

Academic Integrity Procedure

2026-27

Contents

1	Purpose of this Procedure	2
2	Definition and Scope – Breach of Academic Integrity	3
3	Partner Organisations	6
4	Relevant Policies/Procedures	6
5	Communication Strategy.....	6
6	Detection of Academic Integrity Breach(es).....	7
7	Academic Investigative Interview	8
8	Determination of Level of Breach	9
9	Minor Breach of Academic Integrity Process.....	10
10	Major Breach of Academic Integrity Process.....	12
11	Membership of Committee of Enquiry	12
12	Penalties	15
13	Interaction with Fitness to Practise Procedure.....	20
14	Implementation of Decision of Committee of Enquiry	21
15	Support for Students at Hearings	21
16	Attendance at Hearings.....	22
17	Timeline for Major Academic Integrity Hearings	23
18	Appeals by Candidates Found Guilty of a Breach of Academic Integrity	24
18.1	Minor Breach of Academic Integrity.....	24
18.2	Major Breach of Academic Integrity.....	24
19	Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA).....	26
20	Monitoring of Procedure	27
21	Forms.....	27
22	Accessibility	27
	Appendix 1 – Protocol in respect of student register on University of Chester awards ..	28

1 Purpose of this Procedure

1.1 Wrexham University makes awards to its students based on their own achievement, drawing upon the skills and understanding they have acquired during their studies at the University. Consequently, it treats all breaches of academic integrity seriously, as they represent a failure to respect the fairness of the assessment process.

1.2 It is the responsibility of both students and staff to work together to ensure that academic integrity is upheld at all times and that any disregard for the required academic integrity does not occur as a result of misunderstanding or lack of awareness.

1.3 Wrexham University undertakes to:

- Ensure that this procedure is operated in a fair, consistent and timely manner.
- Provide clear information in respect of this procedure and the definition of what constitutes academic integrity in programme handbooks and on the Student Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) portal.
- Provide students with access to on-line materials and services to support their development in understanding how to avoid plagiarism.
- Ensure that the principles of natural justice are observed throughout the implementation of this procedure.

1.4 The University expects all students to take responsibility for the security of their own work and to take reasonable measures to prevent others from copying from them.

1.5 The University has signed up to the QAA Academic Integrity Charter (<https://www.qaa.ac.uk/about-us/what-we-do/academic-integrity/charter>), and commits to implement its principles and commitments which include working with staff and students and, in collaboration across the sector, to protect and promote academic integrity, and take action where academic integrity is not adhered. As part of this the University commits to the following principles:

- Everyone is responsible as part of a 'whole community' approach.
- A 'whole community' approach.
- Working together as a sector.
- Engage with and empower students.
- Empower and engage with staff.
- Consistent and effective institutional policies and practices.
- Institutional autonomy.

2 Definition and Scope – Breach of Academic Integrity

2.1 It is a breach of academic integrity to commit any act whereby a person may obtain for themselves or for another, an unpermitted advantage. This shall apply whether the candidate acts alone or in conjunction with another/others. The action may occur during or in relation to, a formal examination, a piece of coursework, or any form of assessment undertaken in pursuit of a qualification.

2.2 This procedure will apply to all students (taught and research) registered at Wrexham University, including those studying at partner colleges/institutions and students studying wholly online or via distance learning¹.

2.3 This procedure shall apply to allegations of a breach against academic integrity on any assessed component contributing to a Wrexham University award ².

2.4 In the event of a force majeure, Academic Board reserve the right to vary, as necessary, the procedural steps laid down in Sections 7 - 11. This may include, but is not limited to, removing or simplifying the panel processes to give authority to the Academic Deans of Faculty or their nominees to determine integrity outcomes. Academic Board will ensure that student equity is maintained under any new temporary arrangements.

2.5 Where an allegation questioning research integrity relates to someone funded by, or engaged with, Research Council(s) (including acting as a supervisor for a Research Council postgraduate student or engaged with peer review activities), even if it is about work not connected with a grant from a Research Council, the case may be reported to the relevant Council once the level of breach has been determined. Depending on outcomes, the relevant Council will usually be informed at the following stages:

- When the outcome of a minor case is known.
- When the outcome of a major case is known.

The Councils reserve the right to take appropriate action about any duties being performed for them at any stage during the process.

In addition, there is a statutory requirement for the Research Integrity Committee to provide an annual report to the Board of Governors on all related cases.

¹ For students registered on an award of a professional body e.g. NCTJ, CIM etc, the procedure/regulations regarding academic integrity of that body will apply.

² For research students studying for an award of the University of Chester, the Academic and Research Integrity procedure of the University of Chester will apply. The protocol to be used is provided in Appendix 1 of this procedure.

2.6 Where an allegation against academic integrity is found proven, at any time after a mark has been approved by an assessment board, the Committee of Enquiry shall have the authority to cancel the assessment result previously published.

2.7 Where an allegation of a breach against academic integrity is found proven, at any time after an individual has been admitted to a degree or any other award has been conferred or granted, Academic Board shall have the authority to deprive the individual of the degree or to revoke such other academic award.

2.8 When a student is also a member of staff, the Deputy Vice Chancellor may authorise a variation to the procedure to permit the Director of Strategic Planning and Student Administration or their nominee to assume the duties assigned to the Associate Dean under this procedure.

2.9 Specific examples of behaviour which may fall under the definition of failures to adhere to academic integrity are provided below, although it should be noted that this list is not exhaustive and that the University reserves the right to include other types of breaches of academic integrity under this procedure, if it deems appropriate.

