

Student Academic Misconduct Procedure



Document owner

UCD Student Engagement, Conduct, Complaints and Appeals

Approval date and body

ACEC, 30 May 2024

Effective 1 September 2024

Note on The Student Academic Misconduct Procedure 2024-25

The Academic Council has approved the establishment of a Working Group to review this procedure to reflect the definitions of academic misconduct outlined in the UCD Academic Integrity Policy. Current practice with regard to academic misconduct (previously 'plagiarism') will continue for the 2024-2025 academic year, and School Level Committees are not expected to amend their approach to investigating academic misconduct, pending the outcome of this review.

1. Introduction

The Academic Integrity Policy and the Student Code of Conduct outline the University's commitment to upholding academic integrity and the standards of academic conduct expected of students. The following procedures are intended to assist academic staff in effectively addressing instances of student academic misconduct. The document outlines the steps and procedures that should be followed when suspected incidents arise.

This procedure applies to all work submitted for assessment by all students registered to University College Dublin, on all taught and research programmes¹ and should be read in conjunction with related documents: Academic Integrity Policy, the Student Code of Conduct and the Student Discipline Procedure.

Incidents of alleged academic misconduct that do not involve work submitted should continue to be referred to the Student Discipline Procedure by Academic Integrity Committees or module coordinators as appropriate. In addition, this document does not include procedures relating to alleged breaches of Examination Regulations reported by invigilators following university managed examinations. This category of academic misconduct is addressed under the Student Discipline Procedure.

¹ Section 6 of the [UCD Procedure for the Investigation of Misconduct in Research](#) states: *An allegation of misconduct in research by a student may be investigated through the [Procedure for the Investigation of Misconduct in Research](#) and if upheld and if appropriate will be managed through the student disciplinary process. In handling allegations against students, the university is aware of its particular obligations in respect of student supports, and in such instances the Research Integrity Officer, in consultation with the Registrar or nominee, may decide that the allegation would be more appropriately dealt with directly under the provisions of the Student Code. It is expected that allegations relating to minor research assignments undertaken by students on taught programmes will generally be handled in the first instance under the Student Code, unless the research appears in the published literature, is externally funded or is otherwise of a significance that merits handling through this procedure.*

2. Principles

The procedures are established on principles of natural justice, that is the application of procedural fairness for all students who are alleged to have committed academic misconduct. Decision-makers considering allegations of academic misconduct will act without bias.

These procedures should be interpreted in a manner that:

- a) Promotes equal opportunities for all students to develop a commitment to personal responsibility and academic integrity in assessment;
- b) Treats students fairly and consistently in a transparent manner;
- c) Applies penalties that are fair and proportionate; and
- d) Respects the dignity of all persons involved.

3. Roles and responsibilities

3.1 Head of Schools' responsibilities include:

- a) Establishing a School Academic Integrity Committee or joining the School in a joint School Academic Integrity Committee (see 3.4). The School Academic Integrity Committee will consist of three voting members (a Chair and a maximum of two additional members of academic staff) for the purposes of reviewing suspected instances of academic misconduct within the School(s) and deciding whether the matter may be resolved at School Academic Integrity Committee level or whether a referral to the University Discipline Procedure is required;
- b) Ensuring that records of all instances of academic misconduct and outcomes of investigations are kept;
- c) Periodically evaluating arrangements for dealing with academic misconduct to ensure consistency in case management, and that where any recurrent patterns of academic misconduct emerge, either in the case of individual students, or groups of students, the overall approach is appropriate and capable of ensuring that any further recurrences are addressed.
- d) Heads of School may delegate the above operational responsibility to a nominated individual (hereafter referred to as the School Academic Integrity Adviser).

3.2 School Academic Integrity Advisers' responsibilities (if nominated) include:

- a) Carrying out duties delegated by the Head of School;
- b) Being aware of the types, nature and outcomes of allegations of academic misconduct that arise in the School;
- c) Advising academic staff who wish to consult on suspected or ongoing allegations of academic misconduct.

