

Request for Senate Review of Complaint Regarding Mr Daniele Rosina

I am herein making an official request for a Senate Review of a formal complaint made against Mr Daniele Rosina, Head of Orchestral Studies and conductor, as part of the University of Birmingham Music Society (hereon: UoBMS, or simply "Music Society"). Having gone through the formal complaints procedure, involving the supplying of a statement, witness testimony, and dialogue with the Investigating Officer (IO) Prof. Aengus Ward, and receipt of the response to that investigation (hereon: "the report" or "the response" or "IO Report") from School of Languages, Culture, Art, History, and Music (LCAHM), I am dissatisfied with the conclusions and recommendations of this complaint. Therefore, I am making this request for a Senate Review of this complaint according to the [CODE OF PRACTICE ON STUDENT CONCERNS AND COMPLAINTS](#) (attached, hereon CoPSCC).

For the reference of the reader, I will refer throughout to relevant documents which shall be attached, by page numbers and/or section headings and bullet points (§, •) where appropriate.

The issues taken with the Response provided by the IO are given on the [SENATE REVIEW PANEL SUBMISSION FORM](#) (SRPSF), but are listed below in brief:

1. The IO fails to apply the Reasonableness Test described in the [UNIVERSITY'S HARASSMENT AND BULLYING POLICY \(HEREON HBP\) §5.2](#).
2. Whilst communication with the IO was thorough throughout, the nature of that communication meant that I was not provided with the opportunity to supply relevant information to the IO that, I believe, would have impacted the conclusions drawn in the School's response.
3. I have multiple concerns over the handling and communication of witnesses for both parties and their statements; including which witnesses were and were not considered, and the standard for witnesses and evidence being unequal for complainant and complainee.
4. There are in the IO's report: multiple factual errors, allegations stated as facts, an overall lack of precision regarding witness testimony, and occasions where accounts of events are presented from Mr Rosina's (and presumably his witnesses') viewpoint with no contrast against mine (and my witnesses') own, and no assertion of supporting evidence to justify taking Mr Rosina's and co.'s version of events over mine and my witnesses' own.
5. There is a general lack of sense of contrition by Mr Rosina for the substance of his actions, only merely for the manner of communication of them.

This document will detail these issues one by one in a depth better suited to a standalone document than the limited space available in the [SRPSF](#).

Attached Documentation

The following is a list by filename of all the attached documentation attached to this complaint in support thereof (including this document):

Amira Campbell Statement.docx
Chris Hill Reasonable Adjustment Plan.pdf
Christopher Hill complaint School final.pdf
Communication from Gavin Allsop Regarding Dress Rehearsal Absence.pdf
Concern Review Form.doc
cop-student-concerns-complaints-20-21.pdf
Correspondance Between Complainant and IO.pdf
Formal Complaint Against Mr Daniele Rosina.pdf
Fwd Advice on piece for Soloist competition.pdf
Fwd_ Advice on piece for Soloist competition.eml
Mark Mingard Statement.odt
RE_ This week schedule (Jun22).eml
Record of interview with Chris Hill 6 Fbnruary 2023.docx
Request for Senate Review of Complaint Regarding Mr Daniele Rosina.pdf
Review Panel Form Christopher Hill.doc
University of Birmingham bullying.pdf

Regarding the IO

I would like it known that I have no personal complaint against the IO. Throughout the course of this process they were exemplary in their kindness and consideration of my case, and discussions with them were as pleasant as a discussion of such a distressing nature could be reasonably made to be, and they were particularly good at detailing the steps of the formal process, and being considerate of the factors that could help me navigate the process in accordance with my [RAP](#). The nature of my complaint here regarding their report is purely to do with what I see as failings of the report produced by them, matters of the process of producing said report, and what I see as logical and procedural failings in the content of that report.

Regarding the "Test of Reasonableness"

Quoting [HBP§7.3](#):

When considering allegations of bullying, the University will apply the test of 'reasonableness' to determine if bullying has taken place. The test will be applied as outlined in paragraphs 5.1- 5.2 above with due regard in particular to the perception of the Complainant and whether the behaviour in question could reasonably be considered to undermine, humiliate, denigrate or injure the Complainant.

