

Goldsmiths Senior Management Team: Response to Goldsmiths Anti-Racist Action Group extended letter of 7 April 2019

3 June 2019

On 7 April 2019, Goldsmiths Anti-Racist Action Group (you) wrote to Goldsmiths' Senior Management Team (SMT), in response to our detailed letter of 1 April 2019. Our letter sought to address each of the demands raised by your initial manifesto (published on or around 15 March 2019). Your letter of 7 April introduced additional demands and provided commentary on both SMT's response, and the issues underlying your protest.

SMT has always acknowledged that your protest raises important issues, which Goldsmiths should not, and cannot, avoid. We have stated publicly that we respect the overarching aims behind your protest and that we want to listen attentively to your lived experience, to help improve the environment we offer to BAME students.

It is important for us to place on record that, since your protest began on 12 March 2019, SMT has accelerated and expanded a significant amount of work, informed in part by your demands. While a range of work was already underway at Goldsmiths to address the attainment gap and tackle instances of racism, we have been actively engaged in stepping up this work in recent weeks. Your protest has been a standing agenda item on SMT meetings and we have been discussing, on a daily basis, how we can seek to address your concerns. We have also been discussing your concerns with a range of stakeholders, within and outside the College, to try and build practical support for addressing issues of racial justice in a long-term, sustainable way.

The following table sets out some of the commitments we have made in our previous letters to you (particularly those not covered in greater depth in our narrative response below), alongside the progress we have already taken towards these goals.

Commitment/activity	Progress so far
Review operation of current hate crime reporting processes and how these relate to internal complaint procedures	First review meeting scheduled for end of May with Students' Union staff and sabbatical officers: Students' Union representatives withdrew, so meeting has been postponed
£100k investment in student wellbeing services	A number of new staff posts approved for immediate recruitment, and will be advertised imminently with specific

	encouragement for BAME candidates to apply
Mandatory training package for student-facing staff on diversity and race awareness	Project being scoped by HR, with a report to SMT scheduled for the second week of June. Detail of design and delivery will be discussed further with staff unions and other stakeholders.
Increasing staffing resource for work to address the BAME attainment gap	Further investment agreed by SMT on 9 April to appoint additional staff members to support this work; and for Dr Nicola Rollock to spend an additional day per week on this work from September.
Transparent publication of updated statistics on BAME student lifecycle	2019 update published on 30 April
Insourcing of cleaning services by 1 May	Achieved on 1 May
Continue discussions about future of security provision	Discussions with UNISON have continued, and UNISON has held a separate meeting with their members in the CIS security team (7 May). Council will review options by end of 2019, ahead of January 2020 contract end
Facilitating consultation process on architecture of DTH	Lewisham Council contacted for information on process required for changes to listed buildings
Completion of investigation into a complaint relating to defacement of Students' Union election poster	Investigation completed and findings communicated to relevant student
Completion of investigation into a complaint relating to reduction of contact hours on a specific programme within STaCS	Complaint process completed and findings communicated to those students who made the formal complaint.

Additional contact hours for current cohorts have been arranged and will be communicated to students this week (w/c 3 June).

We believe that this work demonstrates the range of concrete action that is already being taken. We hope, going forward, that it can be more closely shaped by your input.

To date, SMT has adopted the view that prolonging a lengthy correspondence with GARA would be unlikely to resolve the underlying issues or help you inform the detail of how the College responds to your concerns. We have been very keen to get back around a table with you to discuss in person how we can plan a constructive way forward.

However, we acknowledge that you feel that this approach is unhelpful and that you are keen for further written material from us as a basis for any further face-to-face talks.

We reflected upon your perspective on this, and on that basis we now offer a response to your letter of 7 April. We know that you are keen for a detailed response, but also an honest one that reflects what Goldsmiths can reasonably achieve within certain timescales and within our resource constraints.

We have already made extensive commitments which seek to address your concerns, and we therefore need to ensure that any further pledges are also realistic – as we fully expect that staff and students will rightly hold us to account on any promises we make. This means that we will be upfront where we are not in a position to meet your demands, or where we have a different analysis of the situation to yourselves.

At the end of this response (p30), we share the details of three specialist mediation organisations which we think may be able to assist in facilitating conversations between us after we have next met. A mediator would act impartially with the aim of facilitating conversations between us. We would be interested in your thoughts about these options.

In light of the response that follows, which you have made a condition of future meetings, we repeat our offer of face-to-face talks with all members of SMT. We would propose that this should be arranged for a mutually convenient time during w/c 10 June. This would be an opportunity to discuss the mediation options and any other matters which GARA deems to be a priority for the next stage of talks. We would be grateful if you could propose some times to meet during that week, and indicate whether you would be happy for SMT to come to the DTH Council Chamber for this meeting, or prefer another location.

Once we have agreed a time, we would be happy to arrange representation from Goldsmiths recognised staff trade unions and Goldsmiths Race Equality Group, if you would like additional

staff members to be present. We would also expect elected representatives from Goldsmiths' Students' Union to be present.

We look forward to meeting you in person in the very near future. We repeat our aim to work in partnership with you, with the Students' Union, and our wider community of staff and students to meet our shared aims of creating a truly inclusive place of learning, free of all forms of racism and discrimination.

Elisabeth, Helen, Ian, David and Mark
Goldsmiths Senior Management Team

Note: GARA's text of 7 April is shown in grey text in an unedited form. SMT's response is shown in blue text, in enclosed boxes.

1. Opening hours and access to Deptford Town Hall

We did not formally respond to your requests because we will not protest at your convenience. That would be giving the Senior Management Team permission to continue ignoring us.

As addressed in our open email sent on **Sunday 31st March at 8:55am**, on your website, it states the building is open during normal opening hours, which is until 10pm.¹ We would also like to add, if the Senior Management Team is to care about our learning experiences as is claimed, why have requests to open up Room 110 as a study space been ignored?

This denial of space to study will inevitably contribute to the BAME attainment gap, and we refuse to choose between protest and education.

We understand you have been using Room 109 as a quiet study space, and advertised such on social media, for a number of weeks now.

We have also clarified that DTH typically closes before 10pm once any evening activity has concluded: it does not have a set closing time of 10pm. We have corrected the Goldsmiths website to remove reference to "normal opening hours" in this context.

We also note for the record that we continued to facilitate access into and out of DTH during these hours during the Easter vacation period, when the building would usually be closed entirely for six days. We have also done the same on Sundays, when the building is typically closed.

It is difficult for us to believe that the Senior Management Team are interested in our safety. Had this been the case, the Senior Management Team would not have allowed externally hired security and members of estates staff to assault protesters during the first week of the occupation. We have been keeping a log of physical and verbal assaults committed against protesters throughout the occupation.

Such allegations against contractors should be substantiated by supplying us with evidence that can be passed to the contract managers for investigation, following formal protocols.

¹ <https://www.gold.ac.uk/students/dth-protest-college-response/>

Not to mention, the orders for security staff to check in on the protesters and enter Council Chambers unannounced, has endangered the well-being of particularly women protesters who have been fearful of being seen changing.

SMT believes we have a duty of care to you while you remain on College property, even if the occupation is unauthorised. DTH is not designed as a living space. We therefore stand by our requests that relevant colleagues seek to make occasional checks on your welfare. We understand that in practice you have made this difficult by refusing access for security staff to enter the Council Chamber. However, we are aware that the Campus Support Officers have been in contact with you during the occupation. You also have ongoing access to the full range of Goldsmiths' student wellbeing services.

Fire exits are not fully accessible if they are chained shut and there are no members of security staff present; we have both video and photographic evidence of this being the case.

This refers to complaints from early on in the occupation. Our earlier approach to locking down some areas of the building was discussed with London Fire Brigade, who were content with our evacuation procedures. Fire exits have been left unlocked for a number of weeks now.

