

THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTMINSTER: DIVERSITY AND DIVERGENCE

A report by the Independent Panel

September 2015

[Blank page]

THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTMINSTER: DIVERSITY AND DIVERGENCE

A report by the Independent Panel

| | | |
|-----|---|----|
| 1. | PANEL MEMBERSHIP..... | 5 |
| 2. | BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT | 5 |
| 3. | METHODS AND PROCESS..... | 6 |
| 4. | CHARACTER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTMINSTER | 6 |
| 5. | THE UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSE | 7 |
| | Staffing and approach..... | 7 |
| | External speakers – process and procedures | 7 |
| | Awareness and engagement..... | 8 |
| 6. | THE PREVENT STRATEGY | 8 |
| 7. | POSSIBLE AREAS OF INTERNAL REFORM | 9 |
| | Role of the Students' Union | 9 |
| | External pressures and monitoring | 10 |
| | Diversity training and development..... | 10 |
| | Faith Advisers | 11 |
| | Role of the Interfaith Adviser | 11 |
| | Staff support and mentoring | 11 |
| | Grievances, complaints and support procedures | 11 |
| 8. | SECTOR-WIDE ASPECTS | 12 |
| | Working in partnership..... | 12 |
| | The Prevent Duty..... | 12 |
| 9. | THE WIDER CONTEXT | 12 |
| | University influence..... | 14 |
| 10. | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 14 |
| | Internal..... | 14 |
| | Sector-wide..... | 15 |
| | Wider context..... | 15 |
| 11. | CHAIRMAN'S CONCLUDING NOTE | 16 |

[Blank page]

THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTMINSTER: DIVERSITY AND DIVERGENCE

A report by the Independent Panel

1. PANEL MEMBERSHIP

1.1 The Lord Morgan (Chair)

Historian, former Vice Chancellor, University of Wales and member of the House of Lords' Constitution Committee.

1.2 Lakshmi Cheeli

New business creator and HR professional by qualification, Lakshmi is keen on Diversity in Business and facilitating collaboration across markets.

1.3 Smita Jamdar

Partner and Head of Education at Shakespeare Martineau LLP. A leading education specialist, Smita regularly advises on topics such as human rights and duties of care to students.

1.4 Fiyaz Mughal OBE

Director, Faith Matters. Social Entrepreneur and former adviser to the then Liberal Democrats Leader, Nick Clegg MP, on interfaith and preventing radicalisation and extremism.

2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

2.1 The Independent Panel was established by The University of Westminster to review how the University manages the promotion of diversity and freedom of speech within the institution. This included practice, policies and processes regarding the approval of external speakers and assessing the robustness of the University's engagement with the Prevent agenda.

2.2 The key focus of the Independent Panel was to:

- i. Scrutinise the University's current policies and processes, implementation and impact on staff and students;
- ii. Assess the effectiveness of the University's policies and processes through discussion with staff, students and the Students' Union;
- iii. Consider further improvements not least in light of new legislation; and
- iv. Any wider recommendations regarding government and sector wide implications.

3. METHODS AND PROCESS

- 3.1 The panel met on five occasions between 11 May and 10 June 2015. In addition, the chairman had an initial meeting with the University of Westminster Vice-Chancellor (VC). The panel conducted 20 interviews, including interviews with the Vice-Chancellor, the Chair of the Court of Governors (Pro Chancellor), several members of the senior management team, University of Westminster Students' Union (UWSU) staff and representatives of student societies. In addition, the Panel were fully serviced by the University with documents on its policy and process in relation to academic and financial strategy, organizational structure, and the approach to cultural and religious diversity, the running of student societies and many other matters. This allowed the Panel to obtain a very full picture of the University's objectives, procedures and aspirations for the future.

