Student Academic Misconduct Procedure

Approved by Academic Council: 30 April 2025
Effective from: 1 September 2025

1. Purpose

UCD is committed to upholding academic integrity. The Academic Integrity Policy and the Student Code of Conduct outline this commitment, and the standards of academic conduct expected of students. This procedure is intended to assist academic staff in effectively addressing instances of alleged student academic misconduct and to guide students in understanding the steps that will be followed by schools. It is also intended to provide students with clear and transparent information about the procedure that will be followed when suspected incidents arise in relation to their work.

This procedure is intended to support the application of procedural fairness for all students. It has been established on the principles of natural justice. Those with responsibility for applying this procedure should:

- treat students fairly, consistently and in a transparent manner,
- apply penalties that are fair and proportionate,
- respect the dignity of all persons involved,
- make decisions that are free from bias.

This document should be read in conjunction with related documents: Academic Integrity Policy, the Student Code of Conduct and the Student Discipline Procedure and relevant guidelines issued by the University from time to time.

2. Scope

All forms of academic misconduct are unacceptable and will be addressed under the relevant University procedure. This procedure should be followed in instances where specific categories of academic misconduct are suspected or alleged in any work submitted for assessment by students registered to taught programmes. The following categories of academic misconduct have been identified as suitable for consideration by School Academic Integrity Committees and Module Coordinators. Definitions and examples relating to each category are presented in Section 3 of this procedure.

- Self-Plagiarism
- Recycling
- Misrepresentation of authorship
- Contract cheating
- Collusion / Violating the limits of acceptable collaboration
- Facilitating academic dishonesty
- Inappropriate use of digital information, including unauthorised use of generative artificial intelligence
- Ghost writing

Not all categories of alleged academic misconduct are dealt with by School Academic Integrity Committees. The table below indicates categories of alleged academic misconduct that will be addressed under the Student Discipline Procedure or another designated process.

Exam Hall Academic Misconduct	• Invigilator reports of alleged breaches of Examination Regulations should be submitted to be dealt with under the Student Discipline Procedure by Assessment in the case of centrally organised exams and by Module Coordinators in relation to locally organised examinations.
Research Student Academic Misconduct Alleged academic misconduct by students registered to research programmes.	• Where alleged academic misconduct of a research student relates to a taught module, the matter should be reported to the relevant School Academic Integrity Committee and the procedure outlined in this document will apply. However research students are subject to additional policies and procedures relating to alleged incidents of misconduct, including the UCD Procedure for the Investigation of Misconduct in Research. Where an alleged breach relates to submitted research work the matter will be reviewed by the Research Integrity Officer, in consultation with the Registrar or their nominee, to determine which university procedure and/or policy should apply or take priority.
Academic misconduct involving fraudulent behaviour Including use of proactive / premeditative efforts to deceive, manipulate, or enable dishonesty in others.	The following categories of academic misconduct will be addressed under the Student Discipline Procedure. • Fabricating or falsifying data • Fabrication of credentials in materials • Inappropriately publishing, uploading or sharing assessments • Inappropriately publishing, uploading University teaching or course material to third party a website or file sharing site.[1] • Impersonation, sitting an exam in the place of an enrolled student or having someone else sit an exam. • Advertising cheating services and/ publishing advertisements for cheating services.

3. Definitions

3.1 Academic Misconduct

The Academic Integrity Policy provides the following definitions and examples of academic misconduct, which are taken from the National Academic Integrity Network Lexicon of Common Terms. These are the definitions and examples of categories of academic misconduct that should be addressed using this procedure.

[1] Guidance for faculty and students on Unauthorised Academic File Sharing is available in guidelines.

3.1.1 Plagiarism: Presenting work / ideas taken from other sources without proper acknowledgement. Plagiarism is a failure to cite or otherwise acknowledge ideas or phrases used in any paper, exercise assessment or project submitted in a course but gained from another source, such as a published text, another person's work, or materials on the internet.

