



---

## Academic Misconduct Procedure

### 1. Purpose

This procedure sets UniHaven's process for dealing with academic misconduct suspicions and cases.

### 2. Roles and Responsibilities

This procedure is relevant to all students and will be implemented by the Programme Manager in conjunction with the Academic Director and Teachers.

### 3. Documentation

UFORM020 Academic Misconduct Form Rev 1 is used to implement this policy.

### 4. Procedure

#### **During the Examination Sitting**

Any member of staff who suspects academic misconduct during assessment under examination conditions must report such suspicions immediately to the Programme Manager (PM). The PM is required to approach the student concerned and ask them to step outside the examination hall. A second invigilator or staff member should be present for this. The PM needs to:

- Confirm the identity of the student and confiscate the student's I.D card temporarily.
- Explain the suspicions and reason for suspicion.
- Note the response of the student.
- Remove any unauthorised material.



- 
- Advise the student of the entitlement to complete the examination and confirm the requirement for the student to report to the Academic Director immediately after the examination concludes.
  - On returning to the hall, the invigilator is required to annotate the script clearly at that point. The student is then permitted to finish the examination.
  - The PM is required to submit a full, written report on the incident to the Academic Director.
  - At the end of the examination, the student concerned must present himself/herself immediately to the Academic Director where s/he will be advised on the next steps in the case of suspected academic misconduct.
  - The student will have their ID card returned at this juncture, along with any personal items not deemed relevant to the investigation.
  - The relevant script is corrected as normal.

### **Suspected Academic Misconduct during Grading of Student Assessment**

Any teacher or examiner who suspects academic misconduct must report such suspicions immediately to the Academic Director. In making such a report the examiner is required to provide:

- A copy of the student submission.
- The mark sheet and feedback for the student based on being marked as normal.
- Copies of all relevant evidence/documentation, supporting this suspicion.
- A completed copy of UFORM020 UniHaven Academic Misconduct Form Rev 1.

This should be done as soon as the academic misconduct is suspected, to allow for appropriate investigatory action and possible disciplinary proceedings in advance of the examinations and/or Exam Boards. Each student is entitled to the presumption of innocence and therefore the assessment must be marked as normal. The grade and feedback will not be released until such a time as the allegation has been investigated and an outcome determined on the balance of probability. Where suspicion arises due to a report from plagiarism detection



---

software, the teacher must first have reviewed and interpreted the report and made an informed judgement on whether it appears academic misconduct may have occurred. Information produced by the plagiarism detection software does not automatically equate to confirmation or evidence of plagiarism. Further guidance can be obtained from the PROGRAMME MANAGER.

### **Procedures in Cases of Suspected Academic Misconduct**

The Programme Manager or nominee reviews the Invigilator's report or the examiner's report and evidence to determine if there is a case of potential academic misconduct or whether it is academic impoverishment. If it is decided that there is an insufficient basis for a charge of academic misconduct, no further action is taken in the matter. If it is decided that there is a case to answer, the Programme Manager will arrange for the student to be advised of the allegation and requested to respond to the evidence and allegation put forward.

#### Investigatory Stage

Each student is entitled to the presumption of innocence and must also be afforded the right of response to any allegations. The student must be contacted and provided with the following:

- Confirmation that an allegation of suspected misconduct has been received.
- The origin of the allegation including the role of the individual making the allegation and the assessment concerned.
- The report and evidence presented to support the allegation.
- A copy of the Academic Misconduct portion of the UPOL015 UniHaven Assessment and Awards Policy Rev 2 or link to it.
- The right to respond.
- The availability of support from the Student Support Officer to help.
- The deadline by which a response must be received in writing.
- Notification that failure to respond will result in the case proceeding anyway.



- 
- A warning that failure to admit any wrongdoing in the investigatory stage may result in more severe penalties should the allegation be proven at a later stage in the proceeding.
  - Notification that penalties for academic misconduct are applied up to and including expulsion from the college with no right to return or entitlement to a refund.

