BEZEMER & SCHUBAD
Advies Onderzoek Training

Design Academy Eindhoven

Report on the assessment of social safety and culture

Rotterdam, April 9, 2021

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In the 2nd half of 2020, the Design Academy Eindhoven (hereinafter 'DAE') was confronted with statements on social media about alleged unacceptable behaviour by teaching staff. The situation that has arisen causes unrest in the area of social safety within the DAE organisation and among the students. In addition to initiating a separate investigation that focuses specifically on the events at the Identity department, the Executive Board of the DAE decided to conduct a broad assessment of social safety and culture.

2. Terms of reference

The Executive Board of the DAE commissioned Bezemer & Schubad to perform a broad and exploratory assessment of the social safety and social culture within the DAE and, in addition to the findings, to provide recommendations for measures.

The Executive Board of the DAE decided to open a reporting centre for students, alumni, (ex)tutors and (ex)staff at Bezemer & Schubad. Reporting could be made in any way desired, by (anonymous) letter, by email only, information, a story or with documents. If anyone wanted to be considered for an interview, they could indicate this accordingly. And Bezemer & Schubad selected tutors and staff by random sampling and invited them for an interview. Students, tutors and staff connected to the Studio Identity were not involved in this assessment. The reports that appeared to relate to the parallel investigation at Studio Identity were to be passed on to the investigators of that specific investigation.

Interviews took place with reporting persons who indicated that they are open to an interview or were selected for this. A semi-structured questionnaire was used to explore how students, tutors and staff experience social interaction at DAE, what irks or annoys them and what they like and enjoy, what they find important, what they would like to change and what they would like to keep. Reporting persons were free to name other themes, which they themselves considered more relevant.

The reports from the reporting centre and interviews with reporting persons and staff are expressed in this report in findings and the relevant themes have been analysed. The report is anonymised as much as possible, except for the capacities of persons who are repeatedly mentioned by the reporting persons and/or interviewees. Recommendations are made in the report about any measures to be taken.

This assessment did expressly not target any particular individuals. The terms of reference, approach and working methods employed for this investigation, the open call for participation and the random sampling among tutors and staff form an appropriate methodology for this kind of investigation.

3. Investigators

The assessment was carried out by Marja Jeanson, senior investigator at Bezemer & Schubad. Project secretary Ad van Wijk facilitated the reporting point and supported the investigator. The analysis and recommendations were produced in consultation with Ernst-Jan Schubad, director at Bezemer & Schubad.

4. Regulations

The Working Conditions Act served as the legal framework for this assessment, at least for tutors and staff. The Working Conditions Act requires employers to implement policies against unwanted behaviour (Article 3, paragraph 2). Unwanted behaviour is part of what the law calls 'psychosocial workload'. The employer's policy must focus both on dealing with unwanted behaviour displayed by co-workers or supervisors, and on unwanted behaviour coming from third parties. The aim of such policy is to prevent unwanted behaviour and, if that proves impossible, to limit psychosocial workload by implementing state-of-the-art measures.

The investigators also used the 'Institutional Plan 2019-2024' and the Design Academy Eindhoven's 'Complaints procedure for unwanted behaviour' for the assessment.

5. Method

In the run-up to the assessment, the Executive Board posted several messages on the website www.designacademy.nl, which they know is popular among the Design Academy community. Successively, the following messages were posted on the website (abridged by the investigators).

- November 26, 2020: *'The Executive Board decided to assign an independent external agency to perform an assessment on the general environment and culture, with a view to identifying critical situations that may affect the wellbeing of students and staff within the school. The assessment, led by professionals, will start from instances of discomfort that have been made known to us, and will guide us in the future improvement of conditions for everyone in the academy. And the availability of confidential counsellors (both internal and external) were announced.'*
- December 4, 2020: *'Announcement of the Bezemer & Schubad assessment open for all students, tutors, staff and alumni. The Executive Board also stated that Design Academy Eindhoven should be a safe environment for all its students, tutors and staff. Those who do not respect of who violate this safe environment do not belong to our community. All students, tutors and staff – the Executive Board included – must be at all times be aware of the responsibility they carry and act accordingly. Ensuring DAE is a safe space for all, and not just for some, is the responsibility of the Executive Board.*
  It is only in an environment of harmony and reciprocal respect that we will be able to achieve our goals as an institution.'
- December 15, 2020: *'Today the investigation carried out by Bezemer & Schubad starts. The goal of this assessment is to address experiences of intimidation, sexual harassment, bullying, discrimination, aggression, non-inclusion, violence, or other forms of social insecurity that you may have experienced. This investigation is not only into inappropriate behaviour. We are also interested in more subtle, silent or hidden aspects of a culture that makes you feel unsafe. We would like to stress that while we take all allegations of misconduct seriously, this is not a witch-hunt and staff should not feel insecure or intimidated. We have absolute confidence in our extraordinary community as a whole. We must and will address the individual instances that we have been already made aware of, but our larger goal is to understand what can be done to make DAE a better environment for all – students and staff alike.*

