

Evaluation of Safeguarding Students Catalyst Fund Projects

Summative Evaluation Report

Report to: The Office for Students

June 2019

Authors: Helen Baird, Kay Renfrew, Zeb Nash-Henry, Professor Graham Towl

Table of Contents

1.	Executive Summary	5
1.1	Catalyst safeguarding funding.....	5
1.2	About the evaluation and this report.....	5
1.3	Key findings	6
1.4	The case for further strategic change.....	8
1.5	Governance and leadership of change.....	9
1.6	Coordination and development.....	12
1.7	Addressing gaps among groups of providers and students.....	13
1.8	Knowledge gaps	13
1.9	Recommendations.....	14
2.	Introduction	19
2.1	Background and context.....	19
2.2	Terminology	19
2.3	About the Catalyst safeguarding projects.....	20
2.4	Evaluation of the Catalyst funding	21
2.5	About this report.....	23
3.	Delivery and effective management	25
3.1	Intended outcomes	25
3.2	Summary assessment	25
3.3	Relative impact of the Catalyst funding	28
3.4	Lessons learnt and recommended next steps.....	29
4.	Leadership and governance	33
4.1	Intended outcomes	33
4.2	Summary assessment	33
4.3	Relative impact of the Catalyst funding	35
4.4	Lessons learnt and recommended next steps.....	36
5.	Staff involvement in safeguarding	38
5.1	Intended outcomes	38
5.2	Summary assessment	38
5.3	Relative impact of Catalyst funding	40
5.4	Lessons learnt and next steps.....	40
6.	Student engagement and experience	42
6.1	Intended outcomes	42
6.2	Summary assessment	42
6.3	Relative impact of Catalyst funding	45

6.4	Lessons learnt and recommended next steps.....	46
7.	Reporting mechanisms.....	48
7.1	Intended outcomes	48
7.2	Summary assessment	48
7.3	Relative impact of Catalyst funding	51
7.4	Lessons learnt and recommended next steps.....	53
8.	Partnership and collaboration.....	55
8.1	Intended outcomes	55
8.2	Summary assessment	55
8.3	Relative impact of Catalyst funding	60
8.4	Lessons learnt and next steps.....	60
9.	Sustainability.....	62
9.1	Intended outcomes	62
9.2	Summary assessment	62
9.3	Relative impact of Catalyst funding	64
9.4	Lessons learnt and next steps.....	65
10.	Culture change	66
10.1	Intended outcomes	66
10.2	Summary assessment	66
10.3	Lessons learnt and recommended next steps.....	68
11.	The case for further sector level change.....	69
11.1	Overall assessment	69
11.2	Further sector level change	70
11.3	Governance and leadership of change.....	72
11.4	Coordination and development.....	75
11.5	Addressing gaps among groups of providers and students.....	76
11.6	Knowledge gaps	76
	Appendix One: About the safeguarding projects.....	79
	Appendix Two: About the evaluation	89
	Appendix Three: Evaluation Framework	91
	Appendix Four: Data tables from quantitative analysis.....	95

Acknowledgements

The Advance HE team would like to thank all those who have contributed their time and ideas to inform the research for this evaluation. They include:

- Catalyst project team members and other leaders and staff at the funded higher education providers, as well as the students and external expert partner organisations engaged in the projects;
- Members of the Expert Group convened in early 2019 to consider the findings from the evaluation and deliberate on the recommended next steps for the sector;
- Colleagues at the Office for Students and Advance HE who have provided support and input to the evaluation process;
- Other subject matter and sector experts; and
- Universities UK, in particular Fiona Waye for her advice and guidance throughout the evaluation, and for permitting us to make use of anonymised survey data on the progress being made in the sector on tackling gender-based violence, harassment and hate crime, to help us better assess the contribution of the Catalyst safeguarding funding.

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Catalyst safeguarding funding

In response to the recommendations made in the Universities UK (UUK) Harassment Taskforce's 2016 report [Changing the Culture](#)¹, and in alignment with UUK's ongoing work in this area to drive cultural change, the Office for Students (OfS)² provided matched funding support to English higher education (HE) providers for 119 projects through three Catalyst funding calls.

The aim of this [Catalyst safeguarding funding](#)³ was to support effective practice by helping HE providers to improve student safeguarding. The OfS's objective was to make a short-term diverse intervention, designed to support high coverage activity and thereby stimulate sector-level culture change in tackling these challenging issues. This was based on the Taskforce's recommendations for providers to undertake a coordinated set of preventative and responsive actions. The OfS provided £4.7m in one-to-one matched funding of up to £50,000 to undertake a range of initiatives between 2017-20 as follows:

- The first round funded 63 one-year projects addressing safeguarding students on campus, mainly focussed on tackling sexual misconduct;
- A second round of funding was issued to 45 providers to tackle hate crime/incidents and online harassment on campus; and
- Finally, a third round of funding for 11 providers was issued to address hate crime/incidents directed at students on the grounds of religion or belief.

1.2 About the evaluation and this report

The OfS appointed independent evaluators from [Advance HE](#) in early 2018 to support learning, exchange and dissemination of effective practice from the projects, and help establish 'what works' in safeguarding students. This evaluation is in addition to but mindful of the individual projects' evaluations. The focus of this summative evaluation report is on the now completed projects funded under first two rounds of funding⁴.

The evaluation of the Catalyst safeguarding funding and spending was based on a multi-methods approach, which considered whether there is evidence for intended outcomes of

¹ Universities UK (2016). *Changing the Culture*. Available at: <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/changing-the-culture-final-report.aspx>.

² The OfS inherited the Higher Education Funding Council for England's (HEFCE) role in promoting safeguarding when the latter ceased to exist.

³ Details of the projects are available at: <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/student-wellbeing-and-protection/student-safety-and-wellbeing/what-are-the-projects/>.

⁴ Other outputs include two interim Thematic Analysis reports covering each round of projects in detail. These are available at: <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/evaluation-of-safeguarding-students-catalyst-fund-projects/>. A final report on the Round Three projects will be produced in spring 2020.

the projects within the nine key themes shown below being met. Analysis of the results from all the research for the evaluation considered the extent to which these outcomes are evident across the funded providers, and the contribution to this of the Catalyst funding.

Figure 1 Evaluation themes



1.3 Key findings

The **aim of the Catalyst safeguarding funding** was to identify and support good practice to improve and enhance student safeguarding, looking specifically at tackling sexual misconduct⁵, hate crime⁶ and hate incidents⁷, and online harassment⁸.

The **timing of the funding** for HE providers meant that there was no time to pilot initiatives at a sector level or for pathfinders to emerge. Therefore, the Catalyst project teams put in

⁵ The term “sexual violence” includes both criminal and non-criminal behaviour. However, in policy and practice within HE providers, the ambit of institutional governance is better captured as **sexual misconduct** (conduct which may be in breach of a provider’s rules and regulations). The level of evidence required with cases of misconduct is at a civil level, in other words the **balance of probabilities**. Just as the level of evidence is different to the Criminal Justice System, so are the range of possible sanctions.

⁶ **Hate crime** is characterised by the motivation for the commission of the offence (on the grounds of: disability; gender identity; race, ethnicity or nationality; religion, faith or belief; and sexual orientation - by far the most prevalent hate crime reported is viewed as racially motivated). There is a lack of clarity and understanding across the HE sector (among both students and staff) about what constitutes hate crimes, and what can and should be done about them, which can lead to certain crimes being overlooked.

⁷ **Hate incidents** is a broader term not necessarily involving the commission of a crime. These are described commonly as “everyday harassment” or “micro-aggressions” affecting students, also based on their disability, gender identity, race, ethnicity or nationality, religion, faith or belief, and sexual orientation.

⁸ A further definitional issue exists with **online harassment** in the HE sector and elsewhere. Online incidents are part of a bigger picture and cannot be addressed in isolation from the perpetrators’ behaviours which needs to be addressed, rather than focussing solely on the channel for the harassment.

place supporting infrastructure to address these issues using a variety of different approaches including finding their own way. For this reason, there was some duplication of effort and little time for providers to be able to learn lessons as to the effectiveness of different approaches.

Nevertheless, this work is becoming **embedded as part of 'business as usual' within some, though not all, providers, and in different ways**. Most participants in the research for the evaluation reported that one of the direct impacts that receiving Catalyst funding had on safeguarding work at their providers was the ability to progress this work more quickly and more comprehensively than would otherwise have been the case.

Crucially, the Catalyst funding intervention was timely in that it helped to maintain the momentum in the HE sector stemming from the *Changing the Culture* report, particularly in tackling sexual misconduct. The wider media and societal interest in challenging sexual misconduct across multiple sectors has also been a significant part of the context and supported the impetus for change. Moreover, the scale of the funding across 108 projects in the HE sector meant that *'there's a huge safety in numbers'* for providers and their leaders to feel more confident in openly tackling these issues (given concerns over potential reputational risks).

Overall, the findings from the research for the Catalyst evaluation have shown that although there are many issues to be resolved, **tolerance for sexual misconduct has decreased within the HE sector** in recent years through awareness raising, and correspondingly reporting of incidents by students is now increasing. This is as a result of students' increased confidence that their provider will respond to their reports and disclosures, and this is an important early outcome and evidence of emergent culture change.

Although the HE sector's work in addressing **hate crime/incidents** is at an earlier stage than that of sexual misconduct and is less embedded, there is greater awareness of these issues affecting students. There are also signs of a reduction in tolerance of hate crime (at least among the 45 providers with Round Two funding), and consequently reporting is beginning to increase. Generally, the vast majority of the Round Two funded providers were not addressing hate crime/incidents in any meaningful or coordinated way prior to receipt of the funding.

Analysis of data from UUK's recent survey of members carried out between October and December 2018 on progress made since the *Changing the Culture* report in 2016 enabled us to assess the contribution of the Catalyst funding to developing safeguarding (at least among respondents to the survey) in key areas. On multiple key measures, such as levels of senior leadership support, embeddedness in governance structures, reporting mechanisms, student engagement, effective partnership working and taking an institution-wide approach, the impact of the Catalyst funding has been significant on progress made by funded providers in England compared with those without funding. Moreover, this impact increases where funding has been at more than one round, meaning that project activity has been taking place over a longer period. A clear finding from our research with both rounds of projects is that it takes more than one year to develop and embed safeguarding initiatives.

The OfS's intervention has therefore **succeeded in stimulating a wide range of activities across multiple English HE providers** as intended. However, there remains **substantial variation** across the providers in how advanced they are, particularly in tackling hate crime and incidents and online harassment affecting students, and crucially in whether the initiatives were 'one-off' or have become embedded as part of 'business as usual' within the providers. Indicators of sustainability include many examples of increased resources within providers committed to tackling safeguarding issues. There are also more sustained and embedded initiatives and projects, including more iterative ongoing training programmes and more sustained partnerships in place with local and regional partners.

1.4 The case for further strategic change

The evaluation team set up and facilitated an **expert advisory group during the latter stages of the** study comprising national stakeholder organisations (the OfS, NUS and UUK), expert institutional practitioners and academic experts. The purpose of the group was to consider what may be required next to help ensure that the effective and innovative practice developed through the Catalyst safeguarding funding is disseminated, embedded and sustained. While the group concluded that there has been substantive progress made, this is still very variable across the HE sector.

Research for the evaluation shows there remains a great deal of variation in the level of response by institutional leadership teams to the widespread problem of sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents within HE providers. Such variations in practice provide support for arguments in favour of further impetus for change being needed, given that many providers are yet to make significant progress - or where they have, it may be tailing off.

Many of the Catalyst funded providers at both rounds indicate that students now have a better understanding of how to report and what to report, and that the numbers of reports are increasing. However, student experiences of hate crime/incidents share in common with sexual misconduct a huge under reporting problem, and this is one reason why it is imperative for the HE sector to do more. Additionally, the issue of intersectionality needs particularly close attention and there is a need to have a more bespoke set of policies and practices to target specific groups of students and particularly those who may be caught up within intersectional disadvantage.⁹

Consequently, **HE providers** in receipt of the Catalyst funding do need to continue to build on the work undertaken so far in the short to medium term. They should also continue to monitor and evaluate their work to better understand its impact over time and introduce further needed change as a result. For those providers yet to respond to the original UUK Taskforce's recommendations on developing a coordinated set of preventative and

⁹ For example, ableism appears to remain a significant problem at universities and rates of sexual misconduct may be high for disabled students yet reporting levels remain very low. The same may be said for international students, for whom safety remains a significant concern, and who appear to have lower reporting levels than 'home' students. Similarly, BME students participating in this research reported significantly lower levels of confidence than white students on all items, and this needs further examination and response.

responsive mechanisms, there are now many examples of good policy and effective practice available on how to do so. These are described throughout the body of this report and are available elsewhere, particularly through additional guidance developed by UUK. Resources from the Catalyst projects will also be published on the OfS website.

HE providers are well placed to contribute to the prevention of sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents affecting students in combination with ensuring appropriate personal and educational support for victims/survivors. In the short term, HE providers can contribute to prevention by skilling staff and students in bystander intervention training and educating students (and staff) around consent and capacity. In the medium term, as **reporting becomes the ‘new norm’** at HE providers, this may very well deter some potential perpetrators. In the longer term, if providers can contribute to influencing the next generation to be more mindful of the destructive impacts of sexual harassment and hate crime they could potentially influence generations to come. Many graduates will go on to take up senior leadership roles in society, a key part of the potential reach and influence of the HE community.

For their part, the **Government and HE sector bodies**, particularly the OfS and the Equality and Human Rights Commission, should continue to monitor the progress being made by HE providers to ensure student safeguarding in these areas. The Government should monitor and determine whether enough is being done by providers themselves and if this work is being sustained, with support and encouragement from sector bodies, and/or whether any regulation may be needed in the longer term. Regulatory options range from what may be viewed as ‘light touch’ stewardship at one end of the continuum to measures with a higher degree of prescription in terms of both process and outcomes.

Some additional strategic recommendations are included in the remainder of this section which may help drive further positive and sustainable change, including options for the longer term.

1.5 Governance and leadership of change

We suggest that better governance and leadership of change are needed, both at sectoral and individual provider level, to sustain and develop effective practice in tackling student safeguarding issues across the sector.

The OfS (with other sector bodies such as UUK, and the National Union of Students (NUS), working in close consultation with HE providers, should develop a set of inter-related actions, which together could constitute a framework of **‘minimum safeguarding practice’** to help drive a further step change in addressing student safeguarding issues. Some initial suggestions on what minimum practice might look like within HE providers are set out in the figure below. The OfS could work with HE providers to develop and agree this and thereafter the implementation of this safeguarding practice at a minimum within all HE providers should be actively encouraged and supported by the OfS and other sector bodies.

Progress on the adoption of this minimum safeguarding practice should also be monitored by the Government over time and consideration made of whether HE providers are making

sufficient progress or whether these should become future requirements monitored through regulation by the OfS. This is not possible at present within the existing Regulatory Framework and would require future legislation.

Figure 2 Possible ‘minimum safeguarding practice’

Action	Summary
<p>1. Annual reports to the institutional governing body which are publicly available covering reports, disclosures and outcomes</p>	<p>The format of such reports needs to preserve the anonymity of reporting parties of sexual misconduct and hate crimes/incidents. Under each such rubric the date of the report and date of the incident should be recorded. The date of the safeguarding multidisciplinary team meeting should be included too.</p> <p>Providers’ responses may be codified under four headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Personal and health support; ii) Educational support; iii) Internal investigations; and iv) Police investigations. <p>For each of these categories there needs to be a clear narrative statement of the inputs and outcomes. Inputs are actions taken by the institution. Outcomes are just that.</p> <p>In terms of ‘inputs’ we would anticipate that in every case there should be an input in terms of i) and ii) subject to the agreement of the reporting party.</p> <p>Inputs in terms of iii) and iv) are likely to be less common but offered and discussed as option for the decision of reporting parties as to whether or not to go ahead with either iii) or iv) both or neither.</p> <p>In terms of ‘outcomes’, personal and health support could, for example, include specialist counselling and educational support could be educational adjustments made mindful of the particular ‘mitigating circumstances’.</p>
<p>2. Integration into communications for prospective students so they are aware of the behaviour expectations and student safety support in place, and which will remain in place throughout their student journey</p>	<p>It is potentially reassuring for prospective students to hear of arrangements in place to ensure their wellbeing and safety, and which will remain in place throughout their student journey.</p> <p>Open discussion of matters such as addressing sexual misconduct and hate crime sends a message of reassurance out to potential victims/survivors and a message of an intolerance of such behaviours to potential perpetrators.</p> <p>For those students who are uncertain of the precise requirements of establishing consent and capacity, or what constitutes a hate crime/incident or online harassment, such communications may give them the opportunity to reflect upon such matters before they need such decision making.</p>

Action	Summary
3. There need to be active communications campaigns urging victims/survivors to come forward and report their experiences	In short, very high reporting levels need to be actively encouraged along with disclosure levels too, to inform the development of services to ensure that victim / survivor support is optimised. This may very well deter some would be perpetrators too. Campaigns will need continued support, coordination and reinforcement at sector level to protect individual providers against reputational damage and ensure take-up.
4. Staff and student training programmes need to be in place	Disclosure training is key for staff and students enacting representational roles. Sessions on consent for undergraduate and postgraduate students are important early in their time at the provider along with the option to engage with bystander intervention training to contribute to prevention. This should be co-created and designed with students (as per evidence in section 6).
5. A member of the senior executive team needs to hold accountability for work on addressing sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents	Executive level responsibility and accountability for decision-making and driving and monitoring the work is effective in ensuring that a whole-institution approach is taken to addressing sexual misconduct and hate incidents.
6. Good policy and practice	Communications and policy documents need to make it explicit that internal investigations rely on a civil, in other words balance of probability level of evidence, rather than beyond reasonable doubt as per criminal justice levels of evidence. This may help encourage more students to come forward to report.
7. Resources	It is especially important for HE providers to plan for the rise in reporting levels to ensure that support and investigations may be put in place in a timely fashion. One FTE per 10,000 students who specialises solely in this area would seem to be a basic requirement to support staff training and coordinate investigations and organise awareness campaigns working with student leaders.
8. Partnership working	Local and regional collaborative working and liaison with local Sexual Violence Referral Centres (SARCs), local police, other HE providers, schools and expert specialist voluntary and community organisations should be in place.

For their part, **institutional governing bodies** need to hold the executive team to account in tackling sexual misconduct and hate incidents. In capturing the extent of hate incidents, it may be worth including the students' protected characteristics in reports of such incidents. Although in practice most such 'hate incidents' may have as their focus racism, we need to also ensure that the other protected characteristics are included in any such reporting arrangements.

The **Committee of University Chairs** (CUC) may wish to develop a **framework for tackling sexual misconduct and hate crime** affecting students for governing bodies to

hold the executive to account. Benefits of this approach would be: ensuring sustainable long-term engagement and accountability; bringing the wider leadership teams of providers into safeguarding; and raising awareness among governing bodies that they should be taking overall responsibility for safeguarding (rather than the current focus which is mainly on the executive). The framework could incorporate advice for governing bodies on what they should be seeking assurance of. This may include being better informed to aid understanding of aspects such as: under-reporting, especially for minority groups the importance of intersectionality; liability (trustee responsibility); how to interpret the data (both quantitative and qualitative); and confidence in the appropriateness of responses / action being taken by the executive.

HE providers themselves should ensure that student safeguarding in relation to **sexual misconduct and hate crime are added to their strategic risk registers**. The benefits in doing this would include: awareness raising; embedding safeguarding work across the institution; providing clarity for governing bodies; challenging the executive to act; increasing visibility; and requiring active mitigation and management (controls).

1.6 Coordination and development

Better coordination and development of safeguarding initiatives are needed within individual providers and between groups of providers. For example:

- Developing **specialist expertise within HE providers** would be beneficial. This would be pro-rata depending on size (i.e. very small providers could collaborate; very large providers could have multiple roles). One FTE per 10,000 students who specialises solely in this area could provide support staff training, coordinate investigations and organise awareness campaigns working with student leaders. The benefits of having specialist expertise in safeguarding within every provider would be to provide: students with access to knowledgeable services; and staff working in this area with adequate resource / pay and professionalisation. Additionally, a **network for specialist safeguarding practitioners should be developed and supported**, potentially meeting regionally (and building on existing networks where these already exist e.g. the South Western universities), with representatives from each region also meeting nationally to develop and share effective practice. Many of the specialist practitioners operating in the sector are already informally networked, but a funded or subsidised and coordinated network would be able to:
 - Share effective practice, resources and data (reducing duplication and wastage);
 - Help prevent 'burn-out' and provide support to a developing group of professionals;
 - Connect local partnerships and collaborations with other agencies and organisations with all HE providers in the area; and
 - Be a communications tool, support trend monitoring and provide a source of information and a sounding board for policymakers and regulators.

1.7 Addressing gaps among groups of providers and students

Further research is needed to explore the safeguarding experiences and needs of **groups of students with individual and intersectional protected characteristics**, including international students, disabled students and BME students. Similarly, research and/or support for small pathfinder projects may be helpful to understand the issues for **groups of HE providers**, which have less-well developed safeguarding infrastructure in place, such as small and specialist providers and alternative providers.

1.8 Knowledge gaps

Finally, the need for enhancing knowledge of safeguarding incidents was discussed with the expert group including issues such as: prevalence data monitoring of incidents and outcomes (at both the individual HE provider and sector level); developing standard ways of measuring impact and success; and collating existing research, guidance and resources and tools.

“...in terms of reporting; there are lots of different mechanism for reporting which I feel is really positive, but then also how do we ensure that we’re identifying all the trends and making sure that we’re not missing something that needs any kind of preventive action or further specific training. So, I think that is something that we definitely need to look at it as we develop.” **Pre-92 provider, three rounds of Catalyst funding**

The **standardisation of impact measures** across interventions that have shared areas (e.g. training, awareness raising, student engagement) was identified as having value to understand impact across the sector, which was identified by participants in the research and the expert group as an area requiring further research and development. The take-up of the optional NSS questions on students’ perceptions around safety is low at present unfortunately, but if HE providers would agree to implementing these, they could become a key component of a basket of measures for determining impact over time of safeguarding initiatives within providers and enable benchmarking between them.

Further to this, the expert group also discussed the need for a **cost benefit analysis study of prevention and response activities being undertaken within HE providers** (starting with sexual misconduct and then hate crime/incidents). Such a study would: provide strong evidence for investment, helping make the business case as well as the moral case for providers; provide realistic calculations of spend; and offer providers benchmarking data.

Additionally, the group considered possible ways of encouraging HE providers to **collate and more openly share reporting rates** (of disclosures and reports and their outcomes), and whether there may be a need for eventually developing standardised data collection across the HE sector. There was agreement in the group that census/report data collection was neither necessary nor implementable at this stage, and that further regulation is not needed at this stage.

However, there is a need for better accuracy and consistency in data collection to address some of the knowledge gaps. Therefore, guidance needs to be developed on good reporting

systems. A team of data specialists could be commissioned by the OfS and other sector bodies, and in consultation with the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), to quickly devise a set of data standards which could be used by individual providers. Adopting these standards and publishing the results would enable HE providers to undertake their own campus climate surveys and compare these with their peers. Strong encouragement is needed by the OfS for providers to do this on a sufficient scale across the sector, to give HE leadership teams confidence that there is ‘safety in numbers,’ and drive further positive culture change within the sector.

1.9 Recommendations

All the recommendations arising from the findings from the evaluation are summarised below and discussed in detail in the body of the report.

