

(12 October 2001)

Annual report to the Senate

1 Introduction

1.1 This report was agreed by the University Committee on Teaching and Learning (UCTL) on 12 October 2001 as the Committee's second annual report to the Senate. It covers teaching, learning, assessment and quality assurance issues discussed by the UCTL during 2000/2001 and summarises the issues considered by the Academic Standards Committees (ASCs) and the Undergraduate Programme Committees (UPCs). The report also includes data regarding student progression, academic appeals and academic discipline.

1.2 The Committee invited the Convener of the Sub-Committee on Disabilities to be in attendance at UCTL meetings in view of the importance of ensuring that disability issues were fully taken into account in all aspects of teaching, learning and assessment.

1.3 The UCTL met on five occasions in 2000/2001. A summary of teaching and learning issues arising from meetings was made available to staff via the e-mail group *dept-info* following each meeting. Staff were informed that copies of the minutes could be browsed at the following address: <http://www.abdn.ac.uk/minutes/minuctl.hti>. Issues that required action by departments were sent to Heads of Department for implementation.

2 Teaching, learning and assessment

Communication and Information Technology Skills (C&IT skills)

2.1 The Senate (13 June 2001) approved a recommendation that the University policy on C&IT skills be amended. Essential C&IT skills would be delivered via teaching on all the University's degree programmes. Additional skills would either be embedded in degree programmes or would be made available to all students via the University's web-based provision.

Aberdeen University Programme for Higher Education Teachers (AUPHET)

2.2 The Staffing and Development Committee and the UCTL jointly established the AUPHET programme to enable participants to develop a sound approach to their teaching and learning activities. The target audience for the programme comprises lecturers in the early career stage and usually on probation, and hourly-paid teachers such as honorary teaching staff, postgraduate students and teaching assistants. The programme has two elements, a Core and an Extension. The aim of the Core is to provide a foundation for a range of topics considered to be essential for a university teacher and to help participants create a framework through which they can develop their thinking about teaching and learning and direct their future development. The Extension aims to provide participants with the opportunity to apply and reflect upon the theory they have encountered in the core element and pursue in more detail one or more topics that are of interest and relevance to their needs. The Committee noted that this two-year programme for newly-appointed teaching staff would be taken forward from September 2001.

Learning and Technology

2.3 It was decided that the Convener of the UCTL would in future be more closely associated with the Steering Group for the Promoting Independent Learning project as the promotion of independent learning was a key element of the University's Strategic Plan.

2.4 The Committee received regular reports on the activities of the Learning Technology Unit (LTU), including the Unit's Business Plan for 2001/2005, and endorsed the Unit's successful application to the University Management Group for further funding. The Committee recommended that the LTU Steering Group should, in future, be chaired by a member of academic staff, with a view to the Chair becoming an *ex officio* member of the Committee, subject to approval by the Senate of a revised composition (and remit) for the UCTL.

Assessment, including monitoring of failure rates, and External Examining

5. As a consequence of its consideration of the sections of the QAA's Code of Practice on assessment of students and external examining (see section 3 below), the UCTL approved substantial revisions to the relevant sections of the *Academic Quality Handbook*, the second edition of which was due to be published in autumn 2001. After approval by the Senate, where appropriate, policies and practices have been established in regard to, *inter alia*:
 - the need for an External Examiner to be present at final Examiners' Meetings;
 - feedback to students on their performance in written examinations;
 - the timing of oral examinations at the end of full-time taught Masters programmes;

- the distinction between oral examinations and interviews held with an external examiner for the purpose of soliciting students' views on their educational experience.

2.6 The UCTL (May 2001) endorsed a recommendation by the Working Party on Student Retention that the Registry should produce standard reports indicating the pass rates on all level 1 and 2 courses at the end of each examination diet. The first such reports were sent to Deans and the Conveners of the undergraduate Academic Standards Committees in June. Deans are asked to seek comments from Heads of relevant Departments where course failure rates are over 20% for the relevant cohort. Heads of Department are also asked to suggest possible remedies, where appropriate, and to report through the Deans to the relevant ASC.