Attached you find an invitation from Bezemer & Schubad to participate in this investigation. They explain their working method and guarantee the anonymity and confidentiality of all who reach out to Bezemer & Schubad.
As the Executive Board, we cannot stress enough the importance and urgency of this investigation. We take it seriously and will act upon the final findings and advice of Bezemer & Schubad. Therefore, we urge you all to participate in order to create a safe learning and working environment.'

All were invited to submit issues and experiences at the reporting centre, via a special Bezemer & Schubad email address. This email address was directly linked to the investigators.

After the opening on December 15, the reporting centre was slow to start up. The Christmas period and New Year may have played a role in this. More reports were received at a faster rate in the course of January. A total of 30 reports were processed with 31 respondents (1 report was made by 2 respondents). To select tutors and staff, random samples were drawn by Bezemer & Schubad from the list of names provided by the Executive Board and were actively invited by Bezemer & Schubad. Out of a total of 28, 21 employees (tutors and staff) were interviewed in January and early February 2021, online with Zoom.

In summary, 52 respondents decided to participate in the assessment. 31 of these respondents (students, alumni, tutors and staff) came in to the reporting centre spontaneously. For 11 of these respondents, we only used the written material they submitted initially, while interviews were also held with the remaining 21 respondents. The 21 respondents (DAE tutors and staff) were approached by the investigators and only interviewed.

The distribution of respondents was as follows: 18 students, 5 alumni, 10 tutors, 8 heads/coordinators and 11 staff members. 7 of the tutors and staff members were also alumni.

One-third of respondents from the reporting centre were, as far as the investigators are aware, Dutch, while two-thirds of the DAE respondents approached by the researchers were Dutch.

The reporting centre respondents were 80% female and 20% male, while the respondents who were approached proactively by the investigators were 50% female and 50% male, without this being the investigators' express intention.

6. Analysis

This analysis is based on the responses of the 52 respondents. Although respondents shared their input with due care and attention, frequently going into great detail and highlighting positive aspects too, the total number of respondents was rather limited, given the size of the overall community, which consisted of 720 students, 225 tutors and 105 staff members, as well as an unknown number of alumni and former employees.

In other words, many community members opted against contributing to this assessment, for which there may be myriad potential reasons. Possibly, people did not feel the need to respond because they are satisfied with the DAE, whereas others may believe that sharing their input would be pointless. It cannot be ruled out that some people might not have felt safe enough to participate or may not be inclined to express

their views because of their cultural background. Alternatively, people may have been too busy to participate, and the COVID-19 pandemic may have also been a barrier.

We also note that experience has taught us that giving people access to a hotline or reporting centre, as for this assessment, generally attracts those people who feel the need to tell their stories or who want change. People who are more satisfied generally feel less inclined to share their stories.

Many respondents gave detailed accounts to the investigators, some of which contained personal experiences and could therefore not be included in this report to guarantee respondents' anonymity. Seeing as a large part of the DAE community was unable or unwilling to participate, the investigators note that the results will not be endorsed by the entire DAE community.

6.1 Current organisation

The DAE is an educational institution that offer bachelor's and master's degree programs in design. The DAE has a great reputation and is highly regarded in the Netherlands and abroad.

The current Executive Board consists of Joseph Grima (Artistic Director since 2017) and Raf de Keninck (Member of the Board since November 2019). Between 2012 and 2019, there was significant instability in the Executive Board, changes were rife, and there were tensions between the Executive Board and several department heads.

