

Policy on academic misconduct

1 Principles

1.1 The **academic enterprise** at the University of Nottingham, whether scholarship, research or innovation, is based on the values of academic integrity, honesty and trust.

1.2 Any inappropriate activity or behaviour by a student which may give that student, or another student, an **unpermitted academic advantage** in a **summative assessment** is considered to be an act of academic misconduct and unacceptable in a scholarly community. Such action(s) will be considered under these Regulations and this may lead to a penalty being imposed.

Note: Formative assessment is primarily designed to give feedback on progress and inform development, but does not contribute to a module mark. If the affected work does not count towards an award, a transcript mark or a progression decision, the problematic work should normally be addressed by specific and extensive feedback on the issue that is the subject of concern. This is to ensure change of behaviour and act as a preventative measure for future incidents.

1.3 These Regulations are to be applied to **all** current students of the University, whether currently registered or not. **Former** students, will be subject to the academic misconduct regulations that were in place whilst they were a registered student.

1.4 The University's Fitness to Practice procedures may also be applied to students on programmes of study which lead to professional registration and whose actions are considered under these Regulations.

1.5 Schools/Departments will provide **advice** and **examples** to students as to what constitutes academic misconduct and make them aware of these Regulations and the possible outcomes of action constituting academic misconduct. Students have a responsibility to attend such sessions and study such advice.

1.6 Students should **take responsibility** for the integrity of their own work, including asking for clarification.

1.7 Confirmed instances of academic misconduct and any penalty awarded may be referred to in student references (relating to a student's academic achievement at University) or notified to an accrediting body.

1.8 The standard of proof is that of 'the balance of probabilities'. Evidence indicating that, on the balance of probabilities, academic misconduct has occurred will be deemed sufficient evidence for action under these Regulations.

1.9 Students are responsible for ensuring that they inform the University of any mitigating circumstances that they consider are affecting their ability to undertake an assessment, to ensure appropriate support can be provided. Although mitigating circumstances do not justify the occurrence of academic misconduct, such circumstances may be taken into account when determining a penalty.

1.10 It is not necessary to prove intention to commit academic misconduct in order to make a finding of academic misconduct. However, proven intent to commit academic misconduct may be considered an aggravating factor when determining a penalty. Examples of proven intent include, but are not limited to;

False authorship

Falsifying data

Falsification of an extenuating circumstances claim

Access to Moodle or other websites during an examination (where the use of such websites is unauthorised)

Taking unauthorised, pre-prepared materials into an examination where the materials are potentially relevant to the examination.

Being in possession of unauthorised electronic devices (e.g. mobile telephones, smart watches) in an examination.

2 Academic Misconduct

2.1 The following is a non-exhaustive list of examples of academic misconduct which will be considered under these Regulations:

2.1.1 **Plagiarism:** representing another person's work or ideas as one's own. For example by failing to correctly acknowledge others' ideas and work as sources of information in an assignment, and neglecting use of quotation marks. This also applies to the use of graphical material, calculations etc. in that plagiarism is not limited to text-based sources.

Note: Where permitted, a proof-reader may identify spelling and basic grammar errors. Inaccuracies in academic content must not be corrected nor should the structure of the piece of work be changed; doing so may result in a charge of plagiarism. A proof-reader may be used to ensure that the work meets a quality threshold in accordance with the University's Proofreading Policy, **unless a School/Department policy specifically prohibits this**. Students should make every effort to familiarise themselves with their School/Department's policy regarding proof-reading. Schools/Departments should ensure this information is accessible to students.

2.1.2 **False Authorship:** where a student is not the author of the work they have submitted. This may include a student submitting the work of another student. This may also include the submission of work that has been produced (in whole or in part) by another student or third party. As it is the authorship of an assignment that is contested, there is no requirement to prove that the assignment has been purchased.

2.1.3 **Collusion:** cooperation in order to gain an unpermitted advantage. This may occur where students have consciously collaborated on a piece of work, in part or whole, and passed it off as their own individual efforts or where one student has authorised another to use their work, in part or whole, and to submit it as their own.

Note: legitimate input from University tutors or approved readers or scribes is not considered to be collusion.

