

Witness Name: Katherine Linehan

Statement No: WITN0066001

Dated: 19th November 2025

THE NOTTINGHAM INQUIRY

FIRST WITNESS STATEMENT OF PROFESSOR KATHERINE LINEHAN

I, Katherine Linehan, of the University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD will say as follows:-

Introduction

1. I am Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education and Student Experience at the University of Nottingham (the **'University'**). This role involves leading on the University's strategy to deliver an outstanding educational and student experience for every student in the University's community. My role as Pro-Vice-Chancellor also includes me being a member of the University Executive Board. I have held the role of Pro-Vice-Chancellor for Education and Student Experience since January 2025. Prior to this appointment, I was the Pro-Vice-Chancellor for People and Culture at the University for 3 years (appointed January 2022).
2. This witness statement is made to assist the Nottingham Inquiry (the **"Inquiry"**) with the matters set out in the Rule 9 Request dated 1 July 2025. The University, its staff and students, remain devastated by the loss of two valued members of their community. The University continues to support staff and students (some of whom were contemporaries of the victims) who were deeply impacted by the events of 13 June 2023 and will do all it can to

assist this important Inquiry in any way possible. On behalf of the University, I offer my condolences to all of those affected by the tragic events.

3. I have been asked to provide a 'Corporate' statement on behalf of the University in relation to the support services provided to, and the University's interactions with, Valdo Calocane, who I will refer to as VC throughout this statement. I did not join the University until 2022 and so have been assisted by information gathered from University staff and contemporaneous documents. The internal University legal team and external legal team supporting the University in preparation for the Inquiry have assisted with researching particular issues and compiling this statement. I have made reasonable checks of facts which I am not aware of firsthand and I can confirm that there is nothing in this statement which I do not believe to be true. Where I give views, I can confirm that I am speaking on behalf of the University.
4. At the relevant time in 2022, I was Pro-Vice-Chancellor for People and Culture, one of nine Pro-Vice-Chancellors on the University Executive Board. In this role I was responsible for leading the People and Culture Strategy at the University to ensure inclusivity for all of our staff and student community.
5. Before joining the University, I was at the University of Sheffield for 18 years. As a Professor of Anatomical Education, I taught and supported students across a number of undergraduate and postgraduate Health courses. I was the Faculty Director for Equality, Diversity and Inclusion and a personal tutor which included a significant role in supporting staff and student wellbeing prior to, and during, the Covid-19 pandemic. Throughout my career, I have always had a particular interest in how universities can foster students' sense of belonging and inclusion. Over the years, I have personally been involved in assisting hundreds of university students in a range of complex scenarios, including mental health crises.

Governance and Structure of the University

6. By way of background for the benefit of the Inquiry, I will first explain in general terms the basis on which the University exists and operated at the relevant time.

7. The University was founded by way of a Royal Charter of Incorporation on 20 August 1948, which was updated in 2010 (“**Charter**”) [WITN0066002], although its antecedents stretch all the way back to 1798. The University is an exempt charity whose principal regulator is the Office for Students. The University is also a member of the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education’s (“**OIA’s**”) student complaints scheme, pursuant to which students who remain dissatisfied once they have used or been subject to certain of the University’s internal processes, e.g. those relating to complaints or discipline, can raise a complaint with the OIA. The OIA has the power to make recommendations following a partially or wholly successful complaint which universities are expected to comply with.

8. The University’s governing body, as referred to in the Charter, is its Council which is, among other things, responsible for appointing the President and Vice-Chancellor of the University and making and/or amending the University’s primary internal laws, its Statutes, Ordinances and Regulations. From Council there flow a number of committees that oversee key areas for the University; these committees include Audit and Risk, Finance and Health and Safety.

9. The Statutes set out the headline provisions in relation to the governance of the University, such as the composition and powers of Council and the appointment of key officers of the University, including the Registrar and Vice-Chancellor, and staff generally. The Ordinances contain more detailed governance provisions that flesh out what is in the Statutes and include information about the management of staff and student discipline matters.

10. Council's powers, pursuant to Statute VII [WITN0066039] and Ordinance X [WITN0066026], included the power to:
- “*govern, manage and regulate the finances...business and all affairs whatsoever of the University*”; and
 - “*receive and consider reports on teaching and the welfare and development of students*”.
11. The academic authority of the University is its Senate which, as set out in the Charter [WITN0066002] and Statute VIII [WITN0066039], is responsible for overseeing the teaching and research of the University and can make regulations (this can be by way of policies and procedures), including in relation to student discipline. Senate also had the power, by way of Ordinance XV(20), to require individual students to withdraw either temporarily or permanently from the University [WITN0066026].
12. Senate has a number of committees to assist in its work, including the Education and Student Experience Committee, of which I am currently the Chair and which I refer to in more detail below.
13. Statute III sets out that the Vice-Chancellor has “*responsibility to the Council for maintaining and promoting the efficiency and good order of the University*” [WITN0066039]. The Vice-Chancellor has a senior leadership team, the University Executive Board, that assists her to discharge her responsibilities and direct the affairs of the University on behalf of Council and Senate.
14. The University's academic structure, as set out in Ordinance XVII, comprises Faculties (Arts, Social Sciences, Science, Engineering and Medicine and Health Sciences) in each of which there are Schools (or, in the case of the Faculty of Engineering, Departments) that provide programmes of study, at undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research level, in a variety of subject areas [WITN0066026]. Each Faculty has a Pro-Vice-Chancellor and each School/Department a Head, who oversees the academic and administrative structures for their respective area.

15. The University's administrative structure comprises several Professional Services departments that provide the infrastructure required to help the University to run effectively and was headed, until December 2024, by the Registrar. Each of these departments supported the University in achieving its core objective of advancing education. Professional Services departments at the relevant time included Finance, HR, Estates and Facilities and the Registrar's department, which was the home of key central administrative functions of the University, such as Student Services (later Registry and Academic Affairs), Campus Life (later Student and Campus Life), External Relations, Strategy, Planning and Performance, the Careers and Employability Service and Sports.
16. The University's academic calendar runs from August to July, with each academic year divided into two semesters: Autumn (generally spanning late September to late January) and Spring (generally spanning late December to late June). Additionally, postgraduate students usually remain on roll over the Summer to complete a third semester of study (June to September). New students can register for study from late August, but returning students can do so from early August. Undergraduate assessments take place in January and May/June, with students who fail assessments having resit opportunities in August.
17. At the relevant time, the University had seven campuses in the UK at which students could study – which one(s) depended on their programme of study; the campuses were: (i) University Park; (ii) King's Meadow Campus; (iii) Sutton Bonington; (iv) Jubilee; (v) the Medical School (based at the Queen's Medical Centre) and the University Hospital sites (at Royal Derby Hospital and Nottingham City Hospital). As well as studying on campus, students could also live on campus, in University owned and managed accommodation. Students who did not live in such accommodation could live in third party partner accommodation, other purpose built student accommodation or in private accommodation.

18. As an exempt charity, the University can only act in furtherance of its charitable object/purpose. As set out in the Charter [WITN0066002], the object/purpose of the University is to advance education, i.e., promote, sustain and increase individual and collective knowledge and understanding of specific areas of study, skills and expertise.
19. The University's obligations in relation to those with physical or mental health issues are serious obligations, but they are relatively limited. To the extent that the University provides health- and support and wellbeing-related services and support, it does so only in the context of an educational setting. The ultimate aim of such services is to enable the University's students to maximise their student experience and, wherever possible, graduate from the University with the qualification for which they studied.
20. The University, in common with all other higher education institutions, is not a statutory service: in contrast to the NHS, local authorities and police, it does not provide statutory services relating to risk management and healthcare. In contrast to the NHS, universities do not have a statutory duty to provide effective healthcare, and are not a provider of physical or mental healthcare. In contrast to local authorities, universities do not have a statutory duty to provide mental health support, such as support after release from detention under the Mental Health Act. In contrast to the police, universities do not have statutory duties of preserving life and property and preventing crime. Universities are not funded to provide risk management and healthcare services, do not have the expertise needed to provide those services, and are frequently not in possession of the information required to perform those services safely. The safety and wellbeing of students is very important to the University, and the University seeks to work closely with statutory bodies where appropriate to help them provide the best care to students.
21. As the Inquiry will be aware, the extent of higher education establishments' responsibilities in relation to students' mental health is an area of significant

debate, disagreement and evolution. The University has been engaged with developments and debate in this area and has contributed to the national discussion, for example through conference sessions. The central responsibility of universities is as educational organisations, and 20 years ago the expectation on universities was squarely to provide education to adults. There has iteratively been a growing expectation on universities to provide much more by way of pastoral, wellbeing, and health services. That expectation is muddled by the fact that universities provide residence to many of their students. The expectations on universities, and how they can meet those expectations, has become very unclear, in my view. I am identifying this by way of wider context for the Inquiry, and not because I think that lack of clarity had an impact in this case: as far as I am aware, there was no expectation by the NHS mental health services or anyone else that the University was providing mental health assessment or care to VC.

22. In recent years a call for a statutory duty of care for universities has been rejected. On 5 June 2023, Parliament debated whether higher education establishments should hold a statutory duty of care towards students [WITN0066040]. The Government opposed the suggestion, with the Department for Education saying that further legislation to create a statutory duty of care on universities would be a “*disproportionate response*” [WITN0066041]. Universities UK (“UUK”) took the same stance as the Government in their briefing [WITN0066042]. UUK said that the current statutory framework (including the general duty of care, Equality Act 2010, and contractual duties) is “*proportionate and practical, commensurate with [universities]’ role in education settings*” and that a further statutory duty would not be the best approach to improve student outcomes.

23. Parliament has not imposed a statutory duty, but following the debate a Mental Health Implementation Taskforce was set up by the Government “*to drive forward the development and adoption of good practice amongst higher education providers in England*” with a particular focus on suicide prevention [WITN0066043]. The Taskforce’s original Terms of Reference [WITN0066044] set out four priority areas:

- Develop a plan for better identification of students in need of mental health support and a clear user journey for accessing that support.
- Support the adoption of common principles and baselines for approaches across providers.
- Develop a 'Compassionate Communication Statement' for more sensitive student-facing policies, procedures and communications in the sector.
- Support sector engagement with the National Review of Higher Education Student Suicides.

24. Following extensive consultation, the Taskforce extended its work to include these other areas, as explained in its December 2024 update [WITN0066045]:

- the relationship between Higher Education and the NHS – promoting models of good practice and developing practical guidance to encourage collaboration between Higher Education and NHS mental health services.
- learning and development for non-clinical staff – so they can respond to students with empathy and offer a clear pathway to more specialist services.
- case management - improved management and sharing of student information to enable coordination of support within higher education providers.

25. The University is aware of a great deal of guidance about how higher education establishments can support those with mental health issues. New guidance is also being developed. In addition to the guidance referred to above from the Taskforce, it is understood that the national Committee of University Chairs is expected to publish (perhaps in Autumn 2025) a governance framework for staff and student mental health.

26. The University has found the most useful current guidance to be the University Mental Health Charter, which has Government backing. The 2019 version [WITN0066003] has now been replaced by the 2024 version [WITN0066046]. The University joined the University Mental Health Charter

Programme in September 2022 and has been an active member since then, engaging with events and resources provided by Student Minds (which published the University Mental Health Charter). The University is committed to the University Mental Health Charter framework and continues to work towards the principles of best practice set out in that document with the intention of submitting for award assessment in the 2026/2027 academic year.

27. In relation to university support services, the University Mental Health Charter promotes a whole university approach to wellbeing, a collaborative approach between the NHS and universities, information-sharing between the NHS, universities and others, and inclusivity.

28. Within the 2019 University Mental Health Charter, universities' responsibilities in relation to risk are described in this way (p35): *"While it is clear that students are less likely to end their lives than their matched peers in the general population, risk related to mental health is a very real factor within universities. There is, therefore, a clear ethical responsibility for universities to act in this area. That is not to argue that universities are entirely responsible for the safety of seriously ill students or for treating or keeping safe those who require urgent psychiatric intervention. Nor are they entirely responsible for the safety of staff experiencing serious mental illness. Much of this clearly lies with the NHS and Social Care. However, as much of this risk will be presented within the university environment and have an impact throughout the community, institutions do have a responsibility to plan for prevention, intervention and post-vention activities. This includes planning for potential suicide clusters."*

[WITN0066003]

Covid-19 Pandemic

29. For some of the period in question, from March 2020 until around the end of January 2022, the University, like many across the world, was deeply affected by the Covid-19 pandemic and associated lockdowns and restrictions imposed by the UK Government. A very brief chronology of the key

touchpoints of the pandemic will give a flavour of what the University was contending with at the time.

30. It was in February 2020 that the potential impacts of Covid-19 started to become apparent. The University began preparing contingency plans, including in relation to taking teaching and learning wholly online. The University kept staff and students informed of its activities in response to the pandemic (from 1 April 2020, it was producing weekly Covid-19 updates).

31. In March 2020, the University transitioned to fully online learning, meaning that there were no face-to-face lectures, seminars or tutorials. Most buildings, including the libraries, closed, although a few remained open to named staff members. The Vice-Chancellor wrote to students to recommend that they return to their permanent home if they could and doing so would help their wellbeing. Not all students could return home, e.g. international students who could not fly home and the University supported those students who chose to stay in their term-time accommodation. The University continued to provide essential services, such as cleaning, catering, campus security and welfare support at that time.

32. On 26 March 2020, the first UK lockdown began. On 27 March 2020, the UK Government wrote an open letter to higher education students to explain the latest Covid-19-related developments. Amongst other things, it said that those students who were still in their term-time accommodation should now stay there and not attempt to travel home. On 31 March 2020, the University wrote to those students who had indicated they would be remaining in the Nottingham area – over 3,500 – to let them know they could join the Staying in Nottingham Support Group. Of these, between 100-200 students remained in University owned and managed accommodation. In its first weekly update, the University let students know that the University's pastoral and support services had also moved online and could be accessed remotely.

33. In the week commencing 22 June 2020, the University began a phased re-opening of buildings: all priority research buildings and facilities were open by

the end of July 2020 and all other buildings required for University operations opened during August and September ready for the start of term in September 2020.

34. On 2 September 2020, the Vice-Chancellor informed staff that there would be a phased return to campus between September 2020 and January 2021. The University recognised that some students would need to continue studying online rather than on campus, e.g. because of travel restrictions or shielding requirements.
35. On 1 November 2020, the Government announced a further full national lockdown. At first universities were permitted to remain open, but from 2 December 2020 the University's teaching went fully online again for the period leading up to and including the winter break.
36. There was a phased return after that lockdown. Students on a limited number of programmes, including Medicine, Nursing and Veterinary Science, were allowed to return to study in-person between 4 – 18 January 2021, but all other students still had to study online until 17 May 2021.
37. The University decided to continue with a blended approach to large-group teaching (i.e. a mix of online and in-person) in the first semester of the 2021/22 academic year, but otherwise wherever possible teach students in person.
38. On 8 December 2021, the UK Government announced new restrictions in light of the Covid-19 Omicron variant circulating in the UK. The University was permitted to continue with its teaching as planned and resumed fuller in-person teaching in January 2022.

Student Support Services

Introduction

39. I have set out below the information requested in relation to each of the key services of the University that students could access if they required assistance from a support and wellbeing perspective, namely the Support and Wellbeing team, the Mental Health Advisory Service (“MHAS”), the Counselling Service, the Disability Support Services (“DSS”), the Residential Experience team (“ResX”) and the Report and Support team. I have also provided broad information about the senior tutor and personal tutor system at the University, since these roles also had a part to play when it came to student support and wellbeing. I have provided a snapshot of these key services as they operated in 2020 when some of them were first engaged in relation to VC and explained if there were any significant changes to these services between 2020 to 2023.
40. The University does not provide any healthcare services. There is and was at the relevant time an NHS GP practice on the University’s University Park campus, which is called the University of Nottingham Health Service. From September 2018, this practice operated from the University’s Cripps Health Centre. The NHS GP practice is a tenant of the University. Students, staff and other patients can register for its healthcare services, subject to NHS provisions. The GP practice operates independently of the University.
41. For a number of years preceding 2020, the University was engaged in a major transformation project, partly to respond to the rapidly changing needs and demands of students. As part of this, it was decided that the resource for student welfare support located in Schools/Departments would be restructured and managed centrally, albeit the support itself would continue to be provided locally. In August 2016, as a result of this project, a new Student Services department was created; overall management of this rested with the Registrar. The aim of the Student Services department was to support students holistically from the point at which they were deciding whether to apply to the University through to them becoming alumni following graduation.
42. The Student Services department had two main sub-departments: Service Development and Service Delivery. In Service Development, there was a

number of student-related functions: Specialist Processes, Academic Processes, Customer Service and Service Quality. The Service Delivery sub-department operated Student Services centres and teams for the University campuses; there were four, each with a Head of Student Services: (i) University Park Central and West; (ii) University Park East; (iii) Queen's Medical Centre/Derby/City Hospital/Sutton Bonington; and (iv) Jubilee. In the Student Services centres, students could access a variety of administrative services including registration, module enrolment, fees and finances and a range of student support services, such as academic services (e.g. for help with extenuating circumstances claims), disability support and welfare support. The Welfare Support team came under the remit of the Heads of Student Services and was based locally in the Faculties and Schools, with each Faculty having one or more Welfare Managers and Welfare Officers. In around May 2019, the Welfare Support team's overall management moved into the Specialist Processes team (as did DSS) and it was around this time that the Welfare Support team became known as the Support and Wellbeing team. The team was still made up of managers and officers who sat locally in the Faculties, but they were now known as Support and Wellbeing Managers and Support and Wellbeing Officers. MHAS, the Counselling Service and ResX/its predecessor service sat under the Campus Life umbrella managed by the Registrar.

43. In or around August 2021, the Student Services department became the Registry and Academic Affairs department and the Campus Life department became the Student and Campus Life department. At this time, DSS and the Support and Wellbeing team were brought into Student and Campus Life and the Associate Director (Student Wellbeing) managed the Support and Wellbeing team as well as MHAS and the Counselling Service. DSS was led by the Associate Director (Disability).

44. Notwithstanding the moves from one department to another, the essence and expertise of the services provided by the Support and Wellbeing/Welfare Support team, MHAS, the Counselling Service and DSS in 2017 and the way those services operated, including in relation to each other, the Security team

and external mental health services, did not vary in any material respect from the position in 2020 - 2023 except as described below. This is not quite the case for ResX, which, when it came into operation in the 2021/22 academic year, was a replacement, rather than continuing, service in relation to student accommodation support and I have explained this further below.

45. I am asked what the position of the various support services was in the wider University governance structure. As I mentioned above, I am the current Chair of the Education and Student Experience Committee (“**ESEC**”), which is a committee of Senate. ESEC is and was responsible from the 2018/19 academic year for all matters relating to student experience, including wellbeing and its responsibilities included ensuring that the University had effective strategies and structures in place to support students to achieve their potential. Such structures included the University’s support services.

46. At the relevant time, the University had in place a system of senior tutors and personal tutors.

47. The senior tutors each had specific responsibilities, as set out in the University’s Quality Manual [WITN0066004], which included:

- overseeing and coordinating the operation of student support and development and the personal tutoring system in their School/Department, as well as acting as a point of reference, advice and guidance for all personal tutors in their area;
- organising induction training for new tutors and refresher training for all personal tutors biennially; and
- liaising closely with staff who had responsibilities for specific areas of support for students’ learning and development, such as Disability Liaison Officers and Support and Wellbeing/Welfare Officers.

48. All senior tutors were members of the University’s Senior Tutor Network which is led by the University Senior Tutor. That Network met regularly for the

purpose of supporting senior tutors in their roles and providing them with relevant information, e.g. about the University's support services.

49. Each undergraduate and postgraduate taught student at the University was allocated a personal tutor, who would remain their personal tutor for the duration of their studies. Personal tutors were usually academic members of staff who met with their tutees on a relatively regular basis, particularly in the early stages of their studies and could assist them with academic matters as well as signpost to support services as required. Sometimes these meetings were scheduled, other times they were ad hoc depending on student need. Personal tutors were required to undertake induction training and refresher training biennially thereafter. They were also expected to provide references for employment and further studies [WITN0066005].

50. The University also had a range of other resources and activities available to promote student wellbeing – for example, encouraging participation in sport and exercise, providing guidance on healthy lifestyles and sexual health matters – with signposts to non-University support that students might be able to access. There were also other services such as the Students' Union which could support students with aspects of welfare and education, such as money, housing and course issues. Whilst connected to the University, the Students' Union is a separate entity with its own management and administrative structure and the University does not oversee the welfare support the Students' Union provides to its members.

Support and Wellbeing team

51. There was a Support and Wellbeing team in each Faculty. The role of each Support and Wellbeing team for the period 2018-2023 was to promote a healthy study/life balance to students and be the first port of call for students, and a point of contact for academic staff dealing with students, for a range of issues impacting a student's ability to thrive academically or socially. Whilst there were no specialist qualifications and experience required to undertake roles in the Support and Wellbeing team, appointments were made on the

basis of individuals having skills suited to working in the wellbeing sphere, e.g. listening skills and how to manage boundaries and sensitive information.

52. The Support and Wellbeing team could be contacted through drop-in sessions, scheduled appointments, email and telephone (and by Teams when the pandemic took hold). The Support and Wellbeing team acted as a frontline service; whilst it could deal with some issues itself, it would signpost and refer students to other services where appropriate. Staff could refer or signpost students to the Support and Wellbeing team or a student could contact them directly for assistance. The team could also proactively intervene and support students in crisis.

53. I am asked what training the staff of the Support and Wellbeing team received. In addition to on-the-job training I refer to below, they undertook the University's mandatory training as well as training in safeguarding. They also undertook a range of additional training, including on mental health first aid, domestic abuse, hate crimes and drugs and alcohol. The programme of additional training was not static; it was to some extent responsive based on need and the changing priorities of the University and higher education sector.

54. As the Support and Wellbeing team had a frontline role, it interacted closely with the other University support services at the relevant time, usually to refer or signpost students to other services or bring those services in for advice on complex student matters. The team would at times deal with situations themselves, such as by giving advice and talking to a student about relevant policies. In more complex situations they would refer to other services. For example, the Support and Wellbeing team might refer a student to DSS if they thought the student had a disability that required reasonable adjustments or to MHAS if a student was presenting with significant mental health needs. They might tell a student to go to ResX if they were experiencing an accommodation-related difficulty. How and to what extent the Support and Wellbeing team interacted with other University services in relation to a student would depend on the individual circumstances of a case.

55. The role of the Support and Wellbeing team was to act in a pastoral, not an academic, capacity. As such, the team did not tend to get directly involved in academic matters, but where wellbeing might impact on academic matters, the Support and Wellbeing team could help to manage the situation in conjunction with academic staff, e.g. by supporting a student to make a claim for extenuating circumstances. In addition, the Support and Wellbeing team in each Faculty acted as a first point of contact for academic staff who had concerns about a student – those academics could ask the Support and Wellbeing team for advice and support, e.g. about where to signpost a student to. The guide for staff on ‘Identifying and responding to students in difficulty’ set out the role of the Support and Wellbeing team, including that it would *“work closely with tutors and supervisors. Co-ordinated support will ensure that advice is realistic and in line with University and external regulations”* [UNIN0001820].

56. The Support and Wellbeing team and the University’s Security team interacted with each other as needed. For example, if the Support and Wellbeing team was concerned that there was an urgent and serious risk of a student harming either themselves or someone else, they would call Security for assistance. It was well established across the University that staff should contact Security in such circumstances and guidance to that effect was set out in the ‘Identifying and responding to students in difficulty’ guide for staff [UNIN0001820].

57. In any situation with a student, the Support and Wellbeing team would automatically consider risk. If Support and Wellbeing staff were concerned about the risk posed by a student to themselves or to others, they could, as set out above, contact the Security team. They could also escalate the matter to the manager of the Support and Wellbeing team who could take action as needed, including escalating the case further in the University for consideration as to whether any University policies and procedures should be applied in relation to the matter.

58. The Support and Wellbeing team would be unlikely to contact the police; this was usually done through Security as the Security team had a relationship with the police. Similarly, the Support and Wellbeing team would not usually contact external mental health services in relation to a student – the Support and Wellbeing team would contact MHAS which would make contact with the external mental health services. The Support and Wellbeing team would not obtain medical information about a student from an external mental health service; this would be for MHAS to manage.

59. It is possible but unlikely that external mental health services, GPs and housing providers would liaise with the Support and Wellbeing team directly. Those entities would be more likely to contact either Security, MHAS, ResX or the Accommodation team as appropriate who would contact Support and Wellbeing if needed.

Mental Health Advisory Service

60. MHAS is a specialist advice and support service, designed specifically for a higher education setting, which was available at the relevant time to assist students who experienced significant mental health difficulties to maximise their experience at the University. The staff who worked in MHAS were University employees. MHAS did not diagnose, assess or treat students – its role was to advise and support and this was reflected not just in the name of the service, but also in the job titles of the staff who worked in it: Mental Health Advisor and Senior Mental Health Advisor.

61. MHAS was generally accessed on a referral basis. Referrals could be made through the University's support services or by staff in other areas, including academics. MHAS also accepted referrals from external services, such as the NHS where a student was under the NHS's care. Referrals could be made by telephone, email or via a referral form. MHAS was not advertised to students as a service into which they could selfrefer, but, in practice, if a student did contact MHAS directly, MHAS would respond. MHAS could become involved in a student case at any time during the student lifecycle, possibly even before

a student started at the University if their application disclosed information that required MHAS input.

62. Students who engaged with MHAS were allocated a specific mental health advisor. This was because consistency was important for building trust with the student so that they maintained their engagement with MHAS. Students had scheduled appointments with their allocated mental health advisor (they could contact them outside of these interactions too) to discuss and plan strategies to manage their health alongside their higher education studies. MHAS liaised with internal and external services where relevant to arrange appropriate support. MHAS could assist students with referrals to primary care and secondary mental health services and provide liaison with these services, for example to provide contextual information about the student's circumstances that might assist those services with their assessment of a student's specialist support needs.

