

Academic Integrity in the Assessment Process

6.10 Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure

6.10.1 Introduction

Griffith College promotes and supports learners in their development of academic writing, emphasising the role and value of researching and referencing the work of others as they develop their own views and findings, alongside fostering creative ideation for practical projects. These academic supports create a positive culture around academic integrity and recognise that both critical thinking and creative development are interconnected and focus on the fact that academic integrity is a mind-set and a set of skills, practices, and values to be developed. This includes helping learners to avoid possible situations of academic misconduct.

The College recognises that academic misconduct may arise from a range of factors including misunderstanding of academic conventions, inadequate academic skills development, time pressures, language barriers, misuse of emerging technologies, or deliberate attempts to gain advantage through different types of academic misconduct. Accordingly, the College adopts an educative and proportionate approach to academic integrity, particularly where concerns arise at an early stage of a learner's academic development.

6.10.2 Academic Integrity

The College applies the NAIN definition of Academic integrity as being

“the commitment to, and demonstration of, honest and moral behaviour in an academic setting”⁷.

Academic integrity includes:

“compliance with ethical and professional principles, standards and practices and a consistent system of values, that serves as guidance for making decisions and taking actions in education, research and scholarship”⁸

“Academic integrity is built on honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility including the courage to uphold these values.”⁹

⁷ Writing Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Academic Integrity: [Accessed 18/11/2025] in National Academic Integrity Network (NAIN) (2025) [Academic Integrity: National Principles and Lexicon of Common Terms](#). Dublin: QQI., page 5

⁸ National Academic Integrity Network (NAIN) (2025) [Academic Integrity: National Principles and Lexicon of Common Terms](#). Dublin: QQI., page 14

⁹ National Academic Integrity Network (NAIN) (2025) [Academic Integrity: National Principles and Lexicon of Common Terms](#). Dublin: QQI., page 7

Section F: Assessment of Learners

Each learner is responsible for adopting and maintaining their own academic integrity, underpinned by a commitment to the six values outlined by NAIN which include honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage.

Appropriate guidance, instruction, and support in relation to academic writing, ideation, referencing conventions, collaborative learning boundaries, and the ethical use of artificial intelligence and other technologies in assessment is provided to learners.

Any form of academic misconduct is unacceptable. This policy outlines the different categories of academic misconduct, and the associated means of prevention and detection. It details the penalties associated with levels of academic misconduct and describes the investigation, academic misconduct meeting and the right to appeals procedure associated with cases of academic misconduct. Academic misconduct will in the first instance be the subject of a academic misconduct process within the relevant faculty.

The College is committed to ensuring that all allegations of academic misconduct are considered fairly, consistently, confidentially, and in accordance with the principles of procedural fairness. Any learner subject to an academic misconduct process shall have the opportunity to respond to concerns raised, provide relevant evidence, and avail of the applicable appeals procedures.

6.10.3 Objectives

- To promote a culture of academic integrity through education, learner support, clear guidance, and early intervention strategies.
- To define the terminology and provide the definitions associated with academic integrity and misconduct.
- To, in the first instance, focus on academic integrity rather than misconduct at induction and in all assessment communication with learners.
- To identify the means of promoting and developing learners' academic writing and preventing and detecting academic misconduct.
- To distinguish, where appropriate, between poor academic practice arising from misunderstanding or inexperience, and deliberate or repeated academic misconduct.
- To ensure that all allegations of academic misconduct are managed in a timely, transparent, fair, and consistent manner across all faculties and programmes.
- To identify the means of promoting and developing learners' creative ideation within practical creative modules, while ensuring appropriate processes are in place to prevent and detect academic misconduct in both theoretical and practice-based work.
- To provide academic misconduct procedures applicable to cases of academic misconduct.