The DAE's current strategy is articulated in its Institutional Plan 2019-2024. The current Executive Board picked up the pace in 2020. With its new student-first approach, new preparatory courses were set up in 2020, bachelor's courses are being restructured and students can now determine their own learning pathways, with some necessary guidance and assistance.
On top of that, the DAE has established a new professorship focused on diversity and inclusivity. The participation structure has been redesigned and the position of the management team has been reconsidered. All MT members now have a management contract and undergo reviews at fixed intervals. Finally, the new Code of Conduct is in the final stages of development. It strikes the investigators that not all respondents are aware of the organisational changes made by the Executive Board.

Many respondents, also students, lack an organisation chart, because you do not know who to contact for what. Roles, tasks, responsibilities and authorities are not transparent enough. In the past, much has been arranged informally and has developed accordingly.

Nevertheless, the investigators note that the vast majority of respondents have noticed that the DAE is making progress. Many are happy with recent developments and believe DAE has a bright future ahead of it, and there appears to be a great deal of confidence in the current Executive Board among respondents. However, the investigators also picked up signals that may indicate some resistance to change, which we cannot elaborate on here to protect the anonymity of the respondents.

6.2 This assessment

Most of the respondents indicated that they were pleased that the actual Executive Board is pressing ahead and having this assessment done. A few interviewed tutors, who had not foreseen this coming, were shocked by this assessment. The investigators were told by reporting students and alumni that they are afraid to share their experiences because of the risk of traceability and negative consequences for assessments and/or future career. According to the reporting parties, there is always a fear of tutors and heads in a study programme, because of the dependence in the assessment. But at the DAE, this fear of students is greater because the assessments are less transparent and much more personal.

A lot of respondents express their gratitude that they can tell their story to an external independent party that they can trust. They are also positive about the way this assessment is conducted, with an email to an external investigator and to remain anonymous. Online interviewing is also appreciated, because the DAE building is pretty much open plan and there is no room where you can safely talk about confidential matters out of sight.

Among respondents there is broad support for improving social safety and social culture in the DAE community. According to them, this would be necessary for the health and well-being of the students who are too often affected, due to structurally unsafe social and didactic conditions in the DAE.

Generally speaking, a lot of respondents thank the actual Executive Board for this assessment. They finally feel heard and taken seriously. According to them, this assessment will contribute to improvement and some suggest to repeat this assessment on a regularly basis. Respondents have indicated that they want to be informed of the findings of the assessment and they hope that this will be communicated transparently.

In addition, people speak enthusiastically and passionately of the unique design academy, how many students are willing to pay for the diploma and the value of the student community. Many reporting persons want to help change the DAE and bring it into line with society. With regard to social safety and culture, the keywords mentioned are: student central, flexibility, transparency, care system, inclusiveness and diversity. Many have indicated that they want to be heard and seen more and participate actively.

6.3 Tutors, staff and educational competence

The interviews highlighted that many of DAE's tutors have been affiliated with the academy for a long time and enjoy a great deal of autonomy. Many are self-employed (ZZP) and, formally speaking, work relatively few hours. Many of the tutors interviewed by the investigators, however, indicated that they structurally work unpaid overtime due to their passion for their field, students and the DAE. Several tutors and staff members reported that they deliberately remained within the confines of their own courses and teaching in order to steer clear of the 'hassle' of the organisation as a whole. Other tutors, however, indicated their desire to participate more actively in the rejuvenation of and developments at DAE.

According to respondents, a tutor does not see beyond him/herself, places his/her own course at the top, while there is a great need among students for connection and coordination. The investigators were told, for instance, that tutors and staff have little

time for individual students and that the usually demanding assignments do not correspond with each other in terms of workload and timing. Reporting students and alumni experience assessments as uncertain up to the last moment, subjective and biased, which creates insecurity. Many of the tutors interviewed by the investigators agreed and expressed their intention to improve their assessment methods.

In the accounts given by students and alumni of certain tutors, heads and coordinators, who will not be named here, similar expectations emerge, which can be summarised as: 'be available 24/7', 'work hard', 'shut up and carry on' and 'you do your best work when you're exhausted'. Respondents suggest that, because these tutors and staff are alumni, their teaching methods may reflect how they themselves were taught.

Reporting persons say that tutors and staff in the past are recruited through favouritism and can stay on for a long time without being subjected to any critical examination of their performance. The investigators have come to conclude that several tutors and members of staff possess no or insufficient didactic and teaching skills. Tutors explicitly require more training and performance reviews, and there seems to be a significant need among responding tutors and staff for an improved introduction programme.