3.3 Module Coordinators' responsibilities include:

- a) Guided by these procedures and the School Academic Integrity Protocol, Module Coordinators will exercise their judgement when deciding whether incidents will be dealt with directly, or referred to the School Academic Integrity Committee or the Student Discipline Procedure for consideration, and may consult with the School Academic Integrity Adviser, where one has been appointed.
- b) When deciding on whether cases should be referred to the School Academic Integrity Committee, Module Coordinators may wish to consider the following:

- the extent and nature of the suspected academic misconduct;
 - the relative experience / stage of the student;
 - any additional school guidance that may have been developed.
- c) Initiating procedures in suspected cases of academic misconduct;
- d) Preparing a short report outlining the grounds of suspicion, a copy of the piece of work and supporting evidence;
- e) Follow the school's academic integrity protocol with regard to communicating with the student about the alleged academic misconduct, this may include:
- informing the student that their assignment or examination script is under scrutiny as an alleged instance of academic misconduct;
 - advising students who they refer to the School Academic Integrity Committee of the supports available to them, such as those provided by Student Advisers or the Students' Union.

3.4 Joint-Committees

Schools may group together to form a joint School Academic Integrity Committee, with the following arrangements:

- a) Proposals to establish joint School Academic Integrity Committees must be notified to ACCSCC;
- b) The Head of School retains the responsibilities for Head of School under this policy;
- c) Hereafter in this policy the term School Academic Integrity Committee may be taken to mean a single or joint School Academic Integrity Committee;
- d) Each School's Academic Integrity Protocol should specify whether the School has a single School Academic Integrity Committee or is part of a joint School Academic Integrity Committee;
- e) Committee membership numbers and all other arrangements in this policy apply equally to single and joint Academic Integrity Committees. Joint committees may be drawn from a panel of the appointees from each constituent School.

3.5 School Academic Integrity Committees' responsibilities include:

- a) Examining allegations of academic misconduct in submitted work referred by Module Coordinators;
- b) Evaluating the case and deciding whether academic misconduct has taken place;
- c) Deciding whether a case should be addressed by the School Academic Integrity Committee or referred without decision to the Student Discipline Procedure. Cases will be referred using the Student Misconduct Incident Report form, available at: <https://www.ucd.ie/secca/studentconduct/>
- d) Providing accompanying supporting documents where allegations are referred to the Student Discipline Procedure;
- e) Deciding on a penalty where academic misconduct has taken place. Where the category of academic misconduct is plagiarism, the application of the penalty is guided by the UCD Plagiarism Tariff; ²
- f) Providing an accompanying report where allegations are referred to the Student Discipline Procedure without decision;

² A UCD Plagiarism Tariff, adapted from the AMBeR Tariff <https://www.plagiarism.org/paper/plagiarism-reference-tariff> has been developed and is associated with these procedures.

- g) Communicating the outcome of the School Academic Integrity Committee meeting to the student and the Module Coordinator;
- h) Keeping a record of the type, circumstances and outcome (decision and penalty) of referred allegations of plagiarism;

Where a Module Coordinator who refers a case to the School Academic Integrity Committee is a committee member, they must be replaced by an alternate member when the case that they referred is being considered.

3.6 Examiners' responsibilities include:

- a) Being aware of, and considering, the UCD Academic Integrity Policy when reviewing assignments and examinations;
- b) Grading as normal and consulting the Module Coordinator in suspected cases of academic misconduct.

3.7 Student's responsibilities in relation to this procedure include:

- a) Engage with and respond to Module Coordinators and the School Academic Integrity Committee in a timely manner and within any timelines set out;
- b) Where meetings with the School Academic Integrity Committee are held students should attend and respond to the committee's questions relating to the alleged academic misconduct.
- c) Students may be accompanied by a support person of their choice, such as their Student Adviser or a Students' Union Sabbatical Officer;
- d) Students are expected to speak for themselves at meetings. The role of any person accompanying students is to provide support.

3.8 Academic Council Committee on Student Conduct and Capacity's (ACCSCC) responsibilities include:

- a) Maintaining oversight of implementation, and periodic review, of these procedures;
- b) Receiving notifications from new joint School Academic Integrity Committees of their constituent Schools, and of any subsequent changes in membership;
- c) Keeping a record of joint School Academic Integrity Committees and their constituent Schools.

