



ACADEMIC INTEGRITY REGULATIONS

2026/27

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	Seventh Issue Inclusion of undergraduate ethics policy Reinstate investigation into L7 cases of plagiarism	James Perkins	QAC/Academic Board/Board of Governors	June 2026

Version	Issue Date	Revision Description	Author	Approved By & Date	Next Review Date
8.0	September 2026	Eighth Issue 3.11 & section 9.1 Glossary of Terms - amend IISA to International Advice Team. 4.2 – Amendment to wording, to clarify for AIOs when cases can be referred to Faculty Level. 7.1.3 International Students – update 'Tier 4' to 'Tier 4/Student Route Visa'.	Wendy Roberts	AC/Academic Board/Board of Governors	June 2027

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	5
1.1. Academic Integrity Regulations	5
1.2. Applicability of Regulations	5
2. PRINCIPLES	5
2.1. Principles of academic integrity	6
3. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY RULES	7
3.1. Referral timing	7
3.2. Suspicions about other students	7
3.3. Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements	7
3.4. Concurrent and related cases	7
3.5. Responsibilities	8
3.6. Substantiating a suspected breach of academic integrity	8
3.7. Student statements and evidence	8
3.8. Meetings with staff or witnesses	8
3.9. Extenuating circumstances	9
3.10. University of South Wales Ethics Policy	9
3.11. Confidential advice and support	9
4. DEALING WITH SUSPECTED ACADEMIC INTEGRITY BREACHES	9
4.1. Faculty Level	10
4.2. University Level	10
4.3. Request for Review	10
5. DEALING WITH SUSPECTED ACADEMIC INTEGRITY BREACHES BY LEVEL OF STUDY	10
5.1. Types of academic misconduct	10
6. DEFINITIONS	11
6.1. Definition of academic integrity	11
6.2. Definition of academic misconduct	12
6.3. Definition of poor academic practice	12
6.4. Types of academic misconduct	12
6.4.1. Plagiarism	12
6.4.2. Cheating	13
6.4.3. Contract cheating	13

6.4.4.	Falsification	13
6.4.5.	Recycling.....	13
6.4.6.	Collusion.....	14
6.4.7.	Other types of academic misconduct	14
6.4.8.	Examples of academic misconduct	14
6.5.	Exploratory meetings	14
7.	POSSIBLE PENALTIES FOLLOWING CONFIRMED BREACHES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY – Students on taught programmes	15
7.1.	Further information regarding penalties for taught programmes	19
7.1.1.	Extenuating circumstances	19
7.1.2.	Revoking credits or awards	20
7.1.3.	International students.....	20
8.	POSSIBLE PENALTIES FOLLOWING CONFIRMED BREACHES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY – Students on postgraduate research programmes.....	21
8.1.	Postgraduate research students – pre submission of thesis	21
8.2.	Postgraduate research students – post submission of thesis.....	22
8.3.	Right to revoke awards	22
9.	Appendix	23
9.1.	Glossary of Terms.....	23
9.2.	Possible penalties following a breach of the USW Ethics policy	24

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Academic Integrity Regulations

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

1.2. Applicability of Regulations

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. PRINCIPLES

2.1. Principles of academic integrity

As a member of the academic community at the University of South Wales, it is expected that students work in accordance with the following principles:

- Take responsibility for their own work;
- Fully acknowledge the work of others wherever it has contributed to their work by referencing appropriately (further information can be found on the [LDS webpages](#));
- Ensure that their work is reported honestly;
- Avoid actions which seek to give them an unfair advantage over others;
- Ensure that they follow the ethical conventions and requirements appropriate to their course;
- If students are studying on a professionally-recognised vocational programme, maintain standards of conduct which are appropriate to a practitioner in that area;
- Behave with respect and courtesy when debating with others, even when they do not agree with them;
- Support others in their own efforts to behave with academic integrity.

If it is suspected that students have breached academic integrity, as defined in [Section 6, Definitions](#), the case will be considered.