63. Mental health advisors and senior mental health advisors were required to have significant experience of working within statutory community mental health services, experience of working with students and be professionally registered as either a Psychiatric Social Worker, Community Psychiatric Nurse, Occupational Therapist or Clinical Psychologist [WITN0066006]. They had built up professional relationships with external services, including NHS Locality Mental Health Teams and Crisis teams. In addition to advising and supporting students, senior mental health advisors provided case management supervision to other advisors in MHAS and worked alongside the Head of MHAS on matters requiring rapid and timely response, such as critical incidents and safeguarding issues.

64. Prior to joining the University, MHAS advisory staff would have undertaken training in their previous roles, for example in risk assessment, that would be relevant to their work for MHAS. MHAS staff also completed the University's mandatory training and safeguarding training. As MHAS advisory staff were all professional registrants, they had to undertake continuing professional

development in order to maintain their relevant professional registration. They identified their continuing professional needs, bearing in mind their individual requirements and their role at the University, and undertook training as required to fulfil their professional obligations

65. I am asked how MHAS interrelated with the other support services. As MHAS was not ostensibly a service into which students could self-refer, a student's first point of contact if they were facing mental health difficulties would usually be the Support and Wellbeing team. That team could refer the student to MHAS. As such, there was regular contact between MHAS and the Support and Wellbeing team and a student could remain engaged with both; just because a referral was made to MHAS did not mean the student could not continue to liaise with the Support and Wellbeing team. Most of the students who accessed MHAS were classed as disabled due to long-term health conditions and had or needed a support plan through DSS setting out reasonable adjustments. As a result, MHAS and DSS worked together on a regular basis, with MHAS able to input in terms of the adjustments to be made for a student. MHAS's contact with ResX was less frequent. ResX contacted MHAS as required for ad hoc advice and referred students to it. Similarly, with Report and Support, if a report was submitted that related to a student mental health issue, the Report and Support team would contact MHAS to seek advice and make a referral if needed. The Counselling Service could also refer students to MHAS, but this did not happen often. Where there were shared cases between MHAS and the Counselling Service, information was shared between the two services on a need to know basis.

66. MHAS's relationship with the academic function and staff of the University was relatively limited. The Support and Wellbeing team was the primary resource for academics who needed advice in relation to a student or who wanted to signpost a student to assistance. If an academic referred a student to MHAS, MHAS would update them, but provide minimal information unless a student was happy for more to be shared. MHAS occasionally contacted academics directly in relation to students, usually only if they had the permission of the

student to do so and there was an academic issue that needed resolving There were circumstances in which MHAS would speak to academics without the student's permission, e.g. if MHAS considered the student to be a risk to others. In terms of guidelines and procedures, MHAS had an FAQs for Referrers document that provided information for referrers, who might include academics, about communication and sharing of information[UNIN0001811]. MHAS also attended Senior Tutor Network meetings and meetings of senior and personal tutors within Faculties to provide information about MHAS.

67. There was a good working relationship between MHAS and the Security team. MHAS would contact Security for assistance if they were concerned that a student was a risk to themselves or others. MHAS might also contact Security if they wanted to obtain information from the police about a student. If Security were managing contact with the police or ambulance service in relation to an unwell student, MHAS would contact Security to get updates as required. There were no guidelines or procedures as such that set out or explained the relationship between MHAS and the Security team, but the relationship was well-established and well-understood by both teams and others in the University.

68. I am asked how MHAS assessed risk. MHAS did not use a structured risk assessment at the time, but they assessed risk on a dynamic basis in all their interactions with and about students who had been referred to them. This included an initial risk assessment when they first met with the student and consideration of risk in subsequent interactions. The purpose of MHAS making a judgment about risk was to ensure that the student received the right support, whether from the University and/or external services. MHAS did not conduct clinical risk assessments such as those carried out by NHS primary and secondary care services, but it shared risk information with those services where appropriate for them to manage.

69. If MHAS staff were concerned about the risk posed by a student to either themselves or to others, they could contact the Security team and any external

services the student was under the care of, e.g. an NHS Crisis team. Staff could also escalate issues to the Head of MHAS, the Head of Student Welfare (later the Associate Director (Student Wellbeing) and/or the Director of Campus Life (later the Director of Student and Campus Life).

70. I am asked in what circumstances MHAS would contact the police, external mental health services, GPs or housing providers in respect of a student. MHAS did not tend to contact the police directly, this was done through the Security team as they were the University conduit to the police. However, MHAS would contact the police themselves if, for example, they needed to report a missing student. MHAS would liaise with NHS teams in a crisis as I have explained above. They would also do so in less immediately urgent circumstances, e.g. to get an update on a student that MHAS knew was in hospital, ask to join in with a ward review, assist in arranging an assessment under the Mental Health Act, make a referral or pass on relevant risk information. There was relatively regular contact between MHAS and GPs; where appropriate, MHAS copied them into referrals to secondary care services and liaised with them about students who were their patients. MHAS did not tend to interact directly with any housing providers – interaction would be through ResX if the accommodation was supported by ResX.

71. In the course of the interactions between external mental health services and MHAS, information about a student would be exchanged, but the nature and extent of the information exchanged would depend on whether students had agreed to full or limited information sharing with the University. The purposes for which MHAS would seek to obtain information from the external mental health services would be to ensure that the University could provide appropriate support to the student and to inform the management of any risk to the University community. MHAS would expect the external service to share relevant information about risk as this could be done without permission from the student, but this did not always happen.

72. I am asked in what circumstances the police, external mental health services,

GPs or housing providers would contact MHAS in respect of a student. Direct contact from the police to MHAS was rare, contact was usually made through the Security team. If MHAS had contacted the police, say about a missing student, then there might be reciprocal contact from the police to provide updates. The external mental health services would contact MHAS for a variety of reasons: to share or ask for information about a student under their care, request MHAS to attend a ward review or a Mental Health Act assessment or discuss a referral made by MHAS. GPs might contact MHAS in response to receiving information from MHAS or to provide information about a student patient. Housing providers did not usually contact MHAS directly, any contact was normally through ResX, if ResX was providing services to the relevant accommodation.

Counselling Service

73. At the relevant time, the University had a Counselling Service to which students and staff could self-refer (it is now a referral only service). The Counselling Service was accredited by the British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy. All counsellors within the Counselling Service were either professionally accredited or working towards accreditation. The Counselling Service provided students and staff with counselling interventions appropriate to the level of need presented.

74. In terms of training, as the counsellors working within the Counselling Service were accredited, or working towards accreditation, they were under an obligation to complete continuing professional development training to meet the requirements of their accreditation. In addition, counsellors received internal support to assist with case management. External supervision, to assist with consideration of the themes, dynamics and relationships that may be impacting counsellors in their work, was provided by an accredited supervisor who was unconnected to the University. Counsellors also completed the University's mandatory training and safeguarding training.

75. The Counselling Service's interaction with the University's other support services was relatively limited; in the course of their work with students, counsellors were unlikely to encounter issues that required escalation or signposting to other services. However, if such issues did arise, the Counselling Service would interact with other services as required in line with its privacy notice [WITN0066047], e.g. with MHAS if they thought a student with a serious mental health condition required support from MHAS.

76. The Counselling Service would be unlikely to interact with the University's academic function/staff in relation to students, partly because of the importance of confidentiality in relation to counselling. The Service might on a student's request confirm that a student had used the Counselling Service to support a student's extenuating circumstances claim, but even in this context, there would usually be no direct interaction with academic staff; the Counselling Service would provide a letter to the student. As such, there were no guidelines or procedures which set out the relationship between the academic function and the Counselling Service. However, the Counselling Service did, from time to time, contribute to training for tutors on the role of the Counselling Service and how it could be accessed by students.

77. The relationship between the Counselling Service and the Security team was as it was for other support services; counsellors would contact Security in the event of an emergency or a need for emergency services.

78. I am asked how the Counselling Service assessed risk. As a British Association of Counselling and Psychotherapy-accredited service, it followed professional body guidelines. Through their training, counsellors understood how to assess and address risk in their work with students.

79. If Counselling Service staff were concerned about the risk posed by a student to themselves or others, they could contact the Security team or another support service, such as MHAS, depending on the nature of the risk. In terms of escalation, they could contact the Head of the Counselling Service (who

could escalate further upwards as required) and, after March 2022, the Safeguarding team via Report and Support.

80. I am asked in what circumstances the Counselling Service would contact the police, external mental health services, GPs or housing providers in respect of a student. The Counselling Service would not have direct contact with the police as part of its role. It is also unlikely that the Counselling Service would have direct contact with external mental health services. If a student was in a position where external mental health care was warranted, it is likely that MHAS and not Counselling would be the appropriate support service, and the Counselling Service would probably have already referred the student to MHAS. The Counselling Service would not seek to obtain medical evidence from an external mental health service.

81. It would be very unlikely that the Counselling Service would contact a student's GP, but contact could be required in certain circumstances. For example, if a student had difficulty communicating with their GP, then the student's counsellor might make contact with the GP and share information on the student's behalf. It would also be unlikely for the Counselling Service to contact a housing provider directly – they would direct a student to the Students' Union if any housing advice was required. Similarly, the police, external mental health services, GPs or housing providers would be very unlikely to directly contact the Counselling Service.

Disability Support Services

82. DSS provides support to students with a disability. Their support extends from the time that an applicant is offered and accepts a place at the University through to graduation.

83. Applicants are encouraged to let the University know in advance and as early as possible if they have a disability so that the University can arrange for appropriate support to be in place for when they start their studies. At the relevant time, UCAS, the body through which applications for undergraduate

study are made, had a set of options, A-J, that applicants could choose from to describe their disability. For example, selecting option F indicated that an applicant had a '*mental health condition, such as depression, schizophrenia or anxiety disorder*'. Such applicants were referred to DSS which requested further information from the applicants and then considered their circumstances, including any relevant supporting evidence (this had to be from an appropriately qualified professional, such as a GP, consultant, specialist nurse or Educational Psychologist). DSS would in liaison with the School/Department put a support plan in place for the applicant with reasonable adjustments. Typical reasonable adjustments would include access to teaching materials and lecture recordings; extensions to coursework deadlines; examination adjustments such as extra time or breaks; and enhanced library support. Once a support plan was in place, it was kept under review and amended as needed. Students could request appointments with Disability Advisers or Specialist Support Tutors at any time.

84. Where a student's disability became apparent or developed after they joined the University, they were referred to, or advised to engage with, DSS to discuss and arrange a support plan.

85. In addition to assisting students with support plans, DSS provided guidance to students on: appropriate supporting evidence required for a support plan; disability-related funding; support for the transition to university; and study support through one-to-one sessions and workshops.

86. DSS was staffed by Senior Disability Advisers, Disability Advisers, Senior Specialist Study Support Tutors, Specialist Study Support Tutors and an administrative team. The Disability Advisers provided information and advice, including on reasonable adjustments, and liaised with academic and support staff in the relevant Faculty/School/Department. Specialist Study Support Tutors supported students with specific learning differences with study strategies such as time management and organisation, notetaking and planning and revision and exam technique. All advisory and study support staff in DSS were expected to have a knowledge and understanding of a

range of disabilities and their impact upon higher education study, as well as experience of supporting disabled students within a higher education setting.

87. In terms of training, Disability Advisers were members of the National Association of Disability Practitioners, the professional association for disability and inclusivity practitioners in further and higher education and undertook continuing professional development training, e.g. in relation to supporting specific disabilities in the classroom, living experiences of specific disabilities and reasonable adjustments. Specialist Study Support Tutors were members of other professional associations, either the Professional Association of Teachers of Students with Specific Learning Difficulties, the Professional Association of Specific Learning Difference Specialists in Higher Education and/or the Dyslexia Guild. They undertook continuing professional development training in relation to supporting students' specific learning difficulties. DSS staff also completed induction training which included training on support plans, reasonable adjustments, making referrals and the processes used in DSS. In addition, DSS staff completed the University's mandatory training and safeguarding training. DSS staff also received training through internal supervision meetings and collective group work.

88. I am asked how DSS interacted with the University's other support and wellbeing services. As the Support and Wellbeing team, MHAS, ResX and the Counselling Service dealt with students who were or could be disabled, there was liaison between DSS and those services on a relatively regular basis, with referrals being made, and advice being sought, either by DSS or vice versa.

89. I am asked what DSS's relationship was with the academic function and staff of the University. There was a close working relationship between DSS and academics. As the Schools/Departments developed and ran their own programmes of study, they were best placed to confirm what adjustments were feasible for a student. DSS and academics worked closely together within the bounds of confidentiality as set out in DSS' privacy statement for students. Each School/Department was also required to have a Disability

Liaison Officer (“**DLO**”) as the point of reference for staff and students and to ensure an appropriate level of understanding about disability matters in their area. There was a DLO network that met regularly at which DLOs could share information about good practice and which DSS and other Professional Services staff attended to provide advice and training. Outside the DLO network meetings, there was regular liaison between DSS and the DLOs, whether in relation to general matters or specific student issues, including support plans. In terms of guidelines and procedures, there was information on the University’s website about DLOs and the expectations on Schools/Departments. There was also guidance for DLOs in relation to their contact and engagement with current students and applicants. In addition, in the autumn of every year, DSS facilitated induction training for new DLOs and refresher training for those already in post about roles, responsibilities and the University’s support services.

90. DSS’s contact with the Security team was relatively limited, but they would have called Security if a student seemed to be posing either a risk to themselves or to others. There were no guidelines or procedures which set out or explained the relationship between DSS and the Security team.

91. Any member of staff could refer a student to DSS via email, telephone/Teams and in-person. Students could also self refer: from 2019 onwards that was done through the University’s MyNottingham function in its Campus Solutions records system. Information about DSS was on the University’s website and students were signposted to it through a variety of means, e.g. in student handbooks, at student events, induction information and promotional materials such as flyers and posters. There were occasions when the University was aware that a student was disabled, but the student refused to engage with attempts to refer them to DSS for a support plan or did not engage with DSS once referred. In such circumstances, the University could not force the student to engage with DSS, but if there were concerns about the student the University could potentially take action through the Fitness to Study policy and procedure (this was available from the 2020/21 academic year onwards) [UNIN0001824] or the policy and procedure that required

students to withdraw on grounds of health and safety (“**Withdrawal on Grounds of Health and Safety policy**”) [UNIN0001828, WITN0066007].

92. I am asked how DSS assessed risk. As set out above, DSS’s primary role was to receive and review information about a student’s disability with a view to formulating a support plan. In order to do this, they considered the risk involved in a disabled student undertaking their studies without support in place. There was no structured risk assessment that DSS used for this.

93. If DSS staff were concerned about the risk posed by a student to themselves or others, they could contact the Security team and escalate issues to their head of service, the Head of Student Welfare (later the Associate Director (Student Wellbeing)) and/or the Director of Campus Life (later the Director of Student and Campus Life).

94. DSS did not contact the police or housing providers directly in respect of students; any contact would have been through Security or ResX. DSS also did not contact external mental health services and GPs (although they would receive evidence from those services for the purposes of a support plan). If liaison was required with those services, DSS would support the student to make contact independently.

95. The police and housing providers did not contact DSS; their primary relationship was with the Security team and ResX respectively.

Report and Support

96. In the 2021/22 academic year, the University started using a Report and Support online platform (“**Report and Support**”), in line with many other universities. This enabled staff, students and members of the public to report incidents, such as of harassment, abuse, assault or other misconduct either on or off-campus. Reports could be made by victims or witnesses and could be made anonymously or with identifying details. All support services could make reports through Report and Support: for example, if the Counselling Service

had a safeguarding concern, they could raise this through Report and Support or contact the Senior Manager Critical Incidents and Safeguarding directly.

97. Up until March 2022, Report and Support was managed by the Associate Director (Student Wellbeing) and the Student Wellbeing Service Manager in Student and Campus Life. From March 2022, the Senior Manager Critical Incidents and Safeguarding took over responsibility for Report and Support and a team was subsequently recruited to assist with managing reports submitted through Report and Support: a Student Wellbeing Service Manager and two Support & Wellbeing Practitioners. All members of the Report and Support team were required to have experience in, and knowledge of, safeguarding. The Senior Manager Critical Incidents and Safeguarding was a registered social worker.
98. Reports made through Report and Support were reviewed every working day. When a report was made by a student, it was assessed to identify any immediate safeguarding issues and action was taken as required. Otherwise, reports were assigned to whichever team in the University was best placed to manage them. For example, if the report related to an off-campus noise issue, it would be assigned to the Off-Campus Student Affairs team (known from September 2022 as the Community Engagement team). If it related to a possible misconduct issue, it was assigned to the Conduct and Investigation team. Once a report had been assigned to another team, the Report and Support team kept it under review and was responsible for closing reports once they had been resolved.
99. The Report and Support team undertook the University's mandatory training and training on a variety of other topics such as safeguarding, domestic abuse and the role of sexual violence liaison officers. It was also responsible for delivering the University's safeguarding training to student-facing staff.
100. As reports made through Report and Support could relate to issues relevant to one or more of the University's support services, the Report and

Support team liaised with all of the support services, depending on need. If a report from a student raised immediate concerns regarding mental health, the Report and Support team would contact the MHAS duty team to discuss next steps and the report would be assigned to MHAS if required. The Report and Support team liaised regularly with ResX; for example, it was through Report and Support that requests from students to access temporary emergency accommodation were managed. The Report and Support team would liaise with DSS if a student who had made a report was disabled or it was thought that they would benefit from support from DSS.

101. I am asked what the relationship of the Report and Support team was with the academic function and staff of the University. Academic staff could make reports about students through Report and Support. In terms of guidelines and procedures, the University's Safeguarding Policy set out information about Report and Support and advised that University-related safeguarding concerns should be reported through Report and Support [WITN0066008, WITN0066009].
102. The Report and Support team would contact the Security team if a report made through Report and Support flagged any campus security issues or if they needed to make Security aware of a student's safety plan, e.g. if the plan set out that a student could summon assistance directly from the Security team in an emergency situation.
103. I am asked how the Report and Support team assessed risk. When the team reviewed any report, they would consider risks when deciding on the best approach to take. At that time, the Report and Support team did not use a structured risk assessment, but they would record in their notes what action they had taken in relation to a student report and why.
104. If Report and Support staff were concerned about the risk posed by a student to either themselves or to others, they could contact the Security team and MHAS, if there was mental health involved. If the issue raised in a report

was complex, staff could escalate it to the Associate Director (Student Wellbeing) (who was also the Deputy Designated Safeguarding Lead for the University) and/or the Director of Student and Campus Life (the University's Designated Safeguarding Lead).

105. I am asked in what circumstances the Report and Support team would contact the police, external mental health services, GPs or housing providers in respect of a student. They would contact the police if a report from a student disclosed details of a potential crime, but only if they had the student's permission to do so unless there was felt to be an immediate risk to the University or wider community. They would refer safeguarding concerns into local authorities. The Report and Support team would not contact external mental health services and GPs directly, but it did sometimes liaise directly with private landlords, e.g. if a report from a student raised concerns about issues they were having with a housemate. However, contact with private landlords was usually through ResX or the OffCampus Student Affairs team (later the Community Engagement team).

106. The Report and Support team would not seek to obtain medical information about a student from an external mental health service. If such information was required, it would be obtained by MHAS.

107. I am asked in what circumstances the police, external mental health services, GPs or housing providers would contact the Report and Support team. The police and housing providers did use Report and Support on occasion to report issues with students or to seek information from the University. External mental health services did not make reports through Report and Support or contact the Report and Support team directly. GPs might contact the team directly, but did not make reports through Report and Support.

Residential Experience Team

108. ResX came into operation in the 2021/22 academic year. Before then, the

University had a system of wardens and resident tutors in the halls of residence.

109. At the time, 'halls of residence' meant the student accommodation owned and managed by the University and four purpose built student accommodations ("PBSAs") that were owned/leased and managed by third parties with which the University had partnership arrangements (Broadgate Park, Raleigh Park, St Peter's Court and Bonington Hall).

Warden system

110. Wardens were University members of staff– they could be academic or Professional Services – who, in addition to their substantive role, were paid to act as a warden for either a specific hall of residence or a group of halls. Some lived in the halls, others nearby, and were responsible for pastoral support and behaviour in the halls, having due regard to the relevant policies and procedures in place at the time. The OffCampus Student Affairs team acted as wardens for Raleigh Park and St Peter's Court.

111. The main duties and responsibilities of wardens included:

- being responsible for the educational, social and cultural functions of a hall, student welfare and the good order and discipline of students in the halls;
- undertaking disciplinary action as an Officer with Summary Jurisdiction;
- recruiting and overseeing deputy wardens and resident tutors; and
- taking the lead in responding to critical incidents in halls.

112. Resident tutors could be University members of staff– they could be academic or Professional Services– or a postgraduate student of the University or an undergraduate student in either their fourth or fifth year of study. The role of the resident tutor was to assist the warden and deputy warden with the pastoral care of students in the hall. They were the designated first point of

contact for pastoral care in the hall and assisted in the cultural and other activities of the hall.

113. During term time, a resident tutor was on duty every day from midnight until 6am the following morning. During the duty period, they were required to remain on the grounds of the hall and have the duty tutor mobile telephone with them at all times. Resident tutors had a role in maintaining discipline, both generally in the hall and in relation to their specific tutees.

114. Resident tutors undertook a two day induction training programme.

ResX

115. Following an audit of the University's residential provision, the University decided to replace the warden system with a Residential Experience team, known as ResX. The ultimate aim of ResX was to deliver a consistent residential experience across all University and relevant third party partner accommodation.

116. ResX had three main functions, to: (i) support low level wellbeing issues, such as home sickness, difficulties settling into university life and academic concerns, offering students a non-judgmental listening ear and practical suggestions on how to resolve issues they were facing, including by signposting them to appropriate internal and external services; (ii) promote positive community values, helping students to find a sense of belonging and experience the benefits of living in a vibrant and diverse student community. ResX promoted the expectations of respectful community behaviours as well as highlighting community issues and causes. ResX could help students navigate any difficulties they faced adjusting to communal independent living. ResX also supported behaviour management, including by helping to resolve conflict and offering mediation; and (iii) deliver events and activities to students to help them make the most of their residential experience. These events and activities were delivered under three strands: social, developmental and welfare

and were aimed at connecting students and providing new experiences. Students could use these events and activities to simply chat to ResX or have a break from studying and a change of scenery.

117. Students could contact ResX by email, telephone or in person.
118. ResX was led by the Head of Residential Experience who managed a team of three Residential Experience Managers, five Residential Experience Co-Ordinators, two Residential Experience Officers, five Residential Support Managers and around one hundred Residential Assistants (“**RAs**”) (now known as Residential Experience Ambassadors) split over the halls.
119. The Residential Experience Managers’ role was a daytime role (although they might have to provide cover up to 8pm and cover the emergency rota) and they assisted the Head of Residential Experience in achieving ResX’s overall objective of building and achieving an excellent residential experience. Residential Experience Managers developed and delivered a student support programme covering student welfare, community building, socialisation and personal development. They acted as a first line of contact for students in the context of pastoral care, which could include carrying out welfare and wellbeing checks on students, signposting students as required, providing informal mediation between students and between students and local residents to manage and settle disputes and making referrals to other University services when welfare issues arose that required support from others. Residential Experience Managers were also responsible for maintaining student discipline, working in line with the Code of Discipline and with appropriate colleagues and stakeholders, both within and outside the University. Residential Experience Managers also delivered induction, training and development for team members. In order to undertake this role, Residential Experience Managers were required to have experience of providing and developing programmes of activity aimed at increasing social cohesion and a sense of community within a particular setting, as well as experience of student incident management and assessing risk.

120. Residential Experience Co-Ordinators also operated during the daytime and supported the Residential Experience Managers to deliver the residential experience programme and help build a supportive and inclusive residential environment that was conducive to study. They had the same duties as Residential Experience Managers in the context of pastoral support for students and assisted the Residential Experience Managers in dealing with anti-social behaviour and misconduct in line with the Code of Discipline. Residential Experience Co-Ordinators were required to have experience of student incident-management and an understanding of the principles and practice of student welfare support.
121. The RAs were University students who had to be either a postgraduate student or an undergraduate student in their second year or above. They were paid hourly for their work (they had to do a minimum of eight hours work a week). RAs were on duty from 6pm – 10pm and their role involved organising and running events for students, staffing a drop in centre for students and supporting students with a variety of issues such as homesickness, communal living problems and any concerns they had. RAs provided peer to peer support and could signpost students to other members of ResX or appropriate services in the University as required.
122. Residential Support Managers worked at night, between 8pm – 4am. They maintained a peripatetic presence on the relevant accommodation sites and managed any student issues that arose whilst they were on duty, working with Security as needed to support students until the wider ResX team and other University services were available the next day. (Between 4am – 9am, Security dealt with any issues in University accommodation.) Residential Support Managers were required to have proven conflict management and mediation skills and experience of incident investigation and reporting.
123. It might be helpful for me at this point to explain the different types of accommodation that were available to University students from the 2021/22

academic year and the relationship of the University, if any, with each type of accommodation:

- As was the case in the earlier part of the relevant period, the University owned and managed a number of halls of residence based on its University Park and Jubilee campuses.
- Some PBSA sites had partnership agreements with the University (through a nomination or referral agreement), and I will explain the relevance of this below. They were owned/leased and operated by third parties, and included Raleigh Park and St Peter's Court.
- Other PBSA sites, also owned/leased and operated by third parties, did not have partnership agreements with the University and the University had no connection to them.
- Private landlords also provided accommodation to students in various houses and sites around the city, and again the University did not have any connection to these private landlords.

124. In the halls that were owned and managed by the University, students entered into licence agreements in order to live in the accommodation over the course of an academic year and paid the University rent. Students would have entered into similar contractual arrangements with the partner PBSA providers, other PBSA providers and private landlords.

125. Where there was a partnership between the University and a PBSA provider, the PBSA provider made an agreed number of rooms available for University students and, in return, the University advertised the accommodation on its website.

126. The University offered pastoral and welfare support to University students in the PBSA if requested by the PBSA. In addition, if there was a breach of the University's Code of Discipline at the PBSA, the University would take such disciplinary action as would be reasonable and appropriate in the circumstances. The PBSAs had their own security teams, but the University did provide partner PBSAs with security and emergency support through the

University Security team if needed.