Section F: Assessment of Learners

- To ensure that learners suspected of academic misconduct have the right to a fair and impartial determination of the issues concerned, considering any other relevant or appropriate evidence, factors, or circumstances.
- To relate penalties to associated levels of academic misconduct, and to ensure that any resulting penalty arising should be reasonable and proportionate.
- To encourage reflective learning and developmental outcomes where appropriate, particularly in cases involving minor or first-instance breaches.
- To seek to ensure that all guidelines and workshops are conducted with the relevant audience in mind – ensuring that they are presented in plain language, that is jargon free, and accessible to all stakeholders in the process.
- To ensure that the use or misuse of artificial intelligence tools and emerging technologies in assessment are addressed clearly, consistently, and proportionately.

6.10.4 Scope

This policy applies to all forms of assessment, whether conducted in-person, online, synchronous, asynchronous, supervised, unsupervised, individual, or group-based, including assessments involving the use of digital platforms and artificial intelligence technologies.

The College recognises that approaches to assessment and academic misconduct continue to evolve in response to technological developments, sectoral guidance, and emerging academic practices. Accordingly, this policy may be supplemented by operational guidelines, and institutional guidance documents issued from time to time.

This policy should be read in conjunction with the following institutional policies, procedures, and guidance documents:

- i. Assessment Control Principles
- ii. Role and Responsibilities of an Invigilator
- iii. Control Principles for Academic Use of AI
- iv. AI in Learner Assessment Policy

6.10.5 Responsibility for implementation

- Head of Faculty
- Programme Director
- Year Head
- Faculty nominee
- Lecturers
- Learners
- Invigilators and Senior Invigilator
- Senior Examinations Officer
- Director of Academic Programmes
- Faculty Administrator

6.10.6 Definitions of Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct is an act or omission contrary to the College's academic regulations which, if undetected, would confer an unfair advantage on a learner in an assessment, under which a learner's knowledge, skills and performance is measured for progression towards, or for the conferment of, an academic award or a professional qualification. It includes both intentional and unintentional behaviours where such conduct results in, or has the potential to result in, an unfair academic advantage.

Based on the National Academic Integrity Network (NAIN) Lexicon¹⁰, the classifications of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to:

Plagiarism	Plagiarism includes copying or incorporating material derived from pre-existing work (published or unpublished) without the permission of the originator, or without an established form of acknowledgement. It includes verbatim quotation, editing, paraphrasing, imitation or other devices, including the use of generative or AI-assisted tools, use of AI-generated or edited material, which give the impression of the material being a learner's original work. It also includes the exploitation of ideas from others or via AI, without proper acknowledgement or authorisation, which mostly occurs in research, project work or assignments. Plagiarism may occur in any medium, including written, visual, audio, or digital/AI-generated content. For example, plagiarism in film refers to the use or reproduction of another person's script, visuals, audio, or creative ideas without proper acknowledgement or permission, presenting them as original work. It includes copying scenes, dialogue, or stylistic elements in a way that is clearly identifiable.
Collusion	Collusion occurs when a learner submits, without appropriate acknowledgement of source, work that is done in collaboration with another person or AI application. It also occurs when a learner produces work for another learner, or permits another learner to copy all or part of their work, or use that piece in order to generate work via an AI application, knowing that the work will be submitted by the other learner as their own work, other than where such behaviour is expressly permitted in relation to that particular piece of coursework. This includes unauthorised collaboration involving generative AI tools where individual authorship is required. For more information reference the Appendix 32: Guidelines on the Prevention and Detection of Academic Misconduct in Programme work.

¹⁰ National Academic Integrity Network (NAIN) (2025) [Academic Integrity: National Principles and Lexicon of Common Terms](#). Dublin: QQI.

