

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY REPORTER

No 6732

WEDNESDAY 28 FEBRUARY 2024

VOL CLIV No 22

CONTENTS

Notices			
Calendar	405	Obituaries	
Discussion on Tuesday, 19 March 2024	405	Obituary Notices	420
Statutes approved	405	Graces	
Registration process for online voting in votes of the Senate	406	Grace submitted to the Regent House on 28 February 2024	420
Ballot of the Regent House: Voting open until 4 March 2024	406	Acta	
Vacancies, appointments, etc.		Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 14 February 2024	421
Electors to the Whewell Professorship of International Law	406	Congregation of the Regent House on 24 February 2024	421
Notices by the General Board		<i>End of the Official Part of the 'Reporter'</i>	
Outcomes of the Academic Career Pathways 2023 Appeals Committee	406	College Notices	
Student Disciplinary Procedure	407	Elections	427
Reports		Vacancies	427
First-stage Report of the Council on the alteration and redevelopment of the Hutchison Building on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus site	419	Events	427
Report of the Council to revise the length of co-opted membership of the Finance Committee	420	Awards	427
		External Notices	
		Oxford Notices	427



UNIVERSITY OF
CAMBRIDGE

NOTICES**Calendar**

4 March, *Monday*. End of third quarter of Lent Term. Ballot of the Regent House, voting closes at 5 p.m. (see p. 406).

15 March, *Friday*. Full Term ends.

19 March, *Tuesday*. Discussion by videoconference at 2 p.m. (see below).

Discussions (Tuesdays at 2 p.m.)

19 March

Congregations (at 10 a.m. unless otherwise stated)

23 March

6 April

Discussion on Tuesday, 19 March 2024

The Vice-Chancellor invites members of the Regent House, University and College employees, registered students and others qualified under the regulations for Discussions (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2023, p. 111) to attend a Discussion by **videoconference** on Tuesday, 19 March 2024 at 2 p.m. The following items will be discussed:

1. Annual Reports and Financial Statements for the year ended 31 July 2023 (*Reporter*, 6731, 2023–24, p. 298).
2. First-stage Report of the Council, dated 23 February 2024, on the alteration and redevelopment of the Hutchison Building on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus site (p. 419).
3. Report of the Council, dated 23 February 2024, to revise the length of co-opted membership of the Finance Committee (p. 420).

Those wishing to join the Discussion by videoconference should email UniversityDraftsman@admin.cam.ac.uk from their University email account, providing their CRSid (if a member of the collegiate University), by 10 a.m. on the date of the Discussion to receive joining instructions. Alternatively contributors may email their remarks to contact@proctors.cam.ac.uk, copying ReporterEditor@admin.cam.ac.uk, by no later than 10 a.m. on the day of the Discussion for reading out by the Proctors,¹ or may ask someone else who is attending to read the remarks on their behalf.

In accordance with the regulations for Discussions, the Chair of the Board of Scrutiny or any ten members of the Regent House² may request that the Council arrange for one or more of the items listed for discussion to be discussed in person (usually in the Senate-House). Requests should be made to the Registry, on paper or by email to UniversityDraftsman@admin.cam.ac.uk from addresses within the cam.ac.uk domain, by no later than 9 a.m. on the day of the Discussion. Any changes to the Discussion schedule will be confirmed in the *Reporter* at the earliest opportunity.

General information on Discussions is provided on the University Governance site at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/decision-making/discussions/>.

¹ Any comments sent by email should please begin with the name and title of the contributor as they wish it to be read out and include at the start a note of any College and/or Departmental affiliations held.

² <https://www.scrutiny.cam.ac.uk/> and https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/regent_house_roll/.

Statutes approved

22 February 2024

The Registry has received notice from the Clerk of the Privy Council that His Majesty the King, at a Council held on 21 February 2024, was pleased to approve amendments to Statutes A V, A VII, E VI, F I and F II, and A IV, A V, A X and B I, which were submitted in accordance with Grace 2 of 8 March 2023¹ and Grace 2 of 17 May 2023².

The first set of changes transfer references to the Chest and the description of the Reports on the University's financial position that the Council is to make to the University from Statute to Special Ordinance. The second set of changes correct and remove references that were overlooked when changes were originally presented for approval, and make other minor changes.

¹ See *Reporter*, 6691, 2022–23, p. 454.

² See *Reporter*, 6700, 2022–23, p. 665.

Registration process for online voting in votes of the Senate

22 February 2024

Following changes approved in July 2023, members of the Senate can now choose to cast their votes in Senate ballots and elections in person or online. In November 2023, the Council launched a pilot to seek feedback on a process to allow members of the Senate to register to change their method of voting in votes of the Senate and make or support nominations (*Reporter*, 6718, 2023–24, p. 111). That pilot closed on 26 January 2024 and the Council is grateful to those who tested the registration form and provided comments on the draft process, during which 143 people successfully registered.

A revised form is now available for use on the Senate website¹, which also provides further information on membership of the Senate and the voting process. In Senate elections and ballots:

- members of the Regent House who already vote online in votes of the Regent House are automatically opted in to voting online, are already registered to make and support nominations, and can use the form to register to vote in person;
- members of the Senate who are not members of the Regent House are automatically opted in to voting in person and can use the form to register to vote online and/or make and support nominations online;
- any member of the Senate can use the form to check or update their current voting method.

¹ <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/key-bodies/senate/Pages/Voting-in-an-election-of-the-Chancellor.aspx>.

Ballot of the Regent House: Voting open until 4 March 2024

The following ballot is currently open for voting by members of the Regent House:

- Election to the Council in class (c)

Voting closes at 5 p.m. on Monday, 4 March 2024 and members who were listed on the Roll of the Regent House promulgated on 6 November 2023¹ are eligible to vote. Voting information, including candidate statements and links to the voting portal, is available online at <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/ballots/voting/>.

¹ See <https://www.admin.cam.ac.uk/reporter/2023-24/special/02/section1.shtml>.

VACANCIES, APPOINTMENTS, ETC.

Electors to the Whewell Professorship of International Law

The Council has appointed members of the *ad hoc* Board of Electors to the Whewell Professorship of International Law as follows:

Professor Pippa Rogerson, *CAI*, in the Chair, as the Vice-Chancellor's deputy

(a) *on the nomination of the Council*

Professor Timothy Harper, *M*

Professor Janne Nijman, *Geneva Graduate Institute*

(b) *on the nomination of the General Board*

Professor Marcello Kohen, *Geneva Graduate Institute*

Professor Sandesh Sivakumaran, *ED*

Professor Jorge Viñuales, *CL*

(c) *on the nomination of the Faculty of Law*

Professor Dapo Akande, *University of Oxford*

Professor Mark Elliott, *CTH*

Professor Helen Scott, *DOW*

NOTICES BY THE GENERAL BOARD

Outcomes of the Academic Career Pathways 2023 Appeals Committee

Following a referral from the Academic Career Pathways 2023 Appeals Committee, the Vice-Chancellor's Committee decided to put forward Mr David Tual for the award of a Professorship (Grade 11) and Dr Nikola Baumgarten for an appointment to Teaching Associate (Grade 7). The General Board agreed on 14 February 2024 to recommend the establishment of a Professorship (Grade 11) for Mr Tual, to be backdated to 1 October 2023. It also approved the appointment of Dr Nikola Baumgarten to the post of Teaching Associate (Grade 7), also to be backdated to 1 October 2023.

After consulting with Mr Tual, the Board has agreed that the title of the Professorship should be the Professorship of Language Education (Grade 11). Mr Tual's current office will be held in abeyance during the tenure of the Professorship (Grade 11).

The Council is submitting a Grace (Grace 1, p. 420) to establish a Professorship (Grade 11) for Mr Tual.

Student Disciplinary Procedure

With effect from 1 October 2023

The General Board, on the recommendation of its Education Committee, the Education Committee's Examinations and Assessment Committee and with the support of the Senior Tutors' Committee, agreed on 12 July 2023 to make changes to its Student Disciplinary Procedure (reproduced in *Statutes and Ordinances*, 2023, p. 198). This Notice was originally intended for publication in September, in advance of the changes coming into effect, but was overlooked in error. The procedure, which has been in effect since 1 October 2023, is reproduced below for the information of the University.