127. Additionally, in respect of nomination agreements entered into after the institution of ResX, PBSA partner providers could pay for a student experience package from the University which included ResX support (Raleigh Park where VC lived in 2022 was one of the PBSA partners which took up ResX support)
128. In terms of training, when staff joined ResX, they were required to undertake the University's mandatory training. They also had to do training on safeguarding as well as the Student Life system, used to record ResX interactions with and about students and Campus Solutions, the University's wider records system. Continuation training included mental health first aid training, training on domestic abuse and suicide prevention.
129. I am asked how ResX interacted with the other University support services. Given that one of ResX's main functions was to support and signpost students and they dealt with critical and emergency situations in halls ResX worked closely when needed with the Support and Wellbeing team, DSS, MHAS and the Report and Support team. ResX could call on these services for advice and refer students to them. There was limited interaction between ResX and the Counselling Service.
130. I am asked what ResX's relationship was with the academic function and staff of the University. The Head of Residential Experience attended Senior Tutor Network meetings to advise them how to contact ResX if required and academics did very occasionally get in touch about students who were having difficulties, but this contact was limited and there was not otherwise an interface between ResX and academics. As such, there were no guidelines or procedures that set out or explained that relationship.
131. On the other hand, there was a much closer relationship between ResX and the Security team. If an incident occurred when ResX staff were available and they were seriously concerned about the behaviour of a student, whether

because they were posing a risk to themselves or others or otherwise, or there was a serious first aid incident, they contacted Security for assistance. ResX also relied on Security to manage incidents in relevant accommodation between the hours of 4am-9am when the ResX team was off duty. If incidents occurred in this period, ResX and Security would liaise to ensure an effective handover and clarity as to roles and responsibilities when it came to next steps. There were no guidelines or procedures that set out the relationship between ResX and Security, but Security's role in dealing with incidents was well established and understood across the University.

132. In terms of assessing risk, ResX did not have its own structured process, but would make a judgment about risk in most of the interactions they had with students, particularly if there appeared to be a risk of students being a danger to either themselves or others. As ResX worked closely with the other support services and Security as needed, it contributed to their judgments about how to manage risk. For example, if ResX was aware that a student in accommodation had a support plan, ResX would work with DSS to assess whether a room would be suitable for a student given their disability or whether a 'Personal Emergency Evacuation Plan' was needed.

133. If ResX staff were concerned about the risk posed by a student to themselves or to others, they could contact the Security team and relevant support services. They could also escalate issues to the Associate Director (Student Wellbeing) and/or the Director of Student and Campus Life by contacting them directly.

134. It was not ResX's role to contact proactively the police, external mental health services and GPs. They did interact with the police and external mental health services from time to time, but such interactions would have been led by Security in the case of the police and MHAS or the Support and Wellbeing team in the case of external mental health services. ResX played a supporting role, e.g. by facilitating access to accommodation for a Mental Health Act assessment or directing the police to the scene of an accommodation incident.

ResX did not have contact with GPs. Contact with housing providers depended on the nature of the provider. Where a PBSA provider had paid for ResX support, there were regular meetings between ResX and the PBSA provider and they worked together if there were any issues with the student that they thought the other party ought to be aware of or where consideration was being given to the University's disciplinary process.

135. As University interactions with external mental health services were led by MHAS and Support and Wellbeing, ResX would not obtain medical information about a student from those external services.

The Security Team

136. I have been asked what the role of the University's Security team was in relation to mentally ill students or students who posed a risk to themselves or others.
137. University staff and individuals working at PBSA partner providers who had a student experience package contacted Security if they were seriously concerned about the behaviour of a student, whether because they seemed to be posing a risk to themselves or others or otherwise. Students might also call upon the Security team directly, particularly in the early hours when there were no other University staff on duty, if, for example, they were having issues with a peer. If external mental health services or the police or an ambulance needed to reach a student, Security could be called upon to assist.
138. Members of the Security team were given extensive training. When they first joined the University, they were given induction training about a wide range of topics, including the Code of Discipline [WITN0066010, WITN0066011, WITN0066012], the risk assessments used by the Security team (including one relating to mental health) [UNIN0001808, UNIN0001809], the Identifying and Responding to Students in Difficulty Guide for Staff

[UNIN0001820], incident reporting and the standard operating procedures used by Security. Security staff were also required to undertake the University's mandatory training and received training in a number of other areas including:

- first aid;
- mental health first aid;
- conflict management; and
- defibrillator use.

139. The Security team are not health professionals and their role is not to deal with any health issue presented by a student; it is to manage and triage it. Generally speaking, if the Security team was called upon to assist with mentally ill students or those who were posing a risk to themselves or others, their role was to stay with the students, try to de-escalate the situation if required, call for help from relevant services and attempt to keep the students safe until help arrived. Where a student posed a risk to themselves or others, the Security team could escalate to external emergency services in the usual way, such as calling an ambulance to take a student to A&E for urgent mental health treatment and assessment. If there was a potential crime, the Security team could report this to the police. They could also contact or refer students to University services as appropriate, such as MHAS, the Support and Wellbeing team and Report and Support. They could also get in touch with the Conduct and Investigations team (now the Investigation and Resolution team) if there was a potential misconduct issue that needed looking into. In particularly serious cases, they could escalate issues to the Director of Campus Life (later the Director of Student and Campus Life) or the Registrar.

140. The Security team would not contact a student's family directly in respect of a student unless contact with the family had already been established, either through the police or other University services. For example, in the sad event of a student death, staff from Support and Wellbeing would get in touch with the family initially and then Security might liaise with them about certain arrangements, such as picking up the student's belongings and provide

Security staff and drivers to support the family in getting around Nottingham.

141. The Security team could contact the police for a variety of reasons. For example, if there was a risk to a student and Security were unable to de-escalate and manage the situation, they could call the police for assistance. It would usually be the local police force, Nottinghamshire police, Security contacted, although on rare occasions they would contact other police forces. For example, when a student living in Leicestershire was at risk from a London-based family member, the Security team contacted the Metropolitan force and also liaised with Leicestershire police.

142. There was an information sharing agreement in place between the University and the Nottinghamshire police from June 2015, the ultimate purpose of which was for the parties to work together to alleviate crime and anti-social behaviour in the Nottinghamshire area that might involve University students [UNIN0001829, UNIN0001807]. The agreement set out the circumstances in which the University would share information with the police and vice versa. In the case of the University, it could share:

- complaints from neighbours or the public relating to criminal or anti-social behaviour at, or in the vicinity of, a University campus or in an off-campus student area, where there was evidence these were committed by a resident student or invited visitors;
- personal details of University students, where appropriate;
- details of forwarding addresses of recent past students, where appropriate; and
- concerns raised by students, complaints and intelligence, subject to the student's approval.

143. In the case of Nottinghamshire police, it could share:

- redacted and de-personalised information relating to crime or antisocial behaviour in the area of University campuses or other areas frequented by University students;

- details of convictions or cautions connected to the University, i.e. the incident leading to the conviction or caution took place on University property, on campus or in an off-campus student area and the person/s receiving the sanction/s were current staff or a student and the police considered the sanction may impact on other staff or students; and
- copies of statements made to the police by third parties where the statement giver had provided written permission for the statement to be disclosed for use in civil proceedings and the sanction related to University staff or students.

144. The Security team might occasionally contact external mental health services, but any contact would be limited and sporadic. For example, if one of the University's support services let the Security team know that there was a need for a student to go to hospital because of a mental health crisis, Security may have attempted to contact the NHS Crisis team or other appropriate external mental health service.

145. In terms of housing providers, the Security team would only rarely contact private housing providers; they might do so in the event that there was a serious off-campus incident that required Security to co-ordinate with a private landlord, e.g. a fire at the property or loss of accommodation. Where there was a nomination agreement in place with a PBSA provider, the Security team would assist the security team of the PBSA provider as requested, but particularly in relation to out-of-hours critical incidents, e.g. a fire.

146. The Security team operates highly effectively; they are on the scene very quickly, and they manage issues until they are handed over to an appropriate service.

Limitations of the student support services

147. I am asked what the limitations of the various support services were. As I set out above, the University operates with a very specific purpose in mind: the advancement of education and everything that it does, including the

provision of support services, is for this purpose – it has to be, due to the constraints of charity law, to which the University is subject and the University's own governance framework. It follows that the support services set up in our University are focused on providing the best possible assistance to students so that they can complete their studies. The central limits on the student support services, which I think are appropriate limits, are linked to this: the support services are not healthcare providers, and do not assess, diagnose or treat mental or physical illness. Those limits are recognised in the University Mental Health Charter Framework.

148. I think that the various support services operated effectively. For example, I think students had comprehensive support from support services in relation to extenuating circumstances and support for assessments and exams. I think MHAS was effective in relation to supporting students with severe mental health problems.

Training

149. I am asked to set out what training staff received in various areas, whether training was monitored and rates of compliance if measured.

150. At the relevant time, the University provided mandatory training to all staff in their induction which included video briefings on topics such as data protection and the Equality Act 2010, and familiarisation with University policies, procedures and regulations. Managers could request viewing data to check whether the video briefings had been undertaken. It was required for all relevant staff to undertake safeguarding training. During the relevant time period, up until around 2022, the University's policy and approach to Safeguarding was outlined in the document: Guidance on the Safeguarding of Children and Adults at Risk [WITN0066013, WITN0066014]. Topics covered in safeguarding training included: the procedure to be followed in the event of an accident and key information about vulnerable groups. Line managers were responsible for ensuring that relevant staff were aware of the

guidance and for monitoring compliance with relevant training requirements. Rates of compliance were not measured by the University.

151. Some positions in the University, including those connected to student support, required particular previous experience or professional registration which would include training requirements. For example, MHAS required applicants to be a member of a professional body such as a social worker or a psychiatric nurse. That meant that they would have had training in risk assessment and management and would also have to undergo regular continuing professional development training. Other staff would also have been able to undertake external training relevant to their role, e.g. training on domestic abuse.
152. Some staff also completed Mental Health First Aid training, such as members of the Security team. The aim of this training, akin to physical first aid training, was to keep people in a mental health crisis safe until more specialist help arrived. We have about 450 staff who are mental health first aid trained.
153. During the relevant period, the University had in place a personal tutor and senior tutor system, with a Senior Tutor Network [WITN0066015, WITN0066016, WITN0066005, WITN0066004]. Senior tutors were expected to train personal tutors in their area to enable them to fulfil their role. The training would have included topics such as: an overview of the role and duties of a personal tutor, details of the tutorial system, extenuating circumstances and other relevant policies and procedures, personal development planning, boundary setting, disciplinary issues and signposting. The Senior Tutor Network acted as a central hub for training/resources and senior tutors across the University were required to disseminate information to personal tutors and other relevant colleagues. Training for senior tutors through the Senior Tutor Network included presentations from the University's support services, which aimed to educate staff on what the different services did and which issues it was appropriate to refer to them. Senior tutors also attended several Senior Tutor Network meetings each year, which provided information on a variety of

topics, which could then be distributed to personal tutors. Examples of meeting topics included: supporting students, impact of grief, loss and bereavement on students and the construction of a model for tuition in support of mental well-being. The Senior Tutor Network also distributed procedural guidance and information to senior tutors (who disseminated it further), including documents on supporting students in a variety of contexts, for example, a guidance document on 'Supporting students from diverse backgrounds' [WITN0066048].

154. The Senior Tutor Network also provided formal training modules from the University Senior Tutor/Deputy Senior Tutor on the role of a senior or personal tutor, which were available several times a year, with one training module for senior tutors and another for personal tutors. Wellbeing conferences were also held for staff to attend, through which information on the support services and their function was provided.

155. I think it is important to say that a key way in which the University trained staff was through 'on-the-job' training, in the sense that relevant staff are trained by more experienced colleagues in their teams on matters such as student support and wellbeing and how to deal with mentally ill students. Staff also received training and development through mentoring, case meetings and supervision where appropriate. The training needs for roles within the University were developed for each role, with specific training identified depending on the nature and context of the role. For example, as teams such as MHAS dealt more directly with welfare issues, their training on welfare-related topics was more extensive than training for academic members of staff.

Monitoring of student mental health

156. There are many ways in which the University seeks to support students with mental health issues to get the most out of their studies and that includes providing wellbeing support, disability support and mental health advice and support in the ways previously outlined. We want all our students to thrive.

However, the University does not monitor student mental health, and that is not part of the service provided by the University. In the same way, the University does not monitor student's physical health. Monitoring of health is not part of the University's remit.

157. Where students have serious mental health issues which need to be monitored, such as an eating disorder, it would be for the NHS to determine what monitoring was appropriate and which statutory service should carry out that monitoring (such as the GP, or community mental health team). Our MHAS does not have a role in monitoring students' mental health. Of course, if any member of the University is concerned about a student's mental or physical health deteriorating, then they would be expected to take action so that the student was signposted to appropriate support and so that external NHS services were alerted where appropriate.

Information sharing

Information sharing between the University and others

158. In relation to external mental health (and physical health) services, there were no written information sharing agreements; to our knowledge, there was (and is) no national framework in place and it would have been difficult to have such agreements with all of the different services. The University's expectation is that when information about a student's mental health is shared with the University, that sharing takes place from the external service with our MHAS which holds the information on behalf of the University and may share with others within the University where appropriate and lawful (applying our confidentiality policy, 2023 [UNIN0001812]).

159. At its highest, the information which the University has from external mental health services is headline information and is selective. That is to be expected; our MHAS is not making decisions about care or treatment or admission or discharge or diagnosis, and would never expect to be in possession of all of the details of a student's mental health such as clinicians'

notes of meetings, daily records, etc. The University does not need, or wish, to hold large amounts of information about a student's physical or mental health. It is appropriate that we are in receipt of information that helps us support the student where possible, and information about risks posed by the student to themselves or others.

160. Where a student has given consent to an external mental health service for information to be shared, then we would expect there to be liaison between that mental health service and the University's MHAS. I understand from MHAS that the degree of information sharing and liaison depends on the particular case. Sometimes there is direct information sharing, for example a member of MHAS could be invited to attend a ward review, where they would see the hospitalised student and hear from their treating clinicians. Sometimes information is shared in telephone calls between MHAS and the ward or community team. I understand that there is generally a good relationship and effective information sharing between local mental health services and MHAS, although even that is dependent on which individual picks up the telephone, and some have less understanding about what can be shared than others. I understand that it is much harder to get information from wards which are outside Nottinghamshire.

161. Where a student has not given consent to an external mental health service for information to be shared, then the University would expect limited information to be shared with MHAS where permissible under data protection law, such as some information relating to a student's risk to themselves or a risk to others in the University community. Again, that type of information sharing is better with local services where MHAS has built up a relationship (although still inconsistent) and poor with NHS services out of area.

162. In terms of information sharing with police forces, we have a strong relationship with the local police force; our head of Security, Stuart Croy, has a well-established relationship with them. There is now a police officer physically based at the University, which has further improved our information sharing with local police. We are able to obtain information from the police

more easily than we do from the NHS in relation to students in crisis. That process was formalised in an Information Sharing Agreement, in place from at least 2015 [UNIN0001829]. That agreement has been updated in 2024 [UNIN0001807], and that new agreement extends the list of University staff who can request information from the police. If students become involved in incidents involving police elsewhere in the country, then generally we are not informed about those by the police and, as far as I am aware, there is no national framework for information sharing between police and universities.

163. In terms of information sharing with families, we generally do not share information about students with friends or family without that student's consent and that is made clear on information provided (such as on our webpage) [WITN0066017]. We generally will not even confirm whether a student is actually a student: they are adults and may not want family members to know where they are or to know whether they have interrupted or left their studies. There is also a specific policy governing communications with third-parties in relation to discipline, complaints etc [WITN0066018]. In short, that policy only permits communication with third parties in exceptional circumstances. The University appreciates that there will be situations where a student's family member is very worried about them and we will always take on information provided by a family member and seek to take appropriate action (for example, check up on the student's whereabouts or check on their attendance and take steps to engage the relevant support services). In emergencies, there is now an Emergency Contact protocol [WITN0066019] that we can use and which we make clear to students before they join us. This informs students about the circumstances in which the University might get in touch with their nominated emergency contact, which include where a student is exhibiting behaviour that may pose a serious risk to their safety and/or wellbeing or that of others or, in the view of experienced mental health practitioners, there is evidence to suggest that a student is experiencing a mental health crisis of a nature and degree that warrants invoking the emergency contact protocol. Before this protocol was in place, we would have contacted the emergency services if the student was a risk to themselves or

others but may not have contacted anyone else because of concern about breaching data protection law. We often did not have an emergency contact for students as many did not complete that section in their registration information.

Barriers to information sharing

164. I am asked about barriers which limited the effectiveness of multi-agency working. They seem to me to include:

- The lack of a national protocol for information-sharing between mental health services – and the NHS more broadly – and universities. That creates inconsistency about what information is shared and creates practical difficulties because there is no clear pathway setting out who is permitted to hand information over to the University (e.g. whether administrative staff can do so).
- The lack of a national protocol for information sharing between police forces and universities.
- The pressure on NHS resources.

165. There are also, of course, legal restrictions on data sharing, including data protection laws. Whilst data protection and its impact on information sharing have been an issue that the higher education sector has grappled with for many years, the introduction of the EU General Data Protection Regulation (“**GDPR**”) and Data Protection Act 2018 (“**DPA 2018**”) added additional layers of complexity to an already complicated area. In addition, due to the very large fines that could be imposed by the Information Commissioner’s Office under the GDPR and DPA 2018 for data breaches and the publicity surrounding this power, institutions became even more cautious about the sharing of personal data, in particular sensitive personal data, such as health information. This was reflected in the University’s Data Protection Policy (“**DP Policy**”) and ancillary information.

166. The DP Policy during the 2017 academic year up until around May 2018 was relatively basic, reflecting the pre-GDPR world. In or around May 2018,

following the introduction of the GDPR, the University published an updated DP Policy, the stated purpose of which was to ensure that there was clarity about how personal data was to be processed and ensure compliance with data protection law and good practice [WITN0066020, WITN0066021].

167. The DP Policy required staff to not disclose personal data to any unauthorised third party, whether verbally or in writing and keep all personal data secure. If staff were unsure as to who were the authorised third parties to whom they could legitimately disclose personal data, they were told to seek advice from the Information Compliance team or the University's Data Protection Officer. The DP Policy stated that in the absence of consent, a legal obligation or other legal basis of processing, personal data should not generally be disclosed to third parties unrelated to the University, e.g. students' parents, members of the public and private property owners.

168. The DP Policy set out the legal bases for processing non-sensitive personal data, including consent (which had to be specific, freely given either by statement or positive action and had to be capable of easy withdrawal), contractual necessity (e.g. monitoring academic performance), legal compliance and protection of vital interests and legitimate interests as set out in relevant privacy notices. The DP Policy also set out the legal bases for processing sensitive personal data, including special category data such as data concerning health. These bases included explicit consent, protection of vital interests where the data subject was physically or legally incapable of giving consent, substantial public interest and necessity for reasons of public interest in the area of public health, subject to professional confidentiality. Processing health data for the purposes of assessing fitness to study was given as an example of processing sensitive data under the policy. Protecting the confidentiality of personal data meant that only those who needed to know and were authorised to use personal data should have access to it.

169. At the relevant time, the University had a privacy notice in place for students and applicants ("**Privacy Notice**") [WITN0066022]. This remained broadly the same during 2017-2023. This explained to students and

applicants how the University would process their personal data (including health data) for the purposes of providing academic programmes of study and related services, such as welfare support. The Privacy Notice stated clearly *“We only process data for specified purposes and if it is justified in accordance with data protection law. The table below lists examples of personal data we process and the justification for it.”* Examples in the table included reference to personal data required to:

- operate security, disciplinary, complaint and quality assurance processes and arrangements;
- make reasonable adjustments for disabilities and providing relevant support to students with ill health;
- regulate the University’s community (including dealing with misconduct).

170. The Privacy Notice also set out information that the University might obtain from third parties with the consent of a student. This included medical, accessibility-related and similar information. The Privacy Notice also gave examples of when the University might need to share a student’s personal data. These included:

- sharing with academic, administrative and support staff – it was stated that health information would be shared subject to a student’s consent;
- sharing student details with housing providers and tutors in halls of residence; and
- sharing information with the police only upon request and where there was a legal basis for doing so.

171. As well as in the central DP Policy and Privacy Notice, information sharing was referred to in some services’ policies:

- MHAS’s FAQs for Referrers stated *“In line with the University of Nottingham’s policy, confidential information will only be shared internally and externally on a need-to-know basis. ‘Need to know’ is likely to include liaison with the person who has referred, communication with a student’s academic department if this is*

indicated, and information sharing with the NHS where required – including GP and Secondary Mental Health Service. We will always inform students when we are sharing information except in exceptional circumstances.” [UNIN0001811];

- Report and Support had its own lengthy privacy notice that set out the ‘need to know’ principle of information sharing and listed non-exhaustively the personal data processing that could take place in the context of Report and Support; and
- DSS had a privacy statement that outlined that information it held about students would be treated confidentially and appropriately under the ‘*terms of the Data Protection Act*’ and the DP Policy, but that DSS might need to share data internally with Schools, accommodation and administrative and support services (and possibly others, the list was not exhaustive) and externally with funding bodies and placement or study abroad partners.

172. It can be seen from the above that the University, particularly in light of the GDPR and DPA 2018, took the protection and sharing of personal data, particularly sensitive personal data, very seriously. I find it hard to assess whether the GDPR regime sets appropriate barriers. The University does not need or want to hold sensitive information about students unless necessary. Not everyone in the University needs to know everything about a student in order for the University to fulfil its core purpose of advancing education and supporting students to complete their studies. Students are entitled to a degree of privacy and confidentiality and sharing information more widely could result in stigmatisation of a student, whether consciously or otherwise, which could cause unnecessary harm and distress to them. Holding personal information increases the risk of data breaches. On the other hand, there were instances in this case where it may have been useful for the University to have had more information from bodies including the NHS and police. I do not know whether those bodies could lawfully have shared specific pieces of information with us under the data protection regime, and/or whether they had good reason which we are unaware of for not sharing specific pieces of information.

173. Regardless of whether the degree of information sharing was appropriate, I think that there is a lack of clarity about information sharing between universities and third parties in light of the GDPR and that lack of clarity creates nervousness about sharing information, and creates inconsistency. The absence of any clear inter-agency guidelines with clear examples of what should and should not be shared makes inter-agency work less effective than it could be.

Student violence or criminal conduct and student interactions with police

174. In general terms, the University would not know about incidents of violence by students or student interactions with the police before they came to University. Students who wished to live in University accommodation had to declare that they did not have any relevant unspent convictions. Otherwise, the University only required details of criminal convictions from applicants for the professional courses, e.g., Medicine, Nursing, where this is required by the regulator. That approach is informed by sector guidance that has been endorsed by the Office for Students [WITN0066049 and WITN0066050] and is in line with UCAS which stopped asking every applicant for their criminal record in 2019. Once a person starts studying, the University is still not generally made aware of interactions with the police. In some circumstances, the University would be given information by Nottinghamshire police, if it came within the Information Sharing Agreement [UNIN0001829, UNIN0001807], or it may become aware of an incident from media reports. In other circumstances, the University Security team might be directly involved (for example being called to an incident of violence on campus). The University would not expect to have a full record of a student's police interactions and would not know about information held by other police forces unless told. It follows that the University could not, and did not, have a system for tracking students' interactions with the police. If student interactions with the police were brought to the University's attention, we would not as a matter of course

keep tabs on these, unless there was an ongoing University process to which such interactions were relevant.

175. If there was a report of violence on campus, the Security team would be dispatched if they were needed to triage the situation, and they could escalate to emergency services. In some circumstances, the emergency services would be called by the University before Security had assessed the situation, if it was obvious that immediate assistance was needed. Where the Security team were involved, we would follow up with appropriate support for the students involved in the incident. We would also consider what intervention was appropriate, such as the Code of Discipline [WITN0066010, WITN0066011, WITN0066012].

176. If a student is arrested, we may well not know about that. The police do not tell us this as a matter of course – the Nottinghamshire police should tell us if it falls within the Information Sharing Agreement [UNIN0001807] but not otherwise. We may find out through the media, the student themselves, other students or members of the public. If the University did learn about an arrest, then we would consider what support or intervention was appropriate, including whether disciplinary action was required.

177. Under the Code of Discipline [WITN0066010, WITN0066011, WITN0066012], a student could be suspended or excluded or asked to leave or move University accommodation pending an investigation under the Code of a serious allegation. If there was also police action underway, the University would normally pause consideration of the discipline case (after making the decision to suspend/exclude/impose other interim measures) until any police and, where applicable, subsequent court action, had been completed. The University would then restart the discipline case and take it to its conclusion if appropriate – and it could do so even if the police/court action did not result in a caution/conviction for the student (we decide cases on the balance of probabilities, not the beyond reasonable doubt standard).

178. If a student is studying to enter a regulated profession, e.g., Medicine, Social Work, then there are also fitness to practise considerations that might come into play if a student is convicted or accused of violence or other potentially criminal conduct.

Complaints and Discipline

Complaints

179. The University had in place a Student Complaints Policy and Procedure under which students could make complaints. The Student Complaints Policy remained broadly the same between the 2017/18 and 2022/23 academic year [WITN0066023, WITN0066024]. A complaint was defined as “*an expression of dissatisfaction by one or more students about a university’s action or lack of action, or about the service provided by or on behalf of the university*”. Essentially, this meant that students could complain about something the University had done or not done that had affected them or about the service provided by the University to them. The Student Complaints Policy could be used by students to complain about the University’s handling of a matter involving another student, but it could not be used to complain about the behaviour of fellow students which would instead fall within the scope of the University’s Code of Discipline for Students (“**Code of Discipline**”), explained further below.

180. There were three levels to the complaints process: Level 1 was informal, with complaints handled locally by the relevant area; Level 2 was formal, with an investigation conducted into the complaint and an outcome provided; and Level 3 was the review stage, with the grounds for review being limited to (broadly speaking): (i) procedural irregularity; (ii) unreasonableness of decision; and (iii) new evidence that was not previously available. After the University’s internal complaints process was complete, the student could, if they remained dissatisfied, complain to the OIA which can find complaints to be Not Justified, Partly Justified or Justified; if the latter two decisions are

reached, the OIA can make recommendations such as payment of compensation.

