



put to the other students and their responses are incorporated into the final witness statements and investigation report.

- c) **Why this approach?** Interviews conducted collectively allow each student to modify their initial account in accordance with what the other students have already said in the same interview. It may therefore be more difficult to establish the facts on which the case may be based. Individual interviews, on the other hand, afford the investigator a greater opportunity to identify inconsistencies in the accounts and ultimately to form a view on whether there is sufficient evidence to proceed to a hearing.

Disciplinary proceedings are usually confidential, and is not normally disclosed to another except where that other student is a witness. Disclosure in those circumstances is limited to what is necessary in order to obtain the relevant evidence from that witness, who has no further involvement in the disciplinary process. In collusion cases on the other hand, each suspected party to the collusion is both accused and witness, and the confidentiality that obtains in ordinary disciplinary processes cannot be maintained in its totality in collusion proceedings, if the duty of fairness is to be discharged. Students suspected of collusion cannot therefore reasonably expect the same level of confidentiality that would obtain in disciplinary proceedings not involving group misconduct.

All of the students suspected of collusion should be given an equal opportunity to respond to the allegations in the course of the investigation.

Comments, particularly where they are contradictory, and those comments incorporated into the investigation report provided to the students and to the panel before the hearing. This may require second investigatory interviews to be conducted with each student.

- d) **Evidence** . As set out further in Section 2 - Evidence sharing in cases of student collusion, it is appropriate for each accused student to see the work of the other

- e) **Mitigating Circumstances** . Mitigating circumstances from an individual should be considered confidentially and not shared with the other students involved.

Students should have the opportunity to make individual representations on mitigation in private to the panel without the other students being present, following a finding of guilt/misconduct.

Mitigating circumstances will usually be specific to the individual student and in those circumstances, it would be disproportionate to permit the other students to hear, or have access to, that information.

- f) **Outcome/Decision Issued Individual Specific Personalise decision letters** - Decision letters should be sent separately to each accused student setting out the reasons why there is a finding of guilt/misconduct specifically in relation to that particular person.

There will very likely be duplication and cross referencing to the other parties and to the 12 Tf1 0 0 1 8 0 595.32 81.92 reW\*nB/F1 12 Tf1 0 0 1 124.46 6

to be afforded a reasonable opportunity to defend themselves

2. Any disciplinary panel is required to consider the evidence against all accused students in a misconduct investigation into collusion. UCL would be unable to discharge the duties set out above in any disciplinary case without providing all of the accused students with the evidence on which UCL intends to rely to make its case against each one. In allegations of collusion, that evidence will inevitably be the specific work which has given rise to the allegation of collusion and hence the work of all the students for whom there is a case to answer. One accused student will need to see the work of the other suspected party to the collusion in order to understand the extent and nature of the case against them and to be able to rebut the charges.
3. While confidentiality is an important principle, it is not an absolute duty on the university and is subject to the public interest. In this case, collusion is a form of dishonesty and UCL is justified in breaching confidentiality in so far as it is necessary to do so to detect and penalise dishonesty by means of a fair disciplinary process, and to protect the integrity of the university. Confidentiality is usually justifiable in allegations of collusion.

Academic work is likely to amount to personal data relating to the student who authored it and therefore disclosure to the other accused students must have a lawful basis in accordance with GDPR (Art 6) justifying the disclosure. In the circumstances, that justification would be likely to be public interest (Art 6 (1)(e)), for the reasons already outlined in relation to confidentiality. In cases of suspected collusion, one student must see the work of the other suspected party to the collusion and as already indicated above, in order fairly to consider the charges, each student must have access to all of the evidence which is relevant to their case for a fair disposal of that case.

5. Disclosure of personal data must also be proportionate (i.e. relevant and not excessive). If there is material that is obviously not relevant to the proceedings and UCL has no intention to rely on it in making its case, then it should not be included in the evidence bundle.
6. The practical steps that could be taken are as follows:

make clear to each student the confidential nature of the proceedings (except of course for the purpose of seeking advice and support in relation to the proceedings);

warn the students in relation to the current disciplinary proceedings and in relation to any appeal/complaint/legal proceedings and for no other purposes. You could warn them that improper use may lead to further disciplinary action

ensure all of the information to be disclosed to accused students is required in order to ensure each student understands the evidence on which UCL will consider and decide on the case (to give students a

