



UNIVERSITY OF
WINCHESTER

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

Document Title:	Academic Integrity Policy
Responsible Role and Department:	Academic Registrar Registry & Academic Quality
Approving Body:	Senate
Date of Approval:	June 2025
Date Effective From:	1 st September 2025
Review Date:	March 2026
Indicate whether the document is for public access or internal access only. Indicate whether the document applies to collaborative provision? <i>(Strikethrough text, as appropriate)</i>	Public Access Internal Access Only Applies to Collaborative Provision
Summary: This document defines the policy and procedures for dealing with breaches of Academic Integrity.	

Equality Impact Assessment	
Summary of process undertaken to determine equality impacts:	A review of all protected characteristics and the engagement requirements of the policy to establish any detrimental impact of policy, practice or procedure as defined by the Equality Act 2010.
University Committee (name/ date) where equality impacts discussed (may be Committee of approval, or another):	Academic Regulations, Policy and Procedures Committee
Identified equality impact(s) on colleagues and students (i.e. any specific impacts related to this policy that may cause disadvantage for people due to one or more particular protective characteristic)	
Protected Characteristic	Impact(s) identified and any action(s)/mitigation(s) to address these impact(s), as necessary.
Age	There are no discernable impacts relating to Age
Disability	Recognition of where reasonable adjustments may be warranted as defined in section 21 of the Equality Act 2010 are embedded throughout the policy.
Gender Identity	There are no discernable impacts relating to Gender Identity.
Marriage/Civil Partnership	There are no discernable impacts relating to Marriage or Civil Partnership status.
Pregnancy and Maternity	Recognition of where reasonable adjustments may be warranted as defined in section 21 of the Equality Act 2010 are embedded throughout the policy.
Race (incl. nationality)	There are no discernable impacts relating to Race and Nationality.
Religion and Belief	There are no discernable impacts relating to Religion and Belief
Sex	There are no discernable impacts relating to Sex
Sexual Orientation	There are no discernable impacts relating to Sexual Orientation

Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION and PRINCIPLES.....	5
2.	EXAMPLES OF BREACHES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY	7
3.	POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE.....	8
4.	PROCEDURE FOR INVESTIGATION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT.....	9
5.	APPEALS	28
6.	COMPLETION OF PROCEEDINGS LETTER	28
7.	REVIEW BY THE OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATOR	28

1. INTRODUCTION and PRINCIPLES

- 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 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:
 - a. Appropriately acknowledging sources of information used in your academic work according to the permission, citation and referencing practices of the discipline of study;
 - b. Never seeking unfair advantage for yourself or another in any form of academic work or examination;
 - c. Collaborating with others when appropriate but always producing your own work independently when required
 - d. Never obtaining unauthorised external assistance in the creation of academic work;
 - e. Always presenting unfalsified and accurate data, imagery, documentation, and information, in and related to your work;
 - f. Recognising the contribution of others, providing fair and appropriate credit for work done by others, including your supervisory team.
 - g. 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;
 - h. Complying with all ethical requirements for the work undertaken;
 - i. Complying and undertaking all work and research responsibly, following all regulatory, legal, and professional obligations.
- 1.3 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.
- 1.4 All students are expected to develop their skills and, where directed, may use appropriate emerging technologies and resources in the course of their learning. What is not acceptable is the use of generative artificial intelligence (AI), other technology or resources to generate work on behalf of the student. This includes the use of technology to materially improve students' own academic work. The University will always seek to maintain the highest possible academic standards and is within its authority to utilise technology to assist in the identification of cases where misuse of resources is suspected. These include, but are not limited to, mechanisms to confirm authentic authorship of students' work. Every student, when submitting work, confirms that the work is their own and in doing so is affirming that they have created the work

themselves unless specific reference to the use of technology or other resources has been approved and directed within the assessment guidance and accordingly referenced by the student.