As a principle, the University's approach to academic integrity is to develop learning and understanding, without prejudice, depending on the severity of the suspected breach. Therefore, the penalties detailed within [Section 7, Possible penalties following confirmed breaches of academic integrity – Students on taught programmes](#) and [Section 8, Possible penalties following confirmed breaches of academic integrity – Students on postgraduate research Students](#) should be considered with this in mind.

Students may be referred through other University regulations and procedures during or following the conclusion of a case, where this is deemed appropriate. Apprentices/employed students may also be subject to an internal investigation by their employer in concurrence with, or subsequent to the University's own procedures.

Where there is any ambiguity concerning which procedure should be applied due to the nature the case, the Director of Academic Registry (or nominee) will liaise with the Dean of Faculty (or nominee) before deciding on the appropriate procedure. An example of this may be when there are elements of the case which would be more appropriately considered under the [Student Conduct Procedure](#), as well as elements of academic integrity. If more than one procedure applies and it is necessary to follow one before the other, the outcome of the first may be used to inform the subsequent procedure(s).

The Academic Integrity Officer (AIO)/Chair of the Academic Integrity Panel (AIP) is required to seek guidance from relevant faculty members as to whether a case should subsequently be considered under the [Fitness to Practise Procedure](#), or other professional body or employer requirements, and refer on as appropriate. This is particularly relevant to students studying professionally regulated courses/modules or who are already a registered professional.

3. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY RULES

3.1. Referral timing

Suspected breaches of academic integrity must be raised immediately once they have been identified, and no later than 20 working days after identification. There is no time limit on referral if evidence becomes known after a student has received their marks or been awarded their qualification.

3.2. Suspicions about other students

If students believe that another student has breached academic integrity as defined in [Section 6, Definitions](#), they should speak to the course team. The conversation will be in confidence and the identity of students raising concerns will not be revealed as part of any investigation. However, no further action will be taken unless the course team feel there is sufficient evidence. The students reporting their concerns will not be informed of whether a referral for a suspected breach of academic integrity is made and will not be told of any potential outcome under the Academic Integrity Procedures.

3.3. Professional Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) requirements

Where the student is registered on a course governed by a professional body, on a degree apprenticeship course or are an employed student, the University may be required to inform the relevant body or employer, either once an investigation is instigated, during, or following its conclusion.

3.4. Concurrent and related cases

In cases of multiple instances of suspected breaches of academic integrity arising at the same time, they will normally be considered as being concurrent if:

- The student has not previously been found guilty of breaching academic integrity;

and/or

- It is determined there would have been insufficient time for the student to benefit from appropriate academic guidance in the period between the identification of the breach in one piece of work and the submission of another.

Where cases are considered concurrent and in cases such as collusion, where two or more students are accused of related offences, the University will normally appoint the same AIO and students may be invited to an individual or a group meeting with the Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) and/or Academic Integrity Panel (AIP). In such instances, students will be given the opportunity to request that the cases be heard separately if any meetings are arranged.

3.5. Responsibilities

It is the responsibility of the student's faculty to provide them with an opportunity to attend an exploratory meeting with an academic member of staff following identification of a suspected breach of academic integrity.

The AIO and/or AIP will have the following responsibilities:

- To ensure that every case of suspected breach of academic integrity is given full and fair consideration, ensuring the student has been provided with an opportunity to share any information they feel is relevant;
- To establish, as far as possible, the facts of the case and to decide whether or not the case is substantiated, and its severity;
- To determine an appropriate outcome, which may include a penalty, and signpost the student to appropriate academic support;
- To report the decision to the appropriate Assessment Board(s).

3.6. Substantiating a suspected breach of academic integrity

In order to substantiate a suspected breach of academic integrity, the University will not be required to prove that the student intended to breach academic integrity. However, additional proof of intent may be relevant in arriving at an appropriate penalty. It is the University's responsibility to prove that on the balance of probabilities, a breach of academic integrity took place (i.e. the student is more likely to have committed the breach than not).

3.7. Student statements and evidence

It is advisable for students to submit a written statement, along with any relevant supporting evidence for the AIO and/or AIP's consideration, particularly if they are invited to a meeting but are unable to attend.

Additional documentary evidence may only be presented at meetings with the express permission of the AIO/Chair of the AIP.

