
REGULATION 43 NOTICE

OUTCOME OF MISCONDUCT HEARING IN THE MATTER OF A POLICE
MISCONDUCT HEARING PURSUANT TO THE POLICE (CONDUCT)
REGULATIONS 2020

GLOUCESTERSHIRE CONSTABULARY

(Appropriate Authority)

v

Police Sergeant 250279 Adam Bundock

(The Officer)

Panel

Chair: ACO (Retired ACC) Ian Saunders

IPM: Mr Nick Carter

IPM: Ms Lisa Bryant

LQP: Mr Peter Cadman

Representatives

Counsel for the Appropriate Authority: Ms Lissy Verrall-Withers

Counsel for the Officer: Mr Julian King

References

- (i) AA – Appropriate Authority
- (ii) The Officer- PS Bundock
- (iii) LQP - Legally Qualified Person
- (iv) The Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020 (as amended) will be ‘the Regulations’, or as ‘Regulation’ and then the Regulation number referred to.
- (v) The Statutory Guidance on Professional Standards, Performance and Integrity in Policing issued by the Home Office will be the ‘HOG’ and the relevant paragraph number an example being [HOG 9.10].
- (vi) The College of Policing Guidance on Outcomes in Police Misconduct Proceedings 2023 will be referenced as ‘the Guidance’ and on occasion, together with the relevant paragraph number.
- (vii) When referencing a page or pages from the hearing bundle, [‘HB’] the reference will be shown as: [HB 14] or [HB 56-61].

Introduction

1. This is the record of the decision of the Police Misconduct Panel held under the Regulations into the conduct of PS Adam Bundock (the Officer).
2. The Panel hearing commenced on Tuesday September 29th 2026, at Gloucestershire Police Headquarters, Waterwells Drive, Quedgeley.

Allegations and alleged breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour

3. The allegations against the Officer are shown at Appendix A of this notice.

The Panel's Approach

4. The panel approached its task by:
 - a. Firstly, deciding the facts, (**Factual Determination**);
 - b. Secondly, subject to a decision on whether any of the facts alleged by the AA had been proven, determining if any of the Standards of Professional Behaviour had been breached, (**Breaches of Professional Standards**), and if so;
 - c. Thirdly, and if necessary following decision(s) at stage two above, deciding at what level, the panel assessed the seriousness of any breaches found proven, (**Level of Breach**).
 - d. Lastly, if misconduct or gross misconduct has been established, to decide the outcome for the Officer (**Decision on Outcome**).

Purpose of Misconduct Proceedings

5. The Panel reminded itself of the threefold purpose of misconduct proceedings as set out at paragraph 2.3 of the Guidance which are:
 - (i) To maintain public confidence in, and the reputation of the police service
 - (ii) To uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct
 - (iii) To protect the public.

Burden and Standard of Proof

6. The Panel was also reminded that:
 - (i) The burden of proof was on the AA and,
 - (ii) The standard of proof, which must be applied, was that required in civil cases, that is the balance of probabilities.

Evidence considered by the Panel**PCA**

7. PC A provided her witness statement on March 5th 2024 and she also provided oral evidence to the Panel.
8. She described an initial meeting with the Officer during which she informed him of a personal matter. In response, the Officer referred PC A to the force occupational health department. Additionally, the Officer informed PC A that he would not allocate her casework relating to incidents linked to the personal matter that she had disclosed to him. PC A described the Officer as being very supportive during this initial meeting and during subsequent contact.
9. PC A described how she had received an email message from the Officer on October 21st 2024 [HB page 31] in which he wrote “ good girl that will save me having to punish you”. PC A stated that this message did not make her feel upset or awful but that she was shocked at the words used and was taken aback by it.
10. PC A described how the Officer also sent her a message that said “I’m going to smack your arse, stop apologising for something you can’t control” [HB page 165]. She stated that she thought the wording was not appropriate and that it made her feel uncomfortable. However, she was not concerned about the message and thought there had been nothing malicious in it being sent to her. She stated that she did not feel threatened by the Officer. She did however state that these two comments had made her feel uncomfortable and she was

worried that his contact might escalate however she was clear that it did not do so.

