



# Student Academic Integrity Procedures

Complaints and Casework  
Registry and Academic Quality  
2023/24



UNIVERSITY OF  
**WINCHESTER**

<b>Document Title</b>	Student Academic Integrity Procedures
<b>Role of Document Author and Department</b> <i>(no name)</i>	Head of Complaints and Casework Registry and Academic Quality
<b>Role of Responsible person and Department</b> <i>(no name)</i>	Academic Registrar
<b>Approving Body</b>	Senate
<b>Date of Approval</b>	1 September 2023
<b>Date Effective From</b>	1 September 2023
<b>Review Date</b> <i>(normally triennially)</i>	June 2026
<b>Indicate whether the document is for public access or internal access only</b> <b>Indicate whether the document applies to collaborative provision?</b> <i>(Strikethrough text, as appropriate)</i>	<b>Public Access</b> <del>Internal Access Only</del> <b>Applies to Collaborative Provision</b>
<b>Description</b>	
<p>This document defines the policy and procedures for dealing with breaches of academic integrity. It replaces the Academic Misconduct Policy</p> <p>A summary of changes to this document appears on page 3.</p>	

## SUMMARY OF CHANGES

This list summarises the changes since 2023/24. The date confirms when the changes were implemented.


## Contents

<b>GLOSSARY</b> .....	5
<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b> .....	6
<b>2. THE PRINCIPLES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY</b> .....	7
<b>3. EXAMPLES OF BREACHES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY</b> .....	8
<b>4. POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE</b> .....	9
<b>5. PROCEDURE FOR INVESTIGATION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT</b> .....	10
5.1 Initial Identification of Potential Academic Misconduct .....	10
5.2 Academic Integrity Officer’s Response to an Allegation of Academic Misconduct .....	11
5.3 Action to be taken where ‘Academic Misconduct’ is identified .....	11
5.4 Convening an Academic Integrity Panel .....	12
5.5 Conduct of the Academic Integrity Panel Hearing .....	13
5.6 Penalties for Academic Misconduct .....	14
<b>6. APPEALS</b> .....	17
<b>7. COMPLETION OF PROCEEDINGS LETTER</b> .....	18
<b>8. REVIEW BY THE OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATOR</b> .....	18
<b>APPENDIX 1 – Table of penalties</b> .....	19

## GLOSSARY

Additional Academic Learning	Materials provided by the University of Winchester which address common errors made in academic writing, and/or other issues which may be flagged as of concern under the umbrella of being contrary to good academic practice. These materials are to be reviewed by students, as mandatory, upon any upheld allegation or Poor Academic Practice or Academic Misconduct.
Appeal determiner	A member of University staff who considers an appeal against a decision and determines whether the appeal is upheld or not.
Collaborative academic institutions	Also known as 'Collaborative Partner organisations', defined as organisations who have an arrangement with the University to deliver aspects of teaching, learning, assessment and student support, which either lead to a University of Winchester award or allow the student to enter a University of Winchester programme with advanced standing.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The University of Winchester, its students and staff, work as a community with collective responsibility for maintaining and promoting a culture and practice of honesty and ethical behaviour in scholarship. As a community we acknowledge the importance of creating a fair and equal assessment process where all scholarship is assessed on its own merit. Our academic integrity process exists to uphold that principle for the benefit of all students and ensure that allegations of unfair practice, cheating, plagiarism and other academic misconduct are investigated and, where proven, sanctioned appropriately.
- 1.2 These processes apply to all current and former students, including those within Foundation Year, Undergraduate, Postgraduate Taught, Postgraduate Research, Apprenticeships and credit bearing short courses, and relating to their submissions of academic work and assessments towards credit in whatever form. All students must familiarise themselves with the standards of academic integrity expected of them in their work. Breaches of academic standards are based upon whether they have occurred, not whether they are intended.
- 1.3 There are no time limits to commencing an investigation into breaches of academic integrity. Investigations can be commenced even after graduation, and penalties, including reclassification or cancellation (revocation) of award, can be applied retrospectively.
- 1.4 University of Winchester students studying at collaborative academic institutions will be subject to procedures within the that institution unless otherwise stated in the agreement between the two institutions and any violations or penalties will be recorded on their University of Winchester record.
- 1.5 Students who are being investigated under this process will be kept informed of the allegations and the process to be followed. They will also be given time and opportunity to respond to any allegation. Communication with the student will be sent to the student's Unimail account if they are a current student and otherwise as appropriate for former students.
- 1.6 Cases will be determined on the balance of probabilities on the basis of the evidence available.
- 1.7 Cases that are reported to us anonymously or by parties external to the University will not normally be investigated. The Director of Equalities, Conduct and Complaints retains discretion to authorise an investigation in an exceptional case where there is credible and verifiable evidence.
- 1.8 Records of investigations where there has been a finding of no case to answer will be retained for analysis, trend data, and student support purposes. This record will only pertain to the fact that an investigation was undertaken. The retention of records would align with the same mechanism under the Office for Students B4 conditions as applied to retention of work, i.e. the record would be kept for a period of no longer than 5 years after the end of a student's period of registration with the University. A permanent record of academic misconduct will be kept by Registry services only where a case has been proven.
- 1.9 Where allegations relate to students on courses with professional body and Fitness to Practise expectations, the academic integrity process may either combine with a Fitness to