Figure 3 Schedule of recommendations

Theme	Ref	Recommendation
Delivery and effective management	1	For HE providers embarking on safeguarding initiatives, we recommend that they first develop a well-researched, strategic and planned approach, which is then evaluated to understand 'what works' and the impact it has (which will require monitoring). Any initiatives put in place should: draw on peer advice; put in place policies and processes in the first instance; and develop reporting systems that have supporting information and infrastructure in place (including appropriate resources) before embarking on any awareness raising campaigns and training.
	2	<p>More work is needed across and by HE providers in tackling hate crime/incidents. To support this, there is a need for better understanding of the nature of hate crimes/incidents affecting students; and for according these a higher priority relative to other safeguarding work taking place in the sector. Therefore, we recommend that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. HE providers themselves should take a far more active role in understanding and supporting their student populations within their own contexts. For instance, individual providers may wish to undertake campus climate surveys so that these may be used to gauge the extent of the challenge at individual institutions whilst also providing a baseline to inform further evaluative work. In that respect a campus climate survey has the potential to become a key evaluation tool of the range of interventions introduced to reduce sexual misconduct and hate crime. b. The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), the regulatory body responsible for enforcing the Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty, should take account of the findings from this evaluation in their current enquiry into racial harassment in higher education¹⁰, and potentially consider the experiences of students with other (and particularly multiple) protected characteristics in addition to race in future.

¹⁰ See: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/inquiries-and-investigations/racial-harassment-higher-education-our-inquiry>.

Theme	Ref	Recommendation
		<p>c. The OfS should widely disseminate the hate crime training materials now freely available to all HE providers from the University of Leicester’s expert Centre for Hate Studies.¹¹</p> <p>d. Relevant sector bodies and agencies (such as the OfS, UUK and NUS) should undertake or commission further research into the experiences of students affected by hate crime and harassment, and disseminate the findings widely within the HE sector. The purpose of the research should be both to improve understanding and raise awareness of the issues facing students, including the intersectional basis for their experiences, and to consider the impact on the health, educational and employment outcomes for victims/survivors.</p>
	3	<p>Given the relatively low levels of understanding about what constitutes harassment taking place online and that online harassment has become 'normalised' among students, there may be significant underreporting of incidents affecting students which take place online. Therefore, we recommend that:</p> <p>a) The Office for Students should disseminate widely and strongly promote and encourage HE providers to use the University of Suffolk’s Higher Education Online Safeguarding Self-Review Tool, designed for all HE providers to self-review their online safeguarding practice; and</p> <p>b) HE providers should review and seek to better understand the effectiveness of their existing policies and approaches, for example through using the self-review tool, and then take steps to improve their online safeguarding accordingly.</p>
Leadership & governance	4	Where they do not already, senior leaders within HE providers should take responsibility for key decisions and risks around safeguarding, including taking action to direct the work.
	5	Where they do not already do so, HE providers should ensure that safeguarding activity is embedded within their existing institutional governance structures, and that regular monitoring of prevalence (including trend analysis) and outcome reports of all safeguarding incidents is undertaken and reported to the governing body at regular intervals.
Student engagement & experience	6	HE providers and sector bodies and agencies should take more account of victims/survivors’ voices (paying particular attention to intersectionality , i.e. interconnected categorisations such as race or gender as they apply to a given individual or group, which can create overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage) in developing student safeguarding initiatives, and particularly in relation to what may constitute a successful outcome from their perspective in different scenarios.
	7	HE providers should consider how to involve hard-to-engage student groups, for example through delivering some form of mandatory student safeguarding training.

¹¹ Available from: <https://le.ac.uk/hate-studies>.

Theme	Ref	Recommendation
Reporting	8	We recommend that HE providers should seek clearer advice on the use of data gained through anonymous reporting systems, specifically around handling data where an individual has been identified in a report; and in particular how should this data then be used and stored, including where there are several anonymous reports about the same individual.
	9	Related to Recommendation 2, more work is required by HE providers and sector bodies and agencies to seek to better understand and be able to respond to why students with protected characteristics are less confident in reporting any type of incident overall; and BME students may have significantly lower levels of confidence in reporting than white students
Culture change	10	We recommend that further work should be undertaken to explore and understand how best to support partnership working between HE providers and schools, including looking at whether outreach may be the best way to engage secondary schools. In the first instance, we suggest that the Department of Education take this forward to consider (in discussion with Ofsted, the OfS and other sector bodies) what additional activities may be needed to stimulate conversations and interventions around sexual misconduct and hate crime at a younger age before students enter higher or further education.
Strategic governance and leadership of change	11	We recommend that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The OfS (with other sector bodies such as UUK and the NUS) should, in close consultation with HE providers develop and then promote a framework of minimum safeguarding practice (comprising a set of inter-related actions) to help drive a further step change in addressing student safeguarding issues. b) Thereafter, implementing this minimum safeguarding practice should be actively encouraged and supported by the OfS and other sector bodies. c) All HE providers should put in place measures to ensure that they at least meet this minimum safeguarding practice. d) Progress on the adoption of the minimum safeguarding practice should also be monitored by the Government over time and consideration made of whether HE providers are making enough progress or whether these should become future requirements monitored through regulation by the OfS. This is not possible at present within the existing Regulatory Framework and would require future legislation.
	12	We recommend that the Committee of University Chairs (CUC) develops a framework for governing bodies to hold executive teams to account for tackling sexual violence, sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents affecting students.
	13	We recommend that HE providers should ensure that student safeguarding in relation to sexual misconduct and hate crime are added to their strategic risk registers. The benefits in doing this would include: awareness raising; embedding safeguarding work across the institution; providing clarity for governing bodies; challenging the executive to act;

Theme	Ref	Recommendation
		increasing visibility; and requiring active mitigation and management (controls).
Coordination and development	14	We recommend that HE providers should develop specialist safeguarding expertise within their organisation. This would be pro-rata depending on size (i.e. very small providers could collaborate; very large providers could have multiple roles). One FTE per 10,000 students who specialises solely in this area could provide support staff training and coordinate investigations and organise awareness campaigns working with student leaders.
	15	We recommend that the OfS should support and subsidise a coordinated network for specialist safeguarding practitioners. This network could potentially meet regionally to encourage collaboration and sharing of effective practice, with representatives from each region also meeting nationally to develop and share effective practice.
Addressing gaps – groups of students and providers	16	Sector bodies, including the OfS and EHRC, should consider the need for conducting or commissioning bespoke research to explore the safeguarding experiences and needs of particular groups of students with individual and intersectional protected characteristics, including international students, disabled students and BME students.
	17	The OfS should consider conducting or commissioning bespoke research and/or providing support for small pathfinder projects to understand the issues for groups of HE providers which have less-well developed safeguarding infrastructure in place, such as small and specialist providers and alternative providers, and thereby help stimulate development.
Knowledge gaps	18	We recommend that the OfS, and/or other sector bodies, and in consultation with HESA, should research and develop a standard set of impact measures for safeguarding interventions that have shared areas (e.g. training, awareness raising, student engagement).
	19	We recommend that the OfS (and/or other sector bodies) should conduct or commission a cost benefit analysis study of prevention and response activities being undertaken within HE providers (starting with sexual misconduct and then hate crime/incidents). Such a study would: provide strong evidence for investment, helping make the business case as well as the moral case for providers; provide realistic calculations of spend; and offer providers benchmarking data.
	20	There is a need for better accuracy and consistency in data collection to redress some of the knowledge gaps. We recommend that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The OfS should develop and disseminate guidance which will encourage HE providers to collate and more openly share reporting rates (of disclosures and reports and their outcomes). This could be accomplished by the OfS and other sector bodies commissioning a team of data specialists who would, in consultation with HESA, to quickly devise a set of data standards which could be used by individual providers. b) The OfS should strongly encourage HE providers to adopt these data standards and undertake their own campus climate surveys, publish

Theme	Ref	Recommendation
		<p>the results and compare these with their peers as part of the framework of “minimum safeguarding practice” suggested above.</p> <p>c) In the medium to longer term, the Government should monitor progress being made via the levels of reporting and publication of the data by HE providers and consider whether there is any need for future provider-level regulation in this area.</p>

2. Introduction

2.1 Background and context

Universities UK (UUK) Harassment Taskforce's 2016 report [Changing the Culture](#)¹² made recommendations to higher education (HE) providers on the building blocks needed for the effective prevention of and response to sexual misconduct and hate crime in all its forms within the HE sector. At the same time, UUK produced revised [guidance](#) for providers on handling alleged student misconduct which may constitute a criminal offence¹³.

In response to the Taskforce's recommendations, and in alignment with UUK's ongoing work in this area to drive cultural change¹⁴, the Office for Students (OfS)¹⁵ provided £4.8m in matched funding support to English HE providers for 119 projects aimed at safeguarding students through three Catalyst funding calls to be delivered during the period 2017-2020.

The aim of the [Catalyst funding](#)¹⁶ was to support effective practice in the HE sector by helping providers to improve and enhance their student safeguarding, specifically to tackle sexual misconduct, hate crime/incidents and online harassment affecting students. The OfS's objective was to make a short-term diverse intervention, designed to support high coverage activity, and thereby stimulate sector-level culture change in tackling these issues. Further details on the funding and the projects are at [Appendix One](#).

2.2 Terminology

There can be a lack of clarity about the definition of terms used for the safeguarding issues being addressed by the funding, as follows:

- The term "sexual violence" is generally taken to mean acts ranging from what is increasingly being referred to as "everyday sexism", such as sexist comments being made, to the most serious of sexual crimes. Thus, the term includes both criminal and non-criminal behaviour. However, in policy and practice within HE providers, the ambit of institutional governance is more appropriately and accurately captured as **sexual misconduct**. In other words, it refers to conduct which may be in breach of a provider's

¹² Universities UK (2016). *Changing the Culture*. Available at: <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/changing-the-culture-final-report.aspx>.

¹³ Universities UK (2016). *Guidance for Higher Education institutions: How to handle alleged student misconduct which may also constitute a criminal offence*. Available at: <http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/guidance-for-higher-education-institutions.aspx>.

¹⁴ See also: Universities UK (2018). *Changing the Culture: One Year On*. Available at: <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2018/changing-the-culture-one-year-on.pdf>. A second report on progress two years on is forthcoming.

¹⁵ The OfS inherited the Higher Education Funding Council for England's (HEFCE) role in promoting safeguarding when the latter ceased to exist.

¹⁶ Further details on the projects are available at: <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/advice-and-guidance/student-wellbeing-and-protection/student-safety-and-wellbeing/what-are-the-projects/>.

rules and regulations. The level of evidence required with cases of misconduct is at a civil level, in other words the **balance of probabilities**. Just as the level of evidence is different to the Criminal Justice System, so are the range of possible sanctions.

- **Hate crime** is characterised by the motivation for the commission of the offence. Five strands of hate crime are monitored by English police forces: disability; gender identity; race, ethnicity or nationality; religion, faith or belief; and sexual orientation. By far the most prevalent hate crime reported, both in England and across HE providers, is viewed as racially motivated. There is a lack of clarity and understanding across the HE sector (among both students and staff) about what constitutes hate crimes, and what can and should be done about them, which can lead to certain crimes being overlooked.
- **Hate incidents** is a broader term which does not necessarily involve the commission of a crime. These are described commonly as “everyday harassment” or “micro-aggressions” affecting students, also based on their disability, gender identity, race, ethnicity or nationality, religion, faith or belief, or sexual orientation.
- A further definitional issue exists with **online harassment**, which is part of a bigger picture and cannot be addressed in isolation from the perpetrators’ behaviours which needs to be addressed, not solely the channel for the harassment.

2.3 About the Catalyst safeguarding projects

A detailed overview and analysis of the first two rounds of projects can be found in two earlier **Thematic Analysis Reports**¹⁷. In summary, most of the projects over both rounds sought to implement a package of inter-related approaches to meet the required objectives, rather than focussing on a single initiative.

The focus of the **Round One projects** was on **tackling issues of student-to-student sexual misconduct**, with most concentrating on prevention initiatives, involving developing, piloting or delivering general and/or specialist training to students and staff. The most common types of training for students were positive bystander intervention training¹⁸, consent training and/or other forms of awareness-raising training. Most student training was targeted at groups of students (such as sports teams or those living in halls of residence or on specific programmes), and/or student leaders (using the ‘train the trainer’ approach). Staff training focussed on specialist training for staff to handle disclosures of sexual

¹⁷ See: The Office for Students. (September 2019). *Evaluation of Safeguarding Students Catalyst Fund Projects: Thematic Analysis Report 1*. Prepared by Helen Baird, Advance HE. Available at: <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/evaluation-of-safeguarding-students-catalyst-fund-projects/>. And the Office for Students. (September 2019). *Evaluation of Safeguarding Students Catalyst Fund Projects: Thematic Analysis Report 1*. Prepared by Helen Baird, Advance HE.

¹⁸ A mix of training programmes and approaches were used including the **Intervention Initiative** (or a bespoke variation developed by the providers). This is a free educational toolkit for use by HE providers; more information is available at: <http://socialsciences.exeter.ac.uk/research/interventioninitiative/>. Other programmes used include **Bringing in the Bystander** developed at the University of New Hampshire (<https://cola.unh.edu/prevention-innovations-research-center/evidence-based>) and another US-based positive bystander intervention programme, **Green Dot**.

misconduct from reporting students and to provide appropriate support to them, and more general training for broader groups of staff, such as academics or those working in student accommodation, venues or security to educate staff.

Other awareness-raising approaches included cross-campus campaigns (such as posters, web and social media resources, debates, lectures, plays and other events) with many involving students in the co-design and delivery of initiatives. Another key aspect of Round One projects was developing of systems and tools for students to report incidents and seeking to create awareness of these through online sources of information. The reporting mechanisms are also aligned with improved (internal and specialist external) support for reporting students. Many projects also involved new or enhanced regional or community engagement, such as through multi-agency local or regional partnerships, and in many cases including representatives from external organisations on the Catalyst project boards.

The focus of the **Round Two projects** was on **tackling hate crime/incidents and online harassment**. They involved a similar set of inter-related initiatives to the Round One projects, with the most prevalent being: developing or improving reporting mechanisms, including Third Party Reporting Centres¹⁹; implementing awareness raising campaigns and initiatives; student and staff training; producing new resources and tools (including resources now freely available for use across the HE sector); conducting research to better understand hate crime and harassment affecting students; and collaborating with other providers and partners in the local or regional area, including expert third sector organisations, the police and local authorities.

2.4 Evaluation of the Catalyst funding

The OfS appointed independent evaluators from [Advance HE](#) from early 2018 to support learning, exchange and dissemination of effective practice from the Catalyst projects, and help establish 'what works' in safeguarding students. The evaluation used outcome relationship mapping, a form of logic modelling which involves assessing the extent to which an intervention is contributing to the outcomes it aims to impact (outcomes are 'changes' described in terms of their impact e.g. better, more, worse, fewer or quicker).

In brief, the intended outcomes from the Catalyst intervention were categorised by nine key themes, which were derived initially from the [Changing the Culture](#) report and further developed by an expert group at the outset of the evaluation process. The desired outcomes from the Catalyst projects overall within each theme are summarised in Figure 4 below, and the full framework is included at [Appendix Three](#). Research and analysis for the evaluation considered the extent to which these outcomes are evident across providers and the contribution to this of the Catalyst safeguarding funding.

¹⁹ See *National Hate Crimes Reporting Procedures for Third Party Reporting Centres* on the True Vision website available at: http://www.report-it.org.uk/files/third_party_reporting_flowchart_1.pdf.

Figure 4 Evaluation themes and summary of desired outcomes

Evaluation themes	Desired outcomes from Catalyst intervention
i) Leadership and governance of safeguarding projects	More senior leaders are proactively committed to eradicating issues of sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents, and more providers are taking a provider-wide approach to tackle safety issues as a result, with more senior leaders recognising the need to support this work and are acting to direct the work.
ii) Delivery and effective management	More holistic and clearer safeguarding policies and processes are in place across providers for reporting and responding to misconduct, with more revised codes of conduct and staff and student contracts, and increased tackling of safeguarding issues.
iii) Student involvement, training and experience	More co-creation and design of initiatives with students, more student-centred interventions in place, more account taken of victims/survivors' voices, more bystander and other awareness training, all leading to safer students with more positive experiences and ultimately fewer incidents taking place on campuses, with downstream improved student mental health, retention, attainment, and other educational and employment outcomes.
iv) Staff involvement, including of academic and teaching staff and specialist resources	More staff training across providers, increased numbers of specialist practitioners operating within providers (including to handle disclosures and provide support and trained investigators), enhanced use of academic expertise and research in making the case for and driving change (such as of criminologists, sociologists and psychologists) and safety issues becoming more embedded in the curriculum.
v) Reporting mechanisms	More providers have better reporting mechanisms and systems, more holistic reporting process in place, and increased awareness of how to report among students, leading to increased reporting of sexual misconduct, of hate crime and harassment, including online incidents, increased confidence of victims/survivors in reporting and ultimately the reporting of sexual misconduct and hate incidents becoming the new norm.
vi) Partnership/ collaboration	More commonly agreed definitions of misconduct across providers, improved collaboration among sector stakeholder organisations and campaign groups, more collaboration and partnerships between HE and third sector organisations, more local, regional partnership working and community engagement, all leading to an enhanced influence on government policy and cross-silo working.

Evaluation themes	Desired outcomes from Catalyst intervention
vii) Culture, attitude or behavioural change	More providers recognising cultural change needed (not just changes to policies and practice), more providers with action plans to address cultural barriers, better understanding of barriers to cultural change, better understanding among staff/students of all backgrounds on what constitutes sexual misconduct and hate incidents, more students and staff empowered to advocate for themselves and others, all forms of harassment considered by all to be unacceptable, more providers extending approaches to all student safeguarding issues, less sexual offending, fewer hate incidents and less crime.
viii) Risks or negative outcomes/barriers to change	Potentially including reputational damage to providers and the sector from increased reporting and media spotlighting, reputational risks for providers which try something and get it wrong, lack of work in other areas of equality, diversity and inclusivity as a result through trade-off, the risk of active opposition, issues with identity politics, and potential backlash.
ix) Sustainability and embedding of change	Increased resources within providers committed to tackling issues, more sustained and embedded initiatives and projects, more iterative ongoing training programmes, more sustainable partnerships in place with local and regional partners, enhanced influence on public discourse, and ultimately improved sector reputation on safeguarding issues.

2.5 About this report

The focus of this **summative evaluation report** is on the now-completed first two rounds of projects tackling sexual misconduct and hate crime respectively. Other key outputs from the evaluation have included two Thematic Analysis reports²⁰ about the projects, with a focus upon both process and outcomes. [Appendix Two](#) contains more information about the evaluation, including the methodology. This report seeks to address the following aspects:

- The critical success factors and lessons learned from across both cohorts of projects.
- Outcomes and any early emerging evidence of impact from the Catalyst intervention, especially of cultural change, while noting that:
 - Impact and cultural change can take a longer period to become apparent, with many participants in the evaluation research estimating that culture change may take at least three to five years from this intervention;
 - There was little or no baseline data or position available from which to measure change in either the HE sector or at individual provider level;

²⁰ Available at: <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/evaluation-of-safeguarding-students-catalyst-fund-projects/>.

- Nonetheless, the evaluation team sought to assess what change had taken place qualitatively by seeking to understand and triangulate the perceptions of different groups (such as project team leaders, specialist practitioners, academic and teaching, staff, leaders, students, external partners and national stakeholder organisations) on what change has taken place arising from the Catalyst projects, and what remains to be done in student safeguarding to achieve more positive, longer-term outcomes (as shown in [Appendix Three](#)); and
- An important element of the evaluation has been the analysis of UUK’s anonymised survey data, which enabled comparison of those providers with different levels of Catalyst funding with those without funding on key questions, and thereby an approximation to be made of the impact of the intervention overall (this is discussed throughout the report with data tables included at [Appendix Four](#)).
- Embeddedness and how to secure the sustainability of student safeguarding initiatives within providers and the wider HE sector beyond the end of the project funding; and
- Strategic recommendations on priority next steps for policymakers, sector bodies and HE providers to ensure effective and innovative practice developed through the funding is disseminated, embedded and sustained.

The **remainder of the report is structured** per the key themes of the evaluation framework. Each sub-section summarises the evidence available within each theme, provides an assessment where possible of whether intended outcomes have been impacted by the Catalyst funding, outlines effective practice and suggests some further steps where applicable which may help achieve further desired change. The final section presents overall conclusions and strategic recommendations for the sector arising from the evaluation of the first two rounds of projects.

3. Delivery and effective management

3.1 Intended outcomes

Indications that the intended outcomes of the Catalyst intervention are being achieved, as these relate to the delivery and effective management of student safeguarding work, would include evidence of the following changes having taken place within HE providers as a result of the funding:

- More holistic and clearer policies and processes should be in place for reporting and responding to sexual misconduct, hate crime/incidents and online harassment;
- Corresponding revised codes of conduct and contracts for staff and students should have been developed and implemented; and
- There should be more tackling of all safeguarding issues generally in relation to sexual misconduct, hate crime/incidents and online harassment across HE providers.

3.2 Summary assessment

Analysis of the qualitative data and project documentation across both rounds of projects shows that there has been significant progress made across HE providers with Catalyst funding in terms of achieving these outcomes (particularly the first two). In summary:

- More holistic processes are now in place, including an improved ability to handle cases, and better reporting methods. Closing gaps in current services and supporting processes is also reported widely across the funded providers.
- Clearer reporting policies and processes and enhanced resources for handling cases and providing support are now in place among many funded providers.
- In terms of tackling all student safeguarding issues there is variation across the different aspects of safeguarding the Catalyst intervention sought to address:
 - There is particular evidence for breaking down misconceptions of gender-based violence for Round One projects, and thereby reducing tolerance of sexual misconduct affecting students;
 - Generally, among the funded providers (and we can infer the HE sector as a whole notwithstanding the substantial variation among providers) the work to tackle hate crime and hate incidents is at a far earlier stage of development than that to tackle sexual misconduct; and
 - There remains a lack of knowledge and guidance in relation to current practice and regulation around online safety within HE.

These points are illustrated by the quotes below from a range of participants in the research for the evaluation.

“I think personally if I encountered anything, any hate crime or anything like that. I would probably, because I know the Department so well, email someone that I know because I trust them, but if I was [any] student I could use the online reporting system and that’s only a recent thing because of this campaign. So, I think the project is really important in this whole thing and I would expect the Uni to definitely do something about it because this reporting system is in place now.” **Student at provider, with funding at three Catalyst rounds**

“...one of the things we worked on, which is really positive in terms of change, is creating an online reporting system for all forms of harassment and hate crime and bullying and sexual violence. So that, people can just fill out a Google form and they will get a personalised response within two days, but they also get an automated response saying where they can get immediate help. So, that’s new to the University. The reporting prior to that was often in person, you would go to your tutor or you would go to the University counselling team and you could make a disclosure there, but they would be stored separately from one another. So, this is the first central reporting system and it is not just recording disclosures, but also allowing people to take full use of more procedures to have discipline against perpetrators of harassment and violence. So, that’s new... this is the first specific sexual violence policy and procedure at the University. I think that will definitely have a big impact on how students and staff see and treat sexual violence and other forms of harassment because it feels like they’re being talked about now. So then, if they’re being talked about and there is a way of recording them, then I think that will probably have the biggest impact on culture change after the training.” **Pre-92 provider, funding at two Catalyst rounds**

Overall, research with the Round One funded providers showed that the majority have made substantive progress in the delivery and effective management of student safeguarding initiatives as a result of having the funding, despite encountering **various challenges and barriers** in doing so. Most issues – common across both rounds – were in relation to time required to recruit the right staff, not having enough time for implementation of major initiatives, changes having to be made in-flight to the scope of the projects, difficulties in deciding what to prioritise and the sequencing and difficulties in recruiting target numbers of participants onto training programmes.