Respondents also spoke to the investigators of tutors and staff they perceive as 'good', 'stimulating and 'socially safe'. A good teacher is described as someone who mainly focuses on content and education, who stimulates your personal development, who respects your (moral) boundaries and who is open to vulnerabilities (which also includes origin). Someone who can listen and ask questions, who pays attention to well-being. And communicates 'inclusively', with gender-neutral examples and open to debate, criticism and feedback. According to the respondents, a good teacher should have the qualifications of a teacher.

6.4 Social safety

Students, alumni, tutors and staff members alike told the investigators about recent events and occurrences that left them feeling damaged, hurt, insecure, oppressed and unsafe. A general description is given by respondents, of an academy that struggles for many years with ingrained informal agreements, favouritism, and lingering (power) issues that have existed for years as in a vicious circle.

The high pressure students are on weighs heavily for many of the reporting students and alumni; it leads - they say - to stress and too many students and alumni having health issues. This is even more important if the student has a physical or mental vulnerability, or has to deal with transgressive behaviour by the tutors and staff. Some experience the atmosphere at DAE as a culture based on fear and power.

With similar stories from the world of art and art education receiving widespread attention and DAE deciding to commission this assessment, respondents are discovering that their views of their own experiences and the stories of others are changing. Things that seemed 'normal' in the past or 'just something to deal with', suddenly turned out to be 'transgressive' and 'unwanted'.

Although the stories and events that came to the fore during this assessment only touch on part of the DAE community, excluding Studio Identity, the investigators are highly critical of social safety at DAE in general. According to the investigators, the issues highlighted by respondents indicate a structural pattern that has existed for years and

was - to some degree - tolerated by former Executive Boards, and that still continues to linger in DAE's current culture.

6.4.1 Sexual harassment, discrimination, aggressive behaviour and violence

Based on the descriptions and perceptions provided by respondents, several issues appear to meet the definition of unwanted behaviour used in the Working Conditions Act and DAE's Complaints Procedure for Unwanted Behaviour. The investigator's findings are based on the assumption that respondents' perceptions were accurate and truthful, as determining whether unwanted behaviour was actually displayed falls beyond the scope of this assessment. According to the investigators, the response does not warrant the conclusion that there is an unsafe culture across the DAE.

Surveying all the contributions made by respondents, the investigators find that several respondents faced sexual harassment, transgressive behaviour and discrimination. The investigators note that they did not find any signs of structural bullying, aggressive behaviour and violence.

Multiple respondents indicated that former and current DAE employees (tutors, heads, coordinators, staff) also engaged in more severe forms of misconduct, including perceived intimidation, abuse of power, threatening behaviour and unwelcome comments of a sexual nature. Referring to a different employee, respondents mention allegations of integrity violations, with students feeling forced and pressurised to go along with said violations. Yet a different employee is characterised as being 'extreme and intimidating'. It must be noted that these experiences and perceptions were shared by the respondents themselves based on their own subjective interpretation, and that it is beyond the scope of this type of culture investigation to paint a more objective picture. The investigator believes that the experiences shared by the respondents, as well their nature and perceived severity, warrant further action from DAE.

Furthermore, a variety of examples were given by respondents that seem to relate to favouritism, escalated situations, awkward behaviour, unrestrained emotion, labour disputes, insufficient attention to students with (mental) disabilities or misunderstood behaviour, direct and indirect discrimination, denigrating and stigmatising behaviour of male tutors towards female students. *If you do not do what such a tutor says, even if it is against your will and/or it exceeds your boundaries, the boundaries of respect or your norms and values, then you will be - as has been experienced - disadvantaged or 'punished'. These tutors are not open to the student and, it is said, lack empathy, but also lack didactic knowledge and skills.*
Some respondents say that some tutors advice students to use drugs, because they seem to be convinced that you can only be creative when you use drugs.

Things also seem to have influenced the health and study success of (former) students. It can be concluded from the input that there might be more victims than reported.

The investigators note that sexuality is a regular theme in the art and design world. Feedback can easily be about sexuality in relation to the student as a person. That is a difficult balance.

In addition, the investigators note that the respondents (students, tutors and staff) had little inclination to give and accept mature feedback to and from each other and to clearly indicate their boundaries, with fear of reprisal often being given as an important reason.