The key changes are as follows:

- simplification of language: 'Investigating Officer' becomes 'Investigator' and the 'Student Discipline Officer' abbreviates to 'SDO';
- simplification of process: fraudulent admissions documentation and relevant criminal convictions, where relating to Registered Students, are handled through a fast-track, evidence-based process; the powers and responsibilities of Senior Examiners, Chairs of Examiners and Chairs of Degree Committees are widened, including the options of imposing a mark of 0 for assessments impacted by academic misconduct; and the 'Impact Statement' – a document personally compiled by the Reporting Person – is now part of the information collected during the investigation;
- greater transparency for Reporting Persons: they will receive a copy of the investigation report; they will also be permitted to observe the part of the Discipline Committee meeting in which the Committee is receiving information on whether a breach of the Rules of Behaviour has taken place;
- changes following recent legal cases: Reporting Persons, when raising Concerns about serious matters, must attend the Discipline Committee meeting (where the Concern is referred to a Discipline Committee meeting); Reporting Persons will not be questioned directly by the Respondent or their representative at a Discipline Committee meeting but instead filtered questions will come to them from the Chair; legal representation shall be considered and permitted by the relevant decision-maker where the case is serious, including where there is a possibility the Respondent could be removed from the course as a sanction, and where it is reasonable to do so in the circumstances;
- greater transparency for all: clarity around the 'no contact' requirements for Respondents during and after the procedure; provision of explicit timeframes for each aspect of the decision-making process.

In order to ensure effective implementation of the changes, the Office of Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals has provided:

- comprehensive guidance for Examiners in relation to academic misconduct investigation and sanctioning, including issuing further sanctions guidance relating to non-academic misconduct;
- clear and accessible website guidance to students, with different pages aimed at those who may wish to report breaches of the Rules of Behaviour, those who have been accused of breaching the Rules of Behaviour and those who may be involved in the investigation as witnesses;
- briefing sessions for those impacted by the changes to the procedure, specifically for: Examiners and administrators; those who support students involved with the procedure; and decision-makers linked to the procedure.

There is further ongoing work within the Colleges and the University relating to matters linked to the Student Disciplinary Procedure, following the Office for Students' publication of a response to its consultation on harassment and sexual misconduct.

STUDENT DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE

1. Glossary of key terms

1.1 In this procedure, the following terms shall have the meanings set out below:

Appeal Committee	A panel of three trained persons; two appointed by the General Board, and one Proctor, Deputy Proctor or Pro-Proctor, which determines whether an appeal against a decision of the Discipline Committee is upheld or dismissed, with the authority to amend, quash or impose sanctions or measures
Collegiate University Community	All Registered or Formerly Registered Students, other matriculated persons, all members of the Regent House, and all University and College employees, workers, staff or secondees, visiting scholars and visiting students
Completion of Procedures letter	A letter that confirms the completion of the University's internal procedures, following which a student may be able to raise a complaint with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator
Concern	The description of the behaviour causing concern, reported by the Reporting Person and submitted using a Concern Form
Discipline Committee	A panel of three trained persons, appointed by the General Board, which determines whether the Rules of Behaviour have been breached or whether a Registered Student's criminal conviction requires the University to take further action and, if so, has the authority to impose sanctions or measures

Formerly Registered Student	A person who has previously had the status of a Registered Student. ¹ Where a Formerly Registered Student is also an employee of the University and the alleged misconduct concerns conduct in that capacity as employee, the matter shall not be dealt with under the student disciplinary procedure and shall be referred for consideration under the relevant staff disciplinary procedure
Investigator	A person who meets the criteria outlined in Appendix B with responsibility for conducting an investigation into a potential breach of the Rules of Behaviour and presenting the investigation findings to a Discipline Committee
Investigation Report	The report created by the Investigator following an investigation
OSCCA	The Office of Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals
Registered Student	Any person who has accepted an offer to study or is currently pursuing a course of study at the University; or a person who had such student status at the time of the circumstances about which the Concern is being raised. Visiting Students are covered by the terms and conditions of their contract
Reporting Person	A person who is reporting a Concern about a Registered Student or Formerly Registered Student
Respondent	A Registered or Formerly Registered Student whose conduct is the subject of a Concern
Rules of Behaviour	The rules established by the General Board concerning the conduct of Registered Students and Formerly Registered Students
Student Discipline Officer (SDO)	A trained member of Regent House who meets the criteria outlined in Appendix C, appointed by Grace, with responsibility for: commissioning an investigation into a potential breach of the Rules of Behaviour; determining whether a Registered Student's criminal conviction requires the University to take further action; or deciding the University course of action following an investigation, with the authority to impose sanctions
Witness	A person who has witnessed the Respondent's behaviour or has witnessed a matter connected to the Respondent's behaviour as alleged in the Concern, including a disclosure. The Witness may be someone to whom the behaviour was directed, or a third party
Working days	The days the University expects an employee to work, normally Monday to Friday, except bank holidays and the week between Christmas day (25 December) and New Year's day (1 January). 5 working days is usually the equivalent of 1 week.

2. Scope and Principles

2.1 This procedure enables the University to consider whether a Registered Student or Formerly Registered Student has breached the Rules of Behaviour and, if it is found that the Rules have been breached, to impose proportionate sanctions. The procedure enables the University to respond appropriately to breaches of the Rules of Behaviour, to protect the University and the Collegiate University Community. It does not exist to resolve personal disputes.

Legal representation

2.2 This procedure is an internal process and does not have the same degree of formality as proceedings in a court of law. It is not normally necessary or appropriate for a Respondent or the University to be legally represented at any meetings that form part of the procedure apart, from in exceptional circumstances. Where a Respondent wishes to use a legal representative, at their own cost, in relation to this procedure, permission should be sought from the Student Discipline Officer for legal representation relating to the investigation stage of the procedure, or Chair of the Discipline Committee in relation to attendance or involvement with the Discipline Committee. Legal representation will normally be granted in serious cases.

Support

2.3 The procedure itself can be stressful for those involved. The Investigator and decision-makers will take into account the potential effects upon those engaging with the procedure and, where reasonable, assist in minimising these effects. All Reporting Persons, Respondents and Witnesses will receive information about how to access support during this process. The appropriate support will depend on the circumstances of the case, but may be delivered by a College, the University, the Student Advice Service or external support organisations. All Respondents, Reporting Persons and Witnesses can bring a supporter to any meeting. Supporters must not be witnesses to the Concern.

¹ These regulations apply to conduct that allegedly took place on or after 1 October 2019. Where those allegations concern conduct that took place before 1 October 2019, the regulations in force at the time of the conduct in question will be applied to determine whether a breach has occurred (e.g. under the Rules of Behaviour for conduct on or after 1 October 2019 (see *Statutes and Ordinances*, 2023, p. 196), or under the General Regulations for Discipline that were in force at the time for conduct prior to that date), and the respondent will be offered a choice of the case being determined under the Student Disciplinary Procedure in force from 1 October 2019 or the procedure in force at the time of the conduct.

2.4 Before, during and following the procedure, those involved may wish to access personal support in order to help them process and understand their experiences. The University does not limit the sources of support for individuals. Sources of personal support can include the College welfare system, Student Support and the Student Advice Service. However, students may also feel more comfortable seeking support from friends or family. Where they do so, it is important that any information shared about the case is treated confidentially; the friend or family member should not share the information with others while the investigation is ongoing. To do so may negatively impact the investigation. Where a friend or family member receive an account from a Reporting Person or Respondent they may be approached as a witness. While support can be given by anyone to those involved, it is preferable for a reporting person or respondent not to discuss their detailed account of what happened with someone who was present for some or all of that time.

Reasonable adjustments

2.5 Reasonable adjustments shall be made to the procedure to allow fair access for students with a disability. For example, receiving correspondence in a particular format or via an authorised representative, where necessary, as a result of an underlying condition or disability. Respondents, Reporting Persons and Witnesses are requested to make any reasonable adjustments known to the Investigator so that these can be put in place. The Investigator may seek expert opinion regarding reasonable adjustments to ensure appropriate implementation. The Investigator shall keep a record of any such adjustments.

Anonymous concerns

2.6 It will not normally be possible for the Reporting Person to submit a Concern anonymously, apart from in exceptional circumstances where there is a compelling case as decided by the Student Discipline Officer, supported by evidence, for the matter to be investigated. Where an anonymous Concern is accepted, the Concern will normally be accompanied by independent evidence enabling an investigation to take place without the involvement of the anonymous Reporting Person.

Timeliness

2.7 The University can investigate and take action even where a Registered Student has since graduated or stopped pursuing a course of study. However, it will be necessary for the University to consider whether a matter can practicably be investigated and whether it is appropriate to do so, noting the limitations on the potential sanctions available.

2.8 Concerns are ideally submitted in a timely manner, so that matters can be dealt with effectively. However, it is accepted that this is not always possible, for example where evidence of academic misconduct only becomes apparent after a significant period of time, or where a matter has significantly impacted an individual and the effects of this impact has led to a delay in reporting. There is no arbitrary deadline for the submission of a Concern, or a time limit based on whether someone who was a Registered Student at the time of the alleged breach of the rules remains a Registered Student when the Concern is submitted. The timeframe may however have an impact on the investigation, for example, the accuracy of witnesses' memories; or on decisions, and potential sanctions, for example, where students have graduated.