- Plagiarism includes presenting work for assessment, publication, or otherwise, that:
    - uses phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs or longer extracts from published or unpublished work (including from the internet) without appropriate acknowledgement of the source.
    - presents direct extracts without quotation marks or other appropriate indication. Note: It is not sufficient simply to acknowledge the source.
    - copies the same or a very similar idea from a published or unpublished work without appropriate acknowledgement.
    - changes the order of words taken from source material but retains the original idea or concept without appropriate acknowledgement.
    - copies or uses, without appropriate acknowledgement, any material from non-written work including, but not limited to, visual and digital media, images, computer code, musical notation, recording or composition, performance or oral presentations; or
    - uses the work of another student without appropriate acknowledgement in a way that exceeds the bounds of legitimate cooperation.

Plagiarism is unacceptable in academic work, even where it arises as a result of:

- poor referencing;
- error;
- inability to paraphrase; or
- inhibition about writing in the student's own words.

3.1.2 Self-Plagiarism: Reusing one's own work without citing or acknowledging its original use. This could mean submitting one piece of work in more than one course.

3.1.3 Recycling: The practice of data fragmentation or salami slicing where the author(s) separates aspects of a study or their work. Writers should recycle their own material carefully and sparingly.

3.1.4 Misrepresentation of authorship: The submission of someone else's work (or part thereof) as one's own, when the work (all or in part) has been produced by, or purchased from, another person or party.

3.1.5 Contract cheating: a form of academic misconduct where a person uses an undeclared and/or unauthorised third party, online or directly, to assist them to produce work for academic credit or progression, whether or not payment or other favour is involved.
The NAIN Lexicon of Common Terms provides the following examples of contract cheating:

- Buying a completed assignment from a tutoring or ghost-writing company (purchasing from online essay mill websites);
- Asking a partner, friend or family member to write part or all of an assignment for you;
- Paying a private tutoring company to coach you on how to complete an assignment;
- Submitting 'model' assignment answers provided by a private tutor or tutoring company;
- Getting someone else to sit an exam for you;
- Sitting an exam for someone else;
- Buying, selling or swapping assignments or assignment answers via 'sharing' websites or social media platforms, e.g. Facebook, TikTok etc. Examples of prohibited services that students can use to have work produced for them include:
    - essay writing services;
    - friends, family and other students;
    - private tutors;
    - copyediting services;
    - agency websites;
    - reverse classifieds.

3.1.6 Collusion or violating the limits of acceptable collaboration in coursework set by a faculty member or School, through undisclosed collaboration of two or more people on an assignment or task, which is supposed to be completed individually. Examples of collusion include, but are not limited to:

- Using another student's work and submitting it for assessment as your own.
- Giving your work to another student to submit as part of their own assessment.
- Co-writing work, without acknowledgment, that will be submitted for assessment.
- Working with other students without permission to produce material that will be assessed or to produce responses to assessment questions.
- Using social media / chat rooms message groups to collude during the completion of online assessments.
- Inappropriately assisting another student with the production of an assessment task, including sharing answers or providing drafts or completed copies of an assessment task.
  If a student makes an inequitable contribution to a group assignment and claims credit for the work of others, this is collusion and may be considered as academic misconduct

3.1.7 Facilitating academic dishonesty by assisting another student to obtain an academic advantage by dishonest or unfair means.

3.1.8 Inappropriately using digital or information technology to complete an assessment task; i.e., using such technology without explicit permission from relevant academic staff and / or not acknowledging use of such technology when its use is permitted. Examples include, but are not limited to:

- unauthorised and / or unacknowledged use of artificial intelligence tools to generate content for assessment purposes; or,
- unauthorised and / or unacknowledged use of paraphrasing or translation software to, for example, disguise plagiarism, collusion, contract cheating or other academic integrity breach.

3.1.9 Ghost writing or authorship by use of a non-named (merited, but not listed) author to write or prepare a text for publication. Examples of ghost writing include, but are not limited to**:**

- Writing for or in the name of someone else.
- Assisting in the production of work resulting in unfair advantage to someone else**.**

3.2 Academic Integrity Adviser: Optional school role intended to support academic staff by providing advice on issues relating to Academic Integrity and other responsibilities delegated by the relevant Head of School.

3.3 School Academic Integrity Committee: The school level committee responsible for decision-making in relation to alleged incidents of academic misconduct.

3.4 Chair of the School Academic Integrity Committee: ensuring that the committee meetings with student follows the procedure outlined in this this document and that committee decisions are recorded.