“...[the] challenge, hence we were able to get the extension, was around the recruitment into role and often, in universities, you get movement with staffing and... things move a lot more slowly through the HE governance systems and I suppose it helped... for me, the funding, where it’s time limited, really helps to focus those conversations. And it acts as a tool for me to say okay, we need to get this going and this is where we need to be and this is where we are right now, and for us to sort of reach those milestones, this is what we’ve got to do.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

“...we’re slightly behind in the process I think in terms of where we wanted to be because a key barrier for us has been securing ethics approval from [provider] to do this kind of data collection because it involves marginalised groups and talking about fairly sensitive issues. So, that process in itself has taken a long time and then combined with it being the summer holidays when lots of people who needed to feed into that process were on leave it has set us

back in terms of when we could begin the data collection.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

More positively, **new posts** have now been created or responsibilities incorporated into permanent roles within many of the Round One funded providers. There is also evidence that many new **policies, processes and reporting systems** have been developed and have already or are in the process of being implemented. In many instances, prevention strategies, particularly training programmes, were developed ready for implementation from academic year 2018/19. This is illustrated by the quotes below.

“As work has progressed on the project, the ripple effect of change has uncovered the scale of what is involved in achieving institutional realignment. For example, the need for integrating reporting systems and procedures, re-addressing how formal investigations are handled, and the management of mitigating circumstances. There is still a lot more to do. Linked to this first point, we think that with hindsight we would have invested a larger proportion of the project budget in developments like the training offer and policy/procedure work, which have increased in prominence and are pivotal to achieving long-term, sustainable impact.” **Post-92 provider, one round of funding**

“...we would reflect that the original bid submission had a very wide agenda to include all the areas covered in the UUK Changing the Culture report. With hindsight this meant we committed to achieving a huge amount of work and cultural change in varied areas in a very short space of time. On reflection it would have been more strategic to begin working on one aspect such as sexual violence and focusing attention on this. While we feel we have made tremendous progress across the varied strands of the project, this has been challenging, in particular in organising and delivering relevant training to staff so they can handle enquiries across the wide range of issues covered.” **Post-92 provider, one round of funding**

Research with the Round Two projects suggested that many desired changes with respect to delivery and effective management of initiatives are in progress or prospect as a direct result of the Catalyst intervention. They either would not have taken place or would have happened at a slower pace without the OfS matched funding.

However, as mentioned above, the levels of understanding and prioritisation of **addressing hate crime and incidents, and of online harassment, affecting students seem to be considerably lower** among HE providers (and staff and students), relative to that of sexual misconduct in recent years. The quotes below illustrate this point.

“...in comparison to the sexual harassment and violence work undertaken via the Catalyst funding, related training, expertise and conferences on this topic [hate crime] have not been as comprehensive nor delivered by experienced professional individuals to address the issues in HE but also in the wider societal context. It is recommended that further guidance and expertise is developed for HE providers in how to tackle hate crime.” **Pre-92 provider, funding at two Catalyst rounds**

“We are dealing with [various safeguarding issues] as a more general thing with campaigns within that but, it does feel like there’s a lot of voice and a lot of energy behind the sexual violence work and... it feels like, you know, the hate crime and the discrimination is like a poor relation to the sexual violence work, and that echoes something that’s uncomfortable about the issue in the first place, that prejudice and discrimination marginalises.” **Round Two funded provider**

“Our Catalyst funded safeguarding project has aimed to support all students at the [provider name] in dealing with online harassment. Given the complexity of this issue, our research team found that it was necessary to first begin raising student’s critical awareness of online harassment as a significant issue.... Key findings from our study have indicated that a significant number of student participants often perceive online harassment as the ‘norm’. These observations indicate that university-based interventions aimed at tackling online harassment would first have to de-normalise these practices, raise students’ critical awareness of them and thus enable them to recognise them as unacceptable.” **Post-92 provider, one round of funding**

3.3 Relative impact of the Catalyst funding

Analysis of the UUK survey data shows that [see table 1 in [Appendix Four](#)], compared with providers receiving no Catalyst funds, recipients of the funding were more likely to have:

- Set up a working group, interdisciplinary team or project to respond to recommendations in the *Changing the Culture* report;
- Developed a strategy and action plan; and
- Secured buy-in from senior management.

Catalyst funding has also had an impact in ensuring that [see table 2] working groups, teams or projects **are embedded within the reporting and governance systems** and ensuring that any changes are therefore embedded into the provider’s governance systems or structures, policies, practices and processes.

Institutions in Scotland also report that they have embedded changes into their governance systems, structures, policies and practices (a larger percentage of these institutions than the English institutions receiving Catalyst funding), and so it may be worthwhile examining the drivers for this in Scotland.

A different and more coordinated approach has been taken to **tackling gender-based violence in HE in Scotland**. This stems from the Scottish Government's *Equally Safe Strategy and Delivery Plan* for preventing and eradicating violence against women and girls, which informs organisations across the Scottish public sector. This includes the HE sector through the Government funded *Equally Safe in Higher Education Strategy* and related **Toolkit** (containing a detailed checklist for providers developing safeguarding approaches), which HE and FE institutions are expected to adopt and work with.

Institutions' approaches to safeguarding are monitored by the Scottish Funding Council as part of their Outcome Agreements, in which institutions set out what they will deliver in return for their Government funding. Moreover, there is a Ministerial led Advisory Group comprising all the relevant HE sector bodies and agencies in Scotland.²¹

The Catalyst funding has had some impact on the extent to which the funded providers deliver an update to their **governing body**, or similar, on their response to the *Changing the Culture* report or progress on addressing harassment, hate crime and sexual misconduct (compared to those providers not in receipt of funding) [table 3].

However, the responses do not allow granular analysis on whether the reporting is the same for hate crimes and sexual misconduct, for example, so it would be useful to carry out further research to understand if these are treated in the same way in terms of reporting.

Providers in receipt of Catalyst funding are also more likely to have made use of a wide range of channels to make clear **behavioural expectations and potential sanctions to students**. [table 6]. While those providers not in receipt of funding are more likely to use a signed document or contract or include information in a Student Handbook to inform students, those providers with Catalyst funding are more likely to make use of official policies, induction talks, social media and campaigns, websites and pre-arrival information. So, **information is ongoing rather than one-off at the funded providers**.

Less than half of the providers receiving Catalyst funding provide **pre-arrival information** (although this is much higher than those providers not in receipt of funding, with less than one quarter stating they provide pre-arrival information). This suggests, given the importance of informing students at as early a stage as possible, the **need to place more emphasis on early clarification of expectations**.

3.4 Lessons learnt and recommended next steps

²¹ For additional information, including on work to date and more current research on prevalence of incidents being undertaken in Scotland see the following:

- <https://www.gov.scot/policies/violence-against-women-and-girls/equally-safe-strategy/>
- <https://www.strath.ac.uk/humanities/schoolofsocialworksocialpolicy/equallysafeinhighereducation/>
- <https://www.strath.ac.uk/humanities/schoolofsocialworksocialpolicy/equallysafeinhighereducation/eshetoolkit/>
- http://www.sfc.ac.uk/web/FILES/guidance_sfcgd212018/SFCGD212018_University_Outcome_Agreement_Guidance_2019-20.pdf

The research for the evaluation shows that providers in receipt of Catalyst funding have made significant strides in terms of delivery and effective management of student safeguarding initiatives; although notably more so in relation to tackling sexual misconduct than hate crime and incidents and online harassment.

However, there were several common risks and lessons identified by project teams which other providers embarking on safeguarding initiatives may wish to take account of:

- Initiatives should be based on a well-researched and strategic and planned approach which is evaluated to understand ‘what works’ and the impact it has (which will require monitoring). Any initiatives put in place should: draw on peer advice; engage Student Unions or equivalents; put in place policies and processes in the first instance; and develop reporting systems that have supporting information and infrastructure in place before embarking on any awareness raising campaigns and training.
- Awareness campaigns and information are more effective if disseminated at the earliest possible contact with students and potential students such as in pre-arrival materials (as well as being reinforced at appropriate junctures throughout the student lifecycle).
- Ensuring time is factored in to recruit suitably qualified staff, taking account of the academic calendar and achieving approval from ethics committees.
- Central coordination of processes and management information will require significant work and resource time, so should not be underestimated.
- Acquiring internal approval may add to timescales and should be factored into planning.
- Local (community) context in terms of hate crimes/incidents needs to be considered to effectively and appropriately tailor approaches to prevention and response.
- Generally, larger and more complex institutions will face more challenges in introducing safeguarding initiatives.
- Management of expectations of all stakeholder groups is key, given the substantial amount of time needed to design, implement and realise the benefits from student safeguarding projects.

Across the HE sector there is a clear **need to develop a better understanding** of the nature of all forms of **hate crime/incidents affecting students**; and for these being accorded a higher level of priority relative to other safeguarding work taking place in the HE sector, and this needs to be addressed at multiple levels.

Similarly, there are relatively **low levels of understanding about what constitutes harassment taking place online**. Given that online harassment has become ‘normalised’ among students, and more broadly in society, there is likely to be significant under-reporting of incidents affecting students which take place online. UUK’s forthcoming guidance on online harassment (developed with the University of Bedfordshire’s National Centre for

Cyberstalking Research²² with Catalyst funding) should assist providers in this regard. Similarly, dissemination and use of the University of Suffolk’s Catalyst funded *Higher Education Online Safeguarding Self-Review Tool*, has been designed for providers to evaluate and enhance their online safeguarding practice²³.

Recommendations – Delivery and effective management of projects

1. For HE providers embarking on safeguarding initiatives, we recommend that they first develop a well-researched, strategic and planned approach, which is then evaluated to understand ‘what works’ and the impact it has (which will require monitoring). Any initiatives put in place should: draw on peer advice; engage Student Unions or equivalents; put in place policies and processes in the first instance; and develop reporting systems that have supporting information and infrastructure (including appropriate resources) in place before embarking on any awareness raising campaigns and training.
2. More work is needed across HE providers in tackling hate crime/incidents. To support this, there is a need for better understanding of the nature of hate crimes/incidents affecting students; and for according these a higher priority relative to other safeguarding work taking place in the sector. Therefore, we recommend that:
 - a) HE providers themselves should take a far more active role in understanding and supporting their student populations within their own contexts. For instance, individual providers may wish to undertake campus climate surveys so that these may be used to gauge the extent of the challenge at individual institutions whilst also providing a baseline to inform further evaluative work. In that respect a campus climate survey has the potential to become a key evaluation tool of the range of interventions introduced to reduce sexual misconduct and hate crime.
 - b) The Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC), the regulatory body responsible for enforcing the Equality Act 2010 and Public Sector Equality Duty, should take account of the findings from this evaluation in their current enquiry into racial harassment in higher education²⁴, and potentially consider the experiences of students with other (and particularly multiple) protected characteristics in addition to race in future.
 - c) Relevant sector bodies and agencies (such as OfS, UUK and NUS) should undertake or commission further research into the experiences of students affected by hate crime and harassment, and disseminate the findings widely within the HE sector. The purpose of the research should be both to improve understanding and raise awareness of the issues facing students, including the intersectional basis for their experiences, and to consider the impact on the health, educational and employment outcomes for victims/survivors.
 - d) The OfS should widely disseminate the hate crime training materials now freely available to all HE providers from the University of Leicester’s expert Centre for Hate Studies²⁵.

²²See: <https://www.beds.ac.uk/irac/centres/nccr>.

²³ Available from the University of Suffolk at: <https://www.uos.ac.uk/content/digital-civility>.

²⁴ See <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/inquiries-and-investigations/racial-harassment-higher-education-our-inquiry>.

²⁵ Available from: <https://le.ac.uk/hate-studies>.

Recommendations – Delivery and effective management of projects

3. Given the relatively low levels of understanding about what constitutes harassment taking place online and that online harassment has become 'normalised' among students, there may be significant underreporting of incidents affecting students which take place online. Therefore, we recommend that:
 - a) The OfS should disseminate, strongly promote and encourage HE providers to use the Higher Education Online Safeguarding Self-Review Tool, designed for all HE providers to self-review their online safeguarding practice; and
 - b) HE providers should review and seek to better understand the effectiveness of their existing policies and approaches, for example through using the self-review tool, and then take steps to improve their online safeguarding accordingly.

4. Leadership and governance

4.1 Intended outcomes

Indications that intended outcomes of the Catalyst intervention have been achieved, as they relate to the leadership and governance of student safeguarding work and effective monitoring to support decision-making, would include evidence of the following changes across HE providers:

- Stronger senior leadership involvement and more executive ownership of safeguarding issues;
- Senior leaders should be more proactively committed to eradicating issues of sexual misconduct, hate crime/incidents and online harassment;
- A greater proportion of providers should be taking a more holistic ‘institution-wide’ approach to tackling safety issues as a result;
- More senior leaders (including Vice-Chancellors and Principals) should now recognise the need to support this work and be taking action to direct the work; and
- Committees, working groups and related bodies set up to provide oversight and direction to the tackling of safeguarding issues should be embedded within the provider’s governance structure; rather than set up as temporary entities operating for the duration of the project lifecycle only;
- Core metrics should be in place within HE providers to enable the monitoring and reporting of incidents, how these are being dealt with and their outcomes; and
- More governing bodies should be made aware of incidents and actions being taken to eradicate them.

4.2 Summary assessment

Research for the evaluation suggests there is clear evidence of increased **senior leadership involvement and executive ownership of student safeguarding**, including embedding of oversight within the governance structure among many providers with Catalyst funding. Overall, many (though not all) of the Round One project teams reported supportive and positive senior leadership buy-in to the safeguarding initiatives, which included leaders at the highest levels spearheading and/or championing work at their providers. These points are illustrated by the quotes below.

“...we’ve got buy-in right from the start and from our Vice Chancellor and Pro-Vice Chancellor of this directorate so they’ve been actively involved in the campaigning, they’ve been involved in all the filming, photography, supporting the messages – they’re completely behind it.” **Post-92 provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

“We actually really struggled engaging senior leaders until we had something practical and tangible to give them or show them. So, about six months ago we decided that we would

continue to make our plans and do things and then to present those as a solution. So, when we tried to engage with conversations, so this project is very much being led by the [student services team], what we found was that there was still a lot of attitudes and behaviours at a senior level where we found this a difficult conversation to have because they weren't really sure of what we were talking about. However, now we have some actual practical case management tools, resources, solutions... the conversation is easier to have and people are getting on board with what we're doing, so I guess we kind of are on a different journey."

Post-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding

Additionally, there is increased interest among senior leaders as a direct consequence of both rounds of Catalyst funding evident within providers. Many participating providers reported an increase in senior leadership buy-in to safeguarding work as a direct result of the Catalyst funding. Receiving this funding was considered to have alleviated reputational concerns among senior leadership from visibly tackling safeguarding issues, given the large number of other providers involved in this work and at national level.

"I think there's huge safety in numbers, there are 108 [projects], and when it comes to something like sexual violence, no one talks about it, society doesn't talk about it. So, if you have safety in numbers [this helps where leaders may be] so risk averse... because of its reputation, because of its management, whatever the case may be. If you have all these providers who are also acknowledging the problem, that you can point a finger to as well, 100% you're going to go ahead and do it. And, with all of the criticism that they've experienced from the lad culture, and in the following years thereafter, it seemed like a prime time to say, yes, here we are doing something."

Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding

Some projects that participated in the fieldwork had either a clear line of reporting and communication into the provider's **governance structure** or reported directly to an existing committee. This is seen as beneficial both in ensuring that project work is communicated more broadly across the organisation, and also in sustaining safeguarding work once the project concluded due to its being monitored within the permanent governance structure.

"Just in terms of on a governance level, the project does report to, in terms of updates, both reporting channels under our own directorate and the students' union directorate and also committees – the Equality, Diversity and Inclusivity committee as well as other bodies – so it really does kind of do it. The updates in terms of informing the staff are quite widespread on the governance level."

Post-92 provider, one round of funding

"In terms of reporting structures, we report into the assurance committee which is a sub-committee of the academic board. We also do regular reports to the Board of Governors. We also take opportunities to ensure people like our Chancellor are updated on the work.... So, we're very much trying to ensure that the Chancellor, Executive, Board of Governors, the rest of the leadership forum are all very much aware of what we're doing."

Post-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding

“The work will continue, but rather than being a stand-alone, short-term project, the group will report into the University’s governance arrangements through the Equality and Diversity Committee. This will ensure that the work of the group will have a direct impact on discussions, policy development and the ongoing work of the Committee, as well as receiving corporate oversight.” **Round One Catalyst funded provider**

Among some of the Round One projects, senior leaders are now proactively committed to eradicating issues of sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents, recognising the need to support this work and are acting to direct it. This in turn means that more providers are taking an **institution-wide approach** to tackling safeguarding issues as a result.

Within several of the providers, the Catalyst funding appears to have been motivational in converting the recommendations in *Changing the Culture* for strong leadership and governance into observable change – however this is not universal and should continue to be monitored.

Among the Round Two projects, however, the research indicated that the intended outcomes with respect to senior leadership and governance are evident in a smaller proportion of the providers. Although there has been positive senior leadership support in most cases, there are few examples of responsibility for safeguarding work sitting at senior team level within providers. The Catalyst funding though has certainly helped increase awareness among leaders of issues of online harassment and hate crime, and this has in some cases helped to sustain the initiatives beyond the end of the project funding.

4.3 Relative impact of the Catalyst funding

Analysis of the UUK survey data further shows that [see table 1 in [Appendix Four](#)] HE providers receiving Catalyst funding were (compared to those not in receipt of funding) more likely to have:

- Developed an institution-wide approach to addressing this agenda;
- Committed longer term resources to support activities; and
- Secured buy-in from senior management.

It should also be noted however that the (albeit far fewer) Scottish institutions taking part in the survey (see page 30 in Section 3.3 above for further information on the different approach taken in Scotland) had equally high percentages that had developed an institution-wide approach.

As reported in Section 3.3 above, Catalyst funding has also had an impact in ensuring that [see table 2] Working Groups, Teams or projects are embedded within the reporting and governance systems and ensuring that any changes are embedded into the institution’s governance systems or structures, policies, practices and processes. A greater percentage of providers in receipt of funding reported, in comparison to those without funding [table 2], that they had changed temporary structures to permanent structures to help ensure sustainability of initiatives.

The Catalyst funding has had an impact on the **adoption of a zero-tolerance culture** across institutional activities [table 5], with those in receipt of funding more likely to report that preventative activities in this area have been implemented or tested.

In addition, those **providers in receipt of Catalyst funding are more likely to have fully or partially implemented the UUK/Pinsent Masons guidance** on handling alleged student misconduct which may constitute a criminal offence.

When asked about the main **barriers or challenges** to enhancing progress at their provider, a larger percentage of those in receipt of Catalyst funding stated that [table 17] obtaining ownership from senior managers fell into this category (18%) than those without funding (8%). This may be because those receiving the funding are better aware of the issues in practice, and so some further guidance around this may be useful to the sector as a whole.

4.4 Lessons learnt and recommended next steps

Despite active senior leadership involvement among many of the Catalyst funded providers, there appears to be abiding **concern among some at senior levels about the potential for reputational damage** (and specifically about a negative impact on student recruitment) from publicising initiatives to tackle hate crime and harassment, thereby hindering or preventing further work taking place.

Individuals and teams undertaking safeguarding initiatives should:

- Seek senior leadership support and engagement in projects at an early stage of their development;
- Draw on evidence (such as the outcome of this evaluation) to explain the benefits for students and for the providers of promoting a safe culture and environment;
- Help to make the case to senior leadership and help in the understanding of issues by referencing practical examples of what is proposed; and
- Focus on embedding within permanent institutional governance structures rather than ad hoc or temporary committees, to help to keep the issue on senior leadership agendas.

“So, some nervousness in parts of the University, so the marketing imperative is to get students in and say this is a safe place to come and study, come and enjoy your University lives and then we need to put some messages out that this type of anti-social behaviour, hate crime, is never acceptable. So, I think that has been negotiated. Other areas of nervousness would be around colleagues in registry functions worried about the volume of evidence that this might surface now we start unpacking it. To date that has not been founded. And also how it will link with other processes in human resources and the like has come forward. As we’ve started to unpack this there have been quite a lot of negotiations around the University to take it forward.” **Post-92 provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

There is still **significant variation in whether safeguarding work has become embedded within existing institutional governance structures**, with oversight from permanent committees. Simply setting up temporary or ad hoc governance structures, such as short-life working or steering groups, can have a potentially negative impact on the ability to sustain safeguarding initiatives and maintain their place on the institutional agenda following the end of projects. There are concerns that where monitoring of the project is not embedded in institutional governance the safeguarding work will decline at the end of the project funding, rather than become embedded.

“I’ve met with all the [relevant Deans] for all four faculties. I have spoken to so many people, so many departments and faculties.... There’s a really good awareness about the project across the University, but it doesn’t quite sit anywhere as such within our governance structure at the moment. That’s something that we need to look at in terms of the long-term. How we embed some of the work that we’re trying to do. So, it doesn’t just remain as a standalone one-year project.” **Post-92 provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

Recommendations – Leadership and governance

4. Where they do not already, senior leaders within HE providers should take responsibility for key decisions and risks around safeguarding, including taking action to direct the work.
5. Where they do not already do so, HE providers should ensure that safeguarding activity is embedded within their existing institutional governance structures, and that regular monitoring of prevalence (including trend analysis) and outcome reports of all safeguarding incidents is undertaken and reported to the governing body at regular intervals.

5. Staff involvement in safeguarding

5.1 Intended outcomes

Indications that the intended outcomes of the Catalyst intervention have been achieved, as they relate to enhanced staff involvement in student safeguarding work, would include evidence of the following changes being in place across HE providers:

- More staff training should be taking place across the provider, including but not only as part of induction;
- There should be enhanced use of academic subject matter expertise and research in making the case for, advising on and helping to drive change (such as of criminologists, sociologists and psychologists);
- Safeguarding against hate crime and online harassment should have become more embedded in the curriculum; and
- Increased numbers of specialist practitioners (with an appropriate ratio to student numbers) should be operating within HE providers (including to handle disclosures and provide support to students).

5.2 Summary assessment

There are multiple examples of **staff training** being undertaken within the Catalyst funded providers (across both rounds), ranging from **specialist training** for staff in how to receive and respond to disclosures of sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents, and in some cases how to intervene in these; to more **general awareness raising training** on the issues for larger numbers of staff. The latter includes training as part of staff induction and continuing professional development (CPD).

“...what we’ve done in this second-round project is try and create more intersectional approaches to training around sexual violence, sexual harassment and hate crime. So, we’re developing and piloting guidance that’s focused on first response disclosure and bystander training specifically.... We wanted to look at how intersectionality could be more thoroughly embedded into those training models. So, thinking about the intersections between sexual harassment, sexual violence and hate crime but also about how the experiences affect different stakeholder groups.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

“In terms of successes we’ve had quite good feedback from our staff. We’ve raised a lot of awareness around this around campus.... We’ve had quite good feedback from administrators as well who have actually come to us and asked for advice when they are responding to students as well as our safeguarding team who are heavily involved in this as well. We’ve raised more awareness within our student services staff and course administrators and it’s very important that they are involved in these projects as well. We’ve had good feedback around staff training for responding to disclosures of sexual violence

online and offline, and hopefully student awareness of where to report.” **Post-92 provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

Many of the funded providers at both rounds brought in **specialist or expert partner organisations and/or local police to undertake staff training** on sexual misconduct or hate crime and harassment on their behalf, many using the ‘train the trainer’ model.

Key groups of staff who benefit from training are those working closely with students, including: professional services staff, including welfare and student support teams; academic and teaching staff, particularly course co-ordinators and administrators who may see initial indications when students have a safeguarding issue, when they stop attending or request an extension for extenuating circumstances; senior leadership teams; Student Union staff; and security, accommodation, library and catering staff who can be first to become aware of a student having issues given their proximity to them day to day.

In terms of **academic and teaching staff involvement in safeguarding work**, research for the evaluation across both rounds of projects showed that there are many examples of successful **incorporation of safeguarding issues into the curriculum**. This is particularly for students in related disciplines, such as Psychology, Law, Criminology and Social Work, rather than across all disciplines (which is far rarer). However, most student training takes place during induction or ‘fresher’s week’, often when students are overwhelmed by all kinds of information and not in ‘critical thinking mode’, as they are when being taught.