181. In the 2024/25 academic year, the University updated the Student Complaints Policy and it became a Student Complaints Code of Practice [WITN0066025]. The general principles remained the same, but there was more detail added around roles and responsibilities and certain elements of the complaints procedure.

Discipline

182. At the relevant time, the University had in place the Code of Discipline which comprised the regulations – the policy and procedure in effect – that put into operation the provisions of Ordinance XXIV, which stated, amongst other things:

- *“Every student shall be subject to the University’s Code of Discipline as shall be passed by Senate and approved by Council”*; and
- *“The President and Vice-Chancellor may suspend any student from attendance at any class or classes and may exclude any student from any part of the University or its precincts...These powers may be exercised by the Registrar or a Pro-Vice-Chancellor designated by the President and Vice-Chancellor”* [WITN0066026].

183. The University updated the Code of Discipline on two occasions between the 2017/2018 and 2022/23 academic years. The changes made to the Code of Discipline on those two occasions were relatively minor save for the changes made to the University’s general definition of misconduct. In the Code of Discipline in use from the 2017/18 academic year – January 2020, it stated at paragraph 8.1 that:

“The essence of misconduct is improper interference, in the broadest sense, with the proper functioning or activities of the institution, or those who work or

study in the institution; or action which otherwise damages the institution” [WITN0066010].

184. The definition set out in the Code of Discipline in use for January 2020 – the 2022/23 academic year was more nuanced; it said:

“It is a breach of this Code (“disciplinary misconduct”) intentionally or recklessly (1) to commit an act of misconduct or (2) fail to act in circumstances where that amounts to misconduct. The essence of misconduct is improper interference, in the broadest sense, with the proper functioning or activities of the University, or those who work or study in the University; or action which otherwise damages the University” [WITN0066011, WITN0066012].

185. Footnotes in the Code of Discipline defined ‘intentionally’ and ‘recklessly’ in the context of the general definition of misconduct as follows:

- *“A student will be taken to intend a result if they act in order to bring it about or they thought the result was a virtually certain consequence of their action”*
- *“A student will be taken to have acted recklessly as to a result where they are aware of a risk that it will occur and it is, in all the circumstances known to them, unreasonable to take the risk. (It is not sufficient to establish recklessness to show that the student has been negligent or even grossly negligent.)”*

186. The Code of Discipline set out non-exhaustive examples of disciplinary misconduct that remained broadly the same over the years. These included:

- *“(3) violent, indecent, disorderly, threatening or offensive behaviour or language (whether expressed orally or in writing, including electronically) whilst on University premises or engaged in any University activity [or activity of a University Society] or otherwise affecting or concerning a University student or member of staff”* (the

wording in square brackets was introduced in the 2021/22 academic year);

- “(6) *action likely to cause injury or impair safety on University premises*” (the 2021/22 version of the Code of Discipline amended this to say “*acts or omissions likely to cause injury to health or to impair safety on University premises*”); and
- “(17) *conduct which constitutes a criminal offence [or other anti-social behaviour], where that conduct: (a) took place on University premises, or (b) affected or concerned other members of the University community, or (c) damages [or is likely to damage] the good name of the University, or (d) itself constitutes misconduct within the terms of this Code, or (e) is an offence of dishonesty, where the student holds an office of responsibility in the University*” (the wording in square brackets was introduced in the 2021/22 academic year).

187. The Code of Discipline contained specific regulations for halls of residence. The Codes of Discipline in use for the 2017/18 – 2020/21 academic years [WITN0066010, WITN0066011] referred to wardens in its halls regulations, but all references to wardens were amended to ResX in the 2021/22 Code of Discipline [WITN0066012].

188. The powers of wardens as set out in the Code of Discipline in use from the start of the 2017 academic year to January 2020 [WITN0066010] were relatively limited and did not allow wardens to prohibit students from accessing their rooms. However, from January 2020 onwards, paragraph 9.3(iii) of the Code of Discipline stated that wardens or their deputies would be entitled on any reasonable grounds:

“to require a resident member of the Hall to move, temporarily or for the remainder of the semester or session to a different room within the Hall” [WITN0066011].

189. There was a further provision added to the halls of residence regulations

from January 2020 at paragraph 9.4 which stated that:

“An officer designated by the Registrar (or a person authorised by that officer) is entitled on any reasonable grounds to require a resident member of a Hall to move, either (i) temporarily, pending the outcome of an investigation or of disciplinary proceedings, or (ii) permanently for the remainder of the semester or session, to a different room in any other University accommodation...”
[WITN0066011].

190. This provision tends to be used when one student has made an allegation of misconduct against another and it is not appropriate for the reported student to remain in their accommodation whilst the disciplinary process takes its course, either because that accommodation is shared with the reporting student, or for some other reason.

191. Under the Code of Discipline, allegations of disciplinary misconduct could be dealt with either summarily, by Officers with Summary Jurisdiction, or by a Senate Disciplinary Committee. The standard of proof applied was the balance of probabilities. Officers with Summary Jurisdiction included: (i) the Head of Security; (ii) wardens/Head of Residential Experience/Residential Experience Managers; and (iii) the Manager for Off-Campus Student Affairs. Their powers were relatively limited – e.g. they could impose fines of up to £150 or, from January 2020 onwards, up to £1500 in limited circumstances – and so they dealt with minor disciplinary infractions.

192. The Off-Campus Student Affairs Manager’s role was to deal with complaints about off-campus student conduct and behaviour, i.e. conduct that did not take place on University campuses and halls of residence. Complaints could be made by members of the public, other students, or other members of the University community. Whilst most students tend to live in University or partner accommodation in their first year, they are likely to live ‘out’ in subsequent years and therefore be in a mixed residential environment. The Off-Campus Student Affairs team worked proactively with a number of third

parties, including Nottingham City Council and community organisations, to address neighbourhood issues, mediate concerns and promote positive community relations. The Off-Campus Student Affairs Manager could liaise with the public authorities in the area and would normally mediate between complainants and students and attempt resolution between the parties. As an Officer with Summary Jurisdiction, the Off-Campus Student Affairs Manager had authority to give directions to students as to their future conduct and behaviour; failure to comply with these directions would be considered misconduct actionable under the Code of Discipline.

193. Where there were more serious cases of alleged misconduct such that it was not appropriate for them to be dealt with by an Officer with Summary Jurisdiction, these could be referred by the University Assessor (a University Professor of Law appointed by Senate) to the Senate Disciplinary Committee, which could impose sanctions up to and including expulsion. Expulsion meant that a student's studies would be terminated permanently.

194. Before a case could go to the Senate Disciplinary Committee, there would be an investigation. Under the Code of Discipline, and pursuant to the provisions laid out in Ordinance XXIV [WITN0066026], certain officers and staff of the University, including the Vice-Chancellor and Registrar (or designate), could suspend or exclude a student pending the investigation and hearing of a case. A suspension and/or exclusion could also be applied before any University investigation had begun, if a student was accused of a criminal offence and the matter was under investigation by the police or the subject of a court proceeding. Students could appeal against the decision to impose a suspension and/or exclusion. To clarify: a suspension meant that a student's registration at the University would be suspended, such that they could not engage in study or any other University-related activity or use any of the University's services, e.g. the libraries. An exclusion meant that a student would not be permitted to come onto either all or some parts of the University's campuses, but they could still study and, in the event of a partial exclusion, use those parts of the University's campuses that remained open to them.

195. Where a student was being investigated by the police or was the defendant in a court proceeding, the University would not normally take any action beyond imposing a suspension and/or exclusion if thought appropriate until such time as the police investigation or court proceeding was complete.

196. If a student or a member of staff made a complaint about the behaviour of another student, then that would be dealt with by the appropriate team(s). For example, if a complaint about a student harassing another student was reported to the University through the Report and Support platform, this would be considered by the Report and Support team. They would provide support to the complaining student and, depending on the nature of the complaint, they might either deal with the complaint themselves (this was more likely to happen if it was a low-level issue) or refer it for consideration under the Code of Discipline [WITN0066010, WITN0066011, WITN0066012]. If a complaint about a student by another student was made to an academic member of staff, the member of staff would be expected to refer it into the Code of Discipline process if it was not a matter that they could resolve themselves (now they are told to use the Report and Support platform for this purpose). If a complaint about a student was made by a member of the public, e.g. a resident in an area in which the student was living, this may be dealt with under the Code of Discipline, either by the Off-Campus Student Affairs Manager or the Senate Disciplinary Committee, depending on the seriousness of the complaint.

Withdrawal on the Grounds of Health and Safety

197. The University had a Withdrawal on Grounds of Health and Safety policy [WITN0066007]. This remained broadly the same from 2017 until it was replaced by the Fitness to Study policy in 2020 [UNIN0001824]. It was used in cases where a School/Department had serious concerns about a student's health or safety. The steps to be taken under the Withdrawal on Grounds of Health and Safety policy were:

- a tutor or supervisor should discuss the matter with the student, identifying the concerns to them and offering appropriate support if possible. Where the concerns arose outside of a School/Department, e.g. in accommodation, ResX or other staff as appropriate had to report the matter to the Head of School/Department;
- if the situation was not resolved satisfactorily by the discussion, the Head of School/Department (or nominee) should meet with the student;
- if the situation remained unresolved, the matter should be referred to the Registrar. On receipt of a report from the School/Department, if the Registrar was satisfied that a prima facie case existed for the student to be required to withdraw from the University, the Registrar would refer the case for consideration to a Special Committee of Senate and/or immediately suspend or exclude the student using the powers laid down in Ordinance XXIV(2) [WITN0066026]. In cases of urgency, the Registrar was permitted to act notwithstanding that the matter had not been discussed with the student as required;
- if a student was not suspended or excluded by the Registrar as an immediate measure, they and other relevant University officers could suspend or exclude them pending a decision by the Special Committee of Senate;
- the members of the Special Committee of Senate were appointed by Senate. The Special Committee of Senate reserved to itself the right to seek specialist mental health advice when considering the case. It would convene a formal hearing at which the student could be accompanied by a friend, adviser or support worker. An investigating officer would provide a written case and be present to answer questions.
- The Special Committee of Senate could decide that a student was required to withdraw permanently from the University or temporarily until certain specified conditions had been met or for a specified period (with or without a requirement to meet conditions). Any withdrawal that was not permanent would be subject to periodic review on the basis of

medical evidence. Students could appeal against the outcome of the Special Committee of Senate hearing and take a complaint to the OIA if they remained dissatisfied after the University's internal processes were complete.

Fitness to Study

198. The Fitness to Study policy was first implemented in the University at the start of the 2020/21 academic year, in September 2020 [UNIN0001824]. A slightly revised Fitness to Study policy was implemented in September 2021, at the start of the 2021/22 academic year [UNIN0001825] which was not amended further until the 2023/24 academic year when it was replaced by a 'Support to Study' policy [UNIN0001826, UNIN0001827].

199. The introduction to the Fitness to Study policy stated:

"The University is committed to enhancing our students' experience at Nottingham through the creation of a sustainable, consistent and empowering University culture where integrated, holistic health and wellbeing support helps students to make their own, informed choices...Students studying at the University attend on the basis that they are well enough to do so."

200. The Fitness to Study policy was to be used in certain circumstances, namely:

- *"where a student's behaviours give cause for significant concern;*
- *where it is believed either that there is an underlying physical or mental health condition that is actively impairing their ability to engage productively in their academic studies and/or university life in general, and where reasonable adjustments have been made as far as is possible;*

- *where a student regularly submits extenuating circumstances claims as a result of health concerns;*
- *where a student has themselves raised their own concerns about their ability to study due to health and wellbeing concerns;*
- *where a student's behaviours are causing significant, ongoing disruption or risk to the University experience of other students and/or staff members, notwithstanding that the student's academic work or progress may not be significantly adversely affected;*
- *where a student has received support from the University and has had engagement with extenuating circumstance and appeal processes, but continues not to engage as a result of the condition or demonstrates that they are at risk of continued failure;*
- *where the use of the Code of Discipline for Students and/or Faculty or School-specific Fitness to Practise procedures would be inappropriate to address concerns."*

201. Just to explain the references above to extenuating circumstances and processes: the University had in place at the relevant time an Extenuating Circumstances policy and procedure that students could use if their ability to study and complete assessments was detrimentally affected by exceptional circumstances, e.g. hospitalisation, illness or bereavement [WITN0066027, WITN0066028].

202. The Fitness to Study policy was not strictly speaking an alternative to the Code of Discipline and this was explicitly stated in the Fitness to Study policy. The University reserved the right to use the Code of Discipline to deal with inappropriate conduct, depending on the individual circumstances of the case. However, the Fitness to Study policy referred to situations where use of the Code of Discipline "*would be inappropriate to address concerns*" and so clearly envisaged situations where the Code of Discipline could be used, but would not be used.

203. There were three stages to the Fitness to Study policy.

- Stage 1: this was an informal stage intended to check whether a student about whom concerns had been raised was already in receipt of support and, if not, to encourage the student to seek support as required, whether internally or externally;
- Stage 2: if low-level interventions had not resolved a concern or where a concern was too serious to be dealt with informally or the student had refused to engage with the informal stage, a case review meeting would be held between the student and a panel of relevant University staff, including the Head of School/Department (or nominee), a senior tutor and a welfare officer/manager (now named Support and Wellbeing officers and managers). Possible outcomes of the meeting included referring the student for a medical assessment before making any decision, proposing the creation/amendment of a support plan or, with the consent of the student, temporary or permanent withdrawal from the University; and
- Stage 3: this would take place if, for example, a stage 2 panel had referred the case on or the concerns were serious enough to require consideration at the highest level of the Fitness to Study policy. A senior review panel, including a Faculty Pro-Vice-Chancellor (or nominee), the Campus Life Director (later Director of Student and Campus Life) (or nominee) and a member of staff from Welfare Services (now the Support and Wellbeing team), would meet with the student to discuss their case. Possible outcomes included creation/amendment of a support plan, suspension or exclusion from the University or any other action the panel considered to be reasonable and proportionate.

204. The recommendation to permanently exclude (in effect, expel) a student from the University would only be made in the most serious cases, where there was clear medical evidence and it was felt that there was no reasonable prospect of the student re-engaging with their programme in the short to

medium term or within the completion of studies timeframes set out within the Quality Manual.

205. The Fitness to Study policy also had a provision around emergency or urgent situations, outlining that in circumstances where there was a serious urgent concern about a student's wellbeing, the University retained the right to require the individual to withdraw on the grounds of health and safety without needing to initiate Stages 1 to 3 of the Fitness to Study policy. In such circumstances, the Registrar could suspend or exclude the student by exercising their powers under Ordinance XXIV(2)[WITN0066026]. This would be taken as a temporary, precautionary measure until a Stage 3 panel meeting could take place.

206. It seems to the University that there was a mixed institutional understanding of the Fitness to Study policy, possibly due to the level of training given on it. I feel it is important to note in this context that the Fitness to Study policy was first introduced in September 2020, at a time when the Covid19 pandemic was still causing significant disruption to University operations (and continued to do so for months to come). It is likely that, had the Fitness to Study policy been introduced at a time when there were not these other extraordinary circumstances in play, the University would have been able to devote more attention to ensuring the Fitness to Study policy was understood across the University as needed. It seems to the University that the Fitness to Study policy was generally thought of by staff as a policy which only came into play if a student was unable to engage with their studies. On its face, it is relevant in wider circumstances including where students' behaviour is causing concern more generally.

Voluntary Interruption of Study

207. There was another mechanism for students to temporarily pause their studies, which was the Voluntary Interruption of Study procedure [WITN0066029, WITN0066030, WITN0066031].

208. It was used for a variety of reasons including health issues, caring responsibilities and personal difficulties. The policy remained broadly the same for the period 2017-2023, except as set out below. Students who wished to take time out from their studies could make a request to their School/Department which would decide whether or not to recommend Voluntary Interruption, taking into account the guidance set out in the procedure. Schools/Departments had to consider whether interruption was inevitable due to the student's circumstances, whether it was in the best interests of the student to interrupt and whether it would be difficult for the student to resume their studies due to planned significant syllabus changes. Students were advised in the procedure to bear in mind that there might be financial and funding consequences of taking a voluntary interruption. Interruptions were usually for a set period and began at the end of a semester after examinations, so that there was a clearly identifiable point at which a return to studies could occur, although sometimes interruptions would start part way through a term, for example if a student was hospitalised. Whilst students were on a voluntary interruption, their registration with the University was suspended, and they were not entitled to attend teaching and take assessments and they did not have to pay tuition fees. However, they remained subject to the Code of Discipline.

209. In some circumstances, the University could require a student to provide evidence of fitness to return to study before they were allowed to reregister. In March 2021, the Voluntary Interruption of Studies procedure was amended to include reference to the Fitness to Study policy, stating:

“In circumstances where the Voluntary Interruption of Study comes as the result of the informal or formal stage of the Fitness to Study policy, the University reserves the right to request specific forms of evidence or assessment from a named body or clinician before return to study is approved” [WITN0066030].

210. Under that policy, therefore, the University's right to ask for medical

evidence after a Voluntary Interruption was only triggered if the Voluntary Interruption had been preceded by use of the Fitness to Study process. That was in line with the Fitness to Study policy 2020/2021 version [UNIN0001824], where it was only students for whom a period of withdrawal had been imposed, i.e. a suspension, who had to satisfy the return to study criteria. Students who had voluntarily interrupted did not have to satisfy the criteria to return. That was amended in the 2021/22 Fitness to Study policy which said that "*Where a period of withdrawal has been utilised via Fitness to Study or Voluntary Interruption of Study, a student must provide medical evidence that they are fit enough to engage with academic study prior to the next period of proposed registration*" [UNIN0001825].

Chronology

September 2017 – August 2019

211. VC joined the University in September 2017. His course was a Bachelor of Engineering (BEng) in Mechanical Engineering.
212. During his first and second academic years, from September 2017 to May 2019, the University is not aware that VC had any academic or personal issues. I did not ever meet him personally, but the impression from University staff is that he was a polite, quiet and able student.
213. During the summer break between his second and third years, on 4 July 2019, VC contacted the University to request a transfer from the BEng in Mechanical Engineering to the Master of Engineering (MEng) in Mechanical Engineering [UNIN000231]. VC completed the transfer of course form on 11 July 2019, and this was also signed by Dr Giddings on 11 July 2019 in his role as Year 3 Lead for the MEng Mechanical Engineering students [UNIN0001339].

September 2019 – May 2020

214. VC returned to the University in September 2019 as a student on the MEng in Mechanical Engineering.
215. VC participated in a Group Project during his third academic year, from September 2019 to May 2020, which involved building a drone. VC progressed well with this project and the University is not aware that VC had any academic or personal issues whilst he was completing the group project.
216. In March 2020, due to the Covid-19 pandemic, teaching across the University moved online. Most students returned home, but some were not able to or did not want to and remained in term time accommodation.
217. Some aspects of VC's group project changed as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic such as the replacement of a report on testing with a report on predicted compliance. The high-level change in scope was communicated to all students on 17 March 2020, and further details were provided on each element of the change after this [UNIN0001633].

May 2020 – August 2020

218. After 11pm on Friday 29 May 2020, VC's mother contacted two of VC's academic tutors at the University, Dr Campbell-Ritchie and Dr Giddings, to inform them that VC had been admitted to a mental health ward due to a psychotic episode. VC's mother said VC would remain on the mental health ward for the time being and would therefore not be able to take his online exam on 2 June 2020 and would need an extension. She explained that if further information was required, to contact Rowan Ward 1 at Highbury Hospital (a Nottingham hospital) [UNIN0000966].
219. The University believes that VC's mother contacted Dr Campbell-Ritchie as he was the module convener for the group project VC was undertaking, and Dr Giddings as he was Year 3 Lead for the MEng Mechanical Engineering students.

220. This was the first time the University was aware of any struggles VC was having with his mental health.
221. Dr Campbell-Ritchie responded to VC's mother on Saturday 30 May 2020 to explain that the situation would not affect VC's marks for the group project, but that he would check with Dr Giddings that other module conveners would be notified [UNIN0001758].
222. On Monday 1 June 2020, at around 10.30am, Dr Giddings contacted Dr Emma Barney, Senior Tutor for the Mechanical, Materials, and Manufacturing (M3) Department, to inform her about what VC's mother had said, and they agreed that Dr Giddings could fill in the extenuating circumstances ("EC") form himself [UNIN0000070, UNIN0000691]. Dr Giddings let Dr Campbell-Ritchie know that he would fill in the EC form for VC [UNIN0000781].
223. Dr Giddings responded to VC's mother at around 11.15am on Monday 1 June 2020 and explained he would complete an EC form for VC to ensure arrangements were adjusted for his online exam on 2 June 2020 and would contact the Support and Wellbeing team to let them know so they could offer any help with VC's recovery and return to the University when he was ready [UNIN0001206]. At around 11.30am, Dr Giddings submitted an EC form on VC's behalf and informed the Chair of the EC Committee Dr Kishen Rengaraj about the situation [UNIN0001314, UNIN0001212, UNIN0001342]. Dr Giddings also informed Paige Smith, a Student Support and Wellbeing Officer within the Faculty of Engineering's Support and Wellbeing team, by email about the situation [UNIN0000368].
224. On 1 June 2020, VC's mother also contacted the Faculty of Engineering's Support and Wellbeing team to explain that VC was in hospital [UNIN0000801]. Paige Smith picked this up. Due to data protection concerns, she gave VC's mother generic information around the EC process but did not confirm VC was a student. Paige Smith escalated to Claire Thompson, Head

of Student Welfare [UNIN0000801, UNIN0000612] who alerted MHAS [UNIN0000140].

225. Ellie Turner (Head of MHAS) picked up the matter. Ellie Turner spoke to VC's mother – she explained the role of MHAS and reassured her she did not need to complete any forms in relation to VC's academic study [UNIN0000734]. Ellie Turner also called the ward where VC was and asked for MHAS's details to be placed on file [UNIN0000734].

226. Ellie Turner also liaised with Paige Smith. Ellie Turner explained any EC forms were not necessary whilst VC was in hospital and that she would liaise with VC's mum going forward. Paige communicated this to Dr Giddings [UNIN0000595] and Dr Giddings updated Dr Barney, Dr Campbell-Ritchie and Dr Rengaraj [UNIN0001593]. Dr Rengaraj confirmed he would place VC's EC form on hold [UNIN0001161].

227. Ellie Turner also liaised with Jamie Dickinson, Off Campus Student Affairs Manager, but said she was not sure of VC's address as it wasn't on his student record and his mother wasn't sure of the full address [UNIN0000881]. Jamie Dickinson responded to confirm VC's student record had his home (family) address and that he could not identify VC's term time address from the limited information from VC's mother. He said he would normally reach out to housemates if they might be affected, but he wasn't in a position to do that without the address [UNIN0000881].

228. On 3 June 2020, Ellie Turner spoke to VC's doctor at the hospital and to VC [UNIN0000734]. The doctor at the hospital explained that the incident that had led to VC's admission was that he had gained entry to another person's property at Brook Court (private accommodation where they both lived), and she was so concerned for her safety that she jumped out of the window sustaining a serious injury and requiring surgery. The doctor gave Ellie Turner VC's term time address. The University was not aware of the exact date of this incident at the time, though now understands from the 'Independent

investigation into the care and treatment provided to VC' carried out by Theemis Consulting Ltd dated January 2025 ("**Theemis report**") that this incident took place on 24 May 2020 [NHSE0000298]. The University also now understands that the police were involved in this incident. There had been no notification by police to the University about the incident, nor any contact from the hospital to the University (until after MHAS contacted them), nor from anyone else involved in the incident.

229. Following the call with the hospital, at around 1.30pm on 3 June 2020, Ellie Turner emailed Jamie Dickinson to confirm VC's address and relay the conversation she had with the ward [UNIN0000881]. Jamie Dickinson responded to Ellie Turner and confirmed if there were any students close by, he could make contact with them, but that the address looked predominantly residential, i.e. non-student [UNIN0001803].

230. On 9 June 2020, Ellie Turner called the ward and spoke to a staff nurse. Ellie Turner was informed that VC was improving, but still isolating and reluctant to socialise, and discharge was planned for the following week (i.e. the week commencing 15 June 2020). The nurse confirmed VC was compliant with his medication and had been referred to the Early Intervention in Psychosis ("**EIP**") Team. The nurse also confirmed VC would like to move back to his accommodation in Nottingham – Ellie Turner voiced concerns about this plan to return to his accommodation and requested a call back from the consultant and for a copy of the risk assessment to be emailed to her. I understand that she was not called back and did not see the discharge risk assessment.

231. Following the call with the hospital, Ellie Turner called Stuart Croy, Head of Security at the University. Ellie Turner asked Stuart to liaise with the police and voice concerns on behalf of the University about the plan to discharge VC to his accommodation in Nottingham [UNIN0000734]. On 10 June 2020, she sent Stuart Croy a summary of the case [UNIN0000639] and he liaised with the police about the case on 10 and 11 June 2020. The police said it appeared

VC was well enough to be discharged so there didn't appear to be any risk, and they hoped the University would inform the other residents where VC lived. When Stuart confirmed the accommodation was not University accommodation, the police said that they would contact the victim [UNIN0001747].

232. On 10 June 2020, Ellie Turner emailed VC and encouraged him to engage in the support offered by MHAS [UNIN0000734].

233. The University was not made aware of the exact date VC was discharged from the hospital at the time, but now knows from the Theemis report that he was discharged on 17 June 2020 [NHSE0000298].

234. On 23 July 2020, the hospital called the MHAS team and spoke to Cath Gent, a Mental Health Advisor. The hospital said that VC had experienced a relapse in his psychotic illness and that he had reportedly heard voices which led him to break into a neighbour's flat and accuse them of abusing his family. The hospital said the police had been involved, but there was no physical harm to the neighbours. The hospital said VC was in agreement, and complying, with his treatment plan, and discharge was planned for 30 July 2020 if progress continued. At the time, the University was not aware of the exact date VC reportedly broke into his neighbour's flat, but understood he had been admitted to hospital under section 3 on 14 July 2020. The University was not aware of the admission until 23 July 2020 [UNIN0000734, UNIN0000614].