2.9 The University must investigate and consider Concerns in a timely manner, providing reasonable deadlines at each stage of the process for decision-makers to provide decisions and for Respondents, Reporting Persons and Witnesses to provide information. The University normally aims to complete the initial investigation and Discipline Committee decision within 60 days of informing the Respondent of the Concern. However, where a Concern involves sexual misconduct, multiple witnesses or a complex set of allegations, or where for good reason Respondents, Reporting Persons or Witnesses are unavailable for a period of time, the investigation is likely to take longer. Respondents and Reporting Persons will be provided with updates about the anticipated timeline as more information becomes available.

Engagement with the procedure

2.10 Reporting Persons and Witnesses are expected to engage fully with the procedure, as far as is reasonable in the circumstances. Respondents shall engage fully with the procedure and are required to provide contact details during this time.

2.11 It may be necessary to pause the procedure as a result of ill health or other grave cause relating to those involved. Where a Respondent, Reporting Person or Witness is unable to engage in the procedure, information shall be provided to the Investigator or Secretary of the relevant Committee confirming the nature of the reason for non-engagement, providing medical or independent evidence of the circumstances and confirming when they expect to be able to re-engage with the Procedure. The SDO or Chair of the Committee will then consider this information and determine whether it is reasonable in all the circumstances to pause the Procedure. The decision-maker will consider the impact of the person not engaging with the procedure and the impact on all parties if the procedure is paused. The decision-maker may determine that: the Procedure be paused; the Procedure continue without the engagement of the specified person, or that the circumstances provided by the person do not warrant pausing the procedure and the person should continue to engage in the Procedure.

2.12 Meetings can take place virtually or physically, taking into account the preference of the Respondent, Reporting Person or Witness, with the final decision being made by the Investigator or Chair of the Discipline Committee. Where necessary and reasonable, physical meetings can be replaced by virtual meetings, where a Respondent, Reporting Person or Witness may attend a meeting by video or telephone call at the discretion of the Investigator or Chair of the Committee.

2.13 Respondents, Witnesses, Reporting Persons and their supporters and representatives, as well as decision-makers and Investigators, are required to communicate and act respectfully and reasonably at all times whilst using the procedure and to treat the processes with respect. Abusive behaviour will not be tolerated. If, following a warning, someone continues to behave in an unacceptable manner, that person may be subject to separate disciplinary action. The person may be required by a decision-maker to stop engaging with this procedure or engage in a limited manner, even if this impacts upon the consideration of the Concern or a subsequent appeal.

2.14 Except as set out in paragraph 3.8, the Reporting Person or Witness cannot challenge a decision not to proceed with a disciplinary case under this procedure, or the outcome decision of the Student Discipline Officer or Discipline Committee, following an investigation. However, if there are concerns about how the matter was handled or the process used in reaching a decision, then a Reporting Person or Witness (who is a student) may be able to make a complaint under the Student Complaint Procedure.

Role-holder training and deputies

2.15 All decision-makers and Investigators will receive appropriate training to undertake their role and be appropriately resourced and supported. No decision-maker or Investigator will have any previous involvement with the matter that they are considering, or personal knowledge of the people involved. Except in cases of academic misconduct, decision-makers and Investigators will not be a member of the same College or Department as the Respondent or the Reporting Person.

2.16 Any reference in this procedure to a University officer or other named role includes a deputy appointed by that officer or role-holder to exercise the functions assigned to that officer under this procedure.

Conduct that may constitute a criminal offence

2.17 Some breaches of the Rules of Behaviour could also constitute criminal offences. The University will not normally investigate a matter where criminal proceedings are ongoing (including criminal investigations and appeal processes), pausing any action under this procedure until criminal proceedings are complete. Where criminal proceedings are instituted after action under this procedure has begun, the University will normally pause such action until the criminal proceedings are complete. Respondents have a responsibility to update the University of any proceedings. Following an investigation undertaken by the police and any subsequent criminal proceedings, where it appears unlikely that criminal proceedings will take place, or where the behaviour being investigated by the University is different to the behaviour being considered through criminal proceedings, the University may take its own action under this or another procedure.

2.18 The University will treat relevant police fines, cautions, reprimands, final warnings² or criminal convictions received by the Respondent as evidence that the behaviour, on which the offence was based, took place. A 'not guilty' or 'no further action' outcome from the police or criminal proceedings will not prevent the University from undertaking its own investigation as to whether a breach of the Rules of Behaviour has occurred.

Alternative procedures

2.19 Sometimes a Concern will be more appropriately investigated under another procedure, for example, the Procedure to Support and Assess Capability to Study, if the behaviour has been wholly caused by an underlying medical condition, or the Fitness to Practise Procedure for students undertaking professional courses, where the requirements for student behaviour are stricter. It will be at the discretion of the Student Discipline Officer, in consultation with relevant University Officers, to decide which procedure is most appropriate to investigate student behaviour. The University reserves the right to refer a matter to another procedure at any time during this procedure. Sometimes a Concern will be appropriately investigated under this procedure but nonetheless, following the outcome, it will be necessary to refer the matter to another procedure, for example the Fitness to Practise Procedure, to consider the Respondent's ability to continue on a professional course of study where a breach of the Rules of Behaviour has been found. If a breach of the Rules of Behaviour has been found, this will be treated as evidence that the breach of the Rules of Behaviour has occurred, but there may be other elements of a Respondent's ability to study that cannot be considered under this procedure.

2.20 Some breaches of the Rules of Behaviour will also be in breach of a College's Statutes and Ordinances and may result in the Respondent's College taking disciplinary action. The University shall take into consideration any action taken by the College to ensure that the Respondent is not punished twice for the same breach. However, even where the College chooses to take no action, it may still be appropriate for the University to take its own action, after receiving information from the College.

Multiple Respondents or Reporting Persons

2.21 Where a Concern involves more than one Respondent or more than one Reporting Person, it will be at the discretion of the Investigator to decide whether the Concern should be separated into separate investigations for some or all of the Respondents or Reporting Persons. Where an investigation includes more than one Respondent and/or Reporting Person and the Student Discipline Officer has chosen to refer the matter to the Discipline Committee, the Chair of the Discipline Committee shall have the discretion to decide whether there shall be a single meeting for all of the Respondents and/or Reporting Persons, or a separate meeting for each Respondent and/or Reporting Persons. Where a meeting involving multiple Respondents takes place, the personal mitigation of each Respondent, unless it refers to the other Respondent(s), shall not be shared with the other Respondent(s). Where multiple Respondents appeal the decision of the Discipline Committee decision appeals shall usually be considered separately but by the same Appeal Committee. Where multiple Reporting Persons review the decision of the SDO or complaint about the handling of the Concern, the review or complaint shall usually be considered separately but by the same Reviewer or Complaint Officer.

² Reprimands and final warnings are no longer issued by the police but are noted here to provide a complete list of the types of warnings that are covered by this paragraph.

Precautionary and interim action

2.22 Special Ordinance D (v) concerning Precautionary Action permits precautionary measures to be put in place where an investigation is ongoing and when it is necessary to do so in the circumstances. It is the responsibility of OSCCA, where appropriate, to ensure updates relating to this procedure are provided to the decision-makers to ensure that the ongoing risk can be monitored.

2.23 While the procedure is ongoing, unless explicitly permitted by the Student Discipline Officer, a Respondent must not contact or attempt to contact the Reporting Person or any other Respondent(s) to the alleged misconduct either directly or via another person. This includes in person or via electronic means, including messaging or following or responding to social media. Where the Respondent comes across the Reporting Person(s), the Respondent should not acknowledge their presence either verbally or non-verbally or anyone who is with them and keep a distance from them. The same requirement applies for witnesses who have been directly impacted by Respondent's behaviour or are specified by the Investigator. To facilitate this no-contact arrangement, it is necessary for the Reporting Person to have no contact with any Respondent(s).

2.24 When reaching a decision regarding the Concern, regardless of the decision made, the relevant decision-maker shall consider whether it is appropriate to require or request the Respondent and the Reporting Person, if they are a student, to have no direct contact or interaction. This would normally include: not initiating conversations with the other person; not sitting immediately adjacent to one another in communal spaces, not initiating contact online, for example, sending direct messages; not sending letters or items to the other person, and not entering the other person's bedroom. This instruction would take into account the views of the Respondent and Reporting Person, and the College, where both individuals share the same College. A breach of the no-contact order would be a breach of the Rules of Behaviour, under Rule 1(a).

2.25 Except where precautionary action precludes it, Respondents may continue to pursue and complete their studies, including graduating, unless informed otherwise by the Student Discipline Officer.

2.26 The University will treat all members of the Collegiate University Community, including Reporting Persons, Witnesses and Respondents with equal fairness.

Standard and burden of proof

2.27 The standard of proof used when making determinations under this procedure is on the balance of probabilities. This means that it is necessary to prove that it is more likely than not that a breach of the Rules of Behaviour occurred before the decision-maker can impose any sanctions on the Respondent. Decisions must be supported by evidence; it is not enough to simply believe that something is likely to have happened. This requirement means that there may be some cases in which the University decides that it is not appropriate to take or continue action under this procedure.

