1. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to outline the College's commitment to upholding the highest standards of academic integrity from all staff, learners and stakeholders. It will define what areas constitute breaches of academic integrity (AI) and specify the consequences of such breaches, and the procedures which are to be followed in such cases.

The policy is referenced to the following QQI NAIN (National Academic Integrity Network) publications:

"Academic Integrity Guidelines (non-statutory)" (QQI, 2021a)

and

"Academic Integrity: National Principles and Lexicon of Common Terms" (QQI, 2021b).

The latter publication defines 'Academic Integrity' as: "Compliance with ethical and professional principles, standards, practices and a consistent system of values, that serves as guidance for making decisions and taking actions in education, research and scholarship." (QQI 2021b, p.10)

2. Scope

This policy and the associated procedures apply to all individuals at Open Training College engaged in academic work, including all registered students of OTC and academic staff engaged in assessment of academic work which contributes to an award or credits.

The policy also entails an undertaking to collaborate with relevant stakeholders in upholding and updating this policy and its related procedures in line with best practice and to report any findings relating to cheating sites to relevant stakeholders, including QQI.

3. Statement

The College's approach to preserving Academic Integrity is threefold. It operates in advance of programme/module and assessment development, during the delivery of the programme and in cases where there is a suspected breach of Academic Integrity policies, as outlined below; as well as noting that procedures may be invoked retrospectively. It also operates from a threefold viewpoint in

recognising this area as creating explicit responsibilities with regard to the College, its students and its staff.

A. Pre-learning and Awareness-raising

In developing a programme for delivery, the College with take account of AI concerns, ensuring that assessment is designed in such a way as to minimise the possibility of academic impropriety and to maximise the ability to detect breaches of AI policy.

To this end, the College will ensure investment in appropriate technology, copyright licensing and the provision of targeted student and staff inductions in this domain.

Additional specific measures to safeguard against academic impropriety will include:

- An assessment strategy which allows for different modes of assessment, so that continuous assessment by way of written assignment is balanced against other assessment modes such as proctored written examinations, oral presentations and recourse to a viva voce element regarding specific assignments.
- The application of assessment to the workplace or specific case study situations.
- The allocation of a designated Tutor to a small cohort of students (Max. 15); so that the 'student voice' and workplace particularities are familiar to the Tutor with regard to the individual student.
- Providing multi-layered student support mechanisms in order to mitigate against a student's potential temptation to breach the tenets of this policy.
- Providing ongoing CPD opportunities in the area of AI for all teaching and other relevant staff; to include ensuring College representation on or at sectoral initiatives (e.g., NAIN, QQI and HECA/HAQEF).

B. In-course Application

Having provided full induction modules to all new students and all current staff, the College will continue to promote awareness-raising on all AI issues during the delivery of programmes and particularly at the time of outlining of assessment briefs to student cohorts. Added attention will be directed regarding remote proctored examinations and in the case of 'group work' assignments.

Through this learning students will be guided through the College's policy and procedures, while primarily being appraised of why academic impropriety is unacceptable, its main components (plagiarism, collusion, use of cheating sites and misuse of chatbot-generated output) and its consequences. In addition, they will be encouraged to:

- Take part in 'courageous conversations' when appropriate
- Encouraged to direct their attention to additional external resources (e.g., QQI's "myownwork.qqi.ie" and NAIN resources)

The use of proper academic referencing will also be introduced to students and reinforced throughout their programme. Therefore, the induction will contain, at a minimum, coverage of the following areas:

- Definitions of academic integrity and academic misconduct
- What academic misconduct is with examples
- Reflection on when the student felt pressured to think of academic misconduct
- Impact of academic misconduct on the student, programme, college, profession and Ireland
- Expectation of college around academic misconduct
- What are paper mills/contract cheating?
- Misuse of artificial intelligence text generators (e.g., ChatGPT)
- How to avoid academic misconduct
- Proper referencing
- Using Turnitin
- When the college will use a viva voce
- Reference to the academic integrity policy in the student handbook

All student assessment will be investigated through anti-plagiarism software; currently Turnitin. Additionally, as reliable detection software evolves with regard to artificial intelligence based chatbots (e.g., ChatGPT), which can potentially generate text and other artefacts regarding student assessment responses, the College will investigate these tools and invest in them as appropriate. This will also apply where such detection tools evolve in response to cheating sites/essay mills.