As of **Friday 5th April, at 2:24PM**, students were distressed to learn that builders were being hired to **drill doors shut**, cutting off access to working toilets and key fire escapes in Deptford Town Hall. These are not the orders of a Senior Management Team who cares for the welfare of their students; students who are in the midst of their studies with many upcoming deadlines and exams.

Ahead of a weekend where we were not able to arrange adequate security cover, some areas of the building were secured in advance to prevent further unauthorised incursions into College property. Although the closed area included one bathroom, other toilet facilities in the building were available and working (except for one that was behind a barricade you had erected). The broken toilet had not been reported, and once colleagues became aware of the issue, remedial action was taken immediately. Fire escape routes were checked before any action was taken and none of the closures impacted on means of escape, given the number of people in the building. This was discussed at the time and a senior staff member attended DTH to discuss access to facilities with you in person, and at your request it was agreed that the upper floor would remain accessible.

2. The In-Housing of Security and Cleaners:

If the Senior Management Team fail to meet the target deadline of bringing cleaners in-house by May 1st as agreed by both Goldsmiths and Unison, there will be further escalation.

This deadline was met, and cleaning staff were brought in-house on 1 May 2019.

More than 50% of security staff are members of IWGB. **Goldsmiths and CIS are choosing to ignore the agency and will of the majority BAME workforce and this is fundamentally racist.** It is not for the employers to dictate which unions their staff are members of. Despite upholding values of freedom of expression and democratic process, this is a prime example where Goldsmiths is choosing not to respect the democratic will of security staff. As point four of the official recognition agreement between Goldsmiths, UCU and Unison states, "The College will not refuse staff representation by any trade union representative an individual may choose, (whether or not that representative is from UCU or Unison)"²

Staff members are free to join whatever union they wish, and Goldsmiths staff are entitled to individual representation at relevant proceedings from whatever union they wish. However, this does not extend to the College recognising any union for the purposes of collective bargaining. Security staff are not Goldsmiths staff members: however, we understand that CIS have agreed to recognise UNISON for the purposes of such discussions.

The Trade Union Recognition agreement you cite is unambiguous that "the College exclusively recognises two Trade Unions, namely UCU and UNISON"³ and that variations can only be made with the agreement of all parties.

To say that the Senior Management Team will "review options" when the contract comes to an end is inadequate. The inhousing of security staff is the only acceptable resolution. The contracts the College chose to sign with exploitative privatised companies are a problem of its own making, the problem must be addressed directly and immediately. The idea you would even consider extending the contract beyond January 2020 is unacceptable. Both GUCU and Goldsmiths SU have issued their explicit support and political mandate for the in-housing of security.

Goldsmiths' governing Council is required to discuss any contract of this value, and will therefore discuss the options ahead of the end of the current contract in January 2020. While we recognise the stated position of GUCU and Goldsmiths' Students' Union on this matter, it is not a decision

² http://goldsmithsucu.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/union-recognition-agreement1.pdf?fbclid=IwAR3XATDywFsaWE32HUrjiiwx72w_NxGG4zVEGms2ALJ8E_DO7q2JsfoNUAM

³ Page 1, paragraph 2

for which those two bodies are ultimately accountable. UNISON is liaising with their CIS members and separately liaising with SMT on this topic.

In the latest update on the in-housing of cleaners, the College admits that in-housing the cleaners will bring them better material conditions. "This includes improved holiday allowance, improved sickness benefits, improved family leave and membership of the LPFA pension scheme,"⁴ which Ian Pleace confirmed to be true for security workers, too, also, during the meeting with SMT on the first day of the GARA occupation of Deptford Town Hall. Security and cleaning staff should **both** be able to access the same benefits and opportunities as staff directly employed by Goldsmiths. This was witnessed by a representative from the protesters and two sabbatical officers from the Students' Union.

To act as if we are acting autonomously of the will of Goldsmiths' outsourced workers is not only incorrect but willfully ignorant. GARA are already in dialogue with IWGB, (who have a track record of bringing security in-house at other universities) and Justice for Cleaners (who saw the cleaners brought in house at Goldsmiths). In addition, we're in contact with representatives from Unison (who represent the cleaning staff). It is simply up to the Senior Management Team to mitigate the damages done to Goldsmiths' reputation. (The sooner in-housing goes ahead the less damage there will be.)

Goldsmiths staff receive generous benefits, including those you cite. Security staff working for CIS receive different benefits. These do include access to statutory pensions, sick pay and holiday pay, alongside access to specialist training and development, opportunities for promotion and to work on other sites, and flexibility over their working hours including the opportunity to work extended hours and to earn significant levels of overtime payments. We believe this would be very difficult for Goldsmiths to replicate if security provision was brought in-house.

We do not make these points to engage in debate about the rights and wrongs of insourcing, but simply to make the point that different staff will attach different relative value to different benefits. Any proposal to insource therefore requires full consultation directly with all those staff affected.

As we state above, future service provision is a matter for Council to consider in due course.

3. Removal of Statues

This response is not good enough. The process might be difficult, it might take time, but there has been no attempt made over the past 10 days to contact the local authorities about what renovations can be made to the building, or even contact made to members of local council to

⁴ <https://www.gold.ac.uk/about/statements/goldsmiths-cleaning-provision/>

gain an understanding of what the consultation process requires, despite having discussed this already in our last face-to-face meeting which we have recorded.

It is clear that Senior Management are not familiar with the works of their own, such as the late academic Paul Henrich, who writes clearly on the history of the people commemorated by these statues. Negligence is not an excuse. Undoing centuries of institutional racism is not an overnight process, it will require energy and commitment. Goldsmiths, as a so-called progressive institution, needs to take concrete action to prove itself worthy of these associations.

We demand you instigate an immediate investigation into the modifications able to be made to the building and make contact with local community leaders to start the consultation process. Contacting the local council alone is inadequate.

We have already contacted Lewisham Council and Historic England to explore in greater depth the process for applying for consent to alter a listed building.

We have great respect for the work of Paul Hendrich (sic), but his views do not necessarily represent the whole community of Goldsmiths and beyond. That is one of the reasons we have proposed a process of community consultation, to seek the views of local residents on your demands to remove statues from the building. Agreeing the organisations to be contacted, and the form of the consultation, are questions upon which SMT – perhaps not unreasonably – felt that GARA would have strong views. We would value proper discussions about your views of how best to run this, and which Goldsmiths academics might be able to support the process.

4. Opening Deptford Town Hall to the community

As stated before, our campaign has the support of the Students' Union, which represents over 10,000 students at Goldsmiths and their sabbatical officers elected by the student body, so do not deflect responsibility by claiming you will consult "the wider student community". Consult the union, they will give you the same answer.

The Senior Management Team has deliberately misinterpreted our comment regarding accessibility. We are aware the building is physically inaccessible to many people; this is a problem you have consistently failed to address. This does not mean the building should not be opened to the local community in the meantime.

We share your vision for greater public use of DTH, but you may not be aware of the extent to which the building is already used for a variety of public events. A few examples from the twelve months before your protest began included:

- A public research engagement 'Genes & Tonic' event held by the Accessible Genetic Consortium, February 2018
- A public seminar on 'Drone Visions' with Kathryn Brimblecombe-Fox, Dr Claire Reddeman and Dr Elke Schwarz organised by the Centre for Post-Colonial Studies, April 2018
- A public lecture on 'The Ethics and Politics of Research-Creation Methodologies with Diverse Public' organised by the Department of Sociology, November 2018
- A one-day international symposium on 'Human rights in the age of technology', open to the public, November 2018
- A two-day 'Creative Quartets' public workshop on climate change, organised by Metadesigners, November 2018
- A tea party and organising event for local charity Deptford First, December 2018
- A TEDx event organised by the Debating Society, December 2018
- A public seminar on 'Investigating UK complicity in torture after 9/11' with a panel of international experts, December 2018
- Public concert and launch for 'Music as Heritage: Historical and Ethnographic Perspectives', organised by the Department of Music and the Asian Music Unit, February 2019
- Regular free lunchtime music recitals by students and guest musicians, throughout the year

We are surprised that you appear to take such a relaxed approach to the need to improve physical access before the College tries to position DTH as a wider resource for the community. We have been trying to find a feasible way of improving access to the building for people with disabilities for many years, and the second phase of the Enterprise Hub project will achieve this.

