

# ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCEDURES

## 2025/26

### Academic Registry

Version	Issue Date	Revision Description	Author	Approved By & Date	Next Review Date
1.0	September 2019	First issue	Gwenllian Jones	Board of Governors 12 August 2019	June 2020
2.0	September 2020	Second issue	Gwenllian Jones	Quality Assurance Committee/Academic Board/Board of Governors 6 July 2020	June 2021
3.0	September 2021	Third issue	Gwenllian Jones	Quality Assurance Committee/Academic Board/Board of Governors 19 May 2021	June 2022
4.0	September 2022	Fourth Issue	Gwenllian Jones	QAC/Academic Board/Board of Governors	June 2023
5.0	September 2023	Fifth Issue	Siobhan Coakley	QAC/Academic Board/Board of Governors	June 2024
6.0	September 2024	Sixth Issue Academic Misconduct Regulations renamed as Academic Integrity Regulations. Amendment to remove compulsory AIO meetings Separation of regulations from procedures. Remove investigation into L3, L4, & L7 cases of plagiarism	Eliza Jones	QAC/Academic Board/Board of Governors	June 2025
7.0	September 2025	Remove reference to L7 in relation to referrals to the Academic Integrity Module	Wendy Roberts	N/A	October 2026

## Contents

1. INTRODUCTION .....	4
1.1. Academic Integrity Procedures.....	4
1.2. Applicability of Procedures .....	4
2. REFERRING A SUSPECTED BREACH OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY .....	4
3. DEALING WITH SUSPECTED ACADEMIC INTEGRITY BREACHES .....	5
3.1. Plagiarism and poor academic practice .....	5
3.2. Other types of academic misconduct cases and plagiarism at levels 5, 6 & 7.....	6
3.3. Exploratory meetings .....	6
4. Levels of Investigation .....	6
4.1. Faculty Level (AIO Investigation).....	7
4.1.1. No case to answer .....	7
4.1.2. Poor academic practice .....	7
4.1.3. Case to answer – No penalty.....	7
4.1.4. Case to answer – assign penalty.....	7
4.1.5. Case to answer – escalate case to University level .....	8
4.1.6. Receiving an outcome of an AIO investigation .....	8
4.1.7. Accepting the outcome .....	8
4.1.8. Rejecting the outcome .....	8
4.2. University Level (AIP investigation).....	8
4.2.1. Proceedings .....	9
4.2.2. Possible outcomes.....	9
4.2.3. No case to answer .....	9
4.2.4. Poor academic practice .....	9
4.2.5. Case to answer – No penalty.....	9
4.2.6. Case to answer – assign penalty.....	9
4.2.7. Receiving an outcome of an AIP .....	10
4.3. Request for Review.....	10

4.3.1.	Grounds for review .....	10
4.3.2.	How to request a review .....	10
4.3.3.	Student advice .....	11
4.3.4.	Consideration of requests .....	11
4.3.5.	Original decision will stand .....	11
4.3.6.	Administrative error .....	11
4.3.7.	Review Panel .....	11
4.3.8.	Composition of the Review Board and Review Panel.....	11
4.3.9.	Conduct of meetings .....	12
4.3.10.	Review outcomes.....	12
5.	GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR THE OPERATION OF MEETINGS .....	12
5.1.	Support at meetings .....	12
5.1.1.	Legal support at meetings .....	13
5.2.	Meeting location .....	14
5.3.	Exploratory meetings – Timing and attendance.....	14
5.4.	AIO/AIP meetings – Timing and attendance .....	15
5.5.	Meeting preparation .....	15
5.6.	Meeting composition .....	16
5.6.1.	Exploratory meetings .....	16
5.6.2.	AIO meetings .....	16
5.6.3.	AIP meetings.....	16
5.7.	Meeting outcomes.....	17
6.	CONFIRMATION OF CASE OUTCOMES.....	17
7.	MONITORING .....	17
7.1.	Annual Academic Integrity Report .....	17
8.	ADVICE AND SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS.....	18
8.1.	Student Support Services .....	18
9.	OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATOR FOR HIGHER EDUCATION (OIA).....	18
10.	GLOSSARY OF TERMS .....	18
11.	TABLE OF TIMESCALES.....	20

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### 1.1. Academic Integrity Procedures

The University's Academic Integrity Procedures should be read in conjunction with the [Academic Integrity Regulations](#).

