

Academic Reasonable Adjustments Forum, May 7th 2019 *Summary of Findings*

Introduction	1
Discussion 1: Issues Arising in Case Studies	4
Discussion 2: Suggested Solutions and Next Steps	6
Proposed Table of Actions	10
Appendix: Case Studies	11

Introduction

In Lent term 2019, the CUSU Disabled Students' Officer and Education Officer 2018-19 published a report, [‘Substantial Disadvantage’: Reviewing the Implementation of Disabled Students’ Academic Adjustments at the University of Cambridge.](#) This report reviewed the data collected from two surveys created and disseminated by CUSU and the GU during the second half of 2018, concluding, among other things, that while the process of obtaining examination adjustments works fairly well across the board, reasonable adjustments for disabled students in non-assessment teaching and learning are much more variable and deserve urgent attention. The report made a number of recommendations, with the Academic Reasonable Adjustments Forum on May 7th arising from Recommendation 4:

Recommendation 4: An immediate focus on overhauling the existing devolved/individualised model of implementation of academic reasonable adjustments, and investigating ways in which this can be systematised across the collegiate University in the immediate short term. Comparing data of student experience of reasonable adjustments in teaching throughout the year with that of examination adjustments, both at application/initiation and at implementation level, leads to the clear conclusion that a more systematised model of RAs in teaching is urgently necessary. The general move away from an individualised model of adjustments for disabled students towards a more holistic inclusive teaching and learning model will alleviate pressure

in the long term, but short term solutions are needed to ensure that current and incoming disabled students are being provided for in line with legal duty.

The Forum, held in the Fisher Building at St John's College, saw around fifty attendees, ranging from Senior Tutors and various other college tutorial staff, to Directors of Teaching and other academic staff, with representatives from the Disability Resource Centre, Cambridge Centre for Teaching and Learning, Education Quality and Policy Office, and Students' Unions' Advice Service also in attendance. Attendees were split into six groups, each table being facilitated by a current or incoming CUSU/GU sabbatical officer.

After introductions by the CUSU Disabled Students' Officer and Education Officer, and by the Head of the Disability Resource Centre, attendees were first asked to consider what issues currently arise that impede the implementation of disabled students' academic adjustments. Each table was given one of six case studies (see Appendix 1), created by CUSU and SUAS based on real student experiences, to provide their discussions with a collective jumping-off point. The groups then fed back the issues they had pinpointed in their case study to the wider group (see Discussion 1).

After an access break, the CUSU Disabled Students' Officer then gave the room a brief breakdown of the findings of the 'Substantial Disadvantage' report, in particular comparing the tables on page 13 and 16 of the report, which underline the difference in student experience between examination adjustments (an overall net positive experience of +62.5 on a scale of -100 to +100) and other academic adjustments (an overall net negative experience of -4 on a scale of -100 to +100). This served in particular to highlight that the issues with academic adjustments not related to examination underlined in Discussion 1 are more the norm than the exception, and will likely be familiar to most, if not all, disabled students.

Each group was now asked to consider the following three questions, using the report and their case studies as a starting point:

1. How could teaching and/or support staff be better supported in putting students' academic reasonable adjustments in place?
2. What processes might exist – or what existing processes might be utilised, and how – that would clarify responsibility and accountability, to ensure that failures to provide adjustments are correctly addressed and mitigated?
3. On a wider level, how might academic reasonable adjustments for disabled students be managed in a way that would address the 'consistent inconsistency' shown in the report? What might a functional and effective system of adjustment provision look like?

The answers to these questions were again fed back collectively, and have been collected and organised thematically here (see Discussion 2). From this basis, a proposed Table of

Actions has also been drawn up, outlining whose remit each of the suggestions might fall under, and at what stage they might occur (including details of work already ongoing). A significant number of suggested next steps are not considered to fit neatly within the remit or resource of any existing body within the University. These have therefore been assigned in the Table of Actions to the Academic Reasonable Adjustments Working Group proposed by Recommendation 5 of the report:

Recommendation 5: The creation of a Reasonable Adjustments Working Group at University level, reporting to the General Board's Education Committee, to take forward & implement recommendations arising from the Reasonable Adjustments Forum, and bridge the institutional gap in responsibility between the immediate short term future & longer term goals re: inclusive teaching and learning practices.