Examples where Academic Integrity is not adhered to;

- **Plagiarism:** defined as using another person's words or ideas without acknowledgment and submitting them for assessment as if they were one's own work. This can include copying, translating from one language to another or unacknowledged paraphrasing. It includes the use of quotations from the published or unpublished work of other persons, whether from books, articles, the internet or any other format, when these quotations have not been acknowledged as such by being placed in quotation marks and acknowledged. It can also include the use of summaries of another person's ideas, judgements, diagrams, graphs, drawings, computer programmes, laboratory or survey results without reference to that person in the text and the source in the bibliography.
 - *Note: The University will not accept a lack of understanding of the requirements for acknowledging the work of others as a legitimate defence for disregard of academic integrity.*
- **Contracting with a third party to write a piece of work:** this includes any action whereby a third party undertakes work on behalf of the student whether or not paid for by the student. The definition of third party includes a fellow student, friend or family member but where it is another student, that student is also subject to action under this procedure.
 - This category also includes material obtained from commercial essay sites on the internet or any other similar agencies.
- **Inappropriate Use of Artificial Intelligence sites, applications, tools etc:** this includes work generated by AI tools and then claimed as the student's own writing. This includes but is not limited to sites such as ChatGPT etc. These sites themselves may be useful tools used appropriately but it is the manner in which they are used that may constitute a breach of Academic Integrity. Students should refer to the University's Generative AI

guidance (<https://wrexham.libguides.com/generativeai>), the criteria detailed in assignment briefs and seek advice from the Programme Team and the Learning Skills team as needed.

- **Re-use of one's own material** (either in part or wholly): which has previously been submitted in support of an application for academic credit, except where this is appropriately referenced or where it is a resubmission of previously failed work and has been authorised by the programme team.
- **Collusion:** this is defined as work which has been undertaken by or with others but is submitted solely as the work of one person. This can also apply when the work of one person is submitted in the name of another. Where this is done with the knowledge of the originator, both parties can be considered to be at fault. This should not be confused with group working when clear advice will be provided on what is permitted to be submitted for assessment. Unless specifically advised to the contrary, any work submitted for assessment should be that of the individual and not of a group.
- **Fabrication of data:** making false claims to have carried out experiments, observations, interviews or other forms of data collection and analysis, or acting dishonestly in any other way.
- **Failure to obtain appropriate permission to conduct research:** where this directly relates to a student's studies. This may include a failure to obtain Ethical approval or conducting Primary research where only Secondary research has been approved.
- **Presentation of evidence of extenuating circumstances:** to assessment boards, which proves to be false or which in any way misleads or could mislead the Boards.
- **Introduction into an examination room or associated facilities of any unauthorised materials:** such as a book, manuscript, data or loose papers, information obtained via any electronic device, or any source of unauthorised information. This will be deemed to be an breach whether or not they were used to gain advantage.
- **Copying from or communicating with any other person:** during an examination or in class test, including online and in person exams/ tests, except as authorised by the invigilator.
- **Communicating electronically with any other person:** either within or external to the examination venue, except as authorised by the invigilator.
- **Impersonation of an examination candidate or allowing oneself to be impersonated.**
- **Presentation of an examination script or submission as one's own work when the script includes material produced by unauthorised means.**
- **Any other actions leading to the student gaining an unfair advantage.**

3 Partner Organisations

3.1 Specific examples of behaviour which may fall under the definition of failures to adhere to academic integrity are provided in paragraph 2.9. When a breach of academic integrity is identified by academic staff in a partner organisation, the procedure detailed in sections 7-9 below should be followed. If an academic investigative interview is required, staff at the partner organisation are authorised to undertake this interview and if it is deemed that there is sufficient evidence to deal with the matter (either as a case of minor indiscretion or minor academic integrity) the relevant procedure should be followed and an appropriate penalty imposed. Cases dealt with in this manner should be reported to the Student Administration team as soon as they have been completed. A written record of any interviews held with the student should be kept and also emailed to academicintegrity@wrexham.ac.uk.

3.2 If it is determined that the breach should be dealt with as a major breach of academic integrity, a referral form should be completed and sent to academicintegrity@wrexham.ac.uk for a committee of enquiry to be convened to deal with this matter. Evidence of the academic integrity breach should be provided with the referral form and details of any previous breaches committed by that student.

3.3 No mark should be awarded for the assessment and if an assessment board is imminent a mark of OH should be awarded while the breach is being investigated.

4 Relevant Policies/Procedures

4.1 The below Policies/Procedures can be found at: <https://wrexham.ac.uk/quality-and-regulations/student-procedures-appeals-complaints-conduct/>

- Fitness to Practise Procedure.
- Extenuating Circumstances Procedure.
- Student Academic Engagement Policy.

5 Communication Strategy

5.1 Guidance and standard forms and templates are available for use by staff and can be accessed via the [WYOU](#).

5.2 Guidance has been developed for students so that they are clear about the implications of not adhering to academic integrity and how the procedure will be implemented, and this is available from the Student VLE. Guidance on how to avoid plagiarism and improve academic writing is also available from Academic Study Skills: <https://wrexham.libguides.com/studyingatuniversity/academicintegrity>.

6 Detection of Academic Integrity Breach(es)

6.1 Any person who, whether in the course of the marking period or subsequently, considers or suspects that a candidate has engaged in a breach of the academic integrity procedure, shall report the matter to the Programme Leader.

6.2 Allegations must be supported by documentary evidence of the breach, including the original assessment brief. The person detecting the alleged breach should, for example, in the case of plagiarism, highlight those areas in the script which they believe to be plagiarised, and provide a note of the sources from which the text was taken, matching the two where possible. In cases where text matching software is utilised, it should be noted that a Turnitin originality report is an aid when plagiarism is suspected and does not of itself provide proof of plagiarism; the decision as to whether or not plagiarism has taken place is one of academic judgment. (A high percentage in an Originality Report can occur when plagiarism is not present, and a low percentage in an Originality Report does not prove that plagiarism has not taken place). However, Generative AI detection tools and checkers are not currently admissible as evidence.