### 1.2. Applicability of Procedures

The University's Academic Integrity Regulations apply to students who are:

- Studying with the University of South Wales.
- Studying at the Royal Welsh College of Music and Drama. NB Any reference made to 'faculties' or 'faculty' in the regulations should be read as 'the College'.
- Studying university courses at the University's partner institutions.
- Studying on work placements or engaged in work-based learning.
- On an approved leave of absence.
- Apprentices/employed students.

NB Any reference to 'student(s)' should also be read as 'apprentice(s) / employed students'. Information on the receipt, progress and outcome of suspected breaches of academic integrity against apprentices/employed students will be provided to the Dean of Faculty (or nominee), who may inform the apprentice / employed student's employer.

- Postgraduate Research Students (up until the submission of their thesis). Cases are always considered by an Academic Integrity Panel. Following the submission of a thesis the [Regulations for Research Degrees](#) will apply.
- Former students of the University, where there is a suspected breach of academic integrity regarding an assessment, which was completed by them during their time as an active student at the University.
- Sometimes the regulations will refer to specific policies or procedures. These policies and procedures set out details of how we will deliver the obligations set out in these regulations and may change through a student's studies with us. The University will always ensure that policies and procedures deliver the commitments the University has made to students. The University uses the regulations to ensure consistent in academic judgements and that all students are treated fairly and equally.

## 2. REFERRING A SUSPECTED BREACH OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

If an academic staff member suspects a breach of academic integrity, they must first identify the type of misconduct. If further investigation is necessary, as detailed in Section 3 (Dealing with Suspected Academic Integrity), an exploratory meeting with the student should be offered before referring the case for investigation.

If following an exploratory<sup>1</sup> meeting an academic member of staff makes a case referral the anticipated time to conclude a case is a minimum of 10 working days, with the maximum normally 30 working days, typically this would be complex cases (i.e. mass collusion cases). It should be noted cases with Academic Integrity Panel (AIP) involvement may exceed this timeframe due to availability of panel members.

The Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) has 20 working days to determine an appropriate outcome from the date that the final piece of evidence relating to the suspected breach of academic integrity is submitted to Academic Registry. However, if the Progression and Award Assessment Board is due to meet before the end of the 20 working days the outcome should, where possible, be determined before that board.

If a case is referred to an AIP following AIO review, the University has a further 20 working days to meet with students to determine an outcome of a case.

Where it is not possible to adhere to the timescales, for example due to the complexity of the case or unforeseen delays, the University will write to the student to keep them informed of the progress of their case

### **3. DEALING WITH SUSPECTED ACADEMIC INTEGRITY BREACHES**

The Academic Integrity Regulations section 6.4 outlines there are 7 types of academic misconduct defined. When an academic staff member suspects a breach of academic integrity, they select a type of academic misconduct and consider whether an exploratory meeting is required.

#### **3.1. Plagiarism and poor academic practice**

When an academic staff member identifies cases of plagiarism in Level 3 or Level 4 modules, or instances of poor academic practice at any level, initially the case will not undergo formal investigation, and no exploratory meeting will be required.

The academic member of staff will refer the student to support for their academic development which will include a referral to the Academic Integrity module. The referral will be made to Academic Registry via the

---

<sup>1</sup> For applicable case types

'Academic Integrity Module Referral' form. Any referrals to the module will be considered in the event of future concerns about the student's work and may result in a Faculty or University Level investigation.

Academics will be required to check the 'Academic Integrity Module Referral Form Tracker' prior to the completion of any referral to check if the student has been previously referred on at least two occasions for plagiarism. The case may then be investigated, and the academic staff member will arrange an exploratory meeting with the student prior to completing the 'Suspected Breach of Academic Integrity Referral' form and investigation by an AIO.

### **3.2. Other types of academic misconduct cases and plagiarism at levels 5, 6 & 7**

Where an academic member of staff identifies any other type of misconduct as outlined in section 6.4 of the [Academic Integrity Regulations](#), or plagiarism at levels 5, 6 and 7, an exploratory meeting must be offered to be offered to the student prior to a Faculty-level (AIO) investigation.