According to Michael Keith (2006), head of the Centre for Urban and Community Research at Goldsmiths, who was involved in evaluating the Deptford City Challenge urban regeneration programme: "*To the compromise is that you do a long term lease to the College, but you maintain public access ...you've got these community bases within the Town Hall, but with the College having a tenancy of it. That was the way it was pitched to City Challenge. The College would have custodianship of the building, but it would still have public access. Now exactly what that has become is more interesting.* (Michael Keith, interview, 16 August 2006)"⁵.

The College has failed to fulfill its contractual obligation to the local community, as pledged in its initial proposal for Deptford City Challenge. It has been 20 years since Deptford Town Hall was re-acquisitioned by Goldsmiths and yet there has not even been the smallest step taken to make the building open to staff and students, let alone the local community.

It is disgraceful that Goldsmiths would acquire the building under false pretenses, locked away from the residents of New Cross, already infringed upon by Goldsmiths' rampant complicity in gentrification of the area. As testified by local residents⁶, the area needs more spaces for youth groups to meet; faith groups to congregate; children to play; ESOL lessons to take place; refugee and asylum seeker advice services; homeless shelters--a space that Deptford Town Hall could

⁵ https://www.anthropologymatters.com/index.php/anth_matters/article/view/45/84

⁶ <http://www.eastlondonlines.co.uk/2016/11/residents-of-new-cross-dont-want-to-be-next-shoreditch/>;

and should provide. This is research already undertaken by Paul Hendrich and Les Back but needs the resources to expand and encompass the current local community.

Here you appear to be using material from Paul Hendrich, written 13 years ago, when the use of DTH was rather different. When Paul wrote his reasoned critique, DTH was mainly used as office space and student and staff access to the building was more limited. Today, any student or staff member can access the building, and we have actively sought to encourage wider use of the building by departments for public-facing activity (see above).

The ideas for community engagement you cite would all be strong candidates for reduced or free room hire charged under our existing scheme for community use of Goldsmiths' facilities. We are sure that relevant colleagues would look favourably on such schemes, if they were approached by the Students' Union or other student groups who had firm proposals for running such services.

5. Palestinian Scholarships

Upon meeting with members of the Senior Management Team on Friday 22nd March, representative protesters from GARA were told that it was illegal or unlawful to reserve scholarship places for Palestinian students. This has since been proven untrue. It is a shame that the SMT would rather make up false claims than look into the retraction of humanitarian assistance the College prizes itself on.

The Students Union of 2009 may have agreed to a 10 year contract, but it is 2019. The Students Union of 2019 believes it should be extended, and so do we. This is an especially significant commitment that the College must make, given the wide staff and student support for Palestine and the Palestinian cause across the campus, including the policies passed by GUCU⁷, UNISON⁸, and Goldsmiths Students' Union⁹ in solidarity with Palestine and/or calling for the College to implement BDS (Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions) in the fight against apartheid. It is the democratic mandate of these respective unions to uphold these policies, and so it is essential the College recognises the democratic process. The College must follow in the example of Oxford Brookes University¹⁰, Durham University, University of Oxford¹¹, and University of Birmingham¹² which all allocate specific places for Palestinian students.

⁷ https://www.ucu.org.uk/media/3425/Academic-Freedom-International-Study-Palestine-chapter/pdf/academic_freedom_palestine.pdf;
<https://goldsmithsucu.org/2018/06/18/in-solidarity-with-palestine/>

⁸ <https://conferences.unison.org.uk/motions/2017/national-delegate-conference/67-palestine-50-years-occupation/>;
<https://conferences.unison.org.uk/motions/2017/national-delegate-conference/68-palestine-time-new-debate/>

⁹ [https://www.goldsmithssu.org/pageassets/yourunion/governance/policies/Palestine-motion\(1\).pdf](https://www.goldsmithssu.org/pageassets/yourunion/governance/policies/Palestine-motion(1).pdf)

¹⁰ <https://www.britishcouncil.ps/en/study-uk/scholarship/gaza-oxford-brookes>

¹¹ <https://www.britishcouncil.ps/en/study-uk/scholarships/rhodes-scholarships-university-oxford>

¹² <https://www.saidfoundation.org/pages/10-about-our-scholarships>

As stated in the response letter: “During the last ten years, the world has become a more complex, and arguably more dangerous, place.” Therefore, Goldsmiths College must lead by example to enshrine a legacy of solidarity with Palestinians--and students from war and conflict zones across the University of London as a whole. Is it not Goldsmiths’ core responsibility to ensure a safe teaching and learning environment? Thus, what better way to facilitate this than to enable those from war and conflict zones to receive a safe, fully funded education at Goldsmiths.

If Goldsmiths really means what they say about caring about all the “dangers around the world”, then there should be a new scholarship scheme introduced that is for students from different places around the world, **in addition to the already existing Palestinians’ scholarships and not instead of. (So no, we expect the Palestinians only scholarships to continue as they are, and if anything, there should be more scholarships.)**

We believe that our proposal to extend the Humanitarian Scholarships scheme for three years from 2019 entry, making support available to all those at risk of discrimination, persecution, suffering or violence, is offered in the same spirit as the other scholarships you cite which are open to scholars from across that geographical region.

The Award Regulations for the Humanitarian Scholarships specified they were “open to prospective taught Masters students who are residing citizens of any country which is affected by oppression, persecution, political or military strife such that their human right to higher education is denied to them” and this is the basis upon which they were advertised. For an initial ten-year period, they were ringfenced for students from Palestine.

Given the original context, we are not comfortable with continuing to reserve scholarship places for students from one specific country. It would be difficult to frame a legitimate aim that could reasonably be said to follow from our charitable objectives which extended protected scholarship support to students from one country while ignoring other areas of conflict across the world.

In most of the examples you cite, funding is provided by external organisations with specific charitable aims to educate students from Palestine; and furthermore, in the cases of Oxford and Birmingham, the schemes are open to applicants from Syria, Jordan, Lebanon or Palestine. The websites you share also evidence careful demonstration that the scholarships are a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim through identifying individuals with leadership capacity who will become agents of change, or undertake courses of study with direct relevance to the challenges the area faces.

Our preference would be to review the Humanitarian Scholarships alongside all our other scholarship and bursary provision, under the auspices of the Fees Working Group, which includes Students’ Union representation. College resources are limited, and it is important to ensure that all the scholarships we offer are being targeted to the areas of greatest need.

If Goldsmiths is to boast its new human rights focussed law degree¹³ and continue its **MA Human Rights, Culture and Social Justice** course, then it must be able to uphold its own commitment to human rights in the material sense. Anything but a substantial application of human rights in its own practises would be deeply hypocritical.

GARA calls for the College's explicit support for Palestinians and against Israeli apartheid. The bottom line is that Goldsmiths should implement BDS to "cease all ties with institutions, companies and corporations complicit in internationally recognised human rights violations perpetrated by the Israeli Apartheid state"¹⁴.

This is a new demand not contained in your original manifesto, and not one that we are aware has ever been raised at Goldsmiths. We are also not aware of any UK university which has fully implemented BDS.