A student should be provided with a minimum of 5 working days to provide their response before any subsequent action is taken.

### Potential Outcomes of the Investigatory Stage

On completion of the investigatory stage, the Programme Manager is required to determine one of the following outcomes on the balance of probability:

- No offence has occurred.
- Admission of the offence by the student.
- Unresolved i.e., the evidence suggests there may be a case to answer but the student has not admitted to any offence, intentional or otherwise.

The student must be notified of the outcome of the investigatory stage, and any associated actions, at the earliest opportunity and not normally more than 10 working days after the response deadline provided to the student. Where the Programme Manager finds that no offence has occurred the matter will be considered concluded and the results will be authorised for release to the student. Where the Programme Manager is dealing with the admission of the offence by the student the following options apply:

- For a first offence, a mark of 0%, the requirement to repeat the assessment, capping the module mark at 40% and capping the award as a pass award will apply. The student will also be obliged to attend and complete a course on Academic Writing and present their confirmation of completion to the Programme Manager within 4 weeks.
- Any instances of a second or subsequent offence will be referred to the Student Disciplinary Committee. Students found to have committed multiple offences of academic misconduct will be subject to serious penalties up to and including



---

withdrawal from the programme, with no entitlement to refund or readmission. To deter students from considering academic misconduct as a low-risk option in cases where they feel failure is likely, in considering the penalty to be imposed the Programme Manager should normally ensure that any penalty is more significant than having made an honest attempt at assessment and failed.

Where the matter is unresolved, the case is referred to the Student Disciplinary Committee. The Student Disciplinary Committee convenes once per academic term and before the meeting of the Exam Board or as required in respect of cases of Academic Misconduct. The Student Disciplinary Committee can be convened at the request of the Programme Manager outside of the regular schedule as required. For full details on the proceedings of the Disciplinary Committee and potential outcomes see UPRO010 Student Complaints and Disciplinary Procedure Rev 1.

## 5. Quality Control

The Academic Director is responsible for ensuring that policies are developed and maintained, that they remain fit for purpose, that they remain in compliance with QQI guidelines, that they are updated as per agreed timetables, and that they are being implemented as intended. In the latter context, the Academic Director will inspect a sample of policies each year to check for the correct implementation and bring the findings to AC as part of the annual QA/QQI review and reporting process.



**APPENDIX**

**UFORM020 UniHaven Academic Misconduct Form Rev 1**

This form is intended to report an incident of suspected academic misconduct that concerns a single student. You should use Form B (Multiple Incidents) where misconduct is suspected in multiple submissions for a single assessment, as this will save duplication of information.

All suspected cases of academic misconduct should be discussed with the Programme Manager and reported to the Academic Director in the first instance. The Academic Director will decide whether the case can be handled at the college level or dealt with formally. Please note that if the case is formally investigated the student(s) will be provided with a copy of this report.

**PART ONE: For completion by the member of staff reporting the incident**

**1. STAFF DETAILS**

<b>Name of staff member reporting the suspected misconduct</b>			
<b>Role (e.g. Teacher / Marker)</b>			
<b>Programme Manager name (if different)</b>		<b>Date</b>	



## 2. STUDENT AND ASSESSMENT DETAILS

<b>Student name</b>	
<b>Student number</b>	
<b>Teacher</b>	
<b>Programme</b>	
<b>Length of time on the programme</b>	
<b>Module affected (Credits)</b>	
<b>Name of the assessment item</b>	
<b>The proportion of course mark (%)</b>	
<b>Convenor of Exam Board</b>	

## 3. FACE VALUE MARK FOR WORK

The Face Value Mark is the mark that is appropriate for the work as submitted **assuming no misconduct has occurred**. It must be expressed as a percentage (e.g., a mark of 16/20 is entered as 80%). Please report the mark **without** the application of any late penalty where these have been applied.