6.3 While the allegation is being investigated a mark of 0H should be given for the work being considered. If it is not possible to complete the investigation before an assessment board is held, the mark of 0 will be processed and a progression code of Held will be applied.

6.4 If an allegation is raised after an Assessment Board has agreed a mark, then the student's mark will be withheld as well as their progression status until the process has been completed.

6.5 Where a breach of academic integrity is suspected an academic investigative interview should be held in accordance with paragraph 7.3 below. This is irrespective of whether or not additional firm evidence of the breach has been collected.

6.6 Where a case of collusion is suspected, initial discussions should take place with the programme team to ensure that there is no confusion with collaborative working. In this respect, it is imperative that where group working is permitted, parameters are made clear to students and unless explicitly stated otherwise, any work which is submitted for assessment should be produced on an individual basis.

6.7 Until the procedure is complete the student may still continue on their programme of study until a decision has been reached, in order to ensure that a student is not academically disadvantaged if the allegation is not upheld. The relevant Awards/Progression Assessment Board should consider the marks available and determine whether a student should be permitted the opportunity to resubmit work for any modules which are not under investigation.

7 Academic Investigative Interview

7.1 If the marker suspects that a breach of academic integrity has taken place the suspected student should be interviewed to determine whether there is a case to answer. This process is expected when adequate documentary evidence to substantiate the allegation has been found as well as when it has not been obtained.

7.2 The suspicions of the marker may result from a consideration of various factors e.g.:

- The work may be written in different language from that usually employed by the student.
- The work may bear little resemblance to that discussed in tutorials or supervision meetings.
- Source material may not be that recommended on reading lists.
- The work may be of a much higher standard than has previously been presented by the student.

7.3 The following procedure will be applied if the above is suspected:

- The marker should advise the Programme Leader of their suspicions. If the marker is the Programme Leader, the matter will be discussed with another member of the programme team and/or the relevant Associate Dean with responsibility for the subject area.
- The Programme Leader will interview the student with the marker present at that meeting or request another member of staff attend who was not involved with the marking but who has appropriate expertise.
- The student will be invited to a meeting where the student will be given an opportunity to explain how the piece of work was developed. It should be made clear to the student in advance that this meeting is not part of the assessment process but instead is part of a process to determine whether there is a case against academic integrity to be answered. The student should be encouraged to bring with them any previous drafts of the assignment and any rough notes made during its development.
- If a student wishes to be accompanied at the interview, the provisions in section 15 below will apply.
- The interview with the student should take place as soon as possible after the referral to the Programme Leader.
- The following topics are recommended for discussion during the meeting: sources used by the student, methodology, the thought processes involved in the conclusion/findings, the development process involved in the writing of the assignment, in particular the timescales. Every effort should be made to give the student an opportunity to demonstrate that the work is their own.

- If as a result of the interview, it is decided that there is not a prima facie case, no further action will be taken under the Academic Integrity Procedure. The student will be notified in writing that no charge will be pursued, and the work should be marked as usual.
- If it is determined that there is a prima facie case to be answered, the case should be referred to the relevant Associate Dean with responsibility for the subject area providing a copy of the notes of the academic investigative interview.

8 Determination of Level of Breach

8.1 Once the Programme Leader is satisfied that there is sufficient evidence to establish a prima facie breach of academic integrity, they will consult with the Associate Dean to determine the level of the breach and hence the method of dealing with it.

8.2 For students at level 3, all first breaches are to be treated as an Indiscretion.

8.3 For students outside of level 3, a case may be treated as an Indiscretion – only if all of the following three factors apply:

- It is a first breach.
- The breach has occurred within the first 12 months of the student's time at the University (regardless of level).
- There are indications that the breach has occurred because of poor academic practice rather than a deliberate attempt to gain unfair advantage, a decision may be made that the breach should be classified as an indiscretion.
- In such a case, the student should be supported in their academic writing to ensure that a repeat of the breach does not occur and a meeting to provide support should be offered to the student by the Programme Leader. Additional support could take the form of attendance at academic study skills sessions over a stipulated period of time or any other method the Programme Leader deems appropriate.
- The indiscretion should be formally notified to the student in writing with the prescription for improvement stipulated and it should be made clear to the student that any future breach would be dealt with formally following the academic integrity procedure. A note of the incident should be emailed to academicintegrity@wrexham.ac.uk which will be placed on the student record.
- The work should be marked in accordance with the normal assessment criteria and marking scheme, ignoring those sections which are not the original work of the student.

8.4 If the Programme Leader and Associate Dean determine that the breach is of a more serious nature, they may designate it either as a minor breach which will be concluded within the Academic Department or a major breach which will be dealt with centrally by means of a Committee of Enquiry.

8.5 A case of a minor breach of academic integrity will be progressed if there was no intent to deliberately deceive, for example poor referencing technique.

8.6 A case of a major breach of academic integrity will be progressed if there was intention to deliberately deceive. In addition to deliberate deception, a breach repeated breach of academic integrity should be treated as a major case.

8.7 Where alleged breaches have occurred during examinations, the determination of the level of the breach will be determined by the Director of Strategic Planning and Student Administration in consultation with the relevant Associate Dean.

9 Minor Breach of Academic Integrity Process

9.1 For Partner Organisations, please refer to paragraph 3.1 of this procedure.

9.2 If, following consideration of the evidence, the Programme Leader and Associate Dean determine that the case should be dealt with as a minor breach of academic integrity the procedure below will be followed. Normally, a breach of academic integrity will not be deemed to be minor if an earlier breach has occurred. However, care should be taken where the timing of assessments may be simultaneous and students have not received feedback about the first breach, before a further breach is committed.