2.1.4 **Misconduct in examinations.** Including, for example, when an examination candidate:

- copies from the examination script of another candidate;
- obtains or offers any other improper assistance from or to another candidate (or any other person unless an approved reader or scribe);
- has with them any unauthorised book (including mathematical tables), manuscript or loose papers of any kind, unauthorised electronic devices (e.g. mobile telephones, smart watches) or any source of unauthorised information [see the University's [Examination Guidance](#) for further information].
Note: Where a student is found to have taken unauthorised materials or an electronic device to their desk, the student is guilty of academic misconduct, irrespective of that student's intent or the nature of the materials.
- allows himself/herself to be impersonated or when any person impersonates another examination candidate.

It is the student's responsibility to ensure unauthorised items are not taken into an examination. It is not the responsibility of the Invigilator to search for and remove the unauthorised items.

2.1.5 **Fabrication or misrepresentation:** the presentation of fabricated data, results, references, evidence or other material or misrepresentation of the same. Including, for example:

- claiming to have carried out experiments, observations, interviews or other forms of research which a student has not , in fact, carried out;

- falsely claiming to have obtained results or other evidence;

- in the case of professional qualifications, falsely claiming to have completed hours in practice or to have achieved required competencies when this is not the case;

- submitting a false Extenuating Circumstances claim where the claim and/or evidence has been fabricated/falsified.

2.1.6 Failure **to disclose previous experience or qualifications** that are a bar to enrolment on a module (for example, enrolment on inter-faculty language modules).

2.1.7 **Failure to obtain ethical approval:** where work is undertaken without obtaining ethical approval when there is a clear and unambiguous requirement to do so.

2.2 **Recycling**

The multiple submission by a student of their own material (either in whole or in part) **is not considered academic misconduct**. This includes work that the student may have submitted for a previous academic year, for another course or at a different institution. Submission of material that has been submitted on a previous occasion for a different summative assessment is, however, unlikely to be academically appropriate. The merit of such material will therefore be a matter of academic judgement.

The Academic Misconduct Procedure

The information below regarding the Academic Misconduct Procedure should be read in conjunction with the [Academic Misconduct Policy](#).

This procedure and the Guidance on the Application of Academic Misconduct Penalties are only applicable to investigations instigated on or after 21 September 2020. For investigation instigated prior to 21 September, please consult the [earlier version of the procedure](#).

A different procedure applies at the University of Nottingham China campus. Please follow the appropriate link for further information:

Academic Misconduct Procedure: [University of Nottingham China campus](#)

Reporting and investigation

Any reference to the Head of School is to be taken to include a reference to a Head of School or Department or to a member of staff **authorised** by the Head of School or Department to act on their behalf (such as an Academic Misconduct Officer), which can include a delegate at the International Campuses. Decision-making staff will be appropriately trained, enabling the consistent and fair application of these Regulations. Any reference to the Secretary to the Academic Misconduct Committee should be taken to refer to a **panel Secretary** on each campus who manages the procedure on behalf of the Academic Misconduct Committee. The procedure set out in relation to Academic Misconduct Committee hearings should be read in conjunction with guidance documentation relating to arrangements on **each campus**. Staff and students should ensure they understand the procedure relating to the relevant campus (UK, China, and Malaysia) and liaise with the correct Secretary.

Note: Allegations that arise pertaining to assessments from previous academic years can be investigated retrospectively, provided that there is compelling evidence to instigate the investigation.

Reporting a suspicion of academic misconduct

Where a member of staff suspects that academic misconduct has taken place, they will report the matter in writing to the **Head of School or Department** in which the work was undertaken, providing reasons and any relevant evidence.

In cases of suspected **misconduct in an examination**, the invigilator will write a report and the examination script will be annotated to indicate the point at which the suspected misconduct was identified. This report will be forwarded to the Head of School or Department in which the work was undertaken.

In cases of **false authorship**, the reporting staff member is expected to outline their reasoning for suspecting that the student is not the author of the work submitted and provide any pertinent evidence. This may include (but is not limited to): inconsistency in writing style, language and grammar; the assignment not properly addressing the question set; inappropriate referencing and bibliography. This may also involve inconsistency in grades/standard of work, and allegations from third parties.