235. On 23 July 2020, Cath Gent of MHAS spoke to Abi Parsonage from the NHS EIP team who also confirmed the circumstances leading to the admission and additionally said that VC had been non-compliant with his medication for 2 weeks prior to the incident. Abi explained that VC's discharge was planned for 30 July 2020 to his accommodation in Nottingham, where he would remain until he had completed his exam re-sits and then he would move to his family home in Wales. Cath voiced concerns about the appropriateness

of VC returning to his Nottingham accommodation in light of ongoing risk to others [UNIN0000734].

236. Ellie Turner was on annual leave on 23 July 2020 which is why Cath Gent picked up the case on that day, but she spoke to Ellie Turner whilst she was on leave. Ellie Turner emailed Stuart Croy to let him know VC had been admitted again under similar circumstances to those in June 2020. She explained MHAS was advocating for VC to return to Wales, but he was keen to stay in Nottingham and the ward were supportive of that plan [UNIN0000620].

237. Later on 23 July 2020, Cath Gent emailed the Support and Wellbeing team in the Faculty of Engineering to ascertain VC's academic circumstances and options. Between 24 and 29 July 2020, the Support and Wellbeing team liaised with Dr Barney about VC's options [UNIN0000069, UNIN0000840, UNIN0000952, UNIN0000350, UNIN0000991, UNIN0001007].

238. On 29 July 2020, Ellie Turner called the hospital, but no one was available to speak to her [UNIN0000734]. She called again the next day, 30 July 2020, and spoke to a staff nurse. The ward confirmed VC was due to be discharged the next day, on 31 July 2020, and the plan was for him to return to his Nottingham address. Risks were discussed but the ward felt VC had improved enough to manage the risks independently.

239. Later on 30 July 2020, Ellie Turner emailed the Approved Mental Health Professional ("**AMHP**") who had assessed VC for the second admission, and explained she was concerned about the discharge plan and sought his opinion [UNIN0000304]. The AMHP said he would forward her concerns to the ward [UNIN0000304].

240. Ellie Turner also emailed VC on 30 July 2020 and explained she was really keen to form part of his support and asked when it would be convenient to speak. She flagged that it was important to think about his wellbeing

alongside his studies in a way that supported his recovery and academic goals [UNIN0001200].

241. VC was discharged as planned on 31 July 2020. The University believes that he returned to his private accommodation in Nottingham. As this was during the pandemic, and was out of term time, VC would not have been attending any lectures or other teaching.

242. On 4 August 2020, VC responded to Ellie Turner's email of 30 July 2020 and agreed to speak. They spoke later that day. VC said he was feeling well since discharge, had no symptoms of psychosis and no thoughts of self-harm or threat from other people. VC said he was compliant with his medication and understood non-compliance had led to the admission. They discussed VC's upcoming exams – VC was not sure if his EC form had been submitted in time. Ellie Turner advised VC to contact the Support and Wellbeing team about this and provided their email address. VC said he would remain in Nottingham for his fourth year of studies, but was aware of risks around isolation. Ellie Turner recommended to VC that a referral should be made to the University's Disability Support Services, so that a support plan could be put in place, but VC declined. Ellie Turner told VC he could contact her at any time if he changed his mind, but VC said he was not keen to engage with MHAS [UNIN0000734].

243. Ellie Turner emailed the Support and Wellbeing team to flag that VC had a query about his re-sit exams and would be in touch and that he had declined a referral to disability support [UNIN0000778].

244. As VC did not get in touch with the Support and Wellbeing team, Paige Smith emailed him on 20 August 2020. Paige then went on annual leave and flagged to her manager in handover notes on 21 August 2020 that VC may get in touch about his re-sit exams [UNIN0000059, UNIN0000924]. However, VC did not get in touch.

245. VC's extenuating circumstances claim had been approved on 24 July 2020 [UNIN0000840] and he took the exam he had missed on 2 June 2020 in August. VC achieved 73% on this exam, which meant he was able to proceed to the fourth year of his studies.

September 2020 – August 2021

246. VC returned to the fourth year of his studies in September 2020.

247. As part of the fourth year of study, VC was required to complete an individual project with a project supervisor, which he started. On 25 September 2020, VC chose a project supervised by Professor Popov [UNIN0001429].

248. On 26 October 2020, at around 9pm, VC emailed his personal tutor, Dr McWilliam and asked to meet to discuss a serious issue [UNIN0000887]. Dr McWilliam replied and said he could speak straight away [UNIN0000834]. Dr McWilliam and VC spoke on Teams and VC explained he was struggling with his studies. Dr McWilliam felt VC was quiet and withdrawn and suggested VC contact the Support and Wellbeing team. They agreed to speak again on 4 November 2020 [UNIN0001835, UNIN0001767].

249. Meanwhile, Professor Popov had difficulties meeting with VC as he would cancel at short notice or not attend [UNIN0001779, UNIN0001250, UNIN0000380, UNIN0001075, UNIN0000942, UNIN0001153, UNIN0001588]. On 2 November 2020, Professor Popov emailed VC and copied in Dr McWilliam to flag these serious difficulties and asked him to discuss his learning plans with Dr McWilliam urgently [UNIN0000521].

250. Dr McWilliam met with VC on 4 November 2020 as planned and discussed whether his struggles with study were short term or long term. They discussed transferring to the BEng and an interruption of studies, and VC decided he would like to interrupt his studies. Dr McWilliam signposted VC to

Dr Barney and the Support and Wellbeing team, and sent him information about interruption [UNIN0001767, UNIN0001586, UNIN0001835].

251. Dr McWilliam, Dr Barney and Dr Piano (Deputy Senior Tutor) supported VC to interrupt his studies. On 10 November 2020, VC's interruption of studies form was signed off and he left the University until September 2021 [UNIN0001286, UNIN0000492, UNIN0001306, UNIN0000067, UNIN0001685, UNIN0000217, UNIN0001219, UNIN0000816, UNIN0000504, UNIN0001251, UNIN0000226, UNIN0001489, UNIN0001650, UNIN0000908, UNIN0000772, UNIN0001579, UNIN0001586]. Dr McWilliam and Dr Barney informed other academic staff [UNIN0000342, UNIN0000299].

252. During his interruption, the University had no contact with VC.

September 2021 – December 2021

253. VC returned to the University for the academic year starting in September 2021. This was VC's fifth year at the University overall, but due to his interruption of studies for the majority of the academic year starting in September 2020, this was VC's second attempt at the fourth year of the MEng in Mechanical Engineering course.

254. Unbeknown to the University, VC was detained under section from September to October 2021 in varying locations. The University understands from the Theemis report that VC was in Nottingham in an NHS hospital from 3 – 11 September 2021, but was then transferred to an out of area, independent provider hospital until 1 October 2021, and was then transferred back to an independent provider in Nottingham from 1 – 22 October 2021 [NHSE0000298]. The University did not have any information about this at the time in 2021. The University first knew something about this on 18 January 2022 from the Nottingham NHS EIP team: information was limited to the fact VC had a short admission following a police incident where he had been tasered due to non-compliance, and that he had a history of assaulting police.

255. The University now understands from the Theemis report that on 3 September 2021, a Mental Health Act assessment was carried out during which VC assaulted police officers and police had to taser him, following which he was taken to a place of safety under the Mental Health Act and was subsequently detained in hospital until 22 October 2021 [NHSE0000298].

256. Whilst VC was detained from 3 September to 22 October 2021 (unknown to anyone within the University), he continued to liaise with academic staff about his return to studies.

257. On 7 September 2021, Dr Barney emailed VC to ask whether he was returning at the start of term [UNIN0001293]. VC responded on 12 September 2021 saying he was eager to get back and asked to speak to someone about some administrative questions [UNIN0001012]. Dr Barney answered VC's questions and copied in Dr McWilliam so he knew VC was returning [UNIN0001357].

258. On 23 September 2021, Dr McWilliam emailed VC and they arranged a meeting on Teams on 27 September 2021 [UNIN0000204, UNIN0000596]. When they met, they discussed the possibility of VC transferring to the BEng based on his marks in previous years [UNIN0001586] and VC subsequently liaised with Dr Barney on 29 September 2021 [UNIN0000920, UNIN0001150] and with Dr Campbell-Ritchie on 5 October 2021 [UNIN0000293, UNIN0000689, UNIN0001438, UNIN0000768]. VC later confirmed that he would like to continue with the MEng [UNIN0001586].

259. In late September and early October 2021, VC liaised with academics Dr Hann and Dr Rouse about the final year project and it was agreed that VC would be supervised by Dr Rouse [UNIN0001522, UNIN0000365].

260. During October and November 2021, VC met with Dr Rouse several times. However, VC also missed several meetings with Dr Rouse. On 24

November 2021, Dr Rouse emailed VC to check if everything was ok as he had missed their project meeting, and VC responded to confirmed he was fine [UNIN0000104, UNIN0001469]. During this time, Dr McWilliam also checked in with VC several times and VC said he was fine [UNIN0001586]. On 5 November 2021, Dr McWilliam also met with VC after VC requested a reference to work at DHL [UNIN0001586, UNIN0000982, UNIN0000627].

261. On 1 December 2021, Dr Rouse emailed VC again, expressing concern that VC had missed a meeting again and that he was worried VC was falling behind, and asked to meet VC as soon as possible [UNIN0000111]. Dr Rouse and Dr McWilliam liaised about VC's attendance issues [UNIN0001005, UNIN0001079]. Dr McWilliam arranged to meet VC on 8 December 2021, however due to a mix up about whether the meeting was on Teams or in person, it is unclear if this went ahead [UNIN0001586, UNIN0001214, UNIN0001093].

262. On 16 December 2021, VC's progress and planning report was due but he did not submit it. Academic staff liaised about this in early January 2022 [UNIN0001596, UNIN0001776, UNIN0001064, UNIN0001541, UNIN0000263], but further action was not taken as academic staff became aware VC was admitted to hospital, as detailed below.

January – March 2022

263. In the early hours of Sunday 16 January 2022, one of VC's flatmates, Christopher [GRO-B] reported an incident in their flat at Raleigh Park to the University (Raleigh Park was a third-party managed PBSA and a partnered provider meaning there was a nomination agreement in place between the University and the PBSA provider). The report was made via email to Jamie Dickinson, Off Campus Student Affairs Manager [UNIN0000732]. The incident took place on the evening of 15 January 2022.

264. This was around the time I joined the University. I did not know and would

not expect to know about this sort of event.

265. Around 9am on Monday 17 January 2022, Jamie Dickinson forwarded Christopher [GRO-B] report to the ResX team [UNIN0000732] because ResX provided support services to Raleigh Park. Chris Hoskins, Residential Experience Manager, immediately notified Claire Thompson, Associate Director (Student Wellbeing), who created a report through Report and Support and also completed a critical incident report [UNIN0000157, UNIN0000362].

266. Chris Hoskins tried to contact VC throughout the day, but was not able to reach him. He also liaised with Christopher [GRO-B] and they agreed to speak the next day. Claire Thompson also spoke to Christopher [GRO-B] and told him to call the police if there were any concerns [UNIN0000157, UNIN0000362, UNIN0001804].

267. Claire Thompson contacted Ellie Turner who confirmed that MHAS knew VC as a result of the support provided to him in June 2020. Claire Thompson emailed ResX to confirm this and that MHAS would pick up the case tomorrow but that if there were further concerns that evening, they should ring the police [UNIN0000260].

268. On 18 January 2022, at around 08.50am, Claire Thompson sent Ellie Turner the report from Christopher [GRO-B] [UNIN0000938]. Ellie Turner called the EIP team but there was no answer so she requested a call back. Ellie Turner then called the EIP team again and spoke to Adele Pinder who confirmed VC had not attended an appointment for the fifth time the day before, that he had poor engagement and had run out of medication. This is how the University became aware that VC was under the care of NHS community teams for ongoing mental health issues (having last been aware of VC's engagement with the NHS when he was discharged from hospital in July 2020). Adele confirmed she would liaise with local police to get further information. She said once VC had been located the EIP team would attend

with the police to assess VC [UNIN0000734, UNIN0000033].

269. During this call, Adele told Ellie Turner that there had been a further admission previously which involved a police incident and VC had been tasered due to non-compliance – the University is now aware this happened on 3 September 2021, but this call on 18 January 2022 was the first time the University was aware of the incident and the admission [UNIN0000734]. Ellie Turner forwarded the report from Christopher GRO-B to Adele Pinder [UNIN0000525].

270. Ellie Turner and Chris Hoskins liaised several times on 18 January 2022. Ellie Turner advised that VC's flatmates should be re-located. Chris liaised with the Raleigh Park team who confirmed there was an empty flat that VC's flatmates could be moved into. Chris Hoskins liaised with VC's flatmates and helped them to move the same day, and Chris provided information to the Raleigh Park team [UNIN0001033, UNIN0001483, UNIN0000183, UNIN0001202, UNIN0001680, UNIN0000734, UNIN0000381, UNIN0001807].

271. Ellie Turner made several attempts to locate VC on 18 January 2022 so that she could assist the EIP team to carry out an assessment. She asked Chris Hoskins to ask the Raleigh Park team to contact her if they saw VC [UNIN0001483]. She also liaised with both Stuart Croy and Mark Davis (Crime Prevention/Reduction Manager in the Security team) to ask them to check when and where VC had last used his student ID card [UNIN0000734]. At around 11.10am, Ellie Turner emailed Adele Pinder and Claudia Birtles to confirm VC had left the library at about 6am so she thought he might be at home sleeping, and she provided his address – she asked them to let her know when they would attend so she could liaise with the accommodation provider to facilitate access [UNIN0001476].

272. The AMHP called Ellie Turner and confirmed she was applying for a warrant so would attend with the police that day [UNIN0000734]. Ellie Turner

emailed Chris Hoskins to confirm this and provide the contact details for the AMHP [UNIN0001202, UNIN0000734]. The AMHP and Chris Hoskins spoke and the AMHP asked the Raleigh Park team to alert the Crisis team or 999 if they witnessed anything concerning about VC but said he should not be approached – Chris Hoskins shared this advice with the Raleigh Park team [UNIN0001680, UNIN0000125].

273. On 19 January 2022, the AMHP team advised Ellie Turner that the Mental Health Act assessment had not gone ahead as there was no place of safety and it was felt the risk to others was mitigated because VC's flatmates had been moved. Ellie Turner emailed Mark Davis, Claire Thompson and Chris Hoskins to update them [UNIN0001311].

274. Ellie Turner spoke to the AMHP who confirmed she would be convening the Mental Health Act assessment once a bed was available. Abi Parsonage relayed a similar message [UNIN0001476, UNIN0000734].

275. At around 12.20pm, Ellie Turner emailed Mark Davis, Claire Thompson and Chris Hoskins to let them know the AMHP and the police would attend at 1pm to take VC for assessment [UNIN0001485]. Chris Hoskins liaised with the Raleigh Park team and facilitated access to VC's flat and he was taken away for assessment. At around 2.20pm, Chris Hoskins updated Ellie Turner, Mark Davis and Claire Thompson that VC had been taken for assessment [UNIN0001528].

276. Later on 19 January 2022, Ellie Turner spoke to the AMHP and consultant psychiatrist who assessed VC and they confirmed VC had not been detained and would be returning to Raleigh Park. Ellie Turner voiced concerns about risks to other students and asked whether it was safe for VC to be in student accommodation but they said they were unable to answer that but he was suitable for home treatment. They discussed the incident with VC's flatmates but the consultant felt that as the police did not take any action, this was not of any consequence. Ellie Turner said that she did not feel that the

police had linked the recent incident with VC's previous incidents, and so lack of police action was not a good indicator of risk, and the consultant did acknowledge this. Ellie Turner felt that the conversation became cyclical without satisfactory explanation of how the consultant and the AMHP reached the view VC should not be detained [UNIN0000734]. The University understands that VC was then in the care of the Crisis team in the community.

277. Ellie Turner updated Chris Hoskins that VC was not detained and recommended VC's flatmates remained in their alternative accommodation [UNIN0000734].

278. Ellie Turner also updated Claire Thompson on 19 January 2022. Claire relayed this information to her manager, Kirsteen Coupar (Interim Director of Student and Campus Life), and flagged that "*I will check with School how he is doing as, if he is not progressing academically, we may need to consider urgent fitness to study.*" [UNIN0000152]. Claire Thompson sent an email that evening to Paige Smith to ask her to check how VC was engaging with his studies and if there were any concerns [UNIN0000401]

279. On 20 January 2022, Paige Smith forwarded Claire Thompson's email to Dr McWilliam and Dr Barney (Senior Tutor) and asked if they could let her know if VC was engaging in his studies and if there were any concerns [UNIN0000351]. Dr McWilliam spoke with Dr Rouse [UNIN0001805] and with VC [UNIN0000386] and responded to Paige Smith to confirm that there was some evidence of engagement and that he had requested a meeting with VC after his exams and would discuss engagement with him then [UNIN0001605]. VC was engaging at this time: on 20 January he responded when Dr McWilliam contacted him, and spoke to Dr McWilliam who thought he sounded ok and was not struggling. On the same day, VC submitted his take-home examination paper. Around this time, another academic, Dr Rouse, also spoke to VC who seemed fine to him (as set out below). Dr McWilliam copied Professor La Rocca into his email, who responded with further details that VC had not submitted his coursework and had failed his

progress test but had submitted his exam that day [UNIN0000385]. Paige Smith forwarded this information to Claire Thompson [UNIN0000456, UNIN0001641].

280. On 20 January 2022, Ellie Turner also spoke to Chris Hoskins who explained the Raleigh Park team did not want VC to remain in the accommodation. Ellie Turner agreed to seek an update from the Crisis team and try to speak to VC. Ellie Turner called the Crisis team and was told VC had refused to meet and the plan was to discuss at the Multi-Disciplinary Team meeting the next day. Ellie Turner voiced her view that home treatment had fallen down and it was not a sustainable plan for VC to remain in his current accommodation. Ellie Turner asked for a more senior staff member to call her back. Ellie Turner also tried to call VC several times but he did not answer [UNIN0000734].

281. Between 21 January and 28 January 2022, Ellie Turner remained in contact with NHS services, including the Crisis team and the EIP team, speaking to them twice on 21 January 2022 (when she expressed she felt uncomfortable with the current plan of home treatment as VC had disengaged on the first day of that plan and asked for a further Mental Health Act assessment if VC did not engage again that day), twice on 24 January 2022, once on 25 January (when she again expressed her view that the home treatment plan was not working), once on 26 January (when she was told the plan was to request a further assessment if VC did not engage that day) and once on 27 January 2022 (when she was told that a Mental Health Act assessment was being called for that day) [UNIN0000734].

282. Ellie Turner also called VC on 21 January and 25 January 2022, but he did not answer. She was able to speak to him on 24 January 2022, but VC did not want to engage with her or MHAS.

283. Ellie Turner also continued to meet with Claire Thompson about the case, meeting on 21 January, 24 January and 25 January 2022. She also

spoke with Dr McWilliam on 24 January 2022 to provide risk information and advise that she could provide evidence to support the EC process if required [UNIN0001610, UNIN0000734].

284. On 27 January 2022, Dr McWilliam messaged VC on Teams to ask to meet as his exams were now over [UNIN0001586]. VC did not respond and Dr McWilliam emailed Dr Rouse on 30 January 2022 to ask him to let him know when he next saw VC [UNIN0001514]. Dr Rouse replied the same day [UNIN0000806] and said:

“Yes, will do. I did see Valdo last week but not for a scheduled meeting. He turned up at my office (out of the blue if I'm honest) just as I was leaving. I asked how he was doing and he seemed fine. I'll let you know how he is getting on once the new term starts properly.”

285. The date of this interaction between VC and Dr Rouse is not clear, but I understand this is the last face-to-face interaction between University staff and VC. The 30 January 2022 was a Sunday, and so Dr Rouse's reference to 'last week' could mean the week just ending (24 – 30 January), or the previous week (17 – 23 January). The last time he had been seen by the University before then is understood to have been 19 January 2022 when Chris Hoskins facilitated access to VC's flat for the AMHP and other mental health professionals to assess VC.

286. On Friday 28 January 2022 the Crisis team updated Ellie Turner that they were awaiting a warrant and a Mental Health Act assessment was planned for that day. After this assessment, VC was admitted to hospital again. The University was informed about this by the Crisis team on Monday 31 January 2022 [UNIN0000734].

287. On 31 January 2022, Ellie Turner informed the Support and Wellbeing team that VC had been admitted to hospital and asked if they could make the academic staff aware, which was done [UNIN0001745, UNIN0000525]. Ellie

Turner also informed Chris Hoskins who made arrangements to support VC's flatmates to return to their apartment in Raleigh Park [UNIN0000318, UNIN0000734].

288. Throughout February 2022, Ellie Turner remained in touch with the NHS about VC, although VC made it clear he did not want contact between the NHS and the University and so only limited information was shared [UNIN0000734].

289. I understand that while VC was detained in hospital he was permitted leave from the hospital, and that he visited Raleigh Park on 3 February 2022: his presence was reported to the University. The University had not been informed that he was being given leave. Ellie Turner alerted the ward, and a doctor (Dr Gibson) said that VC had broken the conditions of his leave, and agreed that VC would be encouraged not to attend Raleigh Park [UNIN0000734]. When Ellie Turner spoke to VC on 22 February 2022, he was preoccupied with this and said as a result of her communication with the ward, his permitted leave had been revoked [UNIN0000734].

290. Ellie Turner liaised with Chris Hoskins about whether VC's flatmates would be willing to speak to the NHS about the incident on 15 January 2022; I understand this was to ensure that the NHS had as much information as possible about VC's behaviour. They agreed and Ellie Turner provided Christopher GRO-B details to Dr Gibson on 4 February, who confirmed they would call him to understand the context of the assault.

291. On 8 February 2022, whilst still in hospital, VC ended his tenancy at Raleigh Park and the Raleigh Park team confirmed to VC's flatmates that they could move back to their flat [UNIN0001304, UNIN0001830]. VC did not live in University accommodation after this – he remained on the ward until 24 February 2022, and on discharge the NHS informed the University that he had moved into private accommodation [UNIN0000734].

292. On 11 February 2022 the hospital advised Ellie Turner that VC was being considered for discharge on 24 February 2022. This was the last conversation Ellie Turner had with the ward before VC was discharged and the ward confirmed VC had not communicated his plans about new accommodation [UNIN0000734].
293. Meanwhile, Ellie Turner liaised with Dr McWilliam about VC's academic options [UNIN0000926, UNIN0000796, UNIN0001610]. Dr McWilliam discussed options for VC with Dr Barney given VC had missed much of the academic year [UNIN0001473, UNIN0001094]. Ellie Turner asked Dr McWilliam to communicate the academic options to VC as VC did not want to engage with her [UNIN0000404, UNIN0000734].
294. VC was discharged on 24 February 2022. The University did not become aware of this until 28 February 2022, when Ellie Turner spoke to VC who said he had been discharged. During this call, VC declined any input from MHAS, though VC was aware of the need for services to communicate about risks and that Ellie Turner would be emailing Claudia Birtles, the community psychiatric nurse in the EIP team. After speaking to VC, Ellie Turner emailed Claudia Birtles, and said VC had declined input from MHAS and that she had agreed with VC to sit in the background as long as she and Claudia remained in contact. Claudia confirmed in response that VC was discharged on 24 February 2022 and his engagement was superficial but he appreciated the need to engage to avoid further admission. She further confirmed she was happy with the plan Ellie Turner had set out for them to remain in contact. Ellie Turner requested VC's address which Claudia provided and she said "*I believe it is a house share but as is usual VC hasn't shared any information about this.*" [UNIN0000734]. This was an address which was not University accommodation, and not accommodation which ResX supported: it was private accommodation with no link to the University.
295. On 24 February 2022, Dr McWilliam messaged Dr Rouse and suggested he contact VC about his project [UNIN0001805]. Dr Rouse emailed VC the

same day to ask to meet to discuss his project [UNIN0001682].

296. On 27 and 28 February 2022, Dr McWilliam messaged VC to ask to meet up. On 2 March 2022, VC replied and they arranged to meet on 4 March 2022 [UNIN0001586]. Dr McWilliam also liaised with other academics Dr Giddings and Dr Rouse about the possibility of VC interrupting his studies for a second time [UNIN0000449], [UNIN0001805]. On 3 March 2022, Dr Giddings emailed several academic colleagues to request mark breakdowns for VC [UNIN0001149, UNIN0001570, UNIN0001463, UNIN0000471, UNIN0001011, UNIN0001727, UNIN0001032, UNIN0000484, UNIN0001484, UNIN001535, UNIN0001444]. Dr Giddings updated Dr McWilliam as and when responses were given [UNIN0001583, UNIN0000598, UNIN0000407, UNIN0000129].

297. Dr McWilliam met on Teams with VC on 4 March 2022 as planned, and they discussed his options: (1) submit an extenuating circumstances claim; (2) interrupt his studies and return next year; or (3) transfer to the BEng which would, based on his grades to date, only require completion of an individual project based on the group project he did in year 2 of his studies in order to graduate. VC was not keen on interrupting so Dr McWilliam sent him information on the EC process [UNIN0001411, UNIN0001179, UNIN0001586]. Dr McWilliam updated Dr Giddings, Dr Barney and Dr Rouse [UNIN0001449].

298. Dr McWilliam met on Teams with VC again on 9 March 2022 and VC confirmed he was keen to submit an EC form and continue with the MEng [UNIN000104, UNIN0001586]. VC emailed Dr Giddings for guidance on the EC process [UNIN0001452]. Dr Giddings liaised with Dr McWilliam about this to ensure his email to VC was helpful and clear, but before he could send his reply to VC, VC confirmed he had decided to transfer to the BEng instead.