- 1.5 These processes apply to all current and former students at all levels of study for credit bearing awards in relation to their formal, or summative, assessed work. All students must familiarise themselves with the standards of academic integrity expected of them in their work. Where a breach of academic standards is proven it is on the facts that it has occurred and not on the intent of the perpetrator whether proven or not.
- 1.6 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.
- 1.7 University of Winchester students studying at collaborative academic institutions will be subject to procedures within that institution unless otherwise stated in a Programme Specific Requirement and any violations or penalties will be recorded on their University of Winchester record.
- 1.8 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.
- 1.9 The University wherever possible adopts the principles of compassionate communication and therefore, where practicable, will avoid notifying a student that they are subject to a new academic integrity investigation during the main scheduled assessment weeks to mitigate the possible negative psychological impact of the notification. This principle does not extend to investigations already underway for which the student has been notified prior to the assessment period.
- 1.10 Cases will always be determined on the balance of probabilities on the basis of the evidence available. This means that any proven case of a breach of academic integrity standards need not be determined beyond any reasonable doubt.
- 1.11 Cases that are reported to the University anonymously or by external parties will not normally be investigated. The Academic Registrar retains discretion to authorise an investigation in an exceptional case where there is credible and verifiable evidence.
- 1.12 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.
- 1.13 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.

- 1.14 The University will disclose all personal information in accordance with its [Data Protection Policy](#).
- 1.15 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.
- 1.16 Breaches of Academic integrity cannot be legitimised by Exceptional Circumstances, personal, medical, or family problems. These issues, if relevant, may be raised in relation to any penalties considered.
- 1.17 Independent and confidential advice around the academic integrity process can be gained from the [Students' Union Advice Centre](#). Students are encouraged to engage with this support and advice which is available for all stages of an academic integrity process.
- 1.18 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. EXAMPLES OF BREACHES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

- 2.1 Other than instances of poor academic practice, if the principles of academic integrity are breached, the University will investigate as potential academic misconduct.
- 2.2 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.
- 2.3 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.
 - a. **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.
 - b. **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.

- c. **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
- d. **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.
- e. **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 products, or similar. This may include input to an assessment from an organisation, software or an individual whether for payment or not;
- f. **Falsification** is any attempt to present fictitious or distorted material contributing to an assessment and/or knowingly making use of such material.
- g. **Unethical conduct** which deviates from the ethical standards for academic work, as defined in the [University Research Ethics Policy](#)
- h. **False declarations or false evidence** submitted by a student in order to receive special consideration under Exceptional 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.
- i. **Passing Off** is the creation of work by the use of alternative or generative technology that is declared as being the student's own authored work.
- j. **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".

3. POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE

- 3.1 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.

- 3.2 Referrals for Poor Academic Practice should be made through the Faculty marking and grading processes. Such referrals will be reviewed by the Associate Dean and/or an appointed Academic Integrity Officer who will confirm with the Marking Tutor that an outcome of Poor Academic Practice should be delivered.
- 3.3 If there is a record of a previous referral to Additional Academic Learning, the issue will 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.)
- 3.4 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.
- 3.5 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.
- 3.6 No penalty will be recorded but a note that Poor Academic Practice was identified and Additional Academic Learning was undertaken will be forwarded by the assessing tutor to academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk and the Programme Administrator, and recorded on the student's record.
- 3.7 The marking tutor will inform the student's Personal Academic Tutor (PAT) so that this can be discussed at their next meeting.

4. PROCEDURE FOR INVESTIGATION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

4.1 Initial Identification of Potential Academic Misconduct

- 4.1.1 If a marking tutor suspects academic misconduct they will make a written report (see 5.1.3) 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, though the work should be marked up as evidence and included with the written report
- 4.1.2 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.

4.1.3 The written report will:

- a. Specify the name(s), student number(s), programme and year of study of the student(s)
- b. Provide all details of the assessment set and made available to the student
- c. State the basis and evidence on which the allegation is made
- d. 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.
- e. Confirmation whether there are any programmatic or PSRB implications if an allegation is upheld, or requirements that debar the student from the usual right to a second attempt

4.1.4 The Associate Dean or nominee shall appoint an Academic Integrity Officer, normally from another Department within the Faculty, to consider the case.

4.1.5 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.

4.1.6 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.

4.2 Academic Integrity Officer's Response to an Allegation of Academic Misconduct

4.2.1 The Academic Integrity Officer will initially consider the allegations and evidence provided and will decide within 20 working days whether on the available evidence:

- a. 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.
- b. 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.