9.3 The student will be sent communication advising them of the precise nature of the breach and offering them the opportunity to attend a meeting with the Programme Leader and Associate Dean or an appropriate nominee appointed by the Associate Dean. The communication should contain copies of the evidence considered by the Programme Leader (PL) and Associate Dean when making their deliberations. Note that this meeting does not have to be conducted and may be bypassed, particularly if the student does not feel they wish to represent themselves a further time.

9.4 The student will also be advised that they will be given an opportunity to defend their selves and may be accompanied (see section 15). It should also be advised to the student that they should provide documentary evidence of any personal mitigating circumstances in advance of the meeting and that it will only be accepted at the meeting at the discretion of the Associate Dean or the appropriate nominee.

9.5 If a student is studying on a campus other than the Wrexham campus, or is studying wholly online or via distance learning, an electronically facilitated meeting may be arranged.

9.6 If the student has indicated that they will attend the meeting and subsequently is absent, the meeting will proceed in their absence.

9.7 If a member of staff has indicated that they will attend and is subsequently absent, the meeting should be postponed until such time as the member of staff concerned is available or an appropriate alternative has been identified.

9.8 If, during the meeting, new evidence comes to light which indicates that the breach is of a more serious nature than originally thought, the Associate Dean may refer the matter for consideration by a Committee of Enquiry as a major breach of academic integrity. The student will be advised of the reasons for this decision and permitted to submit further evidence in their defence or statement of mitigation.

9.9 Following the hearing, the Programme Leader and Associate Dean will decide whether the case has been proven on the balance of probabilities and determine the penalty to be imposed. If personal mitigating circumstances have been raised by the student at the hearing and evidence has been provided in accordance with the relevant procedure, these circumstances may be considered in the determination of the penalty but not in the decision of whether the case is proven.

9.10 The Programme Leader and Associate Dean will give due regard to the Recommended Range of Penalties when determining the penalty to be imposed and will also consider any precedents set in any previous minor cases.

9.11 The Programme Leader must complete a Minor Academic Integrity Referral Form (page 26) which should be sent to academicintegrity@wrexham.ac.uk. A copy of this form will be sent to the student detailing both the breach and penalty imposed.

9.12 If the evidence considered indicates that the student has difficulties with academic practice, appropriate remedial support will also be made available and the student encouraged to engage with that support to avoid a repeat of the breach.

9.13 The Programme Leader will notify the student in writing of the decision and the penalty as soon as possible and no later than 5 working days of the date of the hearing. If the case is found not proven, any evidence or documentation relating to the case will be destroyed and no record will be kept in the student file. However, a general record of the case, which does not identify the student, will be maintained for statistical purposes. If the case is found proven, a formal record of the breach will be placed on the student record system so that a central record can be maintained.

9.14 If the student wishes to appeal against the decision, they must do so in writing within ten working days of the date of the outcome letter, following the guidance provided at section 18 of this procedure.

10 Major Breach of Academic Integrity Process

10.1 If, following consideration of the evidence, the Programme Leader and Associate Dean determine that the case should be dealt with as a major breach of academic integrity the procedure below will be followed.

10.2 The Programme Leader will advise the Student Administration team via academicintegrity@wrexham.ac.uk of the alleged breach and the Quality & Regulation team will ensure that the case is referred for consideration at the next available Committee of Enquiry. All documentary evidence in support of the case should be clearly annotated and provided by the Programme Leader no later than ten working days prior to the hearing. This documentation should include the assignment brief (for breaches in non- examination assessment), the examination rubric (for breaches in examinations), the investigative interview notes, the module handbook and relevant extracts from the student's submission(s).

10.3 The case against the student will be presented by the Programme Leader or their nominee.

11 Membership of Committee of Enquiry

11.1 Quality & Regulation will provide an officer and a secretary to support the Committee of Enquiry. The role of the officer will be to provide guidance in respect of the University's regulations, policies and procedures and, during the discussion in respect of the penalty to be imposed, to provide guidance in respect of precedents. **The officer will also be a member of the Committee of Enquiry and participate in the questioning and decision making in an advisory role.**

11.2 For breaches by students studying on taught programmes, the Committee of Enquiry will consist of two members of academic staff who are independent of the subject area in which the student is studying, one of whom will act as the Chair.

11.3 For breaches by students studying on research programmes of the University of Chester, the Academic and Research Integrity Procedure of the UoC and the protocol at Appendix 1 will apply.

11.4 Committees of Enquiry will be held either face to face or by electronic means. Where students are studying on campuses other than the Wrexham campus, or are studying wholly online or via distance learning, an electronically facilitated hearing will be organised, where possible.

11.5 In cases of collusion where two or more students are involved, the Chair may decide to hear these cases together, although each student will be given the opportunity to request that the cases be heard separately. If one student makes such a request, all related cases will be heard separately.

11.6 The Secretary will advise the student and the Committee of the date, time and venue of the hearing and provide copies of the documentation to be considered to both the student and the Committee. The student will be:

- Provided with a copy of the procedure.
- Advised of the right to be accompanied (see section 15).
- To provide evidence of any personal mitigating circumstances.
- To hear all the evidence and to call and question witnesses.

11.7 If the student provides additional documentary evidence at the hearing, this may be accepted but only with the express permission of the Chair.

11.8 The student will be required to confirm to the Secretary whether or not they will be attending the hearing and if they intend to be accompanied. (See section 17 for timelines to comply with this requirement and section 16 for further information).

11.9 The Committee of Enquiry's purpose shall be to consider the evidence presented and determine whether, on the balance of probabilities, the case has been proven. If proven, the Committee will determine the penalty to be imposed.

