



University of
Nottingham

UK | CHINA | MALAYSIA

Information for returning students

Regulations on Academic Misconduct



University of
Nottingham

UK | CHINA | MALAYSIA

There are important changes to the Regulations on Academic Misconduct...

Academic Misconduct Policy:

<https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/academicservices/qualitymanual/assessmentandawards/academic-misconduct.aspx>

Academic Misconduct Procedure:

<https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/academicservices/currentstudents/academic-misconduct.aspx>



- The Regulations on Academic Misconduct have changed. Please ensure that you familiarise yourself with both the new Policy and Procedure before undertaking your assessments.
- If you have any questions regarding these changes or your assessments, you should seek advice from your tutor or the module convenor.



Categories of Academic Misconduct

- False Authorship – a newly specified category of academic misconduct:

‘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.’

- Fabrication/misrepresentation – includes the submission of a
Extenuating Circumstances claim where the claim and/or
evidence has been fabricated/falsified.



Academic Misconduct Meetings

- You will be given up to 5 working days notice when being invited to a School/Department Academic Misconduct meeting
- If appropriate, you will be provided with details of the allegation in advance of the meeting.
- For cases of False Authorship, the meeting will include oral questioning where you will be asked questions regarding the assignment. This will not be used as a form of assessment.



Self-referrals

- **Self-referrals:** If you are dissatisfied with a School's decision, any referral to the Academic Misconduct Committee must be substantiated by 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.

- Claims that amount simply to an expression of dissatisfaction with the decision or penalty imposed will not be considered.



- If your case is referred to the Academic Misconduct Committee, a formal hearing will usually take place. If you do not wish for a formal hearing or to be in attendance, you can request your case to be heard at a virtual panel.
- A virtual panel will consist of 3 academic members of the AMC who will conduct a paper-based review of your case.
- As a minimum, all of the following criteria should be met:
 - You admit that academic misconduct has occurred
 - You do not dispute the facts of the case and have no additional evidence (other than that provided to the School)
 - You would prefer a virtual panel rather than a formal hearing



Requesting a review

- If you are dissatisfied with the outcome of a virtual panel, you can only request a review on the grounds that a different penalty should be imposed.
- If you are dissatisfied with the outcome of a formal AMC hearing, you can only request a review on the following grounds:
 - A procedural irregularity occurred in the AMC hearing
 - A compelling argument that the decision and/or penalty was unreasonable and/or disproportionate.
- Dissatisfaction with the outcome alone does not constitute grounds for requesting a review.