As already demonstrated, an immediate investigation into the short-term systematisation of reasonable adjustments – with a view to paving the way for the gradual introduction of inclusive teaching and learning practices and principles across the University – is essential. Compliance with the equality duty for disabled students is an institutional issue, and not something for which responsibility should be delegated in full to already overworked and under resourced services. A centrally situated Working Group, with an expected lifespan of no more than three years, should be created to fulfil this need. This group should include representation from the DRC, CUSU and GU, EQP, CCTL, and representation of management in both colleges and faculties/schools.

The Terms of Reference of this Working Group are currently being drafted under consultation with stakeholders, and it is hoped that this summary of findings report will add weight to Recommendation 5 of the 'Substantial Disadvantage' report by demonstrating the need for a short-term, dedicated body, to properly address the current difficulties arising in the process of the implementation of academic reasonable adjustments for disabled students.

Discussion 1: Issues Arising in Case Studies

- 1) **Issues with the SSD distribution process:** students not knowing who's seen their SSD; students not being CC'd in emails; long confusing email threads; Directors of Studies and Tutors not understanding or fulfilling their responsibilities re: distribution of SSDs; teaching and support staff not receiving SSDs; teaching and support staff not understanding what the next steps to take are when they do receive SSDs. (This summary is intentionally brief, as an improved SSD distribution process is already in development.)

- 2) **Breakdowns in communication:**
 - a) Between faculties/departments and the DRC. Teaching and administrative staff have fed back issues with the format and phrasing of SSDs, e.g. a lack of clarity over concrete next steps, potential confusion where teaching and learning methods fall outside of assumed categories of 'lecture' and 'supervision,' and a dislike of certain phrasings such as "model essays."
 - b) Between colleges and faculties/departments. Chains of responsibility and accountability are often unclear, resulting in certain students or certain adjustments falling through the cracks between the two. Where issues arise in the faculty or department, it's not always clear how the Director of Studies should seek to address this from within the college, particularly if they are from a different faculty/department to the one in question.
 - c) Between students and supervisors. This is particularly important for postgraduate students, who do not have a separate Director of Studies.
 - d) Between faculties/departments and students. Students are often unaware of the structures of their faculties/departments, particularly larger faculties, and it may not be made clear to them who their contact point should be on these issues.
 - e) Between faculty/departmental administration and teaching staff. Similarly, staff may feel unequipped to signpost students as to whom they should contact within the faculty/department on these issues.
 - f) Between outgoing and incoming staff, both in college and in faculties/departments.
 - g) Between one academic year and the next – information must be passed on manually to new supervisors and lecturers every year.
 - h) Misunderstandings (in both directions) of confidentiality re: student information.

- 3) **Lack of clear responsibility and accountability:**
 - a) A general assumption that everything must be someone else's responsibility, resulting in unintentional buck-passing and students falling through the cracks.
 - b) A lack of an obvious mediating third party in many situations, for example between a student and a supervisor who is not implementing adjustments.

- c) No one person has an explicit responsibility to follow up on whether adjustments are being implemented (other than the DRC's automatic follow-up email).
- d) No one person has full oversight and understanding of students' SSDs and reasonable adjustments except in part the student themselves, who is therefore often forced to self-advocate.
- e) No one person has the power or authority to ensure that failures to make adjustments are addressed across the board, and/or has clear channels of communication to those with such power and authority.
- f) There is no central, and for the most part no faculty/departmental, reporting system that might be useful for accountability (outside of end of year reports, which students may feel uncomfortable using for this purpose and which only allow for retrospective raising of issues).

4) Lack of support and training for teaching staff:

- a) SSDs and reasonable adjustments aren't being covered, or covered effectively enough, in central and/or faculty/departmental training.
- b) Staff members don't know where to go to find central guidance on implementing adjustments, where such guidance exists.
- c) There are many cases of good and best practice occurring, but these are not being shared effectively between staff members.

5) Lack of understanding/awareness of disability:

- a) Some staff members are unaware of how likely they are to be teaching or supporting disabled students, due in part to a general cultural lack of awareness/nuanced understanding of disability, particularly with reference to unseen disabilities (though this should not be taken to imply that students with seen disabilities, e.g. mobility aid users, are adequately taken into consideration, or face fewer issues accessing their academic adjustments).