In a case where the use of cheating sites is identified, the identity of the site will also be reported to the College's regulator, QQI.

With regard to staff, having investigated the domain of AI at induction and as part of their ongoing pedagogical training, further CPD opportunities will be made available, so that all staff are kept up to date with respect to continually developing issues and advancements in this domain.

The College undertakes to ensure that relevant HR policies/procedures take into account AI and that job descriptions will include reference to AI. Furthermore, staff contracts will stipulate that material produced on behalf of the College remains the intellectual property of the College. Staff will be

appraised of how the misuse of such copyright material with regard to Academic Impropriety, may invoke disciplinary action.

C. Use of the College's Academic Misconduct procedure

In cases where breaches of AI are suspected or identified the College's 'Academic Misconduct' procedure will be invoked.

This procedure is attached at Appendix 1 to this policy.

This procedure may be invoked retrospectively, including following the conferring of an award upon a student, should Academic Impropriety come to light at a later stage. In such cases, relevant regulatory and professional bodies will be informed of any such actions undertaken and students will be informed that such disciplinary action may result in the withdrawal of an award.

As with all College policies and the implementation of their associated procedures (including the College's 'Disciplinary Procedure' in this instance), the principle of 'natural justice' will prevail.

In general:

The College commits to the following in relation to **communicating** Academic Integrity across all programmes and through assessment guidelines:
- Upholding Academic Integrity is a strategic objective of the College, supported by appropriate structures and with a repository of relevant and clear information on the subject being available to all staff and students.
- Staff and Students will be communicated with clearly and available supports will be made known to them.
- There will be an emphasis on <u>preventing</u> breaches of academic integrity.
- Assessment design will focus on reducing the risk of plagiarism and the use of UDL will be explored with all staff with responsibility for assessment.
- What constitutes the misuse of 'sharing platforms' will be made clear to all students and staff.

The College reserves the right to hold a viva voce in dealing with any and all AI issues which may arise.

The College commits to the following in relation to **learners** in particular:

- Creating awareness of Academic Integrity and the consequences of breaching this policy from the point of induction to the College; including consequences for using 'cheating

sites', text produced by artificial intelligence based chatbots (or similar or newly developed technology) or plagiarising.

- Ongoing awareness-raising in this area during the programme of study, particularly at the point of sharing assessment guidelines; including the use of 'Turnitin'.
- All learners will have access to information on Academic Integrity, including supports available to those under investigation, and general and additional supports available under the College's 'Student Support Policy'.
- Awareness of relevant legislation such as the 'Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Amendment Act 2019'.

The College commits to the following in relation to **staff** in particular:

- Initial training in recognising and preventing instances of breaches of Academic Integrity; including training in assessment design, recognising plagiarism and the use of College tools such as 'Turnitin' to detect possible plagiarism.
- Ongoing CPD in this area to ensure that current best practice is followed.
- Awareness of relevant legislation such as the 'Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Amendment Act 2019'.

The aim of these provisions will be to provide clarity at all times pertaining to Academic Integrity, its upholding and the consequences of any contravention. Parties involved in all aspects of providing information on and investigating breaches of this policy will be supported at all times and treated in a fair, consistent and transparent manner; while taking account of special provisions for recording and storing such information under the College's GDPR Policy. The ultimate aim of all AI policy and procedure is to support and help create a culture of fairness with regard to national and international educational standards, so that the integrity of qualifications gained through the College is maintained.