3 The assurance of quality and standards

Consultation documents

3.1 The UCTL formulated the University's responses to a consultation document on a proposed *National qualifications framework for higher education qualifications in Scotland*, and drafted, for Senate's approval, a response to SHEFC's proposals in regard to institutional quality enhancement strategies.

QAA Code of Practice

3.2 The Committee received sections of the QAA's Code of Practice for the Assurance of Quality and Standards in Higher Education which indicated the extent to which the University already adopted the various precepts and suggested guidance, and listed recommendations for future action where appropriate:

- Section 1: Postgraduate research programmes
- Section 4: External examining
- Section 6: Assessment of students
- Section 7: Programme approval, monitoring and review
- Section 8: Career education, information and guidance

The UCTL, for its part, approved recommendations regarding Sections 4, 6 and 8, and noted the University's response regarding Sections 1 and 7. Section 2 (Collaborative provision) would be considered when the relevant section of the *Academic Quality Handbook* was revised.

3.3 The Committee noted that final responses to the following Sections of the Code would be brought forward in 2001/2002:

- Section 3: Students with disabilities
- Section 5: Academic appeals and student complaints on academic matters

Subject Review and Internal Teaching Review

3.4 The UCTL decided that, in view of the alignment of Internal Teaching Reviews (ITRs) with the requirements of QAA Subject Review, ITRs should not in future relate to research student training. The ASC (Postgraduate) will bring forward recommendations in 2001/2002 regarding an alternative mechanism for monitoring that provision.

3.5 A briefing session was held for ITR Panel members in January and was attended by 19 academic staff. Seven ITRs were undertaken during February-July 2001: Accountancy & Finance; Economics; English; Geography & Environment; History; Philosophy; and Politics & International Relations. The agreed response of the Head of Department and the relevant Dean will be considered by the ASCs. A report giving an overview of the outcome of the ITRs and highlighting any issues of institutional concern will be reviewed by the UCTL.

3.6 The Departments of Geology & Petroleum Geology and Divinity & Religious Studies participated in Subject Reviews undertaken by the QAA during 2000/2001 in the subject areas Earth, Environmental Sciences & Environmental Studies and Theology & Religious Studies respectively. Overall, the Reviewers indicated that they had **confidence** in the academic standards achieved in the undergraduate programmes in these two subject groups at the University. The Reviewers also formed the judgements that teaching and learning, student progression and learning resources were each **commendable** in both subject groups, with the exception of learning resources being **approved** for provision relating to the Certificate in Christian Studies, Diploma in Christian Studies and BTh (all by distance learning). At the time of writing, the published report is awaited, which will include comment on matters relating to the maintenance and enhancement of quality and standards, and will address any particular strengths and weaknesses in the provision reviewed, as well as identifying any specific feature(s) that are deemed exemplary.

3.7 Although the University had agreed that the QAA could undertake an Institutional Review during the spring of 2004, the future of Institutional and Subject Review was thrown into doubt by the announcement in March 2001 by the then Secretary of State for Education and Employment that the burden of the new Subject Review process (which, at the time, had already started in Scotland) should be greatly reduced. At the time of writing, the new Subject Review process was continuing in Scotland in 2001/2002 but was suspended in the rest of the UK

pending consultation by the relevant Funding Councils on further proposed revisions to the new process. The proposals envisage Institutional Audit becoming the primary mechanism for external, peer, review of an institution's internal quality assurance procedures, with the security of quality and standards at the subject level being audited selectively and periodically through the Institutional Audit. The University's response to the consultation paper was approved by the Senate at its meeting on 10 October. This response indicated that the University, in principle, supported the view that Institutional Audit should be the primary external quality assurance mechanism and that external Subject Review should only be carried out if Institutional Audit highlighted weaknesses in internal quality assurance procedures.