Thus, as a **real** gesture of goodwill, Goldsmiths must commit to **at least 10 humanitarian scholarships** which include "full tuition fees and living costs for one year"¹⁵ that reflect the cost of living in London, "as well as airfares to and from the UK"¹⁶ as is already offered **with** places allocated for Palestinian students. This must have a catchment area of war and conflict zones, aside from Palestine, including but not limited to Yemen, Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan and Somalia. Individuals arriving in the UK after living in a war or conflict zone must be cared for, according to their needs and traumas, in order for them to make the most of their scholarship and enable them to adjust to an entirely new living environment. Included in this scholarship must also be structures in place to ensure the wellbeing and support of students when they arrive in the UK, such as **free** supplementary English classes, regular pastoral meetings with course or academic tutors, and a counsellor with whom they meet regularly.

The demand for 10 scholarships is another new demand, and put simply is not one that we are in a financial position to agree to. We have indicated we will extend the current scheme of two scholarships per year, broadened to enable all those living in war or conflict zones, for three years. This would include tuition fees, reasonable living costs and return air fares. Without additional external funding, we are not in a position to expand the number of such scholarships.

We agree that additional support should be signposted to recipients of such awards. This should include information on student wellbeing services and the availability of student hardship funds, which are accessible to international students who can demonstrate need.

¹³ <https://www.gold.ac.uk/news/law-visiting-professors/>

¹⁴ [https://www.goldsmithssu.org/pageassets/yourunion/governance/policies/Palestine-motion\(1\).pdf](https://www.goldsmithssu.org/pageassets/yourunion/governance/policies/Palestine-motion(1).pdf)

¹⁵ <https://www.gold.ac.uk/international/fees-funding/international-scholarships/goldsmiths-humanitarian-scholarship/>

¹⁶ *ibid*

6. Goldsmiths should follow in the footsteps of Glasgow University's efforts to make colonial reparations. Goldsmiths should conduct an independently verifiable study and analysis acknowledging the benefits the university received from colonialism and slavery. From the results, Goldsmiths must commit to a programme of reparative justice. ¹⁷

SMT in their response have mentioned that colonialism has ended. We are embarrassed that the Senior Management Team would make such a claim. Colonialism has not ended. It is not an event but a live process and structure¹⁸ of oppression in which Britain is still complicit, to this day¹⁹, whether it be the financial benefits of colonialism enjoyed by Goldsmiths or the Eurocentric version of history taught in our curricula.

We are sorry if our language was imprecise. We did however make explicit our acknowledgement that “the United Kingdom has historically received a range of benefits from the legacies of colonialism – benefits that many other institutions have been coming to terms with in more recent years.”

It is undeniable that, as areas, New Cross and Deptford were prominent areas connected to the slave trade. The **Royal Dockyard at Deptford**, south east London, played a significant role in the slave trade²⁰. In fact, John Hawkins--one of the statues on Deptford Town Hall--based many of his operations here. Hawkins was a known slave trader or, in today's terms, human trafficker of 400 to 500 West Africans abducted to the West Indies. “Merchants based in Blackheath, Deptford and Greenwich handled some 75% of sugar imports,”²¹ and local iron merchants produced manacles and irons for restraining enslaved peoples on ships. It was also here Olaudah Equiano, the enslaved man who freed himself and became a prominent figure in the slavery abolitionist movement, was trafficked and sold from one naval captain to another in around 1760²².

Goldsmiths was founded by the **Worshipful Company of Goldsmiths** ²³ which directly reaped its benefits from colonialism. Goldsmiths' own Chancellor is HRH The Princess Royal, whose very family, dating back to Queen Victoria²⁴, instigated and propagated colonisation. Further still, referring to recent history, anthropologists funded by the Worshipful Company of Goldsmiths “studied” the Lugbara of colonised Uganda ²⁵.

Contrary to the claims made by the Senior Management Team, colonialism didn't end in 1904 and the impact of slavery is still felt today. It is felt through the unequal distribution of wealth and

¹⁷ <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2018/sep/17/glasgow-university-to-make-amends-over-slavery-profits-of-past>

¹⁸ <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2332649214560440>

¹⁹ <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/brexit/2017/05/11/brexit-is-not-only-an-expression-of-nostalgia-for-empire-it-is-also-the-fruit-of-empire/>

²⁰ <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/lbs/media-new/pdfs/killingray.pdf>

²¹ http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/pathways/blackhistory/africa_caribbean/britain_trade.htm

²² *The Interesting Narrative Of The Life Of Olaudah Equiano Or Gustavus Vassa, The African, Written By Himself, Volume 1, Olaudah Equiano*, Kessinger Publishing, 2004, ISBN 1419167499

²³ <https://www.thegoldsmiths.co.uk/company/history/history-of-the-company/>

²⁴ <https://www.manchesteropenhive.com/view/9781526123848/9781526123848.00008.xml>;

²⁵ Gann, Lewis H., Peter Duignan, and Victor Witter Turner, eds. *Colonialism in Africa 1870-1960*. Vol. 4. CUP Archive, 1969.

insidious gentrification of an area with one of the largest Black populations in the country; Lewisham is the 15th most ethnically diverse local authority in England²⁶. It is these populations who are likely descendants of the enslaved peoples brought to the ports of Deptford and Greenwich. This is just touching the surface of Goldsmiths' complicity with colonialism, racism and gentrification in the local area and beyond.

It is the duty of Goldsmiths College to investigate its own history i.e. to learn from how Glasgow University researched and implemented their reparative justice programme. This is not to say that Goldsmiths should copy it in its entirety; Goldsmiths should aim to improve upon it and advance the work already done. This needs to be led by and conducted in dialogue with the local community, as decolonisation cannot be done with a top-down approach. It must come from the peoples and communities that have experienced--and continue to experience--the violence of British colonialism.

No curricula can be decolonised unless the University itself is able to acknowledge and make reparations for its own colonial history. This is tied to our demand for an institution wide strategy, including the audit and overhaul of the current curricula at Goldsmiths.

We agree with the above and repeat our commitment that Dr Nicola Rollock's work – which will now be supported by an expanded staff team – will include contacting the University of Glasgow for information on how they approached this challenge. In addressing this area of your concerns, consideration will be given to how Goldsmiths might undertake the community-led process you envisage. We would be happy to discuss this in more detail with you.

7. Institution wide plan of tackling racism at Goldsmiths

We have received full support from both Dr Nicola Rollock and Sofia Akel from Goldsmiths' SU, including our demands to hire a full time staff team to work with Dr Nicola Rollock on the BME Attainment Gap research. As the lead of the project, Dr Nicola Rollock has fully engaged with this demand and has made her own recommendations. As you mention, "Goldsmiths is fortunate to be home to a number of researchers whose work is in race equality", which means that Goldsmiths is in the perfect position to offer financial stability to its own researchers -- many of whom are students.

The Senior Management Team have overlooked the calls for (a) paid BAME Department Representatives across the College and (b) an annual fund designated for Black History events for the Students' Union that are held throughout the year, not just during Black History Month. An evidence base is not required to do either of these. It simply requires the funding.

²⁶ <http://www.lewishamsna.org.uk/a-profile-of-lewisham/social-and-environmental-context/ethnicity>

No evidence base is needed to justify why BAME students should be paid the London Living Wage for the hours of labour put into carrying forward the traumas and concerns of other BAME students within departments. Work is work. In the same light, BAME students should be able to enjoy their university experience and make memories that are not solely based on racial traumas they experienced. Funding must be set aside to do this. BAME communities should be able to experience extra-curricular events that cater to specific cultural needs; BAME students-- particularly Black students--should be able to celebrate themselves and their cultures in a safe, accommodating environment.

We have not overlooked these demands; we have stated that they need to be considered as part of Dr Nicola Rollock's audit work. In the meantime, the question of how the Students' Union allocates its funding is a matter for the Union: if they wish to designate funding for Black History events throughout the year, we would hope that they could find scope for this within their budget of over £1.2m per year.