4.2.2 Once a conclusion has been reached the Academic Integrity Officer shall draft an email according to the actions listed below and, where necessary, confirm the details with academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk before sending the email to the student. All correspondence with the student should also be copied to_

4.3 Action to be taken where 'Academic Misconduct' is identified

- 4.3.1 The Academic Integrity Officer shall, normally, within 5 working days of receipt of an allegation email the student (copying academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk) to inform them that academic misconduct is suspected including, where appropriate:
- a. details of the nature of that offence
 - b. the investigating officer's own initial findings;
 - c. a copy of the Academic Integrity Procedures;
 - d. the evidence which supports the allegation, including the tutor's/invigilator's/examiner of PGR viva/other's written report;
 - e. 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
 - f. the deadline to reply is within ten working days of the Academic Integrity Officer's email
- 4.3.2 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.
- 4.3.3 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.
- 4.3.4 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. Where practicable, viva voces should be undertaken by the programme team prior to the Academic Integrity Officer making an initial judgement concerning whether an offence has taken place and details, including a recording or transcript of said viva, should be included within the evidence submitted to the investigating officer.
- 4.3.5 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.
- 4.3.6 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:
- a. 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;
 - b. The issue should be considered as poor academic practice under section 4;
 - c. 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;

- d. 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;
- e. The student denies the allegations and therefore the issue must proceed to a hearing of the Academic Integrity Panel.

4.3.7 A final report will then be completed and sent to both the student and academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk. Should the outcome be deliverable by the investigating officer they shall also accompany the report with a Confirmation of Outcome correspondence, drawing the process to a close.

4.3.8 Where the resolution of an investigation cannot be reached prior to the last Progression and Awards Board of the Summer (typically September), which would have a material impact on the student's ability to progress, the case will be forwarded to Registry and Academic Quality to resolve in an expedited fashion via approval of the Academic Registrar.

4.4 Convening an Academic Integrity Panel

4.4.1 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. 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.

4.4.2 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.

4.4.3 The hearing will be held at the University, 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.

4.4.4 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.

4.4.5 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, Students' Union representative or staff member. This person can advise and support the student.

- 4.4.6 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.
- 4.4.7 A member of Registry and Academic Quality will inform the Programme Leader of the time and date of the hearing.

4.5 Conduct of the Academic Integrity Panel Hearing

- 4.5.1 The conduct of the hearing will normally follow the following route but can be adapted by the Chair to suit circumstances:
- a. A member of Registry and Academic Quality (RAQ) will act as Secretary to the Panel and minute the hearing. Minutes are confidential to those present.
 - b. The Panel and Secretary will meet alone to discuss the case
 - c. The student, support person and Academic Integrity Officer will be invited to join the meeting
 - d. The Chair will open the meeting and summarise proceedings, and ensure the student has received all relevant information
 - e. The Academic Integrity Officer (or Chair in their absence) will outline the allegations and evidence
 - f. The Panel may question the Academic Integrity Officer The student will make representations to the Panel and may question the Academic Integrity Officer
 - g. The Panel may question the student
 - h. Witnesses will be invited in and questioned as appropriate, then withdraw
 - i. Final comments or responses will be invited from all parties
 - j. The student, support person and the Academic Integrity Officer will then withdraw
 - k. 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.
- 4.5.2 The Secretary will inform the student of the outcome and any penalty in writing within 5 working days and copy this to the 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.
- 4.5.3 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.
- 4.5.4 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.

4.6 Penalties for Academic Misconduct

4.6.1 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.

4.6.2 Principles

Penalties will be considered on the basis of:

- a. 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. Exceptional circumstances will be heard where raised in determining penalty. An indication of penalties against conduct types is provided in section 4.7.3.
- b. All misconduct penalties will be recorded on the student's record.
- c. Where a misconduct offence has been recorded previously against a student, a penalty one level higher will normally be levied.
- d. 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.
- e. If a penalty indicated by the Academic Integrity Officer prevents a student from completing their studies, the matter must be referred to an Academic Integrity Panel hearing.
- f. 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.
- g. 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).