One student who did muster up the courage to give feedback to a tutor in a difficult situation recounted that this was a positive experience, as the tutor listened to the feedback and changed their behaviour.

In the meantime, all sorts of things are happening around the DAE. The investigators recognise that the students' mindset has changed. It has become more business-like. They want to know in advance where they stand and what they will be assessed on. Students from abroad have to pay a lot and they want to know what they get for their money. That is different from the past, when teaching staff 'simply' started working with students. Students are more likely to speak up if they feel that something is not quite right. And they publicise their dissatisfaction outside DAE on Social Media, which can have a major impact on the DAE.

6.4.2 The complaint system and HR

An sound reporting structure for unwanted behaviour is important in order to support and give advice to those who have encountered unwanted behavior, as well as to collect input for prevention and policy.

The DAE, respondents say, is supposedly stuck in a pattern, because for years red flags about (undesirable) behaviour, discrimination and exclusion did not seem to get through to former Executive Boards. According to the respondents, they downplayed signals. They seemed to be unapproachable for criticism or avoided taking action. Some reporting persons, students in general, have raised their issues and sought help. They found that transgressive behaviour and/or suspected wrongdoing simply continued.

Generally, respondents believe that the complaint and care system at the DAE is clogged and no longer functions effectively. There is uncertainty among students, tutors and staff about the roles of the mentor, the student counsellor, the psychologist, HR and the (internal and external) confidential counsellor.

The physical conditions in the open space, for meeting the mentor or student counsellor about personal matters, is experienced as ineffective. Respondents experience a high threshold for the confidential counsellor for undesirable behaviour, not to mention submitting an official complaint.

Respondents appreciate the listening ear of the mentor and student counsellor. But solutions are often a long time coming and students and alumni say that tutors are often not informed by the mentor or student counsellor, which can lead to negative consequences for the student.

It seems that students use other channels besides the DAE complaint system to express dissatisfaction. Much has been said of students discussing matters with each other. Much has also emerged on social media and the Dutch Design Week 2020. Many students and alumni turn(ed) to the psychologist associated with the DAE and pay costs themselves.

Among respondents there is a need for more continuity at HR and an adequate personnel organisation. Respondents working freelance with DAE for example, expressed their dissatisfaction with contracts and agreements. There are positive reports about the new medical officer, which has improved the care for sick tutors and staff.

6.5 Diversity and inclusiveness

In many interviews diversity and inclusiveness were mentioned as important future themes. The anti-racist committee set up by students, tutors and staff, Black Lives Matter and the discussion in the Arena during Design Week prompt the DAE to take action. It is also argued that the teaching staff are mainly white and Dutch and do not yet understand what white privilege means. Respondents experience structural racist, (sexually) intimidating and stigmatising behaviour in certain people in the educational system. Students experience that international students are openly insulted, without teaching staff being aware of it, and what the impact is. The rule seems to be that 'you just have to adapt to the prevailing culture'.

Students, tutors and staff ask for training to 'think and behave inclusively' at an individual level and to deal better with 'international students'. Respondents believe that the DAE should be the place to be for questioning, sharing, meeting and discovering and learning together with people from all corners of the world, with talents and vulnerabilities. According to the reporting parties, this is not always the case in practice.

Also is said that too few fresh personnel comes in, there is not enough fishing in 'new ponds'. The tutors and staff who have been trained at DAE themselves would not recognise the 'harshness' in the culture, and does not realise enough that students experience their behaviour and manners as transgressive.

The investigators believe that the recently appointed diversity and inclusiveness professor at the DAE will make a positive contribution to the intended developments.

6.6 Executive Board

The current Executive Board initiated this assessment and strives to drive culture change at the DAE.

The current Executive Board is said to be able to move things where their predecessors seemed paralysed. Signals are now taken seriously and addressed. The timing of this assessment is said to be right, now that Raf de Keninck participates in the Executive Board. It is said that the he has the necessary experience and know-how. His approach gives respondents hope that the course of events at the DAE will really change. Joseph Grima is mainly said to be invisible and unapproachable. It is assumed that he has no active role in improving the organisation. Some wonder where the Supervisory Board was and what their actual role is.

