

IOB ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY¹

1. PURPOSE

Integrity is an essential value of IOB as it underpins all academic activities. To maximise students' learning experience, it is important that they understand the importance of honesty and ethics in scholarship. Working independently, expressing original ideas, and appropriately acknowledging the ideas of others are important skills that will benefit students beyond their time attending IOB.

Academic integrity underpins the UCD Education Strategy and includes adherence to the highest ethical and academic standards. As a recognised college of UCD, IOB acknowledges the importance of academic integrity and urges students when undertaking academic work to ensure it is underpinned by honesty, trust, and respect. Students, faculty, and staff achieve academic integrity through sound academic writing, avoiding plagiarism and using appropriate referencing and citation.

The purpose of the policy and associated documents is to set out IOB's arrangements and supports for enabling students to understand and value academic integrity and to avoid academic misconduct; and to provide a framework for effective, fair, consistent, and timely processes in the event of an allegation of academic misconduct being made against a student.

The policy includes the procedures for investigating an allegation of academic misconduct against an IOB student, the range of penalties that may be applied if an allegation is upheld, the appeals process available to students if an allegation is upheld and supports available to students throughout the process.

2. DEFINITION

This policy uses the definitions from UCD's Academic Integrity Policy.

2.1 Academic misconduct

Academic misconduct (also known as academic dishonesty or academic malpractice) "is any attempt by someone to seek unfair advantage in relation to an academic activity or which

¹ The IOB Academic Integrity Policy closely mirrors that of UCD Academic Integrity Policy approved by Academic Council Executive Committee (ACEC), May, 2024.

facilitates others to gain an unfair advantage, or to profit from the sharing or selling of your own or others' work without permission²".

Examples of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to the following practices:

- a) **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:

- i. uses phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs or longer extracts from published or unpublished work (including from the internet) without appropriate acknowledgement of the source.
- ii. presents direct extracts without quotation marks or other appropriate indication. It is not sufficient simply to acknowledge the source.
- iii. copies the same or a very similar idea from a published or unpublished work without appropriate acknowledgement.
- iv. changes the order of words taken from source material but retains the original idea or concept without appropriate acknowledgement.
- v. 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
- vi. 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.

- b) **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.

² NAIN, 2012 (a), p3.

- c) **Recycling:** The “practice of data fragmentation or salami slicing where the author(s) separate aspects of a study” or their work. “Writers should recycle their own material carefully and sparingly.”
- d) **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.
- e) **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 National Academic Integrity Network (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.” Six types of prohibited services available to students are:
 - i. “essay writing services;
 - ii. friends, family and other students;
 - iii. private tutors;
 - iv. copyediting services;
 - v. agency websites;
 - vi. reverse classifieds.”
- f) **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.

Classification: Public

- 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.

g) **Fabricating or falsifying data**, information or sources of information in coursework or lab work, or forms submitted to the School/Module Coordinator/Instructor. This includes “Forging educational, research or scholarship content, images, data, equipment or processes in a way that they are inaccurately represented” and / or “making up data and presenting that data as genuine”.

Fabrication or falsification of data or information includes, but is not limited to:

- Misleadingly excluding data from analysis;
 - Misinterpreting data to obtain desired results (including the inappropriate use of statistical methods);
 - Producing false data or results under pressure from a sponsor;
 - Data-related misconduct. Examples include:
 - i. “Not preserving primary data where appropriate”;
 - ii. “Withholding data from the scientific community”;
 - iii. “Managing and / or storing data badly. The above applies to physical research materials as well.”
 - iv. “Selective citing to enhance importance of findings”;
 - v. “Establishing or supporting journals that undermine the quality control of research (‘predatory journals’)”;
 - vi. “Grossly exaggerating the importance and practical applicability of findings”.
- h) **Facilitating academic dishonesty** by assisting another student to obtain an academic advantage by dishonest or unfair means.
- i) **Fabrication of credentials** in materials submitted to the University as part of an admissions application or in materials submitted to the University for administrative or academic review.