2.28 The burden of proof that a breach of the Rules of Behaviour has occurred rests with the University. This means that it is for the University to prove that there has been a breach of the Rules of Behaviour, it is not for a Respondent to prove that a breach of the Rules of Behaviour did not take place.

Information sharing

2.29 OSCCA shall share the information and evidence related to an investigation and outcome with relevant members of staff, the Respondent, the Reporting Person and Witnesses where it is necessary in the interests of fairness to do so in order to process, investigate, and/or determine the outcome of an alleged breach of the Rules of Behaviour, or to implement any sanctions following a finding. All information received from a Reporting Person, Respondent, Witness or staff member will be handled sensitively and in accordance with the University's Data Protection Policy.

2.30 The University shall share all evidence considered in reaching a decision (except where the decision-maker determines that there is a compelling reason not to do so), the decision itself, the reasons for the decision and any sanctions, with the Respondent. The evidence considered in reaching a decision may not be shared with the Respondent where the identity of the Reporting Person, or the identity of a Witness, or personal data or special category data belonging to another has been provided, where that person does not wish that data or identity to be shared and there is a compelling case for the matter to be investigated without revealing this information to the Respondent. A compelling case may include where the information is of no relevance to the Concern and therefore it does not need to be relied upon. Any student affected by such a decision can request a review using the Procedure for the Review of Decisions of University Bodies. Where information is unable to be shared with the Respondent, this may affect the decision-maker's ability to rely on this evidence in reaching a decision. Where evidence is not relied upon by the decision-maker, this will be specified in the reasons for the decision.

2.31 The University shall share the initiation of an investigation, the investigation findings and the reasoned determination of the SDO or Discipline Committee, including any sanctions, with the Respondent's College Senior Tutor (if the Respondent is a member of a College) and the Respondent's Head of Department. Where relevant, the University shall also share this information with internal bodies (for example a fitness to practise committee), regulatory bodies (for example, the Disclosure and Barring Service), professional bodies (for example, the General Medical Council), or other organisations with whom the student may be connected, where it is appropriate to do so (for example, where the student holds a position of responsibility for children or vulnerable adults). Where formally requested to do so, or where the University considers that someone may be at significant and immediate risk of harm, the University may disclose information received through this procedure to the police. When initiating an investigation, the Investigator will inform the Respondent in writing that information about the case will be provided to the police if formally requested by the police or if the SDO considers that there is an immediate and significant risk to the Collegiate University Community.

2.32 The University shall share a copy of any Investigation Report, or relevant information from the investigation findings and the reasoned determination of (as appropriate) the SDO, Discipline Committee, or Appeal Committee and sanctions with the Reporting Person where they have been the person directly affected by the Concern. The copy of the Investigation Report may be redacted to remove personal information including any mitigation, relating to the Respondent that is not directly relevant to the Concern. Witnesses may also receive relevant information about the procedure where they have been personally affected by the original incident or the disciplinary process. 'Relevant' information is that which it is reasonably necessary to share in order to safeguard the interests of the Reporting Person or Witness in the interests of fairness.

2.33 It is necessary that all parties feel able to engage fully with the procedure without concern for the wider sharing of information disclosed within the investigation process. Following the conclusion of the procedure, those involved may discuss their personal experience of the procedure with others. However, individuals need to remain mindful of the information they share with others, including how it is shared. Information provided should not constitute or contribute to any abusive behaviour, as defined in the Rules of Behaviour, towards others involved. Otherwise, this may lead to the individual becoming the subject of disciplinary proceedings.

3. Submitting a Concern

3.1 The University will normally be informed of a potential breach of the Rules of Behaviour by a Reporting Person. The Reporting Person may be a person who has been impacted by the reported behaviour, witnessed the reported behaviour or became aware of the reported behaviour through other means. Where the Concern originates from someone who has not been directly impacted, the University will normally attempt to engage with the person(s) directly impacted to understand whether they will voluntarily engage with any investigation. This further information may impact the decision to investigate the Concern.

3.2 For Concerns relating to academic misconduct in examinations, see paragraph 6.

3.3 To submit a Concern, the Reporting Person must complete and submit the Concern Form to the Investigator via OSCCA.

3.4 Within 5 working days, the Investigator shall communicate with the Reporting Person to acknowledge the Concern that has been received, to request further information, and/or to provide further procedural information.

3.5 Within 5 working days of receiving all the relevant information, the Concern Form will be presented by the Investigator to the Student Discipline Officer (SDO) who will consider whether the following criteria are met:

- (a) there is an allegation that, on the face of it, would appear to breach the Rules of Behaviour;
- (b) this procedure is the most appropriate procedure to use to investigate the matter; and
- (c) the Concern has not already been investigated using this procedure or any other relevant University or College procedure.

3.6 The SDO will provide a decision within 5 working days. Where all the criteria have been met, the SDO shall commission an investigation into the Concern. Where at least one of the criteria under paragraph 3.5(a) or (b) has not been met, or where the Concern has already been investigated using this procedure, the SDO shall not commission an investigation under this procedure, although the SDO may refer the matter for investigation under another University procedure in line with paragraph 2.18. Where the Concern has already been investigated under another University or College procedure, the SDO will consider whether, taking into account all the circumstances of the case, any further action under this procedure is appropriate or possible.

3.7 Where part of the Concern has previously been investigated, it is at the discretion of the SDO whether it is in the University's interest to investigate the aspect that has not yet been investigated, taking into account why the matter was not previously fully investigated, the length of time that has elapsed since the investigation, the severity of the misconduct, the impact on the Respondent of undergoing a second discipline investigation, and whether there would be repercussions for the Respondent's fitness to practise were the decision taken not to investigate the matter.

3.8 The SDO shall give written reasons for the decision about whether to commission an investigation and the Investigator shall communicate the decision and the reasons to the Reporting Person in writing, within 5 working days of receiving the SDO's decision. Reporting Persons who are students may be able to seek a review of a decision not to commission an investigation, or about the scope of the proposed investigation, under the Procedure for the Review of Decisions of University Bodies within 10 working days of being notified of the decision.

3.9 Subject to the outcome of any review process as set out in paragraph 3.8, where an investigation is not commissioned and where the Concern is not withdrawn by the Reporting Person, the Respondent shall normally be notified in writing of the Concern, the decision of the SDO, the reasons for the decision, and confirmation that no further action will be taken under this procedure. This notification shall normally be provided to the Respondent within 15 working days of the SDO's decision, to allow for a student Reporting Person to request a review, or within 5 working days for other types of Reporting Person, or following the completion of a review, where this process is commenced by a student. However, where sharing this information with the Respondent may impact upon an investigation being undertaken under a different procedure or by an external body, a delay to informing the Respondent may be necessary.

4. Investigating a Concern

4.1 Where an investigation is commissioned, the Investigator shall write to the Respondent to confirm that a Concern naming them has been received, including the nature of the alleged behaviour, the relevant Rules of Behaviour that have allegedly been breached and the decision of the SDO to proceed with an investigation. The Investigator will provide a brief summary of the Concern, naming the Reporting Person (unless, exceptionally, an anonymous Concern has been accepted), and outlining the limitations on contact with others, investigation process, the possible outcomes, including referral to other procedures, for example fitness to practise, and who may need to be informed of these outcomes. The Investigator will inform the Respondent and the Reporting Person of the avenues of support available to them and the potential consequences if the Concern relates to alleged misconduct that may constitute a criminal offence.

4.2 The Reporting Person and Respondent should not attempt to investigate the matter themselves, instead providing all potential relevant information to the Investigator.

4.3 The Investigator shall conduct the investigation. The investigation may require written statements, meetings and evidence from any member of the Collegiate University Community relevant to the investigation. In addition, the Investigating Officer may request written statements, meetings and evidence from anyone outside of the Collegiate University Community.

4.4 A written record shall be kept of all investigative meetings. During an investigative meeting, a person can present oral and written information, evidence and the names of any Witnesses. The Investigator will provide a copy of the meeting's written record to the person interviewed, providing them with 5 working days to provide clarifications as an addendum.

4.5 The Investigator shall normally meet with the Reporting Person and with the Respondent to receive an oral account of the circumstances leading to the Concern, to receive relevant evidence relating to the Concern and the names of any Witnesses. The Investigator may meet with any Witnesses or instead collect information through written statements and other types of evidence.

4.6 In addition to investigating the Concern itself, the investigation shall include gathering information about: the seriousness of the Concern; any impact of the Concern on the Reporting Person(s) or witness(es); any mitigation relevant to the Respondent's actions; and any relevant previous breaches of the Rules of Behaviour by the Respondent. The relevant information will be determined by the Investigator.

4.7 During the investigation, it may be necessary to request further information and responses from those who have already provided oral or written accounts. Information the Investigator may consider collecting, where relevant and available, includes information validating accounts and evidence that has been provided by others, records of correspondence, CCTV evidence, medical evidence from qualified medical practitioners, and records of online activity. This is a non-exhaustive list and the Investigator may request any information the Investigator considers will provide value to the investigation. The University does not have the resources to undertake its own forensic investigation or investigation that relies on the significant involvement of third parties and therefore, unless this type of information is provided by the party seeking to rely on it, the Investigator shall not normally seek it.