11.10 The Presenting Officer will present the case against the student, calling any witnesses as necessary. The Committee, Presenting Officer and the student will be entitled to question the witnesses. Following this questioning the witnesses will normally withdraw. If the Committee wishes the witnesses to attend throughout the hearing, the agreement of the student and the Presenting Officer will be requested.

11.11 The student will be given an opportunity to present a defence and to call any witnesses they deem appropriate. The Committee, Presenting Officer and the student will be entitled to question these witnesses.

11.12 Both the Committee and the Presenting Officer will be entitled to question the student.

11.13 The Committee and student may question the Presenting Officer.

11.14 The student and any accompanying person are entitled to hear all the evidence. The Chair may invite contributions from the accompanying person.

11.15 The Chair of the Committee may consider an adjournment for the collection of further evidence on the request of Committee members, the Presenting Officer or the student.

11.16 Following the hearing of all the evidence, the Presenting Officer and the student will withdraw, and the Committee will consider their verdict.

11.17 The decision will be reached on the balance of probabilities and the Committee will not be required to prove intent on the part of the student for the case to be proven. However, a lack of intent to engage in academic integrity may be material in the consideration of an appropriate penalty.

11.18 The Committee will not normally be advised of any previous breaches of academic integrity in advance of reaching its decision. However, the Committee will be advised of previous breaches by the officer before reaching a decision on an appropriate penalty. In addition, if in the opinion of the officer, there is good reason for advising the Committee of previous breaches of academic integrity because they have a material effect on the facts in question, then that information will be advised to the Committee in advance of them making a decision. Consideration should be given as to whether the prejudicial effect of this disclosure outweighs its probative value, and information should only be released in exceptional circumstances.

11.19 If the Committee finds the case not proven, the student will be notified in writing and all evidence of the case will be removed from the student's file and record. However, a general record of the case, which does not identify the student, will be maintained for statistical purposes.

11.20 If the Committee finds the case proven, it will proceed to consider the penalty to be imposed, considering the recommended range of penalties provided in the paragraph below and any precedents. The Committee will also be provided with the student's profile of marks and any assessment conventions and regulations for the programme of study in question and will take these into account during its deliberations.

11.21 If the student wishes to appeal against the decision of the Committee of Enquiry, they must do so in writing following the guidance provided at section 18 of this procedure.

12 Penalties

12.1 Minor Breaches (but may also be defined as major depending upon specific circumstances)

Breach	Panel Considerations	Suggested Penalty
Copying of sources without quotation marks and/or in text citing but references included in bibliography or reference list	The extent of the copied sections will also be important, along with consideration of intent (to deceive) in determining whether this is minor or major. Consideration should be given as to whether the percentage comprises a number of small matches or fewer substantial matches.	• Formal reprimand. • Work to be marked ignoring the sections proven to be plagiarised.
Submission of own previously assessed work for another assessment either within the University or to another institution with no intent to deceive		• Formal reprimand. • A mark of zero for the assessment with an opportunity to resubmit for a capped mark.
Permitting another student to copy work and present it as their own	(Where the student has gained no advantage) This breach is applicable to cases of Collusion where one student has done the majority of the work.	• Formal Reprimand only.
Communicating with another candidate in an examination or in-class test	This can be classed as minor where there is no evidence of advantage being gained.	• Formal reprimand only.

12.2 Minor or Major Breaches

Breach	Panel Considerations	Suggested Penalty
Extensive unacknowledged use of sources (first breach)	Consideration should be given as to whether the proportion of unacknowledged sources comprises a number of small matches or fewer substantial matches and also if the breach is due to poor study skills.	- Formal reprimand. MINOR: - Work to be marked ignoring the sections proven to be plagiarised. MAJOR - A mark of zero for the module with an opportunity to resubmit for a capped mark.
Unacknowledged and/or inappropriate use of Artificial Intelligence to generate part of an assignment (first breach)	Consideration should be given as to the extent of the use and also if the breach is due to poor study skills.	- Formal reprimand. MINOR: - Work to be marked ignoring the sections proven to be generated by Artificial Intelligence. MAJOR - A mark of zero for the module with an opportunity to resubmit for a capped mark.

12.3 Major Breaches

Breach	Panel Considerations	Suggested Penalty
Extensive unacknowledged use of sources (first breach)	First breach <u>with</u> evidence of intent to deceive (otherwise see Minor).	- Formal reprimand. - A mark of zero for the module with no opportunity to re-submit.
Extensive unacknowledged use of sources (second breach)	Second breach outcome is irrespective of intention to deceive.	- Formal reprimand. - A mark of zero for the module with no opportunity to re-submit.
Use of the work of others (e.g. from essay banks or from other students unknown to the student) and presented as student's own work	If use is minimal and limited (from publicly available sources), the student may be granted the right of resubmission at the discretion of the Panel. For Contracted Essays see row 9.	- Formal reprimand. - A mark of zero for the module with no opportunity to resubmit.
Contracting with an 'Essay Mill' or 'Contract cheating service'		- Formal Reprimand. - A mark of zero for the module with no opportunity to resubmit.
Collusion with other students	Consideration should be given to student intent in this case, and disproportionate benefit (ie where one student completed the majority of the work, see row 3). Where students intend to deceive, the right of resubmission may be denied at the Panel's discretion.	- Formal Reprimand. - A mark of zero for the module with an opportunity to resubmit for a capped mark.