"We have already committed to the delivery of mandatory training for all student-facing staff, to begin from the next academic year." The Senior Management Team must confirm that this training will be organised in a democratic, transparent process that directly involves multiple liberation groups **as well as** representatives for each of the College's respective unions. In addition to this, it is not enough to commit mandatory training to **student-facing** staff when all staff should receive mandatory training, as these staff will also interact with BAME and otherwise marginalised people in their day-to-day lives. Does Goldsmiths not **want** 100% of its staff to be racially conscious and competent in all areas of life, with all people they interact with?

SMT confirms that it will involve representatives of the recognised campus unions, and Goldsmiths Race Equality Group, in the planning of the staff training on race issues. This training must be well-planned and designed to achieve specific objectives to play its part in meaningful culture change at Goldsmiths. Rolling out meaningful training will need to be done in a phased way. This is why our initial commitment, in order to target our resources, is for student-facing staff to be prioritised for this training. Other staff will be expected to participate in appropriate training at a later stage.

Lacking in the Senior Management Team's response is any tangible commitment to facilitating the audit and overhaul of curricula. Again, as expressed by yourselves as well as GARA, Goldsmiths is full of so much talent and skill that it would make sense to **hire** more staff, including Goldsmiths students, to enable this process. This would also support students' studies by reforming the way that students engage and partake in their education. GARA are aware that more discussions need to take place with course convenors, lecturers, and students from all departments, but in order for this to happen, the Senior Management Team has to use its institutional power to enforce the audit and overhaul of the curricula, like it has done so with the pledge for mandatory training.

We are conscious that this will be a core part of Dr Nicola Rollock’s work, and we do not wish to pre-empt her findings and recommendations. At this stage, we are happy to make clear that we view the comprehensive and careful review of curricula and teaching materials as a critical activity that we expect all programme leaders to be undertaking, informed by student feedback. Departments approach this expectation of our Learning Teaching Assessment Strategy (aim 1, 'liberate my degree') in a range of ways and academic staff are reminded to adopt an inclusive curriculum through various means, including through the development of reading lists and the Liberate our Library project²⁷. This work will be monitored further by the Learning Teaching Enhancement Committee – which includes Students' Union representatives – at its meetings throughout the upcoming academic year.

Moreover, there must be public acknowledgement of Goldsmiths’ complicity in increased attacks against marginalised groups on campus over the period of the occupation. This includes the **racist tirade** by XXXXX, and the homophobia and violence conducted by XXXXX, towards students. The lack of responsibility taken for the hostile environment at Goldsmiths and the racist attacks has been severely disillusioning.

We take such allegations extremely seriously and we are committed to conducting thorough investigations into the incidents to which you have referred. We are mindful of our duty of care to our staff and committed to upholding the principles of natural justice when investigating allegations of misconduct. As we have stated previously, your approach in naming staff members publicly is not conducive to a fair process and risks prejudicing the proper handling of your complaints.

We have now engaged an experienced BAME external investigator who is ready to meet with the students raising the complaint as soon as we receive the relevant contact details from you.

8. Wellbeing, Chaplaincy and Multi-Faith Prayer Room

“SMT today announces significant new investment in student support services, with £100,000 to be spent between now and August on additional specialist mental health and wellbeing staff. This will include the introduction of daytime Campus Support Officer cover over the weekends, and additional faith advisor support, before the end of this academic year.”²⁸

²⁷ <https://www.gold.ac.uk/library/about/liberate-our-library/>

²⁸ <https://www.gold.ac.uk/about/statements/letter190314/>

“This commitment SMT made was for additional recurrent spend in this area. The activities supported by the £100k committed to this financial year (the majority of which is for additional permanent staff) will become part of the baseline for 2019/20 onwards.”²⁹

To reiterate, our demands for increased funding for the Chaplaincy aren't only for the additional faith leader but also for funding to run student led faith and cultural events. The funding for the Wellbeing team are separate demands and should not be conflated with the Chaplaincy. These demands are ones on which we will not compromise on. Additional funding for the **Chaplaincy is still expected.**

Since making the announcement you cite above and following discussions between Student Experience Directorate colleagues and members of the Islamic Society at Goldsmiths, we are now in a position to confirm that the faith advisor post will be a Muslim Chaplain. The appointment of an additional member of the chaplaincy services team is in itself a considerable investment. We would be willing to discuss finding additional budget for costed activities, where student demand for these can be shown.

Religion and Belief at Goldsmiths

50% of Goldsmiths students follow a faith/belief/religion. 15% of Goldsmiths students are Muslims, which is a lot higher than the national average of 8%. Goldsmiths has one of the highest percentage of students who follow a faith, religion or belief.

Having a bigger prayer room has already been brought up by previous sabbatical officers, and has been dismissed, this isn't new.

The SU has also done a lot of research and released a report on “Religion and Belief” which SMT should have read. In this research, there is talk about a bigger prayer room. It has been mentioned so many times by students that the prayer room isn't big enough to accommodate the number of students of faith that exist. The reason Friday prayers are in another room is because it isn't big enough. Even on other days during term times, it is always packed and there isn't enough space for everyone.

There is no need for “reviewing” or “consulting”. A new, bigger prayer room is needed. We will not compromise. The Estates team can find a way over the summer to exchange it with a bigger room in RHB to ensure that the next Academic year has a prayer room that is fit for purpose and accommodates for all.

²⁹ <https://www.gold.ac.uk/media/documents-by-section/about-us/statements/SMT-response-to-GARA-010419.pdf>; https://trello-attachments.s3.amazonaws.com/59e4a7a73a67aee865bd9f42/5bebfedffdd29874c403207/6c3f7c110f8eb373654ace010cda95e9/SU_Report_on_Religion_and_Belief_at_Goldsmiths_-_Arunima_Himawan.pdf

The issues identified in the Students' Union report you cite³⁰ appear to refer to perceived conflicts over usage rights between different groups of students at peak times, from which the authors drew the conclusion that additional space is needed. The Chaplaincy team have undertaken work to seek to resolve these issues, by encouraging more effective communication between different student-led groups.

We have previously committed to undertake a space audit to understand better when the peaks in weekly use are: space on campus is at a huge premium, and any additional prayer space in RHB would have to come from rooms currently used for teaching. We repeat our commitment to run this audit over the autumn term, when we can get a fair view of usage when most students are on campus. We will then discuss the results of this audit with the Students' Union.

Students of faith aren't given the basics that they deserve while studying here. On top of a small prayer room that isn't enough for the students, Muslim students in some courses are denied to go to Friday prayers, which happen at the same time every Friday so that they don't miss their classes. If anything, and if Goldsmiths really cared about the progress and wellbeing of its students, Goldsmiths would actually change its timetabling to make sure that no lectures and seminars happen between 1-2 pm on Fridays since 1,650 of Goldsmiths' students are Muslims.

Stop getting more students in if you are not able to accommodate for all.

"If, in discussion with the Students Union, there is an agreement," is not a valid point, as there already is an agreement. The Students' Union has already publicly supported **all** the demands of the occupation.³¹

While we appreciate the tensions caused by scheduling contact sessions over Friday lunchtimes, we already face a very real challenge in seeking to timetable teaching activity across our available space. We are aware that some Jewish students object to attending contact sessions on Friday afternoons, for similar reasons of religious observance. Generally speaking, fewer contact sessions run on Friday than on other days of the week.

However, a policy of removing teaching slots across the whole College – on top of the current policy of avoiding Wednesday afternoons as agreed with the Students' Union – would pose very considerable challenges likely to prove unpalatable to the wider Goldsmiths community, such as extending the teaching day earlier into the morning or later into the evening.

