

Gazette Supplement



Oration by the demitting Proctors and Assessor

The following Oration was delivered in Congregation on Wednesday, 14 March, by Laurence Whitehead, MA Oxf, Fellow of Nuffield, on demitting office as Senior Proctor.

Senior Proctor: *Insignissime Vice-Chancellorie: licetne Anglice loqui?*

Vice-Chancellor: *Licet.*

Senior Proctor: Although I shall present this Oration, it must be understood as a collective production. The two Proctors, together with the Assessor, spent their year together very much as a team working jointly under the watchful eye of an indispensable clerk. For convenience just one of us will read out the text, but this Oration is from all of us.

Like the University it serves, our office has been changing with the times. Long gone are the bulldogs and the policing powers, and between us we no longer display an equally reliable grasp of the Latin tongue. A quite different though equally unfamiliar discourse of OIAs, QAA, JRAMs and top-slices, and impenetrable terms of art like 'the as-earned principle', invade our minds. We have also learnt to say that 'going forward more work needs to be done if we are to move the needle across the piece'. In addition we found ourselves required to flit from one specialised idiom to another, as we progressed from perustrations to divisional boards, to finance committees, and then ultimately to our demitting Oration. Within the compass of a single year the three of us have glimpsed many lives and sampled an extraordinary range of University activities, some of them still a little archaic (like this one), others ultra-modern, such as the briefing on the latest ideas in architectural theory as they will be applied to the Blavatnik School of Government. As Visitors of the Museums, we have gained privileged access to great cultural events, and as Delegates of the Press we have obtained

a bird's-eye view of all the rich and varied publishing projects under consideration. We can request access to improbable nooks and crannies within the system. I personally benefited from a half-day briefing in Madrid on the challenges and inventive responses affecting the large and critical OUP business in Spain, just as back in Oxford I also satisfied my personal curiosity about the workings of the CCTV system when we burrowed into the fortress of the Marshal's control room. Some of our duties are more stressful than others. In hearings before the Student Disciplinary Panel, for example, it can be necessary to master an intricate and detailed charge sheet and to argue a case with quasi-legal precision. But whether the task is a pleasure or a strain, wherever we go we are greeted with a respect and goodwill that rightly accrue to the office rather than the officeholder. The pace of these activities can be intense, and early on in my year I took to answering the question 'what is it like to be a Proctor?' with 'like white-water rafting'.

The contrast with earlier centuries provides a recurrent source of anecdote in proctorial Orations, and I cannot resist adding my grain of sand. In our year there was a brief moment of dissension between the University and the government of the day when we oversaw the congregational debate that resulted in a vote of no confidence in the minister with responsibility for higher education. But it may put that friction into perspective if I remind this assembly of what transpired in this very room in 1647. Parliament had just prohibited the University from making any new appointments to vacant posts or entering into new leases of its property. A board of visitors was despatched for the 'correction of abuses' at the University, and in due course parliament granted that body powers to seize and examine the University's records and to imprison refusers. Despite all these assertions of ministerial authority, however,

the University still resisted. I quote from Volume IV of the *History of the University* (p. 725) as follows:

But time-wasting and prevarication on the part of the academics, the refusal of University officers (including the Proctors) to give up keys and insignia, and of the Vice-Chancellor and the Registrar to yield seals and books, led to further delays.

As you can see, while certain features of this narrative remain recognisable, in our year the contrasts outweigh the similarities. Nor were we called, like our predecessors in 1683, not only to forbid members of the University from reading censored books, but even to instruct the University Marshal to publicly burn such books in the Bodleian Quadrangle. I am particularly glad that there was no such requirement in my year, since among the books thus incinerated were the founding texts of my own discipline (such as Hobbes's *Leviathan*), not to mention work by Milton.