4.8 The Investigator may require a Respondent to engage in an expert assessment(s) to assess the level of risk they present to themselves, members of the Collegiate University Community, anyone within the Precincts of the University, and anyone with whom the Respondent comes into contact whilst engaged in study. Where a Respondent does not engage with the process, this may make any breach of the Rules of Behaviour more serious, as outlined in Regulation 5 of the Rules of Behaviour. In addition, not engaging with the process is likely to be a separate breach of Regulation 1(a) of the Rules of Behaviour and further disciplinary action may be taken. Where a Respondent does not engage with an expert assessment, commissioned to assess the level of risk associated with the Respondent, the Investigator may assume that there is a high level of risk associated with the Respondent. Any action taken must be proportionate to the circumstances; however, the level of risk may be relevant to any precautionary action taken, or to any sanction imposed by the SDO, Discipline Committee or Appeal Committee.

4.9 The Investigator shall produce an Investigation Report, outlining the findings of the investigation. The Investigator will share a copy of the Investigation Report and all evidence with the SDO.

5. Student Discipline Officer (SDO) decision

5.1 The SDO shall consider the Investigation Report and evidence from the investigation. At the SDO's discretion, the Investigator may be asked to obtain further evidence or to clarify any aspect of the Investigation Report.

5.2 The SDO shall reach one of the following decisions:

- (a) To impose a sanction listed in paragraph 5.4 where the SDO is satisfied that a breach of the Rules of Behaviour has occurred and that such a sanction is appropriate;
- (b) To refer the case to the Discipline Committee where the SDO considers that a breach of the Rules of Behaviour may have taken place and that sanctions beyond those listed in paragraph 5.4 may be required;
- (c) Where neither (a) nor (b) is appropriate: (i) to take no further action; (ii) to refer the matter for decision under another University procedure.

5.3 In considering whether to impose a sanction, or refer the case to the Discipline Committee, the SDO shall give consideration to Regulation 5 of the Rules of Behaviour and any guidance published by the General Board in relation to sanctions, as well as the following factors:

- (a) The seriousness of the breach;
- (b) The harm or damage caused;
- (c) The advantage gained or the advantage that could have been gained by the Respondent as a result of the breach;
- (d) The intent and planning involved in the breach;
- (e) The impact on the Collegiate University Community, including the content of any Impact Statement;
- (f) Whether the Respondent has admitted to the breach and when such an admission took place;
- (g) Whether the Respondent has expressed remorse and/or shown insight into the impact of the breach;
- (h) The evidenced personal circumstances of the Respondent.

5.4 Where the SDO decides to impose a sanction, one or more of the following sanctions are available:

- (a) To require the Respondent to pay the cost of material damages up to the amount of £250;
- (b) To require the Respondent to provide a written apology;
- (c) To require the Respondent to engage with an educative or reflective session;
- (d) To require the Respondent to complete a written reflection;
- (e) To impose a 'no contact' order, specifying actions to prevent interaction between the Respondent and named person(s)

5.5 The SDO shall provide the decision and the reasons for the decision in writing to the investigator within 10 working days of receiving the Investigation Report. Within 5 working days of receiving the SDO's decision and reasons, the Investigator shall communicate this in writing alongside a copy of the Investigation Report and evidence to the Respondent and others in line with 2.25–2.28 of this procedure.

5.6 Where the SDO has imposed a sanction, the Respondent will have 10 working days from receiving the decision to appeal the decision in accordance with paragraph 9 of the procedure.

5.7 The SDO shall refer the case to the Discipline Committee for consideration where the Respondent does not comply with the sanction so that the Discipline Committee can consider imposing more serious sanction(s).

5.8 The SDO may at any time withdraw a referral to the Discipline Committee. Such a decision will be communicated in writing to the members of the Discipline Committee, the Respondent and others in line with 2.25–2.28 of this procedure. If a referral to the Discipline Committee is withdrawn then the SDO shall substitute an alternative decision in accordance with paragraph 5.2.

6. Investigating Academic misconduct

6.1 Any person who suspects that a Registered Student has engaged in academic misconduct, should report this using a Concern Form to the Senior Examiner or Chair of Examiners for undergraduate students, or the Chair of the Degree Committee for postgraduate students. The Concern can be reported directly to the appropriate person, or to OSCCA, who will refer the Concern Form onto the appropriate person.

6.2 The Chair of Examiners, Senior Examiner or Chair of the Degree Committee will determine whether it is reasonable to commission an investigation, or alternatively to take no further action on the basis of the information provided.

6.3 Where an investigation is commissioned, the Chair of Examiners, Senior Examiner or Chair of the Degree Committee will undertake the investigation or delegate the investigation to a specified individual.

6.4 The investigation will involve the following steps:

- (a) Gathering and analysing relevant documentation, for example: Turnitin reports; original source material; detection tool software outcomes; confiscated examination materials; the information provided to the candidate about the assessment and academic misconduct;
- (b) A meeting or written statement from the Respondent. An invitation to meet with the Respondent should provide an outline of the Concern. An invitation for the student to provide a written statement should include all documentation relevant to the Concern. If a meeting takes place, a written record will be produced, and the Respondent given 5 working days to provide any clarifications as an addendum. The meeting may include questions about the academic substance of the assessment, to help determine the Respondent's knowledge and ability in relation to the assessment task. The Respondent shall also be given an opportunity to provide any mitigation relevant to the Concern.
- (c) A meeting or written statement from the Reporting Person or other relevant Witnesses. Having shared with them such information about the allegation or response as is necessary in the circumstances.

6.5 Following the investigation, the documentation will be provided to the Chair of Examiners, Senior Examiner or Chair of the Degree Committee, who will consider all of the information, normally consult with at least one other Examiner or member of the Degree Committee and make one of the following decisions:

- (a) There is no evidence of academic misconduct, and no further action should be taken;
- (b) There is evidence of academic misconduct and sanctions from paragraph 6.6 will be imposed, in accordance with the sanctions guidance;
- (c) There is evidence of academic misconduct and further sanctions than those available in paragraph 6.6 may be required, consequently, the matter requires a referral to the Discipline Committee.

6.6 The sanctions that a Chair of Examiners, Senior Examiner or Chair of the Degree Committee can impose are as follows:

- (a) An educative session regarding academic integrity;
- (b) A mark for the assessment that only reflects the parts of the assessment not affected by academic misconduct;
- (c) A mark of 0 for the assessment affected by academic misconduct;
- (d) An apology;
- (e) A written reflection;
- (f) Where re-sits are permitted by the course of study regulations, a re-sit assessment where the maximum mark permitted is a pass mark.

6.7 The Chair of Examiners, Senior Examiner or Chair of the Degree Committee shall:

- (a) notify the Respondent and OSCCA of the decision, the reasons for the decision and a copy of all of the investigation materials within 5 working days. Where a Reporting Person or Witness(es) has been directly affected by the alleged academic misconduct, for example, they have reported concerns that their writing has been used without due acknowledgement by the Respondent, then a copy of the outcome and the investigation report shall be provided to them in accordance with paragraph 2.24–2.28.
- (b) Refer the matter to the Chair of the relevant Fitness to Practise Committee where a sanction has been imposed in accordance with paragraph 6.6 and the student is on a course with fitness to practise requirements.

6.8 The Respondent shall have 10 working days from receiving the decision to appeal outcome 6.5(b) to the Appeal Committee.

7. Registered Students who receive a relevant criminal conviction while a Registered Student or are suspected of using fraudulent information during the University application process

Relevant criminal conviction

7.1 It is a Registered Student's responsibility to inform the University immediately about any relevant criminal conviction received while a Registered Student. If a relevant criminal conviction is not reported within 5 calendar days of conviction, then the Registered Student will be in breach of Regulation 1(c) of the Rules of Behaviour.

7.2 The purpose of a student reporting a criminal conviction is so that the University can assess whether the Registered Student is able to continue to study at the University and whether there are any further actions that need to be taken. The behaviour resulting in the criminal conviction may not necessarily be in breach of any of the Rules of Behaviour.

7.3 Where a Respondent has already received a criminal conviction as a result of behaviour that is raised within a Concern, an investigation shall be conducted in accordance with paragraph 4 of the procedure. The conviction will be used as evidence that the behaviour on which the conviction was based has taken place.

7.4 Any criminal sentence given to the Respondent will be taken into account by decision-makers when considering whether to apply any sanctions under this procedure. There is a need for all action taken and sanctions imposed by the University to be proportionate.

7.5 Where a Registered Student reports a criminal conviction to OSCCA, or where the University is informed by a third party that a Registered student has received a criminal conviction, the Investigator shall require the Registered Student to provide relevant court documentation, including a copy of the sentence, any judgement and any pre-sentence report. The Registered Student shall also have the opportunity to provide a written statement. Where the Registered Student does not provide this documentation, it is likely that this will result in the Registered Student's removal from their current course of study.