Where a student has reason to **suspect a fellow student** of academic misconduct, they may report this, to the Head of the School or Department in which the work was undertaken. Anonymity cannot be guaranteed as the accused student has a right of access to information pertaining to their personal data. If the reporting student does not give their consent for their identity to be revealed, no further action can be taken, unless additional and/or compelling evidence is identified by an academic member of staff. Reports which are motivated by malice will not be considered and will be addressed by the University's [Unacceptable Behaviour Policy](#) and/or [Code of Discipline for Students](#).

Where a **third party has reported a student** as having committed academic misconduct and the member of staff authorised by the Head of School or Department believes there is compelling evidence to investigate further, the student will be made aware of all allegations made against them. Details of the case will not be shared with the reporting third party due General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR).

Where the student suspected of misconduct is **registered in a different School or Department**, the Head of that School or Department will also be informed that an investigation is underway and of the outcome.

The Head of the School or Department in which the work was undertaken is required to conduct an **investigation**.

Investigation by the Head of School/Department (or authorised member of staff)

The Head of School will **consider the evidence** and may **question** appropriate people to gain additional information.

The Head of School will ask the student to **attend a meeting, giving the student up to 5 working days' notice** [[letter template available here](#)]. For overseas students and students unable to attend a meeting in person, the option of an online meeting should be made available. In the case of a student taking examinations at the time the investigation is initiated, notice of the meeting will be given after the student has finished their examinations. Meetings will not take place whilst the student has ongoing exams. The student is entitled to have a supporter attend the meeting with them. The supporter must be either: an Education Adviser from the SU (or equivalent at UNNC/UMNC), a fellow student, a member of staff, or a Union representative (eg. BMA, RCN). The supporter may take notes on the student's behalf, make representations on the student's behalf and ask questions, but may not answer questions on the student's behalf. The supporter cannot attend the meeting in the student's absence. The student should inform their School/Department who will be attending as supporter in advance of the meeting.

If the student does **not respond** to a written request to attend the meeting, the Head of School may continue with the meeting without the student's involvement and (provided the student has been given adequate opportunity to make representations) make a decision. The student will be sent **written notification** of the outcome.

The meeting will be attended by a **third-party**, such as a module convenor, personal tutor or an Examinations Officer, who should take notes.

The student will be **notified in advance** of the meeting of any other people who will be attending (for example to provide evidence or further information at the Head of School's request).

Ordinarily, the student will be provided with the evidence of suspected misconduct in advance of the meeting, so the student is clear regarding the allegations. However this may not be applicable in all cases, particularly concerning cases of false authorship or collusion (see below). In cases where a Head of School believes it more appropriate to inform the student of the details of the allegation in person, it will be ensured that the student is not put at a disadvantage as a result.

In the meeting the Head of School will:

- i. Ensure the student is aware of the **definition** of academic misconduct.
- ii. Outline the **Regulations on Academic Misconduct**, including the procedure and possible outcomes.
- iii. **Explain** the reasons for suspecting the student of academic misconduct and ask the student if the student understands these reasons. **All material** relating to the case should be made available to the student.
 - For cases of suspected plagiarism, where possible, the evidence will not rely solely on a Turnitin text matching report but should refer to the student's assessment and (unless unavailable for good reason) the original source(s) to demonstrate the extent of any plagiarism.
 - For cases where the authorship of the assessment is contested, the meeting will be conducted in the manner of oral questioning: the student will be asked questions regarding the assessment subject to the allegation. This will not be used as a form of assessment, only as a form of questioning as part of the investigation.
 - Questions will be designed to give the student the opportunity to demonstrate that they are the sole author of the piece of work. Students may be requested to provide drafts of their work and explain the development of the assessment. For these cases it is recommended a subject specialist is present at the meeting.
 - It is recognised that there are factors which may impact a student's ability to respond to questioning, such as spoken English Language ability, the presence of a Specific Learning Difference or stress. Any decision made will take into account all available

evidence (including responses to questioning) and a decision will be made on the balance of probability.

iv. Ask the student about any **training/guidance** they had received relating to academic misconduct and, in the case of suspected plagiarism, determine whether or not, upon submission of the piece of work, the student had declared that the work was their own. The Head of School should also ascertain what training/guidance was available to the student.