All this is, of course, very ancient and well-recorded history. But at a more personal level, my wife recently deposited the correspondence of my father-in-law in the Bodleian, and in the process we found one of the first letters he wrote home, after coming up to read PPE in the autumn of 1936. His November 19th letter reads in part:

On Tuesday we had the big protest meeting at the Union. I suppose you've heard all about it - the Proctors banned the Peace Council March on Armistice Day - which means that undergraduates haven't the rights of ordinary citizens... The Proctors simply haven't the vestige of a shred of a case. They have put an arbitrary interpretation on 'clubs' in the statutes to cover individuals marching as 'individuals.'

Since more often than not I lost any

arguments I was rash enough to engage in with my father-in-law, I am thankful that during my year no protest march posed us with any such dilemma. Indeed, under the current dispensation the rights of students are heavily protected, with appropriate process of redress and appeal where required, and the nearest I have witnessed to the proctorial practices of past centuries was the Junior Proctor sprinting down Banbury Road in hot pursuit of a malefactor engaged in the spraying of tomato ketchup after an examination had finished.

So times have changed, and the University has changed with them. The past decade has been a period of very rapid innovation, not only in proctorial matters but across the entire spectrum of academic policies, priorities and structures. It has been our privilege to observe many facets of this shifting panorama, and even at times to help cross-reference or connect up some of the disparate elements involved. All universities are engaged in the pursuit of multiple potentially conflicting objectives. They have to balance the claims of diverse disciplines; the imperatives of quality teaching (at many different levels) with those of original research; the preservation of traditions with the capacity to innovate; and the expectations of their members with the ever-more insistent external demands of government regulators and of competitor institutions. Oxford is under exceptional pressure to excel along many dimensions at once. Its collegiate structure, its libraries and museums, its medical and business schools, its divisional structure, its multinational University Press and its diverse funding sources, from research councils to generous donors, all tug it in different directions. Ours is not a simple institution, not a profit-maximising corporation focused heavily on its quarterly trading results, and it is not just a sleepy custodian of past glories either. So the task of balancing, reconciling and choosing between overlapping priorities is extraordinarily demanding. It cannot be left to the forces of custom and inertia, but nor can it be straightforwardly 'managed' from the centre or by any one body. Since the 1990s an elaborate new structure of information gathering, resource channelling, consultation, education and experimentation has been set in place. It is still very much a work in progress, and many of those affected have found it hard to understand or fully internalise. For one year, from our unique vantage point, we have been given the extraordinary opportunity to monitor, observe and, in some places, even advise on this ongoing experiment. Each of us came into office with distinct perspectives and prior understandings.

For example, in my case it was agreed that I would 'follow the money' – or try to make sense of, and double-check on, the mysteries behind the University's financial statements. The Junior Proctor specialised in overseeing the education side of University affairs, and the Assessor delved closely into various other aspects of the student experience. Each of us also found ourselves making discoveries in areas we had never expected to learn about. I, for example, found myself immersed in the intricacies of various student sports clubs, the very last topic I would have anticipated. But although it was essential for each of us to specialise it was also necessary for all of us to pool our experiences in order to form a picture of how the University as a whole was evolving.

Happily we can report back that most of what we have observed was quite reassuring. Under intense pressures, and in the midst of upheavals in higher education that are still far from ended, we found many signs of effective adaptations, often quite localised and perhaps 'below the radar'. This is not the place for a detailed checklist, and we might not agree on all the details if we made one. One day we hope that the long-promised review of the North Commission's reforms will indeed provide such an assessment. But our report can only be a snapshot, a sense of the overall direction of movement and how well it measures up to the prospective challenges.

Two key observations emerge. First, much of the internal strength, resilience and adaptability of the University comes from its diverse ecology. Of course there is a need for overall co-ordination and administration, but this is often best when it is collaborative and supportive rather than directive. Out there in the departments, the laboratories, the colleges and the seminar rooms is where the scholarly creativity flourishes. All that talent and imagination is the essence of our institution and enables Oxford to cope with adversity. Business enterprises with focused objectives can flourish and excel, but they also take gambles and run out of road. Oxford's multiple objectives and diverse ecology may not be so agile, but the associated evolutionary adaptability could be the key to our long-term survival and success. Multiple objectives can best be reconciled through the constructive engagement of distributed energies.