Respondents indicate that there is a need for clarity about the composition of the management team (MT), transparent decisions by the MT and the Executive Board and a clear communication structure. As mentioned before the investigators were told that the MT was re-positioned in 2020, this might not yet have been communicated effectively in the DAE organization.

Changes have started that are welcomed by the majority of the respondents. A fresh wind is blowing, but it is not going smoothly. Heads, coordinators, tutors and staff will have to adapt and change along with the Executive Board. And that is not all going to be smooth sailing. The investigators noticed respondents among tutors and staff who struggle to stick to the way things have always been, maintaining autonomy and avoiding

cooperation, avoiding criticism and not wanting to follow up the Executive Board's decisions.

7. Summary

In 2020, the DAE's management embarked on a transition with the aim of effecting a major overhaul of the DAE's teaching, organisational structure, and culture in order to become more student-centred.

Although there is no socially unsafe culture across the DAE, the academy's social culture, organisational structure and reporting system were, for many years, a breeding ground for unwanted behaviour by tutors and staff in certain parts of the organisation. For a long time, the former Executive Board failed to see and ignored signals and reports of harassment, sexual harassment and discrimination. With regard to social safety for students, tutors and staff, much was left to be desired. Several respondents had 'harmful' experiences during their time at the DAE and require care.

According to respondents, after years of being tolerated by all 'bystanders', it is to the credit of the actual Executive Board that they persist and have this assessment conducted. This brings hope for improvement.

The DAE is moving towards creating a safe social climate and educational system that strives to develop students' knowledge, as well as implementing improvements in the fields of diversity, inclusion and health. In addition, there is a great need for a more professional care and complaint system, as an engine for correction of the system and self-cleansing capacity. The investigators observe a strong desire among all respondents for debate, dialogue and participation.

8. Recommendations

In 2020, the DAE's management embarked on a transition with the aim of effecting a major overhaul of the DAE's teaching, organisational structure, and culture in order to become more student-centred.

Based on the findings from the assessment described above, we propose the following.

- ✓ Inform the students, alumni, tutors and staff of the main points of this report and keep them informed of further decisions and developments. Preferably do this in an interactive form, so that emotions can be expressed and questions can be asked. Think carefully about communication regarding specific accused persons. The utmost care/restraint in communication about this seems to be highly recommended.

- ✓ Talk intensively with the persons associated with the DAE who emerged as alleged perpetrators in this assessment. Say goodbye to those who cannot or do not want to do so. And if there is perspective, make an individual plan for the future. Consider what is still possible with the alleged perpetrators who have left; perhaps there is a possibility of hearing both sides. The same applies to persons still affiliated with the DAE. After all, the findings in this investigation are only the respondents views/perceptions. Those directly involved were unable to equate

their own view with or against those of the interviewees. It may be desirable to conduct more in-depth, more person-oriented research.

- ✓ Go deeper into the results with the tutors and staff in groups. Make an inventory of the impact it has on them and what they need for improved attitude and behaviour. Ask them how they can help each other stay alert.
- ✓ Show the DAE that unacceptable behaviour is not tolerated by communicating about it in newsletters, websites, etc, with the clear message that the Executive Board takes it seriously. Emphasise that everyone at the DAE is expected to intervene in the event of undesirable behaviour.
- ✓ Provide help to the (former) students to process experiences and advice.
- ✓ Draw up a code of conduct and attach a roadmap to it where support and help can be found.
- ✓ Make a plan for the future care and complaint system with a plan-do-check-action cycle and draw up a plan to implement it. Pay attention to independence, quality, the physical workplace and the gathering of facts on which to base future policy. Ask the confidential adviser(s) to provide information.
- ✓ Develop a renewed DAE vision of the 'education of the future', and familiarise tutors and staff with it. Provide broad and 'diverse' participation.
- ✓ Organise peer review groups for tutors and others who work with the students. (Cross-pollination can be very productive)
- ✓ Provide many more didactically competent tutors and staff and hold performance interviews that are recorded.
- ✓ Increase transparency and objectivity in student assessments and streamline interim feedback.
- ✓ Make a plan for promoting inclusiveness and increasing diversity and involve the Institutional Participation Council in this.
- ✓ Talk to freelancers about the dissatisfaction and - together with HR - find solutions.
- ✓ Remember that everyone needs attention from time to time and make sure to include this in the annual calendar, so that all tutors and staff members can feel heard and seen.