Practise process or refer a finding to be considered under that process in an appropriate case, at the discretion of the Academic Registrar. University of Winchester retains the right to disclose proven breaches and penalties under these processes to individuals outside the University, including professional bodies, where it considers it necessary and appropriate to do so.

- 1.10 The University will disclose all personal information in accordance with its [Data Protection Policy](#).
- 1.11 Where students have declared a disability to the University, the University will endeavour to ensure that information is available at all stages of the procedure in appropriate formats, and where needed reasonable adjustments will be made to our process.
- 1.12 Breaches of Academic integrity cannot be legitimised by Extenuating Circumstances, personal, medical, or family problems. These issues, if relevant may be raised in relation to any penalties considered.
- 1.13 Free, independent and confidential advice around the academic integrity process can be gained from the [Student Union Advice Centre](#). Students are encouraged to engage with this support and advice which is available for all stages of an academic integrity process.
- 1.14 The University's Academic Integrity process is subject to independent review by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator and students who are dissatisfied with the process or outcome may qualify to apply to this scheme. Details are found in section 8 of this policy.

## **2. THE PRINCIPLES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY**

- 2.1 Academic integrity requires an adherence to some simple principles of fairness and transparency which allow a student's work to be judged on its own academic merit and on an equal playing field with their academic peers. These principles include:
  - Appropriately acknowledging sources of information used in your academic work according to the permission, citation and referencing practices of the discipline of study;
  - Never seeking unfair advantage for yourself or another in any form of academic work or examination;
  - Collaborating with others when appropriate but always producing your own work independently when required
  - Never obtaining unauthorised external assistance in the creation of academic work;
  - Always presenting unfalsified and accurate data, imagery, documentation, and information, in and related to your work;
  - Recognising the contribution of others, providing fair and appropriate credit for work done by others, including your supervisory team.
  - Declaring when you have used academic work that you have previously submitted in another academic context and using it only with permission from the module lead and appropriate acknowledgement;

- Complying with all ethical requirements for the work undertaken;
- Complying and undertaking all work and research responsibly, following all regulatory, legal, and professional obligations.

2.2 Where actions inconsistent with the principles above occur because of inexperience, error or lack of understanding in a student normally in their Foundation Year or at Level 4 of study, and where the effect on the academic work is limited in scope or effect on the academic work concerned, this may be classed as poor academic practice rather than academic misconduct and processed in accordance with section 4.

### 3. EXAMPLES OF BREACHES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

3.1 Other than instances of poor academic practice, if the principles of academic integrity are breached, the University will investigate as potential academic misconduct.

3.2 As a general guide, such breaches include the giving or receiving of aid on an academic assignment in circumstances in which a reasonable person should have known such aid was not permitted. We recognise and include here that new technological and commercial aids and services continually emerge that, if used as aids against the principles of academic integrity above, would be considered as breaches for investigation under these procedures.

3.3 The list below, which is not exhaustive, provides instances of academic misconduct. Examples of each can be found in guidance on the University's intranet.