3.5 School Academic Integrity Protocol: Schools are required to publish a protocol which provides students and faculty with information about how this procedure is applied within the school. Protocols include information such as the name of the School Academic Integrity Adviser, if one has been appointed, and Academic Integrity Committee membership, the school's required citation style and referencing system and information about the steps that will be followed where academic misconduct is alleged.

3.6 Poor Academic Practice: minor errors or inconsistencies in a student's work such as inadequate citation; poor referencing, inappropriate paraphrasing; overreliance on sources without sufficient input of the students own work.

'Poor academic practice may result from a learner's lack of understanding of what is expected in producing a piece of academic work. It might include poor referencing, weak citation, or failure to identify the contributions made by others in completing the work. Such errors can arise from inexperience or carelessness rather than a clear intention to deceive.' NAIN Framework for Academic Misconduct Investigation and Case Management.

In the context of this procedure Module Coordinators may choose to address minor examples of poor academic practice directly without referring the matter to the School Academic Integrity Committee.

3.7 Mitigating and Aggravating Factors: when determining an appropriate penalty, the School Academic Integrity Committees may consider aggravating and/or mitigating factors.

Aggravating Factors: circumstances that increase the severity of academic misconduct, warranting stricter penalties. These may include repeated offenses, deliberate deception, premeditation, large-scale impact, involvement of third parties, or refusal to take responsibility.

Mitigating Factors: circumstances that reduce the severity of misconduct, which warrant consideration of a more lenient penalty. These may include first-time offenses, lack of intent, genuine misunderstanding, demonstrated remorse, cooperation during the investigation, or challenging personal circumstances which may have affected judgement.

4. Roles and responsibilities

4.1 Head of Schools' responsibilities include:

a) Establishing a School Academic Integrity Committee or joining the School in a joint School Academic Integrity Committee (see Section 4.4).
b) Ensuring, in consultation with the Chair of the School Academic Integrity Committee, that records of all instances of academic misconduct and outcomes of investigations are kept in line with the relevant record retention schedule.
c) Ensuring that the school develops, publishes and periodically reviews an Academic Integrity Protocol setting out arrangements for dealing with academic misconduct to ensure consistency in case management.
d) Appointing a School Academic Integrity Adviser, who may also be the chair of the School Academic Integrity Committee.
e) Review school data from the University's Academic Misconduct Record System.

4.2 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.

4.3 Module Coordinators' responsibilities include:

a) Guided by this procedure and the School Academic Integrity Protocol, Module Coordinators will exercise their judgement when deciding whether suspected incidents should be referred to the School Academic Integrity Committee or whether the matter can be addressed directly with the student (see Section 5.1).
b) Initiating procedures in suspected cases of academic misconduct.
c) Submitting reports to the School Academic Integrity Committee to include the grounds of suspicion, a copy of the piece of work and supporting evidence.
d) Follow the School's Academic Integrity Protocol when communicating with the student about the alleged academic misconduct.

4.4 Joint-Committees

Schools may group together to form a joint School Academic Integrity Committee. Requests to establish a joint- committee should be submitted by relevant Heads of School to Academic Council Committee on Student Conduct and Capacity. Where joint- committees are established, it should be indicated in the School Academic Integrity Protocol.

4.5 School Academic Integrity Committees' responsibilities include:

a) Examining allegations of academic misconduct in submitted work referred by Module Coordinators.
b) 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/
c) Evaluating the case and deciding whether academic misconduct has taken place.
d) Deciding on a penalty where academic misconduct has taken place in line with the UCD Plagiarism Tariff; [2] Where the UCD Plagiarism Tariff is not applicable, the committee may decide to impose a penalty from those outlined in Section 5.3.6.b.
e) Communicating the outcome of the School Academic Integrity Committee meeting to the student and the Module Coordinator.
f) Keeping a record of the meeting, e.g. summary note or minutes and record the case on the University's Academic Misconduct Record System where academic misconduct has been found. Such records will be required for referral under the Student Discipline Procedure, see section 5.3.7 or in the event a student appeals the decision of the School Academic Integrity Committee. See section 6.
g) Providing accompanying supporting documents where allegations are referred to the Student Discipline Procedure.
h) Providing an accompanying report where allegations are referred to the Student Discipline Procedure without decision.