11. Accordingly, PC A made the decision not to report these messages nor to make any form of complaint.
12. PC A stated that the Officer was an excellent supervisor who had been very supportive to her at a time of great personal need. She stated that he was highly professional and was a great mentor and source of help and guidance within a very busy operational environment.

PC Z

13. PC Z provided her witness statement on December 6th, 2024, and she also provided oral evidence to the Panel.
14. She described receiving a text message from the Officer in which he said to her that he “fancied the hell out of her.” She stated that she thought that it was a joke. She did not think that he was saying that he found her sexually attractive, and she didn’t believe that he was making a sexual advance on her. She stated that the Officer sent her an email the following day in which he apologised her for the text message sent. Following receipt of this apology, PC Z felt that the Officer had not been joking when he sent her the text message.
15. PC Z stated that in hindsight, the text message sent by the Officer was inappropriate and that it had made her feel slightly uncomfortable.
16. PC Z stated that she didn’t particularly recall the email about ‘joggers’ [HB page 71]. Having now reviewed that email again, she stated that she didn’t find that it was offensive. In her opinion, the Officer had instead demonstrated an inappropriate level of informality for a supervisor but that he had not stepped beyond that level of inappropriate communication.

17. She stated that she had remained feeling comfortable working with the Officer after she had seen this email. She stated that she hadn't felt humiliated, degraded or offended by the content of the message.
18. PC Z stated that she recalled a message sent by the Officer in which he referred to her physical appearance. She stated that she didn't think that this was an inappropriate comment, and in fact, she recalled that she took it as a compliment.
19. PC Z did not feel in any way uncomfortable following this message, she did not report the matter and she did not make any form of complaint.
20. PC Z stated that the Officer was an excellent supervisor. She stated that he was highly professional and was a great mentor and source of help and guidance within a very busy operational environment.

PC Mollie Brown

21. PC Brown provided her statement of evidence on January 3rd 2025 and she also provided oral evidence to the Panel.
22. She stated that she spoke to PC Z regarding the messages that she had received from the Officer. PC Brown stated that PC Z said that they had made her feel uncomfortable but that she hadn't felt belittled by them. PC Z had instead used the term 'embarrassed' in her description of how the Officer's actions had made her feel. PC Brown stated that PC Z appeared to have been happy with how the matter had been dealt with at that time and that she did not have any concerns regarding the Officer.
23. With regard to PC A, PC Brown stated that she had been aware that PC A had been exchanging messages with the Officer on an occasion when they were out at a birthday party. PC Brown stated that the Officer had not been present at that social event and that she felt that it had been unprofessional of PC Z to have been sending such messages to her supervisor.

24. PC Brown described how PC A had spoken to her about the message sent by the Officer in which he had made reference to punishing her. She stated that PC A appeared to have been more confused about this situation rather than demonstrating any apparent concern or displaying any sign of distress or unhappiness.

PC Aaron Parry

25. PC Parry provided his statement of evidence on 6th December 2024 and he also provided oral evidence to the Panel.

26. PC Parry stated that PC Z had spoken to him about the message the Officer had sent her. He stated that PC Z appeared to have been more uncomfortable with the actions of the Officer rather than upset. He stated that he had not been aware of any repeated actions by the Officer of a similar nature.

27. With regard to PC A, PC Parry described a shift social event during which she had been sending personal messages to the Officer. PC Parry stated that he believed that PC A had been boasting about the attention that she was receiving from the Officer.

28. PC Parry stated that he was not aware of the content of those messages however he believed that it had not been appropriate for PC A to have been sending personal messages to her supervisor whilst on a social function.

29. PC Parry stated that the Officer was a highly regarded supervisor who could be relied upon to demonstrate the highest standards of professionalism in the workplace.