3.8. Meetings with staff or witnesses

The AIO reserves the right to meet with the member of academic staff raising the suspected breach of academic integrity or any witnesses should they deem this necessary for informing their investigation. When a case is referred to the AIP, all questions to the member of staff raising the breach and/or any witnesses during the panel, must relate directly to the suspected breach 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. All AIO and AIP meetings will be formally recorded as part of the case file.

3.9. Extenuating circumstances

Extenuating circumstances cannot be used as justification for breaching academic integrity.

In certain cases, the University may decide to put the Academic Integrity Procedures on hold pending further advice or may refer the student to the [Support to Study Procedure](#).

3.10. University of South Wales Ethics Policy

Undergraduate students must consult the USW Ethics Policy to determine whether their proposed project or data collection requires ethical approval before it begins. If approval is needed, it must be obtained at the project's outset and prior to any data collection that meets the policy's criteria.

Evidence of whether ethical review was required (and, if applicable, obtained) must be included in the dissertation's appendix.

Students are responsible for ensuring their project complies with all ethical guidelines and secures necessary approval before starting. The USW Ethics Policy outlines when ethical approval is required, the appropriate contents of an ethics application, and the pathways for seeking review. Note that processes for ethical review may vary by course, so students should confirm requirements with their lead staff supervisor.

Failure to assess the need for ethical approval or to obtain it when required may breach the Academic Integrity Regulations. This could lead to penalties being applied following confirmed breaches of Academic Integrity. (For examples of penalties pertaining to the University of South Wales Ethics policy see Appendix 9.2 Possible penalties following a breach of the USW Ethics policy)

3.11. Confidential advice and support

Students are encouraged to seek confidential advice and support from the Student Union (SU), Advice Zone (AZ) or the International Advice team.

Please refer to the Advice and support section of the [Academic Integrity Procedures](#) for the current academic year.

These regulations 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 they intend to submit in support of a case that is particularly complex and the potential outcome is serious. Please refer to the [Academic Integrity Procedures](#) for details.

4. DEALING WITH SUSPECTED ACADEMIC INTEGRITY BREACHES

There are three levels in the University Academic Integrity Procedures. Details of the process at each level can be found in the [Academic Integrity Procedures](#).

4.1. Faculty Level

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 AIO from outside of the faculty where the course resides may be required to consider the case.

4.2. University Level

The University has established an Academic Integrity Board from which the members of an AIP will be drawn to consider cases that are either complex, serious or where it is possible the penalty may exceed penalty 3 (see [section 7. Possible penalties following confirmed breaches of academic integrity – Students on taught programmes](#)). This can include any type of misconduct, and may include cases of exam cheating, falsification, contract cheating or where there is a history of repeated breaches of academic integrity.

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.

5. DEALING WITH SUSPECTED ACADEMIC INTEGRITY BREACHES BY LEVEL OF STUDY

5.1. Types of academic misconduct

Plagiarism can sometimes happen as a result of students not being not familiar with academic practices, rather than committing academic misconduct with intent. Therefore, cases identified at levels 3 and 4 will not be investigated and will be referred to the Learner Development Service to support their academic development. The student will be offered an opportunity to complete the Academic Integrity module as part of their development. If a student who commits plagiarism at levels 3 and 4 does not complete the

Academic Integrity module within ten working days of the referral, the reporting academic member of staff will refer the student for investigation.

If more than two cases are suspected at these levels, then it will become a referral for investigation unless they are considered to be concurrent cases.

Students with a case of poor academic practice, although not a type of academic misconduct, will also be referred to the Learner Development Service for their academic development. If the student continues to commit poor academic practice, the University will consider that they have breached academic integrity by committing academic misconduct, as set out in [Section 6, Definitions](#) unless the circumstances are considered concurrent.

NB there may be exceptions due to PSRB requirements.