4. CHARACTER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTMINSTER

- 4.1 The University of Westminster is a large, complex institution of over 20,000 students from more than 150 nations in the process of rapid development. For a number of reasons, it is more challenging than some other universities to administer:
- a. It consists of several physically separate locations (Regent Street, Marylebone Road, New Cavendish Street, Well's Street, Little Titchfield Street and Harrow) and much effort has been applied to create a uniform system of organization, including in relation to operating the Prevent policy, and a 'one-University' ethos.
 - b. It is a very large, highly metropolitan university neither collegiate like Oxford or Cambridge nor a campus university. It has nearly 3000 staff including a third of which are part time visiting lecturers. Eighty percent of the 'home' undergraduate student population live at home; others have left home on entering university. There are few residential halls where students from different backgrounds come together, share thoughts and live in close contact with each other. This poses particular challenges including student isolation or loneliness.
 - c. There is inevitably a very close interaction with the outside community, including on religious matters, and thus a possible danger of so-called 'entryism' not simply through outside speakers coming in but through a close - albeit unstructured and informal - involvement with students elsewhere and others. If this kind of influence becomes too intense, the climate of student relations could change and perhaps deteriorate.
 - d. Over forty percent of the student body is (predominantly British) black and minority ethnic (BME). In many ways this diversity of ethnic and religious bodies is a source of strength since it makes for cultural diversity of a positive kind in the University. But potentially it could also lead to friction with and between groups (many different strands of Islam are represented across the student body, of course), and between them and other student organizations. This could lead to

disputes on cultural or moral issues, which would need particularly sensitive and skilful handling.

5. THE UNIVERSITY'S RESPONSE

Staffing and approach

- 5.1 The Panel was impressed with all the officers of the University, including officers of the Student Union, for the intelligence and awareness that they showed in responding to the possible security or ideological issues that might emerge from such a complex institution. They rightly felt that the diversity of the student population at Westminster was a quality which should in many respects be cherished and celebrated. Several of these officers, however, reported that they felt under pressure following some years of rapid change within the institution, and were all too aware of the immensity and complexity of the tasks with which they were entrusted.

Political themes and legislation

- 5.2 The University has responded in a variety of ways to the political themes that have arisen in recent years, to the unfavourable publicity raised by recent events, especially that surrounding the former student 'a Mohammed Emwazi' identified in the press as 'Jihadi John', and to the many issues raised by the government's Prevent Strategy as elaborated in the Counter-Terrorism Bill passed through the last parliament just before the election. In the past two years, the University has responded to the challenges of growing ethnic and religious diversity and possible extremism on the campus with vigour. It has woven the key points embodied in the Prevent policy into major aspects of its programmes, while continuing to have a prime regard for freedom of speech, outlook and movement within the university amongst its large and multi-cultural student body. Thus an important new committee, the Referred Student Activities Committee (RSAC), was set up in 2014 to monitor outside speakers coming into the university. This was an issue which had given rise to sharp controversy, especially over possible visiting speakers to the Islamic Society who had strong views on such topics as the role of women or LGBTI questions.

External speakers – process and procedures

- 5.3 The University has adopted a procedure of formally assessing all proposed external speakers. The External Speaker Assessor (ESA) who also serves as Interfaith Adviser, has powers to interrogate such proposed speakers in advance, to assess their preparedness to abide by the University's values and policies. In high profile or controversial cases, the ESA refers the case to the RSAC. When external speakers attend, University staff may be present and the event filmed, or recorded. Although this raises the difficult precedent of a university monitoring ideas circulating amongst its students, this seems to have worked well enough, and to have been broadly (though certainly not universally) accepted. The Panel would suggest that perhaps more effort be applied in ensuring that possible outside speakers, and the societies inviting them, adhere more promptly to the timetables demanded. The Panel heard about cases where the proper operation of the procedure had been compromised by the short notice given by societies to the ESA about proposed outside speakers.

- 5.4 The RSAC is well aware of the possible danger of appearing to target particular societies, notably Muslim groups, in their concern to monitor outsiders, but action is sometimes unavoidable. Proposed outside speakers, who do not accept the University's regulations and guidelines would be refused access. Various university officers are involved in the training of university staff in such difficult areas as risk assessment, and embedding an awareness of possible unacceptable doctrines or behaviour within the general processes of the university, along with having a duty of care in protecting the cultural integrity and physical safety of everyone within the institution. It was recognised that it was difficult to make staff training mandatory.