In summary, the focus of this policy is to encapsulate how the College:

- Raises student awareness of Academic Integrity considerations from the outset of their studies;
- Includes a focused module on this area as part of student induction;
- Teaches students how to reference properly in order to avoid plagiarism;
- Provides additional online resources to support students in upholding Academic Integrity;
- Outlines misuse of cheating sites/essay mills and other text generation tools (misuse of Artificial Intelligence);
- Provides clear definitions to students as to what constitutes Academic Integrity and correspondingly what constitutes Misconduct;

- Clearly outlines the consequences of Academic Misconduct (re. Academic Misconduct procedure);
- Provides initial and ongoing training to relevant staff in this domain;
- Continues discussions relating to Integrity throughout the course of studies, particularly at the point of Assessment briefing;
- Encourages 'Courageous Conversations' between students and staff where appropriate;
- Provides a full range of supports for students at each stage of the Academic Integrity journey, including where suspected misconduct has taken place;
- Continues to update students through the College's communication protocols on any developments in this area, while appraising/training staff in relation to same;
- Ensures policies and procedures are updated in a timely manner to reflect any such developments.

Definitions of terminology and relevant examples are given at Section 4, below.

4. Definitions

Selected definitions are provided below (adapted from *Academic Integrity: National Principles and Lexicon of Common Terms* (NAIN, 2021) and the College's Quality Assurance Document (QuAD), with a full lexicon provided at:

https://www.qqi.ie/sites/default/files/2021-11/academic-integrity-national-principles-and-lexicon-of-common-terms.pdf

Accessory to Cheating, Accessory to plagiarism A person assisting someone to cheat or plagiarise.

Academic Ethics Values that are recognised and abided by, in the academic community.

Academic Integrity Compliance with ethical and professional principles, Standards, practices and a consistent system of values, that serves as guidance for making decisions and taking actions in education, research and scholarship.

Artificial Intelligence Text Generators/Chatbots AI text generators use artificial intelligence to learn from large bodies of text to create coherent text that can easily pass as human-generated text. The unauthorised (and unattributed) use of such text generators/chatbots (e.g., ChatGPT) in work presented for assessment is considered to be academic misconduct of a serious nature.

Academic misconduct covers all behaviours which contravene academic integrity. Academic misconduct is also known as academic malpractice, academic mispractice or academic impropriety.
Academic misconduct is any attempt by someone to seek unfair advantage in relation to academic activity or which facilitates others to gain an unfair advantage, or to profit from the sharing or selling of your own or others' work.

Advertising Cheating Services/ Essay Mills/ Provision of Cheating Services:
Advertising the provision of assignments for learners where this has not been authorised by the provider. Advertising the undertaking of assignments (in whole or in part) on behalf of an enrolled learner, or sitting an exam, or have someone sit an exam, in place of an enrolled learner where this has not been authorised by the provider.

The College undertakes to inform relevant stakeholders should it become aware of such services being offered and to make every effort to block such sites from its internal systems, as used by both staff and students.

CC – by Creative Commons Licence giving the right to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format (share) and remix, transform, and build on the material for any purpose, even commercially (adapt).

Cheating Actions that attempt to get advantage by means that undermine values of integrity.

Citation Attribution A note in the text using a recognised referencing style which identifies the source of an idea or fact and acts as a link to a more detailed reference in the Bibliography or References section of the work. The opposite of this is plagiarism. I.e., How you reference someone else's material in your work. Failure to cite other's work appropriately is considered plagiarism.

Collusion/Conspiracy Undisclosed collaboration of two or more people on an assignment or task, which is supposed to be completed individually. Collusion, where work if permitted to be copied, is a form of plagiarism by both parties.

Examples of Collusion include:

• 	students providing their work to another student before the due date, or for the purpose of them plagiarising at any time;

• 	paying another person to perform an academic task and passing it off as your own;

• 	stealing or acquiring another person's academic work and copying it;

• 	offering to complete another person's work or seeking payment for completing academic work. This should not be confused with academic collaboration where there has been a general group discussion about a projector question but where each student writes his/ her own answer. (UNSW - University of New South Wales [Accessed April 26th 2021])

Copyright Exclusive legal right of the originator to copy, reproduce, print, publish, perform, film or record literary, artistic, or musical materials digitally or in any other form. (see Plagiarism)

Courageous Conversations were developed in the University of New South Wales and described in this article by Prof. Cath Ellis https://www.qqi.ie/news/courageous-conversations

They involve a student taking their concerns in relation to possible academic misconduct to their relevant Tutor/Programme Director in order to discuss any implications in an open and frank manner. A courageous conversation may allay any fears regarding Academic integrity or may invoke the appropriate use of the published Academic Misconduct procedure.