4. Categories of Academic Misconduct

4.1 The Academic Integrity Policy provides the following categories of academic misconduct and includes definitions and relevant examples for each.

- Plagiarism
- Self-Plagiarism
- Recycling
- Misrepresentation of authorship
- Contract cheating
- Collusion

- Fabricating or falsifying data, information or sources
- Facilitating academic dishonesty
- Fabrication of credentials
- Inappropriately using digital or information technology
- Inappropriately publishing, uploading or sharing an assessment
- Inappropriately publishing or uploading University teaching or course material
- Impersonation
- Ghost writing or authorship
- Copying or cheating at formal examination³
- Advertising cheating services and / publishing advertisements for cheating services

4.2. Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the most commonly reported category of academic misconduct.

Minor infringements and poor academic practice may be addressed directly by Module Coordinators without referral through the actions set out under section 5.1 but may be addressed by the School Academic Integrity Committee in some cases depending on the circumstances of the alleged breach.

Cases that are deemed to be minor infringements and evidence of poor academic practice may be characterised as follows:

- Apparent unintended misuse of source materials.
- Inadequate citation such as poor referencing, inappropriate paraphrasing, where it demonstrates the need for further guidance on referencing and citation.
- Over-reliance on sources without sufficient input of the student's own work.
- The suspected misconduct represents only a small proportion of the work and/or an element in a piece of work which makes a small contribution to the grade for the assessment component.

Cases that are referred to the School Academic Integrity Committee are likely to include instances where larger proportions of suspected plagiarism are evident, the component assessment under scrutiny is worth a significant proportion of the module, or where a Module Coordinator notes repeated minor instances. Decisions available to the School Academic Integrity Committee are outlined in section 5.3.5.

Cases that are considered sufficiently serious by the School and where the penalties available to the Academic Integrity Committee are considered to be inappropriate may be referred without decision to the UCD Student Discipline Procedure (e.g. categories such as contract cheating, or second offences or significant plagiarism in major assessments).

³ *Alleged Incidents of misconduct during formal examinations are reported by university invigilators to UCD Assessment and where appropriate referred to be dealt with under the Student Discipline Procedure.*

5. School Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedure

5.1 Initial investigation and procedure

Where an examiner, who is not the Module Coordinator, detects a suspected instance of academic misconduct in a student's assessment, they should grade the assessment as normal and then consult with the Module Coordinator.

Taking account of the specific context and nature of the case, any or all of the following courses of action may be followed by the Module Coordinator as soon as possible:

- a) Discussion directly with the student about the issue that has arisen with their assessment;
- b) Consultation with the School Academic Integrity Adviser (if nominated);
- c) Provide, or arrange that the student receive one-to-one advice about academic integrity and avoiding academic misconduct and / or refer the student to the UCD Library and / or the University Writing Centre for advice and guidance on good writing practices and how to avoid academic misconduct. Instances of poor academic practice and minor infringements may be reflected in the grade awarded by Module Coordinators using the [Component Grade Scale](#);
- d) Refer the case to the School Academic Integrity Committee. The Module Coordinator should submit a short report outlining the grounds of suspicion, a copy of the piece of work and any supporting evidence to the School Academic Integrity Committee. Where it is decided to refer the case to the School Academic Integrity Committee, Module Coordinators may advise the student that their assessment has been referred to the School Academic Integrity Committee and that the Committee will contact them in relation to the matter and note the supports available, such as their Student Adviser or an SU Sabbatical Officer. A Module Coordinator may refer a case to the School Academic Integrity Committee without following actions a-c.

5.2 Referral to the School Academic Integrity Committee

Where an allegation is referred by a Module Coordinator, the School Academic Integrity Committee will:

- a) Inform the student, through their UCD email address, that:
 - i. their assessment is under scrutiny as an alleged instance of academic misconduct; the Module Coordinator's report should be included in the correspondence;
 - ii. they are invited to respond to the allegation in accordance with the School's Academic Misconduct Protocol;
 - iii. in the absence of any response the committee may, within any timeframes established, proceed to consider the case.
- b) The student must be advised about sources of support such as those provided by Student Advisers and by the Students' Union.