6) Lack of transparency of expectation:

- a) What is expected of students and teaching staff throughout the progression of a degree – for example, the kind of feedback given and how it is delivered – often develops and changes, but this does not tend to be made transparent, which can add to students' "imposter syndrome" and compound issues arising from disability.

Discussion 2: Suggested Solutions and Next Steps

- 1) **Improvement of the SSD distribution process.** Some suggestions here focused around undertaking a user experience review; reconsidering the format of SSDs, so as best to enable staff to implement adjustments; and a general consideration of a ‘pull’ rather than a ‘push’ style system, to fix current issues around inconsistent distribution and timings of distribution.
 - a. **CURRENT ACTION:** An SSD improvement process is already in progress under the OurCambridge initiative, with the core involvement of the DRC, CUSU, EQPO, and college support staff.
 - i. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** Ideally this work might involve a user experience review of the current system to add staff data to the student data gathered in the ‘Substantial Disadvantage’ report, and then a repeat of this review in future to measure improvement. Such a review might be part of the remit of the proposed **Reasonable Adjustments Working Group**.
- 2) **Information provision.** Various suggestions were made as to how to improve this, including ensuring that links to central DRC resources are embedded in all relevant websites both public and inward-facing (i.e. the VLE and other internal systems), as well as in all relevant emails sent to teaching staff. Better publicising of the Code of Practice on Reasonable Adjustments for Disabled Students was a particular concern. It was suggested that teaching and support staff might benefit from a regular (termly or annually) all-staff email bulletin from the DRC, modelled on existing bulletins such as the Education Bulletin and the Exam Access and Mitigation Committee Bulletin. A further suggestion was the undertaking of user experience research to see how teaching staff respond to existing central information and resources, and what improvements might be made to this to facilitate more productive engagement.
 - a. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** A central audit to be undertaken of what sites and systems teaching and support staff use, whether relevant materials are included or signposted on those sites, and what simple immediate improvements might be made. Such an audit might be part of the remit of the proposed **Academic Reasonable Adjustments Working Group**.
 - b. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** Investigate the possibility of a staff-wide DRC bulletin.
 - c. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** User experience research to analyse how staff interact with existing resources and information might be part of the remit of the proposed **Academic Reasonable Adjustments Working Group**.
- 3) **Clarifying responsibility.** All six discussion groups independently offered the idea of introducing a designated Adjustments Coordinator in each faculty/department (with a disclaimer that such a position would need to be embedded within day-to-day

departmental admin, rather than e.g. adding more hours of volunteer work onto Disability Liaison Officers). Further suggestions centred on improving clarity for students and staff as to the appropriate communication channels and levels of hierarchy within faculties and departments. It was also suggested that colleges should discuss together the ways in which they currently ensure that Directors of Studies and Tutors fully understand and fulfil their roles and responsibilities in relation to students' reasonable adjustments; colleges, too, should ensure they inform students fully on where to go if issues arise with their Director of Studies or Tutor, as many students feel intimidated or discouraged from e.g. directly contacting their Senior Tutor if they are not expressly encouraged to do so.

- a. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** Explore the possibility of instituting designated Adjustments Coordinators – initial discussions to be had e.g. at GBEC, among Faculty Reps at CUSU Academic Forum; a more sustained project might come under the remit of the proposed **Academic Reasonable Adjustments Working Group**.
- b. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** Encourage faculties and departments to improve the clarity of their structures so that students and staff know who the appropriate person to speak to might be.
- c. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** Encourage colleges to review the clarity of their structures and how these are communicated to students to ensure that all students are confident they would know where to go in the event of an issue with their Director of Studies or Tutor.

4) **Training & mentorship.** Both making a relevant training module mandatory (similar to training on the Prevent duty or on health & safety), and creating an accreditation system to encourage staff to undertake optional training, were suggested. Most groups wondered about ways to ensure that training, or professional development, in relation to disabled students is ongoing rather than a one-off module. It was suggested that efforts towards building forums for best practice on teaching disabled students to be shared, and providing some simple best practice models, would help with this; one group floated the concept of a mentorship programme between more and less experienced staff.