299. On 11 March 2022, Dr Rouse met with VC about his project. Dr Rouse said VC had a lot to catch up on and they discussed transferring to the BEng

and suspending project meetings [UNIN0001805, UNIN0000387]. Dr McWilliam also met with VC and VC confirmed he had decided to transfer to the BEng instead of submitting an EC form [UNIN0001586]. I understand that these meetings with Dr Rouse and Dr McWilliam were both on Teams and were the last time anyone at the University who knew VC personally had contact with him other than via email. Dr McWilliam updated Dr Barney, Dr Giddings, Dr Rouse and asked Dr Giddings if he could sign the transfer form [UNIN0000377]. Dr McWilliam updated Ellie Turner the same day [UNIN0001610, UNIN0000734].

300. On 16 March 2022, Dr Giddings emailed VC about transferring to the BEng. He emailed VC guidance on the individual project that was required and provided the change of course form, which he asked VC to check and sign, following which he would process it [UNIN0000616, UNIN0001661, UNIN0000109]. On 18 March 2022, VC sent his change of course form to Dr Giddings [UNIN0001296]. On 21 March 2022, Dr Giddings signed the change of course form and sent it for processing [UNIN0000305, UNIN0000084]. To complete the BEng, VC only had to complete an individual project, based on the group project he did with Dr Rothwell in his third year.

April 2022 – July 2022

301. As far as I am aware, from 18 March 2022 until 2 June 2022, no one at the University had any contact with VC. ResX and MHAS had some communication about VC from 21 – 29 April 2022, details of which are set out below.

302. On 21 April 2022, VC visited his old flat at Raleigh Park. His lease had been terminated in agreement with the third-party provider as of 8 February 2022 and so he should not have been on site. VC's ex-flatmate Christopher GRO-B reported to the ResX team at around 8.20pm that the Raleigh Park security team had seen VC and moved him on. Christopher GRO-B spoke to two members of the ResX team who provided safety advice and confirmed

additional presence in the area that evening. The Raleigh Park security team also emailed the ResX team at around 8.50pm to report that they had seen VC and asked him to leave. The Raleigh Park security team confirmed they carried out a welfare check on VC's ex-flatmates who said that VC had let himself into the flat which had been unlocked. ResX followed up with Christopher [GRO-B] on 22 April 2022 with further safety advice [UNIN0001801]. Chris Hoskins had been on leave during this time, but he followed up with the flatmates on his return who explained VC had asked for his post and when they asked him to leave, he did, and he was not aggressive [UNIN0000125, UNIN001066]. On 26 April 2022, Chris Hoskins emailed Ellie Turner to explain what had happened and to ask her to reiterate boundaries to VC [UNIN0001354].

303. Ellie Turner had not been in contact with VC, as he had declined to have MHAS support. Later on 26 April 2022, she therefore sent the details that had been provided by Chris Hoskins to Claudia Birtles in the EIP team and said she wanted to make her aware in case it was indicative of deterioration. Claudia Birtles responded the same day and said she would discuss the matter with VC on Friday (29 April 2022). Claudia Birtles updated Ellie Turner on 29 April 2022 and said VC had said he was not aware he was not allowed to return to Raleigh Park but had spoken to reception and got his mail. She also said she was handing VC over to a new care coordinator and copied him into the email so Ellie Turner had his details [UNIN0000633].

304. On 2 June 2022, VC emailed Dr Giddings to explain he had completed his individual project and they liaised about how to submit it [UNIN0000275] [UNIN0001119].

305. VC contacted Dr Giddings and Dr McWilliam in June 2022 to request a reference for further academic study, which Dr McWilliam provided on 30 June 2022 [UNIN0001497, UNIN0001493] and which Dr Giddings provided on 6 July 2022 [UNIN0000635, UNIN0000258].

306. VC sent his individual project report to Dr Campbell-Ritchie on 12 June 2022, who reviewed it and provided feedback on 14 June 2022 [UNIN0001405]. After several iterations of the report throughout June, on 6 July 2022 Dr Campbell-Ritchie confirmed to VC the report was at pass level [UNIN0000048]. On 7 July 2022, the engineering assessments team confirmed to Dr McWilliam and Dr Campbell-Ritchie that VC had achieved a 2:1 with an overall average of 67 and said that the information would be available on Blue Castle (the University's system on which exam / assessment results are released) the next day [UNIN0000497]. Dr McWilliam emailed VC to ask him to look on Blue Castle and confirm he could see his results and degree outcome, but VC did not reply [UNIN0000748]. This was the last time anyone at the University who knew VC personally had contact with him via email.

307. After this, VC left the University. Analysis of data held by the University about card access to University premises shows that the last time VC accessed the library was on 15 June 2022 and the last time that he accessed any other University building was on 21 June 2022, when he accessed the Coates Building, a building used primarily for teaching, learning and research purposes by the Faculty of Engineering [WITN0066032, WITN0066033].

308. The University does not know when, or if, VC left Nottingham. VC was invited to a graduation ceremony, as all students are, but records show he graduated *in absentia*, meaning he received his degree without attending the ceremony. The last known contact from VC to the University was on 8 August 2022 when he called the Registry and Academic Affairs team about his academic transcript. The Registry and Academic Affairs team sent him a follow-up email the same day about his academic transcript [WITN0066034].

Risk Assessment

309. I am asked whether the University carried out any risk assessments in respect of VC. It is important to note that our University staff such as those in MHAS and Security are not expected or required to assess and manage risk

in the way that Approved Mental Health Professionals or psychiatric medics and nurses or police in statutory services are. If the University is concerned that a student may pose a risk to themselves or others because of mental health, then the University would take action: that might be calling an ambulance or, through MHAS, alerting NHS psychiatric services so that any appropriate clinical assessment can be made. The University does not carry out any clinical risk assessment process. When a student is under the care of NHS mental health services, whether inpatient or community, those services are relied on to carry out necessary assessment of risk, including risks to other people. The University would not expect to be in possession of all of the information required to make a comprehensive risk assessment and sometimes, when the student does not want the University to be informed about their health by the NHS, the University may have very limited details. For example, the University would not expect to have full information about whether a student was meeting with a community team, what their diagnosis was, what behaviours led to diagnosis, what their protective and risk factors were, whether they were taking medication, etc. That partial information is just one of the reasons why the University does not step into the shoes of statutory services and carry out full mental health or physical health assessment.

310. Having said that, whenever colleagues in the University interact with a student regarding any issue touching on their wellbeing, physical health or mental health, they are alive to risk. Staff at the University make judgments about whether to escalate concerns to an internal University service for support, or to a statutory service for full and formal evaluation of risk. That judgment is necessary in order to determine how best to support a student. The University wants to ensure that all students are safe and supported, and wants to work with statutory services by providing as much information as possible to enable them to formally assess risk and need.

311. No formal risk assessment of VC was carried out by the University. However, I am aware that the University, largely through the Support and Wellbeing team and MHAS, was alive to the existence of possible risks associated with VC's mental health. On various occasions, as set out in

witness statements, the University took actions demonstrating that the University was actively escalating concerns to statutory services for them to carry out formal risk assessment, actively sharing information with statutory services to support their risk assessment and decision-making, and escalating concerns internally to provide support to VC and other students. For example:

- In early June 2020 when VC was detained, MHAS repeatedly advocated for his discharge plan to involve him returning home rather than returning to Nottingham accommodation.
- In early June 2020 when VC was detained, MHAS alerted police to the hospital's plan for VC returning to Nottingham accommodation.
- In early June 2020 when VC was detained, the Off-Campus Student Affairs Manager checked that there were no other University students in his flat at Brook Court.
- In July 2020 when VC was detained again, MHAS repeatedly voiced concerns with the NHS and the AMHP about the appropriateness of him returning to his accommodation in Nottingham.
- In late July 2020 when VC was discharged, the University through MHAS considered whether any exclusion from campus was warranted under the Withdrawal on Grounds of Health and Safety policy [WITN0066007] (but decided it was not, given the combination of the pandemic and it being out of term-time, and because he was at that point judged fit to be in the community by the NHS, who were monitoring him via the Crisis team).
- In late July and August 2020 while VC was in the community, the University through MHAS encouraged him to engage with MHAS and with the Disability Support Services, and the Support and Wellbeing team also offered support.
- In January 2022 when an assault was reported by a fellow student, the ResX team made contact with that student and other flatmates to offer support. The ResX team then arranged for students who shared a flat with VC to be moved out of accommodation and provided with different accommodation, as the University generally would seek to do

whenever violence/anti-social behaviour is reported by one student against a flatmate.

- In January 2022, the University, through Claire Thompson, considered whether emergency provisions under the Fitness to Study policy [UNIN0000152] could and should be used to require VC to leave third-party accommodation (in the event, he agreed to leave).
- In January 2022, the University supported a formal Mental Health Act risk assessment; Security assisted the NHS to locate VC (via checking use of his University student card) and MHAS liaised with the EIP team to ensure that they had full information about the alleged assault by VC on a fellow student.
- In January 2022 the University, through Ellie Turner of MHAS, voiced concerns about the decision by a consultant and AMHP not to detain VC under the Mental Health Act and drew information to their attention.
- In January 2022, Claire Thompson noted that the NHS should be involved in assessing the potential risk that VC posed to other students such as in a laboratory, once the immediate crisis had been resolved (in the event he did not return to such teaching environment after that date).
- In January 2022, MHAS repeatedly made contact with the Crisis team to understand the NHS's risk management plan and to raise concerns about VC being in the community and to press for a further Mental Health Act assessment.
- At the end of January 2022 when VC was detained, the University assessed that it was safe for his former flatmates to return to their flat and so arranged that through MHAS and ResX.
- In February 2022 when VC was given day release without the University being aware, and visited his flat, the ResX team informed MHAS, which informed the NHS ward and asked for the ward to ensure that VC understood that he should not attend the flat unaccompanied.
- In February 2022 while VC was detained, MHAS and ResX liaised between the student who had reported the assault and the hospital, so that the NHS could obtain full information about the incident.

- In February 2022 while VC was detained, MHAS asked the NHS to consider making a community treatment order when he was released.
- In February 2022 after VC was released, MHAS liaised with the EIP team to seek agreement that the EIP team would alert MHAS if there were concerns about relapse.
- In April 2022 while VC was under the care of the community EIP team, MHAS alerted the team to the fact that VC had visited his old accommodation, in case that was indicative of deterioration.

Consideration of Disciplinary and Fitness to Study Processes in relation to VC

312. There were no disciplinary/misconduct investigations into VC's actions, and VC was not asked to undertake a Fitness to Study assessment.

313. To answer questions from the Inquiry as fully as I can, I will take a chronological approach and consider the potentially relevant policies which were in force at the points that the University knew of aggressive or violent behaviour by VC. My views in summary are:

- In relation to the Summer of 2020, although I do not consider that action should have been taken against VC under any policy by the University, I do consider with hindsight that it would have been preferable if the University had recorded formal consideration of policies and recorded reasons for decision-making. At the time, the University was in a very difficult position because of the pandemic, and the pressures on staff were extreme.
- In relation to January 2022, I consider that careful consideration should have been given to using the emergency provisions under the Fitness to Study policy to temporarily exclude VC from University grounds while further information was gathered. That would have been an extremely difficult decision, and I do not know what would have been decided. I recognise that VC was under the care of NHS services throughout this period, and that at times when those services judged him fit to be in the

community it would have been difficult for the University to exclude him from any location.

314. In June 2020, the University became aware of VC's mental health difficulties at the point that he had been hospitalised. The University's MHAS learned that there was an allegation that VC had indirectly caused serious injury to a woman who had jumped out of a window. No complaint was made to the University about that. The person who was harmed was not a student and the incident did not take place on University premises. VC was living in private accommodation at the time.

315. The Fitness to Study policy was not in force at that time. The Withdrawal on Grounds of Health and Safety policy [WITN0066007] was in force which would have been a route for the University to exclude VC from campus. Plainly there was no need to impose such an exclusion while VC was in hospital. I understand that such an exclusion was considered when VC was discharged from hospital in July 2020. I understand that it was ruled out because the combination of the pandemic and it being out of term-time meant that he would not have been on campus, and because he had been judged fit to be in the community by the NHS, who were monitoring him via the Crisis team. I do not disagree with that approach. Hospital doctors had deemed that he had recovered sufficiently from an episode of psychosis to be in the community and I feel it may have been discriminatory to exclude him from any part of the University on the basis of his behaviour while suffering from a mental illness, when he was no longer exhibiting any disruptive or aggressive behaviour. I understand that there are many students who have episodes of psychosis and recover fully: it would not be aligned with our inclusive approach to exclude people on the basis that they have had mental health problems. However, in my view, it would have been better if there had been more structured consideration of whether VC should be excluded from any part of the University.

316. The Code of Discipline January 2020 was also in force at the time [WITN0066011]. Usually that Code was triggered by a complaint about a

student's behaviour. There was no complaint in 2020: the person who jumped from the window did not make contact with the University, and was not a student. I believe that lack of a trigger complaint had a part to play in the conduct policy not being used, although I note that the Code of Discipline does not require that a complaint is made. It seems to me from witness statements that another reason that the Code of Discipline was not used was that where a student's behaviour seemed to be linked to severe mental health issues, the discipline route was generally not considered to be appropriate. I can understand that approach. It seems likely that the behaviour occurred when VC lacked capacity during a psychotic episode which on my understanding means his actions may not have been reckless within the definition in the Code and would not be a breach of the Code. I also note that the Code of Discipline focused more on matters which occurred on University premises, or were actions against students or staff, neither of which was the case here. It would have been very difficult, if not impossible, to use the Code of Discipline given the underlying issues connected to VC's health and how little was known about the incident. I entirely understand why it was not used in the circumstances, but again I would have wanted to see more structured consideration and decision-making around the Code of Discipline.

317. Overall, I am aware that in June and July 2020, Ellie Turner of MHAS was in regular contact with Claire Thompson, then Head of Student Welfare, about VC's case. That escalation by MHAS is what I would expect in this complex case.

318. In November 2020, the University used the Voluntary Interruption of Study process [WITN0066029] when VC indicated that he was struggling with his studies. There was no indication to the University at that time that VC was experiencing a relapse or posing a risk to himself or others. The Voluntary Interruption of Study process was followed, and there was no need to use any other policy to control VC's access to the University.

319. In 2021, there were no reports to the University and so no matters which could have triggered the use of any policies in relation to VC. The voluntary

interruption which VC instigated in 2020 ended at the start of the 2021/22 academic year. Under the policies in place at that time, because VC had voluntarily interrupted his studies, there was no provision for the University to require any check on his fitness to study after the period of interruption ended.

320. In 2022, the University was made aware of the allegation of assault by VC's flatmate, and I understand that the University ResX team was also made aware by VC's flatmates of other less serious issues. It is now believed that at that time VC was, unknown to the University, in the care of the NHS in the community. He was living in third-party PBSA which was supported by the University ResX team.

321. The Fitness to Study (June 21 update) policy [UNIN0001825] was in force by that point (and had replaced the Withdrawal on Grounds of Health and Safety policy).

322. It seems from witness statements that the Fitness to Study policy [UNIN0001825] was considered in a limited way in 2022: enquiries were made of academic staff to see whether VC was engaging with studies and enquiries were made to see whether the policy could be used to remove him from third-party accommodation. I understand that the policy was not used because he was sufficiently engaging with his studies and it was not necessary to seek to remove him from accommodation as he agreed to leave. The Associate Director (Student Wellbeing), Claire Thompson, also explains that in her view the policy should not have been used because while VC was unwell in 2022, he was either in hospital or was under the care of the Crisis and/or EIP team which had judged him safe enough to be in the community; he was under the care of the NHS throughout this period.

323. The first stage under the Fitness to Study policy [UNIN0001825] requires the University to look into whether relevant support is being provided and to try to resolve the situation using that relevant support, which includes support from external health agencies. The University was effectively taking the actions which would be required under that first stage, through supporting VC

to engage and be assessed, treated and supported by the NHS, although I acknowledge that those actions were not formalised as part of the Fitness to Study process. I do not think that it would have been justified at any stage to use the Fitness to Study process to seek to expel VC from the University, because VC's behaviour when not unwell did not cause concern and he did recover from episodes of illness to re-engage as required with his studies.

324. However, I have grappled with whether the University should have sought to use emergency provisions in the Fitness to Study policy [UNIN0001825] to restrict VC's access to campus while more information was gathered. The standard way to use the policy is through a structured staged process, but the policy also had a provision around emergency or urgent situations, outlining that in circumstances where there was a serious urgent concern about a student's wellbeing, the University retained the right to exclude or suspend the student on the grounds of health and safety without needing to initiate previous stages, as a temporary precautionary measure until further investigation could take place. The policy is not limited to students who are struggling academically, but applies "*where a student's behaviours are causing significant, ongoing disruption or risk to the University experience of other students and/or staff members, notwithstanding that the student's academic work or progress may not be significantly adversely affected.*" On reflection, I think that there should have been more formal consideration of the Fitness to Study emergency provisions and, in particular, more formal consideration of whether VC's behaviour was likely to cause disruption or risk to the University experience of other students and/or staff members.

325. Excluding VC from any part of the University would have had a severely limiting effect on VC, and probably affected his studies. Such a decision would have required balancing VC's rights, the role of the University, the role of the NHS as a statutory service, the appropriateness of taking VC through a University process when he was in crisis or recovering from a relapse, and consideration of whether it would be discriminatory to do so. I do not know what would have happened if the University had sought to impose that emergency provision, but I think it should have been given careful

consideration, particularly in the period 16 – 28 January 2022. On 16 January 2022, the University became aware of an allegation that VC had assaulted his flatmate. Given what the University already knew about the incident with the woman jumping out of the window, the University could have given consideration to excluding VC from University premises in the short-term while more information was gathered. In the event, the focus, understandably, of the MHAS team was to press for Mental Health Act assessments, and VC was assessed on 19 January 2022 and detained after a second assessment on 28 January 2022.

326. As I say, I do not know what decision would have been made about whether to use the Fitness to Study emergency provisions if that had been considered around 16 January 2022. It is possible that the University may have decided that the two incidents which it was aware of by early 2022 justified a temporary exclusion while more information was gathered. However, there are many factors which would have weighed against temporary exclusion. The University had immediately escalated its concerns to the statutory services, who had much more detailed information, and expertise to conduct formal risk assessments. The NHS confirmed their view that he could be managed in the community when he was assessed on 19 January; he was not detained and was under the care of the NHS Crisis team. The police had also not treated VC's behaviour as indicative of high risk: they had not arrested him or taken any action and left VC and the other students in the flat. The alleged assault was relatively minor and no injury was caused. The University may well have taken the view that the statutory services were in the best position to determine VC's risk. That is particularly the case given that VC's risk seemed to be so linked to his mental health – he did not cause any disruption in the University when he was well. Even in January 2022 VC was not generally behaving in a disruptive way; for example, on 20 January 2022 he had a conversation with his tutor Dr McWilliam who did not think he was struggling, and also on 20 January 2022, VC completed and submitted a take-home exam.

327. The other policy which could have been relevant in 2022 was the Code of Discipline; the August 2021 version was in force [WITN0066012]. It seems that there were two reasons why University staff did not use the Code of Discipline: there was no formal complaint, and the incident was being dealt with as a mental health issue and not seen as a discipline issue. The only matter which could be referred to as a complaint to the University about VC was by his flatmate in relation to the January 2022 incident. That complaint was not formalised by the student in any way and the situation was resolved by moving the flatmates to alternative accommodation.

328. I can understand why those dealing with VC did not proceed under the Code of Discipline. It seems likely that the behaviour occurred when VC lacked capacity during a psychotic episode which on my understanding means his actions may not have been reckless within the definition in the Code of Discipline and would not be a breach of the Code of Discipline. The University would generally not wish to take a student who was in a mental health crisis or recovery period through a disciplinary procedure, and the Fitness to Study policy would have been a better fit for this sort of situation. I note that the Fitness to Study policy explicitly stated that it may be used *“where the use of the Code of Discipline for Students and/or Faculty or School-specific Fitness to Practise procedures would be inappropriate to address concerns”* [UNIN0001825]. However, in hindsight, and particularly given that the University was aware of an alleged assault by VC on another student, I think it would have been preferable if the decision whether to take action under the Code of Discipline had been considered in a multi-disciplinary way and formally documented with reasons.

329. After VC was released from hospital in February 2022, I do not think that it would have been appropriate for the University to consider using policies to control his access to campus, let alone seek to suspend or expel him. He was under the care of the EIP team which had agreed to update the University via MHAS if there were any signs of deterioration. He was liaising with academics about his plans to complete his degree, he seemed ‘okay’ according to academic staff in Teams meetings in March 2022, and he submitted a

completed project in July 2022. There was no new evidence to trigger the use of any policies.

Observations

330. I would like to say at the outset of these observations that I have answered the Inquiry's questions in as comprehensive a way as possible, and included observations about shortcomings even where there is no obvious link between those shortcomings and VC's actions. VC was not a student at the time that he attacked and killed others on 13 June 2023 and had not been a student for almost a year. The University had not had contact with VC since early July 2022 (save for an email in August 2022). In the last interactions which the University had with VC, he did not present as unwell or violent and he was able to complete his degree. The attacks did not take place on University premises. As far as we are aware, VC had not been in contact with the people who he killed while he was a student; as far as we are aware, his time at University did not overlap with the time at University of the students who were killed. The University is aware that it is not in possession of all of the details of this case, and recognises that it is for the Chair to say whether anything done differently while VC was a student may have prevented the later tragic events. We welcome this Inquiry and are keen to learn from the Chair's findings. However, the University does not, on the basis of information which we have at present, identify anything related to the University's dealings with VC which could have prevented his subsequent relapse and extreme violence.

Observations in relation to provision of information

331. I am asked whether I think the University should have been provided with more information from external agencies about VC's mental health and conduct while he was student.

332. There are some areas where I feel that it would have been helpful if the University had been provided with more information about VC, although I

acknowledge that the decision to share information is an extremely complex one which is bound by many legal requirements, and I do not have the information or expertise to judge whether statutory services could have lawfully shared any particular piece of information at any particular point in time. I also acknowledge the huge pressures placed on NHS staff and the difficulties in them finding the time to liaise with the University.

333. I agree with Ellie Turner of MHAS that it would have been helpful if the University, through MHAS, had been provided with more information about VC from the local healthcare trust. That information could usefully have included clarity about when he was under the care of NHS community services, the dates of admission, discharge and the discharge plans. When the NHS was managing VC within the community in Nottingham, the University could usefully have been alerted to non-engagement with services, non-compliance with medication and other risk markers. The University could usefully have been informed about VC's day release from hospital. I also think the University could usefully have been made aware of VC's detention in 2021, and the violence to police around the time of that detention; that information could have been shared by the institution where he was detained in 2021, or by the police.

334. The following are examples of situations where the University was not aware of significant information, or not aware of it until a later date. Knowing more information at the relevant time would have helped us to work collaboratively with the NHS in the most effective way. More information provided in a timely manner would have assisted the University to provide the best support to VC. Knowing about VC's behaviour when unwell and knowing about behaviour indicating increased relapse risk would have helped the University to judge what, if any, action the University should take under its policies to support VC or protect students/staff. I acknowledge that third parties may not have been able to lawfully share some of this information with the University.

- The police did not provide the University with information about the two incidents on 24 May 2020: (1) when VC was arrested for criminal

damage to a neighbour's flat; or (2) later the same day, when VC was arrested again for scaring another neighbour who jumped out of a window, resulting in his detention under the Mental Health Act. The University, via MHAS, found out some limited information about the second incident on 3 June 2020 when speaking to the hospital where VC was detained [UNIN0000734].

- The police did not provide the University with information about the incident on 13 July 2020 when VC broke into a neighbour's flat which led to his second detention under the Mental Health Act. The University, via MHAS, found out about this incident on 23 July 2020 following contact with the hospital where VC was detained [UNIN0000734, UNIN0001652, UNIN0000614].
- In August 2021, the NHS did not inform the University that VC's condition was deteriorating or that there was an increasing lack of engagement (now known from the Theemis report [NHSE0000298]).
- The police and the NHS did not provide the University with information about the incident on 3 September 2021 when VC apparently assaulted a police officer or his subsequent detention under section from 3 September 2021 – 22 October 2021. The University was corresponding with VC throughout September and October 2021 without knowing that he was detained. The University was given limited information on 18 January 2022 about an assault and detention but did not know when it happened, the extent of the assault on the police or about VC's violence during the initial days of his detention until the publication of the Theemis report [NHSE0000298].
- The University was not aware that VC was under the care of community mental health services in Nottingham in 2022 and was not complying with medication until 18 January 2022 when the University contacted the EIP team following a report of assault by VC's flatmate [UNIN0000734].
- VC was detained under the Mental Health Act on Friday 28 January 2022, but the University was not informed until Monday 31 January 2022 when MHAS made enquiries [UNIN0000734].

- Whilst detained under the Mental Health Act in January and February 2022, VC was given section 17 leave, but the University was not aware of this until VC's flatmate reported to ResX that VC had returned to their accommodation on 3 February 2022 [UNIN0000734]. There may have been other periods of leave which the University is not aware of.
- VC was discharged from hospital on 24 February 2022 but the University, via MHAS, only became aware of this on speaking to VC on 28 February 2022 [UNIN0000734].
- On 28 February 2022, the NHS agreed to maintain communication with MHAS should there be any concerns in relation to VC's engagement, relapse or other risk, as agreed between MHAS and VC [UNIN0000734]. The NHS provided an update on 29 April 2022 [UNIN0000633]. The Theemis report suggests VC was disengaging from mid-June 2022 onwards [NHSE0000298], which the University was not aware of. The academic staff in the Engineering department continued to have contact with VC during June and early July 2022 whilst he completed his degree.

Observations in relation to the University's actions

335. I am asked whether in retrospect I consider there are additional actions that the University could have taken in respect of VC. As I have set out above, based on the information we had and the policies in place at the time, I think that careful consideration should have been given to using emergency provisions to exclude VC from University grounds in early 2022 while further information was gathered. Decisions about whether to use various policies in the Summer of 2020 and early 2022 should have been made with more formality and should have been documented better with reasons.

336. I note, however, that the changes to policy would mean that the University would deal with some aspects differently now. The University now would deal with VC's case under the Student Cases of Concern process, which I explain further below. Whilst that may not have resulted in any different

outcome, it would have prevented the situation which arose where Ellie Turner of MHAS was carrying much of the burden and worry about the NHS's decisions. Although she was able to escalate to the Associate Director (Student Wellbeing), and did so, I feel that it would have been better if the University had addressed the problem through a multi-disciplinary lens as would happen now. That process would also mean that there would be more formal consideration of whether to engage the Code of Discipline, or the Fitness/Support to Study process, and more formal consideration of whether a student should be excluded from all or part of the University.