³⁰ https://trello-attachments.s3.amazonaws.com/59e4a7a73a67aee865bd9f42/5bebfedffdd29874c403207/6c3f7c110f8eb373654ace010cda95e9/SU_Report_on_Religion_and_Belief_at_Goldsmiths_-_Arunima_Himawan.pdf, see pp86-88

³¹ <https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:65C5yH-nZi0J:https://www.goldsmithssu.org/news/article/6013/Supporting-the-occupation-of-Deptford-Town-Hall-a-message-from-your-Officers/+&cd=4&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=uk>

This is not a matter of accepting too many students who we are unable to accommodate (as most rooms are not full): it is a question of how many programmes are running different contact sessions at any one time. This is the inevitable consequence of offering such a wide range of modular options for students to choose between. A policy of further constraining available teaching hours would mean that programme options would have to be reduced due to lack of space.

9. The removal of SEAtS for its racist and xenophobic surveillance

It is important for College administration to understand that, even when a data-based attendance policy is applied equally to all students, it can have unfair adverse impacts for BAME students, particularly those on Home Office visas given the potential for deportation. Simply having the intention of making bureaucratic processes more efficient is not sufficient to avoid unintended or harmful outcomes from the introduction of new technical systems. This is thoroughly documented in many recent academic studies such as the volume on 'Automating Inequality' by Virginia Eubanks. Being 'colour-blind' is no more an effective policy for college admin systems than it is for the Facebook corporation; without additional efforts to be anti-racist outcomes that are harmful and racist are inevitable.

Ever since this decision was made by the college, an elected SU officer has been opposing the card readers and bluetooth SEAtS system. In addition, the SEAtS system has no mandate passed as policy by the Students' Union. No such mandate was passed by UCU either, as they have not been consulted on this student attendance monitoring software.

While SEAtS may streamline classes, staff, and student experience to the benefit of Goldsmiths' business management model, this comes at the cost of international students. It is a privilege that the Senior Management Team can be oblivious to the harm of the surveillance of vulnerable students, which has been the thesis for many an academic paper.

We are aware that, for some staff and students, there appears to be a degree of apprehension about any form of IT solution to help support a more consistent approach to implementing the College's attendance policy³² (which is in itself a development of the principles in our General Regulations about attendance³³, to which all students sign up upon enrolment).

SEAtS is a piece of software which allows for an electronic register to be taken during teaching sessions, with this register feeding into individual records for each student. The methods we are trialling in a small number of departments this year involve tutors recording attendance via a tablet, or keeping paper records and then entering into an online portal after the session.

³² <https://www.gold.ac.uk/media/documents-by-section/about-us/governance/policies/Student-Attendance-Policy.pdf>

³³ <https://www.gold.ac.uk/governance/generalregulations/attendanceandprogress/>

The decision to pilot an IT system to support attendance recording was made for a number of reasons, chief among them a desire to more quickly identify students who may be at risk of disengaging and require some form of targeted help, while enabling greater consistency of record-keeping across departments in a way that reduced the administrative burden on academic staff. The project was initiated following repeated feedback from across the College, rather than a 'top down' project designed by SMT.

As an example, this year's Student Representative report focusing on retention³⁴ suggests that greater "consistency" and "regulation" is needed across departments at Goldsmiths in terms of identifying and support students at risk of disengaging from the studies. The same report explicitly mentions an "analytics engagement team" created at Queen Mary, University of London, which appear to perform a similar function.

You raise points about the consultation with unions. We have held discussions with UCU to understand their concerns about the implementation of SEAtS. The Students' Union President sits on the project board overseeing the SEAtS pilot. We conducted an initial survey of students last academic year and we will be conducting surveys of all students and staff involved in this year's pilot studies, to gather views on their experiences of the system.

In terms of any unintended harmful outcomes, a full Equality Impact Assessment has been planned drawing on the experiences of staff and students from the SEAtS pilot. This will be conducted, the evidence made available for scrutiny, and decisions regarding the shape of the project informed by such evidence.

SEAtS own website says it "identifies students who are not visa compliant"³⁵. We demand to know what this system has been used for and the number of students who have been "supported", because international students, who are isolated and threatened enough as it is, have certainly not received sufficient support. This is racist and xenophobic surveillance culture. If this truly does not introduce greater surveillance than previously existed at Goldsmiths, this only raises further questions as to Goldsmiths' collusion with racism and xenophobia. There is a difference between monitoring in-house, and utilising a system of surveillance that is detrimental to international students.

We do not understand the distinction you are drawing here. For the avoidance of doubt, there is **no** automatic link or feed of data from SEAtS to any external organisation, such as the Home Office. Our reporting requirements are in **no way** changed by the introduction of a technological solution for a task that departments have been undertaking manually for many years.

³⁴ <https://www.goldsmithssu.org/asset/News/6013/RETENTION.pdf>

³⁵ <https://www.seatssoftware.com/ukvi/>

The UK governments' Hostile Environment policy is racist, and UKVI requirements for monitoring students holding Tier 4 visas are part of that racist system. While there is a legal requirement for Goldsmiths to be in compliance with these systems, international human rights principles require minimal cooperation with these kinds of regulations that have the potential to have harmful impacts. The monitoring of student attendance in every class is not an explicit requirement of UKVI compliance and other Higher Education Institutions have less granular approaches.

Compliance does not have to come at the expense of students' visa status. We demand that the College is transparent on its minimum requirements of compliance--what it entails, so that international students are able to publicly access the terms of their own visas. For example, we know that at Brunel University, their way of ensuring compliance is a system that does not rely on digital technology: instead, students must have three "points of contact". This involves genuine human interaction and enables staff to check on a students' progress in a compassionate manner which provides both qualitative and quantitative data. Surely, it would be more logical to track a student's progress in a way that does not rely on an automated system of threatening emails and warning systems which SEAtS would bring. SEAtS is not holistic, ignores the individual needs of students, and does not actually track performance.

The contract with SEAtS must be terminated.

We appreciate your strength of feeling on this point and it is evident that you object fiercely to aspects of UK immigration policy. Many staff, including SMT members, may agree with you on some of those points. But we have to comply with the law. While you are correct that "monitoring of student attendance in every class is not an explicit requirement of UKVI compliance", we are seeking to encourage an approach that allows for quicker identification of students at risk of falling behind with their studies, or even dropping out of their programme.

Many colleagues in academic departments are keen to have the use of technology that enables them to be alerted when students may be experiencing issues. This is not because they want to undertake surveillance of students, but because they are motivated to support their students in sensitive and appropriate ways to enable them to fulfil their potential while at Goldsmiths.

SEAtS allows academic departments to cope with the collation of often a huge amount of attendance data, reducing the time spent on this so that more time can be spent meaningfully supporting students with their studies. The SEAtS project is guided by the intention to support academic and professional staff, and it is certainly guided by the need to support academic staff in their face-to-face interactions with students.

Moreover, we propose an alternative system based on these three areas of consideration:

i. Wellness

Registers have never been a tool for pastoral care. More effective means of pastoral care are lower teacher/student ratios, enhanced wellbeing services (reversing the financial cuts), and also looking at the structural sources of distress (high fees, racism, lower senses of community through reduced contact hours, other forms of structural oppression, etc).

Registers are primarily taken by associate lecturers and fractional staff. If there was a crisis that these staff could address, they are only on campus part-time, leaving students open to risk.

A college mechanism for Race Impact Assessment should be created to assess the systemic impacts of new technical systems, starting with attendance systems.

The College should clearly decouple the monitoring requirements of UKVI compliance from monitoring intended to support student wellbeing.

Monitoring for wellbeing should **only** be introduced in conjunction with well resourced measures to address the newly identified needs. College mechanisms for supporting students, in particular around mental health needs, are already overwhelmed. Introducing new mechanisms of surveillance, even when the stated aims are benign, cannot be justified when the capacity to deliver additional support has not been evidenced.

No-one has claimed that attendance registers are in themselves a tool for pastoral care. They are, however, the only practical way in which the College can become aware of instances when a student has stopped attending contact sessions. Of course, we agree that more efficient attendance monitoring must be accompanied by development of student wellbeing services and signposting to external support.