4.6.3 Penalties available for examples of academic misconduct include:

Example of Academic Misconduct	Penalty Levels 3 & 4	Penalty Levels 5, 6, and 7	Penalty Level 8	Authority
Plagiarism/self-plagiarism (with intent to deceive if L3&4) Where failure to use quotation marks, unreferenced paraphrasing and missing referencing of sources	Penalty 1: A mark of zero will be given for the assessment concerned, but a second attempt for a capped mark will be given, where resubmission is possible	Penalty 2: Marks of zero will be given for all assessments within the module, but second attempts will be given for capped marks where resubmission is possible	Penalty 2: Marks of zero will be given for all assessments within the module, but second attempts will be given for capped marks where resubmission is possible	Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner
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: Marks of zero will be given for all assessments within the module, but second attempts will be given for capped marks where resubmission is possible	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	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 AND Penalty 4: 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	Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner

			<p>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>	
Fabricated referencing	<p>Penalty 3: Fail and retake module for capped marks (or substitute module if original module not available)</p>	<p>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</p>	<p>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.</p>	Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner
Deviation from ethical standards at any point where project is ethically low risk	<p>Penalty 1: A mark of zero will be given for the assessment concerned, but a second attempt for a capped mark will be given, where resubmission is possible</p>	<p>Penalty 1: A mark of zero will be given for the assessment concerned, but a second attempt for a capped mark will be given, where resubmission is possible. Ethics breaches – student also required to restart process with new data/ethics documents or resubmit an amended</p>	<p>Penalty 1: A mark of zero will be given for the assessment concerned, but a second attempt for a capped mark will be given, where resubmission is possible. Ethics breaches – student also required to restart process with new data/ethics documents or resubmit an amended Research</p>	Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner

		Research Proposal/Ethics Form as appropriate where resubmission still available	Proposal/Ethics Form as appropriate where resubmission still available	
Deviation from ethical standards at any point where project is ethically high risk	Penalty 3: Fail and retake module for capped marks (or substitute module if original module not available)	<p>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</p> <p>AND Penalty 4: Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.</p>	<p>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 AND</p> <p>Penalty 4: 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 Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner and for Penalty 4 approval by the Academic Registrar

Any involvement in personation or attempted personation	<p>Penalty 3: Fail and retake module for capped marks (or substitute module if original module not available) AND</p> <p>Penalty 4: Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.</p>	<p>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</p> <p>AND Penalty 4: Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.</p>	<p>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 AND</p> <p>Penalty 4: 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 Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner and for Penalty 4 approval by the Academic Registrar
---	--	---	--	---

<p>Passing off any work confirmed by the student as being authored by themselves but proven to be generated by unauthorised use of technology</p>	<p>Penalty 3: Fail and retake module for capped marks (or substitute module if original module not available) AND Penalty 4: Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.</p>	<p>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 AND Penalty 4: Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.</p>	<p>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 AND Penalty 4: 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. Any data, evidence or results collected/obtained up to that point cannot be used in any subsequently submitted thesis.</p>	<p>Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner and for Penalty 4 approval by the Academic Registrar</p>
---	---	--	---	--

<p>Commission or attempted commission of work by another – which would be assessed as student's own work</p>	<p>Penalty 3: Fail and retake module for capped marks (or substitute module if original module not available) AND Penalty 4: Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.</p>	<p>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 AND Penalty 4: Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.</p>	<p>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 AND Penalty 4: 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. Any data, evidence or results collected/obtained up to that point cannot be used in any subsequently submitted thesis.</p>	<p>Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner and for Penalty 4 approval by the Academic Registrar</p>
--	--	---	--	--

Unauthorised removal of used or unused official paper from an examination	Penalty 1: A mark of zero will be given for the assessment concerned, but a second attempt for a capped mark will be given, where resubmission is possible	Penalty 1: A mark of zero will be given for the assessment concerned, but a second attempt for a capped mark will be given, where resubmission is possible. 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	Penalty 1: A mark of zero will be given for the assessment concerned, but a second attempt for a capped mark will be given, where resubmission is possible. 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
Possession of unauthorised devices in examination conditions	Penalty 2: Marks of zero will be given for the assessment(s) within the module and second attempt(s) will be given for capped marks where resubmission is possible	Penalty 2: Marks of zero will be given for the assessment(s) within the module and second attempt(s) will be given for capped marks where resubmission is possible	Penalty 2: Marks of zero will be given for the assessment(s) within the module and second attempt(s) will be given for capped marks where resubmission is possible	Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner

<p>Cheating by stealing another student's work; or copying/attempting to copy, during an exam, either the work of another; or accessing/attempting to access during an exam, data or answers via unauthorised means or materials</p>	<p>Penalty 3: Fail and retake module for capped marks (or substitute module if original module not available)</p>	<p>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 AND Penalty 4: Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.</p>	<p>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 AND Penalty 4: 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. Any data, evidence or results collected/obtained up to that point cannot be used in any subsequently submitted thesis.</p>	<p>Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner</p>
--	--	---	--	--

