

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

Policy Title:	Academic Integrity Procedure
Description:	Procedure for Responding to Suspicions of or Confirmed Breaches of Academic Integrity Among Students.
Author (Position):	Registrar and Vice President (Academic Affairs)
Version:	1.1
Approved By:	Governing Body
Policy Approval Date:	2024 *
Date of Next Policy Review:	June 2027 (or as required)

Revision History		
Previous Version no.	Summary of Amendments <i>Inc. date of approval of the update</i>	Reviewed Version no.
1	Appendix 3: minor change to the length of viva voce, approved by Quality Committee, April 2025	1.1

Academic Integrity Procedure

1. Context

The need for academic integrity is essential among all who attend or contribute to higher education. Potential threats to academic integrity have increased from varieties of plagiarism to contract cheating and inappropriate use of artificial intelligences including large language models.

2. Purpose

This procedure is designed to support the Academic Integrity Policy by outlining a process to follow when suspicions of or confirmed breaches of academic integrity arise. This procedure applies to students. Where a breach of academic integrity is suspected or confirmed with a staff member, the Staff Disciplinary policy will be invoked.

3. Procedure

1. In general students will be asked to acknowledge supports used while completing an assignment. The Appendix in this procedure contains a template which can be used for this purpose.
2. Any suspected breach of academic integrity should be fully investigated. A lecturer may become suspicious for several reasons:
 - Work that is submitted is identical to or similar to other work that was submitted by students in the past or present.
 - They recognise the work from a familiar source (e.g. a published article, book or website).
 - The style differs from the student's usual work.
 - References cited do not exist or are difficult to access.
 - A high level of plagiarism has been detected by plagiarism-detecting software.
 - Metadata in the assignment document contains anomalous information.
 - Content is not related to the assigned topic.
3. The lecturer estimates the extent of any alleged breach of academic integrity.
4. A lecturer who suspects that a breach of academic integrity may have occurred contacts the Registrar's Office to ask if a previous offence is on record for the

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

student(s) concerned and logs onto the Tool for Academic Integrity Calculation on Maestro.

5. The lecturer may set up a meeting, face-to-face or online, with the student to discuss their concern. The questions asked should relate to the criteria for classifying breaches of academic integrity. They are:
 - Level of programme
 - Stage of programme
 - Extent of breach (i.e. the amount of work that is deemed not to be original or acknowledged as being created by someone else)
 - Student acknowledgement
 - Number of previous offences
 - Available evidence
 - Student intent
 - Mitigating/extenuating circumstances.
6. If the lecturer continues to have suspicions of an alleged breach of academic integrity, the lecturer may hold a viva voce assessment with the student(s) involved (see Appendix 3 for details about viva voce).
7. Following the meeting the lecturer uses the tool on Maestro to estimate a value for the extent of the suspected breach.
8. Mild or moderate outcomes are dealt with by the lecturer at local level, who selects an outcome from the “Supports and Sanctions” menu below. This decision may be appealed to the Registrar.
9. The outcome and chosen support or sanction is submitted to the Registrar’s Office.
10. Where the outcome of the investigation is potentially Serious or Very Serious, the Registrar’s Office will set up a meeting among the student, their tutor (or other representative, such as a Student Union member), the module lecturer, the course leader and the Registrar/Assistant Registrar or their nominee. A record of the meeting is kept by either a member of the Registrar’s Office or the Education Office.
11. An outcome is selected from among the available supports and sanctions. The decision is sent to the tutor and the student, and the lecturer is informed by the person who records the meeting. Where a proposed sanction is grave in nature (e.g.

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

expulsion from the Institute or withdrawal of an award), legal advice may be sought before communicating the outcome to the student.

12. The decision may be appealed to a subcommittee of the Academic Council. The appeal should be presented to the Assistant Registrar (as secretary of the Academic Council). A sub-committee of three members will be established by the President (who chairs Academic Council) one of whom will be a student and one of whom will be a lecturer). The grounds for appeal will be that (a) there was a breach of the policy on academic integrity in how the case was handled or (b) there was a breach of this procedure in how the case was handled. The subcommittee may decide to uphold the decision of the lecturer or to repeat the process with a course leader, a Dean or a Vice President involved who was not involved in the original decision.

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

The following table provides a list of the potential sanctions and supports that may be used. More than one may be used. In all cases a record of the breach of academic integrity will be kept. This list will be updated on an ongoing basis.