Essay mill An organisation, or individual, usually with a web presence, that contracts with students to complete an assignment or assignments for the student, for a fee.

Fabrication Fabrication in the context of research means making up data, experiments, or other significant information in proposing conducting or reporting research.

Ghost-writing/ Ghost Authorship/ Ghost Author (see also Essay mill; Contract Cheating) Ghost Authorship is the practice of using a non-named (merited, but not listed) author to write or prepare a text for publication.

• 	To write for or in the name of someone else;

- To assist in the production of work resulting in unfair advantage to someone else.

<u>Impersonation</u> Undertaking in whole or in part any work required as part of a programme in the place of an enrolled learner, without permission from the provider;

Sitting an exam, or having someone else sit an exam in place of an enrolled learner, without permission of the provider.

<u>Paraphrasing</u> A re-statement of notions, opinions, ideas or text in own words preserving their essence that does not amount to verbatim or near-verbatim copying of the respective source, with a proper acknowledgement of the original source.

<u>Plagiarism:</u>
Presenting work / ideas taken from other sources without proper acknowledgement.

Plagiarism, i.e., the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit, including those obtained through confidential review of other's research proposals and manuscripts.

Auto-Plagiarism
Instead of creating an original piece of work, the author adds insignificant additional data and/ or information to his/ her previously published work and changes title, modifies aim of the study, and recalculates results. Also, it is the omission of cross-citation to own previous publications.

Self-Plagiarism/ Redundant Publication
A form of redundant publication by recycling or borrowing content from the author's own previous work without citation. Self-plagiarism is the use of one's own previous work in another context without appropriate citation. Related to self-plagiarism is the practice of data fragmentation or salami slicing where the author(s) separate aspects of a study and publishes it as more than one publication. Writers should recycle their own material carefully and sparingly.
 Plagiarism includes but is not limited to:

- Verbatim copying of another's work without clear identification and acknowledgement;

- Close paraphrasing of another's work by simply changing a few words of altering the order of presentation without clear identification or acknowledgment;

- Unidentified/ unacknowledged presentation of another's concept as one's own.

In instances of suspected plagiarism the procedure which follows this policy will be used:
"Academic Misconduct procedure".

<u>Provision of Cheating Services</u> Providing assistance for others to engage in cheating:

- Providing answers, or arranging the provision of answers, to an enrolled learner for an exam, during the course of that exam, without permission of the provider;

- Providing, or arranging the provision of, an assignment required of an enrolled learner without permission of the provider;

- Before an exam, providing answers for, arranging the provision of answers for, an exam for an enrolled learner without permission from the provider.

<u>Text-matching software</u> Software that searches a text-based document and provides a list of intext similarities and references to matching sources.

5. Roles and Responsibilities

The College Director has ultimate executive responsibility for the effective development and implementation of academic policies.

The Head of Quality & Academic Affairs has overall delegated responsibility for coordinating the day-to-day operation of the policies and the development, maintenance and monitoring of supporting procedures.

All internal and external stakeholders share overall responsibility for this Academic Integrity Policy, with the ultimate aim that a culture of Academic Integrity is imbued throughout the College.

Programme Directors and Tutors are responsible for pursuing the implementation of these policies in relation to the activities of their programmes.

Policy Title:		Academic Integrity Policy
OTC Policy No		2102
Version		2.0
Date approved: February 2023	Date policy will take effect: February 2023	Date of Next Review: Annual
Approving Authority:		Academic Council
Document Owner/Contact:		Head of Quality & Academic Affairs
Supporting documents, procedures & forms of this policy:		Student Handbooks, Induction and Assessment Guidelines Staff induction Academic Misconduct procedure Disciplinary procedure
Audience:		Public access

Reference(s)	General Data Protection Regulation, 2018
	Data Protection Acts, 1988-2018
	"Academic Integrity Guidelines (non-statutory)" (QQI, 2021a)
	"Academic Integrity: National Principles and Lexicon of Common Terms" (QQI, 2021b)
	Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Amendment Act 2019

APPENDIX A.1: Academic Misconduct Procedure

The following diagram and explanatory notes illustrate the steps that the College will take if a student is suspected of academic misconduct; *in relation to all definitions of 'misconduct'/'cheating' as outlined in the Academic Integrity Policy.* This includes but is not limited to all definitions of academic misconduct as outlined, use of essay mills/cheating sites and misuse of Artificial Intelligence text generators (e.g., ChatGPT and other similar resources as developed/released). It is anticipated that, where possible, the process be completed as quickly as possible (and usually within the timeframe of eight weeks). All assessments will be graded as "WH" (Withheld) until any and all investigations and related processes are completed.