	Level ¹ 3	Level 4	Level 5	Level 6	Level 7
Plagiarism	No penalty, refer to support	No penalty, refer to support	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate
Cheating	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate
Contract cheating	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate
Falsification	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate
Recycling	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate
Collusion	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate
Other	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate	Investigate

6. DEFINITIONS

6.1. Definition of academic integrity

Having integrity means being honest and sticking to morals that most people would agree with, such as telling the truth. The University is a 'learning community' within which students and staff learn from each

¹ Credit points are grouped in units, and each group is assigned a higher education level. The level describes the overall standard of achievement, as defined by the skills, knowledge and understanding, and degree of learner autonomy reached by students gaining the credits within the group.

other, from their peers and through original research. All members of the University are expected to maintain high standards of academic conduct and professional relationships based on courtesy, honesty and mutual respect. In maintaining this learning community, the concept of academic integrity is fundamental.

6.2. Definition of academic misconduct

Academic misconduct is failure to comply with the above principles and is defined as 'any action or attempted action that may result in creating an unfair academic advantage or disadvantage for any member(s) of the academic community'. Failure to comply with the principles undermines the integrity and fairness of the academic environment.

Committing academic misconduct undermines the primary purpose of attending university, which is to learn and grow into a more skilled and knowledgeable person. It leads to gaps in student's knowledge that future colleagues and employers will notice, potentially costing them dearly in their professional and personal development.

Acting with academic integrity allows students to showcase their own knowledge, skills, and understanding of the subject, enabling them to receive constructive feedback to help them progress.

If a suspected breach of academic integrity is upheld, it could impact the student's results profile, progression and final classification. It could also impact their ability to engage in further studies and their career. In summary, students would be devaluing their award and future potential.

6.3. Definition of poor academic practice

The University acknowledges that students may unintentionally breach academic integrity, through poor academic practice. Poor academic practice occurs as a result of a lack of awareness or understanding of academic skills. A student early in their student journey is more likely to engage in poor academic practice.

If a member of academic staff considers that a student has committed poor academic practice, an exploratory meeting may be offered to the student to explain their concerns.

The student will be referred to the Learner Development Service to support their academic development. It does not require a formal referral to the Academic Integrity Procedures, but a note will be recorded and will be considered in the event of any future concerns about their work. The entirety of the student's work will be marked, taking account of the poor practice appropriately and proportionally, according to the marking tutor's academic judgement.

6.4. Types of academic misconduct

6.4.1. Plagiarism

Plagiarism is when a student uses someone else's work, ideas or intellectual property, uses computer programs or software (including the use of generative artificial intelligence platforms such as ChatGPT)

without proper acknowledgment by use of correct referencing conventions, or approved method of declaration. Plagiarism may be written or non-written.

6.4.2. Cheating

Cheating is when students act dishonestly or unfairly before, during, or after an examination or a summative class (including online) test in order to gain advantage or assist another student to do so.

6.4.3. Contract cheating

Contract cheating is when students seek other people to produce work or buy an essay or assignment, either 'off the shelf' or specifically written for them and submit it as their own work.

- If students are suspected of being involved in the selling of work to other students or third parties, regardless of whether or not that work is submitted for assessment, the case will be dealt with through the University's [Student Conduct](#) or [Fitness to Practise](#) Procedures.

If a member of staff is suspected of being involved in assisting students to breach academic integrity or sell work to other students or third parties, regardless of whether or not that work is submitted for assessment, the case for the member of staff will be considered through the Disciplinary Procedure for Staff.

6.4.4. Falsification

Falsification is when students attempt to present fabricated or distorted data, evidence, references, citations or experimental results and/or knowingly make use of such material as part of an assessment.

This includes the use of generative artificial intelligence platforms, such as ChatGPT, to fabricate experimental results or bibliography.

For students on courses leading to a professional qualification, falsely claiming to have completed non-academic requirements such as hours in practice, or to have achieved professional competencies, may lead to discontinuation from the course and escalation to the relevant professional body (for further information see the [Fitness to Practise](#) Procedure).

6.4.5. Recycling

Recycling, sometimes referred to as self-plagiarism, is when students submit work which has already been used in one context (eg, in an assignment) and is then used again in another.

In some instances, it may be acceptable to use work previously submitted for a written assignment as the basis for an examination answer or to further expand and develop work at a higher level; for example, developing the ideas formulated in a third-year dissertation into a Master's level thesis. These situations would be governed by the specific regulations of the appropriate course of study.