Minor (5 – 12)	Moderate (13 – 24)	Serious (25 – 36)	Very Serious (37 – 48)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student is required to take a short online course on an academic integrity topic (e.g. paraphrasing) and to pass a follow-up test on the topic. • A student's mark is reduced by 20% but is capped at the level of a pass. • Work is awarded 0%. Student is asked to resubmit work for the same examination session (i.e. re-assessment or annual), where practical either with a cap or with no cap on the mark. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student is required to take a short online course on an academic integrity topic (e.g. paraphrasing) and to pass a follow-up test on the topic. • Work is awarded 0%. Student is asked to resubmit work for the same examination session (i.e. re-assessment or annual), where practical either with a cap or with no cap on the mark. • Work is awarded 0%. Student is asked to resubmit work for next examination session (i.e. supplemental or annual) with no cap on the mark. • A student's mark is reduced by 20% but is not capped at the level of a pass (i.e. it could mean that the student's overall mark for the assessment is a failing one). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student is required to take a short online course on an academic integrity topic (e.g. paraphrasing) and to pass a follow-up test on the topic. • Work is awarded 0%. Student is asked to resubmit a new piece of work for the next examination session with no cap on the mark. • Student asked to submit a new piece for work for next examination session, module mark capped at 40% • Student is asked to resubmit work for next examination session (i.e. re-assessment or annual) with a cap of 40% on the module (in the case of modules with more than one assessment component) • The student disciplinary policy* is instituted in the case. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student is required to take a short online course on an academic integrity topic (e.g. paraphrasing) and to pass a follow-up test on the topic. • The student disciplinary policy is instituted in the case. • Suspension/Expulsion from course. • Withdrawal of Graduate Award • Legal Consequences

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

Minor (5 – 12)	Moderate (13 – 24)	Serious (25 – 36)	Very Serious (37 – 48)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student is asked to resubmit work for next examination session (i.e. supplemental or annual) with a cap of 40% on the mark. 		

*https://www.mie.ie/en/about_us/quality_assurance/policies_procedures/disciplinary_policy.pdf

13. In order to decide the level of sanction – minor, moderate, serious or very serious – points are assigned for various features and

- where a student accumulates 5 to 12 points, the breach is classified as Minor;
- where a student accumulates 13 to 24 points, the breach is classified as Moderate;
- where a student accumulates 25 to 36 points, the breach is classified as Serious
- where a student accumulates 37 – 48 points, the breach is classified as Very Serious.

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

14. Points are assigned as follows for features of each case:

i. Level of programme

Scale 1 – 3	1	2	3
Level	6/Foundation	7, 8 (Undergraduate)	8, 9, 10 (Postgraduate)

ii. Stage of programme

Scale 1 – 5	1 – 2	3-4	5
Stage	First quarter of programme, where marks do not contribute to award grade.	After first quarter and in first half of course where marks do not contribute to award grade.	Stage of course where marks contribute towards award grade.

iii. Extent of breach

Scale 1 – 10	1 – 2	3 – 5	6 - 7	8 – 10
Category	Minor	Moderate	Serious	Very Serious
Extent of unoriginal, unattributed work	One paragraph or 5%* of overall work, whichever is the greater.	6%* or more of overall work but less than 20% of overall work	20%* of overall work or more.	50%* of overall work or more.

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

*Percentages refer to the extent of the content and not to the percentage that is identified in detection software (such as Turn-it-in).

iv. Student acknowledgement

Scale 1 – 5	1-2	3-4	5
Category	Minor	Moderate	Serious
Student Response/Attitude	Student outlines satisfactorily or credibly how the work was done and how the use of unoriginal or unattributed work arose.	Student acknowledges and/or uses mitigating circumstances or other evidence to explain wrongdoing	Student maintains that the work is their own in face of concrete evidence to the contrary.

v. Number of previous offences

Scale 0 – 10	0	1-3	4-10
Category	Minor	Moderate	Serious
Number of Previous Offences	None	One to three recorded cases, regardless of extent of each	More than three recorded cases, regardless of extent of each

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

vi. Available evidence

Scale 0 - 10	0 – 3	4 – 6	7 - 10
Category	Low	Moderate	Substantial
Available Evidence	No concrete evidence is available or the available evidence is not deemed to be fully reliable.	The work is inconsistent with previous work presented by the student and/or the language used differs from language used by the student in the past and/or other evidence links the work to a source of work that is not original to the student	The original work is available either online or in hard copy and the work presented by the student is clearly not original.

vii. Student Intent

Scale 1 – 5	1-2	3-4	5
Category	Minor	Moderate	Serious
Student Intent	Students working as a group and the same work is submitted by more than one student. Poor citation.	Self-plagiarism.	Take work of a previous student (or another person) or pay someone to do work and submit it as their own.

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

	Student did not know how to acknowledge work taken from a large language model.	Used material from a large language model in a module where it was not permitted.	Submit work from a large-language model as their own work with no acknowledgement.
--	---	---	--

viii. Mitigating/extenuating circumstances

Scale (-4 – 0)	-4	-3 or -2	-1 or 0
Category	Strongly Extenuating	Moderately Extenuating	Somewhat Extenuating
Mitigating/Extenuating Circumstances	Student has been dealing with substantial documented ill health of self or significant other at time of offence; student experienced bereavement at time of offence; student did not know that self-plagiarism is an offence.	Student misunderstood nature of academic integrity in a group project/assignment; student has completed documented training in academic integrity; student was an accomplice to plagiarism by another student.	Student did not fully understand referencing conventions; attempts were made to cover-up breach of academic integrity (e.g. paraphrasing).; student is a non-native speaker of English.