- j) **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 including, but are not limited to:
- a) unauthorised and / or unacknowledged use of artificial intelligence tools to generate content for assessment purposes; or
 - b) unauthorised and / or unacknowledged use of paraphrasing or translation software to, for example, disguise plagiarism, collusion, contract cheating or other academic integrity breach.
- k) **Inappropriately publishing, uploading or sharing an assessment,** or part of an assessment, including responses to university assessment questions, to a website, or a filesharing site or other online platform. To publish, upload or share such material without explicit permission from the owner of the material and / or the Module Coordinator may also be a breach of copyright laws.
- l) **Inappropriately publishing or uploading IOB teaching or course material** to a website, or a file-sharing site or other online platform. To publish, upload or share such material without explicit permission from the owner of the material and / or the Module Coordinator may also be a breach of copyright laws.
- m) **Impersonation** by “Undertaking in whole or in part any work required as part of a programme in the place of an enrolled [student], without permission ...; Sitting an exam, or having someone else sit an exam in place of an enrolled [student]”.
- n) **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 iii. Writing for or in the name of someone else; iv. Assisting in the production of work resulting in unfair advantage to someone else.
- o) **Copying or cheating at formal examination:** To give or receive assistance in order to gain an academic advantage. Such assistance may include written material, another person or their work, or any other source during an examination or test; or to hire or attempt to hire someone to take your exam for you.

Academic misconduct in relation to formal examinations is identified in the [IOB Student Code of Conduct](#) and in the [Examination Regulations](#). Some examples include:

- Copying or cheating at any examination or other assessments, such as an in-trimester test. This includes colluding with others during an online examination. This

means seeking the assistance of others, or offering to assist others, during a period in which the examination is taking place.

- Sitting / attempting to sit an examination under another student's identity at any examination or in-trimester test.
- Arranging for someone else to sit an examination under your name / on your behalf.
- Bringing unauthorised notes or other materials into an examination or test.
- Use, or attempted use, of a mobile phone or any other unauthorised electronic device during an examination or test.
- Removing examination scripts, question papers or other stationery from an examination.
- Any other breach of the examination regulations or any action that may jeopardise the integrity of an assessment.

p) **Advertising cheating services and / publishing advertisements for cheating services:**

Students are prohibited from advertising any service which is considered to be academic misconduct under this policy (for example selling past papers or providing essay writing or assignment completion services). Students are also prohibited from publishing such advertisements, for example on their social media pages.

2.2 Generative Artificial Intelligence

Generative artificial intelligence technologies consist of a range of artificial intelligence (AI) tools that use models based on patterns learned from large quantities of training data to generate new text, audio, or other media. Large language models (LLMs) are a type of generative AI which understand and generate human-like content in response to varied prompts. They are referred to as 'generative' due to capabilities to create a range of content including text, audio, video, image and code by processing and analysing large volumes of data they are pre-trained.

3. SCOPE

This policy and any associated procedures apply to all work submitted for assessment by all students registered to IOB on all taught programmes.

4. PRINCIPLES

Like UCD, IOB upholds the principle of *academic integrity* and expects students to ensure that the intellectual efforts of others are acknowledged correctly in any material submitted for assessment.

Classification: Public

4.1 Supporting Academic Integrity

All faculty / tutors / instructors are encouraged to educate students about academic integrity and to develop an open culture in which faculty, staff and students champion academic integrity. Supporting students in developing their learning and critical thinking is key and is formed within their disciplinary / subject contexts. It is important that information about academic integrity is shared appropriately and acted upon so that:

- IOB's expectations of students in terms of academic integrity are clearly set out and easily accessible.
- the definitions of academic misconduct are explained as per this policy.
- the module descriptors/study guides set out expectations regarding academic integrity for each specific module;
- students are directed towards materials regarding academic integrity through the provision of links to policies and other materials.