5.3 School Academic Integrity Committee

5.3.1 In cases where a student has been referred previously to a School Academic Integrity Committee and found to be in breach of the terms of the University's Academic Integrity Policy, the committee will make a judgement as to whether the recurrence can be handled as an academic matter at School level or whether it merits referral to the Student Discipline Procedure.

5.3.2 The Assessment and Module Coordinator's Report will be reviewed by the committee and one of the following decisions will be taken:

- If the nature and extent of academic misconduct warrants it, the case may be referred directly to the Student Discipline Procedure.
- If the matter could have been appropriately dealt with as a minor infringement or poor academic practice the case may be referred back to the Module Coordinator for resolution.
- Academic misconduct proceedings will be initiated and the student will be invited to meet the School Academic Integrity Committee to discuss the alleged academic misconduct case and to assist decision-making. Reasonable efforts should be made to accommodate students' requests to change the meeting time/date. However, if the student does not respond to the meeting notification, or cannot or does not attend the meeting, the committee will proceed in their absence.

5.3.3 Where offered by the student, mitigating circumstances may be taken account of, following the committee's decision on whether academic misconduct has occurred. Where a student indicates the presence of issues that fall under the scope of the Extenuating Circumstances Policy the committee may advise the student to make an application using the Extenuating Circumstances procedure if they have not already made such an application.

5.3.4 School Academic Integrity Committee decisions will be taken by a simple majority and on the balance of probabilities.

In cases where it is determined that **plagiarism** has taken place, the penalty will be guided by a University-approved plagiarism tariff.⁴ It is noted that the tariff is not appropriate for guiding penalties in relation to other categories of academic misconduct, such as collusion, exam cheating or contract cheating.

5.3.5 The School Academic Integrity Committee may decide any of the following:

- a) That academic misconduct has not occurred; the assessment component grade will stand. No record is kept on the Plagiarism Record System.⁵
- b) That academic misconduct has occurred. In all cases the student will receive a verbal or written warning, be directed on where and how to receive advice about academic integrity (good writing, citation and referencing practices and avoiding plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct) and the case will be recorded in the Plagiarism Record System. In addition, the committee may:
 - i. Permit the student to re-submit the assessment component, incurring a late submission grade penalty⁶;
 - ii. Permit the student to re-submit the assessment component and direct that the grade be capped⁷; School Academic Integrity Committees may select the capped grade from all passing grades of the Component Grading Scale as deemed appropriate. When capping grades, School Academic Integrity Committees may wish to limit this to a D- or at the original grade or an adjusted original grade in line with Academic Regulation 4.26 and the Component Grade Scale.

⁴ A UCD plagiarism tariff, adapted from the AMBeR Tariff <https://www.plagiarism.org/paper/plagiarism-reference-tariff> has been developed and is associated with this procedure. ⁵ Use of the existing UCD Plagiarism Record System will continue for the 2024-2025 academic year, however, the system may be updated pending the outcome of the Academic Misconduct Procedure review.

⁵ Use of the existing UCD Plagiarism Record System will continue for the 2024-2025 academic year, however, the system may be updated pending the outcome of the Academic Misconduct Procedure review.

⁶ UCD Late Submission of Coursework Policy (the late submission penalty applies to all penalties that permit re-submission so that the student is not advantaged by re-submitting after the deadline).

⁷ School Academic Misconduct Committees cannot apply grade reductions or cap resubmitted work that is graded using pass/fail, this includes where misconduct occurs in a resit.

- iii. Direct that the grade for the assessment component be reduced without an opportunity to resubmit the assessment. School Academic Integrity Committees may select grades from all passing grades of the Component Grading Scale as deemed appropriate.

If a penalty results in a change to a grade that has already been approved by a Programme Examination Board, the Chair of the School Academic Integrity Committee should request that the Module Coordinator submits an *exceptional change of grade* request to the Chair of Academic Council Committee on Examinations.