PC Amelia West

30. PC West provided an undated witness statement and stated that she could not recall when it had been made. PC West also provided oral evidence to the Panel. PC West was working with PC A and PC Z at the time of the relevant events. She noted what she described as a particularly close working relationship between PC A and the Officer.
31. PC West described a birthday party on 19th October 2024 during which PC A spoke frequently about the Officer and referred to him as "Bundy". She stated that she saw how PC A exchanged numerous WhatsApp messages with him throughout the evening while under the influence of alcohol.
32. PC West stated that despite others advising against it, PC A had sent the Officer a photograph of the group. PC West stated that she saw the reply from the Officer and that it included comments such as "looking good" and "have a nice time". She stated that the messaging continued throughout the night and how PC A was openly discussing her contact with the Officer with others at the social event.
33. PC West described how she could recall other colleagues describing how PC A and the Officer would communicate extensively via work email and that some messages contained comments such as "good girl" and references to "punishing" her. PC West stated that she did not see these messages directly but stated that PC A spoke to her about them and how she appeared to enjoy the attention he was giving her. She also stated that PC A did tell her how she had recognised that some comments he had made to her were inappropriate.
34. PC West then described another social occasion on 27th October 2024 during which PC A, who had been drinking, repeatedly suggested messaging or video-calling the Officer and sending him photographs. PC West stated that colleagues had discouraged this and at one stage took her phone away from her because they considered it inappropriate PC West also recalled being told by PC A that the Officer had made a comment about her appearance when she

attended work in gym clothing allegedly referring to her body in conversation with another officer.

35. More generally, PC West described the Officer as using familiar terms of address with staff such as “darling” and “chicken”. She considered him to have been friendly and informal, but she did note that there appeared to have been a degree of favouritism displayed towards PC A. PC West observed what she considered to be flirtatious banter between the two and felt uncomfortable given the age difference, the Officer’s family circumstances, and his supervisory position over PC A.
36. PC West stated that there had been discussion of the relationship between the Officer and PC A amongst colleagues and that others appeared to share similar concerns. As a result, PC West decided to raise the matter with DI McNerny because she felt that this situation was inappropriate and should be brought to the attention of managers.

PC Georgia Dewar

37. PC Dewar made a witness statement in these proceedings on 27th January 2025 and also provided oral evidence to the Panel.
38. PC A had shown her the text messages she had exchanged with the Officer. PC Dewar stated that these messages had been sent outside of work time and were not related to operational matters. She stated that these messages appeared to have been ‘flirty’ in nature.
39. PC Dewar described how she had attended a birthday party in October 2024 and how during this social event, PC A had been sending messages to the Officer. She felt that this behaviour was inappropriate and that she reported the matter to her Sergeant.

The Officer

40. The Officer admitted that he had sent the messages and that he said the words as alleged in the Regulation 30 notice. He admitted that this was misconduct and that it had breached the Standard of Authority Respect and Courtesy and the Standard of Discreditable Conduct.
41. He denied that he had breached the Standard of Equality and Diversity. He also denied that his behaviour was gross misconduct.
42. The Officer described how PC A had joined the department in June to July 2024. He stated that he held a one-to-one meeting with her and she had confided some personal matters to him and he had referred her to occupational health.
43. He admitted that he had sent the message to PC Z in which he said that he fancied her. He stated that this had been a lack of judgement but that he had not been looking for a relationship with her. He stated that he had not meant it to be a sexual comment but could see how it can be interpreted in that way.
44. He stated that he thought that she might have a crush on him and that in hindsight he recognised that he should have raised this with his manager.
45. He recognised that his comment to PC Z was inappropriate, He expressed his shame and apologised for the wider impact on the team. He realised what he'd done and how he had sent an apology to her via force email the next morning. He stated that he sent this email as he did want her to feel uncomfortable.
46. He also admitted to sending PC Z a message in which he had said that she was 'too pretty to wear joggers'. He stated that he had sent this message within the context of arranging a CID attachment for her and was helping to clarify the dress code that should be followed. He stated that he was trying to be supportive but that he recognised that the wording he had used was inappropriate.
47. The Officer also admitted to sending the messages to PC A that were subject of the allegations considered by the Panel.

48. He accepted that his language to the two officers was inappropriate. He did however state that he used the same over familiar language to all other colleagues, both male and female.

49. He stated that he had not sexually harassed either PC A or PC Z. He stated that neither officer had been made to feel uncomfortable after he had sent these messages. He directed the Panel to consider a message that they had left on his car windscreen in which they had joked with him and tried to persuade him to come to the Christmas party saying "space hopper or Pogo stick?" signed in their first names. [HB page 95]. The Officer stated that this message was evidence that neither officer had been distressed by his inappropriate messages.