“Some of them will adapt training for use with their students. You know, certainly, our Childhood Studies, and our Health and Social Care, and our trainee teachers will get a ‘student-ified’ version of that training. I mean, all our students go through safeguarding training, but they will do the more in-depth session, which will be based on what we’re pulling together for staff, as well, which, as I say, will incorporate a lot of the stuff that’s come out of this project.” **FE college provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

“...our Psychology department has incorporated this into one of their modules to attend bystander training and then [for students] to write about it. There has been some consultation with Social Policy and Sociology in terms of what they can add. Then more broadly the University is currently undergoing a curriculum transformation so just a complete re-haul of how we’re teaching, what we’re teaching our students and inclusivity is one of the key themes amongst employability and sustainability.” **Pre-92 provider, three rounds of Catalyst funding**

There were also many specific examples of projects being led successfully by academic staff, and others making use of academic staff expertise in the design or development of projects. **Lack of time for academic staff to become involved** rather than willingness was the most frequently cited barrier to their engagement across the Round One projects.

Academic staff involvement between the two rounds varied in that Round Two projects had stronger academic involvement from academic and teaching staff in areas such as: contributing their **subject matter expertise and knowledge on hate crime and online**

harassment to inform the safeguarding projects; in publicising, supporting and in some cases evaluating the work of the projects; as well as in some cases embedding aspects of safeguarding work into the curriculum.

“One of the things that we did want to do was try and make sure that we’ve got some type of central recording process. As we entered into this we did look at a ‘theory of change’ model and engaged a couple of academic colleagues who do research related to crime and in particular hate crime as well. It’s quite interesting. A couple of things that came up from that were role intimates; the people immediately around particularly after hate incidents. They can be quite deterministic in terms of whether somebody goes forward and makes a report or not. So, we were trying to think about that as well as influencing the individual students who are the set of intimates, the people that somebody might talk to immediately after [an incident] who would encourage reporting.” **Post-92 provider, one Round of Catalyst funding**

In addition, many providers have created new **specialist roles to undertake or coordinate safeguarding work**, either independently or in partnership with local community organisations, as a result of the funding. These include roles such as: expert Independent Sexual Violence Advisors (although there were few examples of this and similar expert roles among providers participating in this research); as well as other roles, with varying degrees of specialism and qualifications required (such as Sexual Violence Liaison Officers, Hate Crime Liaison Officers, Sexual Harassment Specialists, Case Managers, Senior Wardens and Sexual Assault Responders). These latter roles are likely to have responsibility for taking initial reports from students and then for signposting them to (internal and external) specialists for taking disclosures and providing support. One key theme which came up across providers is the need to provide better support to this group.

5.3 Relative impact of Catalyst funding

Analysis of the UUK survey data shows [see table 4 in [Appendix Four](#)] that providers in receipt of Catalyst funding are more likely to involve staff in the development of their response to the Taskforce’s recommendations than those without funding. However, this question was not broken down by academic, teaching or other types of staff.

While there is clear variation across providers in the success of efforts to involve staff across the organisation, there is evidence of a small number of specialists now operating within many HE providers as a result of the Catalyst funding, and many more generalist staff who have had training as first responders. Moreover, there is now a group of experienced project managers and administrative staff with expertise in implementing measures to tackle safeguarding issues as a result. Safeguarding roles are discussed further in Section 11 below.

5.4 Lessons learnt and next steps

There are clear examples of enhanced use of academic expertise and research in making the case for and driving change, particularly in tackling hate crime. While there are fewer instances of safeguarding issues being embedded in the curriculum, there is good practice

which should be encouraged and supported. The main barrier to engaging more academic and teaching staff in safeguarding initiatives is related to the amount of time they have available to be involved with the project, in addition to their other workload responsibilities and/or timetabling constraints, and this not being recognised or prioritised.

Institutions undertaking safeguarding initiatives should:

- Recognise that involvement of staff will be in competition with other draws on their time. Consider what can be done to prioritise involvement in safeguarding;
- Put in place support for staff undertaking specialist roles to undertake or coordinate safeguarding; and
- Ensure training for staff is not limited to one group but available to all staff that have contact with students.

6. Student engagement and experience

6.1 Intended outcomes

Indications that the intended outcomes of the Catalyst intervention have been achieved, as they relate to student engagement and experience in safeguarding, would include evidence of the following changes within HE providers:

- There should be more student-centred interventions within HE providers;
- Students should be involved in co-creating and designing safeguarding initiatives;
- There should be increased levels of bystander and other awareness training covering hate crime/incidents;
- Account should be being taken of victims/survivors' voices in developing approaches to tackling sexual misconduct, hate crime/incidents; and
- Students should feel more confident in reporting sexual misconduct, hate crime/incidents and consequently reporting of these should increase.

Ultimately over a longer period, the intermediate outcomes set out above should contribute to the following changes:

- Student wellbeing should be core to more providers' value propositions;
- Safer students should be having more positive experiences;
- Eventually there should be fewer incidents of sexual misconduct and hate crimes/incidents affecting students; and
- These outcomes should in turn contribute to enhanced student mental health, student retention, attainment and other positive educational and employment outcomes.

6.2 Summary assessment

There are multiple examples among the funded providers of **student-centred interventions** being developed by the Catalyst funded projects, many of which have involved students in their design and delivery. Successful approaches include students creating content for the project with staff oversight, peer-to-peer interaction e.g. in the facilitation of student focus groups or delivery of in-person training or campaign information.

Research with the Round One projects showed that students were heavily engaged in the co-creation and design of initiatives, and therefore that there are more **student-centred interventions in place tackling sexual misconduct** through the Catalyst funding. Student involvement and engagement, particularly in training, is considered most successful when projects are conducted in collaboration with Student Unions, or where they are tied to students' academic interest areas.

“We also got a lot of the Visual Art students to do some of the artwork for it. That was a really good way of showing students as producers and get[ting] involved with that. And also the Criminology students, we’ve had a really good success with them because they sat and had a debate all about it and something really interesting came out of it, that they thought that crime towards women should be considered a hate crime because they’re also considered a protected characteristic and there was a really quite heated conversation about it, it was really interesting to sit in and note all the stuff that they were saying, and the arguments for and against.” **FE college provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

“It was a really quite hard hitting play, it was a 10 minute play so obviously we had to be sort of knowledgeable about how it was affecting the students watching it so we had support mechanisms in place for that but a lot of the students, although it was hard hitting, they said that they really enjoyed watching it, that it raised awareness for them, it made them think about what they’re actually doing and educated them on hate crime and hate incidents. So, we had some really, really good feedback.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

“The key distinction is that in the third round project we’ve got a group of students who are actually themselves leading the consultations and discussions with students and that seems to be working much better. I don’t know why particularly but maybe just that kind of peer led approach seems to be working much better so if I could go back to the beginning of the second round project I would do in that context but obviously the boat has gone on that.” **Post-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

Levels of student engagement in Round Two projects were lower overall. Although there were good examples of project teams successfully engaging students, this was mainly where it was done mandatorily as part of their course, or as an internship, and often where there was substantive collaboration between the project team and the Student Union, particularly where this was achieved through peer-to-peer interaction and education.

Bystander intervention training has been a key element of many of the funded projects at both Round One and Two. This includes a broad range of models including face-to-face, online, mandatory or voluntary training. For instance, in some providers training is incorporated into induction for all students with more in-depth training focussed on roles, such as the leaders of student clubs and societies. There are also numerous examples of **consent training** being offered to students, which may be multi-layered and tailored to different audiences, drawing on a range of external materials and internal research.

“So, we have five different trainings and they are on three different levels. So, level one is online training, level two would be like workshop based and level three would be like a modern-day training. So, we have for students more a consent link and active bystander workshops, and for staff we’ve got online resource training, a three-hour disclosure training and a day long Rape Crisis training.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

“We designed the training based on a combination of previous training. One being some active bystander training, [for] which we borrowed some stuff from the Intervention Initiative, at the University of West England. And, then the majority of it was research informed and based heavily on training that was provided for staff at our institution, in supporting survivors of sexual violence.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

Most projects which have rolled out new reporting systems and associated awareness raising campaigns report the positive benefit across both rounds of an **increase in reports of misconduct** (including historic reports), particularly of sexual misconduct but also of hate incidents. It is broadly considered among providers that higher reporting levels are a result of increased confidence among students to make a report, and that reports tend to increase following campaigns and training events. The increase in more accessible mechanisms for students to report incidents is also clear across many projects, as is the option for students to have multiple routes to report in certain circumstance e.g. online or in person.

“So, reporting to us, we’ve seen an increase in harassment reporting 133%, and sexual offences 175%. To put that into context, we had 21 reports of sexual harassment compared to the previous year of nine, sexual offences we had 11 compared to previous year of four, so still relatively low. But, it was the spike that we expected and, actually, that was positive for us to see that, because we know that the message is getting out, and people are getting more confident in reporting these issues.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

“They do map on sometimes there, but the spike is a day after [training sessions] the report comes out because we need a little while to digest it, but it really does map very accurately. This doesn’t quite show you because you can’t see hour by hour, but it was quite striking from that perspective. So, yes, just to continue [training] events seems really important, and putting the University backing and resource behind them as well is really striking.” **Pre-92 provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

“We have had lots and lots of conversations and I think it is probably one of the most powerful tools that has come out around the campaign, funding an anonymised mechanism has enabled students and staff to be able to feel safe and secure, to actually describe what has happened to them but without having to take the next step. Say nothing or formally report; it is about creating something in the middle. Until there is confidence and a sense of relief that the culture has changed, and the response will be different, that is quite an important mechanism to have. I think what it has also done is enabled the University to see the extent of the problem and the extent of the issues and it is through that because it is so anonymised, and it is so safe, it has meant survivors are really speaking out about what has been happening to them.” **Pre-92 provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

6.3 Relative impact of Catalyst funding

The analysis of the UUK survey data shows [see table 4 in [Appendix Four](#)] that while a high percentage of providers both in receipt of funding and without involve the Students' Union or Guild in developing their strategic response to the Taskforce's recommendations, those with funding are far more **likely to involve students from different backgrounds and identities** (19% without funding compared to 91% of providers that received funding from two or more rounds of Catalyst funding).

A larger percentage of the Catalyst funded providers had implemented or tested student led activities (45%) compared to 27% in institutions without the funding [table 5]. It should be noted that 64% of the Scottish institutions taking part in the survey reported that they had implemented or tested student-led activities. As this is higher than the English institutions in receipt of Catalyst funding it would be worthwhile examining what the drivers for this in Scotland have been.

Analysis of the student representative survey conducted as part of the evaluation shows that respondents tended to 'agree' and 'strongly agree' that student involvement in the project was successful overall (mean = 4.5 out of 5.0). When analysed by particular issues that the projects tried to address (sexual misconduct by students, hate-based incidents and crime, staff-to-student sexual misconduct and online harassment), over 90% of respondents 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' that student involvement had been successful. In open text comments, respondents particularly emphasised the **effectiveness of peer-to-peer learning and the need to include the broader student population in any safeguarding project** of this kind.

A clear benefit from the Catalyst projects has been the increased awareness generated (among students and staff) of **internal and external support available for students** who have been affected by sexual misconduct, hate crime or harassment. Additionally, there has been a realisation of the need to improve the coordination of safeguarding support services for students.

It is not clear whether account is being taken directly of **victims'/survivors' voices**; only one or two examples of this being done were found during the field research with both rounds. Likewise, analysis of the UUK survey data showed that the involvement of students making reports or those responding to allegations in developing providers' strategic response to the *Changing the Culture* recommendations was low across all providers (though highest among those with the largest number of students).

Many providers reported significant barriers to engaging students in the design and delivery of the Round Two projects aimed at tackling hate crime/incidents, in contrast to the high levels of student engagement reported by Round One projects tackling sexual misconduct.

6.4 Lessons learnt and recommended next steps

There were several common risks and lessons identified by project teams which other providers embarking on safeguarding initiatives may wish to take account of:

- Student participants in the research for the evaluation, whether they had been a part of project development, its delivery or recipients of training, emphasised the importance of **peer-to-peer learning and mentoring** as the most impactful ways of engaging students in safeguarding work.
- Student engagement in the projects has been most successful when conducted in collaboration with Student Unions, tied to students' academic interests, or to their extra curricula interests (e.g. sport or drama);
- Early intervention is most effective in setting out expectations of behaviour;
- A key issue was a perceived **lack of diversity among student groups involved** or engaged in the projects. Male students in particular were found to be a group difficult to engage on sexual misconduct, unless the area was directly linked to their subject area interests or participation in sports clubs. Providers have introduced incentives to encourage attendance at training programmes which have included vouchers for catering outlets, requiring training to be completed to be able to buy tickets to social events, linking training to the drawing down of funds by societies, making training credit bearing, linking attendance to awards such as "Hall of the Year" where there is a competitive element and peer pressure, and taking a multi-tiered approach where all students undertake a basic level of consent training with some groups required to undertake more in-depth training;
- To reach student groups that remain difficult to engage, providers may need to consider making safeguarding training compulsory for all students;
- Flexibility and adaptability of programmes was recognised to be a key factor, whether this relates to style of delivery (peer-to-peer or online for example) and length of training programmes.

Communications need to be made relevant to all student groups, and further research is required to identify the most effective means of engaging with different types of students. The fact that some student groups would only engage in safeguarding work if this was mandatory, and the difficulty of reaching students not involved with the Student Union, led to some participants reflecting on the need to make any **training on safeguarding issues compulsory for students**.

“I think one of the things we need to do is make the workshops mandatory... or at least provide more incentive for students to go.... It is just hard to get students to want to go to a two-hour workshop, because that’s the time that we really need for these workshops, as they are now, is about two hours. I think that just getting involved early on, just so that they can get a glimpse of the programme, get acquainted with it and then hopefully that will be more of a motivation for them to at least be partially involved for the rest of the year. Or they could never be involved again, but at least they would have had some understanding of these issues, of these concepts moving forward.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of funding**

“...for me there are two main things – the first is about the role that the [provider] wants to play in terms of engaging more students [and] how mandatory we want to make the training that we’re doing. I know from a Students’ Union perspective, when we picked up the mandate to do it, based on last year’s student votes and stuff, there was definitely a mandate for it to be a compulsory workshop, compulsory training and I know that sometimes that is not always 100% feasible, but I think for me, it would be really good to see more of an effort to make that something that is rolled out, just to all students. There are definitely students who aren’t members of our sports clubs and societies and wouldn’t have a reason to do it, to join it [the training]. They are interested in something else, and that is fine, but I think we need to find a way to reach them through the University more.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of funding**

Students also highlighted the need for any initiatives and interventions around safeguarding to be introduced by providers right from the start to first year undergraduates, and ideally even before students enter HE (which is what one participating provider considered as part of their project). As many student participants in the research stated, addressing the issues earlier at schools is needed for real culture change in HE be achieved, leading eventually to fewer incidents of sexual misconduct, hate crimes and hate incidents affecting students.

Recommendations – Student involvement

6. HE providers and sector bodies and agencies should take more account of victim’s/survivors’ voices (paying particular attention to intersectionality, i.e. interconnected categorisations such as race or gender as they apply to a given individual or group, which can create overlapping and interdependent systems of discrimination or disadvantage) in developing student safeguarding initiatives, and particularly in relation to what may constitute a successful outcome from their perspective in different scenarios.
7. HE providers should consider how to involve hard-to-engage student groups, for example through delivering some form of mandatory student safeguarding training.

7. Reporting mechanisms

7.1 Intended outcomes

Indications that the intended outcomes of the Catalyst intervention have been achieved, as they relate to improving reporting mechanisms and information sharing, would include evidence of the following changes within HE providers:

- More providers should have better reporting mechanisms and systems in place;
- There should be more holistic reporting processes;
- Students should be more aware of how to report sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents;
- Victims/survivors should be more confident that if they report incidents their provider will respond effectively;
- In turn, there should be an increase in the reporting of sexual misconduct, hate crime/incidents and online harassment; and
- (Eventually) reporting by students of sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents should become the new norm.

7.2 Summary assessment

Many of the Catalyst funded providers focussed as part of their of their project on the development of new or enhanced online tools to improve the mechanisms by which students can report incidents; as well as on how these reports are subsequently managed and how reporting students are supported.

There is ongoing discussion in the sector around the relative merits of **attributed or anonymous reporting**. All of the projects with reporting systems in place or planned allow anonymous as well as attributed reporting of incidents. However, a **key unresolved issue is around handling data** where an individual has been identified in a report as an alleged perpetrator and, in particular, how should this data then be used and stored, including where there are several anonymous reports about the same individual.

“The key outcomes of the project for us that we wanted to progress is we wanted to make sure there was an online tool so there’s some 24/7 reporting from the University perspective. We wanted to also make sure that we had a group of educators in place because it will be clearer. I think engaging students and having a friendly face they can talk to and start a disclosure process is important because otherwise it’s quite a cold set of processes, and, aspirationally we wanted to also have really good active social media too that was quite engaging. I think that’s proved more challenging than perhaps just talking about how we might safeguard our active students in the social media space as well.” **Post-92 provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

“The system will allow students to report anonymously. They can log a report or they can speak to an advisor. And the advisor’s role or the Case Manager’s role is to signpost students to appropriate sources of help and that can be internal or external to the University. Or they can just speak to them if they want to speak to them and we’ll do what the student wants basically. It’s been up since the 8th and we’ve had five reports already, both staff and students. So, it’s starting to work.” **Post-92 provider, more than one round of funding**

Several providers are now making use of aggregated data from anonymised reports to make management decisions about what support is required, and whether to develop particular campaigns and implement training. Many projects now consider that their students are better supported as a result.

In terms of awareness of how to report, many **projects report increased awareness of the issues in general, and publicity of new reporting options**. There is some discussion about the relative benefits of single versus multiple channels for reporting incidents, with some identifying that the need to report in a specific way may be a barrier for some students and this may vary in terms of the type of incident and the individual characteristics, background and preferences of the reporting student.

“The other challenge that we have with it, and again this is just from the conversation we’ve had with students is, the speed at which things are followed up sometimes so if you report something and it’s on an online system it feels a bit mechanised, it feels like you’re just reporting it into the ether and you don’t know who’s reading it and how it’s going to be responded to and I think students still sometimes just want a cup of tea and a human, actually someone personal that can talk to them and just say “I’m really sorry you’ve gone through this experience, we’ll try our best to help you”. And again that doesn’t work for all students and sometimes anonymising it and reporting it at your computer, at your desk, when no-one else knows is really important. What we’ve learnt from the last few months is that there needs to be a range of things on offer for students because not every student wants to use it in the same way and that’s culturally, and also religiously, I think mediated as well because it depends who you’re reporting it to, the nature of society and how things are dealt with within family structures, and internationally I think there’s a whole other layer of that for some of students where they just wouldn’t report, so we’re trying to find out why.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of funding**

Round two project teams varied in their views as to whether to have a **single reporting tool for a broad range of issues or multiple (but joined-up) reporting routes** in place to give students options in addition to a single online system or form. The key point is that awareness-raising campaigns and initiatives are needed in tandem as students need to know how to report and also what to report.

“Our intended outcome obviously is increasing the awareness, but it’s also to empower students to actually challenge behaviours that they’ve either witnessed or experienced, and it’s also to work with the local police and the University with the data that we collect in order for us to develop and identify any initiatives that would support our aims as well. We’ve just

completed quite a large part of the project because it was the National Hate Crime Awareness Week but now we're... producing further merchandising and publicity materials and also we're now starting to roll out some training.... We'll be doing the same thing with the Student's Union, again making sure that everybody knows exactly how to report and also what constitutes a hate crime." **Post-92 provider, more than one round of funding**

"In terms of successes we've had quite good feedback from our staff. We've raised a lot of awareness around this around campus.... We've had good feedback from administrators as well who have actually come to us personally and asked for advice when they are responding to students as well as our safeguarding team who are heavily involved in this as well. We've raised more awareness within our student services staff and course administrators too. It's very important that they are involved in these projects as well. We've had good feedback around staff training on responding to disclosures of sexual violence online and offline and hopefully student awareness of where to report." **Post-92 provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

In terms of the levels of reporting, many of the project teams, across both rounds but more markedly in Round One, identified an **increase in reporting**, and this was variously attributed to: new reporting options for students; publicity relating to the launch of these; provider training and other campaigns tackling misconduct of various forms; a mixture of all these activities; all within the context of broader cultural change and discussions amongst students (at least in relation to sexual misconduct).

"We've seen really tangible increases in the numbers of first attendance at the Wellbeing Service, because of an incident of sexual assault, or behaviour that's troubled someone. I think, we're averaging about two or three a month, and that's definitely an increase from last year at this time." **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of funding**

"I think a challenge, [although] we see it as a success, is that we are getting more students coming forward. It is a challenge and I do think that universities need to be mindful of that. That as they start doing their awareness raising, they have to be ready to deal with these complex cases. So, we've seen a massive increase in our workload, which is a challenge because, again, we're balancing that alongside other activities and it's also about managing the student expectations. And, I think, even though we've worked with external experts, their role, working in the community, is very different to working on a campus university when you've got students living in close proximity, sitting alongside each other, living together. And, that is probably one of the big challenges that we're learning from. We've adopted appropriate procedures to manage that and to assess risk and take appropriate action, but I think that's a lesson learned for other universities. You do need to have procedures in place because otherwise, what are you going to do when students come forward, if you don't know what your next.... It's not enough just to do support. You have to do what we've done and look at your procedures and discipline and everything. Even like your accommodation terms and conditions." **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of funding**

Almost two-thirds of the Round Two providers were focussed on improving reporting mechanisms and/or management information as part of their projects. In some cases, new reporting systems were developed and implemented; while in others existing reporting systems in place for reporting of sexual misconduct were being adapted to also cover hate crime/incidents, and in a minority to cover broader safeguarding issues and concerns. Most of the reporting tools were web-based, with very few of the providers using mobile apps as a reporting mechanism.

Additionally, four of the projects were in the process of setting up or improving a Third-Party Reporting Centre, often in conjunction with other reporting mechanisms being provided for students.

7.3 Relative impact of Catalyst funding

Analysis of the UUK survey data shows that the **Catalyst funding has had an impact on the development or improvement of reporting mechanisms** [see table 8 in [Appendix Four](#)]. 62% of providers that received no funding stated that they had done this, compared with 95% of providers that had received two or more rounds of funding. In addition, 91% of providers that had received two or more rounds of funding stated that they had implemented clearer information for students on how to report (compared to 58% of those that did not receive funding).

The survey also indicates that the Catalyst funding has had an impact on the **support provided for both the reporting students and the responding students**. 69% of providers without Catalyst funding stated they had improved support for reporting students, compared with 94% of those with two or more rounds of funding (and 90% of those receiving one round of funding).

Support for responding students is less well developed it seems, although those in receipt of Catalyst funding have clearly done more in this area. Notably, 58% of providers without funding stated that they had improved support for responding students, compared with 88% of those with two or more rounds of funding, and 74% with one round of funding.

Providers in receipt of Catalyst funding are also more likely to have developed or improved **recording of data on incidents**.

Aligned with the findings from the qualitative research for the evaluation, there is some variation in availability of **reporting options and mechanisms** by type of misconduct, although in all cases those in receipt of Catalyst funding are more likely to report that the provider offers these than those without funding [tables 9 – 12].

In all cases, under 25% of institutions without funding provided a dedicated reporting tool. Of those providers in receipt of two or more rounds of Catalyst funding:

- 64% provided a dedicated reporting tool for student-to-student sexual misconduct;
- 59% provided a reporting tool for staff-to-student sexual misconduct;

- 50% provided a reporting tool for hate crime/incidents; and
- 45% provided a reporting tool for online bullying and harassment.