Please note that incidents of academic misconduct will be maintained on a student's permanent record, and that the process described below will apply for the full period of their registration, regardless of progression within a programme or onto a new programme.

The College sees the dialogue between the student and the tutor and the mentoring and coaching of the student to avoid academic misconduct, as a Level 1 'Pre-Academic misconduct Learning Level' as very important. At this stage, the tutor will identify any potential academic misconduct that occurs due to lack of referencing skills or misunderstanding of appropriate use of external resources, and direct the student to the appropriate supports provided by the College to support appropriate student behaviour around this area. Should the student disregard the need to develop these skills or demonstrate more serious academic misconduct (e.g., copying directly from another student's work) the investigation will move to Level 2 or 3 as deemed appropriate. These procedures are outlined below.

Level	Process	Documentation
Level 1 (Pre-Academic Misconduct)	**Tutor identifies suspected Academic Misconduct** ▪ Student notified ▪ Initial exploratory discussion with student by telephone (and/or in writing) ▪ Information Gathering	**Note made on tutorial form and/ or rubric** **Student directed to appropriate Study Supports**
	Tutor identifies possible case of academic misconduct ▪ Classify Offence ▪ Refer to Programme Director	**Letter to student informing them of progression to level 2 investigation** Report A

	Tutor concludes there is no case of academic misconduct to be answered at this level	Letter to student informing them of finding of no case of academic misconduct to be answered
Level 2	**Student case referred to Programme Director** ▪ Reviews Report A ▪ Meets with investigating Tutor ▪ Meets with student	**Report B**
	Programme Director decision ▪ Classify Offence ▪ Determine sanction/penalty or ▪ Refer back to Tutor or ▪ Refer to College Director	**Letter to student** ▪ Student accepts or appeals to Disciplinary Committee
Level 3	**Student case referred to College Director** ▪ Reviews all documentation ▪ Meets with Programme Director and investigating Tutor ▪ Forms Panel of Enquiry	**Report C**
	College Director decision ▪ Classify Offence ▪ Determine sanction/penalty and meet with the student *or* ▪ Refer back to Programme Director ▪ Form Panel of Enquiry	**Letter to student** ▪ Student accepts *or* appeals to Disciplinary Committee
Appeal	**Student appeal received by Disciplinary Committee** ▪ Reviews all documentation ▪ Meets Tutor/Programme Director/College Director as appropriate	**Disciplinary Committee report** ▪ Appeal to Academic Council (AC)
	Disciplinary Committee decision ▪ Classify Offence ▪ Determine sanction/penalty	**Letter to student** ▪ AC decision is final ▪ No appeal

LEVEL 1

At the 'Pre-Academic misconduct Learning Level' the tutor will identify any pre academic misconduct errors due to lack of referencing skills or understanding and direct the student to the appropriate supports provided by the College to support appropriate student behaviour in this area. Should the student disregard the need to develop these skills or demonstrate more serious academic misconduct

(e.g., copying directly from another student's work) the investigation will move to Level 2 or 3 as deemed appropriate.

Reasons a tutor might suspect a possible case of academic misconduct:

1. Specifically identified text by 'Turnitin' software as containing an unacceptable amount of material taken directly from identified sources.

2. Un-cited text copied from College materials.

3. Incongruity in style of writing e.g., deviation from students' own voice, use of advanced academic writing.

4. Identification of use of cheating site or Artificial Intelligence text generator.

5. Inconsistency of fluency and spelling.

6. Change in formatting e.g., font, headings, margins; inconsistency of I.T. style e.g. very complicated table/chart having been inserted etc.