**Plagiarism** is the act of using someone else's work, ideas or words without giving them appropriate acknowledgement. It can be in the form of verbatim or near-verbatim copying or paraphrasing without acknowledgement, from published or unpublished material which is the intellectual property of another, including the work of other students and Artificial Intelligence services, regardless of whether the work was used with or without permission from the author.

**Self-plagiarism** refers to a student substantially re-using their own work, without prior permission from their module lead, that has been published or submitted previously for another assessment.

**Cheating** is defined as using deceitful or fraudulent means to obtain an unfair advantage in an assessment, for instance by bringing unauthorised materials into an exam venue, or breaching University regulations, policies or procedures relating to assessments

**Collusion** is working with another student/s or other individuals in an unauthorised way to create a piece of assessed work, where the expectation is that the submitted work should be the work of the individual and created independently.

**Contract cheating** or 'ghosting' is when a student:

Commissions and intends to submit or does submit **as their own work**, a piece of work that has been produced in whole or part by another person, software, and/or



organisation on their behalf, e.g. the use of a 'ghost writing' service, essay mills, Artificial Intelligence services or product, or similar. This may include input to an assessment from an organisation, software or an individual whether for payment or not;

**Falsification** is any attempt to present fictitious or distorted material contributing to an assessment and/or knowingly making use of such material.

**Unethical conduct** which deviates from the ethical standards for academic work, as defined in the [University Research Ethics Policy](#)

**False declarations or false evidence** submitted by a student in order to receive special consideration under Extenuating Circumstances, Student Support and Success, Progression and Award Board processes or other University processes, including requests for an extension and/or exemption from work, Learning Agreement, or an appeal.

**Personation** is the assumption by one person of the identity of another person with intent to deceive or to gain unfair advantage. It is the legal term for what is usually described by the lay person as "impersonation".

## 4. POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE

- 4.1 Poor academic practice is considered to be a minor failure to employ appropriate standards of academic conventions such as non-standard referencing, over-representation of reference material, poor (as opposed to deceptive) paraphrasing and failure to include quotation marks but attributing the source, or failure to attribute sources. The scale and effect of the deficiency in standard, the level of study of the student and the existence of prior similar deficiencies in standards are relevant to the assessment by the marking tutor or examiners in PGR vivas, as to whether such breaches are poor academic practice or may constitute academic misconduct. Sources may include Artificial Intelligence and an indicative list of these can be found on the University intranet.
- 4.2 Marking tutors should consult with their administration team to ascertain if a previous referral for Additional Academic Learning exists before deciding whether the issue is poor academic practice or may be academic misconduct.
- 4.3 If there is a record of a previous referral to Additional Academic Learning, the issue may be investigated as academic misconduct. Students should be very clear that having had the opportunity to undertake Additional Academic Learning, any future proven instances of plagiarism could attract sanctions as previous instances will be taken into account when imposing penalties, and each instance at a higher level of sanction. (See section 5.6 and appendix 1 for examples of sanctions.)
- 4.4 If a student submits more than one assessment with the same type of issue and within a timeframe where they would not have benefited from feedback to highlight the issue, the issue should normally be considered as a single deficiency in academic practice.
- 4.5 If work submitted is identified as poor academic practice by the marking tutor, the student will be signposted by them to Additional Academic Learning to reduce any likelihood of

further occurrences or breaches. No further action will be taken and the assessment will be marked in accordance with the quality of the work submitted. The marking tutor will highlight where marks were lost owing to poor practice and failure to follow assessment and marking criteria.

- 4.6 No penalty will be recorded but a note that Additional Academic Learning was undertaken will be forwarded by the assessing tutor to [academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk](mailto:academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk) and the Programme Administrator and recorded on the student's record.
- 4.7 The marking tutor will inform the student's Personal Academic Tutor (PAT) so that this can be discussed at their next meeting.