7.6 The Investigator shall present the information to the Student Discipline Officer, and the Student Discipline Officer shall decide either that:

- (a) the criminal conviction does not require the University to take any further action; or
- (b) the criminal conviction or the non-reporting of the criminal conviction requires the University to take further action.

Fraudulent admissions information

7.7 When applying for entry, it is an applicant's responsibility to provide accurate and true information. In accordance with the terms and conditions of an offer of admission, using fraudulent information is grounds for withdrawing an applicant or student's offer of study.

7.8 Where information is received by OSCCA that a registered student, or someone acting on their behalf, used fraudulent documentation and/or claims as part of their admissions application, the Investigator shall require the Registered Student and any other relevant organisation to provide verification of the documentation. The Investigator shall require the relevant Department or Faculty to provide a statement on the impact of the alleged fraudulent information and/or claims. The Registered Student shall also have the opportunity to provide a written statement within 5 working days.

7.9 Once the information has been gathered, it shall be presented to the SDO, who shall determine within 5 working days:

- (a) The Registered Student's application contained no false or fraudulent information and can continue on the course of study; or
- (b) The Registered Student's application contained false or fraudulent information and the Registered student should be withdrawn from the course; additional sanctions from paragraph 5.4 may also be applied; or
- (c) The Registered Student's application contained false or fraudulent information. However, the information was of such limited relevance to the application that the Registered Student can continue on the course of study with sanctions from paragraph 5.4;
- (d) Further information is required prior to a decision being made, and will be reviewed by the SDO once the further information has been provided.

Actions following the SDO's decision

7.10 The Investigator shall provide the Registered Student, a letter confirming the SDO's decision and the reasons for the SDO's decision within 5 working days of receiving the decision. A record of this decision shall be retained by OSCCA in accordance with the University's retention policy.

7.11 Where paragraph 7.6(b) is the decision, the SDO shall refer the matter to the Discipline Committee for further consideration. The Discipline Committee shall consider whether to impose any sanction outlined in paragraphs 5.4 or 8.18 of this procedure for the protection of the interests of the University, in accordance with the process outlined in paragraph 8. Where the student has not reported the criminal conviction, the Discipline Committee shall also consider imposing a sanction for the breach of Rule of Behaviour 1(c).

7.12 The Registered Student will have 10 working days to appeal the SDO's decision to the Appeal Committee, in accordance with paragraph 9.

8. Discipline Committee consideration

8.1 Where the SDO, or for academic misconduct the Chair of Examiners, Senior Examiner or Chair of the Degree Committee, refers any case to the Discipline Committee, a member of OSCCA shall act as Secretary to the Discipline Committee and shall assign by lot a Chair and two members to the Discipline Committee from among the members of the Panel appointed by General Board who are available and in accordance with paragraph 2.11.

8.2 The Discipline Committee shall consist of:

- (a) A Chair, who shall be experienced in decision-making relating to misconduct, either through legal training or in relation to student, staff or professional procedures;
- (b) A member of Regent House;
- (c) A Registered Student or a Sabbatical Officer of Cambridge Students' Union.

8.3 Except as set out in this procedure, the Chair of the Discipline Committee has the power to determine its own procedure, including adjournment.

8.4 The Secretary of the Discipline Committee shall organise a meeting of the Discipline Committee and will communicate the membership of the Committee, date, time and location of the meeting to the Discipline Committee members, the Investigator, the Respondent, the Respondent's Senior Tutor, and the Reporting Person. A copy of the Investigation Report, the Student Discipline Procedure, the sanctions guidance, an order of meeting will be provided to all invitees at least 5 working days prior to the Committee.

8.5 The Respondent shall be expected to attend the Discipline Committee meeting either in person or virtually.

8.6 Where the Respondent does not admit the alleged breach(es) of the Rule(s) of Behaviour during the investigation or within 5 working days of receiving the investigation report, the Reporting Person shall be invited to observe the part of the Committee that determines whether a breach of the Rules of Behaviour has occurred. The Reporting Person may also attend to answer any questions from the Committee, which may include questions received from the Respondent. The Reporting Person may choose to attend via video link, or if the meeting takes place in person, to attend in person. If the Reporting Person chooses to attend by video link, they can choose whether to be visible on camera or not.

8.7 Where the Respondent admits the alleged breach(es) following 5 working days of the Investigation Report but before the Discipline Committee determines whether a breach of the Rules of Behaviour has occurred, it will be for the Chair of the Discipline Committee to determine whether to accept the admittance or have the Discipline Committee determine whether a breach of the Rules of Behaviour has occurred.

8.8 Where the Respondent does not admit the alleged breach(es) and disputes evidence in the Discipline Committee papers provided by a Reporting Person or Witness and has questions for that person, the Respondent can request, within 5 working days' of receiving the Investigation Report, that the person attends the fact-finding part of the Committee to answer questions from the Committee, which may include questions received from the Respondent that the Chair determines are relevant to be asked. The request shall include the questions that the Respondent wishes to be asked of the person. A request to call a person will be considered by the Chair, who shall determine whether to request the person to attend or provide evidence in an alternative format as outlined at paragraph 8.6. Where the Respondent is dissatisfied with the Chair's decision, the Respondent can appeal this decision following the Discipline Committee to the Appeal Committee.

8.9 Where the Respondent admits the alleged breach(es) of the Rules of Behaviour, the Discipline Committee will focus on what, if any, sanctions to impose. The Reporting Person will not be permitted to attend this part of the Discipline Committee.

8.10 The University has no power to compel the attendance of a person before the Discipline Committee. If the Respondent is unable to attend the Discipline Committee meeting, it shall be at the Chair's discretion as to whether the Respondent has provided a sufficient reason for absence, and is likely to attend at a future date, in which case the meeting date should be re-arranged. The Discipline Committee meeting may nevertheless proceed in the Respondent's absence. Where a person other than the Respondent declines to attend, the Discipline Committee will take into account their reasons for doing so in determining what weight to attach to the information they have provided.

8.11 The Investigator will be present during the Discipline Committee to outline the information gathered and presented in the Investigation Report and answer questions from those in attendance at the Committee. In matters of academic misconduct, the Chair of Examiners, Senior Examiner or Chair of the Degree Committee will attend to present the information gathered and referred to the Discipline Committee.

8.12 During the Discipline Committee meeting, there shall be the opportunity for the Committee members to ask questions of the Investigator and, if in attendance, the Respondent, Reporting Student(s) and Witness(es). Where the Discipline Committee meeting includes determining whether there has been a breach of the Rules of Behaviour, the Respondent and Reporting Person (and any representatives) shall have the opportunity to submit questions for the other to the Chair. If the Chair determines the questions are relevant, then the Chair shall ask these questions. The Investigator shall also have the opportunity to ask questions. The Respondent shall have the opportunity to make a final statement before the Discipline Committee meet privately to determine whether an alleged breach of the Rules of Behaviour has occurred or to determine what sanctions, if any, to impose.

8.13 Where the Respondent wishes to challenge the evidence of a Reporting Person or a Witness, the Chair of the Discipline Committee will determine the most appropriate format for this. Appropriate formats may include the Reporting Person or Witness attending the Discipline Committee meeting in person or by video link to answer questions asked by the Chair. Alternatively, a further written response may be sought from the Reporting Person or Witness. The Discipline Committee may pause the meeting to request further information where the Chair deems it appropriate to do so.

8.14 Once the Discipline Committee is satisfied that it has received all of the relevant information, all persons except for the Committee members, the Secretary and the note taker of the Discipline Committee shall withdraw.

8.15 The Discipline Committee shall consider all the information that has been provided and reach one of the following decisions:

- (a) To dismiss the case;
- (b) To find that there has been a breach of the Rules of Behaviour.

8.16 Where the Discipline Committee has found that the Rules of Behaviour have been breached, the Secretary shall inform the Discipline Committee of any previous breaches of the same Rule. The Respondent and the Investigator shall be invited back into the meeting, informed of the outcome and given the opportunity to make a statement and answer questions regarding the sanctions, if any, to be imposed. The Committee may ask questions of the Respondent and the Investigator. The Respondent shall have the opportunity to make a final statement.

8.17 All persons except for the Committee members, the Secretary and the note taker shall withdraw. The Discipline Committee shall then consider the sanctions, if any, to be imposed. Consideration shall be given to the factors outlined in Regulation 5 of the Rules of Behaviour and paragraph 5.3 of this procedure and the sanctions guidance. The Discipline Committee can impose any sanctions listed at paragraph 5.4 or 8.18.

8.18 Sanctions the Discipline Committee can impose are as follows:

- (a) Restrictions or conditions on the right to use or access University premises, facilities or services or, with the permission of the relevant College, College premises, facilities or services;
- (b) The amendment of academic results or the temporary or permanent removal of academic awards;
- (c) Temporary or permanent exclusion from membership of the University;
- (d) Restrictions on representing the University, or membership of University clubs or societies;
- (e) Any penalty considered by the Discipline Committee to be lighter.