4 Working Parties

4.1 During 2000/2001 the UCTL received final reports from the following Working Parties:

- Working Party on Assessment and External Examining;
- Working Party on C&IT Skills
- Working Party on Careers Guidance

4.2 The Committee received interim reports from the following Working Parties, the work of which was to continue during 2001/2002:

- Working Party on Advising and Students' Progress Review
- Working Party on Student Retention
- Working Party on Academic Appeals and Student Complaints on Academic Matters

4.3 In addition, the UCTL set up the following Working Parties to bring forward recommendations in 2001/2002:

- Working Party on the Qualifications Framework
- Working Party on Progress Files for Higher Education
- Working Party on Student Progress Issues

5 Reports from Academic Standards Committees

5.1 The main issues considered by the Academic Standards Committees (ASCs) are described below.

Course and Programme Proposals and Regulatory Changes

5.2 Course and Programme Proposal forms were redesigned in summer 2000 both in the light of the QAA *Code of Practice Section 7: Programme approval, monitoring and review* and with a view to assisting academic departments to meet the requirements of QAA Subject Review.

5.3 All undergraduate programmes offered by the Departments involved in QAA Subject Review in 2000/2001 and 2001/2002 were revalidated, with all other undergraduate programmes offered by the University due to be revalidated by December 2001.

5.4 The ASCs approved the following course and programme proposals during 2000/2001 (the undergraduate programmes being approved on the recommendation of the relevant UPC). Comparative figures for 1999/2000 are also given.

Proposal	ASC (PG)		ASC (A&SS,D&L)		ASC (SEM)		TOTAL	
	00/01	99/00	00/01	99/00	00/01	99/00	00/01	99/00
New programme	11	9	21	11	21	10	53	30
Amended programme	18	28	39	22	141¹	208 ²	198	258 ²
Withdrawn programme	7	4	4	9	11	9	22	22
New course	31	47	123	133	77	113	231	293
Amended course	17	40	245	339	111¹	199	373	578
Minor changes	9	-	-	-	-	-	9	-
Withdrawn course	26	49	61³	113	58³	46	145	208

1 includes courses and programmes approved consequent upon: (a) the review of science teaching at level 2, following the restructuring of Level 1 teaching carried out in 1999/2000; and (b) the successful visit of the Degree Accreditation Board to the Department of Engineering in February 2000.

2 includes 132 approved by the UPC (Science), primarily as a consequence of re-structuring at Level 1 following the review of the undergraduate modular structure.

3 does not include those withdrawn as part of new or amended course proposals.

5.5 Although the figures in the table above appear to reflect a net increase in the number of available courses, in practice this may not be the case as they do not include those courses withdrawn as a consequence of the introduction of a new course or as an amendment of an existing course (note 3 above refers). The Committee agreed that future reports should include details of all courses that had been withdrawn whether or not they had been replaced by another course.

5.6 Various regulatory changes were also approved and referred to the Senate.

External Examiners' Reports

5.7 In accordance with University practice, Deans forwarded Heads of Departments' responses to External Examiners' comments to the relevant ASC. The ASCs approved responses and forwarded comments to the UCTL regarding facilities for postgraduate students; and the operation of the Common Assessment Scale and the Grade Spectrum.

Internal Teaching Reviews (ITRs)

5.8 The ASC (Arts & Social Sciences, Divinity & Law) and the ASC (Postgraduate) approved recommendations arising from two ITR follow-up reports relating to Accountancy & Finance and Law.

Students' Progress Committees

5.9 The Students' Progress Committee (SPC) of the relevant Undergraduate Programme Committee met in September 2001 to consider the cases of undergraduate students who had failed to satisfy the minimum progress requirements. The SPC (Medicine) also met in July and August 2001. A summary of the SPC decisions for each of the six undergraduate areas of study is given in Appendix 1, with comparable data for 1998/99 and 1999/2000. This data highlights a significant increase both in the number of overall cases considered by the SPCs in 2000/01 as compared to

previous years and an accompanying rise in the number of students deemed to have withdrawn or required to discontinue their studies by these committees.