<b>Face Value Mark for work (%)</b>		
<b>Has the Face Value Mark been released to the student?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No



---

#### 4. INCIDENT DETAILS

State below the reasons for suspecting academic misconduct and details of evidence gathered to date. Please include only factual statements: do not speculate on potential motivations for the suspected misconduct. Make an academic judgement and describe both the nature and extent of areas of concern.

- The '*nature*' of issues might include, for example, presence of verbatim or closely paraphrased text, use of unattributed sources, exam misconduct, self-plagiarism, secondary citation, etc.
- The '*extent*' of issues should indicate the proportion of the work affected by potential academic misconduct; for example, the proportion of pages of work affected. Raw similarity scores from plagiarism detection software should not be relied on for this as they constitute evidence only if contextualised.



---

Please provide documents as evidence to support the above comments. These can be provided as attachments or as accessible web links.

- The student's submission annotated or highlighted as appropriate to indicate the content of concern. (e.g., a plagiarism detection software report). [Note: do not use a web link for student submissions]
- Any relevant sources referred to in the statement above; must include sources that are not identified by Turnitin or equivalent software but may also include those which are, if required.
- Any course level material that should be excluded from originality considerations, if applicable.
- Details of specific instructions/advice given to students about Academic Misconduct or good scholarly practice that are relevant to this assessment.

## **5. IMPACT OF SUSPECTED MISCONDUCT ON THE FACE VALUE MARK**



<p>If possible, please estimate the benefit gained from the suspected misconduct. This could be expressed as a fair mark estimate.</p>	
--	--

**CHECK THAT PARTS 1 TO 5 OF THE FORM ARE COMPLETE BEFORE**

**SENDING IT TO THE ACADEMIC MANAGER OR PROGRAMME MANAGER – MISSING INFORMATION CAUSES DELAYS**

**PART TWO: For completion by the Programme Manager**

**6. Manager Details**

<b>Name</b>		<b>Date</b>	
<b>Position</b>			

**7. Programme Manager Decision**



Indicate (☐) which one of the following decisions was made:

<b>Either</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Case was dealt with as poor scholarship	(go to section 8 below)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Case referred to as academic misconduct	(go to section 9 below)
	<input type="checkbox"/> No case to answer	(delete this report and records)

### 8. OUTCOME OF PROGRAMME MANAGER INVESTIGATION OF THE CASE

Indicate (☐) which one of the following actions was taken:

<b>Either</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> The student was given a warning.
	<input type="checkbox"/> The assessment was returned to the marker to determine a mark that fairly reflects the student's own contribution.



---

**9. REFERRAL TO THE ACADEMIC DIRECTOR**

Record all and any Programme Manager comments on the referral, if required.

If preliminary discussions with the student have taken place, please include the outcome of these and attach any appropriate documentation.

If previous warnings were given to the student by the Programme Manager, then please summarise these.



By referring to Academic Director you confirm that

- this case does not meet the criteria allowing the Programme Manager to deal with it.
- you have informed the convenor of the Exam Board.
- you have included all relevant documentation to date, including those items listed in section 4 above and the information.

<b>Quality Assurance Manual (QAM) Chapter 7</b>	
<b>Document Name</b>	<b>Academic Misconduct Procedure</b>
<b>Procedure Document Number</b>	<b>UPRO008</b>
<b>Version Reference</b>	<b>Rev.1</b>
<b>Document Owner</b>	<b>Academic Director</b>
<b>Roles with Aligned Responsibility</b>	<b>All academic staff</b>
<b>Approved By</b>	<b>Academic Council (AC)</b>
<b>Approval Date</b>	<b>2.3.2023</b>
<b>Date Procedure Becomes Active</b>	<b>1.4.2023</b>
<b>Revision Cycle</b>	<b>Annually</b>
<b>Revision History/Amalgamation History</b>	<b>Revised for text errors post programme validation</b>
<b>Additional Information</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>References/ Supporting Documentation</b>	<b>UDOC000 UniHaven Quality Assurance Manual Rev 2 UPOL015 UniHaven Assessment Policy Rev 1</b>