

Actions that will be taken in response to the recommendations contained in the Reindorf Report

Recommendations contained in the Reindorf Report		University of Essex actions	
1	<p>The University should issue an open apology to Prof Phoenix for</p> <p>(1) failing to plan adequately for her seminar on 5 December 2019, such that the event had to be cancelled at the last minute because of a risk of disruption;</p> <p>(2) failing to undertake a timely investigation (and thereafter disciplinary action if appropriate) in respect of the flyer circulated on 5 December 2019 containing violent and profane imagery which was targeted at her;</p> <p>(3) inappropriately asking her on 10 December 2019 to provide a copy of her seminar for the purposes of vetting its content;</p> <p>(4) infringing her freedom of speech without justification by deciding on 11 December 2019 to (a) rescind the invitation to present a seminar and (b) not invite her to attend a future seminar in the Department of Sociology; and</p> <p>(5) thereby causing her distress.</p>	1	<p>The Vice-Chancellor, on behalf of the University, to issue an open apology to Professor Phoenix and to Professor Freedman sending them each suitably redacted versions of the report and links to the University Statement.</p> <p>Apologies to also be published on the dedicated webpages.</p>
4	<p>The University should issue an open apology to Prof Freedman for</p> <p>(1) threatening to infringe her freedom of speech without justification between 9 and 27 January 2020 by rescinding the invitation to her to take part in the Holocaust Memorial Week roundtable debate on 30 January 2020;</p> <p>(2) causing her distress [REDACTED]</p>		
2	<p>The Department of Sociology should declare void the decision taken on 11 December 2019 <i>[note: date not as shown in report]</i> to not invite Prof Phoenix to a future seminar.</p>	2	<p>The Department of Sociology to set aside any decision not to invite Professor Phoenix to speak, and to reflect on the implications for future speaker invitations, including clarifying its policies and procedures in relation to external speaker invitations.</p>
3	<p>Prof Phoenix should be invited to present a seminar in the Centre for Criminology.</p>	3	<p>The Centre for Criminology, in consultation with relevant communities, to agree a way forward that will result in Prof Phoenix being invited to present a seminar.</p>

15	The University should communicate to all members of staff that the external speaker notification procedure is mandatory and is not limited to cases which fall within the scope of the Prevent Duty. Staff should be warned that persistent refusal or failure to comply with it could result in disciplinary action.	4	Implement a range of communications (including an email sent to Heads of Departments and Heads of Sections, Monday Management Meeting members and all staff) to reiterate the importance, and mandatory nature, of the University's external speaker notification procedure.
16	The University should ask all members of staff to confirm in writing that they are aware of the external speaker notification procedure, and to state whether they require any clarification or training in relation to the procedure. If they require clarification or training this should be provided to them promptly.		Ensure this is included in all relevant essential and additional training.
17	The University should inform all staff that (1) decisions on whether to approve external speakers will be made on a case by case basis within the existing procedure, and must not be made outside the procedure (and in particular must not be made on a departmental basis and/or by way of any kind of vote); and (2) under no circumstances should an external speaker be blacklisted or no-platformed.		All staff to confirm via iTrent (or suitable alternative mechanism) that they have understood the requirement and whether they require further clarification or training. Work with the Students' Union to extend training to students where appropriate. Review existing procedure to ensure it is explicit in relation to blacklisting/no-platforming.
6	The External Speaker Code of Practice should be amended to clarify that speakers must not be asked to provide copies of their papers or seminars in advance for the purposes of vetting, other than in cases which appear to fall within the scope of the Prevent duty.	5	Review and amend as necessary: a. the External Speaker Code of Practice; b. the external speaker notification form and review process; and c. the system of block-booking rooms
7	The external speaker notification form should be amended to add a section within which the organiser must properly set out any concerns they may have about potentially controversial or distressing topics or speakers.		Secure specialist professional legal advice as necessary to assist in complex or difficult external speaker reviews and compliance requirements in relation to any proposal to rescind an approved invitation to an external speaker.
8	The External Speaker Code of Practice should be amended to state that compliance with its provisions will be monitored and that persistent failure or refusal to comply with it may result in cancellation of events and/or disciplinary action. An effective mechanism for monitoring by Compliance should be put in place.		In undertaking the review (or when legislation comes into force) consider the impact of the Government's proposed new legislation on: Higher education: free speech and academic freedom https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/higher-education-free-speech-and-academic-freedom
5	A facility should be implemented to send an automatic notification where a room has been block-booked to prompt both the organiser and the professional services staff team which manages room bookings that the external speaker notification form needs to be completed.		Review existing support mechanisms, consult on, and implement any additional support necessary to ensure appropriate and adequate support is in place.
9	The external speaker review process should adopt a decision making structure to be used in cases of potential concern. It should be		