### **3.3. Exploratory meetings**

Where an academic member of staff identifies a suspected breach of academic integrity that requires investigation, they will offer the student a meeting to explain that there are concerns about their work or behaviour.

An exploratory meeting is an informal discussion that allows the student to respond to the concerns and explain how they conducted their work. Notes from the meeting will be included as evidence for the suspected breach of academic integrity referral.

Following the meeting, the academic member of staff will decide an outcome: either there is no case to answer or the case will continue for investigation. Students will be notified of the decision by Academic Registry within 5 working days of the meeting.

If the decision is that there is no case to answer, and the concerns are attributed to poor academic practice, the case will not be investigated. In such cases, students will be referred to Student Development and Study Skills (SDSS) for support in their academic development, including a referral to the Academic Integrity module. This decision will be recorded using the 'Academic Integrity Module Referral' form and will be taken into account in the event of any future concerns regarding their work..

## **4. Levels of Investigation**

There are three levels in the University Academic Integrity Procedures as detailed below. Cases will be investigated at Faculty and University Levels. The Request for Review level may only be initiated following completion of the investigation levels.

#### **4.1. Faculty Level (AIO Investigation)**

The Dean of Faculty (or nominee) where the course resides will manage academic integrity cases within that faculty. This includes cases relating to cross-faculty modules.

Each faculty will have a team of AIOs who will consider cases at faculty level. The AIOs will be academic members of staff, with relevant experience, nominated by the Dean (or nominee). The AIO will have had no direct involvement in the case, neither will they be involved in the consideration of the student's module results for which the case is suspected. In certain instances, an AIOs from outside of the faculty where the course resides may be required to consider the case.

An AIO will be appointed to the case to consider the evidence provided and decide on one of the below outcomes based on the case information and evidence provided. In exceptional circumstances only, the AIO may consider that a discussion is required with the student before making a decision. Please refer to Section 5: General principles for the operation of meetings.

##### **4.1.1. No case to answer**

It is concluded that there has not been a breach of academic integrity. No further action will be taken, other than to advise the reporting academic member of staff of the outcome.

##### **4.1.2. Poor academic practice**

It is concluded that poor academic practice has taken place. The student will be referred to SDSS to support their academic development. This will include completing the Academic Integrity module.

A copy of the outcome will be kept on record to identify repeat referrals through this procedure.

##### **4.1.3. Case to answer – No penalty**

It is concluded that plagiarism has taken place on a level 3 or level 4 module and the student has not previously been referred to the academic integrity module. No penalty will be assigned. The student will be referred to SDSS to support their academic development. This will include completing the academic integrity module.

##### **4.1.4. Case to answer – assign penalty**

It is concluded that there is a case to answer; on the balance of probabilities, a breach of academic integrity has taken place.

Any previous history of academic misconduct will be made known to the AIO after a case has been determined. The AIO will take this into account when deciding on an appropriate penalty (refer to section 5, Possible penalties following confirmed breaches of academic integrity - Students on taught programmes of the [Academic Integrity Regulations](#)).

#### **4.1.5. Case to answer – escalate case to University level**

Where cases are considered to be more serious (for example, exam cheating, falsification, contract cheating) or complex or where there is a history of repeat offences) they will be escalated to University level to be considered by an AIP.

#### **4.1.6. Receiving an outcome of an AIO investigation**

Students will be notified of the outcome in writing, along with the rationale for the AIO's decision by Academic Registry. In the event that students receive an outcome of 4.1.1 to 4.1.4 above, students will have 5 working days from the date of receiving the outcome to reject it, in writing to [academic.integrity@southwales.ac.uk](mailto:academic.integrity@southwales.ac.uk).

Where the student receives an outcome of 4.1.5 they will receive notification in writing from Academic Registry and the case will move to the University Level of investigation. For outcomes of 4.1.1 to 4.1.4 the outcome will be a Case Closure Letter which will conclude the investigation into the case.

#### **4.1.7. Accepting the outcome**

Where students accept the outcome or do not respond by the deadline, they will receive a Case Closure Letter advising them that the case has been closed and that the reporting academic member of staff and other relevant parties will be notified of the outcome of the case.

#### **4.1.8. Rejecting the outcome**

Where students choose to reject the outcome, they are able to request to meet with the AIO to discuss the reasons for rejecting the outcome. Please refer to section 5: General principles for the operation of meetings. Following the meeting, the AIO will review the case and decide on one of the outcomes as stated in section 4.1.1 to 4.1.4.