- a. **CURRENT ACTION:** CUSU and CTL are already working together to make small-scale improvements to existing online and blended learning modules (Effective Undergraduate Supervision and Supervising Graduate Students).
- b. **CURRENT ACTION:** Kirsty Wayland (DRC) is developing a more comprehensive module on inclusive teaching and learning, which will include practical help with providing students' reasonable adjustments as well as guidance on a more generalised inclusive approach to teaching.
 - i. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** Investigate different possibilities for encouraging participation in this module once it is released, e.g. publicity strategy, embedding within existing websites and systems (see 2.a), linking the module

with CamCORS in some form, etc. This work, which may span the DRC, CCTL, CUSU/GU, and various education and other committees, might usefully be overseen by the proposed **Academic Reasonable Adjustments Working Group**.

- c. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** Undertake research with teaching staff in order to better understand where they already feel knowledgeable and equipped to implement students' reasonable adjustments, where there are gaps in their knowledge or support, and how training might be improved, as well as to identify metrics to measure this improvement over time. This research might fall under the remit of the proposed **Academic Reasonable Adjustments Working Group**.
 - d. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** Create and disseminate simple best practice models for implementing reasonable adjustments and supporting disabled students through inclusive teaching practice. This could be undertaken between CCTL, the DRC, and CUSU/GU, but might also benefit from the oversight of the proposed **Academic Reasonable Adjustments Working Group**.
 - e. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** Explore the possibility of organising forums for teaching staff to share best practice, and facilitating good mentorship practice between teaching staff. This could be undertaken between CCTL, the DRC, and CUSU/GU, but might also benefit from the oversight of the proposed **Academic Reasonable Adjustments Working Group**.
- 5) **Feedback & intervention.** It was noted that a number of other areas feed into this: for example, if training and best practice sharing is implemented successfully in an ongoing model (as opposed to a one-off model), this should reduce the need for direct intervention and provide an avenue for ensuring that issues are remedied; if college and departmental structures and channels of communication are successfully clarified, this should enable and encourage students and staff to raise active issues where they arise. However, it was suggested that providing a form of departmental reporting system – particularly one where it is possible to make anonymous reports – might be a useful way to ensure that issues are raised and able to be dealt with constructively. A further suggestion was that existing feedback mechanisms, e.g. supervisor/supervisee feedback via CamCORS, might be modified to incorporate explicit space to discuss the provision of academic reasonable adjustments.
- a. **CURRENT ACTION:** CCTL and CUSU/GU have already begun to collaborate on the initial stages of a project looking to review and improve the current CamCORS feedback system. With specific reference to the inclusion of reasonable adjustments within such a review, the project might also benefit from input and oversight from the proposed **Academic Reasonable Adjustments Working Group**.
 - b. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** Review any existing departmental reporting systems and consider how an anonymous departmental reporting system might function, with a view to trialling this in a small number of pilot departments.

- c. **CURRENT ACTION:** Estates Management are implementing a centralised accident & incident reporting system which it has been suggested to the Sub-Committee on Accessibility might also serve for reports relating to all aspects of accessibility (including relating to teaching and learning), rather than simply physical access issues. This discussion will continue, however due to the diversion of focus from the remit of the Sub-Committee on Accessibility (which deals primarily with physical access features) and the need to liaise with EM this might usefully be part of the remit of the proposed **Academic Reasonable Adjustments Working Group**.

- 6) **Awareness.** It was noted that a necessary part and parcel of systems improvement is a wider, more intangible institutional culture change towards a nuanced awareness and understanding of disability and disabled students' needs, particularly as this relates to unseen disabilities. Some suggested ideas included a targeted University-wide campaign or initiative working on the Breaking the Silence model, an explicit and well-publicised unified University policy, and a departmental audit of current practice with an Athena Swan style charter and annual reviews. Attention was drawn to the existence of the Code of Practice on Reasonable Adjustments and the question of how it might be better publicised, as well as to the importance of spreading the understanding that the Disability Resource Centre is advisory and does not itself have the capacity to follow up individual issues in any sustained manner.

 - a. **SUGGESTED ACTION:** Discuss these possibilities further, especially in relation to how the University might better support and publicise the existing work of the CUSU Disabled Students' Campaign in raising awareness and disseminating information on disabled students' right to reasonable adjustments.