Second, while Oxford is competing with many formidable rivals, and needs to measure its strengths and weaknesses against external yardsticks, ours is an institution that should also cherish its autonomy and vigorously defend its self-

rule. To borrow intelligently and selectively from the experiences of others is essential. But too much reliance on standardised metrics designed for elsewhere would be misguided, and would in any case be unlikely to achieve the desired effects. Lessons from other institutions – even the Ivy Leagues, even Cambridge – are best incorporated selectively rather than through wholesale imitation. Our internal dynamics cannot simply be over-ridden, and conformity to external guidelines should always be tempered by careful appraisal.

Overall, therefore, we reach a positive conclusion. From our crow's nest we observe a very seaworthy vessel navigating in quite choppy waters, carrying some ancient ballast, but well supported by all hands and capable of learning the use of new instruments where they help keep the ship on course.

Beyond that summary assessment we also need to report more specifically on our own activities during the year. Proctorial responsibilities include ceremonial events, examinations, complaints and discipline as well as our role in scrutinising the running of the University on behalf of Congregation. We rapidly learned that the key to degree conferrals was (a) the confident projection of both the Latin instructions and the occasionally unpronounceable names of supplicants and (b) the need for perfect synchrony in walking and the doffing of caps. At Encaenia, the Public Orator in the person of Richard Jenkyns presented the honorands with his usual good humour and, of course, in elegant Latin. However, prior to the ceremony, it fell to the Junior Proctor to intercept Giorgio Napolitano, the President of Italy, as he headed to the front of the assembling procession in Exeter College, and to direct him to the back of the procession, which he accepted gracefully, despite his surprise as a Head of State.

During our proctorial year, there was a threat of industrial action by University staff in support of their grievances over pensions, and a working party was duly set up to monitor developments. It had to consider what would need to be done if the examiners for a particular subject failed to produce the required examination papers on time. The answer, to our horror, was that since it is the Proctors' responsibility to oversee the entire examination process, it would be up to us to set and mark the appropriate papers in subjects that were way beyond our knowledge and expertise. Luckily the situation never arose.

As you will see from the figures that will

be appended to this Oration, the number of complaints received by the Proctors increased sharply from 124 last year to 224 in the present year. The overwhelming majority of these complaints (89%) were related to examination matters, and it is interesting to speculate that one of the reasons for the increase might be due to the widespread use of complaints procedures in GCSE and A-level examinations. Roughly one-third of the examination issues were requests for 'marks checks' which are only forwarded to Chairs of Examiners by the Proctors when there are good reasons for suspecting that there might have been procedural errors or mistakes in recording marks, as could be the case when the mark for one particular paper is substantially out of line with the candidate's other marks. However, it remains true that some colleges forward requests for marks checks where the only basis appears to be that the candidate is disappointed with the mark they have received.

Of more concern this year has been the increase in the number of errors on examination papers, including cases where questions were not set according to the syllabus. One-third of these complaints were upheld. In addition, a further 16 of the 25 complaints about the staging of examinations were upheld. These included situations where the incorrect question paper or the wrong materials were given to candidates. It is inevitable that some errors of this sort will arise, given the very large numbers of candidates and examinations. But more needs to be done to ensure that these errors are minimised.

There were also two cases where incorrect degree classifications were posted. Chairs of Examiners need to be particularly vigilant and to ensure that the correct versions of marks and results spreadsheets are forwarded to the Examination Schools.

Oxford is justifiably proud of its diversity in many respects, but in terms of examining conventions it is not clear that there is justification for the myriad different rules and procedures used by the various subjects. Do there really need to be 20 or more different sets of criteria for being awarded a first? And what determines whether an examiner should choose a 'failing mark' of 15 rather than 16? There are many issues of a similar nature which, by themselves, might not seem particularly important, but in our view the whole question of how we assess examinations, assign marks and decide on degree classes needs to be addressed if we are to prevent the criticism from both within and without the University. Education Committee has

asked divisions to comment on their present practices. In our view we should be tackling this proactively.