7. Lack of flow and/or development of topic. Paragraphs inserted that are inconsistent with previous points made – evidence of cutting and pasting.

8. Work that is very similar or the same as another student's work[1] . In assessments where group work is a component the presentation of the assessment outline will include specific advice on academic misconduct considerations which may arise.

9. Work that is very similar or the same as the student's previously assessed work.

10. A piece of work written to a much higher standard than the student's previous work.

11. Suspicion that the student may have had assignment written for them by another person – 'ghost' writing.

This list is not exhaustive and the tutor may commence an investigation based on any reasonable suspicion. Following initial analysis, the tutor may decide that there is no case of academic misconduct to be answered. In this instance the student's attention will be drawn to the incident and feedback provided through the assessment rubric. If the tutor confirms that a possible case of academic misconduct has occurred the investigation continues to the information gathering stage as follows.

The tutor notifies the student of the situation and has an initial exploratory discussion by telephone (and/or in writing). Following this, the tutor commences the information gathering process.

---

[1] In a situation where two current students have presented the same/similar work both students will be subject to the academic misconduct policy and procedures and both may have penalties applied as appropriate. In the case of a current student presenting work which seriously overlaps with that of a previous student the current student will be dealt with through these procedures and the previous student will be informed of the situation. The current student in question however will not be identified in this communication. There will be no exceptions to this practice.

Information gathering may include but is not limited to review of previous work, discussion with a previous tutor, and review of assignments of current or former students, and consideration of any explanation/comments offered by the student in the initial telephone conversation. Students are made aware that their previous work may be reviewed as part of an investigation to provide background information about their standard of work.

On completion of the information gathering stage the tutor compiles a written report (Report A) and based on the evidence makes a decision as to whether or not there is a case of academic misconduct to be answered. In making his/her decision, in addition to the information gathered the tutor will also consider:

1. The Declaration of Authorship Form and the Student Handbook Terms and Conditions Statement, that have been submitted by the student stating that they have understood the nature of academic misconduct and its implications as outlined in the Student Handbook.
2. Was the information about academic misconduct and its implications made sufficiently clear?
3. Has the student misunderstood the above?
4. Is this a first incident?
5. Previous performance and assessment results from completed assignments.
6. The student's participation in programme/attendance at workshops etc.
7. Extenuating personal circumstances?
8. Has the issue arisen due to any oversight by the College?

If the tutor decides that yes, there is a case to be answered they will notify the student of this outcome in writing and refer the case for consideration to the Programme Director. The student may exercise their right to appeal to the Disciplinary Committee at this stage, and will be informed of this in the letter from the tutor.

If the tutor decides that there is no case of academic misconduct to be answered they will also notify the student of this outcome in writing.

Level 1: Minor Offence Classification		
Criteria	*Indicators*	*Penalties/Sanctions*
Amount/Extent	Low percentage from individual source identified by Turnitin

Some material appears to come from an unauthorised source (e.g., text generated, ghost-written)

Basic referencing error | Reflective grade: deduct marks for referencing portion of assignment and/ or
Reflective grade: deduct marks for portion of assignment with referencing errors |
| **History** | No History

Too many direct quotes | |
| **Level/Stage** | Stage 1 | |
| **Additional Information** | No evidence of deliberate attempt by student

Extenuating personal circumstances | |

Table 8: Level 1 Academic misconduct Offence Classifications.

LEVEL 2

Student case is referred to the Programme Director by Tutor who has completed investigation at Level 1. The student has received notification of this development by the tutor.

The Programme Director commences the information gathering process, which will include but is not limited to a review of Report A, meeting with the investigating tutor and meeting with the student. On completion of the information gathering stage the Programme Director compiles a written report (Report B) and, based on the evidence, makes a decision as to whether or not there is a case of academic misconduct to be answered at Level 2 or above.

If the Programme Director decides that yes, there is a case to be answered they will classify the offence as Level 2 (major) or Level 3 (grave). In the case of a Level 2 offence the Programme Director will determine a sanction/penalty (see below for sanctions/penalties available at Level 2) and will notify the student of this outcome in writing. In the case of a Level 3 offence the Programme Director will refer the case to the Disciplinary Committee for further investigation at Level 3; the student will also be notified of this outcome in writing. The student may exercise their right to appeal to the Disciplinary Committee at this stage, and will be informed of this in the letter from the tutor.

