent in the University community are reinforced by different cultures in different academic disciplines, and the very different recruitment profiles of disciplines in terms of gender, ethnicity and socio-economic grouping. There appears to be little opportunity for students from different disciplines to interact in the classroom, and to engage in constructive debate. We **Recommend** that the Annual Report on Respect should explicitly cover educational developments including the embedding on Respect within curricula. **(R7)**

4.8

subjects with Engineering overwhelmingly male and veterinary nursing being predominantly female, for example. The proportion of BAME-001S2fab 1082-4m)3(panaurin)Rn001002,,apLTDCW0EEdUQ

one, and we **Recommend** that a joint steering group with joint Chairs, is established to oversee reviews and revisions to the policy and progress in implementation. **(R9)**

4.10 In our meetings we heard a perception that the Student Union was overly focused on events involving alcohol, and on revenue generation from bar sales. We also heard that the University had historically underfunded the Union, leaving it with limited funds to promote clubs and societies, and therefore limited ability to provide activities and opportunities to the full range of students, and a dependence on bar and event profits to fund other activities. We were also told that there is limited social space for students on campus that is not linked to the sale of alcohol. The Union was clearly aware of this perception and was taking

an application for an increase in block grant funding for the Union. We **Recommend** that the University and the Union engage in joint wo(to)Tf1 02C405 9Tm02 61c,bp-7(nd)4)-m9Tul(mi)7(t(l)6)]TJETQ.00