Proposed Table of Actions

Area of focus	Action	Involving?	Timescale
SSD distribution improvement	OurCambridge process	CUSU, DRC, OurCambridge, EQPO	<i>Two-phase; exp. end year 2020-1</i>
	User experience research	ARAWG	<i>Phase 1 Mich-Lent 2019-20</i>
Information provision	Audit of websites and systems	ARAWG	<i>Ac. year 2019-20</i>
	Investigate bulletin option	DRC, EQPO, CUSU/GU	<i>Summer 2019</i>
	User experience research	ARAWG	<i>Ac. year 2019-20</i>
Clarifying responsibility	Investigate 'Adjustments Coordinator' position option	GBEC, Faculty Reps, ARAWG	<i>? Initiate discussion ASAP</i>
	Encourage facs/depts to clarify structures & comms channels	GBEC, Academic Reps via CUSU/GU	<i>Summer 2019, review 2020</i>
	Encourage colleges to clarify structures & comms channels	STEC, STC	<i>Summer 2019, review 2020</i>
Training & mentorship	Improvements to existing online/blended modules	CUSU/GU, CCTL	<i>End of Easter term/beginning of summer 2019</i>
	Development of Inclusive Teaching & Learning training module	DRC - Kirsty Wayland	<i>ETA by start of academic year 2019-20</i>
	Publicising of Inclusive Teaching & Learning training module	DRC, CCTL, CUSU/GU, ARAWG?	<i>Academic year 2019-20 (mostly Michaelmas?)</i>
	Research on staff training needs & improvement metrics	ARAWG	<i>Multi-phase 2020-2021?</i>
	Create and publicise simple best practice models	CUSU/GU, CCTL, DRC, ARAWG?	<i>Summer 2019 or Christmas 2019-20</i>
	Investigate possibility for forums to share best practice & facilitate mentorship	CCTL, CUSU/GU, ARAWG?	<i>Lent-Easter 2020</i>
Feedback & intervention	Explore possibility for embedding in CamCORS	CCTL, CUSU/GU, GBEC?, ARAWG	<i>Ongoing 2019-20?</i>
	Review existing & possible departmental reporting systems	Academic Reps via CUSU/GU, ARAWG	<i>Michaelmas 2019-Lent 2020</i>
	Investigate possible integration into central A&I system	Sub-Committee on Accessibility, ARAWG	<i>Summer 2019, ac. year 2019-20</i>
Awareness	Discuss possible initiatives	CUSU/GU, DRC, CCTL, EQPO, GBEC, STEC	<i>Michaelmas 2019 onwards</i>

Appendix: Case Studies

Case Study 1 - Mary

Course: Tripos

Year: 3

Student Support Document Recommendations:

- Clear feedback on written work highlighting positive points in addition to areas for improvement
- Recording of lectures
- Any supervision discussion materials to be e-mailed in advance

Throughout her undergraduate degree Mary has experienced issues with consistency with her Student Support Document (SSD) being adhered to by lecturers in her department. Despite having raised these issues with the department and via her College numerous times, the situation remains the same with only one lecturer taking forward the recommendations on the SSD. Over time, Mary gets discouraged and stops pursuing the implementation of her reasonable adjustments. The pattern of raising issues and dropping them is in part due to the nature of Mary's disabilities. The feeling Mary has of 'battling' for these adjustments (and the additional work and stress this has created) has exacerbated the effects of her disabilities, all of which have had a negative impact on her studies. Last year, for the one course where Mary's adjustments were put in place her results were significantly higher. Mary feels that this is direct evidence that having her adjustments in place allows her to achieve her full academic potential. Mary is in her final year and has a job offer which is conditional on her final grade.

Case Study 2 - Josh

Course: PhD

Year: 1

Student Support Document Recommendations:

- Timetables to take account of symptoms, medication needs and appointments for support
- Lecture materials and deadlines in advance and clearly described academic tasks

Due to symptoms arising from his disabilities, Josh struggles in the mornings to go to the department and often will only be able to arrive later in the day. Certain activities such as group or individual meetings with his supervisor are often set to take place at the start of the work day. This has meant that Josh has often missed meetings or has arrived late. This has made him feel very stressed which has consequently impacted negatively on his mental

health. When Josh discusses his disabilities with his supervisor and asks if their one to one meetings could take place later in the day, the supervisor dismisses the request stating, 'your work is fine and it is not a big problem'. The meeting time is therefore not adjusted and Josh's health continues to deteriorate. This deterioration impacts on his work and Josh eventually applies for intermission.