Receipt of Catalyst funding also seems to have had an impact on whether there is a publicised option to make an **anonymous report of misconduct**. A lower percentage of providers in receipt of funding reported that this option was not available (compared with those not receiving funding) [table 13]. Where those providers that received funding offered this option, anonymity tends to be afforded to the reporter rather than to both parties. A similar percentage of providers with funding and without provided an option where both parties remain anonymous. There may be a need for further research to understand why this is the case, and what the issues are.

The UUK survey data shows that a side effect of introducing improved reporting is that **responding to an increase in the volume of disclosures** is identified as a challenge or barrier to enhancing progress by 50% of providers receiving two or more rounds of funding (compared with 15% of those not receiving funding) [table 17]. This is more of a barrier for providers with under 25k full-time equivalent (FTE) students (of which 65% reported this as an issue or barrier).

Of the respondents to the Round One **student representative survey 80% indicated that they knew how to report an incident** of sexual/online harassment or hate crime at their provider. However, **this means that 20% still did not**. In the Round Two student representative survey, the percentage of students that indicated they knew how to report an incident had increased, with 94% stating that they knew how to report a hate crime/incident. However, only 80% knew how to report an incident of online harassment.

Overall, respondents to the Round One student survey reported feeling 'confident' that their provider was able to tackle hate crime/incidents targeted at students with protected characteristics, such as black and minority ethnic students, disabled students, LGBTQ+ students, students of a particular faith or no faith and transgender students. However, responses from **students with protected characteristics showed they were less confident in reporting** overall, and **BME students reported significantly lower levels of confidence** than white students on all items.

Respondents did tend to 'agree' that the Catalyst-funded project had contributed to their providers' **ability to tackle hate crime/incidents** targeted at students with protected characteristics. In the Round Two survey, respondents were most confident that their provider would respond appropriately to reports of hate incidents (a score of 4.1 where 5 = very confident, 81% Agree or Strongly agree) than online harassment (a score of 3.6, 53% Agree or Strongly agree).

Results from the Round Two survey (noting the much lower response rate to this second survey so the results are indicative) suggested that the majority of respondents were **confident that their provider was able to tackle hate crime/incidents** targeted at students with protected characteristics, with the most confidence in tackling incidents targeted at disabled students (73% confident or very confident), and the least confidence in

handling incidents targeted at trans students (53% confident or very confident). The size of the response group does not make it possible to analyse results by the respondents' protected characteristics (e.g. to see if disabled students themselves have similar high levels of confidence).

Additionally, in open text comments to the Round One survey, respondents reported that some student groups had been included less than others and reflected on the need for buy-in from the top to affect cultural change, rather than bottom-up activism.

“More could have been done to target these groups [with protected characteristics] individually (support and reporting) but there was a wider approach used for this funding, although throughout marketing materials diversity is considered extensively.”

The UUK survey data shows a clear impact of the Catalyst funding on the development or improvement of reporting mechanisms within funded providers.

There is some variation in the availability of reporting options and mechanisms by type of misconduct, although those in receipt of Catalyst funding are more likely to report that the provider offers these than those without funding. The UUK data also shows that Catalyst funding has had an impact in providers offering a dedicated reporting tool for reporting student-to-student sexual misconduct, however the areas around staff-to-student sexual misconduct, hate crime and online harassment still require further work.

7.4 Lessons learnt and recommended next steps

There were several common risks and lessons identified by project teams which other providers embarking on safeguarding initiatives may wish to take account of:

- There is no optimum approach as to whether to provide a single reporting tool for a broad range of issues or have multiple reporting routes in place to give students options, in addition to a single online system or form. The optimum approach will vary per individual provider.

All the projects with reporting systems in place or planned allow anonymous as well as attributed reporting of incidents. Receipt of Catalyst funding seems to have had an impact on whether there is a publicised option to make an **anonymous report of misconduct**. However, a key unresolved issue is around handling data where an individual has been identified in a report; and in particular how should this data then be used and stored, including where there are several anonymous reports about the same individual.

Many Catalyst funded providers at both rounds indicate that students now have a better understanding of how to report, what to report, and that the **numbers of reports are increasing**, presumably because students are more confident that their provider will respond positively to their reports. Nonetheless, **students with protected characteristics were less confident in reporting overall**, and BME students reported significantly lower levels of confidence than white students on all items, and this needs further examination.

Providers implementing new reporting systems should be **prepared for an increase in the volume of reports**, and ensure they have an appropriate level of trained resources and clear processes and procedures in place, in advance of rolling out the systems and awareness raising campaigns about them.

Providers embarking on safeguarding initiatives may wish to take account that:

- Increases in reporting will place an increased burden on staff to respond. This needs to be factored in (as per lessons learnt in Section 3.4 above);
- There will be a need to manage expectations around reporting and responses and response times through clear communications;
- Providers should monitor/analyse reporting data where available to identify any discrepancies in reporting (e.g. from BME students) and take steps to address this.

Recommendations – Reporting

8. We recommend that HE providers should seek clearer advice on the use of data gained through anonymous reporting systems, specifically around handling data where an individual has been identified in a report; and in particular how should this data then be used and stored, including where there are several anonymous reports about the same individual.
9. Related to Recommendation 2, more work is required by HE providers, and sector bodies and agencies, to seek to better understand and be able to respond to why students with protected characteristics are less confident in reporting any type of incident overall; and BME students may have significantly lower levels of confidence in reporting than white students.

8. Partnership and collaboration

8.1 Intended outcomes

Indications that the intended outcomes of the Catalyst intervention have been achieved, as they relate to working in partnership and collaboration, would include evidence of the following changes being made within HE providers:

- More commonly agreed definitions of different types of misconduct should be used across providers;
- There should be improved collaboration among sector stakeholder organisations and campaign groups;
- More collaboration and partnerships between HE providers and third sector organisations should be in place;
- There should be more local and regional partnership working and community engagement taking place; and
- All these should be leading to an enhanced influence on government policy and cross-silo working.

8.2 Summary assessment

A key component needed for the successful tackling of sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents is HE providers working in partnership and collaboration with other providers and external organisations tackling the same issues. Research for the evaluation shows that there is extensive collaboration taking place between providers and the police, third sector organisations and campaign groups among the Catalyst funded providers.

There is an abundance of evidence of more **local and regional partnership working and community engagement**, which has been either developed or strengthened through the Catalyst projects. Examples include networks bringing together providers with local authorities, health organisations, Sexual Assault Referral Centres, community and third sector organisations, local police, and licensed venues on and off campus. In some cases, these partnerships are supporting sustainability of safeguarding work following the end of the project, for instance through funding from the local authority or providers becoming permanent members of collaborative regional or local partnerships and boards.

“But, actually, because of the partners that we’ve had on board with the project, the safeguarding board and the domestic abuse steering group, there’s been a lot of support from those arenas. So much so now, that one of our local councillors wants to take it further afield now, wants to, now that the foundation work has been done, wants to roll out the app, and the resources and the website, with other post-16 establishments. They’re going to take over driving that forward.... So, although the project has come to an end, in the Borough it’s going to progress further with the support of the local authority and the safeguarding board, which is fantastic news.” **FE college provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

Some of the key benefits that providers found from in working in partnership with external agencies were **accessing specialist knowledge** for the design and delivery of projects (including using the correct language), their **providing support to students**, and also opportunities to work together on effective reporting and on information sharing about incidents of different types.

“Due to the nature of the project, dealing with sexual and domestic violence, possibly having an impact, a very serious impact, on participants, we were very aware that we needed to have experts in place not only delivering the [training] programme but also providing students with information and support should they require it.” **Post-92 provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

“...from the bystander project we had information sessions, engaged our local rape and sexual assault support centre and police, local charities. We used them as well for consultation, so when providing resources for students and staff, they have encoded to make sure that the language that we’re using was appropriate. That we had all their details correct, those kinds of things, yes. Throughout, and with the task force meeting later, members from their different partners would sit on the taskforce as well. Yes, they’ve been involved throughout the whole thing.” **Post-92 provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

Providers highlighted the opportunity to engage in regional collaborations through their Catalyst-funded projects and pursue **joined-up approaches on safeguarding issues with key stakeholders and other providers in their localities**. They particularly value the ability to develop a joint approach to areas off campus in the community where incidents affecting students commonly take place, such as nightclubs. This is illustrated below.

“But, I think that aspect was the fact that we came from the student perspective and, of course, their entire life, funnily enough, it’s not on campus, it’s also in town. And, hence, one of the areas where they were really reporting issues, were in nightclubs in town. ... the Student Community Partnership, with both universities in [area] and the council, and both Student’s Unions. Under that heading, with [name] chairing and championing it, we’ve gone down the route of getting a small pilot group of nightclubs together, who are going to do all of the branding, so that students won’t just recognise it on campus, but in town, as well. We’re doing some training for... the bars on campus. And, sort of, taking it out to the local community, newspapers, articles, the lot. Then, I think we want to try and do a bit of work with sixth forms [schools and colleges], so that they will recognise the brand, as well. There’s, obviously, something about reporting mechanisms in the clubs, as well, and what they do... there’s a person who is linked very much with taking this training into the clubs, who is linked with the police... who have been prepared to put their logo on our posters, so that’s quite powerful, as well. I think it will have quite a big impact.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of funding**

Participants in the research from **specialist external agencies and organisations** voiced their appreciation for the fact that HE providers are conducting safeguarding work. For instance, a participant from the police in one region found that working with students had led

to the ‘demystification’ of police in the area of safeguarding, which they saw as a positive development. However, some participants also reflected on barriers to working in partnership with external agencies, which predominantly centred on a lack of resources and the limited capacity of external partners.

“I guess from a [specialist organisation] perspective, we have always had connections into particular colleges. So, long before the [provider’s] campaign we might have been approached by a college very often where they had an incident of sexual violence and either felt lacking in confidence to deal with it or had dealt with it in a particular way and then were beginning to realise that perhaps the mechanisms in the systems weren’t there necessarily for staff and students to feel contained by that. So, we would often get called in to work with the particular colleges, which we have been doing for a number of years, leading up to this work. So, going and delivering some training, talking about the context of sexual violence. Trying to support colleges to think maybe quite differently maybe about some of the traditional approaches that had been taken, which are quite punitive towards victims and survivors. So, that work was already going on and established....” **Partner, pre-92 provider, one round of Catalyst funding**

“[Collaboration with the provider] is breaking down barriers between the police, who ultimately are seen generally as this big scary organisation, who people are worried to come and ask advice from. Partners know they can come to us, anybody in my team, we can go to them, we can get advice over the phone, without having to go through a whole load of red tape, and just ask people’s advice, and what their experience has been. From our investigation point of view, by adopting that, sort of, myth-busting environment, if you like, it means these guys can all offer the complainants of the crime good advice. Which means, they can then make a clear and informed decision about how they want to progress. Because, there’s nothing worse from our point of view, where we have a complainant of some of the most serious offences coming through to us, who feels like they’ve been railroaded, and that just causes issues for us down the line.” **Partner, pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

“So, as a result of this work, I’ve been asked to come in now into various areas of the university. I’ve got students that [now] sit on my volunteer committee, both to benefit the courses that they’re on, but also to learn new skills. Because, it would be ideal to have champions, so along with the work that they know about, but also go to their peers and talk about an alternative way to report information, particularly if you’ve seen something like that. And, it’s definitely a relationship that I’m trying to replicate right across the [region].” **External partner, post-92 provider, funding at more than one round**

Among the **Round Two projects over half explicitly mentioned positive involvement and ongoing collaboration** with external partners beyond the end of the projects, particularly with expert and campaign organisations and the police, which have provided a range of support. This includes providing: expert advice on the subject areas and language to use; training to staff and students; helplines and referral pathways for reporting students for support – or for reporting where this is preferred; mediation and restorative justice

initiatives for reporting and responding students (in a minority of cases); and data and information sharing agreements. For a few projects, they contributed to or undertook evaluations of the Catalyst projects.

“The culture change, we want students to feel confident to report anything at all. Police have been on board with this project from the start and they’ve delivered two training sessions here on our campus for students and staff as well which has been proved really, really useful. So, we want to change the culture and encourage students to report anything, whether it’s just something in passing that they’ve seen and they think that that’s acceptable, we want them to report it because all these low-level incidents can build up to some quite serious hate crimes. We want to try and target the low-level stuff.” **Round 2 funded provider**

“We also have worked closely with Tell MAMA so there’s a lot of reporting of Islamophobia signposted to them, and Interfaith where different religions come together and they came along to our events so we had people from every single religion, even ones I’d never heard of, coming along to say this is who we are and you can come and talk to us at any point. So, they are going to be lasting relationships for sure with us.” **Round 2 funded provider**

“...we also have connections with national organisations – the Internet Watch Foundation, Mary Collins Foundation – and they focus on indecent images and under-age imagery online, and revenge pornography as well. So, we’ve got good links with the Revenge Porn Helpline and they’ve delivered either training or seminars at the University for staff and students and they’re also part of the main sort of signposting organisations that we use for our students as well so we really encourage them if they see under-age images or they have them on their phone coming from high school that they report them to the Internet Watch Foundation. If they have an indecent image of them sent around online without their consent we signpost them as well to the Revenge Porn Helpline. So, having those links has been really, really beneficial in getting the right resources and information to our students and the support.” **Round 2 funded provider**

“And in those occasions where the individual doesn’t feel safe enough to report a hate crime or hate experience that they have witnessed, to the university or either to the Student Union, they could actually go to other third parties that are local to us within reach of those students and also sometimes they may be able to access better support, for example, people who have expertise around supporting LGBT groups. So, accessing organisations like that would help them with the reporting mechanism but also would be able to provide them with tailored support to their needs.” **Round 2 funded provider**

Additionally, there has been extensive networking and sharing of good practice across the HE sector. UUK has been instrumental in driving forward work in this area and sharing effective practice with members. Individual providers as well as other sector and non-sector organisations have also hosted numerous conferences and events in these areas. In terms of sharing learning, the development of an online **Shared Practice Area**²⁶ as part of Anglia

²⁶ See: http://ftp.anglia.ac.uk/anet/student_services/unsilenced/campaigns/shared-practice-area.phtml.

Ruskin University's Round Two project allows providers to upload and share their resources and other information for the benefit of peers. Many of the Catalyst projects have developed helpful resources which they are willing to share with other providers across the sector following completion of their projects. The OfS plans to develop a mechanism to host and facilitate the ongoing sharing of resources developed through the Catalyst safeguarding initiative and will also be undertaking further activities to facilitate sector-level sharing of practice in due course.

There are examples of formal **partnership working between providers** and of less formal sharing of good practice through pre-existing professional networks, and networking opportunities enabled through participation in the Catalyst funding and the evaluation.

“So, there are four elements to this particular project. One is to consult with people at five/six partner universities (who have already participated either in first response disclosure training or bystander intervention training)... [provider names] participated in one of those forms of training that we've developed and so we wanted to ask them about their experience of the training and particularly collaborating with student societies and groups that represent marginalised groups. So, BAME, LGBTQ+, disabled groups and international student societies as well and thinking about how we can work with community groups representing those stakeholders as well to think about how both first response and bystander training can be more responsive to their different experiences and perspectives.” **Round 2 funded provider**

“We didn't start out to work with partners particularly other than the Student Union but actually as an unintended consequence we now have a meeting with [other provider name] who are just across the road from us and the [other provider name] who are also just down the road from us and it started from a conversation about bystander training and trying to create a sense of safety around this. Because our students, they are crossing each other's territory all the time, there's a log of shared space and we agreed that actually for this bit of [area name] it would be a good idea if we actually spoke more to each other so about twice a term we have a [collaborative group name]. It now involves local accommodation providers, a local police officer, we have a campus police officer as well, and we just go and share information. If there are particular issues going on we'll talk about that and what each of us is doing about it. If there's local initiatives how we can get involved. So, it wasn't a key part of the project at all but it has come out of it and it's been really useful.” **Round 2 funded provider**

A key mechanism for effective sharing of advice and insights on effective practice for any providers across the UK (which predates the Catalyst funding and merged at grass-roots level) has been via an internet-based mailing list hosted by JISCmail: **Changing the Culture**.

8.3 Relative impact of Catalyst funding

Analysis of the UUK survey data also suggests that receipt of Catalyst funding has had an **impact in involving third sector and/or local specialist agencies** in developing institutions' strategic responses to the Taskforce's recommendations. [See [Appendix Four](#), table 4.] In total, **86% of providers** receiving two or more rounds of Catalyst funding have involved these agencies, compared with 58% of those without funding.

The survey also shows that 82% of Scottish institutions responding had also involved third party agencies (comparable to 81% of providers in receipt of one round of funding). This suggests that it would be useful to examine the approach taken in Scotland to achieve this outcome.

Around 77% of providers in receipt of two or more rounds of funding stated that they had engaged with other providers or local organisations within the community to support a joined-up approach to this agenda, compared with 38% of those without funding [table 5]. Again the percentage of Scottish institutions stating that they do this is similar to that of the English providers receiving Catalyst funding (73%).

Where institutions had received Catalyst funding, they were more likely to have implemented partnerships with local **specialist services established to enhance referral pathways** for students (over 80%) compared with 54% of providers without funding [table 8]. Although a much lower percentage of providers without funding had worked with third party agencies or groups, this was **not identified as a barrier or challenge** to enhancing progress. This may suggest that there is a need to examine what the impediment is to doing this.

The **Catalyst intervention has had some impact in engaging local schools and colleges through outreach activities** to support a joined-up approach to address the agenda although this remains at a very low level (around 10% compared with 4% of providers without funding). This is related to the relatively low levels of providers that state they provide information on behavioural expectations and potential sanctions in pre-arrival information (23% without funding compared to 41% of institutions with two or more rounds of funding and 32% of institutions in receipt of one round of funding). This suggests that more research is required to look at what has prompted the increase in providing pre-arrival information by those providers in receipt of two or more rounds of funding.

We make recommendations with respect to enhancing joint working with local schools in Section 11 below.

8.4 Lessons learnt and next steps

Catalyst funding has clearly been an effective **stimulus to creating sustainable collaborations and partnership working** between HE providers and with community and regional organisations. There are numerous examples available, across both rounds of Catalyst funded providers, of collaboration involving regional and community organisations including local authorities, police and various expert third sector, community and specialist organisations.

There is potential for those providers which are more advanced to support their local peers by advising them on how best to make progress quickly and helping to draw them into existing networks and partnerships.

Providers embarking on safeguarding initiatives may wish to take account of the advantages to be gained by collaborating with external agencies in terms of:

- Additional capacity and expertise they offer;
- Sharing of resources;
- Contributing to student safeguarding across the whole student experience (including interactions in the local community);
- Sustainability of interventions; and
- Providers' contribution to tackling issues of sexual harassment and hate crime/incidents in the wider community.

We make recommendations on developing networks of specialist practitioners across the HE sector in Section 11 below.

9. Sustainability

9.1 Intended outcomes

Indications that the intended outcomes of the Catalyst intervention have been achieved, as they relate to sustainability and embeddedness of the work, would include evidence of the following changes within HE providers:

- More resources committed to tackling issues;
- More sustained and embedded initiatives and projects;
- Sustained and ongoing work in sector;
- Iterative ongoing training programmes;
- More sustainable partnerships in place between HE providers and local partners;
- More influence on public discourse; and
- Improved sector reputation on safeguarding issues.

9.2 Summary assessment

Research with Catalyst funded providers and analysis of project documentation demonstrates that there are more sustained and embedded safeguarding initiatives in the sector than in the past. There are numerous reports of safeguarding projects having become embedded across providers, with structures put in place to continue to the work, such as: incorporation of initiatives within the curriculum; continuation of campaigns, and student and staff training; introduction of new reporting systems and supporting policies, processes and procedures; partnership working; continuing senior leadership support; and embedding the work within institutional governance structures.

The most common way in which the Round One projects' work is being sustained is through iterative ongoing training programmes. There are numerous examples of providers committing to continue staff and student training (with compulsory training for some groups of students, such as student leaders), including bystander intervention training, beyond the lifecycle of the project, with several providers adopting a 'train the trainer' model in order to sustain the training offer, and others embedding training for students within induction.

“And then the other, one of our key means that we're still bringing together is training resources; there's already commitment from the Student's Union for standard compulsory training for all the committee members ... so that it can be the starting point for all student leaders in the University and there's already a lot of buy-in for that but that will need on-going sort of championing and I will be doing that anyway.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

“We are also investigating offering the training as a module which will be offered to all students. These modules are aimed at increasing the employability of students, and students

have to choose one such module each year on a mandatory basis – we have also been in discussion about including it as a compulsory element for students who have undergone disciplinarys linked to hate crime and discriminatory incidents.” **Round 2 funded provider**

As discussed in the previous section, there are many more sustainable partnerships in place between providers and local partners, which are set to continue. For the Round Two projects focussed on hate crime/incidents this was the most commonly cited way of sustaining the safeguarding work after the end of the project funding. Several of the projects will continue or plan to develop Third Party Reporting Centres.

“One of the biggest impacts of the project has been the multi-agency connections. All organisations involved recognise that [provider name] is a large part of the local community. Many had found it difficult to find the right person within [provider] to talk to. Therefore, this project did serve as a catalyst for action – creating a link to the wider community and providing a way into and out of the University. It also allowed more formal referral pathways to be created when students need to access professional support.” **Post-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

Another common approach (particularly among Round One projects) to sustaining the work has been through staff recruitment and the creation of new roles or incorporation of project responsibilities within permanent or fixed term non-project roles. The case must be made internally for this well in advance of the end of projects.

“The university is piloting the employment of a full-time Independent Sexual Violence Advisor (ISVA) post in partnership [...] and has approved a permanent post for a University project manager to continue to embed the outcomes of the Catalyst-funded project. This post will dovetail with the ISVA and have responsibility for providing the university with high level advice, guidance and support in coordinating a visible and effective response to sexual violence, hate crime and harassment on campus.” **Round 1 funded provider**

“The University has committed to continue to fund one FTE member of staff (who was initially funded via the first wave of OfS funding) who is based within Student Support Services and who is responsible for overseeing the operational aspects of [the campaign]. The online reporting tool is now an established part of the infrastructure in the Student Support Services team which supports improved responses to incidents.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

“Substantial plans are in place to ensure that the project continues post-Catalyst funding. Reallocation of work involving existing university staff and the potential funding for a new post will enable the work to progress. The University is currently recruiting a team of senior wardens who will oversee the welfare of students living in university residences. The senior wardens will be the first point of contact for serious incidents, involving students, outside of normal working hours and will oversee the work of the assistant wardens.... We have secured funding initially for two years.” **Round 1 funded provider**

Some providers reported they are introducing integrated approaches to tackle all student safety and wellbeing areas holistically. Others highlighted that the momentum created through the Catalyst funded projects, particularly through ongoing levels of student reports, will itself help ensure the work continues.

“[There is] an entirely new post within Student Services that does two things. The first is to manage a small team of Wellbeing Officers who respond to things like disclosures of sexual assault and hate crime. The second part of the responsibility of that team is to engage with the University community, the professional community and external parties whether that be mental health services and so on. This is an entirely new Senior Manager post and it’s been borne out by the necessity to build capacity to develop a whole institution approach to wellbeing.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

“The Welfare Policy and Project Officer post has been made permanent. This will ensure long term sustainability of the initiative. The post will also have responsibility linked to welfare inclusion more generally for ‘hard to reach’ student cohorts.” **Round 1 funded provider**

“We have extended the contract for the serious case officer and then also, once you’ve started doing something like this, you can’t stop it. And, I think something that we recognise is that, as we’ve increased our awareness raising and been open about what we’re doing and why we’re doing it. We have seen an increase in the number of disclosures, of students coming forward.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

An issue for a minority of the projects for sustaining the work has been where they were run by academic experts, rather than through corporate services or similar, and the need for embedding change within the wider organisation.