Factual Determinations

50. The Panel applied the following principles:

- a. The burden of proving any allegation rests with the Appropriate Authority. The Officer does not have to prove anything, let alone his innocence from Misconduct.
- b. The standard of proof in establishing any fact is the balance of probabilities.
- c. The Panel does not have to decide every matter in dispute; only those which assist them in deciding whether or not a particular allegation is proved.
- d. The Panel is required to consider and where possible determine factual matters not specifically alleged within the Regulation 17 notices, but which are nonetheless relevant to an allegation.
- e. The Panel can draw inferences from the evidence adduced before them, meaning they can reach common sense conclusions arising from that evidence, but they must not cross into speculation. Any conclusions reached must be reached fairly.
- f. The Panel must not find that the conduct of the Officer amounts to gross misconduct unless:

- (i) The Panel is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that this is the case, or
- (ii) The Officer admits it is the case.

51. The Panel was assisted by the clear submissions made by both Counsel. The Panel noted and considered the good character of the Officer.

52. In the AA's closing submission, the Panel was informed that for sexual harassment to have taken place, three tests should be applied in the circumstances of this case:

- (a) That the conduct and messaging of PS Bundock was sexual in nature
- (b) That this conduct and messaging was unwanted
- (c) That this conduct and messaging violated a person's dignity, or created an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment.

53. Counsel for the AA also invited the Panel to apply a 'common sense' approach to their determination of sexual harassment in the circumstances of this case.

54. All the alleged words said by and the messages sent by the Officer were admitted by him as being factually correct. Witnesses gave evidence about the background circumstances and the Panel accepted that all witnesses gave their best recollection of what had happened.

55. There was a common thread from all witnesses that the Officer was a conscientious and approachable Sergeant always willing to assist junior officers and fellow sergeants.

56. It was agreed by PS Bundock that Allegations 1-5 were admitted.

57. The Panel noted that there were some contradictory recollections but accepted that this was inevitable after the passage of time. Witnesses were giving their recollection of events of some two years ago.
58. The Panel first considered Allegation 6. The Officer admitted that he had sent the messages referred to in Allegation 6a and Allegation 6b.
59. With regard to Allegation 6(a) the Panel found that the Officer had sent a message to PC Z saying that “he fancied the hell out of “her. This was the recollection of PC Z and was accepted by the Officer himself.
60. The Panel found that this message was sexual in nature and also that it was unwanted.
61. However, the Panel accepted the evidence of PC Z that she had not felt humiliated degraded or offended by his actions. In addition, her own evidence was not supportive of a contention that her dignity had been violated. Indeed, she felt comfortable working with the Officer. Both PC Brown and PC Parry separately confirm that the PC Z’s reaction was being “uncomfortable” rather than upset.
62. In these circumstances the Panel did not find that the message and these words in Allegation 6(a) constituted sexual harassment as the Panel was not persuaded that the message had violated PC Z’s dignity or created an intimidating hostile degrading humiliating or offensive environment.
63. With regard to Allegation 6(b), the Panel noted the circumstances in which the words had been used. The words were not said in isolation but was during an email exchange in which the Officer had been arranging a CID attachment for PC Z and there was a discussion about dress code. In these messages, reference was made to ‘grey joggers’ and the appearance of PC Z. In her evidence, PC Z stated that she had not found this message to be offensive or distressing. In fact, she stated that she didn’t really have any feelings about the message at all.

64. Whilst the Panel found that the language used by the Officer was too informal and inappropriate for a supervisor to a junior officer, it was not found to be sexual in nature and therefore did not amount to sexual harassment.
65. With regard to Allegation 7(a), the Panel noted this came from an email exchange on October 21st 2024 in which the Officer had been chasing up some work that had been allocated to PC A.
66. In the message exchange, PC A confirmed that this work would be finished that day and the Officer made a comment that he would not need to punish her. The Panel found that words used had to be read in the context of the full exchange of messages and not in isolation. The Panel found this was a clumsy use of language by a supervisor within an exchange of messages but that it was not sexual in nature. As such, this comment did not constitute sexual harassment.
67. With regard to Allegation 7(b), there had been a message exchange between the Officer and PC A in which she had apologised for a work-related matter. The Officer made a comment in which he used the phrase ‘smack your arse stop apologising for something outside your control’”. This was in relation to her suggesting that she was intending to come into work to complete a task whilst she was unwell.
68. The panel found that this was within a work-related email exchange. Whilst it was another example of an ill-judged and inappropriate comment by the Officer, the Panel did not find that it was sexual in nature given the surrounding circumstances in which it was sent. The Panel was not persuaded that this comment constituted sexual harassment.
69. With regard to Allegation 8, the Officer admitted that he had used the words as alleged towards PC A and PC Z. The Panel found that the comments made were discourteous inappropriate and unprofessional.
70. With regard to Allegation 9, the Panel carefully considered the evidence of both PC A and PC Z and how they described their ongoing engagement with the Officer after he had sent the messages subject of Allegations 6 and 7.