Awareness and engagement

- 5.5 University officers have also woven this new awareness into their general activity. One took care to emphasise the special character and values of the University of Westminster and the importance of working in partnership with other institutions in seeking to find common lines of policy. Another has added this new dimension to the supervision of student well-being and happiness on the campus, making more evident the routes to expressing concern. Other officers have worked closely with staff and the Students' Union to ensure that the Prevent approach is better understood and that diversity training is extended. The Regional Prevent Co-ordinator (not a university employee) works to integrate the procedures at Westminster with those of over twenty-five other institutions in the London area (not a straightforward task) and to ensure that students are 'on board', although it should be said that the effectiveness of this, a policy introduced by an external body, is not clear. The Students' Union is fully engaged in trying to mitigate some mistrust within the student body and to ensure that the mechanism for channelling inter-faith activities operates better – although one officer admitted that this was not always the case. The officers of the Student Union are active in taking on their new responsibilities in these areas, including taking steps to monitor external speakers, while admitting that the situation was far from perfect in terms of possible friction within the student body. Finally, an active Court of Governors undertakes a constant re-evaluation of policy in this areas, a difficult matter especially in dealing with physical and other communication off-campus. In all these respects, the internal procedures of the university would appear to have been significantly re-oriented, and some real progress made.

6. THE PREVENT STRATEGY

- 6.1 There was diversity of opinion about how helpful or constructive the government's policy was likely to be. Some felt it provided a more clarified framework and useful terms of reference in guiding policy in this sensitive area. Others found it significantly less useful. Terms like 'risk', 'radicalisation' or 'a threat to democracy', traditional in counter-terrorism measures, were vague in themselves and not easy to reconcile with the traditional freedoms which existed in western universities. In Britain, the liberal, sceptical spirit of the Frenchman Voltaire is still abroad in the land. The government's term 'non-violent extremism' was particularly slippery when attempts were made to give it some meaning. It was also not easy to grasp the idea of university officers being confronted with a 'statutory duty' in enforcing the Strategy,

with (in theory) the threat of legal action if they were deemed not to be doing so. Some felt that the Prevent Strategy was not working and perhaps never could in a free society: it alienated rather more than it protected.

- 6.2 How far 'guidance' led to more prescriptive approaches about the behaviour of students and their societies needed more careful thought. One key university officer felt that the Prevent document was 'not a good benchmark' and it was often said to be difficult in getting an intelligent and articulate body of university academics, with their own varied range of attitudes, to accept it. Government directives of 'following best practice' did not appear to be universally accepted, nor was there a clear consensus about what constituted 'best practice' in this area. They challenged the essence of the necessarily personal, trusting relationship between 'academic' and 'student', and could do damage similar to that allegedly caused within the medical/nursing and other professions.

7. POSSIBLE AREAS OF INTERNAL REFORM

Role of the Students' Union

- 7.1 The Panel felt there was clear concern that arose from the role of the Students' Union, an autonomous body independent of the University but nevertheless receiving substantial funding from it in carrying out its work. It had the important task of monitoring the operation and running of all societies. While the Panel were most impressed by the Students' Union officers that it met, it was not clear if they were necessarily best placed to judge on their own such key matters as whether to refer outside speakers to the ESA, or disseminating the main issues of Prevent amongst the student body. It did not apparently receive guidance from other, more senior members of the university and should be encouraged to do so.
- 7.2 In partnership with the University the Students' Union should be more pro-active in monitoring the behaviour of some of the student societies, notably the Islamic Society, be more forceful in instructing this Society to hold proper elections and attend public activities in which other student societies participate, and be more effective in ensuring that societies obey the rules governing them. They should consider the possibility of more direct action such as withdrawing funding or facilities, withdrawing support for room bookings on campuses, or even removing recognition from aberrant student societies. Women's' groups did not feel adequately supported by the Students' Union. The contact between Students' Union Officers and student societies was described as 'sporadic' and it should not be so. If the Union feels unable to act along these lines, for whatever reason, the Vice-Chancellor and Court of Governors should do it for them, if necessary, pointing out that the University's funding of the Student Union is dependent on how effectively they conduct their role. The same need for active monitoring applies to transparency in the way that the funds and equipment at the disposal of student societies are used.
- 7.3 The Students' Union needs to be unusually pro-active and visible in these areas. While each of the University sites include Students' Union offices and social spaces for students, there is no recognisable Students' Union building, as there is in many