- c) Refer the alleged instance, without any decision, for resolution under the University's Student Discipline Procedure. In some contexts, a first instance may require direct referral (e.g. misconduct in single-assessment modules, second or subsequent offences, heavily weighted assessments or serious incidents of academic misconduct such as contract cheating).
 - d) Decisions will be communicated to students through their UCD email address (copying the Module Coordinator). Where a decision is made under 5.3.5b the communication should include reference to their right to appeal decisions under specified grounds and under Student Appeals Procedure (see section 8).
- 5.3.6 In all cases of referral to the University Student Discipline Procedure, the School Academic Integrity Committee should:
- a) Prepare and send a short report outlining the grounds of suspicion, reason for referral, a copy of the assessment component and any supporting evidence, copying the Module Coordinator;
 - b) Inform the student, through their UCD email address, that their assessment has been referred for scrutiny as an alleged instance of academic misconduct under the Student Discipline Procedure⁸; and
 - c) Advise the student of the supports available to them. Where meetings are held students may choose to be accompanied by a support person of their choice, such as a Student Adviser, or a Students' Union Sabbatical Officer.

5.3.7 The School Academic Integrity Committee will record incidents.

- a) The Plagiarism Record System is a central university system for Schools to record incidents of academic misconduct found by the School Academic Integrity Committee. A member of staff, nominated by the Head of School will maintain the record.
- b) Access to the system will be limited to faculty and staff with responsibility for applying the policy, administering the student discipline procedure, and maintaining the system. This will include the Chair of a School Academic Integrity Committee and the member of School staff nominated for the purpose of implementing the policy, i.e. identifying previous breaches of the Academic Integrity Policy by students, and entering decisions of School Academic Integrity Committee.
- c) Personal data collected and processed under the Academic Misconduct Procedures will include: student name and ID number, relevant module code, misconduct category, assessment type and the decision of the School Academic Integrity Committee. Personal data will not be included in any university reports on academic misconduct.

⁸ Referrals are made without decision, therefore, the Student Appeals Procedure is not applicable and should not be referenced in communications informing students that the case has been referred to be dealt with under the Student Discipline Procedure. Students will be provided with the opportunity to appeal decisions made under the Student Discipline Procedure.

6. Appeals to School Academic Integrity Committee outcomes

6.1 An appeal to decisions of the committee may be made to the University's Student Appeals Committee within 10 working days from the date of issue of the decision of the School Academic Integrity Committee. Details of the appeal procedure can be found in the [Student Appeals Procedure](#).

6.2 Appeals may be made on the following grounds:

- New evidence: information directly relevant to the decision, which for good reason was not available to the School Academic Integrity Committee.
- Procedural irregularity: there is evidence that the procedures relating to a decision were not followed properly, which may have impacted on the School Academic Integrity Committee's decision.
- Disproportionate outcome; the outcome applied was disproportionately severe with regard to the circumstances of the case.

6.3 Decisions of the Student Appeals Committee. The Committee may:

- Uphold the Appeal, in full or in part.
- Reject the Appeal.

In cases where a Student Appeals Committee upholds an appeal either on the ground of a procedural irregularity in the process leading to the original decision, or on the ground of new evidence, the Student Appeals Committee, at their discretion, may refer the case back to the original decision-making body for a new hearing with such conditions as the Student Appeals Committee deems appropriate, this may include the constitution of a new committee.

6.4 On upholding an appeal a Student Appeals Committee may require the appellant to meet specified conditions and in considering an appeal against a penalty the Student Appeals Committee may decrease or increase the penalty or change the nature of the penalty.

6.5.1 The outcome of an appeal will be communicated to the relevant School for implementation.

7. University Student Discipline Procedure

7.1 The Student Discipline Procedure under the Student Code of Conduct will be followed.

7.2 Where an allegation of academic misconduct referred to the Student Discipline Procedure has been proven:

- d) Any of the penalties available under the Student Discipline Procedure may be applied, this includes, but is not limited to, reduction of a component assessment or module grade up to and including the award of NM (No Grade) for the module or deprivation of any academic award, scholarship or prize, suspension or expulsion at a Student Disciplinary hearing;
- e) The outcome of the case will be communicated to the School and recorded by the Student Engagement, Conduct, Complaints and Appeals on the Plagiarism Record System.