71. Based on all the evidence, the Panel was not persuaded that the Officer had violated their dignity and/or created an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating or offensive environment for them in the workplace.

72. Based upon these findings of fact, the Panel found the following:

Allegations 1-5: Proven

Allegation 6(a) and 6(b): Not proven on the basis that the Panel determined that sexual harassment had not taken place

Allegation 7(a) and 7(b): Not proven on the basis that the Panel determined that sexual harassment had not taken place

Allegation 8: Proven

Allegation 9: Not proven.

Breaches of the Standards of Professional Behaviour

73. On the basis of the findings of fact and PS Bundock's admissions, the Panel found that his conduct breached the standards of:

- (i) Discreditable Conduct
- (ii) Authority, Respect and Courtesy.

74. The Panel then considered whether on the basis of its findings, PS Bundock's conduct breached the Standard of Equality and Diversity.

75. With regard to Allegation 8 the Panel noted parallel comments of familiarity with male officers. While the informality of the language could be criticised, the evidence produced to the Panel was that similar language was used to male and female officers. They therefore were not persuaded that there had been discriminatory behaviour by the Officer in relation to this allegation.

76. Having carefully considered the College of Policing Code of Ethics, the circumstances of this case and their findings of fact against the allegations the

Panel found that the Officer had not breached the Standard of Equality and Diversity.

Level of Breach

77. The Panel considered whether individually or collectively the breaches of standards of authority respect and courtesy and discreditable conduct constituted misconduct or gross misconduct.
78. The test applied to this determination was on the basis of whether the proven conduct of the Officer could justify his dismissal from the police service.
79. The Panel found that neither PC A nor PC Z had expressed any ill will towards the Officer even after his behaviour had been reported to the Professional Standards Department. They both gave evidence that they were comfortable working with him after the events that gave rise to the allegations and until he had been removed from the department.
80. The Panel had not found that the Officer had sexually harassed PC A and PC Z but that he had undoubtedly acted in an inappropriate and unprofessional manner.
81. While the behaviour of supervisors towards junior female officers is a matter of obvious and correct concern to the police service and to the public, in the particular circumstances of this case the Panel did not find that his proven conduct was sufficient to justify dismissal from the police service.
82. The Panel therefore determined that the Officer's actions amounted to misconduct rather than gross misconduct.

Decision on Outcome

83. In accordance with Regulation 41 of the Police Conduct Regulations, the Panel has determined that the conduct of the Officer amounted to misconduct.

84. In determining the appropriate sanction, the Panel assessed the seriousness of the proven misconduct. They did so by reference to the Officer's culpability, the harm caused by his misconduct, the existence of any aggravating factors and the existence of any mitigating factors.

85. Culpability - The Panel found that the Officer was entirely blameworthy and responsible for his own actions. The Panel found that his actions were deliberate and that he should have foreseen risk of harm from his actions. The Panel therefore found that the Officer had a high degree of culpability for his misconduct.

86. Harm - The Panel found that the Officer's misconduct would harm public confidence in policing. This finding was also made in recognition of public interest in the issue of Violence against Women and Girls. Whilst sexual harassment was not found proven, the Officer's actions had made PC's A and Z feel uncomfortable. On this basis, the Panel finds that the harm caused by the Officer's misconduct was Medium.

87. Aggravating factors – Following careful consideration, while taking care not to “double count”, the Panel found that the following aggravating factors were engaged in their assessment of seriousness:

- (i) Multiple incidents of misconduct over a prolonged period of time
- (ii) Two victims
- (iii) A disparity in rank and age between the Officer and PC's A and Z
- (iv) The Officer's failure to act as a role model in a position of responsibility.
- (v) A clear lack of judgement displayed by the Officer.