4.6 Examiner 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. Where extensive academic misconduct is suspected and the assessment is being reviewed for the disciplinary process, module coordinators may enter an NM grade for the assessment component in which a suspicion of misconduct has arisen, and an IH grade for the module.

4.7 Student 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, a Students' Union representative, or friend or relative.
d) Students are expected to speak for themselves at meetings. The role of any person accompanying students is to provide support.

4.8 Academic Council Committee on Student Conduct and Capacity's (ACCSCC) Academic Council Committee on Student Conduct and Capacity's (ACCSCC) responsibilities are to:

a) Maintain oversight of implementation, and periodic review, of these procedures.
b) Receive notifications and keeping a record of proposed joint School Academic Integrity Committees.
c) Review data recorded by schools annually.

[2] The UCD Plagiarism Tariff was adapted from the AMBeR Tariff: https://www.plagiarism.org/paper/plagiarism-reference-tariff.

5. School Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedure

5.1 Module Coordinator Review

5.1.1 Incidents of Poor Academic Practice

It is recognised that early-stage learners may find it difficult to transition to the standards and skills required in assessments at third level education institutes, and this may lead to incidents of poor academic practice in assessments. The NAIN Framework notes that 'timely discussions with learners help raise awareness of what constitutes academic integrity and what practices are considered unacceptable and why.' Under this procedure Module Coordinators have discretion to address minor incidents as poor academic practice directly with the student, using the incident as a learning opportunity where additional guidance can be offered and training recommended. Module coordinators may consult with the School Academic Integrity Adviser, (where one has been appointed) or the Chair of the Academic Integrity Committee for guidance relating to individual cases, as appropriate. (See Section 4.3)

Some examples of poor academic practice that may be suitable for Module Coordinators to address include:

- 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.
- A small element of the work and/or an element in a piece of work which makes a small contribution to the grade for the assessment component is affected.

5.1.2 When choosing to deal with incidents of poor academic practice directly Module Coordinators should note the following:

- Incidents are not reported to the School Academic Integrity Committee and the student will not be subject to a disciplinary process.
- Incidents are not recorded in the University's Academic Misconduct Record System.
- Reports produced by the University's originality checking software should be reviewed carefully before discussing them with students.

5.1.3 When reviewing a student's assessment and deciding on whether an incident should be referred to the School Academic Integrity Committee, Module Coordinators may consider relevant factors which may include the following:

- The experience and stage of the student, for example, failure to cite correctly may be considered as poor academic practice for inexperienced students but for later stage students, who have received appropriate guidance, referral to the School Academic Integrity Committee will likely be appropriate.
- The nature of the academic misconduct, whether the work demonstrates clear errors rather than any attempts to deceive.
- Poor academic practice that is extensive in an assessment may warrant referral to the School Academic Integrity Committee.
- The proportion of the assessment that has been impacted, for example, the presence of one of the examples of poor academic practice impacting a small amount of the assessment compared to multiple examples of poor academic practice impacting a large proportion of the assessment.
- The category of academic misconduct.
- Has the Module Coordinator previously provided feedback or guidance on any of the examples of poor academic practice.
- Any additional school guidance that may have been developed.

5.1.4 Module Coordinators deciding to address the matter with the student directly should take one of the following actions:

a) Arrange a meeting with the student to discuss the issue that has arisen with their assessment, or
b) Highlight the issue in feedback on the assessment.

As part of the above actions Module Coordinators may provide information or advice about academic integrity and avoiding academic misconduct and may refer students to other resources such as the UCD Library Guides, or the University Writing Centre.

5.1.5 Module Coordinators may reflect poor academic practice in the grade awarded using the Component Grade Scale. Module Coordinators should be explicit with students where grades have been impacted due to poor academic practice.

5.2 Referral to the School Academic Integrity Committee

Where a Module Coordinator decides to refer an alleged incident of academic misconduct to the School Academic Integrity Committee they will:

- 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.
- Advise the student that their assessment has been referred to the School Academic Integrity Committee. The communication should advise that the School Academic Integrity Committee will contact them in relation to the matter and highlight the supports available, such as their Student Adviser or an SU representative.