5.10 Reports were received from the Undergraduate Programme Committee Conveners for Arts and Social Sciences and Law analysing the reasons behind the increase in the number of cases in their areas of study. Their reports, together with the outcome of discussions at the UCTL in regard to this issue, will be considered by the Working Party on Student Retention and the Working Party on Advising and Students' Progress Review. These working parties will consider ways of monitoring student progress more effectively throughout the year so that students in difficulties can be provided with appropriate support at an early stage.

Other issues

5.11 Consequent upon a complaint from a postgraduate student, the ASC (Postgraduate) revised the research student assessment form and reminded departments of the importance of completing such forms.

5.12 Consequent upon a postgraduate academic appeal, the ASC (Postgraduate) did not endorse the view of the Senate Postgraduate Academic Appeals Committee that a neutral chairperson be appointed to convene the oral examination to ensure that correct procedures were followed. However, the ASC agreed that examiners should not indicate an expected outcome of an oral examination on the independent report form. The ASC endorsed current practice that, for all corrections other than typographical ones, clear written instructions should be given to the candidate as to what was required, a copy of the corrections being attached to the examiners joint report form and submitted to the Postgraduate Registry. In future, the examiners' joint report form would make this explicit.

5.13 The ASC (Postgraduate) endorsed the recommendation by the Student Recruitment and Admissions Committee (SRAC) that there be minimum writing scores required for admission to postgraduate study for non-native English speakers. However, the ASC expressed concern that the suggested minima were not high enough and SRAC will consider the matter further.

5.14 The ASC (Science, Engineering & Medicine) reported that, while the advising system was working smoothly in Science and Engineering, the Undergraduate Programme Committee (Medicine) had reported that discussions were in progress regarding the possibility of amalgamating the Regent and Adviser schemes, given the difficulty of recruiting sufficient volunteers to act as Regents. The ASC noted that either of the two existing schemes, or a future amalgamated one, might have a role to play in monitoring fitness to practise. The ASC reported that the Undergraduate Programme Committee (Medicine) was continuing to investigate ways in which fitness to practise could be monitored and assessed.

5.15 The two undergraduate ASCs reviewed the information provided to students in honours handbooks with particular reference to the information given regarding degree classification.

6 Student progression

6.1 One of the institutional targets in the University's Strategic Plan 2001-2005 is to reduce the number of registered students leaving the University without a qualification by 25%. Partly in response to this aim, and also because of pressures on the advising system in general, the UCTL established two Working Parties. The Working Group on Advising and Students' Progress Review reviewed the operation of the advising system with a view to bring recommendations to the UCTL as to how support for students could be enhanced. The Working Group on Student Retention undertook detailed analysis of patterns of student retention and non-retention in order to recommend strategies as to how long-term retention rates might be improved.

6.2 In accordance with the approval by the University Court (26 September 2000) of a recommendation from the Senate, students who leave the University without obtaining their intended qualification were, from the start of academic year 2000/2001, automatically awarded an Undergraduate Certificate or Diploma in Higher Education if they fulfilled the regulatory requirements for those awards. Data regarding full-time undergraduate students who left the University without obtaining their intended qualification, including those who were awarded an Undergraduate Certificate/Diploma, is given in Appendix 2.

6.3 Procedures were put in place to ensure that, as far as possible, no student was given a withdrawal form without first discussing their options with the Clerk for their degree. Such students were strongly encouraged to consult their Adviser of Studies if they had not already done so and were also informed of other options as an alternative to withdrawal: these might include referral to Student Support Services. The effectiveness of these procedures will be reviewed in 2001/2002.

7 Academic appeals

7.1 Although some academic appeals are upheld by Heads of Department, after consultation with the External Examiner(s), where appropriate (eg, if a Department wished to raise a CAS mark or degree classification in light of the appeal), students who do not accept the Head of Department's decision in regard to an appeal have the right for their appeal to be considered by the appropriate Senate Academic Appeals Committee. If dissatisfied with that outcome, they have a right of further appeal to the University Court.