Students will be notified of the outcome by Academic Registry, along with the rationale for their decision, in writing within 5 working days of the meeting. The email will conclude the Faculty Level investigation. For outcomes of 4.1.1 to 4.1.4 the outcome will be a Case Closure Letter which will conclude the investigation into the case.

### **4.2. University Level (AIP investigation)**

A case will be escalated to an AIP where it is considered serious or complex and it is possible the penalty will exceed penalty 3 (see section 7, Possible penalties following confirmed breaches of academic integrity - Students on taught programmes of the [Academic Integrity Regulations](#)). It will include cases of exam cheating, falsification, contract cheating or where there is a history of repeat breaches of academic integrity.

Members of an AIP will be independent and will not have been a member of an assessment board associated with the suspected breach of academic integrity, will not be connected with the student's course, and will have no prior knowledge of the case. The SU representative will not have previously supported the student during the case.

If students are an apprentice/employed student, their employer may be informed of the investigation. This does not preclude the employer from continuing with their own procedure, should they deem that is necessary.

#### **4.2.1. Proceedings**

The AIP will consider the following during panel proceedings:

- Evidence provided by the reporting academic member of staff
- Evidence provided by the student
- Details of the AIO's investigation
- Evidence provided by any relevant witnesses

#### **4.2.2. Possible outcomes**

Following the AIP meeting they will decide on one of the following outcomes:

#### **4.2.3. No case to answer**

It is concluded that on the balance of probabilities there has not been a breach of academic integrity.

#### **4.2.4. Poor academic practice**

It is concluded that poor academic practice has taken place. Students will be referred to appropriate study skills support which will include a referral to the academic integrity module. A copy of the outcome will be kept on record to identify repeat referrals through this procedure.

#### **4.2.5. Case to answer – No penalty**

It is concluded that plagiarism has taken place on a level 3 or level 4 module and the student has not previously been referred to the academic integrity module. No penalty will be assigned. The student will be referred to SDSS to support their academic development. This will include completing the academic integrity module.

#### **4.2.6. Case to answer – assign penalty**

It is concluded that there is a case to answer; on the balance of probabilities, a breach of academic integrity has taken place.

Previous history of academic misconduct will be made known to the AIP after a case has been determined and will be taken account of when deciding on an appropriate penalty (refer to section 8, Possible penalties following confirmed breaches of academic integrity - Students on taught programmes of the [Academic Integrity Regulations](#)). The AIP may also seek advice in determining a penalty to ensure it is appropriate to the course.

#### **4.2.7. Receiving an outcome of an AIP**

Within 5 working days of the AIP meeting, students will receive a Case Closure Letter concluding the investigation of their case. It will include the outcome, any penalty and the rationale for the decision. The reporting academic member of staff and other relevant parties will also be notified of the outcome of the case.

### **4.3. Request for Review**

Students are entitled to submit a request for review following a letter closing their case, should they feel they meet the grounds (see [Academic Integrity Procedures](#) for details).

The Director of Academic Registry (or nominee) will determine if there is a demonstrable case for review. Where it is decided there is a basis for review unless there is a straightforward administrative error, a Review Panel will be convened to consider the case.

#### **4.3.1. Grounds for review**

Students are entitled to submit a request for review following a Case Closure Letter should they feel they meet one or more of the below grounds:

- Students have evidence that the procedures were not conducted in line with the regulations and this could cause reasonable doubt as to whether the same decision would have been reached had the issues not occurred.
- That there has been an administrative error (for example, the notification of the penalty was not in line with the decision reached at the meeting or was recorded incorrectly on the student's record).
- Students can demonstrate that the penalty was disproportionate.

University staff cannot request a review of the outcome, only students are able to request a review.

#### **4.3.2. How to request a review**

For a request for review to be considered students must submit a completed 'request for review' form **within 10 working days** of the date of the student's Case Closure Letter.

Requests for review will only be received via the 'Request for Review' form, available at <https://registry.southwales.ac.uk/student-regulations/academic-misconduct/>.

#### **4.3.3. Student advice**

Students are strongly advised to seek advice from the SU, the AZ or the IISA team before they seek to progress to the review stage.