6.4.6. Collusion

Sometimes, students will be required to work collaboratively, preparing and submitting assignments together, and in this case 'joint work' is entirely appropriate. Collusion occurs when, unless with official approval (eg, in the case of some forms of group projects), two or more students collaborate in the production of work and they submit work, which is unreasonably similar and/or is represented by the students to be the product of their individual efforts. One student sharing their own work with another student, resulting in similar pieces of work being submitted, could be considered to be collusion by both parties. If this is suspected, the reporting tutor may offer an exploratory meeting with both students prior to submitting a referral for investigation.

In some cases, collusion may not be identified until an investigation is underway into an allegation of a different type of academic misconduct. In which case, the AIO/Chair of the AIP will notify the academic member of staff who submitted the original referral, who will discuss with the Course Team whether further investigation is required including additional referrals. This may cause a delay in the University's usual timeframes.

6.4.7. Other types of academic misconduct

There may be other types of academic misconduct that are not included above. Examples include:

- Undertaking unethical practice such as conducting research without obtaining ethical approval from the University when required, or the unauthorised use of information that has been confidentially acquired.
- Students knowingly sharing their work with another student to provide an unfair advantage.
- Breaching examination rules (as stated in the [Regulations for Taught Courses](#))
- Failure to obtain ethical approval

6.4.8. Examples of academic misconduct

Examples of each type of academic misconduct are detailed in the [Examples of Academic Misconduct document](#).

6.5. Exploratory meetings

Where a member of 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. Notes from the meeting will be provided as part of the evidence for any subsequent referrals for a suspected breach of academic integrity.

7. POSSIBLE PENALTIES FOLLOWING CONFIRMED BREACHES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY – Students on taught programmes

Where an AIO/AIP has upheld a suspected breach of academic integrity the below penalty options are available to them. The penalty options should be read in conjunction with the [Regulations for Taught Courses](#)

	Penalty	Issued by	Detail	First/second sitting implementation & impact of the penalty
Penalty 0 / Poor Academic Practice	Issue referral to support	AIO/AIP	The student will be referred to support services and will be required to complete the Academic Integrity module.	This penalty may be used as a first submission for Level 3 and 4 cases of plagiarism. If there are multiple suspected cases of plagiarism the case will be referred for investigation. Where a student has been referred for Plagiarism, their work will be marked, not taking into account the elements identified as plagiarism
Penalty 1	Issue a formal written warning as to future conduct	AIO/AIP	The warning will be retained on the student's personal record. The entirety of the student's work is marked, taking account of the poor scholarship appropriately and proportionally, according to the marking tutor's academic judgement. Student will be referred to an appropriate workshop or individual tutorial at the Student Development and the Learner Development Service.	This penalty may be used at the first or second submission. In this case, the student's work is marked, not taking into account the elements identified as including academic misconduct. This will be the decision of the marking tutor, who may liaise with the Academic Integrity Officer should they wish. For cases where a student has been found to have shared their work with others, but not gained an advantage they will have their entire work marked. The Assessment Board will record the mark imposed in relation to the module. The Progression and Award Board will record and ratify the decision, subject to the student's academic profile, and according to the Regulations for Taught Courses.

	Penalty	Issued by	Detail	First/second sitting implementation & impact of the penalty
				A note will be recorded electronically on the student record system.
Penalty 2	Cancel mark for the element of assessment, module will be capped.	AIO/AIP	Student must resubmit the work for the element of assessment, subject to consideration of the student's academic profile by the relevant assessment board, if the student is eligible to resit the module (confirmed in line with the Regulations for Taught Courses). The whole module will be capped at the base pass mark², but all other element marks in the module remain the same in line with the Regulations for Taught Courses. Student will be referred to an appropriate workshop or individual tutorial at the Student Development and the Learner Development Service.	First submission - the student would normally be required to resubmit the element at the next assessment point. However, there may be instances where the student may be required to repeat the module, depending on their academic profile at the time. Second submission - the student must resubmit the element at the next assessment point. This may result in having to repeat the module, depending on their academic profile at the time. The Assessment Board will record the mark imposed in relation to the module. The Award and Progression Board will record and ratify the decision, subject to the student's academic profile, and according to the Regulations for Taught Courses. Honours classifications may be affected. Postgraduate award grade may be affected. The offence is recorded electronically on the student record system.
Penalty 3	Cancel marks for the whole module. Module will be capped	AIO/AIP	Student must resubmit the work for all elements of assessment in order to pass the module, subject to consideration of the student's academic profile by the relevant assessment board, if the student is eligible	First submission – the student must resubmit all elements for the whole module at the next assessment point. However, there may be instances where the student may be required to repeat the