7.2 A summary of the outcome of academic appeals lodged in 2000/2001 is given in Appendix 3, with comparable figures for 1998/99 and 1999/2000. This data highlights an overall increase in the number of appeals. This is, in the main, due to a rise in the number of appeals

considered to be not competent. It is also interesting to note the significant increase in the number of appeals which are still currently active. The new procedures being developed by the Working Party on Academic Appeals and Student Complaints on Academic Matters will specify time-limits for the various components of the appeals process, to ensure that appeals are concluded more timeously in the future.

8 Academic discipline

8.1 The *Code of Practice on Student Discipline* sets out the procedures for making a complaint against a student, including allegations of cheating (which includes plagiarism), and indicates the range of penalties available to the Disciplinary Investigating Officer if he/she determines that an allegation of cheating should be upheld. Students can either accept the decision of the Disciplinary Investigating Officer or ask that their case be referred to the Senate Student Disciplinary Committee. Students have the right of appeal against a decision of the latter Committee to the University Court.

8.2 A summary of the outcome of disciplinary hearings considered by the Disciplinary Investigating Officer in the last two academic years is given in Appendix 4. In all cases, students accepted the decision and there was no need to convene the Senate Student Disciplinary Committee. There was no significant increase in the number of cases.

Plagiarism

8.3 Of the 33 disciplinary cases considered in 2000/2001, 31 related to plagiarism. In 1999/2000, 20 of the 23 disciplinary cases considered related to plagiarism, of which 13 were cases of multiple plagiarism in regard to one course.

9 The year ahead: 2001/2002

9.1 Final recommendations to refine the operation of international student exchange schemes will be brought forward for approval by the UCTL and the Senate.

9.2 The UCTL will report to the Senate, the University Management Group and Heads of Schools/ Departments as appropriate regarding proposals arising from the final report received in May 2001 from the Working Party on Careers Guidance. Having reviewed current practice in the light of the QAA Code of Practice Section 8: Career education, information and guidance (see Section 3 above), the Working Party concluded that there was much good practice both in departments and in the Careers & Appointments Service but that coverage should be enhanced and formalised.

3. The UCTL will receive final reports and recommendations from the following Working Parties:

- Working Party on Academic Appeals and Student Complaints on Academic Matters;
- Working Party on Advising and Students' Progress Review;
- Working Party on Student Retention;
- Working Party on the Qualifications Framework;
- Working Party on Progress Files for Higher Education;
- Working Party on Student Progress Issues.

<u>Category</u>	Number of Undergraduate Students by Area of Study																	
	Arts & Social Sciences						Divinity						Law					
	2001		2000		1999		2001		2000		1999		2001		2000		1999	
Total No of Students Registered	3381 ¹		3450 ¹		3479 ¹		79 ¹		79 ¹		61 ¹		561 ¹		573 ¹		570 ¹	
	No	%²	No	%²	No	%²	No	%²	No	%²	No	%²	No	%²	No	%²	No	%²
Students considered by SPC	333³	9.8	231	6.7	215	6.2	5	6.3	8	10.1	10	10.4	34	6.1	16	2.8	13	2.3
Programme Year 1	192	5.7	116	3.4	103	3.0	1	1.3	4	5.1	7	7.3	24	4.3	8	1.4	10	1.8
Programme Year 2	111	3.3	86	2.5	88	2.5	3	3.8	3	7.8	2	2.1	8	1.4	6	1.0	2	0.4
Programme Year 3	30	0.9	28	0.8	24	0.7	1	1.3	1	1.3	1	1.0	2	0.4	2	0.3	1	0.2
Programme Year 4	0	0.0	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Programme Year 5	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Permitted to proceed, repeat or transfer	165	4.9	125	3.6	123	3.5	3	3.8	4	5.1	6	6.3	4	0.7	7	1.2	3	0.5
Discontinued ⁴	70	2.1	34	1.0	39	1.1	1	1.3	2	2.5	1	1.0	29	5.2	9	1.6	10	1.8
Deemed to have Withdrawn ⁵ /Withdrawn	97	2.7	72	2.1	33	1.5	1	1.3	2	2.5	3	3.1	1	0.2	0	0.0	0	0.0

9.4 Partly as a consequence of comments concerning the number of compulsory questions on the SCEF form and the anonymity of the exercise, the ASC (Arts & Social Sciences, Divinity & Law) will bring forward recommendations regarding improvements to the utility of the SCEF exercise.