“... the difficulty is that because this is outside of the usual run of business we’re kind of going to have to integrate into other management systems but we’re not going to be doing that until the end. So, what I mean by that is the Education Committee of the University would normally be the people who sponsor this work and develop it from the beginning, and all the various people would be around the table to agree how to do that and how to mainstream it into University activity but of course that didn’t come that way. It didn’t come through those auspices, it came from me and my colleagues getting the money. So, we’ve developed this project which everybody supports but we’ve got to try and work out at the end how to embed it into mainstream provisions of the University so we’re kind of doing it back to front a little bit... we’re going to have a long period of trying to work out what do we do with it now, who manages that and owns that.” **Pre-92, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

9.3 Relative impact of Catalyst funding

Catalyst funding has contributed to the **recruitment of new staff** to enable providers to respond to the recommendations in the *Changing the Culture* report. 19% of providers without funding have done this compared to 73% of those that had received two or more rounds. [table 1] The funding has also contributed to the **change of temporary structures to permanent** structures [table 2] as reported above in Section 5.2.

The UUK survey shows that a lack of resources, sustainability of funding and the extent to which training for staff and students can be rolled out are identified as the **main barriers or challenges to enhancing progress** by the providers receiving Catalyst funding [table 17]. However, the percentage of providers identifying these as barriers decreases with the number of rounds of funding received. This may suggest that the **Catalyst funding is enabling the sustainability and embeddedness of the approaches** rather than simply funding these in the short term.

In conclusion, as a result of the Catalyst funding there are many examples (particularly among Round One projects) of increased resources within providers committed to tackling safeguarding issues. There are also more sustained and embedded initiatives and projects, including more iterative ongoing training programmes and more sustainable partnerships in place with local and regional partners. However, providers having an enhanced influence on public discourse, and ultimately an improvement in the sector's reputation on safeguarding issues, are longer-term outcomes from this work and are not yet apparent.

9.4 Lessons learnt and next steps

A key **risk to the sustainability** of safeguarding work highlighted by many participants in the research from among providers and sector organisations is that much of this work, (especially since the publication of *Changing the Culture* in 2016) has been driven by substantial contributions of time and energy by **enthusiasts and activists within providers**. This has involved staff in many cases working on these projects on top of their 'day jobs' and, in some cases, in their own time. Clearly, this model of relying on individuals' goodwill is not sustainable at either the individual or organisational level over time, and it should become more professionalised. Many participants in the research for the evaluation consider that there should be at least one full-time (depending on provider size) member of **staff managing and coordinating all the various safeguarding activities** within a provider. This individual can be focal point within the provider and participate in external networks. Ongoing funding commitments are needed from providers for these roles. We make recommendations on this in Section 11 below.

However, providers embarking on safeguarding initiatives should be aware that:

- As mentioned in Section 8 above, working in collaboration with local external partners can help sustainability. In one project, for example, the institution is established as a third-party hate crime reporting centre for students, staff and local residents, and works alongside local community groups, so the project becomes part of a broader agenda;
- Similarly, approaching the issues in the context of joining up agendas so that work in this area becomes part of wider work on, for example, mental health, creating a culture of belonging and addressing attainment gap agendas. Addressing the issues in this way can help towards sustainability of the work, and embed it into the culture of the provider.

10. Culture change

10.1 Intended outcomes

Indications that the intended outcomes of the Catalyst intervention have been achieved, as they relate to culture change within HE providers and the sector generally, would include evidence of the following changes:

- More HE providers recognising cultural change is needed (not just policies and practice);
- More HE providers with actions plans to address cultural barriers;
- More HE providers aware of barriers to cultural change;
- More students and staff empowered to advocate for themselves and others;
- More positive cultural change in HE providers as communities;
- All forms of harassment considered by all to be unacceptable;
- Increased knowledge among staff/students of all backgrounds on what constitutes sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents;
- More positive cultural change in sector;
- More HE providers extending approaches to all student safeguarding issues; and
- Less sexual offending and fewer hate incidents.

10.2 Summary assessment

Many projects identify that it is too soon to measure culture change, and that it will require several years and significant data to fully understand whether culture change is happening, and the impact of the projects on this. Although providers recognise that cultural change is needed to eradicate issues of sexual misconduct, hate crime and other forms of harassment, it is not clear whether many have clear actions plans in place designed to address cultural barriers or a better understanding of barriers to cultural change as yet.

Participants in the research do point to an increased awareness of the issues, more willingness to discuss these issues, and a recognition that culture change is needed. However, in the UUK survey, only 9% of respondents indicated that they would be adopting the voluntary question relating to student safety in the National Student Survey (NSS), which perhaps further points to the impact potential reputational risk has in this area.

Moreover, the welcome increase in students reporting incidents of misconduct is an early indicator of culture change, and there is evidence to suggest that over time perpetrators are less likely to act when they know there is a likelihood of being reported.

Additionally, there is an enhanced understanding among staff and students generally on what constitutes sexual misconduct (aided by the broader awareness of these issues in the

media and society in the past few years), although this is less the case for hate crime/incidents and online harassment.

“This whole idea of culture change, this will require very long term commitment in terms of staffing, finance, resources, to what extent you can see culture change in relation to attitudes to harassment, we’re specifically dealing with online harassment, to what extent you would be able to see these within the short term time frame of these projects is questionable. I think it is possible to begin that process, this is the language that we are using within our reports and when we’re discussing this, there’s like a research team, we all acknowledge that we are aiming to begin this process of starting to mobilise culture change but this is a very long term aim and will require long term institutional commitments to this project. And certainly the hefty funding that we’ve received has made very significant contributions to starting this process and is very valuable because of that.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

“...there is definitely momentum towards more awareness and this is really important. I think it is going to continue to build. I think at this stage, we’ve got the senior leadership team on board and there is suddenly a huge amount of additional buy-in to what we’re doing and have been doing over the last year, that I still think we have got quite a long way to go [despite three years of work]. You don’t change an institution like [provider] overnight. But there are positive sides that we are making changes towards a positive, more inclusive culture. When I say complaint culture, I do mean that more broadly and not just about sexual consent; as in do I have consent to have sex but a consent culture where people respect one another. On whatever basis.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

A small number of HE providers, particularly those with multiple rounds of Catalyst funding, and which have therefore been undertaking safeguarding work for a longer period, report fostering better links with local secondary schools and sixth form colleges through outreach work. A crucial finding was that participants across the board – students, staff, project leads and external partners – identified one key lesson for their projects: that if they were to have a real impact on culture change then, at provider level, these projects were occurring too late in young people’s development.

For real culture change to happen, participants found, conversations and interventions around gender-based violence and hate crime would have to take place before students enter higher or further education. Further research would be helpful to understand what would work in HE providers’ interactions with schools and further education colleges to support earlier discussions taking place with young people. Several projects recognise that introducing training at younger ages in schools and colleges would help a more positive culture once HE is reached.

“I just think that things like this should be tackled earlier. I feel like there is a lot of concentration on putting the funding into universities whereas this is a conversation you should be having at 15, not 19, 20.” **Student, post-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

“The thing that’s frustrating is, obviously, this is also important, but if it’s only being delivered or addressed at a university level, and you’ve gone through 18 years of your life. These are the kind of expectations and unsaid rules, things that, you know, should be literally brought throughout education. Literally, you’ve got those lessons from when you’re in, like, year seven, but I can’t tell you one time where I actually had a day that I came out of a CPHE lesson and was like, yes, today I learned something important. It was, like, globalisation, or something really woolly, and never.... Right down to the sex education it was awful, and actually there needs to be a lot of this kind of stuff incorporated into it a lot earlier. Because, then, once you do that, you’re facing less barriers when you continue doing it at this stage. That’s why you get the backlash of, you’re patronising us, and this, and that, because the assumption is you know it. But, actually, if it’s not been part of the culture that you’ve been brought up with, even within education before you get to university...” **Student, pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

The Catalyst intervention has had some impact in engaging local schools and colleges through outreach activities to support a joined-up approach to address the agenda although this remains at a very low level (around 10% compared with 4% of providers without funding). This is related to the relatively low levels of providers that state they provide information on behavioural expectations and potential sanctions in pre-arrival information (23% without funding compared to 41% of institutions with two or more rounds of funding and 32% of institutions in receipt of one round of funding). This suggests that more research is required to look at what has prompted the increase in providing pre-arrival information by those providers in receipt of two or more rounds of funding.

10.3 Lessons learnt and recommended next steps

More students and staff may be gradually becoming empowered to advocate for themselves and others, particularly because of the prevalence of positive bystander training initiatives, but this is not evidenced yet. Concerns about reputational risk are still prevalent, although work carried out under the Catalyst fund and this evaluation should help to provide the ‘safety in numbers’ mentioned by a number of providers.

Additionally, it will take much more time and effort on the part of providers and sector bodies before all forms of harassment are considered by everyone to be unacceptable on campus, with more providers extending approaches to all student safeguarding issues, including hate crime/incidents and also staff-to-student misconduct, leading ultimately to fewer incidences of sexual misconduct, hate crime/incidents and other forms of harassment.

Recommendations – Culture change

10. We recommend that further work should be undertaken to explore and understand how best to support partnership working between HE providers and schools, including looking at whether outreach may be the best way to engage secondary schools. In the first instance, we suggest that the Department of Education take this forward to consider (in discussion with Ofsted, the OfS and other sector bodies) what additional activities may be needed to stimulate conversations and interventions around sexual misconduct and hate crime at a younger age before students enter higher or further education.

11. The case for further sector level change

11.1 Overall assessment

The **aim of the Catalyst safeguarding funding** was to identify and support good practice to improve and enhance student safeguarding, looking specifically at tackling sexual misconduct, hate crime and online harassment. The rationale for the Catalyst funding approach was to make a short-term diverse intervention, designed to support high coverage activity and thereby stimulate sector-level culture change. This was based on the recommendations for providers to undertake a coordinated set of preventative and responsive actions as outlined by the UUK Taskforce's report.

The **timing of the funding** for HE providers meant that there was no time to pilot initiatives at a sector level or for pathfinders to emerge. Therefore, the Catalyst project teams put in place supporting infrastructure to address these issues using a variety of different approaches and through finding their own way. For this reason, there was some duplication of effort and little time for providers to be able to learn lessons as to the effectiveness of different approaches.

Nevertheless, this work is becoming **embedded as part of 'business as usual' within some, though not all providers, and in different ways**. Most participants in the research for the evaluation reported that one of the direct impacts that receiving Catalyst funding had on safeguarding work at their providers was the ability to progress this work more quickly and more comprehensively than would otherwise have been the case.

Crucially, the Catalyst funding intervention was timely in that it helped to maintain the momentum in the HE sector stemming from *Changing the Culture*, particularly in tackling sexual misconduct. The wider media and societal interest in challenging sexual misconduct across multiple sectors was also a significant part of the context and supported the impetus for change. Moreover, the scale of the funding across 119 projects in the sector meant that **'there's a huge safety in numbers'** for HE providers, their leaders and students themselves to be more confident in openly tackling these issues.

Overall, the findings from the research for the Catalyst evaluation have shown that although there are many issues to be resolved, **tolerance for sexual misconduct has decreased within the HE sector** in recent years through awareness raising and, correspondingly, reporting of incidents by students is now increasing. This is as a result of students' increased confidence that their provider will respond to reports and is an important early outcome and evidence of emergent culture change.

Although the HE sector's work in addressing **hate crime/incidents** is at an earlier stage than that of sexual misconduct and is less embedded, there is an enhanced awareness of these issues affecting students. There are also signs of a reduction in tolerance of hate crime (at least among the 45 providers with Round Two funding), and consequently reporting is beginning to increase. Generally, the vast majority of the Round Two funded

providers were not addressing hate crime/incidents in any meaningful or coordinated way prior to receipt of the funding.

Analysis of data from UUK’s recent survey of members carried out between October and December 2018 on progress made since the *Changing the Culture* report in 2016 enabled us to assess the contribution of the Catalyst funding to developing safeguarding (at least among respondents to the survey) in key areas. On multiple key measures, such as levels of senior leadership support, embeddedness in governance structures, reporting mechanisms, student engagement, effective partnership working and taking an institution-wide approach, the impact of the Catalyst funding has been significant on progress made by funded providers in England compared with those without funding. Moreover, this impact increases where funding has been at more than one round, and therefore where project activity has been taking place over a longer period. A clear finding from our research with both rounds of projects is that it takes more than one year to develop and embed safeguarding initiatives.

The OfS’s intervention has therefore **succeeded in stimulating a wide range of activities across multiple English HE providers** as intended. However, there remains **substantial variation** across the providers in how advanced they are, particularly in tackling hate crime/incidents and online harassment affecting students, and crucially in whether the initiatives were ‘one-off’ or have become embedded as part of ‘business as usual’ within the providers. Indicators of sustainability include many examples of increased resources within providers committed to tackling safeguarding issues. There are also more sustained and embedded initiatives and projects, including more iterative ongoing training programmes and more sustained partnerships in place with local and regional partners.

11.2 Further sector level change

The evaluation team set up and facilitated an **expert advisory group during the latter stages of the work** comprising national stakeholder organisations (OfS, NUS and UUK), expert institutional practitioners and academic experts. The purpose of the group was to consider what may be required next to help ensure effective and innovative practice developed through the Catalyst safeguarding funding is disseminated, embedded and sustained. While the group concluded that there has been substantive progress made, this is still very variable across the HE sector.

Research for the evaluation shows there remains a great deal of variation in the level of response by institutional leadership teams to the widespread problem of sexual misconduct and hate crime within HE providers. Such variations in practice provide support for arguments in favour of further impetus for change being needed. Many of the Catalyst funded providers at both rounds indicate that students now have a better understanding of how to report and what to report. They also report that the numbers of reports are increasing. However, student experiences of hate crime/incidents share in common with sexual misconduct a huge under-reporting problem, and this is one reason why it is imperative for the HE sector to do more. Additionally, the issue of intersectionality needs particularly close attention. For example, ableism appears to remain a significant problem at universities and rates of sexual misconduct may be high for disabled students yet reporting

levels remain stubbornly very low. The same may be said for international students, for whom safety remains a significant concern. This is especially important given the heavy reliance in providers' strategic plans for an expansion of the number and proportion of international students. It may also prove necessary to better ensure the safety of such students, and better publicise efforts to do so. By comparison with 'home' students, international students appear to have low reporting levels. This suggests the need to have a more bespoke set of policies and practices to target those who may be caught up within intersectional disadvantage. Similarly, BME students participating in this research reported significantly lower levels of confidence than white students on all items, and this needs further examination and response.

Consequently, **HE providers** in receipt of the Catalyst funding do need to continue to build on the work undertaken so far in the short to medium term. They should also continue to monitor and evaluate their work to better understand its impact over time and introduce further change needed as a result. For those providers yet to respond to the original UUK Taskforce's recommendations on developing a coordinated set of preventative and responsive mechanisms, there are now many examples of good policy and effective practice available on how to do so. These are described throughout this report and available elsewhere, particularly through additional guidance developed by UUK.

HE providers are well placed to contribute to the prevention of sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents affecting students in combination with ensuring appropriate personal and educational support for victims/survivors. In the short term, they can contribute to prevention by skilling staff and students in bystander intervention training and educating students (and staff) around consent and capacity. In the medium term, as reporting becomes the 'new norm' at HE providers, this may very well deter some potential perpetrators. In the longer term, if providers can contribute to influencing the next generation to be more mindful of the destructive impacts of sexual harassment and hate crime they could potentially influence generations to come. Many graduates will go on to take up senior leadership roles in society, a key part of the potential reach and influence of the HE community.

For their part, the **Government and HE sector bodies**, particularly the OfS and the Equality and Human Rights Commission, should continue to monitor the progress being made by HE providers to ensure student safeguarding in these areas. They should monitor and determine whether enough is being done by providers themselves and if this work is being sustained, with the support and encouragement from sector bodies, and/or whether any regulation may be needed in the longer term. Regulatory options range from what may be viewed as 'light touch' stewardship at one end of the continuum to measures with a higher degree of prescription in terms of both process and outcomes.

Some additional strategic recommendations are included in the remainder of this section which may help drive further positive and sustainable change, including options for the longer term.

11.3 Governance and leadership of change

The OfS (with other sector bodies such as UUK, and the National Union of Students (NUS)) and in close consultation with HE providers, should develop a set of inter-related actions, which together could constitute a framework of ‘*minimum safeguarding*’ practice for HE providers to adopt to help drive a further step change in addressing student safeguarding issues. Some initial suggestions on this minimum practice for HE providers are set out in the figure below. The OfS could work with HE providers to develop and agree these and thereafter, an agreed set of minimum actions should be actively encouraged and supported by the OfS and other sector bodies.

Progress on the adoption of the minimum safeguarding practice should also be monitored by the Government over time and consideration made of whether HE providers are making sufficient progress or whether these should become future requirements monitored through regulation by the OfS. This is not possible at present within the existing Regulatory Framework and would require future legislation. Therefore the OfS and other sector bodies should develop these expectations with the sector, then promote them to HE providers as effective practice which all HE providers should seek to adopt.

Figure 5 Possible ‘minimum safeguarding practice’

Action	Summary
<p>1. Annual reports to the institutional governing body which are publicly available covering reports, disclosures and outcomes</p>	<p>The format of such reports needs to preserve the anonymity of reporting parties of sexual misconduct and hate crimes/incidents. Under each such rubric the date of the report and date of the incident should be recorded. The date of the safeguarding multidisciplinary team meeting should be included too.</p> <p>Providers’ responses may be codified under four headings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Personal and health support; ii) Educational support; iii) Internal investigations; and iv) Police investigations. <p>For each of these categories there needs to be a clear narrative statement of the inputs and outcomes. Inputs are actions taken by the institution. Outcomes are just that.</p> <p>In terms of ‘inputs’ we would anticipate that in every case there should be an input in terms of i) and ii) subject to the agreement of the reporting party.</p> <p>Inputs in terms of iii) and iv) are likely to be less common but offered and discussed as option for the decision of reporting parties as to whether or not to go ahead with either iii) or iv) both or neither.</p> <p>In terms of ‘outcomes’, personal and health support could, for example, include specialist counselling and educational support could be educational adjustments made mindful of the particular ‘mitigating circumstances’.</p>

Action	Summary
<p>2. Integration into communications for prospective students, so they are aware of the behaviour expectations and student safety support in place, and which will remain in place throughout their student journey</p>	<p>It is potentially reassuring for prospective students to hear of arrangements in place to ensure their wellbeing and safety, and which will remain in place throughout their student journey.</p> <p>Open discussion of matters such as addressing sexual misconduct and hate crime sends a message of reassurance out to potential victims/survivors and a message of an intolerance of such behaviours to potential perpetrators.</p> <p>For those students who are uncertain of the precise requirements of establishing consent and capacity, or what constitutes a hate crime/incident or online harassment, such communications may give them the opportunity to reflect upon such matters before they need such decision making.</p>
<p>3. There need to be active communications campaigns urging victims/survivors to come forward and report their experiences</p>	<p>In short, very high reporting levels need to be actively encouraged along with disclosure levels too, to inform the development of services to ensure that victim/survivor support is optimised.</p> <p>This may very well deter some would be perpetrators too.</p> <p>Campaigns will need continued support, coordination and reinforcement at sector level to protect individual providers against reputational damage and ensure take-up.</p>
<p>4. Staff and student training programmes need to be in place</p>	<p>Disclosure training is key for staff and students enacting representational roles.</p> <p>Sessions on consent for undergraduate and postgraduate students are important early in their time at the provider along with the option to engage with bystander intervention training to contribute to prevention. This should be co-created and designed with students (as per evidence in section 6).</p>
<p>5. A member of the senior executive team needs to hold accountability for work on addressing sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents</p>	<p>Executive level responsibility and accountability for decision-making and driving and monitoring the work is effective in ensuring that a whole-institution approach is taken to addressing sexual misconduct and hate incidents.</p>
<p>6. Good policy and practice</p>	<p>Communications and policy documents need to make it explicit that internal investigations rely on a civil, in other words balance of probability, level of evidence, rather than beyond reasonable doubt as per criminal justice levels of evidence. This may help encourage more students to come forward to report.</p>
<p>7. Resources</p>	<p>It is especially important for HE providers to plan for the rise in reporting levels to ensure that support and investigations may be put in place in a timely fashion.</p> <p>One FTE per 10,000 students who specialises solely in this area would seem to be a basic requirement to support staff training and coordinate investigations and organise awareness campaigns working with student leaders.</p>
<p>8. Partnership working</p>	<p>Local and regional collaborative working and liaison with local Sexual Violence Referral Centres (SARCs), local police, other HE providers, schools and expert specialist voluntary and community organisations should be in place.</p>

For their part, **institutional governing bodies** need to hold the executive team to account in tackling sexual misconduct and hate incidents. In capturing the extent of hate incidents, it may be worth including protected characteristics in reports of such incidents. Although in practice most such ‘hate incidents’ may have as their focus racism, we need to also ensure that the other protected characteristics are included in any such reporting arrangements.

The **Committee of University Chairs** (CUC) may wish to develop a **framework for tackling sexual misconduct and hate crime** affecting students for governing bodies to hold the executive to account. Benefits of this approach would be: ensuring sustainable long-term engagement and accountability; bringing the wider leadership teams of providers into safeguarding; and raising awareness among governing bodies that they should be taking overall responsibility for safeguarding (rather than the current focus which is mainly on the executive). The framework could incorporate advice for governing bodies on what they should be seeking assurance of. This may include being better informed to aid understanding of aspects such as: under-reporting, especially for minority groups and the importance of intersectionality; liability (trustee responsibility); how to interpret the data (both quantitative and qualitative); and confidence in the appropriateness of responses/action being taken by the executive.

HE providers themselves should ensure that student safeguarding in relation to **sexual misconduct and hate crime are added to their strategic risk registers**. The benefits in doing this include: awareness raising; embedding safeguarding work across the institution; providing clarity for governing bodies; challenging the executive to act; increasing visibility; and requiring active mitigation and management (controls).

Recommendations – Governance and leadership of change

11. We recommend that:

- a. The OfS (with other sector bodies such as UUK and the NUS) should, in close consultation with HE providers develop and then promote a framework of minimum safeguarding practice (comprising a set of inter-related actions) to help drive a further step change in addressing student safeguarding issues.
- b. Thereafter, implementing this minimum safeguarding practice should be actively encouraged and supported by the OfS and other sector bodies.
- c. All HE providers should put in place measures to ensure that they at least meet this minimum safeguarding practice.
- d. Progress on the adoption of the minimum safeguarding practice should also be monitored by the Government over time and consideration made of whether HE providers are making enough progress or whether these should become future requirements monitored through regulation by the OfS. This is not possible at present within the existing Regulatory Framework and would require future legislation.

12. We recommend that the CUC develops a framework for governing bodies to hold executive teams to account for tackling sexual violence, sexual misconduct and hate crime/incidents affecting students.

13. We recommend that HE providers should ensure that student safeguarding in relation to sexual misconduct and hate crime are added to their strategic risk registers. The benefits in

Recommendations – Governance and leadership of change

doing this would include: awareness raising; embedding safeguarding work across the institution; providing clarity for governing bodies; challenging the executive to act; increasing visibility; and requiring active mitigation and management (controls).

11.4 Coordination and development

Better coordination and development of safeguarding initiatives are needed within individual providers and between groups of providers. Discussions on potential solution options with the expert group focussed on the following.

Developing **specialist expertise within HE providers** would be beneficial. This would be pro-rata depending on size (i.e. very small providers could collaborate; very large providers could have multiple posts). One FTE per 10,000 students who specialises solely in this area could provide support staff training, coordinate investigations and organise awareness campaigns working with student leaders. The benefits of having specialist expertise in safeguarding within every provider would be to provide: students with access to knowledgeable services; and staff working in this area with adequate resource/pay and professionalisation.