This year has seen the start of the very welcome and long-overdue process of combining the different providers of IT support and facilities to the University – OUCS, Business Services and Projects, and the ICT Support Team – under the direction of the recently appointed Chief Information Officer. The provision of properly integrated IT facilities, from help-desks and WebLearn to the major financial and student support programs, is vital for the University. Most important from the Proctors' point of view will be the replacement of the OSS system that handles student records and examination matters. Much work has been done to ensure that previous mistakes are not repeated. Expectations of a significantly improved and enhanced system are high, and we hope that that this proves to be the case.

There have been some small but significant developments over the last year on IT matters relevant to examinations. We are presently trialling the use of a two-factor authentication process, developed by OUCS in conjunction with the Examination Schools and the Proctors' Office, that will permit the secure deposit of and access to the draft electronic copies of examination papers prepared by examiners and assessors. The traditional way of setting examination questions using paper and memory sticks needs to be brought into the 21st century. The same secure system will also allow examination marks to be transferred between examiners and administrative staff more easily, while at the same time minimising transcription errors. In addition, it should be possible in the coming months for examiners to submit final pdf copies of examination papers directly for printing, thereby eliminating the reproduction problems inherent in the present camera-ready copy process.

The discussion of IT matters inevitably brings us to the issue of plagiarism. Reported incidents may only reflect an uncertain proportion of the underlying total of cases, but it is notable that Oxford accounts for a minute fraction of the national figures as collated by the *Independent on Sunday* for last year. The good news is that the number of cases of plagiarism has not increased over the past year, but the not-so-good news is that the number of ways that unscrupulous students have attempted to gain an unfair advantage over their fellows by dishonest means has increased. At a less serious level, there are still too many cases of inadequate referencing in projects,

theses and dissertations and, in particular, the identification of online sources. The Proctors have also had to deal with more serious cases, where students have attempted to use the many websites and organisations that offer to write assignments on particular topics. In one instance, a student submitted the questions that were set for a take-home assignment to a number of 'help forums' and, as a consequence, benefited unfairly from the responses elicited.

The Turnitin program that is licensed to the University can help to address some of these problems, although it needs to be appreciated that it is not a 'plagiarism detection' package, and great care needs to be taken when evaluating its output. At present, the University does not have a coherent policy with respect to the use of Turnitin, and it is left to the Proctors to decide whether a particular course is permitted to use it for examination submissions. Should all submitted work be automatically run through Turnitin? Do students need to sign a declaration to allow this to happen? Who should evaluate Turnitin's output? These are issues that have already been addressed in many other UK universities where all material submitted for examination has to be screened in this way.

Although the number of cases of plagiarism has not shown a significant increase, the Proctors have had to deal with an unprecedented number of requests for extensions of time for submitted assignments, many of which only reach the office a couple of days before the deadline. The incoming Proctors may wish to consider whether late requests of this sort, that are not the result of urgent changes of circumstances, should be rejected. The number of unauthorised late submissions has also increased sharply, predominantly from taught masters students. Candidates need to be aware that, unless there are medical or other serious reasons for the late submission, the examiners are given permission to impose academic penalties.

The role of the Proctors in scrutinising the operations of the University's many committees is perhaps the most important of all our responsibilities. It has sometimes been put to us that key committees may be overly dependent on input from a relatively small group of Pro-V-Cs and heads of division. In our experience, however, most University committees are fortified by dedicated elected members of Congregation. If there is a shortcoming it sometimes seems to us that too few individuals in the wider University put themselves forward to play these important

roles. There have occasionally been moments when we felt that particular meetings would have benefited from more discussion of strategic issues. Oxford should be aiming to be ahead of the game rather than merely following the practices of other universities or being reactive to the most recent demands of outside bodies. The role of the Proctors in considering complaints is a case in point. Oxford has an almost unique system for dealing with complaints that is based on the principle of independence from academic departments and the University hierarchy. We should not be in a hurry to abandon our own system, which is appreciated and admired by most outsiders, simply because it is not what is done elsewhere.