Observations in relation to Structural issues

337. I am asked whether I consider there are structural issues which contributed to any issues I have identified. In order to give as full an answer as possible to this question I will refer to structural issues which I think may be relevant, even where I do not consider that they contributed to issues.

338. I have identified areas where the University was not aware of significant information held by external agencies and consider that there were many factors which contributed to that. I have set out some of the barriers to full communication earlier in this statement.

339. In my view, there is a significant complexity to what information can and should be shared by our support services with other services within the University, not least because of data protection concerns, concerns about privacy, and awareness of the potential for stigmatisation of students with mental health issues. I am aware that some of our academic staff would have wanted to know more information about VC's behaviour, in particular violence towards police in 2021. I think there could have been greater clarity internally in the University regarding the sharing of information, for example more clarity about what information should be shared between support services, or shared with academic staff. There were different statements made in the University policies about information sharing and whilst these were not necessarily in conflict with each other, there was a lack of clarity around how they worked

together. That is, in my view, partly the result of the complexity of the law surrounding confidentiality and information sharing, and the lack of sufficiently clear higher education sector guidance [WITN0066051]. A stronger and clearer internal framework for information sharing may have meant improved working within the University, and a greater understanding among academic staff about what information they could expect to be shared with them.

340. I have noted that there was a mixed institutional understanding of the ways in which the Fitness to Study process could be used. I was not in the University at the time, but my view is that this is likely to have been a training issue. I also think that, in hindsight, the Fitness to Study policy was not sufficiently clear about how/when the University should evaluate within the Fitness to Study policy the risks posed by a student to the wider student community. These issues are likely to have arisen because the policy was drafted as the pandemic was raging and came into force in the Autumn of 2020 when the pandemic was still causing severe disruption to University operations. I am confident that the University disseminates new policies in a clear way now.

341. In relation to co-working between the NHS and the University support services, I am aware that there are many examples of good practice and effective collaboration, particularly between our experienced practitioners in MHAS and the local services with whom they have built a relationship. However, there was not always effective collaboration. I understand that MHAS explicitly flagged concerns with the hospital and the AMHP on a number of occasions about whether a Mental Health Act assessment was needed, and when. I understand that MHAS explicitly flagged concerns with the hospital about a decision not to detain VC, and decisions to allow him to be released with a discharge plan to go back to accommodation in Nottingham rather than go home. Clearly the University has never been in possession of all of the information which the professionals had when they were making those decisions, but University staff had an impression that the concerns of the University, via MHAS, were sometimes not given sufficient weight. I welcome the Inquiry's consideration of whether that was the case. If so, there

may have been contributory structural issues including an insufficiently joined-up approach between the NHS and university-based mental health advisory services (despite in this case the proactivity of MHAS), information-sharing barriers and pressures on the NHS.

Changes at the University made since VC was a student in relation to students suffering from severe mental illness

342. We have not changed the central structure of our support services in relation to supporting students who suffer from severe mental illness since VC was a student, because we consider that the structure is effective. MHAS remains the University's central service for supporting students with severe mental illness. It remains an advisory service which does not provide mental health diagnosis, assessment or treatment.

343. However, the University is constantly seeking to refine and improve all wellbeing services. In September 2022, a Wellbeing Advisory Board was established – its purpose being: to bring together expertise that can advise both Student and Campus Life and the University as a whole on matters relating to health and wellbeing. The Board's planned topics align with the themes of the University Mental Health Charter programme.

344. The University joined the University Mental Health Charter Programme in September 2022. A project manager for University Mental Health Charter development was appointed in May 2023. The Wellbeing Board was refocused as a University Mental Health Charter Steering Group in November 2023, and is chaired by the Director of Student Experience. The Steering Group oversees current provision against University Mental Health Charter principles and progress towards assessment for the University Mental Health Charter Award. Members of the University are actively engaged with national University Mental Health Charter workshops, which share good practice on topics related to the principles of the University Mental Health Charter.

345. There is continual assessment of strengths and development needs against the University Mental Health Charter principles and close liaison with our Students' Union to engage student views on the improvements that are needed. We have completed a gap analysis against the University Mental Health Charter Framework and implemented improvements. For example, we have improved communication about the University's support services and reporting systems and developed the emergency contact protocol. Current plans are to submit for award assessment in the 2026/2027 academic year.

346. There is also a pilot scheme in development within the Senior Tutor Network, which aims to move pastoral duties away from academics. The current system, which would have been in place during the relevant time period, directs students towards personal tutors as a first point of contact. The pilot approach simplifies this in creating a dedicated academic support role, the Academic Guide, who would receive appropriate training to support students effectively through their studies and collaborate closely with University support services, such as the Support and Wellbeing team. The pilot also involves an administrative role, the Student Advice Coordinator, which would act as a dedicated point of contact for directing students to the service that best suits their needs.

347. There have been some changes to the way in which MHAS operates, such as the use of a form to record initial assessment of risk [UNIN0001816, UNIN0001817]. Security use an updated risk assessment tool with linked training: it was updated in 2024 [UNIN0001809]. Some students with mental health issues are considered under the Student Cases of Concern procedure described further below.

Changes at the University since VC was a student to how it deals with students who may pose a risk to the safety of themselves or others

348. The Report and Support team now uses (since July 2023) an initial triage risk assessment for all new reports submitted through the Report and Support platform [WITN0066035]. These reports are discussed in triage meetings with

relevant areas of the University, such as the Investigation and Resolution team, ResX, the Support and Wellbeing team and the Community Engagement team, with a view to deciding which is the best area/policy and procedure to deal with the reports. The initial triage risk assessment requires, in cases where there is thought to be immediate or short-term risk, the identification of risks, how they can be mitigated and whether statutory agencies should be involved. Where there is not thought to be immediate risk, the initial triage risk assessment requires consideration of whether the Code of Conduct (Non-Academic) [WITN0066035] or Support to Study policy [UNIN0001826, UNIN0001827] should be utilised. The Report and Support team uses a more comprehensive risk assessment for the more complex cases which involve ongoing risk [WITN0066037], which is as described below where I explain the University's updated discipline process.

349. As students are increasingly presenting with complex issues which can manifest at different times and in different ways across the University, we now also have weekly meetings of a Student Cases of Concern group (in operation since 2023) that is a cross-institution, multi-disciplinary and operational group whose primary purpose is to formulate a response to concerning or challenging behaviours which may indicate underlying issues that need to be addressed [UNIN0001831]. At these meetings, information can be shared which helps to triangulate risk and prevent issues from becoming siloed.

350. Members of the group include the Associate Director (Student Wellbeing), the Head of Specialist Wellbeing Services (representing MHAS and Counselling), a ResX Manager, the Associate Director (Security), the Senior Manager for Safeguarding (previously known as the Critical Incident and Safeguarding Senior Manager), the Associate Director (Disability) and representation from colleagues in the Investigation and Resolution team. Other colleagues can be brought into meetings as required depending on the nature of a case, e.g. a senior tutor or someone from an NHS secondary care team.

351. The types of issues that might be referred to a Student Cases of Concern meeting will generally fall within the categories of mental health, physical health, safeguarding, antisocial behaviour and domestic problems. Student Cases of Concern meetings can determine what University process would be the most appropriate/beneficial way to address a case and refer into that process as required, e.g. to the Code of Discipline or Support to Study process. They can also decide whether an external referral should be made, e.g. to external mental health services or a GP.
352. The key benefit of the Student Cases of Concern system is that it brings people with different expertise around the same table to share information and determine the best way forward in a timely fashion.
353. Students who pose a risk may also be considered under the Support to Study policy. That was introduced at the start of the 2023/24 academic year [UNIN0001826, UNIN0001827]. The name change from Fitness to Study to Support to Study was a considered decision and based on the University's desire to be as supportive as it can be with its students when they are facing difficulties and ensure that, wherever possible, they are able to complete their studies and graduate from the University.
354. The Support to Study policy retains the: (i) three stage consideration of cases as set out the Fitness to Study policy, (ii) ability to ask the Registrar to suspend and/or exclude in emergency situations, specifically where at any time it is reasonably considered that a student poses an immediate and serious risk to their own health, wellbeing and/or safety of others; and(iii) return to study criteria where a student has interrupted or been suspended pursuant to the Support to Study policy. There is an additional return measure, which is that students are required to attend a return to study meeting prior to their return at which their current health, safety and wellbeing are reviewed alongside the demands of their programme in order to decide whether a return is appropriate and, if so, what support needs to be put in place.
355. In January 2025, as part of their continuous improvement activities, the

Security team introduced a new standard operating procedure to guide its staff when responding to a serious incident [UNIN0001810] which will include incidents involving risk. This sets out what steps staff should take in the event they receive information relating to a serious incident, either from a member of the University, a third party, the police or the NHS. A non-exhaustive list of serious incidents includes life-threatening injuries to students or their deaths, terrorist incidents and serious sexual assault. The procedure sets out, amongst other things, how an incident should be recorded and escalation routes.

356. We now have a SafeZone app which is being launched in the 2025/26 academic year which allows students and staff to summon help immediately, such as Security or mental health first aid. When an alert is sent, the app shares the user's location with the relevant response team.

Changes at the University since VC was a student to how it responds to reports of violent or threatening behaviour by students

357. The University's immediate response to urgent situations remains within the same structures: Security may be involved if they are needed, ResX may be involved if the incident is within a property where ResX provides services and the police may be involved if the incident requires police attention.

358. Reports about violent or threatening behaviour are sometimes made through Report and Support. As set out earlier in the statement, the Report and Support function in the University changed significantly shortly before VC left the University; from March 2022, the Senior Manager Critical Incidents and Safeguarding took over responsibility for Report and Support and a team was recruited to assist with managing reports submitted through Report and Support: a Student Wellbeing Service Manager and two Support & Wellbeing Practitioners.

359. During the course of the 2023/24 academic year, the University

conducted a detailed review of the Code of Discipline. The result of this was an overhauled policy and process called the Student Code of Conduct (non-academic) (“**SCOC**”) which came into force at the start of the 2024/25 academic year [WITN0066036].

360. The SCOC takes a more supportive and overtly multi-disciplinary approach to the issue of discipline. Wherever possible, minor matters should be resolved informally or at a lower level of the SCOC and locally, e.g. residence issues should be handled by ResX. Any cases of serious misconduct are handled centrally, with investigations conducted by the University’s Investigation and Resolution team, and a Student Misconduct Panel hearing to determine an outcome.

361. The definition of misconduct under the SCOC is different to the definition in the Code of Discipline. There is now a distinction made between misconduct and serious misconduct, to aid with deciding when issues can be considered locally versus centrally.

362. The SCOC, like the Code of Discipline, sets out a non-exhaustive list of examples of misconduct in its Appendix 1 and this contains some examples that were not in the Code of Discipline or that have been updated, e.g.:

- *“The use of physical violence, force, or power, either threatened or actual, against another person, group or community”*; and
- *“Behaviour that is intimidating, threatening, disorderly or in any way antisocial, including noise nuisance and any other behaviour that causes or is likely to cause, harassment, alarm, or distress.”*
[WITN0066036]

363. When an allegation of misconduct is made, it is required to be reported into the Report and Support platform if that has not been the mechanism used to make the allegation in the first place and then discussed in a triage meeting as described above to ascertain whether it should be handled under the

SCOC and/or a different policy and procedure, e.g. Support to Study, Fitness to Practise (which applies only to students on specified programmes that lead to a particular professional qualification, e.g. Medicine and Nursing) or Academic Misconduct (which is used to tackle allegations of plagiarism and the like). If a student presents with health-related issues and it is considered that the behaviour which is the subject of the allegations could be due to the health-related issues, it may be decided to use the Support to Study process, either alone or in conjunction with the SCOC. Allegations are assessed on a case-by-case basis to ascertain the most appropriate route(s) to take.

364. The SCOC also sets out a more structured risk assessment process to be used to decide what, if any, precautionary measures should be put in place whilst an allegation of misconduct is being considered by the University or there is police or court action underway. There is a risk assessment template [WITN0066037] and risk assessment/review meetings are held to discuss and populate the risk assessment template and update it as required. Precautionary measures can include suspension, exclusion (whether full or partial), requiring a student to move out of their halls of residence and no-contact orders. As with the Code of Discipline, the University will not normally investigate an allegation under the SCOC while it is the subject of police or court action.

365. The new Support to Study process [UNIN0001826, UNIN0001827] may also be used in relation to students who have been violent or threatening.

Changes the University made since VC was a student to training for staff

366. From the 2023/24 academic year onwards, the University began to consolidate training that was required for all members of staff and introduced a new Compliance Training Code of Practice in May 2024 [WITN0066038]. The Code of Practice sets out the University's approach to compliance training and lists the training requirements that must be completed by all University staff. This includes e-learning modules on Health and Safety Induction,

Embracing Equality, Diversity and Inclusion and Data Protection and Information Security Awareness.

367. The Compliance Training Code of Practice defines how often the training requirements must be repeated and the platform through which it is delivered keeps a record of outstanding training (including the date the training is due to be repeated if applicable) on each member of staff's profile. Email reminders are sent to staff when training is due for renewal.

368. Line managers are also able to run reports and check whether staff have completed training, or whether any topics are due for renewal. They also have overall responsibility under the Compliance Training Code of Practice to ensure that training is completed and refreshed.

369. The University also introduced a Compliance Training SharePoint page, which provides further information on the training covered by the Compliance Training Code of Practice. This includes the main mandatory training for all staff members, but also includes details of training required of staff who undertake specific roles, such as training in Consumer Protection, Recruitment and Safeguarding. Identification of what further training is applicable to certain roles is managed locally: each School and Department assesses what training is required, with input available from the relevant University areas. For some roles, training may also be arranged or completed externally.

370. Schools and Departments are responsible for the induction of new staff, with support from centrally available resources such as the Induction SharePoint pages. The University also holds bi-monthly welcome events for all new staff, which provide an overview of University values. Invitations are extended to all new staff, although attendance is voluntary.

371. In 2022, the University published a new Safeguarding Policy [WITN0066038] and the University's Safeguarding Steering Group approved a new approach to safeguarding training and appointed a Senior Manager

Critical Incidents and Safeguarding to oversee the training. All student-facing staff are required to complete the Safeguarding at University of Nottingham training, which must be repeated every 3 years. All members of staff, regardless of role, are also required to complete the Safeguarding in Higher Education and Prevent e-learning training following their induction. Training is supported by a University Safeguarding Resources page and a network of Safeguarding Leads within Faculties and Professional Service departments. Uptake on available training across the institution is also monitored by the Senior Manager for Safeguarding (previously known as the Senior Manager Critical Incidents and Safeguarding), who reports to the Safeguarding Steering Group.

372. The approach to training within the Senior Tutor Network has also evolved. From 2022 onwards, the focus of training delivered to senior and personal tutors involving welfare issues has been on boundaries, mental health awareness and effective signposting. This aims to equip relevant staff with the appropriate level of training to identify potential welfare issues effectively with the emphasis on re-directing students to the appropriate service where staff have the requisite professional training to deal with those issues (e.g. MHAS, Counselling, Disability Support, etc.)

Changes at the University since VC was a student to Multi-agency cooperation and information sharing

373. The University has been working with Nottinghamshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust to try to develop an information sharing agreement, but there is, as yet, no agreed document in place, nor is there an anticipated date when the University and the Trust expect to have this in place. The Trust has indicated to the University that it is required to have certain measures in place to ensure that patient information is kept safe and secure in line with NHS requirements. This requires completion by the University of the NHS 'Data Security and Protection Toolkit' ("DSPT") which is an online self-assessment tool that allows organisations to measure their performance against 10 specific data security standards. The University is exploring whether it does

comply with the DSPT in the context of patient information shared with MHAS and other support services. If not, this may be a barrier to completion of the agreement. There was generally close contact between MHAS and local NHS mental health services, and that has continued.

374. In 2024, a new information sharing agreement was put in place between the University and Nottinghamshire police which expands the type of information that can be shared [UNIN0001807]. Additionally, there is now a police officer on site at the University, and information-sharing with the local police force has improved.

375. In relation to information sharing with close contacts of students, the University brought in a new emergency contact protocol as described above [WITN0066019]. Between May 2022 – March 2023, the University worked with SUMS Consulting on the Suicide Safer approach, following guidance issued by UUK in 2022 [WITN0066052]. The protocol was included in the Quality Manual from March 2023. The University also developed a new Student Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy, which incorporated Suicide Safer (and University Mental Health Charter) principles [UNIN0001823].

376. The Student Wellbeing confidentiality statement was brought in around 2023 [UNIN0001812]. That statement clarifies to students the circumstances in which information will be shared with others.

Observations in relation to improvements to multi-agency working and information sharing

377. It would be beneficial to have mechanisms for national information sharing so that all the agencies like the NHS and police have standardised information sharing processes across trusts and universities. There have been discussions between the University and the local NHS Trust regarding an information sharing agreement, but that would not be a full solution, given that it would not apply to other NHS Trusts or private healthcare providers. A national system with any necessary approval by, and clear guidance from, the

Information Commissioner's Office would give all agencies confidence and would be welcome. The Inquiry may be aware that this is a national issue, and there are various local protocols in place (as set out, for example in the UUK report [WITN0066053]). The Inquiry may be aware that the University Mental Health Charter considers the complexities of this issue.

378. It would be beneficial to have closer working between the NHS and University support services, although I recognise the difficulties created by the student's right to keep health details confidential. It would be beneficial to have clarity about the respective roles of NHS community services and university support services when a student with mental health issues is in the community. The University Mental Health Charter identifies the national difficulties with the interface between the NHS and university support services.

379. The University recommends its new scheme where a police officer is embedded within the University and is on campus. Some other universities already have a similar scheme. We have found that useful in terms of improving local information sharing – but the improvement is limited to the local police force.

Observations in relation to improvements to the University or to the higher education sector generally in how they deal with acutely mentally ill students and/or students who pose a risk to the safety of others

380. A difficult area for all higher education establishments is the extent to which information about students with mental health issues should be shared within the University. I note that in statements some members of staff feel that they would have liked more information about VC's behaviour when unwell, but others say that they did not need any more information and would not want to know personal health information. There are complex considerations including data protection, breach of privacy and stigmatisation of students. I am aware that the University Mental Health Charter identifies that students may be less likely to access services if they believe that their information will

be shared with academic staff. I welcome the Chair's consideration of that issue, if appropriate.

Observations in relation to recommendations

381. The University would welcome recommendations for clear national protocols and guidance with approval from the Information Commissioner's Office to improve multi-agency information sharing and working and intra-University information sharing in the mental health arena.

382. The University would welcome a recommendation that there is clear national guidance about the role of universities in supporting students with mental health issues, given the many different expectations about that role.

383. Where any recommendations require university work, the Chair is asked to recommend that funding is made available for that work, as the financial straits of many universities currently makes it difficult for new programmes of activity to be undertaken.

Statement of Truth

I believe the content of this statement to be true. I understand that proceedings may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief of its truth.

Signed: _____

GRO-B

Dated: 19th November 2025_____

Index to First Witness Statement of Katherine Linehan

No.	URN	Document Description
1.	WITN0066002	Charter of Incorporation, dated 10 July 2019, The University of Nottingham
2.	WITN0066026	The University of Nottingham Ordinances, 26 November 2019
3.	WITN0066039	Statutes of the University, The University of Nottingham
4.	WITN0066040	UK Parliament - Hansard, Re: Higher Education Students: Statutory Duty of Care
5.	WITN0066041	UK Government and Parliament Petition Re: Create statutory legal duty of care for students in Higher Education
6.	WITN0066042	Universities UK parliamentary briefing, Re: Petition for debate: Creating a statutory legal duty of care for students in Higher Education
7.	WITN0066043	Briefing, Re: Ministerial Announcement of a Higher Education Mental Health Implementation Taskforce to oversee package of new measures
8.	WITN0066044	Higher education mental health implementation taskforce terms of reference, the Department for Education
9.	WITN0066045	Report dated 01/12/2024, compiled by the Department for Education, Re: HE Mental Health Implementation Taskforce - second stage report
10.	WITN0066003	The University Mental Health Charter, Hughes, G. & Spanner, L, Student Minds, 2019
11.	WITN0066046	The University Mental Health Charter, Hughes, G. & Spanner, L, Student Minds, 2024
12.	WITN0066004	Quality Manual: Role and responsibilities of Senior Tutors, The University of Nottingham

No.	URN	Document Description
13.	WITN0066005	Quality Manual: Personal tutoring, The University of Nottingham
14.	UNIN0001820	Policy guidance, re: Identifying and responding to students in difficulty - A guidance for staff
15.	WITN0066006	Mental Health Advisor Role Profile, 2020, The University of Nottingham
16.	UNIN0001811	Guidance, re: Mental Health Advisory Service - Information for Referrers - Frequently Asked Questions, by University of Nottingham & Mental Health Advisory Service, Cripps Health Centre
17.	WITN0066047	Policy document Re: The University Counselling Service Privacy Notice, The University of Nottingham
18.	UNIN0001824	Policy document, re: Fitness to Study Policy, by Quality and Standards Committee/Campus Life Division
19.	UNIN0001828	Policy document, re: Quality Manual - Students required to withdraw on grounds of health and safety, by University of Nottingham
20.	WITN0066007	Quality Manual: Students required to withdraw on grounds of health and safety, 29/06/2020 version, The University of Nottingham
21.	WITN0066008	Policy Document, Re: Safeguarding Policy V3, The University of Nottingham
22.	WITN0066009	Policy Document, Re: Safeguarding Policy V3.1, The University of Nottingham
23.	WITN0066010	Code of Discipline for Students, June 2017, The University of Nottingham
24.	WITN0066011	Code of Discipline for Students, revised 01 January 2020, The University of Nottingham

No.	URN	Document Description
25.	WITN0066012	Code of Discipline for Students, revised August 2021, The University of Nottingham
26.	UNIN0001808	Report dated 25/07/2017 compiled by Neil Everest, re: Risk Assessment Form - Security Operations - Mental Health Issues
27.	UNIN0001809	Master Risk Assessment Form of Estate Office - Security Services: Mental Health concerns, University of Nottingham
28.	UNIN0001829	Report dated 01/06/2015, compiled by NPF, Re: INFORMATION SHARING AGREEMENT (ISA) BETWEEN NOTTINGHAMSHIRE POLICE AND UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM
29.	UNIN0001807	Policy document Re: Information Sharing Agreement between: The Chief Constable of Nottinghamshire Police and University of Nottingham, Tracy Landon, UoN
30.	WITN0066013	Guidance, Re: Safeguarding of Children and Adults at Risk, February 2018, The University of Nottingham
31.	WITN0066014	Guidance, Re: Safeguarding of Children and Adults at Risk, April 2019, The University of Nottingham
32.	WITN0066015	Quality Manual: The scope of student support, development and personal tutoring, The University of Nottingham
33.	WITN0066016	Quality Manual: Induction and tutoring statements, The University of Nottingham
34.	WITN0066048	Report dated 01/12/2019, compiled by The University of Nottingham, Re: Supporting students from diverse backgrounds - Awareness guide for personal tutors

No.	URN	Document Description
35.	UNIN0001812	Policy guidance, re: Student wellbeing confidentiality statement, University of Nottingham
36.	WITN0066017	FAQ for Family and Friends: Information for parents and supporters, The University of Nottingham
37.	WITN0066018	Policy Document, Re: Student Services: Policy on Communications with Third Parties, The University of Nottingham
38.	WITN0066019	Quality Manual: Emergency contact protocol, The University of Nottingham
39.	WITN0066020	Policy Document, Re: Data Protection Policy, The University of Nottingham, April 2018
40.	WITN0066021	Policy Document, Re: Data Protection Policy V2, The University of Nottingham, February 2024
41.	WITN0066022	Policy Document, Re: Privacy Information for Students and Applicants, The University of Nottingham
42.	WITN0066049	Policy Document, Re: The law & collecting criminal records data, Unlock
43.	WITN0066050	Guidance Document Re: People criminal convictions, Office for Students
44.	WITN0066023	Policy Document, Re: Student Complaint Procedure, July 2021
45.	WITN0066024	Policy Document, Re: Student Complaints Policy, July 2021
46.	WITN0066025	Policy Document, Re: Student Complaints Code of Practice, The University of Nottingham
47.	UNIN0001825	Policy document, re: Fitness to Study Policy, by Quality and Standards Committee/Campus Life Division

No.	URN	Document Description
48.	UNIN0001826	Policy document, re: Support to Study Policy (Formerly Fitness to Study), by University of Nottingham
49.	UNIN0001827	Policy document, re: Support to Study Procedure (UNUK), by University of Nottingham
50.	WITN0066027	Policy Document, Re: Extenuating Circumstances Procedure, 20222023
51.	WITN0066028	Policy Document, Re: Policy on Circumstances Affecting Students Ability to Study and Complete Assessments, 2022-2023
52.	WITN0066029	Quality Manual: Voluntary interruption of study, The University of Nottingham, 21-08-2020 version
53.	WITN0066030	Quality Manual: Voluntary interruption of study, The University of Nottingham, 05-03-2021 version
54.	WITN0066031	Quality Manual: Voluntary interruption of study, The University of Nottingham, 10-11-2021 version
55.	UNIN0000231	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Donald Giddings Re: Transfer to MEng
56.	UNIN0001339	Request To Transfer Taught Course of VC
57.	UNIN0001633	Email from Alastair Campbell Ritchie [UNIN] to Students, re: MMME4085 Group Design and Make - 2019/2020 Coronavirus Mitigation
58.	UNIN0000966	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Alastair Campbell Ritchie (UoN) and Donald Giddings (UoN), re: Regarding Valdo's illness
59.	UNIN0001758	Email from Alastair Campbell Ritchie [UNIN] to VC and Donald Giddings [UNIN], re: Regarding Valdo's Illness
60.	UNIN0000070	Email from Donald Giddings to Emma Barney, re: Valdo Mendes Calocane