Case Study 3 - Max

Course: Tripos

Year: 3

Student Support Document Recommendations:

- Submit work electronically
- Submit typed rather than hand-written work
- Flexibility over deadlines where possible

One of Max's teachers asks for classwork to be placed in their pigeonhole by 9am on Monday. This deadline means that Max would have to travel to and from the department specifically to hand this work in, which would take him a significant amount of energy and cause exhaustion. Max highlights to the teacher the recommendations in his SSD i.e. submitting work electronically and needing flexibility around deadlines. He also points out that submitting his work via email makes sense since he has to type it rather than handwriting it in any case. The teacher responds saying that this method of submitting work is inconvenient for them, as it would require them to print out the work for marking, for which there is always a queue at the faculty printer. This would therefore waste their time. Max speaks to his College tutor and DoS who acknowledge this is an issue; they support Max by highlighting the SSD to the lecturer but beyond this, they are unsure what more they can do. Max continues to hand in his work via email, but the teacher tells him every week that he has caused them a huge inconvenience, which makes Max feel guilty and impacts negatively on his mental health, as well as making him worry that his teacher will start refusing to mark his work at all.

Case Study 4 - Melanie

Course: Tripos

Year: 2

Student Support Document Recommendations:

- Copies of lecture power points, handouts, and discussing documents in advance
- Permission to record lectures

- Where discussion material needs to be read during a supervision adequate time should be allowed to enable Melanie to process the information and respond

Whilst Melanie's Student Support Document (SSD) has been in place since she started her course, Melanie has never received a copy of the lecture slides or notes in advance of any lecture. Melanie feels that this lack of adjustment has had a negative impact on her understanding of the course materials. The characteristics of Melanie's disability relate to processing speeds; for example, during lectures Melanie finds it difficult to focus on reading and understanding the slides whilst at the same time absorbing the information that is being covered during the lecture. This has resulted in there being gaps in Melanie's notes and knowledge requiring her to try and catch-up academically which has created an additional workload for her. Melanie feels that this has put her at a further disadvantage as a disabled student. Melanie is aware that other students with SSD recommendations in her department and faculty are experiencing similar issues. When she raises the issue with the department, she is told 'the lecturers don't work like this in our department' or 'we can't force the lecturers to provide you with this information before the lecture'. Melanie is unsure what to do next.

Case Study 5 - Fiona

Course: Tripos

Year: 1

Student Support Document Recommendations:

- Directed reading lists in advance
- Instructions and feedback in written form
- Examples of model essays

It is nearly the end of Michaelmas term, and Fiona has yet to have benefitted from any of the above recommendations. She kept hoping that over time these adjustments would be put in place, and as she was keen to not come across as a nuisance, and unaware who exactly was responsible for making sure her adjustments were put in place, she did not speak to anyone about this. Eventually, Fiona decides to discuss her needs with one of her supervisors. The supervisor is very understanding and feels embarrassed to admit that not only was he unaware that Fiona had a Student Support Document (SSD), he is also unaware of what an SSD is. He indicates to Fiona that he would very much like to support her more in her studies however he doesn't know anything about teaching students with disabilities. The discussion ends with no obvious plan for a way forward. Fiona is unsure what to do next.

Case Study 6 – Chang

Course: PhD

Year: 2

Student Support Document Recommendations:

- Opportunity to ask questions outside the larger group e.g. via email
- Well managed discussion
- Clear feedback on written work highlighting positive points in addition to areas for improvement

Chang spends most of his time working in the lab. He feels at his most anxious during research group meetings and individual meetings with his supervisor. Chang's supervisor has made it clear to him that he finds Chang's participation in group discussions very low and wonders why Chang can't be bothered to make a contribution. The supervisor provides feedback orally to all of his students (including Chang) in their one to one meetings, focusing mainly on the weak points. Chang feels that his supervisor has nothing positive to say about his work and concludes he must be a weak student not worthy of studying at Cambridge. The supervisor further reinforces this idea by showing his frustration when Chang fails to defend his work during their one to one meetings assuming this is another indication that Chang can't be bothered. The anxiety and stress caused by this situation has had a negative impact on Chang's mental health and in addition to seeking counselling, he has now been prescribed anti-depressants. Chang is exploring the possibility of intermission or withdrawing from the course.