5.3 School Academic Integrity Committee Procedure

5.3.1 On receiving a report of alleged academic misconduct the School Academic Integrity Committee will establish whether there has been a previous recorded breach on the University's Academic Misconduct Record System. 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. If, in the view of the School Academic Integrity Committee the matter can be dealt with as a poor academic practice the case may be referred back to the Module Coordinator for resolution.

Where the Committee decides to address the report at the school level the Committee will:

- Issue a communication to the student outlining the alleged academic misconduct and invite them to a meeting to discuss the matter.
- Provide the student with a copy of the Module Coordinator's report and any supporting evidence.
- Advise the student that they may be accompanied to meetings by a support person, who may be a student adviser, students' union representative, friend or family member.
- Where a student fails to respond within reasonable timeframes, or where despite reasonable efforts to accommodate the student's availability, they do not attend the meeting, the committee may proceed to consider the matter in their absence, based on the documentary evidence.

5.3.2 Composition of a School Academic Integrity Committee

- Schools may choose to establish a three-person standing Academic Integrity Committee or establish an Academic Integrity Panel of academic staff from which members will be used to convene committees on a case-by-case basis.
- Schools may appoint as many academic staff as they wish to the panel.
- Where a panel is used it is recommended that a standing chair is appointed to enhance consistency of decision-making.
- For the purpose of reviewing reported incidents the School Academic Integrity Committee will comprise three members, a Chair and two additional members of academic staff.
- Where a Module Coordinator who submits a report to the School Academic Integrity Committee is also a committee member, they must be replaced by an alternate member.

5.3.3 Following review of the submission the School Academic Integrity Committee

The 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, in line with the process set out at Section 5.3.6.
- 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. 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 may proceed in their absence, based on the documentary evidence.
- While it is expected that students will normally attend meetings with the School Academic Integrity Committee, as this provides the best opportunity for the committee to understand the incident and for the student to be guided on academic integrity, chairs of the Academic Integrity Committee may permit a student to submit a written response, where it is deemed appropriate.

5.3.4 Meeting Protocol and Decision-making

The following meeting protocol should be followed by School Academic Integrity Committees:

- The Chair will welcome all attendees, the student, the committee members, the support person (if in attendance) and will introduce the Committee members.
- The Chair will outline the alleged misconduct to the committee, drawing on the module coordinator's report and supporting documentation submitted to the committee.
- The student will be asked to respond to the allegation / provide an explanation for the anomalies outlined.
- If the student accepts that the substance of the allegation is true, the committee may proceed to determine an appropriate penalty.
- If the student denies the allegation, the committee will ask the student further questions to determine, based on the evidence before them and on the balance of probabilities, whether they believe that the student has breached the Academic Integrity Policy .
- Once the committee is satisfied that all relevant information has been heard and there are no further questions, the committee may begin to deliberate in private. At this point the student and their support person (if in attendance) will be asked to leave the meeting.
- Based on all the information presented, the committee will decide whether the student has breached the Academic Integrity Policy and the Student Code of Conduct.
- Decisions will be taken by a simple majority and will be made on the balance of probabilities, i.e. that the alleged breach is more likely to have occurred than not.
- In all cases decisions of the committee should be communicated within 5 working days.
- Where possible it is good practice to notify the student of the decision at the end of the meeting.
- Where it is not possible for the committee to come to a decision at the meeting (for example where further information is required by the committee) the outcome will be issued in writing only.

5.3.5. Mitigating circumstances and/or aggravating factors may be taken into account by the committee and reflected in any subsequent penalty.

5.3.6 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 University's Academic Misconduct Record System.

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 Academic Misconduct Record System. In addition, the committee may:

   i. Permit the student to re-submit the assessment component without academic penalty.

   ii. Permit the student to re-submit the assessment component and cap the resubmitted work. School Academic Integrity Committees may select the capped grade from all passing grades of the Component Grading Scale as deemed appropriate.

   iii. Permit the student to resubmit the assessment component and reduce the grade achieved in the resubmitted work by a specified number of grade points.

iv. Reduce the grade for the assessment 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.

v. Where an assessment component is graded as Pass/Fail or where academic misconduct occurs in a resit, School Academic Integrity Committees may apply an NM grade for assessment components and a NM (R) grade for resit attempts, or consider referral to the Student Discipline Procedure.