9.5 As part of the implementation of the Strategic Plan, the UCTL will review the role of the UCTL and its links with faculty teaching and learning committees and central support services, to ensure that it can exercise its responsibilities more effectively.

<u>Category</u>	Number of Undergraduate Students by Area of Study																	
	Science						Engineering						Medicine					
	2001		2000		1999		2001		2000		1999		2001		2000		1999	
Total No of Students Registered	2232 ¹		2258 ¹		2329 ¹		413 ¹		416 ¹		451 ¹		958 ¹		959 ¹		968 ¹	
	No	% ²	No	% ²	No	% ²	No	% ²	No	% ²	No	% ²	No	% ²	No	% ²	No	% ²
Students considered by SPC	174³	7.8	101	4.5	94	4.0	38	9.2	31	7.5	27	6.0	29	3.0	33	3.4	22	2.3
Programme Year 1	80	3.6	40	1.8	32	1.4	18	4.4	8	1.9	10	2.2	14	1.5	14	1.5	11	1.1
Programme Year 2	77	3.4	47	2.1	50	2.1	14	3.4	15	3.6	12	2.7	2	0.2	3	0.3	4	0.9
Programme Year 3	14	0.6	13	0.6	12	0.5	3	0.7	7	1.7	1	0.2	4	0.4	6	0.6	2	0.4
Programme Year 4	3	0.1	1	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.7	1	0.2	4	0.9	6	0.6	6	0.6	4	0.9
Programme Year 5	N/A	N/A	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	0.3	4	0.4	1	0.2

Permitted to proceed, repeat or transfer	116	5.2	52	2.3	51	2.2	23	5.6	21	5.0	13	2.9	13	2.3	20	2.1	15	3.3
Discontinued ⁴	12	0.5	22	1.0	32	1.4	10	2.4	6	1.4	13	2.9	16⁶	0.7	11	1.1	7	1.6
Deemed to have Withdrawn ⁵ /Withdrawn	46	2.1	27	1.2	11	0.5	5	1.2	4	1.0	1	0.2	5	0.5	2	0.2	0	0.0

9.6 One of the teaching and learning issues identified in the Strategic Plan is the development of a comprehensive institutional strategy for the continuous enhancement of the quality of learning and teaching which is ‘owned’ by the whole academic community. This will be taken forward by the UCTL in the coming year through the development of a Quality Enhancement Strategy. Proposals will be submitted to the Senate in due course.

APPENDIX 1

Students’ Progress Committees (SPC)

A summary of the SPC decisions for each of the six undergraduate Areas of Study is given below, together with comparative figures for 2000 and 1999.

- 1 The total figures relate to the total number of full-time undergraduate students registered in each Area of Study during the relevant academic year.
- 2 The figures indicate the percentage of the total number of students in the relevant Area of Study.
- 3 In session 2000/2001, following the refusal of class certificates for the second half-session, a progress exercise was carried out in June 2001 to identify those students who had lost a number of class certificates and who would therefore be unable to meet the minimum progress requirements by the end of the session. The June 2001 figures are included here.
- 4 Students whose studies are discontinued because of poor academic performance for which there is no, or no satisfactory, explanation.
5. **Students who elected not to take their second half-session end-of-course examinations or their resit examinations, or who had been refused a Class Certificate in all their second half-session courses and who could not, therefore, fulfil minimum progress requirements were "deemed to have withdrawn".**
6. **This figure includes 9 students permitted to repeat the year as external candidates. Subject to passing required resit examinations, they will be eligible for readmission to session 2002/03.**

APPENDIX 2

DATA IN REGARD TO THE VARIOUS CATEGORIES OF FORMER FULL-TIME

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS (EXCLUDING THE SUMMER SCHOOL FOR ACCESS)