Additionally, a **network for specialist safeguarding practitioners should be developed and supported**, potentially meeting regionally, with representatives from each region also meeting nationally to develop and share effective practice. Many of the specialist practitioners operating in the sector are already informally networked, but a funded or subsidised and coordinated organisation would be able to:

- Share effective practice, resources and data (reducing duplication and wastage);
- Help prevent 'burn-out' and provide support to a developing group of professionals;
- Connect local partnerships and collaborations with other agencies and organisations with all HE providers in the area; and
- Be a communications tool, support trend monitoring and provide a source of information and a sounding board for policymakers and regulators.

HE providers which are already part of existing successful local or regional partnerships, could help through the network to draw more of the HE providers of all types which are less advanced on introducing safeguarding measures into partnerships and collaborative networks so that they can learn how best to make progress quickly, and learning can be optimised on how best to work in collaboration with other organisations.

Recommendations – Coordination and development

14. We recommend that HE providers should develop specialist safeguarding expertise within their organisation. This would be pro-rata depending on size (i.e. very small providers could collaborate; very large providers could have multiple roles). One FTE per 10,000 students who specialises solely in this area could provide support staff training and coordinate investigations and organise awareness campaigns working with student leaders.

Recommendations – Coordination and development

15. We recommend that the OfS should support and subsidise a coordinated network for specialist safeguarding practitioners. This network could potentially meet regionally to encourage collaboration and sharing of effective practice, with representatives from each region also meeting nationally to develop and share effective practice.

11.5 Addressing gaps among groups of providers and students

Further research is needed to explore the safeguarding experiences and needs of **groups of students with individual and intersectional protected characteristics**, including international students, disabled students and BME students. Similarly, research and/or support for small pathfinder projects may be helpful to understand the issues for **groups of HE providers**, which have less-well developed safeguarding infrastructure in place, such as small and specialist providers and alternative providers.

Recommendations – Addressing gaps with hard to reach groups

16. Sector bodies, including the OfS and EHRC, should consider the need for conducting or commissioning bespoke research to explore the safeguarding experiences and needs of particular groups of students with individual and intersectional protected characteristics, including international students, disabled students and BME students.
17. The OfS should consider conducting or commissioning bespoke research and/or providing support for small pathfinder projects to understand the issues for groups of HE providers which have less-well developed safeguarding infrastructure in place, such as small and specialist providers and alternative providers, and thereby help stimulate development.

11.6 Knowledge gaps

Finally, the need for enhancing knowledge of safeguarding incidents was discussed with the expert group including issues such as: prevalence data monitoring of incidents and outcomes (at both the individual HE provider and sector level); developing standard ways of measuring impact and success; and collating existing research, guidance and resources, and tools.

“...in terms of reporting; there are lots of different mechanism for reporting which I feel is really positive, but then also how do we ensure that we’re identifying all the trends and making sure that we’re not missing something that needs any kind of preventive action or further specific training. So, I think that is something that we definitely need to look at it as we develop.” **Pre-92 provider, more than one round of Catalyst funding**

The **standardisation of impact measures** across interventions that have shared areas (e.g. training, awareness raising, student engagement) was identified as having value to understand impact across the sector, which was identified by participants in the research and the expert group as an area requiring further research and development. The take-up of the optional NSS questions on students’ perceptions around safety is low at present unfortunately, but if HE providers would agree to implementing these, they could become a

key component of a basket of measures for determining impact over time of safeguarding initiatives within providers and enable benchmarking between them.

Further to this, the expert group also discussed the need for a **cost benefit analysis study of prevention and response activities being undertaken within HE providers** (starting with sexual misconduct and then hate crime/incidents). Such a study would: provide strong evidence for investment, helping make the business case as well as the moral case for providers; provide realistic calculations of spend; and offer providers benchmarking data.

Additionally, the group considered possible ways of encouraging HE providers to collate and more openly share reporting rates (of disclosures and reports and their outcomes), and whether there may be a need for eventually developing standardised data collection across the HE sector. There was agreement in the group that census/report data collection was neither necessary nor implementable at this stage, and that further regulation is not needed at this stage.

However, there is a need for better accuracy and consistency in data collection to address some of the knowledge gaps. Therefore, guidance needs to be developed on good reporting systems. A team of data specialists could be commissioned by the OfS and other sector bodies, and in consultation with the Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA), to quickly devise a set of data standards which could be used by individual providers. Adopting these standards and publishing the results would enable HE providers to undertake their own campus climate surveys and compare these with their peers. Strong encouragement is needed by the OfS for providers to do this on a sufficient scale across the sector, to give HE leadership teams confidence that there is ‘safety in numbers’, and drive further positive culture change within the sector.

Recommendations – Knowledge gaps

18. We recommend that the OfS, and/or other sector bodies, and in consultation with HESA, research and develop a standard set of impact measures for safeguarding interventions that have shared areas (e.g. training, awareness raising, student engagement).
19. We recommend that the OfS (and/or other sector bodies) conduct or commission a cost benefit analysis study of prevention and response activities being undertaken within HE providers (starting with sexual misconduct and then hate crime/incidents). Such a study would: provide strong evidence for investment, helping make the business case as well as the moral case for providers; provide realistic calculations of spend; and offer providers benchmarking data.
20. There is a need for better accuracy and consistency in data collection to redress some of the knowledge gaps. We recommend that:
 - a. The OfS should develop and disseminate guidance which will encourage HE providers to collate and more openly share reporting rates (of disclosures and reports, and their outcomes). This could be accomplished by the OfS and other sector bodies commissioning a team of data specialists who would, in consultation with HESA, quickly devise a set of data standards which could be used by individual providers.
 - b. The OfS should strongly encourage HE providers to adopt these data standards and undertake their own campus climate surveys, publish the results and compare these with

Recommendations – Knowledge gaps

their peers as part of the framework of “minimum safeguarding practice” suggested above.

- c.** In the medium to longer term, the Government should monitor progress being made via the levels of reporting and publication of the data by HE providers and consider whether there is any need for future provider-level regulation in this area.

Appendix One: About the safeguarding projects

The Office for Students (OfS) provided a total of £4.7m to higher education (HE) providers in one-to-one matched funding of up to £50,000 to undertake a range of initiatives across a total of 119 projects as follows:

- The **first round** funded 63 one-year projects addressing safeguarding students on campus, mainly focussed on tackling sexual misconduct. Some projects started on time from April 2017, but many were delayed in starting until the beginning of the new academic year in autumn 2017 and completed towards the end of 2018.
- There was a gap identified in the scope of the first set of projects, which focussed mainly on tackling sexual misconduct, hence a **second round** of funding was issued to 45 providers to tackle hate crime/incidents and online harassment on campus. These one-year projects commenced in October 2017, again with some starting slightly later than this and taking nearer 18 months to complete.
- Finally, a **third round** of funding for 11 providers was issued to address hate crimes directed at students on the grounds of religion or belief. Given the learning from the earlier rounds in the time required for safeguarding projects, the OfS provided Round Three funding for two years and these projects are running between March 2018 and March 2020. A further change at Round Three is the OfS bringing these projects together to form a nationwide, collaborative network of specialist knowledge and leading practice.

The **Round One funding** was designed to cover a broad range of activity to support and safeguard students through:

- Developing the bystander intervention initiative, which trains staff and students in preventing or reducing violence against women and hate crimes, particularly among students;
- Developing projects, systems improvements, training packages and partnership working models to drive real change in this area;
- Delivering key activities and partnerships with students' unions or equivalents; and
- Developing transferable good practice for the benefit of students and institutions across HE.

The OfS then selected the **Round Two projects** for funding across a range of themes and criteria, which were based on an assessment of the HE provider's ability to:

- Establish and strengthen institutional and digital infrastructure, such as effective reporting and information sharing;

-
- Develop and sustain positive campus relations between different groups;
 - Develop respectful approaches to freedom of speech, on-campus debate and protest;
 - Safeguard and support international students;
 - Develop and sustain whole-institution or city- or region-wide collaboration projects;
 - Safeguard against external sources of hate and harassment;
 - Tackle sexual harassment or violence, where projects focus on intersectional aspects of identity such as race, faith, sexual orientation, gender identity, or disability; and
 - Develop innovative approaches to tackling issues such as sexual coercion, disability-related extortion, revenge pornography, or online stalking or bullying.

A list of the providers funded under the first, second or both Catalyst calls is shown below in Figure 5, along with the project titles and an indication of whether the provider had also received funding as part of Round One, Two and / or Round Three of the Catalyst funding.

In summary, 71 HE institutions and 14 FE Colleges received funding as follows:

- 38 received funding for projects under Round One only (therefore one year's Catalyst safeguarding funding and activity);
- 18 received funding for projects only under Round Two (one year's funding and activity);
- Two received funding for projects only under Round Three;
- 19 received funding for projects under both Rounds One and Two (funding and activity over two years);
- Two received funding for projects under both Rounds Two and Three (funding and activity over three years); and
- Six providers received funding for projects under all three rounds (therefore this smaller group have had four years of funded activity).

Figure 5 Projects by provider and level of Catalyst funding

Provider	Round 1 project title	Round 2 project title	Round 3 project title	Round 1 funding	Round 2 funding	Round 3 funding
Anglia Ruskin University		ARUsafe – Development of an online reporting tool to enable better reporting of and sharing good practice on hateful, sexually violent, harassing or discriminatory behaviours on campus			X	
Aston University		The Aston Alliance			X	
Blackburn College	UCBC Safeguarding Hub			X		
Blackpool and The Fylde College	(HESE) HE Safeguarding Enrichment	Tackling Hate Crime and Online Harassment		X	X	
Bournemouth University		Responding to Hate Crime			X	
Brunel University London	Respect @ Brunel			X		
Buckinghamshire New University	NeverOK: Sexual Harassment, Assault and Violence on Campus Intervention Project	Hate Crime Cultural Change Project		X	X	
Bury College	All Part Of The Solution	Digital Values		X	X	
Canterbury Christ Church University	Student Peer to Peer Bystander Training			X		
City of Plymouth College		Students Against Hate Crime			X	
Cleveland College of Art and Design	CCAD Prevents and Safeguards			X		
Coventry University	University Challenge	University Challenge: safeguarding students	Tackling religion-based hate crime on the multi-faith campus	X	X	X
De Montfort University	Safe Campus Initiative			X		
Durham University			Religious Hate Crime in the North East: Driving Interventions for			X

Provider	Round 1 project title	Round 2 project title	Round 3 project title	Round 1 funding	Round 2 funding	Round 3 funding
			Acceptance, Reporting and Supporting			
Goldsmiths, University of London	Sexual Violence & Harassment: changing the culture and preventing harm	Establishing Third Party Hate Crime Reporting Centre		X	X	
Havering College of Further and Higher Education	Mechanisms to raise awareness and support for HE students facing mental health issues and domestic abuse			X		
Imperial College London	An integrated bystander intervention initiative and sexual violence support programme			X		
Keele University	Taking Responsibility – Ensuring Effective Prevention, Support and Response to Sexual Violence on Campus	'Never Stand By' – Ensuring a Coordinated Community Response to Hate Incidents and (Online) Harassment at Keele		X	X	
King's College London	It Stops Here – Training strategy		It Stops Here: Religious Based Hate Crime	X		X
Kingston University	ME & (K)U – Creating Healthy Relationships			X		
Lancaster University	Safeguarding Project	Hate Crimes Project		X	X	
Leeds Beckett University	Developing a Cross Campus Zero Tolerance Approach			X		
Leeds City College	Safeguarding Awareness	Tackling Hate Crime		X	X	

Provider	Round 1 project title	Round 2 project title	Round 3 project title	Round 1 funding	Round 2 funding	Round 3 funding
Lincoln College	Safeguarding for HE in FE	Tackling hate crime and online harassment – HE in FE		X	X	
Liverpool John Moores University	Safer Student Communities			X		
Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine		Welfare First			X	
LSE (London School of Economics and Political Science)	Changing the culture: training-based responses to the UUK Taskforce's recommendations	Changing the culture: building bridges on campus	Changing the culture: creating a faith-inclusive campus	X	X	X
London Southbank University	Stand up, speak out	Stop the Hate Trait		X	X	
Loughborough University	Challenging the Culture of Sexual Violence			X		
Manchester Metropolitan University	Raising awareness and stimulating positive cultural change to prevent or reduce sexual violence and harassment	'Take it outside' Film Festival		X	X	
Middlesex University	The Development, Implementation and Evaluation of a Safeguarding Toolkit Designed Specifically for the HE Sector	The no home for hate project		X	X	
Newcastle University		NU Culture: Respect Without Barriers			X	
Northumbria University		Building Capacity to Tackle Online Hate Crime and Stalking on Campus	Responding to Religious-based Hate Crime on Campus		X	X
Nottingham Trent University	We want to know: enabling and responding to disclosures of sexual violence and sexual	NTU Stands Together	Real Faith, Real Stories, Real Students	X	X	X

Provider	Round 1 project title	Round 2 project title	Round 3 project title	Round 1 funding	Round 2 funding	Round 3 funding
	harassment affecting students					
Oxford Brookes University	Improved safety through better awareness			X		
Queen Mary University of London	Zero-tolerance			X		
Roehampton University	UR Prevention and Protection			X		
Sheffield Hallam University	Supporting the development of ethical behaviour in transitioning students	Don't stand by: supporting staff and student communities to hold respectful discussion of personal and political identity	Standing Together Against Hate: Developing effective community partnerships to tackle religious-based hate crime affecting students	X	X	X
SOAS		Student Leadership in Inclusive Campus Environments (SLiCE)			X	
Southampton Solent University			Human Library: facilitating powerful conversations between LGBTQ+ and faiths communities to foster understanding and empathy			X
St. George's, University of London	Consent for all: within healthcare and outside it			X		
Sussex Coast College		Expect Respect			X	
Teesside University	Multi-Agency Student Safeguarding Model			X		
The Bournemouth and Poole College	Speak Out and Step Up Project			X		
The Manchester College		Human Libraries			X	

Provider	Round 1 project title	Round 2 project title	Round 3 project title	Round 1 funding	Round 2 funding	Round 3 funding
The Open University	Student Safeguarding Training Development			X		
UCLAN (University of Central Lancashire)		Hate Crime and Online Harassment: Understanding and Changing Culture			X	
University of East London		Step Up to Stop Hate			X	
University of Bath	A university community approach to preventing sexual harassment and assault	Combatting online harassment and hate crimes: extending the University community approach	Tackling religiously-based hate crime: extending the University community approach	X	X	X
University of Bedfordshire		Bedfordshire Cyber Awareness Programme (BCAP), together with guidance on effective practice to support online welfare more broadly for all students			X	
University of Birmingham	CUUB: Creating the Culture	Developing Community Relationships and Responses		X	X	
University of Bristol	Student safeguarding on campus			X		
University of Cambridge	Sexual misconduct prevention and victim support			X		
University of Chester	Leading Behavioural Change for Sexual Consent			X		
University of Chichester	STEP IN			X		
University of Derby	It Takes A University			X		
University of East Anglia	A Student Community Safeguarding Partnership			X		

Provider	Round 1 project title	Round 2 project title	Round 3 project title	Round 1 funding	Round 2 funding	Round 3 funding
University of Exeter	Safeguarding Against Sexual Violence	Safeguarding Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic students		X	X	
University of Gloucestershire	What is our Campus Culture?			X		
University of Huddersfield		Enhancing a Safe & Secure Learning Community			X	
University of Hull	Creating a campus culture; "Safe and healthy relationships at the University of Hull"			X		
University of Kent	Violence against Wo/men on Campus Project			X		
University of Leeds		Hate Crime – not on our campus			X	
University of Leicester	Safeguarding by Standing Together	Standing Together Against Hate Crime	Standing Together Against Religiously Motivated Hate	X	X	X
University of Lincoln	Building Respect and Changing Cultures in the University Community	Building Respect and Changing Cultures in the University Community (Phase 2)		X	X	
The University of Liverpool	Changing campus culture through student leaders	#Speakout: calling out harassment, changing the online campus		X	X	
The University of Manchester		Active Bystander Initiative	Passivity, the Bystander and Religious Based Hate Crime		X	X
The University of Northampton	New Spaces: Safeguarding Students from Violence and Hate			X		
University of Portsmouth	Establishing an 'active bystander' culture of citizenship to embed zero tolerance of gender-based violence and hate crime at	Speak UP Step UP Portsmouth: tackling hate crime and sexual violence as part of the city-wide		X	X	

Provider	Round 1 project title	Round 2 project title	Round 3 project title	Round 1 funding	Round 2 funding	Round 3 funding
	the University of Portsmouth, with a particular interest in developing best practice for staff-student sexual misconduct	Restorative Portsmouth initiative				
The University of Sheffield	Empowering students to take an active role in the University community – combatting sexual violence, harassment & hate crime			X		
University of Suffolk		Creating a community of digital civility and safety			X	
University of Sunderland	Embedding Bystander interventions in University life			X		
University of Sussex		Hate crime on university campuses: Repairing the harms of hate and prejudice through student-led dialogue			X	
The University of Warwick	Respect for all at Warwick			X		
The University of Westminster	Development of a bystander intervention for safeguarding in UK universities			X		
University of Winchester		Safeguarding against Online and Social Media Abuse			X	
University of Wolverhampton		Tackling Hate Crime/Online Harassment Through Education			X	
University of Worcester	Bystander Intervention Development (BID)	Transgender Education and Support Programme		X	X	
University of York	Cascading training to change culture: an institution wide approach to prevention,	Developing an intersectional approach to training on sexual		X	X	

Provider	Round 1 project title	Round 2 project title	Round 3 project title	Round 1 funding	Round 2 funding	Round 3 funding
	intervention and response to sexual violence	harassment, violence and hate crime				
University College London	Resilience of International Students to Sex Crime (RISSC)			X		
UWE (University of the West of England)	Creating an Inclusive Campus Culture	Online reporting tool for anti-social behaviour and hate crime at UWE		X	X	
Walsall College	Student Safeguarding on Campus			X		
West Nottinghamshire College	SOS: Safety of students			X		
Wirral Metropolitan College	Safety Through Empowerment			X		
York St John University	Student Safeguarding: Building Healthy Relationships			X		

Appendix Two: About the evaluation

The Office for Students (OfS) appointed independent evaluators from [Advance HE](#) in early 2018 to support learning, exchange and dissemination of effective practice from the Catalyst-funded projects, and help establish ‘what works’ in safeguarding students. Evaluation of Rounds One and Two of the Catalyst safeguarding intervention is now complete, however work on the evaluation will continue until spring 2020 to cover the Round Three projects. This overall evaluation is in addition to the individual projects’ evaluations. Terms of reference for the formative and summative evaluation process were to:

- Monitor and support projects to assess their impact and draw out learning to inform sector and institutional practice about innovative approaches to safeguarding students, with a focus on the role of students in the safeguarding process;
- Support communities of practice among the projects in the areas of tackling sexual misconduct, hate crime and online harassment, with a focus on ‘what works’ for the higher education (HE) sector and help encourage active partnership working and collaboration across projects;
- Encourage projects to recognise and actively incorporate the importance of place in the context of student safeguarding, recognising that students exist and identify as students within physical and digital spaces both within and outside of their institutions;
- Draw out and promote an intersectional approach to identify if and how students with multiple protected characteristics are impacted by projects and the effectiveness;
- Help ensure learning is identified and shared to benefit the wider HE sector;
- Develop an understanding of barriers to effective safeguarding in a specific HE context, and develop recommendations to facilitate wider sector engagement; and
- Report to the OfS and provide recommendations arising from the projects about future policy and strategy in terms of student safeguarding.

A mixed methods though mainly qualitative approach was taken to the evaluation which was informed in summary by the following main activities:

- Field research with representative samples of the Round One and Round Two projects comprising multiple face-to-face, video and telephone interviews and focus group discussions with project teams, senior leaders and other staff within funded providers, with students engaged in projects and with external partner organisations.
- Face-to-face and online focus group discussions and interviews with students involved in the design or delivery of projects, such as those delivering training, campaigns, materials development and research, as well as student evaluators and student members of project boards or working groups.

- An e-survey of students and student representatives circulated via project teams to both Round One and Round Two funded providers in May 2018, and a similar smaller survey of the Round Two provider students engaged in projects in January 2019.
- Documentary review and analysis of the project teams' documentation including the bids, interim and final reports submitted to the OfS, and secondary research sources.
- Numerous semi-structured interviews, discussions and correspondence with senior leaders, project team leads, external partners from regional and specialist community expert organisations and specialist practitioner and academic subject matter experts.
- Multiple round table events and interactive webinars with projects to discuss different aspects of 'what works' in tackling sexual misconduct, hate crime and online harassment affecting students, together with relevant sector experts and representatives from the OfS, Universities UK (UUK) and the National Union of Students (NUS).
- Participation and observation at various related events and discussions organised by the OfS, UUK and other sector organisations and some of the Catalyst-funded HE providers over the period of the evaluation.
- Analysis of anonymised quantitative data from a UUK survey of members carried out between October and December 2018 on progress made since the *Changing the Culture* report in 2016. This enabled us to assess the contribution of the Catalyst funding to developing safeguarding in key areas. Details are at [Appendix Four](#).
- Finally, an Expert Group comprising national stakeholder organisations (the OfS, NUS and UUK), expert institutional practitioners and academic experts was convened towards the conclusion of the main evaluation process. This group met for two full day workshops in early 2019 to: consider 'what works' in tackling sexual misconduct, hate crime and online harassment; and to help determine strategic recommendation for policymakers, sector bodies and HE providers, designed to ensure that the effective and innovative practice developed through the Catalyst funding can be disseminated, embedded and sustained across the HE sector.

The **main outputs** from the Catalyst safeguarding evaluation have been:

- Regular Formative Reports for the OfS to share findings on effective practice in student safeguarding as these were collected from the research and evaluation activities;
- Two Thematic Analysis Reports covering Round One and Round Two projects²⁷;
- This Summative Evaluation Report covering Round One and Round Two;
- An Interim Thematic Analysis Report and a Final Summative Report on the Round Three projects will be produced in summer 2019 and spring 2020 respectively.

²⁷ Available at: <https://www.officeforstudents.org.uk/publications/evaluation-of-safeguarding-students-catalyst-fund-projects/>.

Appendix Three: Evaluation Framework

Outcome relationship mapping (ORM), a form of logic modelling, is being used as part of the framework for the evaluation to help identify the impact of the Catalyst funding through developing measures which show the extent to which the programme is contributing to the outcomes it aims to impact. Outcomes are ‘changes’ described in terms of their impact (e.g. better, more, worse, quicker).

ORM assisted the evaluation process by identifying the anticipated inputs, outcomes and impacts which the projects are seeking to achieve because of the funding. We are using the ORM specifically to:

- + Identify the outcomes that are sought for the Catalyst programme across the English HE sector;
- + Validate the outputs needed to deliver these outcomes;
- + Analyse each of the applicable initiatives and map these together; and
- + Map any externalities, risks or unintended consequences.

A summary of the evaluation framework is below and a tabular representation of all the intended outcomes by theme and type is included in the following figure below.