Misrepresentation	Misrepresentation is a statement or conduct in assessment, which intentionally conveys a false or wrong impression of material significance in the context of the work under assessment. Misrepresentation does not include unintentional inaccuracy. It includes the presentation of AI-generated or externally produced content as original work without disclosure where disclosure is required and/or AI use is permitted
Fraud	Fraud is defined as deception, which includes, without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, the invention, distortion, fabrication or falsification of data or other results of research or work of others. It also includes the manipulation or fabrication of outputs produced through digital tools, software, or artificial intelligence systems.
Impersonation	Impersonation is where an individual assumes the identity of another person with the intention of gaining unfair advantage during an examination or any other form of assessment. It also refers to a person who knowingly and willingly allows their identity to be used with the intention of gaining an unfair advantage for the person impersonated.
Cheating	Cheating is the offence of gaining or seeking to gain an unfair or fraudulent advantage in assessment, where the conduct is of such seriousness as to be regarded as major academic misconduct. This includes but is not limited to the use of unauthorised materials, assistance, or technologies during assessed work or examinations.
Unfair Advantage	Unfair Advantage is the offence of gaining or seeking to gain, conferring or seeking to confer, an unfair advantage by any unlawful device or ill practice, including the improper use of AI applications. This includes any behaviour that undermines the integrity, fairness, or validity of assessment outcomes. Examples include obtaining unauthorised assistance from another person, such as a fellow learner, professional practitioner, graduate of the programme, or any third party, paid service or not, to complete or make a substantial contribution to assessed work without explicit permission.
Unauthorised content generation (UCG) / Misuse of AI	Unauthorised content generation is the production of academic work, in whole or part, for assessment, academic credit, progression or award, using unapproved or undeclared human or technological assistance. This includes Artificial Intelligence (AI) assistance. Submission of AI-generated content without explicit permission, and/or without acknowledging the use of AI, is regarded as academic misconduct. Where AI use is permitted, learners are required to follow institutional guidance on appropriate use, transparency, and attribution.

6.10.7 Distinction between Minor, Major and Gross Academic Misconduct

The College recognises that there is a distinction between minor academic misconduct, major academic misconduct and gross academic misconduct as defined below. These distinctions are intended to support proportionate, consistent, and

educationally appropriate responses to academic integrity breaches, in line with institutional policy and sectoral guidance.

Depending on the nature and category of the academic misconduct, the number of prior infringements, and the seriousness of the breach, a learner may be found to have committed minor academic misconduct, major academic misconduct, or gross academic misconduct irrespective of any prior findings; accordingly, a determination of major or gross academic misconduct may be made without a preceding finding of minor or major academic misconduct where the severity of the offence so warrants as outlined below.

Minor Academic Misconduct	Minor Academic Misconduct refers to plagiarism, collusion, unfair advantage, and unauthorised content generation/misuse of AI arising from negligence rather than deliberate intent. It generally reflects poor academic practice, misunderstanding of academic conventions, or insufficient engagement with academic integrity guidance rather than intentional deception. A “first time” instance may include cases where there is knowledge of previous poor academic practice, provided the learner does not have a formal record of a previous academic misconduct finding. A “second time” instance arises where a learner commits a further act of minor academic misconduct having been formally notified of a previous finding of minor academic misconduct. In determining whether an incident constitutes a second instance, it will be considered whether the learner had a reasonable opportunity to understand and apply the academic integrity guidance and educational interventions (training) provided following the first infringement.
----------------------------------	---

Major Academic Misconduct	Major Academic Misconduct refers to deliberate cases of plagiarism, collusion, unfair advantage (except for when this encompasses the majority of the submitted work, which is considered Gross Academic Misconduct), and/or unauthorised content generation/misuse of AI (even those occurring for the first time, especially where the learning outcomes of the assessment are being undermined) and all cases of misrepresentation, fraud, impersonation (except for impersonation at a formal examination, which is considered Gross Academic Misconduct) and cheating. It also includes repeated instances of minor academic misconduct where prior warnings and/or interventions have not resulted in behavioural change.
Gross Academic Misconduct	Gross Academic Misconduct refers to particular instances of Academic Misconduct for which the only appropriate penalty is immediate expulsion or a third instance of major academic misconduct. Such cases are considered exceptional and involve clear, deliberate, and significant breaches of academic integrity that fundamentally undermine the validity of assessment outcomes or the reputation of the College. The college's Academic and Professional Council have identified these incidents as: • Impersonation at a Formal Examination: Both the learner being impersonated and the person doing the impersonation, if that person is a registered learner at Griffith College, will be charged with Gross Academic Misconduct. • A learner submitting an undergraduate project/ dissertation or a postgraduate project/ dissertation, where the major portion of the work, code or documentation, is directly taken from another source including an AI application, will be charged with Gross Academic Misconduct. Where "major portion" is assessed, this will be determined with reference to the overall contribution, originality, and authorship of the submitted work. • A learner submitting assessed work, where the major portion of the work, code or documentation, fits the definition of unfair advantage, or has been AI generated, whether it is paid for or not, and presented as the learner's own work, will be charged with Gross Academic Misconduct. • Any learner soliciting on behalf of a professional service which creates academic work for submission, or alleged to have referred another learner to such a service, will be charged with Gross Academic Misconduct. Where