## **5. PROCEDURE FOR INVESTIGATION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT**

### **5.1 Initial Identification of Potential Academic Misconduct**

- 5.1.1 If a marking tutor suspects academic misconduct they will make a written report to the Associate Dean for the Faculty, or nominee in their absence, as soon as practicable and no later than five working days of assessing the work. The work should not be further marked or returned to the student at this point.
- 5.1.2 If an invigilator in an exam suspects a candidate of attempting to gain improper advantage, they shall inform the student of their suspicions, confiscate any unauthorised materials or devices, allow the candidate(s) in question to continue with the exam, and complete a written report to Registry, with any evidence, as soon as possible after the exam has ended. Evidence relating to personation should attempt to be gathered through checking and copying ID and referencing against photographic records or other methods. Registry will forward all information to the relevant Associate Dean or nominee for the Faculty.
- 5.1.3 The written report will:
- Specify the name(s), student number(s), programme and year of study of the student(s)
  - Provide all details of the assessment set and made available to the student
  - State the basis and evidence on which the allegation is made
  - Provide all evidence. This should include where appropriate: the student's assignment with clear indications of where the misconduct is considered to have occurred accompanied with any source materials considered plagiarised and relevant passages clearly marked. Turnitin reports, if available, should be used as evidence in a professional manner, e.g. Where Turnitin is used, 'exclusions' should be set for quotes, bibliography and all sources with a cumulative match word count that is less than 10 words and must clearly specify which extracts justify the allegation with links to the original source documents. Allegations which simply cite the overall "Similarity Index" will not be considered for investigation.

- Confirmation whether there are any programmatic or PRSB implications if an allegation is upheld, or requirements that debar the student from the usual right to a second attempt

- 5.1.4 The Associate Dean or nominee shall appoint an Academic Integrity Officer, normally from another Department within the Faculty, to consider the case.
- 5.1.5 If an allegation is made by another student or staff member, a third party, or retrospectively outside of the current academic year or after Progression and Awarding Boards, it should be referred to the Associate Dean or nominee who will consult with the Academic Registrar about how best to proceed.
- 5.1.6 If there are concerns about misconduct around the investigation process, for instance because of potential intimidation/coercion of witnesses or falsification of evidence, the academic integrity process may be paused pending the outcome of any student disciplinary processes if initiated.

## **5.2 Academic Integrity Officer's Response to an Allegation of Academic Misconduct**

- 5.2.1 The Academic Integrity Officer will initially consider the allegations and evidence provided and will decide as soon as is practicable whether on the available evidence:

There is no case to answer. If so, the work should be marked as normal, and no record kept

The issue should be considered as poor academic practice under section 4.

The student should be informed of academic misconduct allegations which, if appropriate, may be investigated further. If sufficient evidence is available, a possible penalty will be indicated.

- 5.2.2 Once a conclusion has been reached the Academic Integrity Officer shall draft an email according to the actions listed below and confirm the details with [academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk](mailto:academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk) before sending the email to the student. All correspondence with the student should be copied to [academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk](mailto:academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk).

## **5.3 Action to be taken where 'Academic Misconduct' is identified**

- 5.3.1 The Academic Integrity Officer shall, normally, within 5 working days of receipt of an allegation email the student (copying [academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk](mailto:academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk)) to inform them that academic misconduct is suspected including, where appropriate:
- details of the nature of that offence;
  - a copy of the Academic Integrity Procedures;
  - the evidence which supports the allegation, including the tutor's/invigilator's/examiner of PGR viva/other's written report;

- a request that the student respond to confirm or deny the allegation and inviting them to put forward any further evidence to be taken into account
  - the deadline to reply is within ten working days of the Academic Integrity Officer's email
- 5.3.2 If more time is needed to investigate the allegation or seek further evidence, the Academic Integrity Officer will write to the student to confirm the details of the offence and that the investigation is on-going and estimate, where possible, when this might be completed. All further evidence will be sent to the student.
- 5.3.3 The Academic Integrity Officer may ask the student to provide their notes, drafts and any other records relating to their preparatory work for the assessment. Any failure to provide this material is likely to be considered when a decision is made about potential academic misconduct.
- 5.3.4 If the Academic Integrity Officer considers it necessary, the student may be required to attend an oral examination or *viva voce* to allow them an opportunity to demonstrate that the work is their own. At least two members of academic staff will assess whether the student's responses indicate authorship of the work. If a student does not participate in the oral examination, negative inferences may be made regarding their authorship of the work.
- 5.3.5 If the student does not respond to the Academic Integrity Officer's email confirming that there is an allegation of academic misconduct being investigated, the University shall interpret this to mean that the student does not wish to deny the allegation.
- 5.3.6 Once all of the available evidence and the student's response have been considered, the Academic Integrity Officer will decide one of the following as soon as practicable:
- There is no case to answer. If so, the work should be marked as normal, and no record kept and the student should be informed;
  - The issue should be considered as poor academic practice under section 4;
  - The student has admitted the allegations and a penalty can be imposed because it falls under the authority of the Academic Integrity Officer as outlined in section 5.6.3;
  - The student has admitted the allegations but the issue must proceed to a hearing of the Academic Integrity Panel because the penalty suggested falls under their remit;
  - The student denies the allegations and therefore the issue must proceed to a hearing of the Academic Integrity Panel.