<p>Acquiring or attempting to acquire, by any means, prior access to an unseen examination</p>	<p>Penalty 3: Fail and retake module for capped marks (or substitute module if original module not available) AND Penalty 4: Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.</p>	<p>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 AND Penalty 4: Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.</p>	<p>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 AND Penalty 4: 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. Any data, evidence or results collected/obtained up to that point cannot be used in any subsequently submitted thesis.</p>	<p>Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner and for Penalty 4 approval by the Academic Registrar</p>
--	--	---	--	--

<p>Submitting or attempting to submit pre-prepared work which should have been created during an assessment</p>	<p>Penalty 3: Fail and retake module for capped marks (or substitute module if original module not available)</p>	<p>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 AND Penalty 4: Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.</p>	<p>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 AND Penalty 4: 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. Any data, evidence or results collected/obtained up to that point cannot be used in any subsequently submitted thesis.</p>	<p>Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner and for Penalty 4 approval by the Academic Registrar</p>
---	--	---	--	--

Collusion – representing as a student's own work, work that was produced or created with another/others	Penalty 2: Marks of zero will be given for all assessments within the module, but second attempts will be given for capped marks where resubmission is possible	Penalty 2 where original authorship undetermined: Marks of zero will be given for all assessments within the module, but second attempts will be given for capped marks where resubmission is possible OR 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	Penalty 2 where original authorship undetermined: Marks of zero will be given for all assessments within the module, but second attempts will be given for capped marks where resubmission is possible OR 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	Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner
---	--	--	---	---

Submitting another student's work, in full or in part, as the student's own	Penalty 3: Fail and retake module for capped marks (or substitute module if original module not available)	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 AND Penalty 4: Reduction of Undergraduate and Post Graduate Taught degree classification or award by one level of classification or award.	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 AND Penalty 4: 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. Any data, evidence or results collected/obtained up to that point cannot be used in any subsequently submitted thesis.	Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner and for Penalty 4 approval by the Academic Registrar
---	---	--	---	---

Being a party to any behaviour or arrangement that would constitute a breach of these procedures	As determined in line with Penalties 1-4 where appropriate	As determined in line with Penalties 1-4 where appropriate	As determined in line with Penalties 1-4 where appropriate	Academic Integrity Officer & Academic Integrity Panel & Appeal determiner and for Penalty 4 approval by the Academic Registrar
--	---	---	---	---

In some instances, the Academic Integrity Officer and the Academic Integrity Panel may determine that the nature and impact of the proven academic misconduct may warrant more significant sanctions and so will make recommendations to the Academic Registrar as follows:

Penalty	Recommendation	Academic Registrar will
5	Termination of registration with or without final or fallback award	Review the case outcomes and where appropriate seek confirmation of penalty from Executive Leadership Team
6	<p>Where a student has already graduated a reclassification or revocation of final or fallback award.</p> <p>For PGR graduates:</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). (after submission) Student required to edit their 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. (after submission) Thesis deemed a fail and not fit for an award.</p>	<p>Review the case outcomes and where appropriate endorse reclassification or revocation of final or fallback award to Senate.</p> <p>Review the case outcomes and where appropriate confirm penalty with the Head of the Doctoral School and Director of Research & Innovation.</p>

5. APPEALS

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

5.1.1 A student can appeal the decision of the Academic Integrity Officer to the Academic Integrity Panel via academic.integrity@winchester.ac.uk on the grounds that there is evidence to support:

- a. The penalty the Academic Integrity Officer levied was not reasonable in the circumstances of the case
- b. The University did not follow policy or process as determined in these procedures

5.2 Appeals against the decision of the Academic Integrity Panel

5.2.1 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 where there is evidence that:

- a. The decision or panel process was not conducted in accordance with these procedures
- b. There is new evidence, not available previously, which would change the outcome
- c. The decision was not reasonable in the circumstances of the case

5.2.2 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 clearly stating the grounds and reasons for the appeal.

5.2.3 Appeals will be considered by the Academic Registrar, or nominee where approval of penalty 4, 5 or 6 have been applied or where the Academic Registrar was the original Academic Integrity Panel Chair. Their decision will be final.

6. COMPLETION OF PROCEEDINGS LETTER

6.1 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.

6.2 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.

7. REVIEW BY THE OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATOR

7.1 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).