In cases where it is determined that academic misconduct has taken place, the penalty will be guided by a University approved UCD Plagiarism Tariff. It is noted that the UCD Plagiarism Tariff is not appropriate for guiding penalties in relation to some categories of academic misconduct, such as collusion.

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 or heavily weighted assessments.

d) Decisions will be communicated to students through their UCD email address (copying the Module Coordinator). Where a decision is made under Sections 5.3.6b the communication should include reference to their right to appeal decisions under specified grounds and under Student Appeals Procedure (see section 6).

5.3.7 In all cases of referral to the University Student Discipline Procedure, the School Academic Integrity Committee should:

a) Submit a Student Misconduct Incident Report Form outlining the grounds of suspicion, reason for referral, a copy of the assessment component and any supporting evidence including minutes or summary notes to student.conduct@ucd.ie;
b) Notify the Module Coordinator that the alleged breach has been referred to the Student Discipline Procedure without decision;
c) Notify the student that their assessment has been referred for scrutiny as an alleged instance of academic misconduct under the Student Discipline Procedure[3]; and
d) 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, Students' Union representative, friend or relative.

5.3.8 The School Academic Integrity Committee will record incidents.

a) The Academic Misconduct 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.

[3] 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.

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.
d) School records should be retained for seven years, in alignment with the SECCA Record Retention Schedule.

6. Appeals to School Academic Integrity Committee outcomes

6.1 An appeal may be made to the University's Student Appeals Committee within 10 working days from the date of issue of the decision of the Subcommittee. 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 Governing Board;

- Procedural irregularity: There is evidence that the procedures relating to a decision were not followed properly, which may have impacted on the Fitness to Continue in Study Subcommittee's decision;

- Disproportionate outcome: The outcome applied was disproportionately severe with regard to the circumstances of the case.

6.3 The Student Appeals Committee may decide to

• Uphold the appeal, in full or in part

• Not uphold the appeal

In cases where a Student Appeals Committee upholds the appeal, in full or in part, it means that the committee disagrees with the decision, or some aspect of the decision, made by the original making-body.

Where a Student Appeals Committee upholds an appeal, the Student Appeals Committee will:

• reverse all or part of, or vary the decision of the original decision-making body, or

• refer the case back to the original decision-making body for a new hearing with such conditions as the Student Appeals Committee deems appropriate within Academic Regulations and University Policy, this may include the constitution of a new committee.

On upholding an appeal a Student Appeals Committee may require the appellant to meet specified conditions.

6.4 In cases where a Student Appeals Committee does not uphold the appeal, it means that the decision of the original

decision-making body is confirmed.

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:

a) 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;
b) The outcome of the case will be communicated to the School and recorded by the Student Engagement, Conduct, Complaints and Appeals on the Academic

Misconduct Record System.

8. Related documents

- Student Academic Misconduct Procedure Guidelines for Staff (pending publication)
- Academic Integrity Policy
- UCD Plagiarism Tariff
- Student Code of Conduct
- Student Discipline Procedure

Document Version History

Approval Body	Date	Summary of Revision
Academic Council	30 April 2024	• Separation of procedures from the rescinded Student Plagiarism Policy to create a separate procedural document. • Edits to the procedure to align it with the new Academic Integrity Policy.
Academic Council	30 May 2024	• Clarification of scope of the procedure, noting that some categories of academic misconduct are dealt with directly under the Student Discipline Procedure and not at school level.
Academic Council	30 April 2025	Updates to the Procedure following review by Academic Council Committee on Student Conduct and Capacity include: • Addition of a definitions section • Scope: clarity regarding categories of academic misconduct that do not fall under this procedure. • Additional detail and clarifying language regarding roles and responsibilities and the required procedural steps. • Updates to the outcomes available to School Academic Integrity Committees. *Minor edits (e.g. grammatical, typographical, formatting) applied prior to publication.
	1 September 2026	Edits to reflect the revised UCD Plagiarism Tariff and Student Appeals Procedure.