Category	No. of Students		
	2000/2001	1999/2000	1998/1999
1. Students who submitted a Withdrawal From Study form effective between the start of the Winter Term and before the end of the Summer Term	367 (60)	299 (44)	320
2. Students not "At Risk" but who submitted a Withdrawal From Study form effective between the last day of the Summer Term and the end of the Academic Year – includes transfers to other institutions (2000/2001 – 23; 1999/2000 – 27; 1998/1999 – 19). [Note: Students who fail to satisfy the minimum progress requirements by the end of the Summer Term are flagged as "At Risk". All other continuing students are eligible to return to the University the following academic year, although a proportion will have insufficient credits to proceed to the next normal year of their programme - see 3 below]	123 (57)	103 (25)	148
3. Students who satisfied the minimum progress requirements but who had insufficient credits to proceed to the next normal year of their programme and who did not register at the start of the next academic year	16 (0 ³)	48 (13)	42
4. Other students who satisfied the minimum progress requirements but who elected not to progress nor to withdraw formally and who were therefore "deemed to have withdrawn"	105 (1 ³)	96 (16)	52
5. Students required to discontinue attendance on courses by the relevant Students' Progress Committee	126 ² (17)	68 ² (19)	102
6. Students "At Risk" [see 2 above] who either withdrew voluntarily or were deemed by the Students' Progress Committee to have withdrawn	129 ² (33)	115 (34)	79
TOTAL	866 (168)	729 (151)	743

¹ Figures in parentheses represent those eligible to be awarded an Undergraduate Certificate or Diploma in Higher Education.

² This figure is less than that reported to the Students' Progress Committees as it does not include part-time students or those subsequently re-admitted on appeal.

³ Awards of Undergraduate Certificate or Diploma in Higher Education to those eligible students have still to be made.

APPENDIX 3

ACADEMIC APPEALS : 1998-2001

Summary of the outcome of academic appeals lodged in 2002/2001, 1999/2000 and in 1998/1999 is given below. Appeals lodged in one academic year may not be resolved until the year following.

Category	Total			A			B			C			D		
	00/01	99/00	98/99	00/01	99/00	98/99	00/01	99/00	98/99	00/01	99/00	98/99	00/01	99/00	98/99
Undergraduate	55	35	50	16	3	4	0	1	7	8	4	3	10	11	23
Postgraduate	26 ²	17	16	5	2	0	3	1	0	0	6	4	4	3	2
TOTAL	81	52	66	21	5	4	3	2	7	8	10	7	14	14	25
Category	<u>E</u>			F			G			H			I		
	00/01	99/00	98/99	00/01	99/00	98/99	00/01	99/00	98/99	00/01	99/00	98/99	00/01	99/00	98/99
Undergraduate	3	6	1	4 ¹	4	1	0	0	1 ³	0	1	0	14	6	0
Postgraduate	1	0	6	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	2
TOTAL	4	6	7	8	5	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	23	10	2

A = Not competent

B = Withdrawn

C = Upheld by Head of Department/Examiners

D = Not upheld by Head of Department/Examiners: decision accepted by student

E = Upheld by Senate Academic Appeals Committee

F = Not upheld by Senate Academic Appeals Committee: decision accepted by student

G = Upheld by University Court

H = Not upheld by University Court

I = Still in progress

1 Cases heard on 26/9/01; at time of writing students still within time limit for appeal to the Court

2 Includes three cases of representations against recommendation that studies be terminated

3 Appeal upheld by Senate Undergraduate Academic Appeals Committee and referred back to examiners. Appeal to Court against decision of examiners following Senate Committee's hearing of the appeal

APPENDIX 4

DISCIPLINARY CASES : 1998-2001

Category	Number of Students			Allegation admitted or upheld			Allegation NOT upheld		
	2000/2001	1999/2000	1998/1999	2000/2001	1999/2000	1998/1999	2000/2001	1999/2000	1998/1999
Undergraduate	30	29	18	24	29	16	5	2	2
Postgraduate	3	0	1	0	N/A	1	3	N/A	0
TOTAL	33	29 ²	19	24	29	17	8	2	2