#### **4.3.4. Consideration of requests**

Requests for review will initially be considered by the Director of Academic Registry (or nominee) to determine whether there is a case for review, within 5 working days of submission of the request.

#### **4.3.5. Original decision will stand**

Where it is concluded that either:

- It does not meet the relevant grounds for review (see section 4.3.1 above)
- It was submitted outside the 10-working day deadline

The request for review will be disallowed, and the original decision will stand. Students will be issued with a University Completion of Procedures Letter within 5 working days.

#### **4.3.6. Administrative error**

Where there has been a clear administrative error (as outlined in 4.3.1), the relevant department will amend the student's record.

#### **4.3.7. Review Panel**

Where it has been decided that the request for review meets one or both grounds as stated in 4.3.1, arrangements will be made by Academic Registry to set up a Review Panel within 20 working days of the decision. The panel will be drawn from a Review Board and the President of the Students' Union (or nominee).

#### **4.3.8. Composition of the Review Board and Review Panel**

The Review Board consists of:

- Four members appointed by the Academic Board;
- Four academic representatives of each faculty (as a minimum).

The Review Panel will consist of:

- One member of the Review Board as appointed by Academic Board (Chair);
- One of the academic representatives on the Review Board, drawn from faculties unconnected with the case under consideration;

- President of the SU (or nominee) who must not have been involved with the original case at faculty or University level (whether in a supporting capacity or as a member of an Academic Integrity Panel).
- A member of Academic Registry will act as clerk to provide administrative support.
- If the student is an apprentice/employed student, their employer may be informed and an invitation extended to them to attend the Panel as an observer only.
- This does not preclude the employer from continuing with their own procedure, should they deem that is necessary. The observer will not be included in any discussions concerning penalties.

#### **4.3.9. Conduct of meetings**

The purpose of the meeting is to review the procedures from the AIO and/or AIP and/or supporting staff, and not to rehear the case. Both students and the AIO and/or the Chair of the relevant AIP will have an opportunity to provide information in writing.

#### **4.3.10. Review outcomes**

The Review Panel will make one of the following decisions:

- That the request for review is rejected and no further action will be taken.
- Recommend to the Director of Academic Registry (or nominee) that the decision be overturned and suggest a rationale for an appropriate alternative outcome.

The decision of the Review Panel is final and the matter will be regarded as closed.

## **5. GENERAL PRINCIPLES FOR THE OPERATION OF MEETINGS**

### **5.1. Support at meetings**

Students are allowed to have a support person with them at any discussions or meetings, for example an officer from the SU or a friend. Their role is to support and normally not to represent students, advocate on student's behalf or to speak for them, unless this has been agreed as a reasonable adjustment due to a disability. Students cannot send any other person to the meeting on their behalf. **At least 48 hours before** the meeting, students must advise the University of the name and status of the person accompanying them. It is strongly recommended that students seek support from the SU or Chaplaincy, as they are independent and familiar with the regulations and procedures of the University.

The Director of Academic Registry (or nominee) reserves the right to refuse the attendance of a support person if it is determined that there is a conflict of interest relating to the nominated person, in which case, the student will be given the opportunity to nominate a different support person.

### 5.1.1. Legal support at meetings

Our procedures are not legal in nature and consequently, students should not need to have a legally qualified support person or representative at meetings. However, students are able to seek preliminary advice, without prejudice, on the scope and nature of evidence for particularly complex cases or where the potential outcome is serious.

While students do not have an automatic right to a legally qualified support person or representative at meetings, any requests for permission must be made in writing to [academic.integrity@southwales.ac.uk](mailto:academic.integrity@southwales.ac.uk) at **least 5 working days before** the scheduled date of the meeting. Students must include the name of the proposed legally qualified support person/representative and the rationale for their request.

The University reserves the right to accept or refuse a request depending on whether a good reason is provided and the complexity and seriousness of the case. With the following being taken into account:

- The seriousness of the charge and whether the outcome could result in the student being deprived of their right to practise their chosen profession or whether it could irretrievably prejudice that right, and/or if a potential outcome could be expulsion.
- Whether any points of law are likely to arise.
- The capacity for students to understand the case
- Procedural difficulties
- The need for fairness between students and the reporting academic member of staff

Students will be advised by email within 5 working days of their request whether it has been granted. The decision is final and there is no right of appeal under this procedure against the decision.