v. Ask the student to **respond**, including providing details of any mitigating circumstances. Mitigating circumstances will not exempt a student from a finding of academic misconduct. However, if the School is satisfied that the mitigating circumstances have a direct impact on the case they may take this into account when determining a proportionate penalty, should academic misconduct be deemed to have taken place.

vi. Ask the student to provide a brief, written, signed **statement** [[link to student statement template here](#)] which:

- acknowledges what it is the student is alleged to have done
- acknowledges why what is alleged counts as academic misconduct
- provides the student's own account of events, which may include an explanation for their behaviour.

vii. The Head of School will permit the student **up to 5 working days** to provide the written statement. If, this course of action having been agreed, the student fails to submit the statement within the timescale, the Head of School will proceed based on the findings of the investigation. A penalty will not be given to a student until the student has had the opportunity to submit a written statement within the permitted timescales. However, if the Head of School is satisfied during the course of the meeting that academic misconduct has **not** occurred, it is not necessary to request this statement. Additionally, if the student clearly states they do not wish to submit a statement, the Head of School may proceed with making a decision.

Once the meeting has taken place and the student has submitted their written statement (where they have chosen to submit one), the Head of School will **write** to the student, summarising the case and giving their decision for further action.

Outcomes from a School investigation

Decision of Head of School

If the Head of School is satisfied that academic misconduct has **not** taken place, no further action will be taken in relation to the case and no formal record of the issue will be kept. The student will be informed of this outcome in writing.

If the Head of School is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that academic misconduct **has** occurred, one of the following courses of action will apply and the student will be notified of the outcome in writing.

Courses of action:

1. Referral to Academic Misconduct Committee

Where the student:

- Is deemed to have submitted work that has been produced (in whole or in part) by another student or third party i.e. False Authorship.
- Is deemed to have accessed course Moodle pages or relevant websites during an examination (where the use of such websites is unauthorised). The School or Department must be able to provide evidence to demonstrate that it was the student who accessed the pages.
- Has a previous case of academic misconduct recorded against them where the first instance was not the result of Poor Academic Practice (and where the second/subsequent offence has occurred after the procedures for the first offence have been completed. If multiple instances are discovered

and investigated at the same time or an instance occurs before the conclusion of the first academic misconduct meeting, this should be considered as one instance).

iv) Where the Head of School believes an appropriate penalty for the instance is not available to them under these Regulations;

v) Is a Postgraduate Research student (unless the misconduct has taken place in a first year, taught module).

The Head of School will forward the decision letter and supporting evidence [see attached list of paperwork required from School] to the Secretary of the **Academic Misconduct Committee** (academic-misconduct@nottingham.ac.uk) for the case to be heard by a panel of the Academic Misconduct Committee. The referral to AMC must be made within two weeks of the student being notified of the final decision.

Where a case is reported to the Secretary of the Academic Misconduct Committee, the Head of School will inform the relevant **Board of Examiners**. The Board of Examiners must defer consideration of the work in question until the Committee has made a decision on the case. The results for modules unaffected by the suspected misconduct should be considered by the Board of Examiners and released to the student. In the case of research students, the Board of Examiners comprises the Internal and External Examiners, and the Joint Report Form should be deferred until the Academic Misconduct Committee has made its decision.

Where it is considered that a **disciplinary offence** may have been committed (such as forgery, theft) in order to commit academic misconduct, the Head of School will refer the case to the Chair of the Academic Appeals and Misconduct Committee (via the Secretary to the AMC). This may also apply to the fabrication/falsifying of Extenuating Circumstances claims by a student in order to gain an academic advantage. The Chair of the Academic Appeals and Misconduct Committee will liaise with the University Assessor to determine whether the case should be considered under the Code of Discipline for Students in addition to, or instead of, the Regulations on Academic Misconduct. Where more than one student is involved all related cases will be referred. Once the Chair has decided on the appropriate course of action, the Secretary will write to the student and Head of School giving further details.

Otherwise, the Head of School will refer to penalties available to the School (below).