If the Programme Director decides that there is no case of academic misconduct to be answered at Level 2 the case will be referred back to the investigating tutor for sanction/penalty at Level 1; the student will be notified of this outcome in writing.

Level 2: Major Offence Classification		
Criteria	*Indicators*	*Penalties/Sanctions*
Amount/Extent	High percentage from individual source identified by Turnitin A substantial amount of material appears to come from an unauthorised source (e.g., text generated, ghost-written)	Viva voce Fail grade awarded with opportunity to resubmit (cap of 40%) Award bare pass mark (40%)
History	Repeat offence	Fail grade awarded without opportunity to resubmit (re-take module)
Level/Stage	Advanced stage of programme	
Additional Information	No evidence of formative engagement with supports and materials Deliberate attempt by student	

Table 9: Level 2 Academic misconduct Offence Classifications.

LEVEL 3

Student case is referred to the Disciplinary Committee by Programme Director who has completed investigation at Level 2. The student has received notification of this development by the tutor and has not exercised their right to appeal to the Disciplinary Committee.

The Disciplinary Committee reviews all documentation relating to the investigation to date and meets with the investigating Programme Director and Tutor to discuss the case, and based on the evidence available decides whether or not there is a case to be answered at Level 3.

If the Disciplinary Committee decides that yes, there is a case to be answered they will classify the offence as Level 3 (grave) and give a determination of an appropriate sanction/penalty (see below for sanctions/penalties available at Level 3). The Committee will arrange a meeting with the student to reiterate the academic misconduct investigation process, findings and outcome to the student and inform them of the sanction/penalty to be applied, and of their right to appeal any decision to the Academic Council. Following this meeting the Programme Director will notify the student of this

outcome in writing; the student may exercise their right to appeal to the Academic Council at this stage, and will be informed of this in the letter from the Programme Director.

If the Programme Director decides that there is no case of academic misconduct to be answered at Level 3 the case will be referred back to the investigating tutor for sanction/penalty at Level 2; the student will be notified of this outcome in writing.

Level 3: Grave Offence Classification		
Criteria	*Indicators*	*Penalties/Sanctions*
Amount/Extent	High percentage from individual source identified by Turnitin Most of the material appears to come from an unauthorised source (e.g., text generated, ghost-written)	Fail grade awarded without opportunity to resubmit or proceed (defer year) Reduced award classification Expel student with credits Expel student without credits
History	Multiple offences	
Level/Stage	Advanced stage of programme	
Additional Information	Deliberate attempt by student Blatantly plagiarised/sourced in an unauthorised manner material No evidence of formative engagement with supports and materials	

Table 10: Level 3 Academic misconduct Offence Classifications

APPEALS:

At any stage of the Academic Misconduct process a student may appeal to the Disciplinary Committee for the handling of their case/sanctions imposed to be reviewed. Appeals must be made in writing to the chair of the committee within two weeks of correspondence regarding the academic misconduct investigation.

The Disciplinary Committee is an 'ad hoc' subcommittee of the Academic Council, chaired by the Assistant College Director and includes one independent external person and an internal person who has not been involved in the case. The Disciplinary Committee will:

- Review all documentation and evidence arising from the investigation to date

- Review documentation and evidence arising from any previous academic misconduct investigations relating to the student
- Meet with the investigating Tutor/Programme Director as appropriate
- Meet with the student

Following this review the Committee will decide whether or not there is a case to be answered.

If the Disciplinary Committee decides that yes, there is a case to be answered they will classify the offence as Level 1 (minor), Level 2 (major) or Level 3 (grave), and will determine a sanction/penalty according to the level of the offence and will notify the student of this outcome in writing.

If the Disciplinary Committee decides that there is no case of academic misconduct to be answered the student will be notified of this outcome in writing.

A full outline of the Disciplinary Procedure is available to all staff and students and is published in student handbooks.

All decisions of the Disciplinary Committee are noted by Academic Council.

A final report comprising detailed notes on the review by the Committee and its decision will be maintained on the student's file indefinitely.