88. Mitigating factors:

- (i) The Officer had made open admissions in his interview, his Regulation 31 response and in his evidence to the hearing.
- (ii) The Officer demonstrated remorse for his actions and the impact upon PC's A and Z for his behaviours.
- (iii) The Officer had offered his apology to the officers.

89. Having carefully considered the Guidance and submissions from both Parties, the Panel determined that the seriousness of the Officer's misconduct was Medium
90. The Panel reminded themselves of the purposes for imposing outcomes in police misconduct proceedings as defined at paragraph 2.3 of the Outcomes Guidance which are:
- (i) To maintain public confidence in and the reputation of the police service
 - (ii) To uphold high standards in policing and to deter misconduct
 - (iii) To protect the public.
91. The Panel were provided with a number of character references and the Officer's service record which they considered in their determination of an appropriate sanction.
92. The Panel were mindful of paragraph 7.4 of the Guidance which states that less severe outcomes should be considered before severe outcomes.
93. The Panel first considered whether a written warning was appropriate and proportionate. However, it decided that this sanction would not be adequate to reflect the seriousness of the misconduct taking into account the aggravating and mitigating factors.
94. The Panel then considered the imposition of a final written warning. They determined that this would be the necessary and proportionate sanction to achieve the purposes of the police misconduct regime.
95. The Panel found that the public would expect nothing less than the imposition of a final written warning for the misconduct found proven.

96. They found that any lesser outcome would serve to discredit the credibility of the police service and not deter other officers from acting in similar way and would undermine the public trust and confidence in the Police.

97. Having assessed the totality of the proven breaches, the Officer's service record, his character references, the contents of the Outcomes Guidance and the purpose of the police misconduct regime, the Panel determined that the Officer will be **made subject of a final written warning for two years.**

ACO Ian Saunders (Chair)

Mrs Lisa Bryant (IPM)

Mr Nick Carter (IPM)

Mr Peter Cadman (LQP)

12th October 2026

APPENDIX A – REGULATION 30 ALLEGATIONS

“It is alleged that Sergeant Adam Bundock breached the following Standards of Professional Behaviour as set out in Schedule 2 of the Police (Conduct) Regulations 2020:

- a. Authority, Respect and Courtesy
- b. Equality and Diversity
- c. Discreditable Conduct

It is contended that, if proven, the conduct below breaches the above Standards of Professional Behaviour.

Background

A. During the relevant period (approximately June 2024 to November 2024), you were employed as a Sergeant in the Response Investigation Team (RIT) of Gloucestershire Constabulary.

B. The allegations below against you include allegations of sexual harassment in the workplace. The Appropriate Authority (AA) adopts the ACAS framework for identifying sexual harassment shown at <https://www.acas.org.uk/sexual-harassment>. Sexual harassment is unwanted behaviour of a sexual nature that violates a person's dignity or creates an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating, or offensive environment for someone, regardless of whether those effects were intended.

Factual Allegations

1. As a supervisor, you were in a position of responsibility over the more junior officers who were under your supervision.
2. By virtue of that position, you were obliged to have regard to the APP on '*Appropriate personal relationships and behaviours in the workplace*'.
3. By virtue of that position, you would have been aware of inherent conflict of interest

in supervisors pursuing personal relationships with those that they supervise.

4. In June 2024, you began supervising PC A and PC Z

5. As part as your role as supervisor, you submitted an Occupational Health referral for PC A.

6. It is alleged that your behaviour amounted to sexual harassment in the workplace in that you sent to PC Z

a. a message stating that you were attracted to her

b. an email stating that she was "*far too pretty to wear*" grey joggers.

7. It is alleged that your behaviour amounted to sexual harassment in the workplace in that you sent to PC A

a. an email that stated, "*good girl, that will save me having to punish you*"

b. a message stating that you would "*smack [her] arse*".

8. It is alleged that you made discourteous, inappropriate, and unprofessional comments to PCs A and Z by addressing them with names such as "*my beauty*", "*fairytale princess*", "*my angel*", "*darling*", "*my love*", "*my little sweet*", "*baby*" and "*Miss Benidorm 2024*".

9. It is alleged that your conduct above towards PCs A and/ or Z violated their dignity and/ or created an intimidating, hostile, degrading, humiliating, or offensive environment for them in the workplace.