	allegations arise, supporting evidence will be considered in accordance with procedural fairness. For the incidents listed above, a learner can be investigated directly for Gross Academic Misconduct without having to progress through Minor and Major misconduct first. Each case will be assessed on its individual merits, considering context, evidence, intent, proportionality, and relevant mitigating or aggravating factors.
--	---

6.10.7 Retroactive Investigations into Academic Misconduct

The College is committed to upholding the integrity of its academic awards and ensuring that all assessments are conducted in accordance with the highest standards of academic honesty in respect to each individual learner.

In accordance with QQI (Quality and Qualifications Ireland) requirements and the associated principles of academic integrity and quality assurance, the College ensures that all procedures relating to academic misconduct are applied consistently, fairly, and in a manner that protects the integrity, validity, and credibility of Griffith College programmes/courses including QQI-validated awards at all times.

To safeguard these standards, the College reserves the right to retroactively investigate any possible academic misconduct where there is a reasonable concern or allegation of academic misconduct. This includes concerns arising at any point during a learner's programme of study and, where appropriate, after the completion of a programme and the conferment of an award. Investigations may be initiated, continued, or reopened where new information or evidence becomes available that may be relevant to a previously considered matter. If this happens in the course of a current academic misconduct investigation, the retroactive cases will be considered as part of the current investigation and not as separate cases for the purposes of a cumulative misconduct designations.

The College may retroactively investigate academic misconduct concerns in relation to:

- i. All summative and formative assessments completed by a learner during the course of their studies with the College, including but not limited to examinations, assignments, dissertations, projects, presentations, and online assessments.
- ii. Any assessment or piece of work that has previously been the subject of an academic misconduct investigation, where new evidence, information, or technological capability becomes available that was not considered, sufficiently or at all, at the time of the original determination or which places earlier considerations or findings in a new evidential light.

- iii. Any assessment where concerns arise during the learner's programme or after completion of studies, including where the award has already been conferred.
- iv. Any instance where credible information suggests that academic misconduct may have occurred, regardless of when the assessment was submitted or when the concern comes to light.

The College reserves the right to investigate allegations of academic misconduct even after a learner has graduated and an award has been conferred. Where such an investigation determines that academic misconduct occurred and that the integrity of the award has been compromised, the College may take appropriate action, which may include the amendment, suspension, or revocation of the academic award in accordance with the College's regulations and applicable awarding body requirements.

6.10.8 Standard of Proof

Having regard to the gravity of the matter for decision, a learner is deemed to have committed one of the forms of academic misconduct defined in sub-section 6.10.5 of this document, in circumstances where the adjudicating body is satisfied that the charge is proven, on the balance of probabilities, based on an assessment of the evidence before it, and in accordance with the principles of fair procedures.

This standard requires that the decision-maker is satisfied that it is more likely than not that the alleged academic misconduct occurred, having considered all available evidence fairly and impartially.