Turning now to student matters: in last year's White Paper, the government urged us to 'put students at the heart of the system'. Students have always been at the heart of this University, but one of the Assessor's concerns this year has been the particular experience of international students, and especially those whose first language is not English.

To arrive in a foreign country and plunge into Oxford's intense working and social environment is a challenge for every student, and when the language and culture of the country are unfamiliar, the experience is more challenging still. This year, the Assessor has worked with the Director of the Language Centre to improve English language support for students who are not native speakers. The first fruit of this collaboration is a new post at the centre, which will enable it to assess and teach more students the key skills of academic writing and oral presentation in English. Language, however, is not the only challenge for international students, and we welcome the start of a project headed by the Director of International Strategy, to consider the experience of international students in the round, and to develop more effective strategies to support their life and work at Oxford.

The welfare of all students, and the University's welfare provision, occupy much of every Assessor's time. Colleges and the University as a whole make extensive and growing arrangements for students, and college and Student Welfare and Support Services are well connected. Departmental provision is sometimes less developed and links with Student Welfare and Support Services less embedded. This is a matter of concern particularly for graduate students, who may spend more time in their faculty or department than in college. There is room for welfare provision to be better networked

around the University, after the model of disabilities advice and provision, where both departments and colleges are aware of their role in making appropriate adjustments for disabilities, and know how the Disability Advisory Service can support them.

Behind our steadily increasing welfare provision lies an important question of principle which the Assessor has begun to explore this year. Most students are at an age to be negotiating the transition from adolescence to adulthood. In many ways they are highly sophisticated, but many have also grown up more protected, and with less experience of the world, than almost any of their predecessors. What is the right level of pastoral support for them? Both colleges and the University currently have a tendency to respond to what may be seen as the 'demands' of 'society' by steadily increasing welfare provision. The implied view of 'society', however, as a monolithic force that cannot be engaged with but only obeyed, is surely not one that any historian or sociologist, linguist or lawyer – or welfare professional – would recognise. Societies consist rather in many competing micro-societies, groups and institutions, all with distinctive cultures. To understand what constitutes appropriate welfare provision in this University, colleges, departments and the University as a whole need to recognise and have confidence in the distinctiveness of our culture, and the place of students within it. Developing such confidence would enable us better to explore what kinds and levels of welfare provision are appropriate in our community, and to enact and communicate them effectively. The Assessor considered this issue this year in triangular discussions with the Welfare Services and the colleges, but there is much still to do.

Questions of culture and the relationship of students with other parts of the University have concerned the Assessor in another context. The government, the media and some students themselves tell us that students today see themselves as consumers of education. The Assessor developed the project 'The idea of a university in the 21st century' – in collaboration with OUSU – to explore what members of the University understand by consumerism in education, and how they evaluate consumerism against alternative models of education in Oxford today. The result has been a vigorous dialogue between students, academic and administrative staff from every division and department of the University, via seminars, an undergraduate debate, Facebook, Twitter and an online questionnaire. Some of the ideas emerging

have already been published; others will appear in the next few weeks, and more will be lodged on the University website for the next few months.

This year's Proctors and Assessor took up office just as the University submitted its Agreement with the Office for Fair Access for 2012–13, and questions of access have been one of the Assessor's ongoing interests. Working groups on access and bridging provision have generated a number of proposals which are now under discussion, and we urge the University to be as bold, as creative and as committed to equality of opportunity in developing new access initiatives as it was in drawing up its financial package for OFFA. It is vital that we do everything in our power to level the playing field for talented young people who want to study here – not only, or mainly, because the government requires it of us, but above all because it is the right thing to do.