Should a request be granted, the University reserve the right to also have a legally qualified person/representative in attendance. Students will be notified if this is the case within 5 working days' of their permission being granted.

The role of the University's legally qualified person will be to:

- Provide the Committee with any advice and guidance required for it to properly perform its function (whether or not advice is requested) including on any questions of law, evidence, procedure and its powers
- Assist the Committee to formulate its reasons and the recording of those reasons
- Ensure that the case is conducted fairly
- Assist with questioning witnesses and/or the parties in order to clarify any issues in the case
- Assist unrepresented parties to present their case (without acting as advocate)
- Raise any concerns about possible irregularities in the conduct of proceedings

The role will not extend to:

- Playing any part in the making of findings of fact

- Directing the Committee on law or summing up facts

The refusal of permission for legal representation does not prohibit or limit student's right to seek legal advice. We also reserve the right to seek legal advice if deemed necessary to do so, which may include a case where a student has not been granted legal representation.

Legally qualified support persons/representatives will be clearly informed of the nature of the proceedings, ie, that they are not a legal process and will not be conducted as such.

Permission for legal representation may be accompanied by conditions (depending on the circumstances) to preserve the informal nature of the internal procedure. For example, the legal representative may be asked to:

- Attend in a supportive capacity only (ie, not ask or answer questions for students)
- Pre-submit their questions
- Address any questions/advocacy through the Chair where questions directly to witnesses may be deemed distressing.

It should be noted that the engagement of legal advice or representation may add additional time or complexity to a student's case, which may impact procedural timeframes.

Where permission is not granted, we recognise that students may require additional time to find alternative support. Students must submit any request to delay any scheduled meetings to [academic.integrity@southwales.ac.uk](mailto:academic.integrity@southwales.ac.uk) within 5 working days of notification of the refusal.

## 5.2. Meeting location

Meetings will normally be held virtually via Microsoft Office Teams. Should students exceptionally require a physical meeting on campus students should make a request by email to [academic.integrity@southwales.ac.uk](mailto:academic.integrity@southwales.ac.uk) . It should be noted that where students request a change of venue after a date has been set it may result in a postponement of a meeting whilst arrangements are made. The University will confirm the online link/venue.

## 5.3. Exploratory meetings – Timing and attendance

Where a member of academic staff identifies a case that requires investigation they will aim to hold an exploratory meeting within 10 working days of identifying the suspected breach, providing students with 5 working days' notice by email to their student email address.

Students should make every effort to attend the exploratory meeting as it provides them with the opportunity to explain how they completed their work.

Students should advise the academic member of staff whether they are able to attend the meeting as soon as possible, but **no later than 48 hours before** the meeting date.

If students require a revised date, they should ideally indicate this when they respond, but **no later than 48 hours before** the meeting date. It will be rearranged only once. Students are responsible for indicating at this time if they are unable to make any further dates. They should also make it known whether they or anyone attending with them has any specific requirements or reasonable adjustments.

If students do not confirm their attendance by the deadline, except in exceptional circumstances, the **meeting will be cancelled** and an exploratory meeting will not be held.

#### **5.4. AIO/AIP meetings – Timing and attendance**

An AIO meeting will be arranged where a student has rejected the AIO's outcome or where, in exceptional circumstances an AIO has deemed a meeting necessary before deciding on an outcome. Where an AIO meeting is required the University will aim to set a date within 10 working days.

Where a case is being escalated to University level, the University will aim to schedule AIP meetings within 10 working days of the date of escalation.

The University will notify students of any AIO/AIP meetings by email at least 5 working days prior to the meeting date and students will be sent all documentation to be considered at the meeting.

Students should advise Academic Registry whether they are able to attend the meeting as soon as possible, but **no later than 48 hours before** the meeting date.

If students require a revised date, they should ideally indicate this when they respond, but no later than **48 hours before** the original meeting date. It will be rearranged only once. Students are responsible for indicating at this time if they are unable to make any further dates. The revised date will take place at least 48 hours after the date of the original meeting.

If students are unable to attend a meeting, they are strongly advised to provide a written statement to support their case.

For AIO meetings if students do not confirm their attendance by the deadline, except in exceptional circumstances, the meeting will be cancelled and the AIO will conclude their investigation.