Figure 6 Summary evaluation framework



Figure 7 Outcomes by theme and type

Theme	Type of outcome	Desired outcome
Leadership	Precursor	Stronger senior leadership involvement / more executive ownership of issues (safety)
		All HE provider leaders proactively committed to eradicating issues
	Principal	More HE providers taking an institution-wide approach
	Positive	All VCs recognise need to support work
Majority of VCs taking action to direct work		
Effective management	Precursor	More holistic processes in place
		Clearer HE provider reporting of policies and processes
		More HE providers with revised codes of conduct
		More HE providers with revised safeguarding policies
		More tackling of <u>all</u> student safeguarding issues
		Changes to student and staff contracts
Academic involvement	Precursor	Safeguarding issues more embedded in curriculum
		More use of academic expertise (e.g. criminologists, sociologists, psychologists)
Student involvement	Precursor	More student-centred approaches and interventions in place
		More co-creation of initiatives with students
		Greater involvement of students in designing solutions
		More account of victims/survivors' voices in new approaches
Student training	Precursor	More students trained in bystander intervention
		More awareness training for students on un/acceptable behaviours
		More training as part of student induction
Student experience	Principal	Safer students
		More students have safer, more positive experience
		Fewer incidents of misconduct/harassment on campus
		Better student support
	Positive	Student wellbeing core to more of HE provider's value propositions
		Students feel safer to be themselves
		Improved student mental health
		Improved student retention
		Improved student attainment
Reporting	Precursor	Better reporting mechanisms and systems in place
		Holistic reporting process in place
		More awareness of how to report among students
	Principal	Increased reporting of sexual misconduct
		Increased reporting of hate crime & harassment

Theme	Type of outcome	Desired outcome
		Increased reporting of online incidents
		Increased confidence of victims/survivors in reporting
	Positive	Reporting sexual misconduct and hate incidents the new norm
Specialist resources	Precursor	Increased numbers of full time equivalent (FTE) specialists (in terms of ratio to student numbers)
		More specialist staff (for sexual violence and hate crime)
		More specialist staff trained in investigating reports
Staff training	Precursor	More training as part of staff induction
Partnership / collaboration	Precursor	Agreed HE provider definitions of misconduct across sector
		Increased working with NUS, trade unions, sector organisations and campaign groups
		Increased collaboration and partnerships of HE sector with third sector and local communities
		Better relationships with community organisations
		More local/regional partnership working and community engagement
	Principal	Improved sector collaboration on these issues
	Positive	Shared sector understanding of a zero-tolerance approach
		Positive influence on Govt policy and cross silo working
		Better relationships with community groups
Research Council requirements on issues		
Monitoring to enable evidence-based decision making	Precursor	More trend analysis
		Governing bodies aware of incidents and actions to eradicate them
		Core metrics in place
		Improved understanding of what doesn't work and why
		Report recommendations do not sit on a shelf
	Principal	Improved HE provider knowledge and understanding of misconduct (how it manifests and how to prevent and mitigate impact)
		Improved decisions by HE providers on what to do to safeguard students
		All HE providers respond effectively to sexual misconduct and hate incidents
	Positive	Better investment decisions by HE providers
		Greater value for money of interventions
		Better understanding of gaps
		Better understanding of true level of incidents
		Better data is collected by HE providers
		Better targeted interventions possible

Theme	Type of outcome	Desired outcome
		More HE providers ensuring lessons learned are implemented to instances in wider community
		Disperse data is collated and correlated
		Improved understanding of impact evaluation in HE
		More HE providers ensuring lessons learned are implemented for staff misconduct issues
Culture / attitude / behaviour change	Precursor	More HE providers recognising cultural change needed (not just policies and practice)
		More HE providers with actions plans to address cultural barriers
		More HE providers aware of barriers to cultural change
		More students and staff empowered to advocate for themselves and others
	Principal	More positive cultural change in HE providers as communities
		All forms of harassment considered by all to be unacceptable
		Increased knowledge among staff/students of all backgrounds on what constitutes sexual misconduct and hate incidents
		More positive cultural change in sector
	Positive	More HE providers extending approaches to all student safeguarding issues
		Less sexual offending
		Fewer hate incidents
		More students ask for consent
Risk	Risk / negative outcome	Reputational damage from increased reporting and media spotlight
		Reputational risks for HE providers which try something and get it wrong
		Lack of work in other areas of equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI) – trade-off
		Active opposition – 'not a priority', 'only trouble', 'nanny state', 'not role of HE providers', issues with(in) identity politics
Sustainability	Precursor	More resources committed to tackling issues
	Principal	More sustained and embedded initiatives and projects
		Sustained and ongoing work in sector
		Iterative ongoing training programmes
		More sustainable partnerships in place between HE providers and local partners
	Positive	More influence on public discourse
		Improved sector reputation on safeguarding issues

Appendix Four: Data tables from quantitative analysis

Part of the ongoing work of Universities UK (UUK) in this area has included a commitment to assess the sector's progress in implementing the recommendations from the *Changing the Culture*²⁸ report published in 2016. A two-stage approach has been taken so far as follows:

- Stage One was a short qualitative study (conducted by Advance HE) based on research with a stratified sample of 20 universities across England, Wales and Northern Ireland. The outcomes from this study were published by UUK in the report *Changing the Culture: One Year On*²⁹.
- Stage Two consisted of a survey to all UUK members carried out between October and December 2018 comprising 27 questions. A total of 93 out of 136 UK HE providers responded to the UUK survey on an anonymised basis. This survey was developed in consultation with other sector bodies and agencies, including with the Advance HE evaluation team to enable us to use the (anonymised) data as part of the evaluation, specifically to compare providers with and without different levels of Catalyst safeguarding funding. The purpose was for us to better assess and approximate the contribution of the Catalyst funding (at least among respondents to the survey) in key areas. UUK's second progress report is forthcoming.

Evaluation team's analysis of UUK survey data

The evaluation team analysed the quantitative data from the UUK survey, focussing on key aspects of the Evaluation Framework and categorising the responses as shown below. The key findings are shown in relation to each theme throughout the body of this report. The number of respondents in each group were as follows:

- All responses = 93
- English institutions = 78
- Scottish institutions = 11
- Welsh institutions = 2 (not analysed separately)
- Northern Irish institutions = 2 (not analysed separately)

²⁸ See: Universities UK (2016). *Changing the Culture*. Available at: <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/changing-the-culture-final-report.aspx>. And Universities UK (2016). *Guidance for Higher Education institutions: How to handle alleged student misconduct which may also constitute a criminal offence*. Available at: <http://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Pages/guidance-for-higher-education-institutions.aspx>.

²⁹ See also: Universities UK (2018). *Changing the Culture: One Year On*. Available at: <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2018/changing-the-culture-one-year-on.pdf>.

-
- Student services accountable for leading on the delivery of this area of activity = 26
 - VC /PVC/CEO/Academic Registrar/Registrar accountable for leading on the delivery of this area of activity = 58
 - Under 5k FTE students = 12 (note: this differs from the UUK categorisation of small as under 10k FTE students). Of this group two are Scottish institutions and the remainder are English. Eight of the 12 are specialist institutions.
 - Specialist institutions = 13 (not analysed separately as a group. Size ranges from 770 FTE students to 16,895 FTE students)
 - 25k+ FTE students = 12
 - No Catalyst funding (English providers only) = 26
 - 1 round only of funding = 31 (English providers only)
 - 2+ rounds of Catalyst funding (English providers only) = 22
 - 2+ rounds of Catalyst funding, under 25k FTE students (English providers only) = 17.

The data tables from our analysis are shown below and where the table numbers are given in square brackets these are referred to in the body of the report.

Table 1 - Q3. How has your institution responded to the recommendations in the Changing the Culture report?

	Student Services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All responses
Q3.1. Set up a working group, interdisciplinary team or project to do this	81%	93%	42%	100%	73%	94%	100%	100%	88%	82%	87%
Q3.2. Developed a strategy and action plan	65%	62%	17%	75%	54%	71%	77%	76%	67%	36%	61%
Q3.3. Developed an institution-wide approach to address this agenda	69%	67%	25%	92%	38%	65%	91%	88%	63%	91%	67%
Q3.4. Committed longer term resources to support activities	50%	48%	25%	75%	46%	42%	68%	65%	50%	45%	49%
Q3.5. Recruited new staff	35%	36%	8%	58%	19%	39%	73%	71%	41%	9%	38%
Q3.6. Secured buy-in from senior management	73%	79%	17%	92%	50%	87%	91%	94%	76%	73%	75%

Table 2 - Q4. How will your institution ensure sustainability of initiatives to address harassment, hate crime and gender-based harassment?

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q4.1. Change temporary structures to permanent structures e.g. Working Group(s), Interdisciplinary Teams, or Project(s)	50%	33%	0%	50%	27%	45%	36%	35%	36%	36%	38%
Q4.2. Ensure Working Groups, Teams, or Projects are embedded within the reporting and governance systems	65%	72%	50%	83%	54%	68%	73%	76%	64%	91%	69%
Q4.3. Ensure any changes are embedded into the institution's governance systems or structures, policies, practices and processes	88%	86%	67%	100%	81%	87%	91%	88%	86%	100%	88%
Q4.4. Regularly review progress	73%	83%	58%	83%	69%	84%	86%	88%	79%	73%	80%

Table 3 - Q5. Do you provide an update to your Governing Body or Court or to a Committee of your Governing Body or Court on the University's response to the Changing the Culture report or on your progress to address harassment, hate crime and sexual misconduct?

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k	England only	Scotland only	All
Yes	42%	55%	55%	58%	52%	45%	59%	65%	52%	45%	51%
No	12%	9%	18%	8%	8%	10%	5%	0%	8%	18%	9%
Not yet but planned	38%	36%	27%	25%	36%	39%	36%	35%	36%	36%	37%
Do not know	8%	0%	0%	8%	4%	6%	0%	0%	4%	0%	3%

Table 4 - Q6. Which of the following groups have been involved in developing your institution's strategic response to the Taskforce's recommendations?

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q6.1. The students' union/guild	88%	93%	67%	100%	85%	97%	91%	88%	91%	91%	91%
Q6.2. Students from different backgrounds and identities	62%	53%	8%	67%	19%	65%	77%	76%	53%	55%	52%
Q6.3. Reporting/Responding students	27%	36%	17%	50%	23%	35%	36%	24%	32%	36%	32%
Q6.4. Staff	88%	97%	75%	92%	88%	97%	95%	94%	94%	91%	94%
Q6.5. Third sector and/or local specialist agencies, such as Rape Crisis centres or similar services for sexual misconduct or National LGBT Hate Crime Partnership etc	73%	78%	50%	92%	58%	81%	86%	82%	74%	82%	75%

Table 5 - Q7. Please state what preventative activities your institution has implemented or tested

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q7.1. Student bystander programme	58%	60%	8%	83%	27%	74%	82%	82%	60%	64%	59%
Q7.2. Student consent training	73%	66%	33%	75%	50%	71%	68%	65%	63%	73%	65%
Q7.3. Student-led activities (other than bystander or consent initiatives), such as peer-to-peer learning/support	42%	43%	17%	50%	27%	45%	45%	47%	38%	64%	41%
Q7.4. Adopting a zero-tolerance culture across institutional activities	58%	64%	25%	50%	46%	61%	64%	71%	56%	64%	59%
Q7.5. Conducting preventative campaigns	73%	72%	42%	83%	58%	81%	86%	88%	74%	45%	71%
Q7.6. Engaging with local schools and colleges through outreach activities to support a joined-up approach to address this agenda	8%	7%	0%	8%	4%	10%	9%	6%	8%	0%	6%
Q7.7. Engaging with other providers or local organisations within the community to support a joined-up community approach to this agenda	65%	62%	42%	58%	38%	55%	77%	76%	55%	73%	59%
Q7.8. Conducting research to get a better understanding of where interventions should be targeted and what works	31%	47%	17%	50%	27%	42%	59%	65%	41%	45%	42%
Q7.9. Updating discipline procedures	69%	84%	67%	92%	77%	77%	91%	94%	81%	73%	81%
Q7.10. Student code of conduct	58%	52%	42%	58%	50%	58%	36%	35%	50%	55%	53%

Table 6 - Q8. How are behavioural expectations and potential sanctions made clear to students for incidents of sexual misconduct or violence, harassment and hate crime?

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q8.1. Official policies (online or in print)	85%	91%	67%	83%	88%	87%	95%	100%	90%	82%	89%
Q8.2. Signed document/contract	19%	29%	17%	42%	31%	35%	18%	18%	29%	9%	27%
Q8.3. Induction talk	58%	66%	50%	58%	58%	65%	77%	82%	65%	36%	62%
Q8.4. Student handbook	38%	45%	42%	33%	50%	48%	23%	24%	42%	18%	41%
Q8.5. Social media	42%	47%	8%	50%	38%	45%	50%	53%	44%	45%	43%
Q8.6. Campaigns	77%	74%	25%	92%	58%	81%	82%	76%	73%	73%	73%
Q8.7. Websites	77%	64%	25%	67%	58%	74%	77%	82%	69%	64%	67%
Q8.8. Pre-arrival information	27%	36%	17%	42%	23%	32%	41%	47%	31%	36%	32%

Table 7 - Q9. There are two additional, optional questions relating to student safety in the National Student Survey (NSS) questionnaire. These invite students to indicate their answers, on an agree-disagree scale, in response to these statements: a. I feel safe to be myself at university/college. b. My institution takes responsibility for my safety. Will your institution be adopting the voluntary questions relating to student safety in the NSS?

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Yes	12%	9%	10%	8%	4%	17%	5%	6%	9%	9%	9%
No	31%	27%	30%	25%	32%	27%	27%	29%	28%	36%	29%
Do not know	58%	64%	60%	67%	64%	57%	68%	65%	60%	45%	62%

Table 8 - Q10. Please state what response activities your institution has implemented?

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q10.1. Clear information for students on how to report	69%	83%	42%	83%	58%	84%	91%	94%	77%	73%	77%
Q10.2. Developed or improved reporting mechanisms	69%	81%	50%	92%	62%	84%	95%	100%	79%	73%	78%
Q10.3. Developed or improved online resources or tools	69%	74%	17%	83%	50%	84%	86%	88%	73%	73%	72%
Q10.4. Training for staff	77%	84%	42%	83%	73%	87%	86%	94%	82%	64%	81%
Q10.5. Improved support for Reporting student(s)	77%	88%	33%	83%	69%	90%	91%	94%	83%	64%	82%
Q10.6. Improved support for Responding student(s)	62%	78%	33%	67%	58%	74%	82%	88%	71%	36%	68%
Q10.7. Partnerships with local specialist services established to enhance referral pathways for students	65%	79%	50%	75%	54%	81%	82%	82%	72%	64%	72%
Q10.8. Developed or improved recording of data on incidents	69%	78%	42%	75%	65%	84%	77%	82%	76%	45%	73%

Table 9 - Q11. Please indicate the options/mechanisms available for students to report a disclosure of the following types of misconduct / Q11.1. Student-to-student sexual misconduct

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No Funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q11.1.1. In person	92%	95%	83%	92%	96%	90%	95%	100%	94%	82%	92%
Q11.1.2. Dedicated reporting tool	42%	43%	8%	42%	23%	45%	64%	71%	42%	27%	41%
Q11.1.3. Website/online	54%	72%	42%	67%	65%	65%	68%	76%	65%	64%	65%
Q11.1.4. Mobile app	4%	10%	0%	8%	4%	3%	14%	12%	6%	9%	8%
Q11.1.5. Telephone	85%	83%	58%	58%	81%	81%	82%	94%	81%	64%	80%
Q11.1.6. Other	23%	19%	33%	8%	19%	26%	23%	24%	23%	18%	22%

Table 10 - Q11.2. Staff-to-student sexual misconduct

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q11.1.1. In person	88%	95%	83%	92%	96%	87%	95%	100%	92%	82%	91%
Q11.1.2. Dedicated reporting tool	42%	41%	8%	42%	23%	45%	59%	65%	41%	27%	40%
Q11.1.3. Website/online	54%	67%	42%	67%	65%	61%	59%	65%	62%	64%	61%
Q11.1.4. Mobile app	4%	10%	0%	8%	4%	3%	14%	12%	6%	9%	8%
Q11.1.5. Telephone	81%	81%	58%	58%	81%	77%	77%	88%	78%	64%	77%
Q11.1.6. Other	23%	19%	33%	8%	19%	26%	23%	24%	23%	18%	22%

Table 11 - Q11.3. Hate crime (including incidents and crimes related to race, religion, disability, sex/gender or sexual orientation)

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q11.1.1. In person	92%	95%	83%	83%	96%	87%	95%	100%	92%	82%	91%
Q11.1.2. Dedicated reporting tool	31%	38%	8%	50%	19%	42%	50%	47%	36%	18%	34%
Q11.1.3. Website/online	54%	69%	42%	75%	65%	61%	64%	65%	63%	64%	62%
Q11.1.4. Mobile app	4%	7%	0%	0%	4%	0%	9%	12%	4%	9%	5%
Q11.1.5. Telephone	85%	84%	58%	58%	81%	81%	86%	100%	82%	64%	81%
Q11.1.6. Other	19%	24%	33%	8%	23%	23%	32%	35%	26%	18%	24%

Table 12 - Q11.4. Online bullying and harassment

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q11.1.1. In person	88%	93%	83%	75%	96%	87%	86%	94%	90%	82%	89%
Q11.1.2. Dedicated reporting tool	31%	38%	8%	42%	23%	42%	45%	47%	36%	18%	34%
Q11.1.3. Website/online	50%	69%	42%	67%	65%	61%	59%	65%	62%	64%	61%
Q11.1.4. Mobile app	4%	10%	0%	8%	4%	3%	14%	12%	6%	9%	8%
Q11.1.5. Telephone	85%	83%	58%	58%	81%	81%	82%	94%	81%	64%	80%
Q11.1.6. Other	23%	19%	33%	8%	19%	26%	23%	24%	23%	18%	22%

Table 13 - Q12. Please state if students have a publicised option to make an anonymous report for the following forms of misconduct.

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q12.1. Student-to-student sexual misconduct											
Yes – reporter remains anonymous	27%	38%	17%	33%	19%	39%	36%	41%	31%	27%	31%
Yes – both remain anonymous	27%	16%	0%	25%	15%	23%	27%	24%	22%	18%	20%
Option not available	42%	41%	58%	33%	58%	35%	32%	35%	42%	45%	43%
No answer	4%	5%	25%	8%	8%	3%	5%	0%	5%	9%	5%
Q12.2. Staff-to-student sexual misconduct											
Yes – reporter remains anonymous	27%	36%	17%	33%	19%	39%	32%	35%	29%	27%	30%
Yes – both remain anonymous	27%	14%	0%	25%	15%	23%	23%	18%	21%	18%	19%
Option not available	42%	45%	58%	33%	58%	35%	41%	47%	45%	45%	45%
No answer	4%	5%	25%	8%	8%	3%	5%	0%	5%	9%	5%
Q12.3. Hate crime											
Yes – reporter remains anonymous	19%	40%	0%	33%	15%	45%	36%	41%	32%	18%	30%
Yes – both remain anonymous	19%	16%	8%	8%	19%	16%	18%	18%	18%	18%	17%
Option not available	58%	39%	67%	50%	58%	35%	41%	41%	45%	55%	46%
No answer	4%	5%	25%	8%	8%	3%	5%	0%	5%	9%	6%
Q12.4. Online bullying and harassment											
Yes – reporter remains anonymous	23%	39%	8%	36%	19%	42%	35%	35%	32%	18%	30%
Yes – both remain anonymous	19%	14%	0%	9%	12%	19%	20%	18%	17%	18%	16%
Option not available	54%	42%	67%	45%	62%	35%	40%	41%	46%	55%	46%
No answer	4%	5%	25%	9%	8%	3%	5%	6%	5%	9%	8%

Table 14 - Q13. Please state if your institution collects, records and stores data in relation to the following forms of misconduct.

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q13.1. Student-to-student sexual misconduct											
Yes	69%	86%	58%	75%	69%	94%	82%	94%	82%	73%	82%
No	8%	2%	0%	0%	4%	0%	5%	6%	3%	9%	3%
No answer	12%	3%	33%	8%	8%	3%	5%	0%	5%	18%	6%
Depends on student's wishes	12%	9%	8%	17%	19%	3%	9%	0%	10%	0%	9%
Q13.2. Staff-to-student sexual misconduct											
Yes	69%	88%	58%	75%	73%	94%	82%	94%	83%	73%	83%
No	8%	2%	0%	0%	4%	0%	5%	6%	3%	9%	3%
No answer	12%	3%	33%	8%	8%	3%	5%	0%	5%	18%	6%
Depends on student's wishes	12%	7%	8%	17%	15%	3%	9%	0%	9%	0%	8%
Q13.3. Hate crime											
Yes	69%	83%	58%	75%	73%	90%	73%	82%	79%	73%	80%
No	8%	5%	0%	0%	4%	3%	9%	12%	5%	9%	5%
No answer	12%	3%	33%	8%	8%	3%	5%	0%	5%	18%	6%
Depends on student's wishes	12%	9%	8%	17%	15%	3%	14%	6%	10%	0%	9%
Q13.4. Online bullying and harassment											
Yes	69%	81%	50%	64%	65%	90%	73%	82%	77%	73%	76%
No	8%	7%	8%	9%	12%	3%	9%	12%	8%	9%	8%
No answer	12%	4%	33%	9%	8%	3%	5%	0%	5%	18%	8%
Depends on student's wishes	12%	9%	8%	18%	15%	3%	14%	6%	10%	0%	9%

Table 15 - Q14. Please state if data is collected centrally or not.

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q14.1. Centrally i.e. there is a centralised point where data is collated and stored	46%	60%	33%	58%	42%	65%	64%	71%	56%	18%	53%
Q14.2. A non-centralised approach is used	31%	29%	25%	25%	31%	35%	23%	24%	31%	36%	30%

Table 16 - Q16. Has institution begun implementing the UUK/Pinsent Masons guidance on dealing with student behaviour which may constitute a criminal offence?

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Fully implemented	31%	36%	8%	42%	23%	42%	32%	29%	33%	27%	33%
Partially implemented	31%	47%	50%	25%	46%	39%	55%	71%	45%	27%	42%
Not yet started	35%	12%	17%	25%	23%	16%	9%	0%	17%	36%	19%
No answer	4%	5%	25%	8%	8%	3%	5%	0%	5%	9%	5%

Table 17 - Q22. What are the main barriers or challenges to enhancing progress in your institution?

	Student services	VC etc	Under 5k FTE	Over 25k FTE	No funding	1 round only	2+ rounds	2+, under 25k FTE	England only	Scotland only	All
Q22.1. Developing a whole institution approach	31%	31%	33%	25%	42%	29%	32%	24%	35%	9%	31%
Q22.2. Lack of resources	42%	48%	25%	25%	46%	52%	41%	47%	47%	27%	45%
Q22.3. Sustainability of funding	54%	34%	25%	33%	31%	58%	41%	47%	44%	27%	40%
Q22.4. Obtaining ownership from senior managers	8%	14%	0%	8%	8%	13%	18%	18%	13%	9%	14%
Q22.5. Extent to which training for staff and students can be rolled out	46%	59%	33%	42%	58%	65%	41%	41%	56%	64%	57%
Q22.6. Lack of an evidence base for interventions	23%	33%	25%	8%	42%	23%	18%	24%	28%	27%	28%
Q22.7. Responding to an increase in the volume of disclosures	15%	40%	0%	25%	15%	29%	50%	65%	31%	18%	31%
Q22.8. Developing effective partnerships with other organisations	19%	7%	8%	0%	8%	13%	5%	6%	9%	18%	10%
Q22.9. Working with survivors to embed the survivors voice	27%	24%	8%	42%	23%	35%	14%	12%	26%	18%	24%
Q22.10. Lack of guidance and support in some areas	19%	28%	25%	25%	35%	26%	23%	24%	28%	0%	25%

Contact us

Advance HE Consultancy
consultancy@advance-he.ac.uk
+44 1904 717500
www.advance-he.ac.uk/consultancy

Advance HE

—
(Registered Office)
Innovation Way, York Science Park,
Heslington, York YO10 5BR

—
First Floor, Westminster Tower
3 Albert Embankment, London

—
Peer House, 8–14 Verulam Street
London WC1X 8LZ SE1 7SP

© 2019 Advance HE. All rights reserved.

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of Advance HE. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any storage and retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. Such permission will normally be granted for non-commercial, educational purposes provided that due acknowledgement is given

Advance HE is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales no. 04931031. Registered as a charity in England and Wales no. 1101607. Registered as a charity in Scotland no. SC043946. Advance HE words and logo should not be used without our permission. VAT registered no. GB 152 1219 50.