6.10.9 Prevention of Academic Misconduct at College Level

The college is committed to putting measures in place, which aim to support and promote academic integrity by preventing instances of academic misconduct. This approach reflects an educative and preventative model aligned with national and sectoral academic integrity principles, including NAIN guidance. To ensure that all learners are aware of how academic misconduct could occur, and the seriousness and potential consequences thereof, the college: will seek to:

- Provide an explanation of academic integrity and include a summary of this policy (i.e. the definitions and penalties for academic misconduct) in the Learner Handbook and post the full policy to the VLE and college website.
- Require learners to sign a registration form which indicates that they are bound by the regulations identified in the Learner Handbook and as updated on the VLE and college website.
- Ensure that the importance of academic integrity is presented to all learners in advance of assignment submission, and that learners are informed as to what constitutes academic misconduct, and what the associated penalties are.

Section F: Assessment of Learners

- Post notices in locations such as outside examination locations, on learner noticeboards, on the VLE and college website indicating inappropriate conduct during examinations.
- Ensure that information provided to learners on academic integrity (and misconduct) and the QAE Manual is also made available to college staff through the Lecturer Handbook and college website.

6.10.10 Prevention of Academic Misconduct at College Level

In order to ensure that all learners are aware of the nature and seriousness of academic misconduct and the consequences thereof, the Programme Director, Head of Faculty, Year Head and/or Faculty nominee will:

- i. Reference this policy in all programme handbooks issued to learners.
- ii. Make specific reference to this policy in programme documents relating to learner assessment.
- iii. Ensure that academic integrity is presented to all learners at the commencement of and throughout the academic year (in a plain language, jargon free, accessible manner), with explicit reference to emerging issues such as generative artificial intelligence and digital authorship expectations.
- iv. Ensure that learners are informed as to what constitutes academic misconduct, and what the associated penalties are.
- v. Provide learners with academic workshops on good academic practice, to endeavour to prevent academic misconduct, prior to issuing the first piece of assessment to include:
 - An overview of this policy
 - Guidelines on proper use of academic referencing
 - Guidelines on appropriate use of online resources
 - The College, Faculty and Programme regulations pertaining to coursework submission
 - An introduction to the College's regulations pertaining to conduct under examination conditions
 - Guidance on the ethical and authorised use of artificial intelligence tools in academic work
- vi. Reinforce the content of the academic workshop and the importance of academic integrity throughout the academic year, to set (and reset) these expectations.
- vii. Implement a progressive programme for supporting academic integrity by helping learners to select appropriate sources and to use them correctly, including citing and referencing.
- viii. Require learners to submit all coursework with the prescribed cover sheet, which includes a signed declaration that the submission is exclusively a result of their own work, unless otherwise permitted by the

programme regulations. This declaration includes confirmation of compliance with AI use and authorship requirements where applicable.

- ix. Require learners to make available a hard and soft copy of their coursework where it is considered necessary to assist in the detection of suspected cases of academic misconduct.
- x. Ensure that information provided to learners on academic integrity (and misconduct) is similarly made available to the faculty team through faculty meetings and programme committee meetings, the Lecturer Handbook and college website (QAE manual).

6.10.11 Learner Right of Attendance at an Academic Misconduct meeting

At all times, in communicating with the learner around the suspected academic misconduct, the college staff involved in the specific process reminds the learner of their rights:

- i. A learner who is the subject of academic misconduct proceedings is entitled prior to the academic misconduct meeting, to a clear statement of the alleged academic misconduct.
- ii. A learner who is the subject of academic misconduct proceedings has the right:
 - To attend
 - To be accompanied by a support person
 - To request (no less than three days in advance of the academic misconduct meeting) sight of evidence to be presented at the relevant meeting
 - To hear and see the evidence presented, and
 - To present their own evidence
 - To call witnesses to the academic misconduct meeting, at the discretion of the panel, within no less than three working days' notice and their contact details to be provided before the meeting
 - To seek an adjournment of a meeting for extenuating circumstances no less than three days in advance of the meeting unless an emergency
 - To counselling and other pastoral supports available to learners throughout the investigation and possible academic misconduct process
- iii. All proceedings will be conducted in accordance with principles of procedural fairness, and consistency of application.
- iv. An accompanying support person at an academic misconduct meeting may be a fellow learner, a relative, a friend or an adviser.