For AIP meetings if students do not confirm their attendance by the deadline, except in exceptional circumstances, the meeting will be held in their absence.

#### **5.5. Meeting preparation**

Students may wish to prepare supporting evidence or a written statement explaining how they completed their work. This should be emailed in advance of the meeting to [academic.integrity@southwales.ac.uk](mailto:academic.integrity@southwales.ac.uk). This is particularly important if they are not attending the meeting.

For AIO/AIP meetings additional documentary evidence may only be presented on the day of the meeting with the express permission of the AIO/AIP Chair.

## **5.6. Meeting composition**

The following people will be invited:

### **5.6.1. Exploratory meetings**

- The student
- A member of academic staff
- Optional - the student's support person (should they wish to bring one)

### **5.6.2. AIO meetings**

- The student
- The AIO
- A member of Academic Registry (to take notes)
- If students are an apprentice/employed student, their employer may be notified of the meeting and may be invited to attend as an observer only, depending on the requirements of their course/employer This does not preclude the employer from continuing with their own procedure, should they deem that is necessary.
- Optional - the student's support person (should they wish to bring one)

### **5.6.3. AIP meetings**

- Two members of the Academic Integrity Board
- President of the SU (or nominee)
- The student
- The academic member of staff who identified the suspected breach of academic integrity (or the Module Leader)
- A member Academic Registry (to take notes)
- The AIO may be invited
- If students are an apprentice/employed student, their employer may be notified of the meeting and may be invited to attend as an observer only, depending on the requirements of their course/employer. The observer will not be included in any discussions concerning penalties
- Any witnesses deemed relevant to inform the case
- Optional - the student's support person (should they wish to bring one)

All questions to the member of academic staff raising the allegation and/or any witnesses, must relate directly to the allegation and the evidence supplied. Witnesses will normally withdraw after questioning by the AIP, but in any event will not remain in attendance at the meeting after the student has left. All parties must agree if the Chair of the AIP wishes to allow witnesses to remain after questioning has been completed.

The Academic Integrity Board is comprised of twenty members at Heads of Subject level or above from across the institution, nominated by the Deans of faculty/principal of college (or their nominees).

The Director of Academic Registry (or nominee) will have responsibility for authorising any amendments to the constitution of committees/panels as required.

### **5.7. Meeting outcomes**

Students will be notified of the outcome of any meetings by email within 5 working days of the meeting taking place. For AIO and AIP meetings the email will include any associated penalty and the rationale for the decision.

## **6. CONFIRMATION OF CASE OUTCOMES**

All case outcomes will be reported to the relevant assessment board. The Progression and Award Assessment Board will note the outcome in relation to the module, record and ratifying an overall decision, subject to the student's academic profile.

Compensation is not allowed on a module where it has been subject to a breach of academic integrity and penalty 2, 3 or 4 has been applied (refer to section 7, Possible penalties following confirmed breaches of academic integrity – Students on taught programmes of the [Academic Integrity Regulations](#)). However, a Progression and Award Assessment Board may at their discretion, consider allowing compensation at the point at which the re-submitted assessment(s), as a result of an academic misconduct penalty, is considered.

## **7. MONITORING**

### **7.1. Annual Academic Integrity Report**

The Academic Integrity report is issued annually to identify any patterns in academic integrity breaches, highlight good practice and make recommendations for areas of improvement. An action plan of recommendations will be presented to the Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Committee (LTEC).

Academic Registry will make recommendations as appropriate to the Quality Assurance Committee and the Academic Board, on any matters arising from the consideration of academic integrity cases that require amendments to regulations and procedures.

## 8. ADVICE AND SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS

### 8.1. Student Support Services

Students are encouraged to seek confidential advice and support students are suspected of breaching academic integrity.

We are committed to safeguarding the emotional, mental and physical well-being of all parties involved during the operation of its Academic Integrity Procedures.