4.2 Course Work

Faculty / tutors / instructors are encouraged to set clear expectations in relation to course work and assessment tasks and indicate, for example, whether or not:

- a) collaborative work is permissible or encouraged in any assessment task;
- b) the extent of collaboration that is allowed in that assessment task; and
- c) whether the use of Generative AI is permissible and under what conditions.

Module Coordinators should inform students about UCD's text-based similarity detecting software. It is at the discretion of the Module Coordinator to allow students to have access to the results of the detection software.

4.3 Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence Technologies

If permissible (by faculty/tutor/instructor) and when used appropriately, generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools can offer support across various aspects of the learning process. However, outputs from these tools must always be considered in the same manner as work created by another person/persons i.e. used critically, ethically, cited and acknowledged appropriately.

This academic integrity policy prohibits students from representing work as their own that they did not write, code or create. Accordingly, submission of AI-generated content without explicit permission and attribution is not allowed. Module coordinators / tutors / instructors may use generative AI in different ways to support student learning. Acknowledging this:

- It should be indicated clearly in the module descriptor whether generative AI will form any part of the learning experience.
- All module coordinators / tutors / instructors may allow the use of generative AI to complete specific assignments.
- Specific guidance based on disciplinary expectations should be provided to students in the use of generative AI where it is permitted.
- Students are expected to follow each step of that guidance and properly acknowledge the use of generative AI in each aspect of their submitted work.
- If a student has any doubt about whether a specific use of generative AI is permitted for an assignment or course, they are responsible for discussing it with the faculty member / tutor / instructor prior to using it.
- Students must indicate clearly in submitted work the nature and extent of any outside assistance (including the use of professional tutors, machine learning or AI technologies) according to the citation practices set out by the relevant subject/discipline.

4.4 Assessment

Module Coordinators should pay careful attention to the design of their assessment so that students are clear about what is required both within the assessment and to avoid academic misconduct. Module Coordinators are encouraged to:

- a) Review the assessment for each module every time the module is offered and redesign assessment tasks to discourage recurrence of any previously identified academic misconduct.
- b) Where possible, not reuse assessment tasks in a way that enables students with knowledge or prior experience of those tasks to gain an unfair advantage for themselves or others.
- c) Where possible, not reuse examination questions and assignment questions except when the Module Coordinator is satisfied that reuse will not:
 - i. jeopardise the academic integrity of the assessment; or
 - ii. create unfair advantage.
- d) For MCQ-type assessment, adopt design measures and features to mitigate academic misconduct, such as: maintaining a dynamic repository of questions (question bank) to facilitate the creation of unique assessments, randomise and shuffle questions and answers, substitute numeric values, and variety of question type.

The Module Coordinator may stipulate assessment requirements, including but not limited to:

- i. file submission type; and
- ii. submission of work-in-progress, including draft documents.

Classification: Public

For work that is not a text-based written assignment, such as demonstrations, laboratory work, objective structured clinical examinations (OSCEs) or other skills-based activities, Module Coordinators are encouraged to take all reasonable steps to design an assessment that minimises the possibility of academic misconduct and, as far as possible provides confidence that:

- a) the assignment is the student's own original work;
- b) the work of others is appropriately acknowledged;
- c) the assignment has not been previously submitted; and
- d) the input of others does not exceed the bounds of legitimate cooperation

5. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

5.1 IOB

IOB sets standards of *academic integrity* for students and puts in place arrangements to:

- a) Enable students to understand and observe academic integrity and avoid plagiarism.
- b) Promote arrangements to inform and educate students about the policy for unacceptable practices in academic writing and assessment; and
- c) Use electronic and other detection mechanisms, such as text-matching software, to identify instances of potential plagiarism. Any work submitted for assessment may be subject to electronic or other detection procedures.

IOB provides information on academic writing and plagiarism which is available on IOB learn, IOB's learning environment.