8. Related documents

- [Academic Integrity Policy](#)
- [Student Code of Conduct](#)
- [Student Discipline Procedure](#)

Appendix 1: Recommended headings for a School's Plagiarism Protocol

- School name;
- School Academic Integrity Adviser (if appointed);
- Chair and member(s) of the School Academic Integrity Committee (noting whether it is a single or joint School Academic Integrity Committee). Schools may not necessarily be represented on the joint Committee if its constituent Schools number more than three Schools;
- A list of the referencing / citation system(s) in use in the School, indicating associated programmes, modules or disciplines as appropriate.
- School Procedure: any other information that clarifies how the School will apply the UCD Student Academic Misconduct Procedure for staff and students, (e.g. who notifies students that they have been called to meet the School Academic Integrity Committee: the Module Coordinator or the committee).

Appendix 2: Recommended information to be included in plagiarism referral documents

a) within School and b) School Academic Integrity Committee.

- School name
- Student name
- Student number
- Programme
- Year of study
- Module(s)
- Information on assessment component including weighting
- Note on grounds of suspicion for plagiarism / academic misconduct
- Supporting documentation should include:
 - A copy of the relevant assessment(s) as submitted by the student
 - A copy of any evidence of plagiarism (e.g. original sources or software detection evidence)
- First or subsequent incident (if known)
- Presence of any mitigating or extenuating circumstances (Yes/No information only in the referral documentation – detail should be revealed to relevant personnel only).

Reporting Under the Student Discipline Procedure

Where it is decided that incidents of academic misconduct are to be reported to be dealt with at the University level, under the [Student Discipline Procedure](#), Student Misconduct Incident Reports should be completed. Forms and guidance on the completion of forms can be accessed via the following website under “information for staff”: <https://www.ucd.ie/secca/studentconduct/>. Completed forms should be submitted to student.conduct@ucd.ie

Appendix 3: Draft template email to student in suspected cases of plagiarism

Dear [insert name]

Your assessment [insert detail] in module [insert module code] has been referred to the [insert name] School Academic Integrity Committee as a suspected instance of plagiarism.

You are invited to meet the School Academic Integrity Committee on [insert date] at [insert time] in [insert location]. You may, if you wish, bring a support person to the meeting with you (e.g. Student Adviser or Students' Union Sabbatical Officer).

If you cannot attend at the above time, please notify us by return email, and we will try to accommodate a change of date, however, if you do not respond to this invitation or do not attend the meeting, it may proceed in your absence, and you will be informed of the outcome in due course.

I attach a copy of the UCD Student Academic Misconduct Procedure for your information.

Yours

[Insert name] [Insert position]

Appendix 4: Guide to using the AMBeR Plagiarism Tariff

Guide to using the AMBeR Plagiarism Tariff

Context

In order to address the challenges of transparency and consistency in the penalties imposed for student plagiarism in the UK, the AMBeR *Plagiarism Reference Tariff* was designed as a guide to the application of penalties that may be imposed for student plagiarism in Higher Education. It is widely used in the United Kingdom and to a lesser extent in Ireland.

The tariff is available at [https://marketing-porg-statamic-assets-us-west-2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/main/Tennant_benchmarkreport-\(1\).pdf](https://marketing-porg-statamic-assets-us-west-2.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/main/Tennant_benchmarkreport-(1).pdf) and a report on its development is available at <https://www.plagiarism.org/paper/plagiarism-reference-tariff>.

The tariff is not designed to be used to assist in determining whether a student has plagiarised. The purpose of the tariff is to determine an appropriate penalty, once plagiarism has been established.

UCD

The AMBeR Plagiarism Tariff was used as a basis for the development of the UCD Tariff. The purpose of the Tariff is to guide those responsible for making decisions with regard to penalties for students who have been found to have plagiarised, i.e. Student Plagiarism Committees, the Registrar or their nominee under the Student Conduct stage of the Student Discipline Procedure and members of Student Disciplinary Committees. The UCD Student Academic Misconduct Procedure permits module coordinators to deal with very minor infringements and poor academic practice through providing advice or arranging that the student receives advice about good writing practice and how to avoid plagiarism (see section 7.1.C. Module coordinators may reflect poor academic practice in the grade awarded, but they do not apply penalties under the Student Academic Misconduct Procedure or the student discipline procedure and therefore will not use the tariff.