8.19 In deciding upon the appropriate sanctions, the Discipline Committee shall consider each sanction in turn and shall impose the lowest sanctions commensurate with the breach, using the sanctions guidance to inform typical sanctions. The Discipline Committee shall record the reasons for the sanctions imposed. Sanctions affecting the academic results or academic awards of a Respondent shall only be imposed where it is proportionate to do so.

8.20 The Discipline Committee shall consider whether to stipulate more serious sanctions that will be imposed in the circumstance that the Respondent does not comply fully with the sanctions initially imposed by the Discipline Committee.

8.21 The Secretary of the Discipline Committee, within 5 working days of the Discipline Committee reaching a decision, shall provide to the Respondent and Reporting Person a written document explaining the Discipline Committee's decision, reasons for the decision and any sanctions applied. The Respondent shall be given information regarding the right of appeal and any Reporting Person who is a student will be given information about raising a student complaint. The notes of the Discipline Committee meeting will be shared with the Respondent within 10 working days of the Discipline Committee meeting. The notes of the fact-finding element of the Discipline Committee will be shared with the Reporting Person where they attended or requested the notes that be shared with them. The outcome will be shared with others in line with 2.28–2.32 of this procedure.

8.22 Where a Respondent subsequently fails to comply with any sanctions imposed by the Discipline Committee, the Respondent will be subject to any sanction specified by the Discipline Committee under paragraph 8.20; or, where other action has not been specified, further disciplinary action may be taken under Regulation 1(a) of the Rules of Behaviour.

9. The Appeal Committee

9.1 A member of OSCCA who has had no previous involvement in the case shall act as Secretary to the Appeal Committee. The Secretary to the Appeal Committee has the authority to extend the appeal deadline, where there is a compelling reason to do so.

9.2 An appeal can be submitted on the following grounds, that:

- (a) The procedures were not followed properly;
- (b) The Discipline Committee reached an unreasonable decision;
- (c) The Respondent has new material evidence that the Respondent was unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process;
- (d) There is bias or reasonable perception of bias during the procedure;
- (e) The penalty imposed was disproportionate, or not permitted under the procedures.

9.3 The Respondent will need to complete and submit an Appeal Form to OSCCA, which includes all evidence the Respondent wishes to be considered as part of the appeal. The University will normally aim to make a decision regarding an appeal within 30 days of the Respondent making the appeal.

9.4 If the appeal has been made on the specified grounds and within the timeframe, as determined by the Secretary of the Appeal Committee, the Secretary shall assign by lot a Chair and a member of the Regent House from among the members of the Panels appointed by General Board who are available and have not had prior involvement in the case, and require the Proctors to confirm a Proctor, Deputy Proctor or Pro-Proctor who is available and has not had any prior involvement in the case.

9.5 The Appeal Committee shall consist of:

- (a) A Chair, who shall be experienced in decision-making relating to misconduct, either through legal training or in relation to student, staff or professional procedures;
- (b) A member of the Regent House;
- (c) A Proctor, Deputy Proctor or Pro-Proctor.

9.6 Except as set out in this procedure, the Chair of the Appeal Committee has the power to determine its own procedure, including adjournment.

9.7 The Secretary of the Appeal Committee shall organise a meeting of the Appeal Committee, either physically or virtually, and communicate the date, time and location for the meeting to members of the Committee. The Respondent will be informed of the membership of the Appeal Committee attending the meeting.

9.8 The Appeal Committee shall receive the Respondent's Appeal Form and evidence, the Discipline Committee outcome, the notes of the Discipline Committee and the material considered by the Discipline Committee at least 7 days before the Appeal Committee meeting.

9.9 The Appeal Committee shall normally consider an appeal in private based on the written materials but has the discretion to request further information; where this happens, the Respondent shall be sent a copy of any further information and be given an opportunity to provide a written response.

9.10 The Appeal Committee shall consider all the information that has been provided and reach one of the following decisions:

- (a) To dismiss the appeal;
- (b) To uphold the appeal.

9.11 Where the Appeal Committee has upheld an appeal on the grounds of new material evidence relating to a breach of the Rules of Behaviour, it will normally send the matter back for re-consideration by a Discipline Committee. Where the Appeal Committee has upheld an appeal on any other ground(s), it can choose to send the matter back for re-consideration by a Discipline Committee, or alternatively it has the power to impose its own decision, including sanctions. Where the Appeal Committee considers a breach of the Rules of Behaviour has taken place, it can impose any sanction outlined in paragraphs 5.4 and 8.18 of this procedure, including more or less significant sanctions than were imposed by the Discipline Committee for the same breach.

9.12 The Secretary of the Appeal Committee, within 5 working days of the Appeal Committee reaching a decision, shall provide to the Respondent a written copy of the Appeal Committee's decision, reasons for the decision, and any substituted decision. This is the final stage of the internal process and therefore the Respondent will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter.

9.13 Where the Appeal Committee has upheld an appeal, any affected Reporting Person or Witness will be given a copy of the Appeal Committee's decision and, reasons for the decision and any substituted decision, along with information about the Student Complaint Procedure where applicable.

9.14 Where the Discipline Committee has imposed a sanction and the Respondent has appealed, the sanctions will not normally be implemented while the appeal is being considered. Paragraph 2.22 of the procedure will remain in place during this time. Following the Appeal Committee's decision, any sanctions shall be implemented, even if the Respondent intends to raise a complaint with an external body.

9.15 Where a Respondent subsequently fails to comply with any sanctions imposed by the Appeal Committee, the Respondent will be subject to any action specified by the Appeal Committee to be imposed in this circumstance; or, where other action has not been specified, further disciplinary action may be taken under Regulation 1(a) of the Rules of Behaviour.

10 Reporting and Monitoring

10.1 OSCCA shall monitor all Concerns reported using this procedure and shall produce an annual report summarising the anonymised decisions made by the SDO; the Chair of Examiners, Senior Examiner or Chair of the Degree Committee in relation to academic misconduct; the Discipline Committee; and the Appeal Committee. The annual report shall be submitted to the General Board through its Education Committee and to the Council.

10.2 The purpose of this monitoring shall be to ensure that decisions are made consistently and at the appropriate level; that appropriate action is taken on issues identified and that information gathered is used to improve guidance and support for students and staff involved in the procedure.

REPORTS

First-stage Report of the Council on the alteration and redevelopment of the Hutchison Building on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus site

The COUNCIL begs leave to report to the University as follows:

1. In this Report the Council is seeking approval in principle for the alteration and redevelopment of the Hutchison Building on the Cambridge Biomedical Campus as set out below.

2. The Hutchison Building opened in 2001 to provide accommodation for a new Centre for Cancer Research, with emphasis on translational research, drawing on the existing MRC and University research groups working in Cambridge. It was constructed through substantial funding contributions from both the MRC (which relinquished its half-share interest in the building to the University in 2013) and the philanthropist Li Ka-shing, through his company Hutchison Whampoa, now part of CK Hutchison Holdings Ltd. The building was correspondingly named the MRC/Hutchison Building according to Li Ka-shing's wishes and subsequently simply the Hutchison Building.

3. The Hutchison Building is now struggling to keep pace with current scientific and clinical needs. It was designed in two distinct operational halves and is therefore inflexible and inefficient in its use of space. Refurbishment will allow the building to be reconfigured to provide the UK with the first National Institute for early cancer research. This will further establish Cambridge as a world-leader in this important field, in line with the University's major scientific focus as part of the CRUK Major Centre at Cambridge.

4. The Hutchison Building¹ sits on the Island site on the Biomedical Campus close to the main Hills Road entrance roundabout, which is the location of several key research and teaching buildings for the Clinical School. The works are principally internal, comprising of updating the wet lab facilities; densifying use of the building (from 34 sqm/person to 19 sqm/person) by integrating separate spaces and repurposing redundant facilities; changing people flow internally and externally to improve health and safety; and

enclosing an undercroft to make a collaboration space and improved goods-in flow. In addition the works to the building, which is currently one of the University's most profligate carbon emitters per square metre, will eliminate the use of gas. This step, together with improved energy efficiency measures, is estimated to save 320 tCO₂e/year and reduce building running costs. The external appearance of the building will be essentially unchanged save for increased cycle parking and a building name to be visible from Hills Road. The project will refurbish 3,657m² (Net Assignable Area) of space. Occupants of the building will decant into the nearby Clifford Allbutt Building laboratory block for the duration of the works, as part of a planned series of moves on the campus.