² The base mark is defined in the validation document. Ordinarily this will be 40%; however, this may differ for some courses and modules, where, for example, there may be a derogation due to professional body requirements.

	Penalty	Issued by	Detail	First/second sitting implementation & impact of the penalty
			to resit the module (confirmed in line with the Regulations for Taught Courses). The whole module is capped at the base pass mark ³ . Student will be referred to an appropriate workshop or individual tutorial at the Student Development and the Learner Development Service.	module, depending on their academic profile at the time. Second submission – the student must repeat the module at the earliest opportunity, depending on their academic profile at the time. The Assessment Board will record the mark imposed in relation to the module. The Progression and Award Board will record and ratify the decision, subject to the student's academic profile, and according to the Regulations for Taught Courses . Honours classifications may be affected. Postgraduate award grade may be affected. The offence is recorded electronically on the student record system.
Penalty 4	Cancel marks for the whole module. All modules capped ⁴ .	AIP	Student must resubmit the work for all elements of assessment in order to pass the module, subject to consideration of the student's academic profile by the relevant assessment board, if the student is eligible to resit the module (confirmed in line with the Regulations for Taught Courses).	First submission – the student must resubmit all elements for the whole module at the next assessment point. This may result in having to repeat the module, depending on their academic profile at the time. Second submission – the student must repeat the module at the earliest opportunity, depending on their academic profile at the time. Honours classifications may be affected. Postgraduate award grade may be affected.

³ The base mark is defined in the validation document. Ordinarily this will be 40%; however, this may differ for some courses and modules, where, for example, there may be a derogation due to professional body requirements.

⁴ The base mark is defined in the validation document. Ordinarily this will be 40%; however, this may differ for some courses and modules, where, for example, there may be a derogation due to professional body requirements.

	Penalty	Issued by	Detail	First/second sitting implementation & impact of the penalty
			The module is capped at the base pass mark⁵. All module marks for the stage⁶ are capped at the base pass mark. Student will be referred to an appropriate workshop or individual tutorial at the Student Development and Service.	The offence is recorded electronically on the student record system.
Penalty 5	Cancel all module marks for current stage	AIP	• Student is not allowed to repeat the year. • The student is allowed to retain the credits already gained. • The student is discontinued from their course.	No difference in penalty implementation between first and second sitting. Student cannot continue on the same course. Student may be allowed to enrol on a new course. Student may exit with an intermediate award, in which case, they will be permitted to attend a graduation ceremony at the discretion of the Vice Chancellor (or nominee). The offence is recorded electronically on the student record system.
Penalty 6	A recommendation ⁷ is made to the Vice Chancellor (or nominee)	AIP	• Student is allowed to retain credits already gained; no further study at the University is allowed. • All existing credit is revoked; no further study at the University is allowed.	No difference in penalty implementation between first and second sitting. Student is expelled from the University. • Student can retain any credit gained and use it to enrol at another institution.

⁵ The base mark is defined in the validation document. Ordinarily this will be 40%; however, this may differ for some courses and modules, where, for example, there may be a derogation due to professional body requirements.

⁶ Modules within a stage are the modules being studied by a student in that particular year.

⁷ The Clerk, in liaison with the Chair of the AIP, will prepare the recommendation statement based on the discussions at the panel which will be forwarded to the Director of Academic Registry (or nominee) for approval, as the Vice Chancellor's nominee.

	Penalty	Issued by	Detail	First/second sitting implementation & impact of the penalty
	that the student concerned be expelled The student may be expelled: • with credit • without credit			Where a student is eligible for an intermediate award they may be permitted to attend a graduation ceremony at the discretion of the Vice Chancellor. • Student cannot retain any credits gained or exit with an intermediate award. The offence is recorded electronically on the student record system.