other universities, and its presence is therefore a little abstract and inaccessible. The Panel also heard some concern that the Union did not always respond sympathetically to societies which felt intimidated by religious pressure and did not believe that their concerns were properly listened to. A common theme emerging from the information provided to the Panel was a fear of appearing prejudiced for or against particular groups if action was taken. For example, the Panel heard repeatedly that action over concerns about the conduct of the Islamic Society had not been taken for fear of appearing Islamophobic. As the Panel describe elsewhere, concerns had in fact been raised by Muslim students themselves, for instance over the availability of the prayer rooms and demand for their accessibility, while the Panel heard of cases of others who would have raised concerns too had they thought action would result.

- 7.4 The Student Union officers should surely receive the same kind of professional diversity training and mentoring afforded for the university staff. Their independence of status should not be used as an excuse for failing to ensure this since the Union is fulfilling here a crucially important role in seeing that the University carries out its statutory duty and that its precious reputation is safeguarded. The officials of the Students Union that the Panel met appeared to concur with a more forceful approach to ensuring that the student community is a happy and tolerant one. The role of the Union, as things stands, seems to us a significant gap in what the University is doing to protect a responsible student community.

External pressures and monitoring

- 7.5 Perhaps inevitably, pressure and influences off campus are a difficult area in which students, living mainly at home or in the community, can be exposed to sometime damaging or even dangerous suggestions. In this sense, the RSAC might apply its energies and talents not only to monitoring the physical presence of outside speakers but also the external influence of the social media and available information technology. Outside activities appear to impact on student life not just through formal meetings but more subtly, for instance through religious institutions and activities of a proselytizing kind. The unusually prominent role which faith considerations appear to play in the university give this issue of external pressures a particular degree of importance.

Diversity training and development

- 7.6 The Panel heard evidence that suggested that students themselves might benefit from diversity training, very much focussing on its positive aspects, and not simply seeing diversity as a kind of ideological threat. This might apply in such areas as the variety of cultural responses within such a student body, eg in defining such terms as disrespectful or provocative behaviour which can appear so different from culture to culture. What governs policy should be that the supreme quality of being at the University of Westminster flows from being a student, a beneficiary of higher learning and the search for truth which transcends boundaries and frontiers. Other themes, including religious fervour (to which the university with its seventeen faith advisers appear to give full, even excessive, attention) are subsidiary to this, and the intellectual freedom that flows from it.

Faith Advisers

- 7.7 The Faith Advisers should see their role as primarily assisting their flock as students, rather than crusaders for a faith, in which a crucial aspect is tolerant acceptance of the diverse views within the University. Perhaps a more secular range of advisers could also be brought to bear here, to address issues that have nothing to do with religion (social, political etc.). The present system of personal tutors is perhaps not as robust as it could be: as with 'moral tutors' at the older universities, the pastoral influence of more senior academics could be an invaluable anchor here for impressionable young people perhaps in some cultural or intellectual turmoil.

Role of the Interfaith Adviser

- 7.8 The Panel also wondered at the very difficult task imposed on the Interfaith Adviser – an excellent, tolerant and sympathetic person. This position is held at a difficult time in relation to religious bodies in the university and can pose a very considerable burden requiring much courage and strength of character. This role asks the person in post to both serve as linking person between the faiths and as the External Speaker Assessor, a very different kind of role and possibly even leading to conflict of interest at times (at least in theory). Both roles are of crucial importance in so diverse a student body. Perhaps they should be split up or else a deputy acquired to assist in the manifold tasks. Some additional financial aid for support external to the University would be helpful.