5.2 UCD Library

UCD Library provides education about and promotes university policy on academic integrity and has a repository of resources on plagiarism and how to avoid it.

5.3 IOB Faculty

Module Coordinators and Programme Directors may arrange for students to receive advice and guidance on correct citation and referencing and avoiding plagiarism, and on the potential consequences of plagiarism.

5.3.1 The Programme Director responsibilities include:

- a) Input into the development and periodic review of the IOB Academic Misconduct Protocol

Classification: Public

- b) Taking part in the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee which will comprise 3 voting members (a Chair, (the Dean or a nominee) the Deputy Dean, a Secretary from RDSS and a maximum of two additional faculty, internal or external) for the purpose of reviewing suspected instances of academic misconduct within IOB and deciding whether the matter may be resolved by the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee or whether a referral to the IOB Discipline Procedure is required.
- c) Ensuring that appropriate and timely student advisory arrangements are in place to promote academic integrity in the subject area(s) and to educate students about avoiding academic misconduct.
- d) Ensuring that records of all instances of conduct misconduct and outcomes of investigation are provided for centralised record keeping in RDSS.
- e) Periodically evaluating its arrangements for dealing with academic misconduct to ensure consistency in case management, and that where any recurrent patterns of plagiarism emerge, either in the case of individual students/groups of students, the overall approach is appropriate and capable of ensuring that any further occurrences are addressed.
- f) Providing support and guidance to Module Coordinators when considering individual cases of suspected impropriety.

5.3.2 **Module Coordinator** responsibilities include:

- a) Ensuring that their students are briefed on avoiding academic misconduct and providing them with information about expectations for citation methods for all assessed work in their module, prior to students submitting assessments or taking examinations.
- b) Guided by this policy and the IOB Academic Misconduct Protocol, Module Coordinators will exercise their judgement when deciding whether incidents will be dealt with directly or referred to the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee for consideration.
When deciding on whether cases should be referred to the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee, Module Coordinators may wish to consider the following:
 - The characteristics of categories of academic misconduct outlined in this policy
 - The relative experience / stage of the student
 - Any additional IOB guidance that may have been developed.
- c) Following discussion with the Programme Director, Initiating academic misconduct 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 IOB Academic Misconduct Protocol regarding communicating with the student about the alleged instance of 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 of the process being followed by referring to the Student Guide on Academic Misconduct.

5.3.3 IOB Academic Misconduct Committee 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 IOB Academic Misconduct Committee or referred without decision to the IOB Student Discipline Procedure
- d) Providing an accompanying report where allegations are referred to the IOB Discipline Procedure
- e) Deciding on a penalty for cases where academic misconduct is deemed to have taken place, guided by the UCD academic misconduct tariff.
- f) Providing an accompanying report where allegations are referred to the IOB Student Discipline Procedure.
- g) Communicating the outcome of the IOB academic misconduct committee meeting to the student and the Module Coordinator.
- h) Keeping a record of the type, circumstances, and outcomes (decision and penalty) of referred allegations of academic misconduct.

Where a Module Coordinator who refers a case to the IOB academic integrity is an Academic Misconduct Committee member, they must be replaced by an alternate when the case that they referred is being considered.

5.3.4. Examiners' responsibilities include:

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

5.3.5. Students' responsibilities include:

- a) Viewing IOB's online material, videos regarding referencing /citation training and avoidance of academic misconduct.
- b) Being responsible for academic integrity of any assessment they submit, including producing original work in all assessment with appropriate citation and reference of sources.
- c) Familiarise themselves with the expectations outlined in the module descriptor for each of their modules; and,
- d) Complete, where required, a declaration statement confirming compliance with this policy.
- e) Engaging with and responding to Module Coordinators and the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee in a timely manner and within any timelines set out.
- f) Where meetings of the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee are held students may be accompanied by a support of their choice i.e., an advisor or friend.
- g) Students are expected to speak for themselves at meetings, the role of any person accompanying students is to provide support.