Breach	Panel Considerations	Suggested Penalty
Unacknowledged and/or inappropriate use of Artificial Intelligence to generate part (first breach) or whole of an assignment	First breach <u>with</u> evidence of intent to deceive (otherwise see Minor).	- Formal reprimand. - A mark of zero for the assessment with no opportunity to resubmit.
Unacknowledged and/or inappropriate use of Artificial Intelligence to generate part (second breach) or whole of an assignment	Outcome is irrespective of intention to deceive.	- Formal reprimand. - A mark of zero for the assessment with no opportunity to resubmit.
Permitting another student to copy work and present it as their own <i>(where the owner of the work has gained financial advantage /payment)</i>	Where the Panel believe there is an intent to gain financial advantage providing illegal essay-writing services, they may expel the student, at their discretion. The University can also decide to report the matter to the authorities.	- Formal reprimand. - A mark of zero for the assessment with no opportunity to resubmit. <i>If the assessment has already been awarded a mark the Committee is entitled to revoke that mark in accordance with paragraphs 2.7 and 14.4 of the procedure</i> - Expulsion from the University***
Copying from or communicating with another candidate in an examination or in-class test to gain advantage		- Formal reprimand. - A mark of zero for the assessment with an opportunity to resubmit for a capped mark.
Introducing into an examination room any unauthorised manuscript, printed text, calculators, books or dictionaries or annotating any permitted equipment to gain advantage		- Formal reprimand. - A mark of zero for the assessment with an opportunity to re-sit for a capped mark.

Breach	Panel Considerations	Suggested Penalty
Impersonating another candidate in an examination or in-class test or permitting someone to act in this way on their behalf	(if both are students two breaches will occur)	• Formal reprimand. • A mark of zero for the examination with no opportunity to re-sit. • Expulsion from the University.
Fabrication of research/project results	Regarding mitigation, consideration should be given to intent to deceive and if the fabrication was intended or misunderstood as extrapolation or expansion.	• Formal reprimand. • A mark of zero for the assessment with no opportunity to resubmit. • Expulsion from the University.
Failure to obtain appropriate permission to conduct research	Regarding mitigation, consideration should be given to the level of guidance regarding ethical / other approval processes given to the student, and if the student could reasonably believe they had secured the necessary permissions. In cases of deliberate / intended failure, the Panel have the right to deny resubmission at their discretion.	• Formal reprimand. • A mark of zero for the assessment with an opportunity to resubmit /no opportunity to resubmit a new research project. • Expulsion from the University.

NOTE: A formal reprimand will accompany all of the above penalties and a record of this will be made in the student's file and on the Student Record System (SITS).

12.4 This range of penalties should be used as a guide only and is not exhaustive or exclusive. The Committee may, at their discretion, substitute other penalties as they deem appropriate. Examples of other penalties are:

- Cancellation of the student's marks in part or an instruction to the markers to ignore any plagiarised text when marking.
- The reduction of the degree result by one class or the non-award of a distinction, as appropriate.
- The disqualification of the student from future examinations (applicable to breaches occurring during examinations).

12.5 The Committee may wish to consider the following additional factors when determining the level of penalty:

- In the case of plagiarism, whether the submission from the student is early in their academic studies at the University.
- In the case of examinations, whether the breach has benefited the student.
- Whether or not the manner of the breach demonstrates a deliberate attempt to deceive the markers.
- Whether or not there have been earlier breaches which show lack of academic integrity or poor academic writing.
- Whether or not the student acknowledges their breach and demonstrates understanding of the wrongdoing and shows reflection.

12.6 The Academic Regulations permit two methods of calculating degree classifications. One of these methods is for only Level 6 marks to be taken into account. The Committee may wish to consider this when determining penalties involving breaches at Level 4 and 5.

12.7 The Committee may wish to consider any personal mitigating circumstances declared by the student in the determination of the level of penalty, providing that appropriate documentary evidence is supplied by the student in a timely fashion.

12.8 If the penalty given is that a mark should be cancelled in whole or in part, the effect of this penalty should not be diminished or removed by the impact of any future re-validation of that programme.

13 Interaction with Fitness to Practise Procedure

13.1 Where a breach of minor or major academic integrity has been found proven in a professional programme, the Committee will refer the case to the relevant Programme Leader for consideration under the Fitness to Practise procedure. Relevant programmes are identified on the referral form.

14 Implementation of Decision of Committee of Enquiry

14.1 If an alleged breach of academic integrity is under investigation at the time of the meeting of the relevant Assessment Board, the relevant Awards/Progression Assessment Board should consider the marks available and determine whether a student should be permitted the opportunity to resubmit work for any modules which are not under investigation.

14.2 When determining the penalty to be imposed, the Committee of Enquiry will give due consideration to the overall mark profile of the student and also decide the student's overall result. This decision will be notified to the Programme Leader, the relevant Associate Dean and the Immigration and Compliance Officer, if appropriate. The Chairs of the relevant module board and progression board will also be notified, and the decision of the Committee of Enquiry will be binding and implemented by those Boards.

14.3 Exceptionally, the Committee of Enquiry will be empowered, as a Panel of Academic Board, to vary the academic regulations in order to ensure that a specific penalty for an breach under this procedure, can be implemented.

14.4 If a case against academic integrity is found proven following the publication of the student's marks, the Committee of Enquiry shall have the authority to cancel the previously published result and substitute it with the result it has deemed appropriate. If this alteration results in the student no longer being eligible for an award and an award has already been conferred, Academic Board will be requested to revoke that award. In the cases of awards granted by the University of Chester, the Academic Board of the University of Chester will be requested to revoke the award.

15 Support for Students at Hearings

(This paragraph applies to all student hearings under this procedure, although it would not normally be expected that a student would be accompanied if the breach was defined as a indiscretion only, as this meeting would be remedial rather than punitive.)

15.1 The student may be accompanied at the hearing for support by another student, friend, relative, member of staff of the University or of a partner college/organisation, a member of the Students' Union or any other person who is needed to support them because of individual needs e.g., a carer or translator. If the student intends to be accompanied, they should advise the Secretary of the name of the accompanying person in advance of the hearing and state whether that person has legal qualifications. The student will be responsible for ensuring that the date, time and venue and the necessary documentation is provided to the person accompanying them.