Unfortunately, these principles do not appear to have been implemented when assessing whether bullying had occurred by Mr Rosina towards myself. This fundamentally alters the IO's assessment of whether or not the actions requested as redress can be undertaken. Furthermore, the language of the IO's report indicates that they did at least consider some form of test of reasonableness in their assessment of the situation, yet fails to acknowledge that the passing of such a test indicates that the alleged bullying under consideration had indeed occurred.

There are multiple points where this is evident in the report:

It is not clear that this event *per se* constitutes a breach of the bullying policy, though given the combination of events mentioned, it may be reasonable that Mr. Hill felt that it did. — [IO REPORT, PG. 4](#)

It is not clear that the incident was intended to undermine, humiliate etc. Mr. Hill, although he may reasonably have experienced it this way. — [IO REPORT, PG. 5](#)

While the student does indeed have a protected characteristic, and associated RAP, there is no direct evidence to suggest that the conduct which is the subject of the complaint is directly related to it; as a result, the incidents cannot themselves be considered harassment. However, they may certainly have been experienced as something similar by Mr. Hill. — [IO REPORT, PG. 6](#)

In these cases, an acknowledgement is clearly made that I, as the complainant, could **reasonably** interpret Mr Rosina's conduct as Bullying, Victimisation, or Harassment. This, by the definitions defined in HBP, would seem to thus concur that by a reasonableness test such conduct could be considered as such. However, the IO instead refers repeatedly to a "test" or "threshold" of Bullying, Victimisation, or Harassment — a bar for which they do not believe this conduct exceeds ([HBP PGS. 5 & 6](#)).

Unless there is some form of threshold undocumented within the [HBP](#), it can only be assumed that this test is referring to the definition the IO cites on the [IO REPORT PG. 5](#) referring to [HBP§6.1](#). If this is the case, I must respectfully disagree that the incidents described do not meet these criteria, and I give exact references to the examples given in the [HBP](#) in my original [FORMAL COMPLAINT \(PGS. 3-9\)](#) for each incident cited, clearly illustrating how each example meets the description of Bullying and/or Victimisation as defined in the [HBP](#).

It is also worth highlighting that, according to the [HBP§5.1](#):

The defining factor in determining if behaviour amounts to Harassment is that the behaviour is unacceptable to the recipient and could 'reasonably be considered' to amount to Harassment. The intention of the person engaging in the behaviour – whether or not they meant to harass – is not a primary factor in determining if Harassment has taken place.

Note that this statement regarding the primacy of the complainant's perception on the acknowledgement of whether or not Harassment has taken place also applies to incidences of Bullying according to [§7.3](#).

Therefore, the IO is, in the course of the report, presenting a contradiction. On the one hand, I have highlighted exactly the ways in which I allege I have been Bullied, Harassed, etc. by Mr Rosina, with specific cross-reference to the [HBP](#). The IO has confirmed that it may be reasonable that I should perceive Mr Rosina's behaviour as such. Simultaneously, they maintain that the conduct does not meet the standard to qualify as such. These two positions are directly contradictory, as laid out by the definition of these terms in the [HBP](#).

Concerning Harassment

It should be pointed out that in my [FORMAL COMPLAINT](#) I only ever allege Harassment by Mr Rosina **in terms of** Victimisation ([PG. 9](#)), since Victimisation is unlawful under harassment and discrimination legislature ([HBP§8.3](#)). The IO seems to have centred their understanding of the Harassment complaint, instead, according to my protected characteristics ([IO REPORT PG. 6](#)) and associated [RAP](#), which was not the central point of my argument. I did recall an event to the IO where I felt that I was being demeaned because of that protected characteristic, but noted at the time that I hadn't included it in the [FORMAL COMPLAINT](#) because I knew I would not have the supporting evidence for that particular incident, which was why I had focussed my complaint on the incidents where I believed Bullying and Victimisation to have clearly taken place, and where I had ample enough evidence to support such a claim.

Crucially, according to the definition of Victimisation according to the [HBP§8](#), there is no requirement that the complainant have any particular protected characteristic, only that the complaine believes them to "intend to make such an allegation" ([HBP§8.1](#)). Considering that Mr Rosina alleges that in Incident 3 I "made allegations of favouritism" ([IO REPORT PG. 4](#)) against him — a charge that would certainly qualify a complaint of Harassment if true — he could reasonably expect that I would make a complaint. It is my belief that what followed in that confrontation, specifically regarding his threatening to bar me from the orchestra for the coming term as well as his generally threatening and aggressive demeanour, was Victimisation by way of an attempt to scare me into not making such a complaint for fear of losing my position (as I describe in my [FORMAL COMPLAINT PG. 9](#)).