While the Tariff is primarily designed to be used for deciding penalties in cases of plagiarism identified in assessments that are graded, an additional tariff table has been included in the proposed UCD Plagiarism Tariff to take account of a) research degree theses, b) PhD Stage Transfer Assessments, or c) final PhD dissertation submission or d) pass/fail assessments, because they do not receive a graded outcome.

Notes

The Tariff is a guide for penalties and only takes account of aspects directly associated with plagiarism. Some of its weaknesses that have been highlighted in <https://www.plagiarismtoday.com/2012/08/06/looking-at-the-AMBeR-benchmark-plagiarism-tariff/> are shown below.

1. **Collusion:** The tariff is not designed to deal with collusion, cases of students working inappropriately together on the same assignment. The tariff is not suitable for use in such cases because it is difficult to accurately determine the extent of plagiarism of individual students when they have worked together. Suspected collusion cases may be referred to be dealt with under the Student Discipline Procedure. Reports of alleged misconduct should be supported by documentary evidence. For information on submitting reports of alleged breaches see <https://www.ucd.ie/secca/studentconduct/> - Information For Staff and the [Guide to Completing Student Misconduct Incident Report](#).
2. **Extenuating Circumstances:** The tariff does not take account of extenuating circumstances. The School Academic Integrity Committee have the discretion to separately factor-in the presence of mitigating circumstances and may adjust penalties accordingly.

3. **Long-Term Impact:** The tariff does not weigh the long-term impact of any punishment on a student's career, which may be relevant in some professions, depending on the extent of plagiarism.
4. **Different Types of Plagiarism:** The tariff is built for verbatim plagiarism but may not adequately address other types, such as source plagiarism, plagiarism of ideas, etc.
5. **Some Room for Judgment:** Though the tariff works to remove most of the human error out of the process and succeeds, there's still some discussion to be had about what the value of the assignment is and whether there was an attempt to hide the plagiarism. In short, two people can use the same tariff and come up with different scores.

Development of a UCD Plagiarism Tariff based on the AMBeR model

- The AMBeR Plagiarism Tariff scoring system is shown on page 2; scoring does not take place until after a decision has been made that plagiarism has taken place.
- The AMBeR Plagiarism Tariff penalty system is shown on page 3.
- The proposed UCD Plagiarism penalty system, adapted from the AMBeR tariff is shown on page 4. Penalties noted at the Discipline level are taken from the Student Discipline Procedure.

The original tariff document and associated research report can be found at <https://www.plagiarism.org/paper/plagiarism-reference-tariff>

1

Assign points based on the following criteria

HISTORY

1st Time	100 points
2nd Time	150 points
3rd/+ Time	200 points

AMOUNT / EXTENT

Below 5% AND less than two sentences	80 points
As above but with critical aspects* plagiarised	105 points
Between 5% and 20% OR more than two sentences but not more than two paragraphs	105 points
As above but with critical aspects* plagiarised	130 points
Between 20% and 50% OR more than two paragraphs but not more than five paragraphs	130 points
As above but with critical aspects* plagiarised	160 points
Above 50% OR more than five paragraphs	160 points
Submission purchased from essay mill or ghostwriting service †	225 points

* Critical aspects are key ideas central to the assignment

† Some institutions may consider this to be a separate form of academic malpractice

LEVEL / STAGE

Level 1	70 points
Level 2	115 points
Level 3/Postgraduate	140 points

VALUE OF ASSIGNMENT

Standard weighting	30 points
Large project (e.g. final year dissertation)	60 points

ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Evidence of deliberate attempt to disguise plagiarism by changing words, sentences or references to avoid detection **40 points**

Tariff amended for UCD use (UCD Plagiarism Tariff)