5. The budget for the project is £23.6m at RIBA stage 2. Approximately 50% of the current estimated costs of this project will be met by a donation of £11m from the HS Chau Foundation and the University will recognise the benefaction by naming the Early Cancer Institute, which is situated in the Hutchison Building, as the Li Ka Shing Early Cancer Institute. The HS Chau Foundation was founded by Solina Chau, who has a close business partnership with Li Ka-shing and is responsible for managing his private investments. The remainder of the costs is to be funded with contributions of £12m from the University's Investment Fund and funds from the Department of Oncology. The naming was approved by the Committee on Benefactions and External and Legal Affairs (CBELA) on 16 January 2024.

6. An Outline Business Case for the project was approved by the Planning and Resources Committee in February 2024. A Full Case will be prepared and a Second-stage Report will be published in due course to seek approval for implementation of the project.

7. The Council recommends:

- I. That approval in principle be given for the works outlined in this Report.
- II. That the Director of Estates be authorised to apply for detailed planning approval in due course.

23 February 2024

DEBORAH PRENTICE,
Vice-Chancellor

ZOE ADAMS

MADELEINE ATKINS

GAENOR BAGLEY

MILLY BODFISH

SAM CARLING

ANTHONY DAVENPORT

JOHN DIX

SHARON FLOOD

ALEX HALLIDAY

HEATHER HANCOCK

LOUISE JOY

FERGUS KIRMAN

SCOTT MANDELBROTE

SALLY MORGAN

RICHARD MORTIER

SHARON PEACOCK

VAREESH PRATAP

PIPPA ROGERSON

JASON SCOTT-WARREN

ANDREW WATHEY

MICHAEL SEWELL

PIETER VAN HOUTEN

¹ See the location on the University Map: <https://map.cam.ac.uk/The+Early+Cancer+Institute#52.176992,0.142032,18>.

Report of the Council to revise the length of co-opted membership of the Finance Committee

The COUNCIL begs leave to report to the University as follows:

1. This Report proposes that the period of appointment for members of the Finance Committee in class (f) (co-opted members) should be not more than three years at a time, provided that no such member shall serve for a total period of more than eight years consecutively. The current wording allows co-opted members to serve until 31 December of the year in which they are co-opted or of the year next following, as the Committee determines at the time of their co-optation.

2. The Committee has been successful in securing the engagement of co-opted members of the Finance Committee with valuable expertise in areas ranging from

pensions to investment. Most of these individuals are external members, who give their time voluntarily to support the University's endeavours.

3. The Council supports the Committee's recommendation to revise the length of co-opted appointments. This change would enable the Committee to set the expectations of those appointed in this class about the normal length of service as a co-opted member. It would also allow the Committee to acknowledge to co-opted members their value to the Committee, hopefully securing the service of such members for longer as a result.

4. The Council recommends that the third sentence of Section 2 of Special Ordinance A (iv) (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2023, p. 70) be amended to read as follows:

Co-opted members shall be appointed by the Committee for not more than three years at a time, provided that no such member shall serve for a total period of more than eight years consecutively.

23 February 2024

DEBORAH PRENTICE,
Vice-Chancellor

ZOE ADAMS

MADELEINE ATKINS

GAENOR BAGLEY

MILLY BODFISH

SAM CARLING

ANTHONY DAVENPORT

JOHN DIX

SHARON FLOOD

ALEX HALLIDAY

HEATHER HANCOCK

LOUISE JOY

FERGUS KIRMAN

SCOTT MANDELBROTE

SALLY MORGAN

RICHARD MORTIER

SHARON PEACOCK

VAREESH PRATAP

PIPPA ROGERSON

JASON SCOTT-WARREN

ANDREW WATHEY

MICHAEL SEWELL

PIETER VAN HOUTEN

OBITUARIES

Obituary Notices

SASKIA MONIQUE MURK JANSEN, M.A., Ph.D., Fellow, Tutor, Director of Development and Acting Praelector of Peterhouse, formerly Fellow, Graduate Tutor and Praelector of Robinson College, member of Newnham College, sometime Proctor (Senior Proctor) and onetime Assistant Director for International Relations, Cambridge University Development Office and Administrator of the American Friends of Cambridge University, member of the Board of Scrutiny, died on 19 February 2024, aged 66 years.

NATHALIE (NATASHA) SQUIRE, M.A., Emeritus Fellow, former Senior Tutor, College Lecturer and Director of Studies in Modern and Medieval Languages of Lucy Cavendish College, sometime Director of Studies for St John's, Queens', Wolfson and St Edmund's Colleges, died on 22 February 2024, aged 92 years.

GRACES

Grace submitted to the Regent House on 28 February 2024

The Council submits the following Grace to the Regent House. This Grace, unless it is withdrawn or a ballot is requested in accordance with the regulations for Graces of the Regent House (*Statutes and Ordinances*, 2023, p. 112), will be deemed to have been approved at **4 p.m. on Friday, 8 March 2024**. Further information on requests for a ballot or the amendment of Graces is available to members of the Regent House on the Regent House Petitions site.[§]

1. That, with effect from 1 October 2023, a Professorship of Language Education (Grade 11) be established for Mr David Tual and assigned to the Department of Engineering.¹

¹ See the General Board's Notice, p. 406.

[§] See <https://www.governance.cam.ac.uk/governance/key-bodies/RH-Senate/Pages/RH-Petitions.aspx> for details.

ACTA

Approval of Graces submitted to the Regent House on 14 February 2024

The Graces submitted to the Regent House on 14 February 2024 (*Reporter*, 6729, 2023–24, p. 283) were approved at 4 p.m. on Friday, 23 February 2024.

Congregation of the Regent House on 24 February 2024

A Congregation was held at 10 a.m. The Graces submitted to the Regent House (*Reporter*, 6730, 2023–24, p. 291) were approved.

The following degrees were conferred:

This content and pages 422–425 have been removed as they contain personal information.

This content has been removed as it contains personal information.

E. M. C. RAMPTON, *Registrar*

END OF THE OFFICIAL PART OF THE 'REPORTER'

COLLEGE NOTICES**Elections****Darwin College**

Elected to Research Fellowships in Title D from 1 October 2024:

Ahmad Elabbar, Adrian Research Fellow
 Tiffany Ki, Henslow Research Fellow
 Lara Abel, Ph.D., *University of Surrey*
 Alex Epstein, Ph.D., *University of California, Berkeley*
 Golan Karvat, Charles and Katharine Darwin Research Fellow, Ph.D., *University of Freiburg*
 Ioannis Sarropoulos, Ph.D., *University of Heidelberg*
 Alan Wanke, Ph.D., *University of Cologne*

Vacancies

Wolfson College: College Research Associate Competition 2024 (up to ten posts available); tenure: up to three years from either 1 April 2024 or 1 October 2024 (non-renewable); non-stipendiary but collegiate benefits apply; closing date: 22 March 2024; further details: <https://www.wolfson.cam.ac.uk/CRA2024>

Events*Hughes Hall***Women's Stories: Changing the World**

International Women's Day event: panel conversation with Afghan journalist Zahra Joya and English author, novelist and poet Megan Hunter, on Friday, 8 March 2024, 5 p.m. to 7 p.m. in the Pavilion Room, Hughes Hall; all University/college members welcome; free to attend but registration required; further details and to register: <https://www.hughes.cam.ac.uk/about/events/international-womens-day-event/>

Awards*St John's College***Harper-Wood Creative Writing and Travel Award for English Poetry and Literature, 2024–25**

Applications are now open for this year's travel and study award for creative writers in the early stages of their careers; tenure: one year from 1 October 2024; funding: up to £18,600; closing date: 24 April 2024 at 4 p.m.; further details: <https://www.joh.cam.ac.uk/early-career-writers-invited-apply-2024-2025-harper-wood-award>

EXTERNAL NOTICES**Oxford Notices**

Faculty of Law and Brasenose College: Professorship of Comparative Law; tenure: from 1 October 2024 or as soon as possible thereafter; closing date: 8 April 2024 at 12 noon; further details: <https://www.recruit.ox.ac.uk>, vacancy ID: 162685

© 2024 The Chancellor, Masters, and Scholars of the University of Cambridge.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of the University of Cambridge, or as expressly permitted by law.

The University is the owner or the licensee of all intellectual property rights in the site and in the material published on it. Those works are protected by copyright laws and treaties around the world. All such rights are reserved.

Material prepared for the primary purpose of providing information about the University of Cambridge, its teaching and research activities, its subsidiary companies and organisations with which it is associated or affiliated has been placed on the site by the University ('University Material').

Subject to statutory allowances, extracts of University Material may be accessed, downloaded, and printed for your personal and non-commercial use and you may draw the attention of others within your organization to University Material posted on the site.

Notices for publication in the *Reporter*, or queries concerning content, should be sent by email to reporter.editor@admin.cam.ac.uk; messages may also be left by telephone to 01223 332298.

Advice and information is available on the *Reporter* website at <https://www.reporter.admin.cam.ac.uk/>.

Copy should be sent as early as possible in the week before publication; short notices will be accepted up to **4 p.m. on Friday** for publication the following Wednesday. Inclusion of notices is at the discretion of the Editor.