I maintain that I did not, at the time, accuse Mr Rosina of favouritism, but that he eminently believed me to be doing so regardless. As of writing my [FORMAL COMPLAINT](#), however, subsequent to my discussions with other members of the orchestra — past and present — about their experiences, as well as reflecting on my own treatment, do believe him to have actively engaged in favouritism and continues to do so.

Regarding Communication with the IO

I have attached as a PDF export, for reference, the email correspondence between myself and the IO for the duration of the process (see "[CORRESPONDANCE BETWEEN COMPLAINANT AND IO.PDF](#)"). Whilst I was greatly appreciative of the regularity of the correspondence, upon reading the report it became clear that there are a number of issues that could have been easily resolved if that communication had asked for clarification or further information on particular matters, particularly those concerning the operation and practices of the Music Society, and matters regarding witnesses. These will respectively be addressed in the sections below on the [FACTUAL ERRORS](#) present in the report, as well as [MATTERS REGARDING WITNESSES](#).

Matters Regarding Witnesses

Regarding Anonymity of Witnesses

As noted in the [IO REPORT PGS. 2-3](#) and [EMAIL COMMUNICATION PGS. 7-9](#), the IO and I spent a great deal of time discussing the viability of whether or not witnesses to events could remain anonymous in some capacity. I was informed, after the IO had consulted with the appropriate people within the University, that this would not be possible under the

Universities' policies. The argument presented in favour of this position is one of natural justice; that the complainee had a right to know what they were being accused of and by whom. I counterargued that this argument does not outweigh the potential endangerment of those giving testimony, and that discussion was had both in the meeting (as can be seen in the meeting summary document "[RECORD OF INTERVIEW WITH CHRIS HILL 6 FEBRUARY 2023.DOCX](#)" [sic] as well as the [EMAIL CORRESPONDANCE PGS. 7-9](#)). The details of that discussion can be found there, and my argument against this as a policy, and especially the posing of the possibility that the identities of the witnesses are revealed to the IO and the School, but not the Music Department or Mr Rosina, which was also rejected. This vastly reduced the number of people that were willing to testify about the incidents in question (there were, at one time, as many as 12 people who wished to submit their testimony, for fear of reprisals, only 3 were ultimately willing to be identified).

My inquiry into why the University was adopting this policy when doing so presented a real and probable threat to student wellbeing remains unanswered ([EMAIL CORRESPONDANCE PG. 7](#)).

Furthermore, upon further scrutiny of the [CoPSCC](#), it seems that there is little procedural justification for demanding that witnesses be identified to the complainee. To address the relevant sections of that document:

Anonymous concerns or complaints will not be dealt with under this Code of Practice. —
[§1.9](#)

This particular section simply states that anonymous **concerns** or **complaints** will not be considered, it says nothing of supporting testimony for a named complainant.

All information received as a result of an investigation into a concern or a complaint will remain confidential to those involved in the process and those who may need to be consulted in order to reach an appropriate outcome. However, it should be noted that, in the interests of natural justice, key individuals referred to in the complaint will be informed of the complaint and outcome. — [§1.7](#)

This statement seems to directly contradict the course of action taken in the course of this investigation. The final sentence refers, again, not to witness statements supporting the named complaint. The complainee would only, under this section, be entitled to know **a)** what the nature of the complaint was, and **b)** what the outcome of the process was. This makes much more rational sense in that it safeguards any student who might wish to testify about the complaint from potential victimisation from the complainee.

The resultant question for the Senate is then clear: if revealing the identity of witnesses to the complainee presents a real and probable threat to their welfare, and the practice of revealing witness identities to the complainee is not supported by the [CODE OF PRACTICE](#), why was that the decision made when investigating this case?

Additionally, if Mr Rosina is entitled to know what he is being accused of and by whom, I would argue that his own witness testimonies should be also revealed to me. I certainly qualify as a "key individual referred to in the complaint" and since their testimonies must pertain to their perception of my own conduct if they are to support Mr Rosina's version of events, I should therefore be entitled to the same right of reply as Mr Rosina has here been afforded.