15.2 Any person attending in support of a student may speak on the student's behalf in presentation of their case, whilst also being allowed to explain discussion points both to the student and the panel. However, all questions from the panel directed at the student directly should be answered by the student not their support. Furthermore, a supporting person may not act in a legal capacity without the Chair's express permission, unless advance notice has been given that the student will be represented.

15.3 Normally, only one person will accompany the student, but in exceptional circumstances, an additional person may attend with them, with the express permission of the Chair.

15.4 If the student wishes to be represented by a legally qualified person or a professional body representative, the University reserves the right to have its own legal representative present, and the student must advise the Secretary of the hearing of this intention at least five working days before the hearing. Each party will bear its own legal costs, and the student will be responsible for ensuring that the date, time and venue and the necessary documentation is provided to those representing them.

15.5 It should be noted that no person will be allowed to accompany the student if it can be demonstrated that the person could potentially gain personal advantage through attendance e.g., a student who is subject to a similar breach of the University's procedures.

16 Attendance at Hearings

(This paragraph applies to academic investigative interviews and breaches of minor and major academic integrity.)

16.1 If a student advises that they will attend the hearing but subsequently, does not attend and no reason or apologies are provided, the hearing will continue in their absence. If reasons are provided, the Chair will decide whether to grant a postponement.

16.2 If a student is unable to attend a hearing for exceptional reasons e.g., international student who has returned home following the expiry of a visa, they must advise the Secretary no later than 48 hours before the hearing. Where possible, an opportunity will be provided for the case to be heard through electronic means and/or the student will be invited to present a written statement for consideration by the Committee of Enquiry.

16.3 If the student requests a postponement, evidence of personal mitigating circumstances will be requested and presented to the Chair for approval. If approved by the Chair, a postponement will be granted but on one occasion only.

16.4 If a student advises that they will not be attending the hearing or no reply is received following one reminder, the hearing will proceed in their absence.

16.5 If the Presenting Officer does not attend the hearing the Chair will decide whether to grant a postponement.

16.6 If a member of the Committee of Enquiry has indicated that they will attend and is subsequently absent the meeting should be postponed until such time as the member of staff concerned is available or an appropriate alternative has been identified.

17 Timeline for Major Academic Integrity Hearings

Every effort will be made to comply with these timescales, but it should be noted that unforeseen circumstances may occasionally result in these deadlines not being met.

Timing (latest date)	Action	Responsibility
10 working days before hearing i.e. date of dispatch from the University (to be sent by email)	Advise student in writing of allegation, date and time of hearing, arrangements for hearing and confirm student's email address for correspondence.	Secretary to hearing
10 working days before hearing	Programme Leader to provide documentary evidence in support of the Case.	Programme Leader
5 working days before hearing i.e. dispatch from University (to be sent by email)	Provide student and Committee with documents to be considered at hearing.	Secretary to hearing
5 working days before hearing	University to be advised whether or not student will be attending. University to be advised if student will be accompanied and/or represented in a legal capacity or by a professional body representative.	Student
5 working days after hearing i.e. date of dispatch from University (to be sent by email)	Student to be notified in writing of outcome of hearing and the right of appeal.	Officer Hearing and Secretary of Hearing
10 working days after date of outcome letter to student	Receipt of full written appeal to be made to the Director of SPSA.	Student

18 Appeals by Candidates Found Guilty of a Breach of Academic Integrity

18.1 Minor Breach of Academic Integrity

- Where a case has been dealt with as a minor breach of academic integrity, and the student wishes to appeal against the decision, they must complete the appropriate form within ten working days of the date of the outcome notification letter.
- Acceptable grounds for appeal will be one of the following:
 - Irregularities in the conduct of the hearing, which are of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt whether the same decision would have been reached had they not occurred.
 - Exceptional personal circumstances which were not known to the programme team when the student's case was considered, and which can be shown to be relevant to the breach of academic integrity. The appellant must show good reason why such personal circumstances were not made known before the meeting. Where a candidate could have reported exceptional personal circumstances prior to the meeting, those circumstances cannot subsequently be cited as grounds for appeal.
- If the appeal is accepted; it will be referred to the next available Committee of Enquiry for hearing under the normal arrangements specified in this procedure.
- Where an individual's case of collusion is successfully referred to Appeal, then any other colluding parties' cases must also be brought to that Appeal's Committee of Enquiry. The outcome of the appeal will affect the context and outcome of both/all students, therefore all colluding parties need to be heard through the same appeal process in light of this new context.

18.2 Major Breach of Academic Integrity

- Appeals against decisions of Committees of Enquiry will only be accepted where the appeal is based upon one or both of the following grounds:
 - Irregularities in the conduct of the Academic Integrity Procedure, which are of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt whether the Committee would have reached the same decision had they not occurred.
 - Exceptional personal mitigating circumstances which were not known to the Committee of Enquiry when the student's case was considered, and which can be shown to be relevant to the breach of academic integrity. The appellant must show good reason why such personal circumstances were not made known to the Committee of Enquiry before its meeting. Where a candidate could have reported exceptional personal circumstances to the Committee of Enquiry prior to its meeting, those circumstances cannot subsequently be cited as grounds for appeal.