Classification: Public

6 CATEGORIES OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

The characteristics that distinguish cases are likely to be:

- a) Cases that are deemed to be minor infringements and evidence of poor academic practice are likely to be characterised as follows:
 - Apparent unintended misuse of source materials
 - Inadequate citation such as poor referencing, inappropriate paraphrasing, demonstrates students' need for further guidance on referencing and citation.
 - Over-reliance on sources without sufficient input of the student's own work.
 - The suspected academic misconduct represents only a small proportion of the student's own work and/or an element in a piece of work which makes a small contribution to the grade for the assessment component.

Minor instances and poor academic practice are likely to be addressed directly by Module Coordinators without referral through the actions set out under Section 7.1 but maybe addressed by the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee in some cases, depending on the circumstances of the alleged breach.

- b) Cases that are referred to the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee are likely to include instances where larger proportions of suspected academic misconduct are evident, the component assessment under scrutiny is worth a significant proportion of the module grade, or where a Module Coordinator recognises repeated minor instances. Decisions available to the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee are outlined in Section 7.3.5
- c) Cases that are considered sufficiently serious by IOB are referred without decision to the IOB Student Discipline Procedure (e.g., second offence or significant academic misconduct in major assessments).
- d) All instances of cheating in a formal invigilated assessment as defined in section 2.1 (o) are dealt with by the Student Discipline Procedure.

7 IOB ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT INVESTIGATION PROCEDURE

7.1 Initial investigation or 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 and Programme Director

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

- a) Discussion directly with the student about the issue that has arisen with their assessment.

Classification: Public

- b) Provide, or arrange that the student receive one-to-one advice about academic integrity and avoiding academic misconduct. Instances of poor academic practice and minor infringements may be reflected in the grade awarded by Module Coordinators using the Component Grade Scale³.
- c) Refer the case to the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee as an alleged case of plagiarism. 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 IOB Academic Misconduct Committee. Where it is decided to refer the case to the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee, Module Coordinators may advise the student that their assessment has been referred to the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee and that the Committee will contact them in relation to the matter and note the supports available. A Module Coordinator may refer a case to the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee without following actions (a) and (b).

7.2. Referral to the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee

Where an allegation is referred by a Module Coordinator, the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee will:

- a) Inform the student through the email address declared on their IOB learn account, 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 IOB'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 the sources of support provided by IOB (e.g., Programme Directors).

7.3. IOB Academic Misconduct Committee

7.3.1. In cases where a student has been referred previously to the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee and found to be in breach of the terms of IOB's Student Academic Integrity Policy, the committee will make a judgement as to whether the recurrence can be handled as an academic matter at IOB school level or whether it merits being handled as a disciplinary matter.

7.3.2. The Assessment and Module Coordinator's report will be reviewed by the committee and one of the following decisions will be taken:

- If the extent of academic misconduct warrants it, the case may be referred directly to the Student Discipline Procedure.

³ Refer to UCD Academic Regulations

- If the matter could have been appropriately dealt with as a minor infringement or poor academic practice the case may be sent back to the Module Coordinator for resolution.
- Academic misconduct proceedings will be initiated, and the student will be invited to meet the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee to discuss the alleged plagiarism 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.

7.3.3. 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.

7.3.4. In cases where it is determined that academic misconduct has taken place, the penalty will be guided by a university approved tariff⁴.

7.3.5. The IOB Academic Misconduct Committee may decide on any of the following:

- a) That academic misconduct has not occurred; the assessment component grade will stand. No record is kept on the Academic Misconduct Record System.
- b) 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 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, incurring a late submission grade penalty⁵.
 - II. Permit the student to re-submit the assessment component and direct that the grade be capped⁶; the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee may select the capped grade from all passing grades of the *Component Grading Scale* as deemed appropriate. When capping grades, the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee may wish to limit this to a D- or at the original grade or an adjusted original grade in line with Academic Regulation 4.22 and the Component Grade Scale.