2. School application of penalties

If the Head of School is satisfied that the academic misconduct came about because of a lack of understanding of good academic practice or convention (subject to the following paragraph), the student will receive a written caution. This will be recorded on the student's record as a case of **Poor Academic Practice** and reported to the Secretary to the Academic Misconduct Committee at the same time that the student is notified of the decision. A penalty will not be imposed although the lower standard of the piece of work is likely to be reflected in the mark awarded. The School will provide the student with relevant guidance to enable the student to develop their understanding of good practice. Should a further allegation of academic misconduct occur subsequent to a finding of Poor Academic Practice, this will be investigated by the Head of School as a first instance.

If the Head of School is satisfied that the student had been provided with the appropriate information and guidance on how to develop skills about such practice and, in all the circumstances, could reasonably be expected to avoid the academic misconduct, a **penalty** will be imposed.

Where the misconduct relates to work undertaken in a taught module or as part of a taught programme of study, the Head of School will impose a penalty. The matter will be recorded on the student's School record as a case of Academic Misconduct and reported to the Secretary to the Academic Misconduct Committee at the same time that the student is notified of the decision. If appropriate, the School will provide the student with relevant guidance to enable the student to develop his or her understanding of good practice. Any penalty that impacts the marks of the assessment will be applied in conjunction with any other penalty (e.g. late submission or exceeding the word count). All penalties should be appropriate and proportionate, taking into account the evidence presented by the School and the student and the impact of the penalty. The penalties available to the Head of School are:

i) **A written warning.** (Where relevant, the lower standard of the piece of work is likely to be reflected in the mark awarded but no further penalty will be imposed).

ii) **A mark of zero for the specific material** which is the subject of the academic misconduct or where the material does not constitute a specific paragraph or section. The amount of material deemed to be academic misconduct is a matter of academic judgment, and cannot be determined by a Turnitin report alone.

iii) **An overall percentage reduction** to the piece of work reflecting the percentage of the work which is the subject of the academic misconduct, as determined by the Head of School. The amount of material deemed to be academic misconduct is a matter of academic judgment, and cannot be determined by a Turnitin report alone.

iv) **A mark of zero for the entire piece of coursework or assessment** in which the academic misconduct has occurred. In the case of misconduct in examination a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question.

v) To be applied in relation to 'failure to disclose previous experience or qualifications that are a bar to enrolment on a module' only, a mark of **zero for the module** with the requirement for the student to take a **different module** as a reassessment (where a reassessment opportunity is permitted).

Or:

vi) If the misconduct does not relate to work undertaken in a taught module or as part of a taught programme of study, the case should be referred to the Academic Misconduct Committee (see above).

vii) Where an academic penalty is not appropriate (eg where a student has been found to have assisted another to gain an unpermitted advantage), the Head of School may request that the Chair of the Academic Appeals and Misconduct Committee uses summary jurisdiction to apply a fine up to a maximum of £150. The Secretary to the Committee will liaise with the Chair on the Head of School's behalf. The Chair may approve the request or liaise with the University Assessor as outlined above if they believe it to be relevant to the case.

Student self-referral to Academic Misconduct Committee

Where a student is dissatisfied with a School's decision, they may be able to request a self-referral on the following grounds:

- A procedural irregularity occurred in the handling of the School's investigation which has a material impact on the outcome/decision making.
- A compelling argument that the decision and/or penalty was unreasonable and/ or disproportionate.

Note: Self-referral requests made on the above grounds must be supported by evidence and a clear rationale for the grounds claimed. Please note that new evidence will not normally be considered within a self-referral request if it has not been submitted for consideration during the School investigation stage of the procedure, without compelling reason as to why it was not submitted for consideration by the School. Should a student self-refer their case to the Academic Misconduct Committee, they are expected to make every effort to attend the hearing, either in person or via an online meeting, where possible.

Students wishing to self-refer their case should complete the **request form** and send it to academic-misconduct@nottingham.ac.uk, within **5 working days** of the date of the outcome of the School investigation. This does not apply where the course of action is to refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Committee. The Secretary will request from the Head of School the decision letter and supporting evidence as required. Students will be notified in writing of the outcome of the self-referral request.

Should you wish to request any adjustments on the basis of a disability which will enable you to access the procedure effectively, please contact the Secretary.