	based on the questions set out in Appendix 6. The EHRC and UUK guidance should also be considered as sources of good practice.		
10	The University should give consideration to engaging specialist professional legal advice to assist in complex or difficult external speaker reviews.		
14	The External Speaker Code of Practice should be amended to add a requirement for Compliance to be notified of any proposal to rescind an approved invitation to an external speaker, and for reasons to be provided. Compliance should review any such proposal and satisfy themselves that it is not based on improper reasons. In difficult cases Compliance may refer this task to the Registrar.		
11	The external speaker review should in every case consider whether the event is likely to cause distress, and if so (1) seek to consult with any relevant staff or student groups as to what support measures might be put into place; and (2) work with Student Wellbeing and Inclusion Services, the Students' Union and/or Human Resources to ensure that appropriate and adequate support is provided.		
13	All marketing materials for external speaker events (including on social media) should be supervised by the event organiser(s) and not delegated to junior staff or interns.		
12	When a potentially controversial or distressing topic or speaker is approved through the external speaker review, the reviewers should seek to consult with staff and student groups who might wish to organise protests or counter-speech (where such groups are reasonably identifiable) and seek to ensure that assistance is provided to organise these appropriately, safely and peacefully. This consultation should form the basis for guidance on appropriate protesting which should be published in good time in advance of the event in a clear and accessible manner and via staff and student groups.	6	Put in place a system to ensure that, when a potentially controversial or distressing topic or speaker is approved through the external speaker review, there is consultation with staff and student groups within a reasonable timeframe who might wish to express counter speech or to organise protests (where such groups are reasonably identifiable) and to seek to ensure that assistance is provided to organise or express these appropriately, safely and peacefully.
18	The University's equality, diversity and inclusion policy documents, Charter and Strategic Plan should be standardised so that they all accurately describe the protected characteristics in the Equality Act 2010, namely age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex and sexual orientation. Any additional characteristics in respect of which the University wishes to extend protection should be clearly identified as such	7	Review the University's equality, diversity and inclusion policy documents, Charter and Strategic Plan to ensure they all accurately describe the protected characteristics in the Equality Act 2010. Any additional characteristics in respect of which the University wishes to extend protection to be clearly identified as such, and to take into account guidance provided by relevant public bodies.

19	The Supporting Trans and Non Binary Staff policy and Harassment and Bullying Zero Tolerance policy should be amended to accurately state the law, in particular with a view to ensuring that they are an authoritative source of information for the purposes of the external speaker review process.	8	Review and make required amendments, on the basis of legal advice, to the University's: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Supporting Trans and Non Binary Staff policy; and b. Harassment and Bullying Zero Tolerance policy.
20	The Supporting Trans and Non Binary Staff policy should be reviewed by a specialist lawyer and if necessary amended to ensure that it offers adequate protection and is lawful.		
21	The University should circulate a statement to staff and students (1) condemning the flyer circulated on 5 December 2019 containing violent and profane imagery; and (2) stating that any similar conduct will be dealt with by way of disciplinary action.	9	In the context of Action 12, prepare and communicate a clear statement to staff and students condemning the flyer circulated on 5 December 2019 containing violent and profane imagery, and stating that any similar conduct will be subject to formal investigation that may be dealt with by way of disciplinary action.
22	The University should set up a Working Group to devise and implement a strategy for repairing relationships between trans and nonbinary University members and those with gender critical views, in particular women. In doing so it should bear in mind its duty to pay due regard to the need to foster good relations between people with particular protected characteristics and others. The Working Group should consult as widely as possible with individual members of the University, staff and student groups, the Inclusion Champions, Human Resources, Student Wellbeing and Inclusion Services and the Students' Union. It should enable University members to contribute to the development of this strategy in a strictly confidential environment or anonymously.	10	Consult with the community to devise and ensure implementation of a strategy for repairing relationships amongst University members.
23	The University should implement at the earliest opportunity the measures identified in the meeting of 20 December 2019 between the Registrar and members of the LGBT Forum (██████).	11	Review and seek to implement the measures proposed by the LGBTQ+ Forum.
24	The University should reiterate to staff and students its commitment to providing a supportive and inclusive environment within which people can expect to learn, grow and develop through challenge; that this means that they will be confronted with people who have different views which may be experienced as objectionable or offensive; but that a line will be drawn at conduct which is unlawful or contrary to the University's policies. The University may wish to consider the wording of the University of Oxford's freedom of speech policy (Appendix 7) in considering how best to communicate this message.	12	Through an ongoing broad range of communications, reiterate to staff and students: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the University's commitment to providing a supportive and inclusive environment within which people can expect to learn, grow and develop through challenge; b. that this means that they may encounter ideas or arguments which may be experienced as objectionable or offensive; c. but that a line will be drawn at conduct which is unlawful or contrary to the University's policies.

25	The University should review the Inclusion Champion roles to ensure that they cover appropriate constituencies and that the postholders are able to work effectively together.	13	Review the role of Inclusion Champions to ensure that they cover appropriate constituencies and that they feel empowered and supported to work effectively together.
26	The University should review the mental health and welfare support provided to trans and nonbinary staff and students, and make such changes to it as are necessary to ensure that it is appropriate and adequate to meet existing need.	14	Undertake a review of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the mental health and welfare support provided to trans and nonbinary staff and students, making any changes necessary to ensure that it is appropriate and adequate to meet existing needs; and b. the “Report and Support” system, making any changes necessary to ensure that it is appropriate and adequate to meet existing need.
27	The University should review the “Report and Support” system, and make such changes to it as are necessary to ensure that it is appropriate and adequate to meet existing need.		15
28	The University should give careful and thorough consideration to the relative benefits and disbenefits of its relationship with Stonewall, bearing in mind the issues raised in this report. In particular, it should consider that this relationship appears to have given University members the impression that gender critical academics can legitimately be excluded from the institution (██████████); the potential effect of this on the University’s obligations to uphold freedom of expression; the effect on University members’ understanding of the values of the institution; and the effect on those members of the University who hold gender critical views. If the University considers it appropriate to continue its relationship with Stonewall, it should devise a strategy for countering the drawbacks and potential illegalities described above.	16	
Additional Action			