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

15. In all circumstances where a breach of academic integrity is found to have occurred, a record of the breach is kept until 13 months following the final Court of Examiners at which a student's award marks have been considered. However, there is no time limit on when a suspected breach of academic integrity can be investigated.

4. Responsibility

The implementation of this policy is overseen by the Registrar and Vice President (Academic Affairs).

5. Related Documents

Academic Integrity Policy

*final sign off pending

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

Appendix 1: Sample Template for Students to Use When Acknowledging Informal Supports.

Sample completed templates are included below.

Type of support	I used this in my work	I did not use this in my work	How I used this and the extent (if applicable)
Discussion of ideas about the work itself. Specify who the discussion was with (e.g. lecturer, classmates, library staff, family, friends, etc.)			
Discussion of ideas about the structure of my work. Specify who the discussion was with (e.g. lecturer, classmates, library staff, family, friends, etc.)			
Help with proofreading (e.g. Grammarly, AcademicWriter)			
Help in translating text (e.g. Google Translate)			
Use of an artificial intelligence (specify exactly how it was used, e.g. including the prompt used and any editing done)			
Use of paraphrasing software			
Discussion with a previous student			
Viewed work of a current or previous student			

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

Other			

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

Appendix 2 Examples of Completed Templates:

Type of support	I used this in my work	I did not use this in my work	How I used this and the extent (if applicable)
Discussion of ideas about the work itself	Yes		I spoke to many different students about my annotated bibliography, all of whom were from various academic and cultural backgrounds.
Discussion of ideas about the structure of my work	Yes		I was able to peer review my work and received helpful feedback.
Help with proofreading (Grammarly, AcademicWriter)		No	
Help in translating text (e.g. Google Translate)		No	
Use of an artificial intelligence		No	
Use of paraphrasing software		No	
Discussion with a previous student	Yes		I examined previous students' work and compared it to mine, it was very beneficial in terms of structure
Viewed work of a current or previous student	Yes		I peer reviewed four annotated bibliographies which helped me reaffirm my skills and vocabulary.
Other		No	

Type of support	I used this in my work	I did not use this in my work	How I used this and the extent (if applicable)
Discussion of ideas about the work itself	I used this		I discussed my first idea with a friend and the idea expanded into the subject I have now.
Discussion of ideas about the structure of my work	I used this		I thought beforehand of how to structure what we saw in the ppt and in class
Help with proofreading (Grammarly, AcademicWriter)	I used this		I asked a classmate for help and to re-read my annotated bibliography, as its better for someone to

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

			read it from an outsider's perspective
Help in translating text (e.g. Google Translate)		I did not	
Use of an artificial intelligence		I did not	
Use of paraphrasing software		maybe	Subtle grammatical help from Microsoft word
Discussion with a previous student		I did not	
Viewed work of a current or previous student	I did		Went and checked other students' work as part of the peer to peer review
Other			

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

Appendix 3: Guidelines for conducting a viva voce examination

The following guidelines should be followed when conducting a viva voce examination.

- Viva Voce assessments are sometimes offered if a student needs to satisfy an assessor that the student is ready for placement or to take an assessment. Alternatively, a viva voce may take place if a student's performance in an assessment raises questions about the integrity of the work done.
- A student should be given at least 48 hours' notice of a viva voce assessment. The student should be told what the purpose of the viva voce is (e.g. to assess their knowledge of the module learning outcomes or to investigate a suspicion of a breach of academic integrity).
- The student should be told why they are being assessed orally and informed about the format the oral examination will take.
- The criteria for assessment should be as close as possible to the criteria for a written assessment and should be communicated to the student along with the invitation to attend the viva voce.
- The duration of a viva voce may vary depending on the content/credits of the module but will typically last not less than 10 minutes and not more than one hour.
- The viva voce should be conducted in person.
- If it is for a supplemental examination, two examiners should be present (at least one of whom should be the same sex as the student) and each marker should mark the student independently. Only one of the examiners will ask questions of the student at a time and this will typically be the module lecturer. Following the assessment the assessors compare marks and agree a final mark. If a mark cannot be agreed, each assessor writes a report and the relevant Dean attempts to reconcile the reports, with reference to the external examiner if necessary. If a mark can still not be agreed, in exceptional circumstances, the student might be invited back for a second viva voce assessment.
- A set of questions should be compiled in advance of the viva voce. The first few questions should be designed to put the student at ease. Where relevant, an early question should ask the student how they went about doing the work in as much detail as is relevant. Subsequently, the complexity of questions can be

Policy Identifier: Academic Integrity Procedure

graded so that the most difficult questions will be asked only if a student successfully answers less difficult/searching questions.

- The examiner will do their best to put the student at ease given that the student might feel nervous in a situation.