Claims that amount simply to an expression of dissatisfaction with the decision or penalty imposed will be rejected. You may request a review of the decision to reject your self-referral request by following the guidance found within the '**Next Steps**' section of the Procedure.

The Academic Misconduct Committee

The procedure relating to the Academic Misconduct Committee is managed by the **panel Secretary** on behalf of the Academic Misconduct Committee on each campus. Staff and students should ensure they understand the full detail of the procedure relating to the relevant campus (UK, China, Malaysia) and liaise with the correct Secretary. The full detail of the procedure should be read in conjunction with the below summary.

Summary of Academic Misconduct Committee procedures

Ordinarily, cases will be heard by a **panel** on behalf of the Academic Misconduct Committee in the form of a formal hearing. The panel will comprise three members, two of whom will be academic staff members of the Academic Misconduct Committee. One of the academic staff members will act as Chair. The third member will be a trained student representative or, where no student representative is available, a third academic staff member of the Academic Misconduct Committee. The student whose case is being heard may insist that the panel does or does not include a student representative.

i) Virtual panel

In some circumstances, the case may be considered by a virtual panel, without need for formal hearing (or for the student to be in attendance). In this instance, the evidence and student representations considered by the School are sent to three academic staff members of the Academic Misconduct Committee. Students can request this, following instructions in their School outcome letter. As a minimum, all of the following criteria should be met:

- The student does not dispute the School's finding of academic misconduct
- The facts of the case are not in dispute and there is no additional evidence to present (other than that already presented at the School meeting)
- The student indicates that they do not wish their case to be heard at a formal Academic Misconduct Committee hearing and would prefer their case to be presented to a virtual panel (where their presence will not be required).

Students will be informed of the outcome in writing. Students who are dissatisfied with the outcome can request a review of the decision by the Director of Service Development (or nominee). Students cannot appeal the finding of academic misconduct, but may appeal against the penalty only on the grounds that a different penalty be imposed. Claims that amount simply to an expression of dissatisfaction with the penalty imposed will not be considered.

ii) Academic Misconduct Committee hearing

If the case is not to be heard by a virtual panel, the School or Department representative and the student will be notified of the date of the next available hearing. The School or Department representative(s) are required to attend to present their case. If the student is unable to attend for good reason, they may elect to have an SU Education Adviser attend on their behalf. Only SU Education Advisers may attend in lieu of the student. Otherwise the hearing will take place in the student's absence and the Chair will have a duty to ensure that the members of the panel are fully aware of all the facts including the points made in the student's statement.

The hearing documentation will be circulated in advance of the hearing and will include the Head of School's decision letter and supporting evidence. The student will be invited to submit an additional written statement for inclusion in the documentation.

Panel members, the student and the School or Department representative will all have access to the same documentary and verbal evidence. An exceptional arrangement may be made at the discretion of the Chair, if a student wishes to request that additional evidence be made available to the panel only (e.g. properly certified medical evidence that the student felt unable to share with the School or Department).

If the student has a **previous case** of Academic Misconduct on their record, the panel will only be told of this after a verdict is reached but before a penalty is decided upon (if appropriate). The

only **exception** to this will be if, in making his or her case to the panel, **the student chooses to disclose a previous instance or makes false representation about previous instances** of academic misconduct in which case the School may correct matters of fact.

The School or Department and the student may invite **witnesses** to attend.

The student is entitled to bring a supporter to the hearing. The supporter must be either; an Education Adviser from the SU (or equivalent at UNNC/UMNC), a fellow student, a member of staff, or a Union representative (eg BMA, RCN). The supporter may take notes on the student's behalf, make representations on the student's behalf and ask questions, but may not answer questions on the student's behalf. The student may be asked to choose a different supporter if, for example, it is perceived that the chosen supporter may cause a conflict of interest or if their presence may prejudice the meeting. The supporter cannot attend the meeting in the student's absence (with the exception of the SU Education Advisor, as outlined above).

The names and roles of those attending, whether as supporter or witness, must be **notified** to the Secretary at least three working days in advance of the hearing.

A panel of the Academic Misconduct Committee acts with the full delegated authority of **Senate**. It has the power to:

- a) **require** members of the staff of the University to make written submissions, attend, give evidence and answer questions
- b) **apply a penalty** if it is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that academic misconduct has taken place.