Confidential advice and support is available from:

- The Students' Union (SU) - [Students' Union | University of South Wales](#)
- Advice Zone (AZ) – [Advice Zone | University of South Wales](#)
- The University's Wellbeing Services - [Wellbeing | University of South Wales](#)
- The Chaplaincy - <http://chaplaincy.southwales.ac.uk/>
- Immigration and International Student Advice (IISA) - <https://intadvice.southwales.ac.uk/>

## 9. OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATOR FOR HIGHER EDUCATION (OIA)

If students are unhappy with the outcome of these procedures they may, following issue of a University Completion of Procedures Letter, lodge a complaint with the OIA. Details of the OIA and the relevant information in relation to the scheme can be accessed at [www.oiahe.org.uk](http://www.oiahe.org.uk). Further information and advice can be obtained from Academic Registry.

## 10. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Term and acronym	Description
Academic Board	Responsible for:

<b>Term and acronym</b>	<b>Description</b>
	<p>General issues relating to the research, scholarship, teaching and courses at the University, including</p> <p>criteria for the admission of students, the appointment and removal of internal and external examiners;</p> <p>policies and procedures for assessment and examination of the academic performance of students;</p> <p>the content of the curriculum; academic standards and the validation and review of courses; procedures for the award of qualifications and honorary academic titles; and, the procedures for the expulsion of students for academic reasons;</p> <p>Considering the development of the academic activities of the University and the resources needed to support them and for advising the Vice Chancellor and the Board of Governors thereon; and</p> <p>Advising on such other matters as the Board of Governors or the Vice Chancellor may refer to the Academic Board.</p>
Academic Integrity Officer (AIO)	AIOs investigate level 1 (Faculty) breaches of academic integrity cases.
Academic Integrity Panel (AIP)	AIPs investigate level 2 (University) breaches of academic integrity cases.
Academic member of staff	This may be the module leader, course leader or a member of the teaching team for a student's course.
Advice Zone (AZ)	<p>AZ is the first point of contact for all student enquiries.</p> <p>They offer confidential advice on anything that affects student's ability to study, and work with a range of other services to ensure students receive the overall support they need.</p>
Centre for Enhancement in Learning and Teaching (CELT)	Work with faculties and support services on the support, development, and recognition of staff and students as educational developers, practitioners, researchers, and leaders.
Immigration & International	IISA's main area of expertise is in the immigration law and rules and offer specialised advice and information for international students and their dependants.

Term and acronym	Description
Student Advice (IISA)	
Learning, Teaching and Enhancement Committee (LTEC)	The purpose of LTEC is to oversee the development, implementation and evaluation of the of the University strategies that impact on its approach to learning, teaching, assessment and the wider student experience and that they support the University's over-arching 2030 strategy.
Quality Assurance Committee (QAC)	The QAC ensures the quality and standards of the University's academic provisions. It reports to the Academic Board and oversees several sub-committees. The committee is chaired by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor and includes various academic and administrative members, as well as student representatives.
Student Development and Study Skills (SDSS)	Exists to raise aspirations, improve academic performance and develop transferable skills for employment. They offer one-to-one appointments, run workshops, offer specialist support for students with disabilities and run peer-to-peer student mentoring schemes.
Student Union (SU)	The SU offers an independent and confidential advice service, which can advise and guide students through the University's academic regulations. The Full-time Officers can support and represent students facing fitness to practice, academic integrity investigations or a disciplinary due to misconduct at University hearings.

## 11. TABLE OF TIMESCALES

Action	Timescale
Minimum notice for requesting a meeting with the student	At least 5 working days
Academic staff to hold an exploratory meeting with the student	Within 10 working days of identifying the breach
Student to confirm attendance for meetings	At least 48 hours before the meeting
Latest time for the student to rearrange a meeting	At least 48 hours before the meeting

Action	Timescale
AR to inform the student of the AIO review (inc exploratory meeting if appropriate) outcome	Within 5 working days of the meeting
If required, AIO to meet with the student	Within 10 working days of receiving the last piece of evidence
The student to notify AR of intent for legal representation	At least 5 working days before the meeting
AIO to decide the case outcome	Within 20 working days of receiving the last piece of evidence
The student to reject the Faculty Level case outcome if no escalation is required	Within 5 working days of receiving the outcome
AIP to convene after escalation to University Level	Within 10 working days of escalation
The student to receive the AIP outcome	Within 5 working days of meeting
The student to request a review after case closure	Within 10 working days of receiving Case Closure Letter
Decision on whether a request for review meets relevant grounds for review	Within 5 working days of receiving the form and evidence
Convening a review panel if grounds for review are met	Within 20 working days of the decision