It is recommended that following receiving the outcome for their case that the student arranges a meeting with an appropriate academic member of staff to discuss and receive support for this outcome and penalty. This would normally be the member of staff who raised the allegation or Module Leader, or the student's Personal Academic Coach.

Offences are recorded at all stages and levels of severity. Failing to record offences will not allow the AIO or AIP to decide appropriate penalties in future cases.

7.1. Further information regarding penalties for taught programmes

7.1.1. Extenuating circumstances

The University will consider evidence of mitigating factors when determining an appropriate penalty. Please note that any approved [extenuating circumstances](#) claims which have affected previous assessment sittings prior to the academic misconduct taking place will be taken into consideration by the relevant Assessment Board.

7.1.2. Revoking credits or awards

The University reserves the right to revoke credits or an award if it is discovered that academic misconduct was committed in order to gain the credits or the award.

7.1.3. International students

There will need to be special consideration when concern is raised regarding an international student who is sponsored by the University on a Tier 4/Student Route visa. The student should be signposted to the Immigration & International Student Advice team for information on the impact that any penalty will have on their Tier 4/Student Route visa.

8. POSSIBLE PENALTIES FOLLOWING CONFIRMED BREACHES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY – Students on postgraduate research programmes

8.1. Postgraduate research students – pre submission of thesis

The following penalties are available to an Academic Integrity Panel:

	Penalty	Detail	Implementation and impact of penalty
Penalty PGR 1	Issue a formal warning.	Student is allowed to resubmit the work.	The penalty may be implemented pre-submission of thesis for examination. The offence is recorded ¹ on the student's file.
Penalty PGR 2	A recommendation ⁸ is made to the Vice Chancellor (or nominee) that the student concerned be expelled. The student may be expelled: • with credit • without credit	• Student is allowed to retain credits already gained on the course on which they are enrolled; no further study at the University is allowed. In the case of professional doctorates where students are not permitted to resubmit their thesis, they may be permitted to exit with a lower award. • All existing credit is revoked; no further study at the University will be allowed.	Student is expelled from the University. • Student can retain any credit gained and use it to enrol at another institution. • Where a student is eligible to exit with an intermediate award they may be permitted to attend a graduation ceremony at the discretion of the Vice Chancellor. Student cannot retain any credit gained or exit with an intermediate award.

⁸ The Clerk, in collaboration with the Chair of the CPUA, will prepare the recommendation statement based on the panel discussions which will be sent to the Director of the Academic Registry (or their nominee) for approval, as nominated by the Vice-Chancellor.

8.2. Postgraduate research students – post submission of thesis

The following penalties are available to the Research Degree Committee:

	Penalty	Detail	Implementation and impact of penalty
Penalty PGR 3	The first submission of the thesis will be discounted.	The student is allowed to resubmit their work for re-examination (at discretion of examiners) but only for a lower award.	The penalty will be implemented post-submission of the thesis for examination. Student may exit with a lower award.
Penalty PGR 4	A recommendation ⁹ is made to the Vice Chancellor (or nominee) that the student concerned be expelled The student may be expelled: - with credit - without credit	- the student is allowed to retain credits already gained; no further study at the University is allowed. In the case of professional doctorates where students are not permitted to resubmit their thesis, they may be permitted to exit with a lower award. - All existing credit is revoked; no further study at the University will be allowed.	Student is expelled from the University. - Student can retain any credit gained and may be permitted to exit with a lower award. - Where a student is eligible to exit with an intermediate award they may be permitted to attend a graduation ceremony at the discretion of the Vice Chancellor. - Student cannot retain any credit gained or exit with an intermediate award.

8.3. Right to revoke awards

The University reserves the right to revoke an award if it is discovered that academic misconduct was committed in order to gain the award.

⁹ The Clerk will, in cooperation with the Chair of the CPUA, prepare the recommendation statement based on the panel discussions, which will be sent to the Director of the Academic Registry (or nominee) for approval, as nominated by the Vice-Chancellor.