Once the panel has made its decision the student and School or Department will be notified of the **outcome in writing**, normally within five working days. Where this is not possible, students will be notified of an alternative timeframe in which they can expect to receive the outcome.

If the panel identifies any **shortcomings** in the School or Department procedure, details of these will be recorded by the Secretary who will report them to the School or Department.

Penalties available to the Academic Misconduct Committee

A panel of the Academic Misconduct Committee has the **power** to apply **one or more** of the following penalties/actions:

- a) any of the penalties/actions listed as available to the Head of School/Department
- b) award a **mark of zero for the entire module** in which the academic misconduct has occurred
- c) award a **mark of zero for all the assessments in the semester** (even where this will lead to, for example, a reduction in degree class or the award of a lower qualification). In the case of year-long modules, this penalty may affect both semesters
- d) award a **mark of zero for the whole year** (even where this will lead to, for example, a reduction in degree class or the award of a lower qualification)
- e) require the student to **take reassessments** (as a result of being awarded zero marks) in the following session before being allowed to progress or complete their course.
- f) require the student to **register** with the University and enroll on modules in which they need to take reassessments (as a result of being awarded zero marks) in the following session before being allowed to progress or complete their course.
- g) in the case of PhD students, confirm the student's probationary status and require the student to undertake another **annual (confirmation) review** in line with the Quality Manual guidance
- h) require a research student to **resubmit** a thesis with or without a viva
- i) require a research student to **register** for a period of supervision before being allowed to resubmit a thesis
- j) **suspend or terminate** the student's course
- k) **withdraw the award** of a degree or other qualification from a former student of the University
- l) if because of the student's pattern of study, the panel believes that the application of any of the penalties/actions available will lead to an inappropriate penalty, the panel has the discretion to **substitute the mark of zero** for a number of credits of its choosing
- m) where an academic penalty is not appropriate (ie where a student has been found to have assisted another to gain an unpermitted advantage), the Academic Misconduct Committee has the **power to fine any amount**.

Any of the penalties/actions may also be applied to a student found to have committed academic misconduct during a **reassessment**. Where the penalty would lead to the termination of the student's course through the automatic application of University regulations (i.e. because the student has

exhausted their reassessment opportunities), the Committee may exercise its discretion and decide to grant the student one further reassessment opportunity notwithstanding regulations.

Next steps

Students who consider that the University has failed to carry out its duty to act fairly in the application of the Regulations on Academic Misconduct should submit a [Review Request form](#) to academic-misconduct@nottingham.ac.uk to **request a review** of their case by the Director of Registry and Academic Affairs (or nominee). Dissatisfaction with the outcome alone does not constitute grounds for requesting a review. In order for a review request to be considered the student must establish the following grounds:

- A procedural irregularity occurred in the handling of your case of academic misconduct.
- A compelling argument that the decision and/or penalty was unreasonable and/ or disproportionate, including the decision not to accept a request for a Self-Referral.

Such requests should be made within **one month** of the student being notified of the decision of the Committee or the Complaints and Conduct Team. Where necessary, the Director, or delegate acting on the Director's behalf, may liaise with the Chair of the Academic Appeals and Misconduct Committee in conducting the review and in determining an appropriate outcome.

The review stage will not usually consider the issues afresh or involve further investigation. The reviewer can:

- Reject the claim and issue the student with a Completion of Procedures letter
- Uphold the claim and refer to the Chair of the Academic Appeals and Misconduct Committee. The Chair may substitute a decision on behalf of the University.

Completion of Procedures

As required by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA), if we are unable to resolve the case to the student's satisfaction, and there are no further steps available to the student, we will issue a formal "Completion of Procedures" letter within 28 days of the outcome being determined. This provides formal confirmation that the student has exhausted the internal procedure and is required for their case to be considered by the OIA.

Office of the Independent Adjudicator

Once the internal procedures of the academic misconduct policy have been completed, if the student is still not satisfied with the outcome, they may take their case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA). The OIA operates externally to the University. It will not normally look at a case unless and until all relevant internal procedures have been exhausted. Further information is available from the [OIA website](#).