No.	URN	Document Description
61.	UNIN0000691	Notes: Messages between Donald Giddings to Emma Barney on 01/06/2020
62.	UNIN0000781	Email from Donald Giddings (UON) to Alistair Campbell Ritchie (UON), re: Regarding Valdo's illness
63.	UNIN0001206	Email from Donald Giddings [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Valdo's illness
64.	UNIN0001314	Email from SS-EC [UON] to SS-ECUPE [UON], re: FW: EC Submission – relates to a form completed by VC in relation to non-submission of coursework/ absence from assessment
65.	UNIN0001212	Email from Donald Giddings [UNIN] to Kishen Rengaraj [UNIN], re: an EC to expect
66.	UNIN0001342	Email from Kishen Rengaraj [UON] to Donald Giddings [UON], Re: an EC to expect - VC
67.	UNIN0000368	Email from SS-Welfare-Engineering [University of Nottingham] to Donald Giddings [University of Nottingham] Re: Valdo Mendes Calocane
68.	UNIN0000801	Email from SS Welfare Engineering (UON) to Claire Thompson (UON), re: FW: Valdo's illness
69.	UNIN0000612	Screenshot of Email from Eleanor Cullen [NOCC] to Celeste Mendes re: FW: Nearest Relative Factsheet
70.	UNIN0000140	Email from Claire Thompson (UON) to SS Welfare Engineering (UON) and MH Support (UON), re: Valdo's illness
71.	UNIN0000734	Notes compiled by MHAS re: Valdo Mendes Calocane
72.	UNIN0000595	Email from Donald Giddings [UNIN] to SS Welfare Engineering [UNIN], re: Valdo Mendes Calocane

No.	URN	Document Description
73.	UNIN0001593	Email from Donald Giddings [UNIN] to Emma Barney [UNIN], Kishen Rengaraj [UNIN], Alastair Campbell Ritchie [UNIN], re: Valdo – Caution because of GDPR
74.	UNIN0001161	Email from Kishen Rengaraj [UON] to Donald Giddings [UON], Emma Barney [UON], Alastair Campbell Ritchie [UON] and others, re: RE: Valdo - Caution because of GDPR
75.	UNIN0000881	Email from Eleanor Turner (UoN) to Jamie Dickinson (UoN), re: Re: Student V.C ID: 10351712
76.	NHSE0000298	Report dated January 2025, compiled by Theemis Consulting Ltd, Re: Independent investigation into the care and treatment provided to VC
77.	UNIN0001803	Email from Jamie Dickinson [UoN] to Eleanor Turner [UoN], re: RE: Student V.C ID: 10351712
78.	UNIN0000639	Email from Stuart Croy (UON) to Jez Shaw (UON), Re: FW: Concern
79.	UNIN0001747	Email from Stuart Croy [UNIN] to Eleanor Turner [UNIN], re: FW: Concerns
80.	UNIN0000614	Report dated 27/03/20 compiled by [unknown], re: Duty Report from 27.03.20
81.	UNIN0000620	Email from Eleanor Turner (UoN) to Stuart Croy (UoN), Claire Thompson (UoN) and Catherine Gent (UoN), Re: Concern
82.	UNIN0000069	Email from SS-Welfare-Engineering to Emma Barney and Catherine Gent, re: Student query – VC 14308023
83.	UNIN0000840	Email from SS-EC-UPE to Valdo Mendes Calocane, Benjamin Rothwell (UoN), Stephen Pickering (UoN) and others, re: EC outcome - Valdo Mendes Calocane

No.	URN	Document Description
84.	UNIN0000952	Email from Emma Barney [UNIN] to SS Welfare Engineering, Kishen Rengaraj [UNIN], Jon Mckechnie [UNIN] and others, RE: Student query - C 14308023
85.	UNIN0000350	Email from Kishen Rengaraj (UON) to Emma Barney (UON) and Jon Mckechnie (UON), re: RE: Student query – VC 14308023
86.	UNIN0000991	Email from Jon Mckechnie [UNIN] to Emma Barney, SS-Welfare-Engineering [UNIN], Kishen Rengaraj [UNIN] and others, re: RE: Student query - VC 14308023
87.	UNIN0001007	Email from Emma Barney [UNIN] to Ben Perrett [UNIN], re: FW: Student query - VC 14308023
88.	UNIN0000304	Email from Eleanor Turner [UNIN] to Catherine Gent [UNIN] and Claire Thompson [UNIN] Re: Fw: Query
89.	UNIN0001200	Email from Eleanor Turner [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane and Abigail Parsonage [NHFT], re: Following your discharge
90.	UNIN0000778	Email from Eleanor Turner (UON) to SS Welfare Engineering (UON), re: Student V.C 10351712
91.	UNIN0000059	Email from Paige Smith [UNIN] to Ben Perrett [UNIN] and Claire Newbury [UNIN], re: Handover Notes
92.	UNIN0000924	Notes on cases relating to students by [unknown] re: Handover Notes
93.	UNIN0001429	Email from David Hann [UNIN] to EZ Eng Teaching Support Team [UNIN], Samantha Woodhams [UNIN], Emma Barney [UNIN] and others, re: Project Section 25-9
94.	UNIN0000887	Email from Valdo Mendes to Stewart Mcwilliam [UNIN], re: Meeting

No.	URN	Document Description
95.	UNIN0000834	Email from Stewart McWilliam (UON) to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Meeting
96.	UNIN0001835	Notes of UoN's staff and system's interactions with Valdo Calocane
97.	UNIN0001767	Email from Stewart McWilliam [University of Nottingham] to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Valdo/Stewart
98.	UNIN0001779	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Atanas Popov [UNIN], re: Design Project Meeting
99.	UNIN0001250	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Atanas Popov [UNIN], re: Design Project Meeting
100.	UNIN0000380	Email from Atanas Popov [University of Nottingham] to Valdo Mendes Calocane [University of Nottingham] Re: project meeting
101.	UNIN0001075	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Atanas Popov [UNIN], re: Meeting
102.	UNIN0000942	Email from Atanas Popov (UoN) to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Re: Meeting
103.	UNIN0001153	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Atanas Popov [UNIN], re: Rescheduling of meeting
104.	UNIN0001588	Email from Atanas Popov [University of Nottingham] to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: rescheduling meeting
105.	UNIN0000521	Email from Atanas Popov to Valdo Mendes Calocane and Stewart McWilliam Re: project meetings
106.	UNIN0001586	Teams conversation between Stewart McWilliam and Unknown user (VC) 07/11/2020 - 14/03/2022
107.	UNIN0001286	Email from Stewart McWilliam [UoN] to Emma Barney [UoN], re: Valdo Mendes Calocane

No.	URN	Document Description
108.	UNIN0000492	Email from Emma Barney (UoN) to Samanta Piano (UoN) Re: FW: Valdo Mendes Calocane
109.	UNIN0001306	Email from Stewart McWilliam (UON) to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Senior Tutor – Voluntary Interruption of Studies
110.	UNIN0000067	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Emma Barney and Eleanor Turner re: Voluntary Interruption of Study
111.	UNIN0001685	Email from Samantha Piano [University of Nottingham] to Emma Barney [University of Nottingham] and Stewart Mcwilliam [University of Nottingham], re: Valdo Mendes Calocane
112.	UNIN0000217	Email from Emma Barney [UoN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane and Eleanor Turner [UoN] Re: Voluntary Interruption of Study
113.	UNIN0001219	Email from Emma Barney [UON] to Samanta Piano [UON] and Stewart Mcwilliam [UON], re: Re: Valdo Mendes Calocane
114.	UNIN0000816	Email from Stewart Mcwilliam (UON) to Samanta Piano (UON) and Emma Barney (UON), Re: Valdo Mendes Calocane
115.	UNIN0000504	Email from Samanta Piano to Stewart Mcwilliam and Emma Barney Re: Valdo Mendes Calocane
116.	UNIN0001251	Email from Samantha Piano [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: meeting
117.	UNIN0000226	Email from Samanta Piano [UoN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane Re: Meeting
118.	UNIN0001489	Email from Samanta Piano [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Meeting
119.	UNIN0001650	Microsoft Teams chat between Samanta Piano and Unknown User (likely Valdo Calocane) re: Meeting

No.	URN	Document Description
120.	UNIN0000908	Email from Samantha Piano [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane, Stewart McWilliam [UNIN] and Emma Barney [UNIN], Re: Voluntary interruption of study
121.	UNIN0000772	Request to interrupt study taught programmes - UK campus form, completed by Valdo Calocane dated 10/11/2020, University of Nottingham
122.	UNIN0001579	Teams discussion of VC with Stewart McWilliams, University of Nottingham
123.	UNIN0000342	Email from Stewart McWilliam (UON) to Atanas Popov (UON), re: Valdo
124.	UNIN0000299	Email from Emma Barney [UNIN] to David Hann [UNIN], Benjamin Rothwell [UNIN], Chantal Cappellett [UNIN] and others Re: Touching base and a request for information
125.	UNIN0001293	Email from Emma Barney to Valdo Calocane, re: Your academic place in M3 at the University of Nottingham for 21-22
126.	UNIN0001012	Email from Valdo Calocane to Emma Barney [UoN], re: Re: Your academic place in M3 at the University of Nottingham or 21-22
127.	UNIN0001357	Email from Emma Barney (UNIN) to Valdo Calocane, David Hann (UNIN) and Stewart McWilliam (UNIN), re: Your academic place in M3 at the University of Nottingham for 21-22
128.	UNIN0000204	Email from Stewart McWilliam to Valdo Mendes Calocane Re: Tutor meeting
129.	UNIN0000596	Email from Stewart McWilliam [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane re: tutor meeting
130.	UNIN0000920	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Emma Barney (UNIN), re: BEng Qualification

No.	URN	Document Description
131.	UNIN0001150	Email from Emma Barney [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane [UNIN] and Alastair Campbell Ritchie, re: BEng Qualification
132.	UNIN0000293	Email from Alastair Campbell Ritchie [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane and Emma Barney [UNIN], Re: BEng qualification
133.	UNIN0000689	Report dated [unknown] compiled by Alan Smithees, re: MME3073 Individual Project Report Submission - Biomimetic Propulsion System
134.	UNIN0001438	Report dated 01/05/2021, compiled by Dr Alastair Cambell Ritchie (UON), re: MMME3073 Individual Report
135.	UNIN0000768	Report dated [unknown] compiled by [GRO-B], re: MMME3073 Individual project report
136.	UNIN0001522	Email from Valdo Calocane to David Hann [UNIN], re: Project Sign up
137.	UNIN0000365	Email from David Hann [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane and James Rouse [UNIN] Re: Project Sign Up
138.	UNIN0000104	Email from James Rouse [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: MEng Project Meeting
139.	UNIN0001469	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to James Rouse [UNIN], re: MEng Project Meeting
140.	UNIN0000982	Email from Stewart Mcwilliam to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Valdo
141.	UNIN0000627	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Stewart Mcwilliam (UoN), re: Accepted: Valdo
142.	UNIN0000111	Email from James Rouse [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: project meeting
143.	UNIN0001005	Email from James Rouse [UNIN] to Stewart Mcwilliam [UNIN], re: Project Student - VC

No.	URN	Document Description
144.	UNIN0001079	Email from Stewart Mcwilliam [UNIN] to James Rouse [UNIN], re: Project Student - Valdo Mendes Calocane
145.	UNIN0001214	Email from Stewart Mcwilliam [UNIN] to VC, re: Valdo/Stewart
146.	UNIN0001093	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Stewart Mcwilliam, re: Accepted: Valdo/Stewart
147.	UNIN0001596	Email from Ian Maskery [UNIN] to James Rouse [UNIN], re: MEng projects - moderation
148.	UNIN0001776	Email from James Rouse [UNIN] to Ian Maskery [UNIN], re: MEng projects – Moderation
149.	UNIN0001064	Email from James Rouse [UoN] to Ian Maskery [UoN], re: Re: MEng projects – moderation
150.	UNIN0001541	Email from James Rouse [UNIN] to David Hann [UNIN], re: MMME4086 Project Marks - James Rouse
151.	UNIN0000263	Email from David Hann [UON] to Tao Yang [UON] , Donald Giddings [UON] , Emma Barney [UON] and others Re: not submitted project
152.	UNIN0000732	Email from Jamie Dickinson (UON) to ResX (UON) and Christopher Hoskins (UON), re: FW: Assault at Raleigh Park
153.	UNIN0000157	Report dated 17/01/2022, compiled by Claire Thompson University of Nottingham, Re: Critical Incident Record of Valdo Calocane
154.	UNIN0000362	Report dated 17/01/2022, compiled by compiled by Claire Thompson and contributed to by Jasmine Hickman, University of Nottingham Re: Report 313 Assault
155.	UNIN0001804	Notes Re: Handwritten notes made by Claire Thompson (Associate Director, Student Wellbeing,

No.	URN	Document Description
		UoN) re: Calls made with various people including students and UoN staff in relation to VC.
156.	UNIN0000260	Email from Claire Thompson [UNIN] to ResX [UNIN] Re: Raleigh Park
157.	UNIN0000938	Email from Claire Thompson [UNIN] to Eleanor Turner [UNIN], re: referral regarding a report relating to Valdo Calocane
158.	UNIN0000033	MHAS Duty Log September 2021 - October 2022
159.	UNIN0000525	Email from Stewart Mcwilliam to Donald Giddings Re: Valdo Mendes Calocane
160.	UNIN0001033	Email from Christopher Hoskin [UON] to Eleanor Turner [UON], re: RE: Incident
161.	UNIN0001483	Email from Rebecca Patterson [Derwent Students] to Christopher Hoskin [UNIN] and Tony Lewis [Derwent Students], re: Flat 15 Madison Court - Raleigh Park
162.	UNIN0000183	Email from Christopher Hoskins [University of Nottingham] to Eleanor Turner [University of Nottingham] Re: Incident
163.	UNIN0001202	Email from Eleanor Turner [UNIN] to Christopher Hoskins [UNIN] re: Incident
164.	UNIN0001680	Email from Rebecca Patterson [UNIN] to Christopher Hoskin [UNIN], re: RE: Flat 15 Madison Court - Raleigh Park
165.	UNIN0000381	Report dated [Unknown Date], compiled by University of Nottingham, Re: Valdo Calocane Incident
166.	UNIN0001476	Email from Eleanor Turner [UNIN] to Abigail Parsonage [NHFT], re: referral
167.	UNIN0000125	Email from Eleanor Turner to Christopher Hoskins, Re: MHAS email - VC no longer a student - 26/4/22

No.	URN	Document Description
168.	UNIN0001311	Email from Eleanor Turner (UON) to Mark Davis (UON), Claire Thompson (UON) and Christopher Hoskins (UON), re: University of Nottingham Security
169.	UNIN0001485	Email from Eleanor Turner [UNIN] to Mark Davis [UNIN], Claire Thompson [UNIN] and Christopher Hoskins [UNIN], re: Re: University of Nottingham Security
170.	UNIN0001528	Email from Christopher Hoskins [UNIN] to Eleanor Turner [UNIN], Mark Davis [UNIN] and Claire Thompson [UNIN], Re: University of Nottingham Security
171.	UNIN0000152	Email from Kirsteen Coupar [UNIN] to Claire Thompson [UNIN] re: Raleigh Park
172.	UNIN0000401	Email from Claire Thompson (UoN) to SS-Sup-Engineering (UoN) Re: student progress check
173.	UNIN0000351	Email from SS-Sup-Engineering [UON] to Stewart McWilliam [UON] and Emma Barney [UON], Re: Student progress check
174.	UNIN0001805	Photographs of MS Teams Screenshot (taken 1/8/25) – Valdo Calocane Message Fragments
175.	UNIN0000386	Email from Stewart McWilliam [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane Re: HNY
176.	UNIN0001605	Email from Stewart McWilliam [UNIN] to SS-Sup-Engineering [UNIN], Emma Barney [UNIN], James Rouse [UNIN] and others, re: Re: Student progress check
177.	UNIN0000385	Email from Antonino La Rocca [University of Nottingham] to Stewart McWilliam [University of Nottingham], SS-Sup-Engineering [University of Nottingham], Emma Barney [University of Nottingham]

No.	URN	Document Description
178.	UNIN0000456	Email from SS Sup Engineering to Claire Thompson [UNIN], re: Student progress check
179.	UNIN0001641	Email from SS-Sup-Engineering [UNIN] to Claire Thompson [UNIN] and Eleanor Turner [UNIN], re: RE: Student progress check
180.	UNIN0001610	Messages between Eleanor Turner [UNIN] and Stewart McWilliam [UNIN], re: VC
181.	UNIN0001514	Email from Stewart McWilliam [UNIN] to James Rouse [UNIN], re: Project Meeting
182.	UNIN0000806	Email from James Rouse (UON) to Stewart McWilliam (UON), re: Project meeting
183.	UNIN0001745	Email from SS-Sup-Engineering (UON) to Emma Barney (UON), James Rouse (UON), Antonio La Rocco (UON) and another, re: FW: Student V.C ID 14308023
184.	UNIN0000318	Email from Christopher Hoskins [UNIN] to [Unknown Recipient] Re: Flat 15 Update
185.	UNIN0001304	Email from Tony Lewis (Derwent students) to Rebecca Patterson (Derwent students) and Christopher Hoskins (UON), Re: RE: Flat 15 Valdo Update
186.	UNIN0001830	Email from Raleigh Park to Student, Re: Flat 15 Madison Court
187.	UNIN0000926	Email from Eleanor Turner (UoN) to Stewart McWilliam (UoN), re: Update
188.	UNIN0000796	Email to Stewart McWilliam (UON) to Eleanor Turner (UON), re: Update
189.	UNIN0001473	Email from Atanas Popov [UNIN] to Stewart McWilliam [UNIN], re: your tutee
190.	UNIN0001094	Email from Stewart McWilliam [UNIN] to Atanas Popov [UNIN], re: Re: Your tutee

No.	URN	Document Description
191.	UNIN0000404	Email from Eleanor Turner (UoN) to Stewart Mcwilliam (UoN) Re: Update
192.	UNIN0001682	Email from James Rouse [UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Student Individual Project
193.	UNIN0000449	Note By UoN Re: correspondence between Stewart Mcwilliam [UoN] to Donald Giddings Re: meeting scheduled with Valdo.
194.	UNIN0001149	Email from Donald Giddings [UNIN] to Michael Clifford [UNIN], re: Valdo Calocane marks for mmme4052
195.	UNIN0001570	Email from Donald Giddings [UoN] to Antonino La Rocca [UoN], re: Valdo Calocane Marks breakdown for mmme4066
196.	UNIN0001463	Email from Donald Giddings [UON] to Simon Lawes [UON], re: Valdo Calocane marks breakdown for mmme3074
197.	UNIN0000471	Email from Donald Giddings (UoN) to Seamus Garvey Re: Valdo Calocane marks breakdown for mmme4056
198.	UNIN0001011	Email form Donald Giddings [UoN] to David Hann [UoN], re: Valdo Calocne marks breakdown for mmme4086
199.	UNIN0001727	Email from Simon Lawes [University of Nottingham] to Donald Giddings [University of Nottingham], re: Re: Valdo Calocane marks breakdown for mmme3074
200.	UNIN0001032	Email from Michael Clifford [UNIN] to Donald Giddings [UNIN], re: Valdo Calocane marks for mmme4052
201.	UNIN0000484	Email from Donald Giddings (UoN) to Simon Lawes (UoN) Re: Valdo Calocane marks breakdown for mmme3074

No.	URN	Document Description
202.	UNIN0001484	Email from Donald Giddings [UNIN] to Michael Clifford [UNIN], re: Valdo Calocane marks for mmme4052
203.	UNIN0001535	Email from Michael Clifford [UNIN] to Donald Giddings [UNIN], re: Valdo Calocane marks for mme4052
204.	UNIN0001444	Email from Donald Giddings [UNIN] to Michael Clifford [UNIN], re: Valdo Calocane marks for mmme4052
205.	UNIN0001583	Email from Donald Giddings [UNIN] to Stewart Mcwilliam [UNIN], re: Valdo
206.	UNIN0000598	Email from Donald Giddings to Stewart Mcwilliam, re: Re: Valdo
207.	UNIN0000407	Email from David Hann (UoN) to Donald Giddings (UoN) Re: Valdo Calocane marks breakdown for mmme4086
208.	UNIN0000129	Email from Donald Giddings (UON) to Stewart McWilliam (UON), re: Re: Valdo
209.	UNIN0001411	Email Appointment (Microsoft teams meeting) from Stewart McWilliam [UON] to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Valdo/Stewart
210.	UNIN0001179	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Stewart Mcwilliam, re: Accepted: Valdo / Stewart
211.	UNIN0001449	Email from Stewart Mcwilliam (UNIN) to Emma Barney (UNIN), Donald Giddings (UNIN) and James Rouse (UNIN), re: Valdo Calocane
212.	UNIN0001014	Email from Stewart Mcwilliam [UoN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Valdo/Stewart
213.	UNIN0001452	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocaneto Donald Giddings [UON], re: EC Process
214.	UNIN0000386	Email from Stewart Mcwilliam

No.	URN	Document Description
		[UNIN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane Re: HNY
215.	UNIN0000377	Email from Stewart McWilliam [University of Nottingham] to Emma Barney [University of Nottingham], Donald Giddings [University of Nottingham] and James Rouse [University of Nottingham] Re: Valdo Calocane
216.	UNIN0000616	Email from Donald Giddings [UoN] to Valdo Mendes Calocane and Stewart McWilliam [UoN], re: transferring to BEng and completing the programme
217.	UNIN0001661	Request to Transfer Taught Course Form, University of Nottingham, partially completed
218.	UNIN0000109	Report dated 01/04/2016, compiled by Prof Arthur Jones, RE: MME3073/MM3IPR Individual project report
219.	UNIN0001296	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Donald Giddings (UON), re: transferring to BEng and completing the course
220.	UNIN0000305	Email from Donald Giddings [UNIN] to SS- Programmes-Eng [UNIN], Valdo Mendes Calocane, Stewart McWilliam [UNIN] and others Re: change of taught course for Valdo Mendes Calocane
221.	UNIN0000084	REQUEST TO TRANSFER TAUGHT COURSE form of the University of Nottingham completed by VC
222.	UNIN0001801	Email from Debbie Keown [UoN] to Christopher GRO-B [UoN] and Chris Mark GRO-B re: Support from ResX following incident last night
223.	UNIN0001066	Email from Ansumana Dibba [Derwent Students] to Tony Lewis [Derwent Students] and Res X [UNIN], re: Former Madison 15D back on site

No.	URN	Document Description
224.	UNIN0001354	Email from Christopher Hoskins (UNIN) to Eleanor Turner (UNIN), re: V.C
225.	UNIN0000633	Email from Eleanor Turner (UNIN) to Claudia Birtles (NUHT) and Gary Carter (NUHT), re: V.M.C
226.	WITN0066051	Guidance Document Re: Sharing personal data in an emergency - a guide for universities and colleges, Information Commissioner's Office
227.	UNIN0000275	E mail from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Donald Giddings (UoN) Re: transferring to BEng and completing the programme
228.	UNIN0001119	Email from Donald Giddings (UNIN) to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Transferring to BEng and completing the programme
229.	UNIN0001497	Email from Stewart McWilliam [UON] to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Final Bits
230.	UNIN0001493	Letter from Stewart McWilliam to Whom it may concern, re: Re: Valdo Calocane
231.	UNIN0000635	Email from Donald Giddings (UON) to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: transferring to BEng and completing the programme
232.	UNIN0000258	Letter from Dr Donald Giddings [UNIN] to Whom It May Concern Re: Valdo Mendes Calocane, academic reference
233.	UNIN0001405	Email from Valdo Mendes Calocane to Alistair Campbell Ritchie (UON), re: MMME3073 Individual Report
234.	UNIN0000048	Email from Alastair Campbell Ritchie to Valdo Mendes Calocane, Stewart McWilliam, Chantal Cappelletti and others, re: Re: MMME3073
235.	UNIN0000497	Email from EZ Assess to Jon Mckechnie, Stewart McWilliam and Alastair Campbell Ritchie Re: MMME3073

No.	URN	Document Description
236.	UNIN0000748	Email from Stewart McWilliam (UON) to Valdo Mendes Calocane, re: Bluecastle
237.	WITN0066032	Valdo Calocane's University of Nottingham Library Access from 01/10/2017 to 15/06/2022
238.	WITN0066033	Screenshot of Valdo Calocane's last access via student card from 25/09/2017 to 17/06/2022
239.	WITN0066034	Email from Christopher Benedict, University of Nottingham to Valdo Calocane, re: Enquiry Regarding Academic Transcript
240.	UNIN0001652	Report dated 18/01/2022, compiled by Ellie, Re: Summary of MHAS Duty Contact with Valdo Calocane 2020 – 2022
241.	UNIN0001816	BLANK Referral to Mental Health Advisory Service Form, University of Nottingham
242.	UNIN0001817	Screenshots of Student Wellbeing Referral Form (24-25) for Valdo Calocane
243.	WITN0066035	Initial Triage Assessment Form, The University of Nottingham, Updated 15 May 2025
244.	WITN0066036	Student Code of Conduct (NonAcademic), The University of Nottingham
245.	WITN0066037	Risk Assessment Template: Student Code of Conduct (Non-Academic) Risk Assessment, The University of Nottingham
246.	UNIN0001831	Policy document, re: Student Cases of Concern Meeting - Terms of Reference, by University of Nottingham
247.	UNIN0001810	Guidance, re: Mental Health Advisory Service - Information for Referrers - Frequently Asked Questions, by University of Nottingham & Mental Health Advisory Service, Cripps Health Centre

No.	URN	Document Description
248.	WITN0066038	Policy Document, Re: Compliance Training Code of Practice V2, The University of Nottingham, 01/05/2025
249.	WITN0066052	Report dated 01/10/2022, compiled by Universities UK, Suicide-safer university: sharing information with trusted contacts
250.	UNIN0001823	Policy document, re: Student Mental Health and Wellbeing Strategy, by The Wellbeing Team - University of Nottingham
251.	WITN0066053	Report dated 01/07/2022, compiled by Universities UK, Re: NHS-university partnerships: Working together for student mental health