Once students are here, increasing numbers will need funding support in the years to come. Undergraduates from 2012 will feel the weight of their increased debts. Many graduate students already carry heavy financial burdens, and those burdens are set to increase. In the past two years, through the University's Fees Panel and committees that award scholarships, bursaries and hardship grants, we have seen the fallout of the global financial crisis affecting more and more students. Over the next few years, no fundraising initiative will be more important than increasing the numbers of graduate scholarships to cover fees and living costs, and increasing hardship funds to meet the unexpected extra needs of both graduate students and undergraduates. There is no other way to recruit and retain the best students, regardless of their material circumstances.

The Assessor has an office to herself, whereas the two Proctors spend the year facing each other across a large desk strewn with files that might in principle be assigned to either of them. One day this whole system could founder if the two individuals concerned proved wholly incompatible. But at least in our experience it brought us together to a remarkable extent, and offered us an opportunity to compare our different backgrounds, and to learn from these contrasts. For those of us who study experimental psychology or political behaviour there are many opportunities to live out our theories. For example, is it the individual or the officeholder who is the bearer of authority? For 12 months we drop our personal names and are everywhere addressed through our roles. To help this

process along we also dress for these roles. On one dark winter morning the Senior Proctor groped for his shirt, and mistakenly took up his palest pink instead of his official white. Throughout the day he went from event to event feeling he was in a state of permanent blush. Moreover much of the ceremonial and official side of what we do is heavily scripted. Who is this speaking to you today? Is it the regular (answerable - only to himself) academic, or the impersonal bearer of institutional practice and probity? Of course British public life is full of silly costumes and ceremonial roles, but this position has some almost unique features. For example, there are two Proctors, and much of what we do is in tandem. As a Proctor you get a crash course in the true significance of the term 'alter ego'. Just as you can't have one hand clapping, you can't have one Proctor processing. Thus, I can no longer doff my cap at my own volition - we must doff in synchrony and also master the art of co-ordinated walking. The Oxford roots of Lewis Carroll's universal archetypes could hardly be more evident. Had he not witnessed proctorial etiquette could he have invented Tweedledum and Tweedledee?

In principle a great deal of power and privilege is temporarily lodged in the office of the Proctors. They can attend any University meeting, summon any member to help with their enquiries into the proper functioning of the institution, and they are essentially answerable only to the law of the land and the good opinion of the corporate University. That is presumably why their tenure of office is so strictly limited to 364 days, after which, like the Cheshire Cat, only a hoped-for smile at their demitting Oration lingers on. My colleagues at Nuffield include eminent authorities on the ways of the international mafia. They tell me that the same yearly rotation in office prevails at the apex of the 'Ndrangheta, the dreaded Calabrian mafia. The *capo criminoso* must relinquish all leadership attributes voluntarily at the twelfth month, or he would become an intolerable threat to all his associates. The implicit contract is a matter of honour, but also of institutional and personal survival. The Calabrian equivalent of the OIA stands ready to enforce that contract, and - like their UK counterpart - no-one crosses them with impunity. So you can either step down to applause and live on under the protection of your partners, or - if you showed the slightest sign of wishing to appropriate the powers with which you were temporarily entrusted - you can become a threat to all, in which case you will never enjoy another day of peace with them.

So, for over 700 years, Proctors have always

demitted on time, and we are no exception.

So, on the ninth week of Hilary, we say our farewell to these:

Nine Pro-V-Cs
Eight subcommittees
Seven working parties
Six curatorships
Five strategic plans
Four division heads
Three freshmen
Two Proctors' gowns
And one - very gracious - V-C.