- Any appeal against a decision of a Committee of Enquiry will be on the appropriate form and received no later than ten working days of the date of the letter advising the student of the Committee's decision. Simple notice of appeal given in writing by a candidate within the above deadline shall not be deemed to constitute an appeal and shall not be accepted.
- The Director of Strategic Planning and Student Administration, or their nominee (who will be a person not previously involved in the case), may disallow an appeal which:
 - Is based on factors which were known to the Committee of Enquiry when the penalty was imposed.
 - Introduces information, which was known to, and could have been reported by the student prior to the meeting of the Committee of Enquiry.
- If it is decided by the Director of Strategic Planning and Student Administration or his/her nominee that there is a prima facie case to be considered, it shall be referred to an Appeal Panel. Where an individual's case of collusion is successfully referred to Appeal, then any other colluding parties' cases must also be brought to that Appeal's Committee of Enquiry. The outcome of the appeal will affect the context and outcome of both/all students, therefore all colluding parties need to be heard through the same appeal process in light of this new context.
- The decision to refer should be documented and included in the information submitted to an Appeal Panel.
- The Appeal Panel shall consist of a Senior member of Academic staff, and one other Academic staff member who shall be independent of the subject area of the student concerned and have no previous involvement in the case. The Director of Strategic Planning and Student Administration will also nominate a secretary to the Appeal Panel.
- The Appeal Panel shall have delegated powers to act on behalf of Academic Board.
- An appellant shall be offered a personal hearing by the Appeal Panel and shall accordingly be informed in advance of the time and date of the meeting. The provisions at section 15 in respect of support for students at hearings will apply.
- The Appeal Panel shall base its decision on the evidence of the appellant's submission and the reporting from the Committee of Enquiry concerned, together with any further evidence which it considers relevant. It may call relevant witnesses, if appropriate.
- The Appeal Panel have discretion to declare inadmissible any matter introduced by the appellant, or by any member of staff or student accompanying the appellant, if they deem it not directly related to the contents of the appeal previously lodged in writing within the stipulated deadline.
- The Appeal Panel shall be empowered to take one of the following decisions:
 - To confirm the original penalty.
 - To vary the original penalty.

- To disallow the original penalty.
 - To require a Committee of Enquiry to re-hear the case.
- The decision of the Appeal Panel shall be final, and the matter shall, therefore, be regarded as closed. There shall be no discussion of the decision of the Appeal Panel with the appellant or any other person.
- If the student's appeal is upheld or partly upheld, then the student will be advised that they can ask for a Completion of Procedures Letter. Where a student's appeal is not upheld, the student will be sent a Completion of Procedures letter without a request being necessary.
- If an appeal is upheld, the Director of Strategic Planning and Student Administration, or nominee, shall take relevant action as appropriate for the Appeal Panel decision then arrange for the publication of the revised result.
- If, as a consequence of a successful appeal, a candidate is regarded as having qualified for an award, such a candidate shall be granted that award at the first available opportunity.
- The Appeal Panel may make recommendations for consideration by the appropriate committee or department on any matters arising from the consideration of appeals.

19 Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)

19.1 Wrexham University subscribes to the independent scheme for the review of student complaints. Once all the relevant procedures above have been exhausted a student may take their complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). A Scheme Application Form must be sent to the OIA within twelve months of the date of notification of completion of procedures letter.

19.2 A Scheme Application Form can be downloaded from the OIA website www.oiahe.org.uk (or you can telephone or write to the OIA for a form).

19.3 The contact details for the OIA is:
Office of the Independent
Adjudicator Second Floor Abbey Gate
57-75 Kings Road Reading
RG1 3AB

Tel: 01189 599813

E-mail: enquiries@oiahe.org.uk

20 Monitoring of Procedure

20.1 It is important that all students are treated equitably under this procedure and therefore the outcomes of all minor academic integrity hearings will be recorded in the form of a report for them to be available for consideration if further breaches occur. Similarly, the University will record the outcomes of major committee of enquiry hearings and build up case law, in respect of penalties imposed for specific breaches. This case law will be made available to future Committees of Enquiry and the Heads of Faculties and Programme Leaders to assist them in their decision making.

20.2 On an annual basis, the Director of Strategic Planning and Student Administration will provide for consideration by the appropriate Academic Board committee, an anonymised report on the operation of the Academic Integrity Procedure.

21 Forms

21.1 Current versions of the Academic Integrity referral forms can be accessed via the Intranet here: <https://wyou.wrexham.ac.uk/departments/strategic-planning-and-student-administration/quality-and-regulation/academic-misconduct/>

22 Accessibility

22.1 Wrexham University strives to be a supportive and trauma-informed university in the design and operation of all our processes and procedures. If you need adjustments to access this procedure or have any other comments to make on the accessibility, wording or any part of this procedure, please do email us on academicintegrity@wrexham.ac.uk.

Appendix 1 – Protocol in respect of student register on University of Chester awards

1. The University of Chester's (UoC) Academic and Research Integrity Procedure will apply. WU will nominate a senior member of academic staff to act in the role of Head of Department.
2. Any allegations of a breach of academic or research integrity against a WU student will be reported to the UoC member of staff appointed as the Senior PGR Tutor for WU. The WU member of staff acting as Head of Department and the Senior PGR Tutor will be jointly responsible for discharging the responsibilities outlined in clause 4 of the procedure.
3. The decision to refer an allegation of a breach of academic or research integrity to the PGR Academic and Research Integrity Review Panel will be made jointly by the GU member of staff acting as Head of Department and the Senior PGR Tutor. In the event of a dispute, the matter will be referred to the Dean of Academic Quality and Enhancement at UoC who will make the final decision.
4. Where an allegation is considered by the PGR Academic and Research Integrity Review Panel, the Panel will be constituted as set out in clause 5 of the procedure. However, one of the Panel members will be a member of academic staff at WU who will be nominated by the Academic Registrar (or nominee).
5. Hearings of the PGR Academic and Research Integrity Review Panel will take place at WU. UoC and WU will be jointly responsible for servicing the Panel.