Staff support and mentoring

- 7.9 Consideration should be given by the University to the provision of mentoring and other support to staff at the frontline for different issues relating to the Prevent Duty. The Panel heard that two members of staff reported being under considerable pressure.

Grievances, complaints and support procedures

- 7.10 The procedures for ventilating grievances in cases of intimidation or other unpleasant behaviour between students or their societies, seemed far from universally clear. In one case a student recalled the pressure faced in private, the difficulty felt in gaining succour or redress, and the assumed lack of sympathy from the Students' Union. The problem resided in extreme hostility from other religious groups rather than from secularists or unbelievers. Another two cases reported some distress experienced when virtually threatened by religious groups who objected to their society being in existence at all. It should be emphasised that in a university, equality - religious, gender and in sexual preference - should be the deciding principle. Women's student organisations are sometimes subjected to pressures which should not exist on a university campus.
- 7.11 The grievance and support procedures at Westminster, inevitably perhaps, do not work smoothly in every case, nor are they always as transparent as they should be. More progress could be made in making them pellucidly clear to the students. One officer gave their view that the system for forwarding anonymous student complaints about bad behaviour should be improved, and the Panel would urge the University to take this forward, since there is dissatisfaction with the effectiveness of this area at

the moment. This principle, of course, applies to many categories of students beyond religious groups. Feminist or other women's bodies, LGBTI students, and those espousing unorthodox or allegedly radical political beliefs, should be eligible for precisely the same level of protection.

- 7.12 The University's policies and procedures as presented to the Panel were deemed to be appropriate and fit for purpose as currently written. However with regard to implementation of the policies, the Panel heard a repeated call for the information to be better communicated to staff and students. It would be useful to explore how Staff and Student Engagement surveys could be used to test the efficacy of the policies.

8. SECTOR-WIDE ASPECTS

Working in partnership

- 8.1 The Panel would urge on the efforts of the Vice Chancellor and his colleagues to inter-act with other institutions in London. It was noted that some of them did not so inter-act. As experience in many other countries has shown, notably in the US and France in the 1960s, disaffection and conflict can spread very rapidly from one campus to another with great speed, whether the grievances ventilated are genuine or mistaken. A hotline should be established, at least across all London's universities, among other things to counter hostile propaganda in the press and to encourage a collective sense of appropriate responses by university authorities. (The same techniques could be used e.g. in dealing with assaults on women students). This is an important aspect of the off-campus influences mentioned above.

The Prevent Duty

- 8.2 The University should continue to use its own officers in key areas in this direction. The regional Prevent Coordinator is necessarily less in touch with internal affairs in University than its own officers. At the same time, the University should move in this direction while remaining true to its own excellent touchstones of freedom, tolerance, and championing a diversity of viewpoints open to inquiry and to rational debate rather than cultural or spiritual aggression or intimidation. That means among many other things using its own judgement in interpreting the guidelines of the government's Prevent Strategy, and assessing the possible legal and educational implications.

9. THE WIDER CONTEXT

- 9.1 There is, however, a very serious, broader context for all these issues. The government's Prevent strategy loomed large in our initial discussions as the point of departure for our inquiries. But, by the end, Prevent seemed a less fundamental issue. The more critical matter was not pressure from without but the atmosphere from within the University. It is of supreme priority that the values and purposes of the University should govern behaviour. Otherwise, its essence will be fundamentally weakened and the university experience of students diminished. While, therefore, the Panel were greatly heartened by the liberality of spirit governing the policy of all the

key university officers, they were disturbed by the way in which some of student life operated.