Proctorial Year 2011-12

Summary of Complaints Cases

During 2011-12, the Proctors received a total of 224 complaints for investigation under the provisions of Statute IX and the relevant Council regulations, compared with 124 the previous year. In addition, they completed the investigation of a number of complaints carried over from the previous proctorial year. In three of the new cases where the Proctors had prior involvement or other potential conflict of interest, the Vice-Chancellor appointed other members of Congregation to deal with the matter in their place. In summary (totals for previous year are given in brackets):

Taught-course examinations (undergraduate and postgraduate): 197 (105)

Of these new cases, 70 involved a straightforward marks check and led to corrective action in only one instance. The Proctors upheld, in whole or in part, a total of 45 complaints relating to new cases, together with two complaints carried over from the previous year. 22 complaints remain under consideration.

Research student matters: 12 (8)

The Proctors upheld one of these complaints, in addition to three complaints from previous years, and provided appropriate redress. Four of the complaints were not upheld and seven remain under consideration.

Equal Opportunities: 0 (0)

Harassment: 2 (6)

Neither of the new complaints was upheld. One case carried over from the previous year resulted in disciplinary action being taken against the student member concerned.

Maladministration: 2 (2)

The Proctors upheld one of the complaints and provided appropriate redress. The second complaint remains under consideration.

Quality of/access to teaching, learning, support facilities: 3 (0)

One completed case was referred for action at college/departmental level. The other two complaints remain under consideration. Some of the examinations-related cases reported elsewhere include representations about matters such as teaching provision and quality of supervision.

Suspension/rustication: 3 (0)

None of these complaints was upheld.

Student Union: 1 (1)

The complaint was upheld and the Student Union agreed to revise a particular procedure.

Other: 4 (2)

Three of these complaints were not upheld and the fourth remains under consideration.

Total new complaints: 224, of which 48 were upheld in whole or in part, along with seven complaints carried forward from the previous year; appropriate redress was provided in each case. 143 complaints were not upheld, were withdrawn or required no further action, and 33 remain under consideration.

Summary of Disciplinary Cases

Information is provided below about the number of cases where disciplinary proceedings took place. Totals for previous year are given in brackets. Where students were accused of more than one breach of the regulations relating to the same incident, the case is reported under the most serious of the allegations. Information is also given about numbers of cases where investigations were carried out but no breach of regulations was alleged by the Proctors, and about numbers of cases still under investigation.

BREACH OF STATUTE XI CODE OF DISCIPLINE*Forgery/falsification of university document and/or dishonest behaviour: 2 (2)*

In two cases carried forward from the previous proctorial year the Student Disciplinary Panel expelled two students who had engaged in dishonest behaviour towards the University. An appeal to the Student Appeal Panel by one student member against the decision of the Student Disciplinary Panel was dismissed.

In two cases, the Student Disciplinary Panel directed that students who had engaged in dishonest behaviour towards the University should be rusticated.

(One case remains under investigation.)

Misuse of property (Information Technology facilities): 0 (2)

(In three cases, the Proctors decided to conclude their investigations without invoking disciplinary proceedings.)

Engaging in offensive behaviour or language: 0 (0)

(In one case, the Proctors decided to conclude their investigation without invoking disciplinary proceedings.)

Engaging in activities likely to cause injury or impair safety and/or disorderly behaviour: 3 (3)

In one case, the Student Disciplinary Panel imposed a fine of £250 on a student member and ordered him/her to write a letter of apology to the aggrieved party.

In two cases, the Proctors' Disciplinary Hearing imposed fines of £150 and £80 respectively on the student members concerned.

Inciting or conspiring with other persons to engage in any of the conduct prohibited under the Code of Discipline: 1 (2)

In one case, where a student member obstructed or attempted to obstruct the Proctors in performance of their duties, the Student Disciplinary Panel imposed a fine of £200 and the student was given a formal written warning.

Misappropriation of University property: 0 (0)

(One case remains under investigation.)

Library misuse: 1 (0)

The Student Disciplinary panel imposed a fine of £25 on a student member who passed his/her card to another student for library use.