Regarding Lack of Witness Statement from Mark Mingard

A witness statement from Mark Mingard, mentioned in my [FORMAL COMPLAINT \(PG. 17\)](#) as the individual who would be submitting a statement after Christmas, and in the [EMAIL COMMUNICATION \(PG. 7\)](#), was not present in the report.

On discussion with this witness, it transpires that whilst he was initially contacted for his testimony, to which he sent a reply, the responding email bounced. The exact technological problem at fault is not clear, although seemingly some kind of server error caused the issue.

Mr Mingard and I feel that this request for testimony was not pursued with an appropriate degree of persistence. Upon struggling to contact Mr Mingard, for example, why did the IO at some point during our frequent correspondence ask me whether or not Mr Mingard was still willing to supply testimony? Nor did he ask me to get in contact with Mr Mingard on his behalf so I, could facilitate finding a good line of communication between them?

Mr Mingard has provided a statement which is attached to this complaint: [MARK MINGARD STATEMENT.ODT](#).

Regarding the Treatment of the Testimony of Amira Campbell

Despite the IO having a face-to-face meeting with Ms Campbell, as well as subsequent email correspondence, the key points of concern raised in those communications were not significantly addressed in the IO report. This is not merely my own opinion as the complainant, but one shared with Ms Campbell, who showed pronounced concern at the minimal impact her testimony had seemingly made on the findings of the IO.

Ms Campbell has provided a statement which is attached to this complaint: [AMIRA CAMPBELL STATEMENT.DOCX](#).

Regarding Character Testimonies

I had no idea until the release of the report that Mr Rosina would be receiving character testimonies from 7 different people, from within the University and externally. It particularly alarms me to note that among those listed are 3 teachers from the Royal Birmingham Conservatoire. Whilst I can understand that testimony from Mr Rosina's work colleagues makes sense as a good measure of his professional character, this also raises the very distinct possibility that my complaint has been discussed by Mr Rosina with music professionals outside the University, which is exactly among the fears I express of professional repercussions for making this complaint that I raise in my [FORMAL COMPLAINT \(PG. 2\)](#), and that many others cited as their reason to wish to remain anonymous.

Furthermore, I was never presented with a similar opportunity to provide character references, quite the reverse in fact. In discussion with the IO, it was impressed on me the importance that I should seek only witness testimony to the incidents about which I was making a complaint, and not the concerns of other students about Mr Rosina's conduct towards them, or of their opinion of myself. Indeed, when one of my witnesses received communication from the IO asking for their testimony, their email specifies: "I would be grateful if you were able to give me your view of the incident that occurred that day, and any other relevant information.", at no point proffering the option to testify to my character. I,

indeed, had thought such a subjective character reference would be inconsequential to such a supposedly facts-based investigation.

Had I been given the opportunity to provide my own character references, attesting to my professional conduct and refuting Mr Rosina's accusations of my "argumentative" attitude and other accusations of unprofessionalism (IO REPORT PGS. 5-6), I would have been able to do so. I have been a member of innumerable orchestras, many of national and international standing, over the course of my musical career, and know of a great many who could attest to my professionalism in orchestral settings, not least of all the organisers of the National Youth Wind Orchestra and National Schools Symphony Orchestra where I had extensive stints as principal chair, as well as members and staff of the City of Birmingham Symphony Orchestra, and former principal flautist of the London Symphony Orchestra and internationally acclaimed flautist, Paul Edmund-Davies, to name but a few. I mention this, not only to highlight my standing as an orchestral flautist, but to highlight how by Mr Rosina being solely able to provide character reference, the report presents a very skewed perspective on the perceptions of our characters.

Vagueness and Inaccuracies Regarding Witnesses

There are multiple occurrences within the document where witness testimony is presented in such a vague manner that it is impossible to draw meaningful conclusions from it. I again refer to my point about my own right to reply if others have been making aspersions against my character in the course of them giving testimony that I mentioned in the section

REGARDING ANONYMITY OF WITNESSES.