9. Appendix

9.1. Glossary of Terms

Term and acronym	Description
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 the student's course.
Assessment Board	Assessment boards consider and confirm student results in accordance with the University regulations, including course specific regulations, or, where applicable, in accordance with approved professional body requirements.
Centre for Excellence 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.
Course Team	Members of staff involved in the learning and or teaching of a course.
Extenuating Circumstances (ECs)	If students experience circumstances that affect their ability to perform in assessments they may be able to apply for ECs. The University aims to ensure that a student who has proven extenuating circumstances is not unfairly disadvantaged as a result; at the same time, students with extenuating circumstances will not be disproportionately advantaged over other students. Examples of mitigating factors that the University may take into account include (but are not limited to): - Admitting to, and demonstrating genuine remorse for actions; - The impact of ill health; - Extreme personal circumstances.
International Advice Team	The International Advice Team's main area of expertise is in the immigration law and rules and offer specialised advice and information for international students and their dependants.
Professional Statutory and Regulatory bodies (PSRBs)	PSRBs are professional bodies, employer bodies, regulators and those with statutory authority over a profession or group of professionals that act as regulators for the University
Reporting tutor (RT)	Member of academic staff that refers a student for a suspected breach of academic integrity
Student Development and the Learner Development Service (LDS)	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.

Term and acronym	Description
Written statement	A written account of events in the student's words.

9.2. Possible penalties following a breach of the USW Ethics policy

Disciplinary offence	Issued by	Penalty	Examples	Examples of sanctions
Failure to obtain ethical approval when it is required by the USW ethics policy (more than one occurrence)	AIO / AIP	Penalty 3	A second (or more) occurrence of failing to seek ethical approval where the work involves any: sensitive research themes**, or vulnerable* participant groups. and the student has been made aware of the need to consider the USW ethics policy and the potential need for ethical approval.	Conditions. E.g., Cancel marks for the whole module. Module will be capped.
Failure to obtain ethical approval when it is required by the USW ethics policy.	AIO / AIP	Penalty 2	Where the work involves any: sensitive research themes**, or vulnerable* participant groups. and the student has been made aware of the need to consider the USW ethics policy and the potential need for ethical approval.	Conditions. E.g., Requirement to discard all data collected without ethical clearance.
Failure to obtain ethical approval when it is required by the USW ethics policy.	AIO / AIP	Penalty 1	Where the work does not involve any: sensitive** research themes, or vulnerable* participant groups. and the student has been made aware of the need to consider the USW ethics policy and the potential need for ethical approval.	Conditions. E.g., Requirement to discard all data collected without ethical clearance.
Failure to obtain ethical approval when it is required by the USW ethics policy.	AIO / AIP	Penalty 0	Where incorrect advice or guidance has been given by the staff responsible for overseeing the student research activity or data collection. This might include either: Advice/confirmation that ethical approval was not required (when it was), or, The student not being informed about the need to consider the USW ethics policy.	Signposting to research ethics training.

* The following categories are regarded as vulnerable:

- Under 18 (that are not in an accredited setting and accompanied by a carer or professional with a duty of care),
- Adults at risk (that are not in an accredited setting and accompanied by a carer or professional with a duty of care)
- Adults or children in emergency situations,
- Adults or children with diagnosed mental illness/terminal illness/dementia/in a residential care home,
- Expectant or new mothers,
- Refugees, asylum seekers or recent migrants,
- Individuals with learning disabilities or communication disabilities,
- Individuals in custody, serving prisoners or young offenders,
- Individuals with impaired mental capacity,
- Individuals with any other condition which may affect ability to consent,
- Anyone engaged in illegal activities,
- Staff, service users, volunteers, or data under the responsibility of a social care organisation,
- Prison or probation staff, clients, premises or records, or datasets,
- Participants in an institutional context (e.g., school, healthcare, or custodial settings) or
- organisational settings (e.g., business, workplace),
- Participants in an organisation or setting in which the researcher has a past/current role or position of authority.

**Sensitive research typically involves any of the following:

- Potential for psychological or physical harm to participants,
- Exploration of topics that present concerns regarding privacy, confidentiality, or data security,
- Inclusion or focus on vulnerable populations or socially marginalised groups,
- Exploration of taboo, stigmatising, or politically charged topics.