Level	Points	Work submitted for gradable assessment
All	n/a	In all cases where it is determined by the School Academic Integrity Committee that plagiarism has taken place a formal verbal or written warning is given, and a record is made contributing to the student's previous history on the UCD Plagiarism Record System. In addition, the committee <u>may</u> apply any of the following penalties as appropriate
School Academic Integrity Committee	280-329	Assessment component provisionally awarded NM ⁹ - resubmission permitted, with a late submission grade penalty ¹⁰
School Academic Integrity Committee	330-379	Assessment component provisionally awarded NM - resubmission permitted, with a late submission grade penalty, or Assessment component provisionally awarded NM – resubmission permitted but grade for the resubmitted assessment capped. School Academic Integrity Committees may select the capped grade from all passing grades of the Component Grading Scale as deemed appropriate. When capping grades School Academic Integrity Committees may wish to limit this to a D- or at the original grade or an adjusted original grade in line with Academic Regulation 4.26 and the Component Grade Scale
School Academic Integrity Committee	380-479	Assessment component provisionally awarded NM – resubmission permitted but grade for the resubmitted assessment capped. Direct that the assessment grade is reduced with no opportunity to resubmit. School Academic Integrity Committees may select grades from all passing grades of the Component Grading Scale as deemed appropriate.
University Student Discipline Procedure ¹¹	480-524	Penalties applied under the Student Discipline Procedure are done so at two stages of the process 1) a Student Conduct Meeting and 2) the Student Disciplinary Committee Hearing. Penalties will be applied as appropriate to the circumstances of the case. Cases scoring 525 and above will normally attract more severe penalties, however, the under the Student Discipline Procedure decision-makers have the authority to select penalties following consideration of all circumstances relating to the case. The lists of penalties available under the Student Discipline Procedure are included in full. They include some penalties that are more appropriate for non-academic misconduct which may not be relevant to incidents of plagiarism.
University Student Discipline Procedure	525+	1. Student Conduct Meeting

⁹ In Academic Regulations the grade “NM” means *No grade - work submitted did not merit a grade*

¹⁰ See [Late Submission of Coursework Policy](#).

¹¹ Penalties available under the [Student Discipline Procedure](#) are set out in full in sections 5.5 and 7. All penalties remain available to Student Disciplinary Committee

Penalties available at the Student Conduct Meeting stage are presented section 5.5 of the Student Discipline Procedure. Applicable penalties may be applied in combination.:

- *Issue a warning.*
- *Impose a fine not exceeding €250.*
- *Require the respondent to pay for, or contribute towards making good any damage or loss they have caused.*
- *In the case of academic breaches, reduction of an assessment component grade (assessment where breach occurred) up to and including the application of No Grade (NM).*
- *In the case of plagiarism, referred by a School Academic Integrity Committee, reduction of a grade up to and including the application of No Grade (NM) for the module where the breach has occurred.*
- *In addition to the penalties above, a respondent may be required to undertake an activity / action intended to satisfy the University that the respondent understands the consequences of their conduct and learns from the experience*

2. Student Disciplinary Committee Hearing Stage

Student Disciplinary Committee may impose any of the penalties available at the Student Conduct Meeting stage of the process, and any of the following penalties, either separately or in combination as appropriate to the breach or nature of the breach. Penalties are taken from section 7 of the Student Discipline Procedure

- *A written reprimand;*
- *A fine not exceeding €1000;*
- *Reduction of a component assessment grade or module grade up to and including the application of No Grade (NM) for the module;*
- *exclusion from sittings of examinations for a specified period;*
- *withhold any academic award, scholarship or prize including on a permanent basis;*
- *require the reparation of any damage or loss caused, either to the University or to any of its members of staff or students or members of the public;*
- *suspension from accessing specific University facilities;*
- *permanent exclusion from accessing specific University facilities;*
- *suspension from a UCD Residence;*
- *terminate licence to reside at a UCD Residence;*
- *suspension from the University for a specified period, or until such time as any requirements laid down by the Committee such as payment of a fine or the restitution of damage or loss are fulfilled;*
- *permanent expulsion from the University.*

In addition to the penalties above, a student may be required to complete an activity / action intended to satisfy the University that a student understands the consequences of their actions. The Committee may in exceptional cases, having regard to all the circumstances of the case, decide not to impose any penalty.

Level	Points	Work submitted for Pass/Resubmit/Fail assessments, including Stage Transfer Assessments and Research Degree Dissertations
All	n/a	In all cases where it is determined that plagiarism has taken place a formal verbal or written warning is given, and a record is made contributing to the student's previous history on the UCD Plagiarism Record System. In addition, the committee may apply any of the following penalties as appropriate:
School	280-479	Revise, repeat or resubmission of the assessment permitted
Discipline*	479+	An appropriate penalty is taken from within the Discipline range of penalties