- 9.2 In the case of the Islamic Society in particular it would be a dereliction of duty not to report that the Panel were disturbed by some aspects of its outlook and practices as reported to us. Its officers and members appear to conduct themselves not as inquiring, open-minded leaders of a student society mixing with other students, but apostles of a self-contained faith, concerned very largely with matters of religious orthodoxy and perceived heresy, including amongst other Muslims, Shias, Sufi etc., outside the Society. It emerged from our discussions with officers of the Islamic Society that they believed their role was primarily about securing the right kind of people to be teachers and moral guardians of the Islamic faith. They did not see their roles as being facilitators, advocates or co-ordinators in providing the best possible advice, service or discussion platforms for all Muslim students (a highly diverse group as mentioned above in 4.1 (d)) but as providing religious instruction to students. It was clear that groups or people they regarded as being 'un-Islamic' would not be able to progress within the Society. According to a number of those interviewed, the views of women Muslims were not given equal weight and standing even when positive advice was given to the Islamic Society from the Students' Union. Issues of this kind have not been prominent in our universities of late.
- 9.3 In practical terms, the Islamic Society, despite its professions to the contrary, does not appear to hold open democratic elections for officers. The Panel were told that its officers are judged not by their competence or personal qualities but by their doctrinal position, whether they are seen as 'sound' and reliable Muslims capable of inculcating the faith amongst their flock. The lack of open and democratic elections means that it is run by a self-perpetuating in-group. It is alarming that some of the university and Student Union officers the Panel met were quite unaware of this dogmatic narrowness and intolerance. The Society does not appear to subscribe fully to the university's very proper guidelines on tolerance and respect for other believers (and non-believers, a category of whom the Panel heard surprisingly little in our inquiries). It makes no effort to encourage others not of their faith to join their Society (though it does not prevent them from joining). It holds no joint meetings with other societies and appears to have little wish ever to do so. It appears to prefer the convenience of the University in accessing the Muslim population: one witness suggested that the experience of strong religious fervour is much greater within the University than outside, making it sound as if the University is regarded as an easier forum for disseminating the faith. The Society makes only limited effort to conduct activities of a more secular kind (eg having discussions of Islamic art and architecture, or perhaps history), though the Panel did hear talk of a most interesting 'Golden Age of Islam' event which focussed on matters like the great Islamic contribution to medical sciences and mathematics, which would have been of the greatest intellectual value.
- 9.4 Its attitude to women students or officers is sometimes hostile or intimidatory. One officer spoke of this behaviour being 'tolerated thus far'. This should no longer happen. It has no place in higher education and is totally unacceptable. The Panel

were greatly saddened to hear evidence that committee members of the Islamic Society would not engage with Muslim female employees, or even listen to them. Therefore they would be unable to carry out their professional duties effectively without seeking assistance from male colleagues in order to undertake work or communications with the Society. It is incumbent on all the authorities in the University of Westminster at all levels to counter this kind of dogmatic intransigence which runs contrary to the liberal traditions of Western universities, and increasingly universities in predominantly Muslim countries (Malaysia for one, to our personal knowledge). Otherwise, all the rules and procedures in the world will not remove the existing and potential problems building up for the university.

University influence

- 9.5 In particular, the Panel urge the Court of Governors (which includes people of immense distinction and deep experience in public life) to be highly pro-active in seeing that university rules are obeyed in the spirit as well as in fact, that student societies are encouraged to be outward-looking and not an inwardly-directed sect of true believers, and that the ideals of free, untrammelled intellectual inquiry and the search for truth flourish within the institution. This should be a matter of absolute priority.
- 9.6 The University will surely progress, and most of what the Panel heard and saw was most heartening. Like the Security Services, the Panel found no evidence at all to support journalistic claims that the University of Westminster was a breeding-ground for extremism, let alone terrorism. But if a change of practice and custom in a major part of the student community cannot be achieved, the university's rightly celebrated diversity of outlook will produce not a market for new ideas but an enclosed place of indoctrination, not a means of opening up the minds of the intelligent, idealistic young on which our society depends, but a way of keeping them permanently and dangerously closed, perhaps with international implications.

10. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Internal

- 10.1 The role played by the Students' Union should be greatly improved in monitoring the activities of societies, the use of funds and equipment and adherence to university regulations and procedures. More training should be undertaken. If necessary, the Vice Chancellor and Court of Governors should step in to help.
- 10.2 There should be more monitoring of off-campus influences, including religious. This includes some basic social media monitoring (using open source materials), of issues that students within the University may be raising. Indeed it is one way of ascertaining whether students may be targeted, or even harassed by specific groups or those espousing specific dogmas or ideologies.
- 10.3 There should be more diversity training provided for students.

- 10.4 Faith advisers (only two of whom out of seventeen are Muslim) should be encouraged to play a more extended role with societies, and secular advisers also considered.
- 10.5 The Interfaith Adviser should be given staff and other help: at the moment the role has to carry too heavy a double burden almost alone which is unfair. It was curious that all societies, including secular ones, had to go through the Interfaith Adviser, which might seem inappropriate. Perhaps an assistant second officer might be helpful in this context. It might also be desirable to separate the posts of External Speaker Assessor and Inter-faith Adviser as they are clearly different (and just conceivably conflicting) responsibilities
- 10.6 Procedures on enforcing the university's rules and regulations on harassment, intimidation and intolerance should be much clearer and should be properly enforced, as they are not. The Panel found the University's policies and processes to be fit for purpose on paper but more needs to be done fully to test and assess those policies and processes in practice, perhaps through staff and student engagement surveys.

Sector-wide

- 10.7 There should be more collaboration between London's universities on these issues, and a hotline set up between institutions to disseminate information and compare institutional responses.
- 10.8 The importance and need for the Prevent Duty to support and guide the higher education sector is clear but further development and training amongst staff and students is required to ensure the legislation better reflects and understands the needs and values of the higher education context.
- 10.9 The Prevent policy clearly raises issues of fundamental importance for a free society. At the same time the Government acknowledges the supreme importance of freedom and liberalism for challenging free discussion as essential to a self-governing university. The University should fundamentally determine the way in which it conducts its affairs and responds to pressures from outside.

Wider context

- 10.10 Measures should be taken immediately to encourage the spread of a more tolerant, outward-looking viewpoint amongst student societies, and especially the Islamic Society. There should be the enforcement of rules on open, democratic elections, contact with other student societies, and possible joint meetings. Hostile, sometimes intimidatory, treatment of women, students or university officers should end. The Court of Governors could take a more active role here, in promoting the values of an open university community. The Panel emphasises again that some of the values apparently espoused by leading officers of the Islamic Society are unacceptable. They are not necessarily representative of the outlook of Islam as a whole.
- 10.11 The views the Panel found amongst Islamic Society leaders replicate just one ultra-conservative and highly inward-looking form of Islam that the Panel were told many

other Muslim students on campus do not find appealing or enlightening. It is imperative, therefore, that work be done in partnership with the Islamic Society to ensure that they reflect the wider diversity of opinions and religious denominations which make up Muslim communities. Thereby a much stronger and more positive reflection of Islam would emerge to enrich the vivid student experience at this large and influential British university.



The Lord Morgan

Lakshmi Cheeli

Smita Jamdar

Fiyaz Mughal OBE

September 2015

11. CHAIRMAN'S CONCLUDING NOTE

I would like to pay very warm tribute to my three admirable fellow-panellists for the insight, intelligence and dedication that they have brought to producing this report. Also I and they are immensely grateful to our panel secretary, for the quite invaluable assistance and attention to detail, and to the University of Westminster in its openness in facilitating our inquiries.

K.O.M.

Documentation considered by the Independent Panel included:

University of Westminster background documentation

1. *Report and Financial Statement for the year ended July 2014*
2. *Westminster 2020*
3. *Student Charter 2014*

University of Westminster policies and processes

4. *External Speaker Guidance*
5. *Code of Practice on Freedom of Speech*

6. *Diversity and Dignity at Work and Study Policy*
7. *Religion and Belief Policy*

University of Westminster Students' Union documentation

8. *Societies' Handbook*

External documentation

9. *Prevent Duty Guidance for England and Wales*
10. *Counter-Terrorism and Security Act 2015 Regulations 2015*