#### **5.4 Convening an Academic Integrity Panel**

- 5.4.1 An Academic Integrity Panel shall be convened by the Conduct and Caseload team (the Convener) at the earliest opportunity if the student has denied the allegations or where the penalty suggested by an Academic Integrity Officer falls under the Panel's remit. The purpose of the Panel will be to consider, on the basis of all the evidence and representations, whether the allegations are proven on the balance of probabilities and, if so, what penalty should be applied.

- 5.4.2 The Panel will consist of the Academic Registrar or nominee (Chair) and one academic member of staff, a secretary will be in attendance to the Panel. The panel members will have no prior knowledge of the student's record, except where the student has provided this information themselves. If an allegation is relatively minor but has been referred to the Panel because of a previous confirmed occurrence, the Secretary will confirm that the proceedings are in line with process.
- 5.4.3 The Convener will ensure that the student has all relevant documents and information related to the case and Panel hearing and will arrange all venues, meeting links and communications with parties attending.
- 5.4.4 The hearing will be held at the University of Winchester, or online via Teams or similar as appropriate. If a student is unable to attend the hearing due to ill health, they are required to submit medical evidence and the Hearing will be postponed where reasonable to do so.
- 5.4.5 Where the student who is the subject of the allegation, does not appear at the hearing, the Panel may proceed to deal with the allegation in their absence provided the Chair of the Panel is satisfied that the student has been properly notified of the sitting of the Panel.
- 5.4.6 The student has a right to be accompanied to the hearing by a member of the University community who must be independent to the allegation and may be a student, Student Union representative or staff member. This person can advise and support the student. Legal representation is not normally permitted.
- 5.4.7 The student, members of the Academic Integrity Panel together with the Academic Integrity Officer and any other witnesses due to appear before the Panel, shall receive at least 5 working days written notice of the date, time and place of the meeting of the Panel (sent by email). The email shall be accompanied by all documents relevant to the meeting.
- 5.4.8 A member of the Conduct and Caseload Team will inform the Programme Leader of the time and date of the hearing.

## **5.5 Conduct of the Academic Integrity Panel Hearing**

- 5.5.1 The conduct of the hearing will normally follow the following route but can be adapted by the Chair to suit circumstances:
- A member of the Conduct and Caseload Team will act as Secretary to the Panel and minute the hearing. Minutes are confidential to those present.
  - The Panel and Secretary will meet alone to discuss the case
  - The student, support person and Academic Integrity Officer will be invited to join the meeting
  - The Chair will open the meeting and summarise proceedings, and ensure the student has received all relevant information
  - The Academic Integrity Officer (or Chair in their absence) will outline the allegations and evidence
  - The Panel may question the Academic Integrity Officer

- The student will make representations to the Panel and may question the Academic Integrity Officer
- The Panel may question the student
- Witnesses will be invited in and questioned as appropriate, then withdraw
- Final comments or responses will be invited from all parties
- The student, support person and the Academic Integrity Officer will then withdraw
- The Panel will discuss the case and either make a decision or require further information or investigation. The student, support person and Academic Integrity Officer will be invited back to the Hearing to hear the decision if reached.

5.5.2 The Secretary will inform the student of the outcome and any penalty in writing within 5 working days and copy this to the the Programme Leader, Programme Administrator, Academic Liaison Officer (for Collaborative Partners), Head of Department and Chair of the Faculty Progression and Award Board or Postgraduate Student Progress Committee, Ethics Committee Chair, as appropriate.