⁴ A UCD academic misconduct tariff, adapted from the AMBeR Tariff <https://www.plagiarism.org/paper/plagiarism-reference-tariff> has been developed and is associated with this policy.

⁵ IOB 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).

⁶ The IOB Academic Misconduct Committee cannot apply grade reductions or cap resubmitted work that is graded using pass/fail, this includes where academic misconduct occurs in a resit.

Classification: Public

- III. Direct that the grade for the assessment component be reduced without an opportunity to resubmit the assessment. IOB Academic Misconduct Committee may select grades from all passing grades of the Component Grading Scale as deemed appropriate.
- c) Refer the alleged instance without any decision for resolution under the IOB Student Discipline Procedure. In some contexts, a first instance may require direct referral (e.g., academic misconduct in single assessment modules, second or subsequent offence, or for significant plagiarism in heavily weighted assessments).
- d) Decisions will be communicated to students through their IOB Learn registered email address, (copying the Module Coordinator). Where a decision is made under 7.3.5b the communication should include reference to their right to appeal decisions under specified grounds and under Student Appeals Procedure (see section 8).

7.3.6 In all cases of referral to the IOB Student Discipline Procedure, the IOB Academic Misconduct 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 the email which they are registered with, that their assessment has been referred for scrutiny as an alleged instance of academic misconduct under the IOB Student Discipline Procedure⁷; 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 colleague or friend. This support person is there to offer support to the student but may not speak on their behalf.

7.3.7. The IOB Academic Misconduct Committee will record incidents of academic misconduct on the Academic Misconduct Record System.

- a) The Academic Misconduct Record System is IOB's central system to record incidents of academic misconduct found by the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee. The central system is maintained within RDSS.
- 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 the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee and a member of IOB staff nominated for the purpose of implementing the policy, i.e. identifying previous breaches of the academic integrity policy by students, and entering outcomes decided by IOB Academic Misconduct Committee.
- c) Personal data collected and processed under the Student Academic integrity Policy will include: student name and ID number, relevant module code, plagiarism category,

⁷ 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.

assessment type and the decision of the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee. Personal data will not be included in any IOB reports on academic misconduct.

8 APPEALS TO SCHOOL ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT COMMITTEE OUTCOMES

8.1 An appeal to decisions of the committee may be made to the IOB Student Appeals Committee within **ten** working days from the date of issue of the decision of the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee. Details of the appeal procedure can be found in the IOB Student Appeals Procedure.

8.2 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 IOB Academic Misconduct Committee.
- *Procedural irregularity*: there is evidence that the procedures relating to a decision were not followed properly, which may have impacted on the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee's decision.
- *Disproportionate outcome*: the outcome applied was disproportionately severe with regard to the circumstances of the case.

8.3 Decision of the Student Appeals Committee. The Committee may:

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

In cases where a IOB 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 IOB 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.

8.3 On upholding an appeal, an IOB 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.

8.4 The outcome of the appeal will be communicated to the school for implementation.

9 IOB STUDENT DISCIPLINE PROCEDURE

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

- a) Where an allegation of plagiarism referred to the Student Discipline Procedure has been proven: 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

Classification: Public

to and including the award of No Grade for the module or deprivation of any academic award, scholarship or prize, at a Student Disciplinary hearing;

- b) The outcome of the case will be communicated to the IOB Academic Misconduct Committee and recorded on the Academic Misconduct Record System.

10 RELATED DOCUMENTS

- Student Code of Conduct

Document	IOB Academic Integrity Policy	  <p>A recognised college of UCD</p>
Version Reference	VI. March 2025	
Changes	Plagiarism Policy updated by UCD Academic Integrity Policy.	
Document Owner	Registrar	
Approved by	Programme Board	
Date	20 th March 2025	

Classification: Public