However, we do not follow the logic that it is better for the College not to be aware of potential issues with individual students just because demand for existing services is high. Caseload would in fact be reduced were more issues to be identified earlier, before issues escalate. Our recent commitment to extra staffing for student wellbeing services will help with increasing capacity, and the counselling team will always prioritise particularly urgent cases.

ii. Equality

The Art department is exempt from using SEAtS, and Computing does not have plans to use SEAtS.

Goldsmiths hasn't produced an equalities report on the use of SEAtS, nor have they been transparent about the entire pipeline of how SEAtS will work.

For example, if there is a case where there needs to be a disciplinary proceeding, we demand to know the process. Students are entitled to know the processes that are in place. In the event that there is a glitch or a mistake, which will happen, what resources have they put in place to ensure that such a "mistake" doesn't come at the extreme cost of a student's wellness and safety?

As noted above, compliance with the College's Attendance Policy is mandatory.

As part of the roll-out process, a Data Privacy Impact Assessment has been undertaken and an Equality Impact Assessment is being conducted in light of experience and feedback from those participating in the pilot. SMT is happy to share these with staff and students and we will find a mechanism for publishing these in the near future.

On disciplinary proceedings, in the event of a 'mistake', students will have the right to make their case and then a further right of appeal, just as they do currently with the use of manual registration systems. It is difficult to see a case where an academic department would rely on a small amount of data to justify a student withdrawal.

iii. Prevent Duty

We cannot talk about surveillance of students without talking about the Prevent Duty, which has been politically mandated by the members of Goldsmiths Students' Union, UCU, and NUS Black Students' Campaign to be challenged.

We demand access to risk assessments the College has done as required by the guidance in relation to SEAtS.

We demand a copy of reviews of policies or procedures including disciplinary, grievance, employment contract and data protection policies SMT have undertaken with respect to the Prevent Duty and any conclusions thereby drawn.

We demand a timetable for how SMT intend to consult with students and staff about the Duty and staff/student response to it.

This is a new topic within our correspondence and we are not quite clear what policies and procedures you are referring to.

Our Annual Report and Risk Assessment in relation to the Prevent Duty can be found online at: <https://www.gold.ac.uk/governance/prevent/>. These documents include information about consultation with students and staff about the Duty.

SEAtS propagates the hostile environment for international students at Goldsmiths. Like the 'Docs Not Cops' campaign³⁶, where NHS staff have refused to take on the role of UK Border Force, universities should not act like border control. It is not the job of the College to police its students' immigration and visa status. That is the jurisdiction of the Home Office and UK Border Force; this should remain that way. Immigration should not be a barrier to education.

³⁶ <http://www.docsnocops.co.uk/>

The normalisation of surveillance of students, particularly international students, has received much criticism and concern from across the UK³⁷ but also from our siblings in the USA³⁸. John Hopkins University in Baltimore is currently under occupation due to the militarisation of their campus, which started with digitised attendance records. Surveillance of student attendance sets a precedent for a hostile campus environment, which was highlighted during the Queen's visit to King's College London, where predominantly Muslim students were singled out and barred from campus for being associated with protesting.³⁹

Overall, without a rigorous process of assessment based on anti-racist principles, the introduction of systems like SEAtS can only deepen existing problems of systematic racism. Why should the College commit to software from an outsourced company that flags up 'real time alerts' for Tier 4 visa students without accounting for the effects that such a system may have on the deeper questions of racism and justice at Goldsmiths?

In light of our responses above, we cannot agree with your conclusion that an IT solution for recording student attendance more efficiently – which still involves the personal input of session tutors, does not involve any intrusive technology, and does not allow for direct reporting to external bodies – is any more inherently racist than current attendance procedures.

Given your evident strength of feeling, however, we would be keen to discuss your concerns in greater depth, and furthermore encourage you to convey your concerns to the Students' Union President, who represents students at the project board.

10. Hate Crime Reporting Centre (HCRC)

Racism on campus continues to be an issue on campuses across the country, as highlighted in the #MyRacistCampus campaign run by NUS Black Students' Campaign⁴⁰. In response to this, hate crime reporting centres were created across the country, but research has shown this is inadequate. As such we need to urgently address the culture on campus around reporting and supporting students.

As stated on the Goldsmiths website: *"The College hosts an official third party hate crime reporting centre which is open to the public and can be used by everyone."*⁴¹ This is incredibly disconcerting, as not even students feel confident using this service, let alone members of the local community. As such, this requires immediate action. Goldsmiths cannot remain open as a hate crime reporting centre if the structures and resources are not already in place, which they clearly are not. There cannot be a protest every time an individual receives inappropriate,

³⁷ <https://cheesegratermagazine.org/2018/09/29/surveillance-tier-4/>; <https://theboar.org/2018/07/university-college-london-face-criticism-over-enforcement-of-immigration-controls-for-international-students/>;

<https://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/mar/02/universities-border-police-academics>

³⁸ <https://truthout.org/articles/the-militarization-of-johns-hopkins-exposes-a-nationwide-trend/>

³⁹ <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/mar/02/universities-border-police-academics>

⁴⁰ <https://www.facebook.com/nusBSC/photos/a.10151085692488197/10156074404968197/>

⁴¹ <https://www.gold.ac.uk/hate-crime-reporting/>

unqualified service, when reporting a hate crime.

We demand an end to the processes of mediation that exist in departments across the university which force students into contact with individuals they are submitting grievances against, resulting in unnecessary mental distress. The reporting scheme around incidents of race must include someone with specialist training in race-based trauma therapy being made available to students who are making complaints. We need to, as a matter of urgency, create a new system by which students are able to submit reports with the confidence that staff are competent and action will be taken immediately.

We demand that the College refers to the report of the study undertaken by the Centre for Hate Studies, University of Leicester titled '**Healing the Harms: Identifying How Best to Support Hate Crime Victims**'⁴² for further advice on how protocol can be followed whilst still ensuring the HCRC is victim-led and considerate of the needs of victims coming forward to make reports. This is but one avenue that Goldsmiths should explore.

It is worth noting that Goldsmiths' decision to join the national network of Hate Crime Reporting Centres was taken at the instigation of the Students' Union, and with their full support at every stage.

We have already committed to a review of the operation of the Hate Crime Reporting Centre, and how it inter-relates to Goldsmiths' internal procedures. As we have set out before, we fear there is some misunderstanding about the scope of the role of the HCRC, which is primarily designed as a signposting service rather than a body which can independently investigate hate crimes. We had hoped to begin the review process by now, but the initial meeting set for w/c 27 May had to be postponed after Students' Union representatives withdrew from participation. Since the Hate Crime Reporting Centre is a joint initiative between the College and the Students' Union, funded originally through a joint bid to the Higher Education Funding Council, the review cannot proceed without Students' Union engagement.

Once student representation can be secured, we will proceed rapidly with the review, which can address the points you make about mediation (which we assume to be a reference to informal procedures in some departments at 'Stage 1' of a student complaint). We would agree that, in instances where an incident of racism is reported, particularly sensitive handling by trained staff is required.

Thank you for flagging the University of Leicester research, which will assist further in the review process.

⁴² <https://www2.le.ac.uk/departments/criminology/hate/documents/healing-the-harms-of-hate-report>

Last but not least, the College must confirm receipt of the following statement in our initial demands:

“Any commitments to hate crime prevention and hate crime resolution must acknowledge the non-existence of reverse racism, responding in kind to prioritise students and staff who face structural oppression of multiple axes. It is vital that the University understands how structural oppression functions. Reverse forms of oppression (i.e. reverse racism) do not exist and must be rejected at all costs.”

We confirm receipt of this statement, as you request, and would be happy to work with the Students' Union to see how an appropriate reflection of this principle could be considered during the review of our procedures.