5.5.3 If the Panel determine that there is no case to answer or that the breach is poor academic practice, processes relevant to those findings will be followed as outlined in sections 1.8 and 4.

5.5.4 If the Panel determine that allegations of Academic Misconduct are proven, the Secretary to the Panel will inform them of any previous penalties on the student's record.

## **5.6 Penalties for Academic Misconduct**

5.6.1 Penalties will be determined by an Academic Integrity Officer, Academic Integrity Panel, and/or Appeal Determiner in accordance with the following principles and based on the outlined penalties available to them outlined below and in Appendix 1.

### 5.6.2 Principles

Penalties will be considered on the basis of:

- the proportion of the work affected by the misconduct, the potential contribution of the affected work towards the overall mark, opportunities for prior feedback relating to the offences, the number of previous and contemporaneous offences and the existence of evidence of intention to deceive or coerce. Mitigating circumstances will be heard where raised in determining penalty. An indication of penalties against conduct types is provided in Appendix 1.
- All misconduct penalties will be recorded on the student's record.
- Where a misconduct offence has been recorded previously against a student, a penalty one level higher will normally be levied.
- All graduated student and postgraduate research student misconduct cases must be determined by an Academic Integrity Panel.

- In all cases other than termination, the student will also be required to undertake Additional Academic Learning.
- If a penalty indicated by the Academic Integrity Officer prevents (or later prevents) a student from progressing, the matter must be referred to an Academic Integrity Panel hearing.
- If a penalty indicated by the Academic Integrity Panel involves terminating with or without an exit award, the matter must be referred to the Vice Chancellor or nominee for endorsement.
- If a case is proven against a graduated student and is considered to have affected the award or classification of award made to the student, the reclassification or revocation of award must be referred to the Vice Chancellor or nominee for endorsement (Penalty 6).

### 5.6.3 Penalties available include:

Authority	Identifier	Penalty
Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner	Penalty 1	Fail and resubmit the assignment affected for capped marks where resubmission still available  Ethics breaches – student also required to restart process with new data/ethics documents or resubmit an amended Research Proposal/Ethics Form as appropriate where resubmission still available
Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner	Penalty 2	Fail and resubmit all module assignments for capped marks where resubmission still available
Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner	Penalty 3	Fail and retake module for capped marks (or substitute module if original module not available)  Ethics breaches – student also required to restart process with new data/ethics documents or resubmit an amended Research Proposal/Ethics Form as appropriate where resubmission still available  If the misconduct occurs at upgrade or final viva, post graduate research students will be required to carry out

		amendments to the satisfaction of, and within a timeframe set by the assessors and the PGR Students Progress Committee.
Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner	Penalty 4	<p>Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.</p> <p>Research degree students will not be permitted to progress (including upgrading to PhD) until they have clearly evidenced that they have addressed the issues that have come to light and may in some cases have their programme terminated.</p> <p>Any data, evidence or results collected/obtained up to that point cannot be used in any subsequently submitted thesis.</p>
Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner	Penalty 5	Termination with or without exit award
Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner	Penalty 6 (students who have graduated)	Reclassification of award or Revocation of award
Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner	PGR additional (at the discretion of the Panel and Appeal determiner)	<p>PGR students' additional possible actions:</p> <p>Student required to restart process with new data or resubmit an amended Research Proposal/Ethics Form as appropriate</p> <p>Student will not be permitted to progress or upgrade until issues are addressed within the work to the satisfaction of the examiner (s).</p> <p>(after submission) Student required to edit their</p>



		<p>assessment work removing the affected sections to the satisfaction of the examiners and resubmit</p> <p>(after submission) Affected sections removed from assessment work and Examiners instructed to assess without student editing.</p> <p>(after submission) Thesis deemed a fail and not fit for an award.</p>
--	--	---

## 6. APPEALS

### 6.1 Poor Academic Practice

If a student considers that their work was not correctly identified as poor academic practice, they can raise a complaint stating their reasons and any evidence through the [Student Complaints Policy](#).