[...] the commentary from **members of the orchestra then present** does not contest this assertion — IO REPORT PG. 4 (emphasis own)

Various people present confirmed the nature of the interaction, but were not able to confirm the content of it. — IO REPORT PG. 5 (emphasis own)

For context, I have been told by **various parties** that there is both a tacit, and explicit (<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSDDKRs7QCAOATaOKQLyVGETUMWsFykZ4H2WA9DnOXQNzYEvcQ/viewform>) understanding that participation in the full concert requires full participation in the dress rehearsal. — IO REPORT PG. 5 (emphasis own)

Several of the witnesses expressed surprise that any absence from dress rehearsals had been asked for, or granted. — IO REPORT PG. 6 (emphasis own)

Witnesses speak of Mr. Rosina's tone of voice and clear exasperation which caused the orchestra to fall silent, and Mr. Hill's disrespectful tone in addressing Mr. Rosina. — IO REPORT PG. 6 (emphasis own)

In all of these incidences, the language implies a general consensus of multiple parties agreeing on an absolute version of events. This, I believe, grossly misrepresents the degree of consensus about these events, especially in light of the inability of witnesses to testify against Mr Rosina anonymously. Looking over the list of witnesses, for example, only one member of the orchestra is listed, so how can there be numerous witnesses to these events?

Regarding the 4th quote about witnesses expressing surprise, for example: not only is the surprise of witnesses completely inconsequential to the veracity of the claim that I did, in fact, have permission to be absent, this suffers greatly from the omission of the witnesses concerned here. Gavin Allsop personally gave me the permission to miss a section of the dress rehearsal (email correspondence attached as "[COMMUNICATION FROM GAVIN ALLSOP REGARDING DRESS REHEARSAL ABSENCE.PDF](#)"), as per the very same [MEMBERSHIP AGREEMENT FORM](#) that is cited in the 3rd quote. To quote the member agreement:

I understand that absences must be agreed with the University Music team, (NOT the conductor) in advance of the rehearsal by phone or email. — Philharmonic Orchestra - Member Agreement (2021/22), •3, emphasis in original

Factual Errors and Allegations Stated as Fact

There is a recurring issue here where factual information is simply inaccurate; inevitably a consequence of having incomplete information. I reiterate that had some of these issues been discussed with me in my communication with the IO subsequent to our formal meeting, I could have supplied some of the evidently missing information, which I believe substantially impacts the conclusions drawn from this report.

One example is that the IO states that "The question of permissions for, and notification of, absences from rehearsals appears not to have been especially clear, and may have been partially responsible for some of Mr. Rosina's reaction." ([IO REPORT, PG. 5](#)). This is untrue, as the process by which members can request permission for absence from rehearsal is definitively stated in the [MEMBERSHIP AGREEMENT FORM](#) for the Philharmonic Orchestra, as it is for any of the Society's auditioned ensembles. One can only hope that the conductor of a UoBMS ensemble would have familiarised themselves with such an agreement; I certainly had to sign one to conduct the Saxophone Choir and the Wind Band respectively! Furthermore, the notification for the absence in question could not have been much more direct, as he was directly copied in to the email correspondence I have with Gavin Allsop where the permission was requested and granted, as can be seen in the [ATTACHED EMAILS](#). This radically recharacterises Mr Rosina's blatant lack of understanding of the process of requesting absence from rehearsal not as the fault of unclear procedure, but as a complete ignorance of the well-documented and established procedure. This can only be seen as negligent at best and wilful at worst, and recontextualises the IO's recommendation to "Review practice and put in place a robust procedure for notifying absence from rehearsals" ([IO REPORT PG. 7](#)). It also highlights the mischaracterisation of Mr Rosina's comprehension of the process highlighted on [PG. 6](#): "it emerged that Mr. Rosina was not aware that Mr. Hill had been granted an absence from this rehearsal. This, of course, was not Mr. Hill's fault, but one of process.". Clearly the fault here, in light of these facts, is not with the process at all, but of Mr Rosina's inability, or refusal, to follow it.

The statement that I was given "the prestigious role of the lead of the woodwind section" ([IO REPORT PG. 2](#)), and that this is evidence that Mr Rosina had cause to hold me to a higher standard than other members of the orchestra ([IO REPORT PG. 4](#)) due to a position of seniority is also factually untrue. There is no "lead of the woodwind section", or at least there certainly wasn't one during my tenure with the orchestra, nor is this a common practice among orchestras in general. Whilst I was given the position as principal flute, this only

places me on the same degree of authority with, for example, the principal oboist: one of the people also using a phone extensively during rehearsal and whom I don't recall a single instance of Mr Rosina admonishing, let alone to the excessive extent he showed for my minor infraction. By claiming that I was given some prestigious position of authority, Mr Rosina is blatantly attempting to justify his holding of me to a different standard than other orchestral members, which rather ironically only supports my position that I was being singled out. Additionally, this claim is clearly being used to try to prove that he was not putting me in any professional detriment, as, so the logic goes, if I am being given this prestigious position, how could he be seen to be acting to the detriment of my career. This serves as a smokescreen from his clear disparaging of my character in the incidents described in the [FORMAL COMPLAINT](#) in front of the orchestra, with the goal of humiliating me and negatively affecting my standing among my peers.