Damaging/defacing University property: 2 (0)

In one case, the Proctors' Disciplinary Hearing imposed a fine of £150 on a student member who damaged property of the University. In the second case, the Proctors' Disciplinary Hearing ordered a student member who defaced property of the University to pay compensation of £35.50 to the Estates Directorate (which had to rectify the defacement).

(In one case, the Proctors decided that the case could be dealt with more appropriately as a welfare matter, not a disciplinary one. Similarly, the Proctors decided that a further case could be disposed of without invoking disciplinary proceedings.)

BREACH OF RULES COMMITTEE REGULATIONS*Behaviour after examinations: 7 (8)*

The Proctors' Disciplinary Hearing considered seven cases and imposed fines as follows: one fine of £100; four of £80; one of £50. In one case, the student concerned was found not to have breached the regulations.

(In two cases, the Proctors decided to give informal warnings about the students' future conduct. In four further cases, the Proctors decided to conclude their

investigations without invoking disciplinary proceedings).

Immediate Fines: 14 (23)

Fourteen Immediate Fines were imposed: one fine was later withdrawn and the case referred to the University Registrar; eleven of £80; two of £50.

In one of the above cases, a student who appealed to the Student Disciplinary Panel against the imposition of an Immediate Fine had his/her appeal dismissed.

Failure to obtain permission for absence: 0 (0)

(In six cases, where students failed to obtain permission for absence from the University in connection with an overseas sports tour during full term, the Proctors decided to informally warn students about their future conduct.)

BREACH OF THE PROCTORS' DISCIPLINARY REGULATIONS FOR UNIVERSITY EXAMINATIONS*Academic misconduct (including plagiarism): 8 (7)*

In two cases, the Student Disciplinary Panel directed that the Examiners should disregard the particular (plagiarised) work. The candidates were permitted to re-submit particular work under specified conditions.

In one case, the Student Disciplinary Panel directed that the Examiners should award the (plagiarised) work marks of zero and marginal fail, which resulted in the candidate failing the examination. He/she was permitted to re-enter the examination under specified conditions and with a marks penalty.

The Student Disciplinary Panel directed that the Examiners should fail one candidate's (plagiarised) work, which resulted in him/her failing the course. He/she was permitted to re-enter the examination under specified conditions.

In a further case, the Student Disciplinary Panel directed that the Examiners should fail the piece of work concerned, which would result in the candidate failing the course.

In one case, the Student Disciplinary Panel directed that the Examiners should fail a candidate's (plagiarised) work, with the effect that the candidate failed the examination. Further, the candidate was expelled from the University with immediate effect.

In one case, the Student Disciplinary Panel directed that the Examiners should fail the

(plagiarised) work. He/she was fined £200 and permitted to re-enter the examination under specified conditions and with a marks penalty.

In a further case, the Student Disciplinary Panel directed that specified work should receive a mark of zero. The candidate was fined £200 and permitted to re-enter the examination under specified conditions.

(In ten cases, where the Proctors were satisfied that candidates did not intentionally or recklessly breach the Proctors' Disciplinary Regulations for University Examinations in respect of work which they submitted for examination, the Proctors decided that the cases could be dealt with more appropriately within the normal academic process.)

(Four cases remain under investigation.)

Unauthorised materials in an examination room: 3 (2)

The Student Disciplinary Panel imposed a fine of £100 on one candidate who took a mobile telephone into an examination room.

The Proctors' Disciplinary Hearing imposed a fine of £40 on one candidate who took a mobile telephone into an examination room.

(One case remains under investigation.)

Total cases where breaches were alleged: 41 (26)

Cases investigated but no breaches alleged: 28

Cases remaining under investigation: 7

OTHER MATTERS

In four cases, where student members of the University were the subject of police investigations, no proctorial action was taken because either no charges were brought or charges were subsequently dropped.

The Proctors dealt with 309 (208) new cases of students reported by libraries for non-payment of fines and/or non-return of books. Replacement costs recovered for non-returned books: £1,510.47; library fines paid: £4,136.53. Total amount recovered: £5,647.00.