### 6.2 Appeals against process followed, and/or penalty set by an Academic Integrity Officer

6.2.1 A student can appeal the decision of the Academic Integrity Officer to the Academic Integrity Panel via [academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk](mailto:academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk), on the grounds that:

- The penalty the Academic Integrity Officer levied was not reasonable in the circumstances of the case
- The process followed was not conducted in accordance with these procedures

6.2.2 There is no further right of appeal on these grounds.

### 6.3 Appeals against the decision of the Academic Integrity Panel

6.3.1 For all decisions of the Academic Integrity Panel other than decisions relating to penalties imposed by an Academic Integrity Officer, students can appeal on one or more of the following grounds:

- The decision or panel process was not conducted in accordance with these procedures
- There is new evidence, not available previously, which would change the outcome

- The decision was not reasonable in the circumstances of the case
- 6.3.2 Appeals in writing must be made within ten working days of the date of the written confirmation of outcome sent by the Secretary to the Panel and should be sent to [academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk](mailto:academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk) clearly stating the grounds and reasons for the appeal.
- 6.3.3 Appeals will be considered by the Academic Registrar, or nominee where the Academic Registrar was the original Academic Integrity Panel Chair. Their decision will be final.

## **7. COMPLETION OF PROCEEDINGS LETTER**

- 7.1 A Completion of Proceedings letter (COP) will be available for issue at the point where all internal processes available for review have been exhausted. This would usually be at the end of the appeal stage but would also cover situations where an appeal request is out of time or not within permissible grounds for consideration.
- 7.2 If a student has had a decision that is not in their favour at the end of that process (e.g., at the end of appeal stage) then a COP letter will be issued automatically. If a student has an outcome in their favour or partly in their favour at the end of that process (e.g., at the end of appeal stage), or is out of time, then a COP letter will be issued if it is requested within 28 days of the communication of the outcome.

## **8. REVIEW BY THE OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATOR**

- 8.1 Students and former students who are dissatisfied with the outcome of the University's internal complaints procedures may refer the matter to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) within 12 months of the date of issue of the Completion of Procedures Letter. Further information can be obtained from the Students Union Advice Centre or the OIA website ([www.oiahe.ac.uk](http://www.oiahe.ac.uk)).

## APPENDIX 1 – Table of penalties

Misconduct Offence	Penalty –Study Levels 3 & 4	Penalty – Study Levels 5,6,7 & 8
Plagiarism/self-plagiarism (with intent to deceive if L3&4) Consisting of occasional failure to use quotation marks, occasional unreferenced paraphrasing and missing referencing of sources	Penalty 1	Penalty 2
Plagiarism/self-plagiarism (with intent to deceive if L3&4) consisting of extensive: reuse of own work, another’s work without quotation marks and/or inclusion in reference list, or close paraphrasing without quotation marks and direct attribution of text in referencing	Penalty 2	Penalty 3 (3 & 4 for Level 8 )
Fabricated referencing	Penalty 3	Penalty 3
Deviation from ethical standards at any point where project is ethically low risk	Penalty 1	Penalty 1
Deviation from ethical standards at any point where project is ethically high risk	Penalty 3	Penalty 3 & 4
Any involvement in personation or attempted personation	Penalty 3 & 4	Penalty 3 & 4
Commission or attempted commission of work by another – which would be assessed as student’s own work	Penalty 3 & 4	Penalty 3 & 4
Unauthorised removal of used or unused official paper from an examination	Penalty 1	Penalty 1
Possession of unauthorised devices in examination conditions	Penalty 2	Penalty 2
Cheating by stealing another student’s work; or copying/attempting to copy,	Penalty 3	Penalty 3 (& 4)

during an exam, either the work of another; or accessing/attempting to access during an exam, data or answers via unauthorised means or materials		
Acquiring or attempting to acquire, by any means, prior access to an unseen examination	Penalty 3 & 4	Penalty 3 & 4
Submitting or attempting to submit pre-prepared work which should have been created during an assessment	Penalty 3	Penalty 3 (& 4)
Collusion – representing as a student’s own work, work that was produced or created with another/others	Penalty 2	Penalty 3
Submitting another student’s work, in full or in part, as the student’s own	Penalty 3	Penalty 3 (&4)
Being a party to any behaviour or arrangement that would constitute a breach of these Procedures.	Penalty determined in line with the penalties outlined above	Penalty determined in line with the penalties outlined above