There are also several occasions where Mr Rosina's perspective is stated as factual information without supporting evidence to support such an assertion. For example: "When YouTube clips were provided, he asked (orally) that Mr. Hill provide him with a score, and this was not forthcoming." ([IO REPORT PG. 3](#)). Not only is this untrue, it is completely hearsay, with no supporting evidence that such a conversation took place beyond Mr Rosina's own testimony. My account of events, by contrast, was supported by the factual evidence of email exchanges that I included attached to my [FORMAL COMPLAINT](#), and have attached to this document as "[FWD ADVICE ON PIECE FOR SOLOIST COMPETITION.PDF](#)". It may not have been the intention of the IO to present this account of events in a more factual and less allegational manner than my own claims, indeed I highly doubt this was the intention, but the phraseology of incidences like these within the text speak to a general treatment of Mr Rosina's testimony as more trustworthy than my own, regardless of the presence or absence of evidence.

Mr Rosina's Lack of Contrition

Mr Rosina has clearly taken the very barest minimum level of accountability for his actions in response to these allegations, and has endeavoured to try and misrepresent the facts of these incidents to shed as much responsibility for his actions as possible.

The only indication of remorse for his actions is shown in [PGS. 5 AND 6](#) of the report:

Whatever the circumstances, it is clear that Mr. Rosina's conduct on this occasion did not live up to the high standard expected of staff/student interactions – and in the course of the investigation he recognised that this was the case. — [IO REPORT, PG. 5](#)

There is no doubt that on occasions his interactions fell below the standard which one would expect in this context, as he himself recognises, and there are recommendations in this regard below. — [IO REPORT, PG. 6](#)

Mr Rosina thus admits to wrongdoing towards me only on one occasion, and only with regards the **spirit** of his conduct (aka. shouting at me, or inappropriate managing of emails) rather than the **substance** of it (accusing me of making allegations I wasn't, thereby implying that I am a liar, that I am disrespectful, and belittling me in front of my peers). At all other avenues, he shirks responsibility either by turning responsibility for his actions back

onto me, or by blaming unfamiliarity with a process that he had no excuse to be ignorant of, especially considering his considerable tenure here at the University.

This is why in addition to the items of redress stated in my [CONCERN REVIEW FORM](#), I feel it is important at this juncture to request a formal, written apology from Mr Rosina, as stated in the [REVIEW PANEL FORM](#). This was not requested originally because I could see no way in which such an apology would bring me any closure to this situation. Now, however, I believe it is necessary, as it would require Mr Rosina to take responsibility for his actions in a manner in which he thus far seems unwilling to do. This is especially important to me, as one of my primary goals in making this complaint is to ensure that my fellow students will not suffer abuse at Mr Rosina's hand in the way I have, and his clear reluctance to accept accountability for his actions makes me feel like he has not intention on changing his manner towards students; his actions, in other words, do not agree with his assertion that he wishes to improve his conduct going forward.

Conclusion and Desired Outcomes

Over the course of this document, I hope to have highlighted the following:

- That there are a number of factual and procedural errors in the report produced by the IO.
- That there is an inequality between the presentation of the complainee's account of events and my own.
- That these errors and representations consequentially affect the conclusions and recommendations made by the IO.
- That a closer examination of the procedure and of the impact of power dynamics between staff and students are required in order to give a fair account of a complaint such as this.

I hope that, should these key ideas be communicated effectively by this document, the Senate should find that further investigation is required in order to come to a satisfactory conclusion on what actions should be taken in light of these incidents, and that such an investigation should supply both complainant and complainee the same rights to information and opportunities to present a diversity of evidence in support of their account of events. Such an investigation should also take into consideration ways in which individuals may provide evidence to a named complaint without fear of reprisals through their identity being made known to a person in a greater position of power than them and about whom they are making allegations.