11. Contact time cuts for BA Applied Social Science, Community Development and Youth work

Goldsmiths Anti Racist Action have worked with students directly on this course, who have made this complaint, multiple times, because nothing has been done to address it. It is thus insulting to refer to our representation of their voices as "third party".

“Third party” simply reflects the fact that GARA do not formally represent the students in question in the College’s complaints procedure. No offence was intended. We do not publish the results of student complaints for obvious reasons, and we wanted to explain why we would not be able to share a running commentary on the resolution of this complaint with you publicly.

The Senior Management Team’s claim that “colleagues in STaCS have confirmed they will be willing to commit to providing temporary additional resource hours” is not only false, as confirmed by students on the course, but the exact opposite of a “gesture of goodwill”. These contact hours are not "additional", as they would be replacing the cut hours. The changes to these courses were not in relation to "the demands of students" hence why they're complaining about contact hours being cut. The College breached the contract students signed when they enrolled on this course; to do anything other than compensate them for lost contact hours would be a disgrace. Such an action cannot be considered a gesture of goodwill, and to suggest otherwise is insulting, as meeting a contract’s requirements is merely adhering to a legal requirement put in place to protect consumers, under which students fall.

The students of **BA Applied Social Science, Community Development and Youth Work** were unable to make a fully informed decision when signing the course contract, as the terms of the contract were changed without prior knowledge, unfairly and unreasonably. This makes it a matter

of the College not adhering to legislation as stated in **Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 (CPRS)**. Thus, it is not just a case of intervening on a “live complaint”; it is a case of choosing to enforce legislation or not, law to which the College is bound.

As you are aware, the College received a complaint from a group of students from various cohorts who are studying or have studied towards the BA Applied Social Science, Community Development and Youth Work. Following investigation of the complaint, findings and outcomes were set out to the complainants in correspondence of 3 May 2019. We are not in a position to discuss the specifics of the complaint for reasons that we hope you will appreciate.

We acknowledge that the manner in which changes made in 2015 to the structure of the programme were implemented and communicated could have been better. This is regrettable, and measures are being taken to address the matter.

It is felt that the revised structure of the programme is the right one. This has been endorsed by the relevant regulatory body. STaCS’ offer of additional temporary resource hours this year is well intentioned and is made in the spirit of the wider resolution of issues raised.

Refusal to address this as a legal problem, as opposed to an internal problem, will result in an escalation of this case to the **Consumer and Markets Authorities** and the **Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)**. This could result in “civil proceedings or criminal prosecutions against certain breaches”⁴³, committed by Goldsmiths College, as appropriate. Neither parties would want to reach this stage, as students of the course have expressed wanting to resolve this internally, but if left with no choice and inaction by the Senior Management Team, this will be the procedure taken. By choosing to minimise the severity of this “live complaint” and prolonging the resolution, the reputation of Goldsmiths College is at further risk from being exposed as breaking the law.

Henceforth, we refer to the Race Relations Act 1968, Part I, Unlawful Discrimination: **2. Provision of goods, facilities and services**⁴⁴. If the College is unable to commit to ensuring that BAME majority courses, such as **BA Applied Social Science, Community Development and Youth Work** and **MA Culture Industry**, are protected against cuts to funding and contact hours that white majority courses do not experience, then it is acting unlawfully. If the College is unable to provide services that enable international students, particularly those with English as a second language, to have fair and equal **access** the course content, then it is not enforcing equal opportunity and it is acting in contrast to the clauses set out in the Race Relations Act 1968.

⁴³ <https://www.universitiesuk.ac.uk/policy-and-analysis/reports/Documents/2016/consumer-rights-universities.pdf>

⁴⁴ <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1968/71/enacted>

By ignoring the needs of BAME students on BAME majority courses, it is knowledgeably refusing the provision of education “of the like quality, in the like manner and on the like terms in and on which the former normally makes them available to other members of the public”⁴⁵. It is the “wider management responsibilities” to ensure that BAME students receive the same quality of education as other students, but it is clear that this is not happening. And the College wonders why the BAME attainment gap exists.

Your legal analysis here is incorrect, not least as you refer to legislation which has been repealed and superseded by two further pieces of legislation. The law as it stands (Equality Act 2010⁴⁶) is clear about the limits of indirect discrimination. It is not the case that, because a programme has a majority of BAME students, it would be unlawful for a university to make any changes to it. What matters is the reasons for the changes.

Inevitably, a College with more than 40% of its students identifying as BAME is likely to have a number of courses where any given cohort has a BAME majority. While the College has publicly acknowledged the need to be sensitive to the potential impact of programme changes on any group sharing a protected characteristic, there will be instances where such changes are a reasonable way of achieving a legitimate aim, typically based on pedagogical developments and the need to reflect wider trends in the discipline. We do not wish to enter into public correspondence about a specific student complaint, but suffice to say that the STaCS team considered the changes to the programme in question carefully, basing their proposals on changing trends within their discipline.

12. Contacting the Israeli Embassy Regarding Hafez Omar

Thank you for sending the letter to the Israeli Embassy in regards to Hafez Omar’s arrest. There is now a public campaign in support of Hafez so we would now expect that Goldsmiths publishes the letter they sent to the embassy publicly on the website and social media as a further proof of commitment.

The Warden’s letter to the Israeli Embassy of 2 April is yet to receive a response. It would be unusual, and probably unhelpful to Hafez’s cause, were the College to publish casework correspondence addressed to international diplomats. We have ensured that GARA received a copy in good time for your own reference.

We have not seen any evidence of a public campaign or any recent media coverage of Hafez’s situation. If you are aware of any developments in his case, we would be interested to hear about

⁴⁵ *ibid*

⁴⁶ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents>

them so that we might consider whether a follow-up to our earlier letter to the Israeli Embassy might be in order.

For a more detailed summary of how the College can provide further support to its students, please refer back to **Section 5** where we outline the support required for Palestinian students.

CONCLUSION

In summary, we have spent great time and effort in doing our own investigation into these demands. We are confident in our demands, and we have full confidence that the College will be able to implement all of these demands with immediate effect, with full consultation of the Student Body and formation of student-led committees.

It would be selfish and irresponsible of us to settle for less, especially when the futures of BAME staff and students at Goldsmiths are at stake. For the College, its reputation as a progressive institution is at stake. We will reiterate: the occupation will not end until **all** the demands are met in a satisfactory, assessable, and transparent manner.

Actions speak louder than words. Let the actions speak, Senior Management Team.

We agree that actions speak louder than words, which is why we have been so keen to get back around the table to start discussing in detail how we can take forward key aspects of this vital work to improve the experiences of all of our BAME students.

We hope that, in this honest and direct response to your supplementary points and additional demands, we have been clear about where we agree, and where we disagree.

That is surely a good basis for resuming talks, which we believe would be assisted by the professional services of a specialist mediator. We have therefore taken up your proposal to approach the Tutu Foundation, alongside two other providers, and we invite you to consider the following options for potential independent mediation support. All three, in our view, are well qualified to assist us in facilitating talks:

Brap: <https://www.brap.org.uk>

Southwark Mediation: <https://www.southwarkmediation.co.uk>

Tutu Foundation: <https://www.tutufoundationuk.org>

We can provide direct contact details of the team members at each organisation with whom we have made contact, in order that you can approach them with any questions – please let us know if you would like these.

SMT is keen to meet w/c 10 June, at a mutually convenient time, when we can perhaps at least agree which mediators to engage, alongside any agenda items you wish to raise as a priority. We look forward to hearing from you, and repeat our desire to enter into discussions in good faith – acknowledging that we appreciate the considerable sacrifices that GARA members have made in order to press your cause so forcibly, and the fact that this reflects your heartfelt agenda for improving the experience for BAME students at Goldsmiths.