Section F: Assessment of Learners

- v. An accompanying support person is not entitled to speak on behalf of the learner, albeit may at the discretion of the academic misconduct panel be invited to contribute to the meeting.
- vi. A learner may choose to be accompanied by a translator. Any costs associated with the appointment of a translator by the learner (other than one provided by the college) must be borne by the learner, unless the College so otherwise determines.
- vii. A learner who chooses to attend without an accompanying support person will be requested to confirm in writing that they have been informed of their right to be accompanied and have declined to exercise it.
- viii. Where a learner fails to attend the meeting, and has not requested to reschedule, the meeting may proceed in the absence of the learner, provided that the College is satisfied that appropriate notice has been given and that proceeding in absence is fair and reasonable in the circumstances.
- ix. Following the determination of the academic misconduct meeting the learner has the right to appeal the outcome of any academic misconduct meeting in relation to suspected academic misconduct

6.10.12 Academic Misconduct Process

The following sub-sections describe the process which takes place when a complainant suspects that a learner has committed one of the forms of academic misconduct, defined in sub-section 6.10.6 of this document, in a piece of coursework and/or examination. All stages of the process will be conducted in line with principles of proportionality, fairness, and consistency, and will take account of both mitigating and aggravating factors where relevant.

Please see [Appendix 26: Academic Misconduct Classification Flowchart](#).

6.10.12.1 Coursework

- i. A complainant who suspects a case of Academic Misconduct gathers all available information and/or documentation about the incident and refers the case(s) to their faculty nominee who is responsible to consider and manage the case. This is typically a Programme Director or specific staff member assigned to consider academic misconduct cases. The faculty nominee reviews all information and/or documentation available. If the faculty nominee determines that there is no case to answer the incident is closed and no formal records are kept. In the case where the complainant is also the faculty nominee, the case goes to the Programme Director (if not the faculty nominee) or another designated member of the faculty/programme team.

- ii. Where no case is found, informal feedback or guidance may still be provided to support the learner's academic development where appropriate, however no mandated penalties are enforced.
- iii. The college also supports the appropriate use of a viva voce (henceforth referred to as a "viva") as a method of determining whether suspected academic misconduct has taken place. A viva may, exceptionally, be held to inform the academic misconduct process, as appropriate. The process for conducting the viva is outlined in [Appendix 25](#). The findings of the viva panel will be considered by the faculty nominee when determining if there is a case to be answered.
- iv. The use of a viva is intended as an evidential and clarificatory mechanism and not as a punitive measure.
- v. If the faculty nominee determines that there is a case to be answered, the learner will be invited to a formal academic misconduct meeting following the procedure outlined in sub-section 6.10.13 Conducting Academic Misconduct Meetings.

6.10.12.2 Examinations

The following sub-section describes the process, which takes place when a complainant suspects that a learner has committed one of the forms of academic misconduct defined in sub-section 6.10.6 of this document, under examination conditions.

- i. Where a member of staff, who is invigilating or otherwise overseeing an examination, assessment or supervised test carried out under examination conditions, has reasonable grounds to suspect that academic misconduct has occurred, or is occurring, or is reliably informed that academic misconduct is suspected, it is the responsibility of the complainant to:
 - Immediately bring to the learner's attention the suspicion of academic misconduct.
 - Ensure that the learner is prevented from further acts of academic misconduct of which they are suspected by confiscating any relevant documentation and in the case of an examination any materials or resources brought into the exam centre.
 - Permit the learner to complete the examination or assessment.
- ii. Inform the Senior Invigilator and provide a statement of the circumstances relating to the incident - including a note of the work completed before the detection of the alleged academic misconduct and the time that the alleged academic misconduct was detected - for inclusion in the Senior Invigilator's Report. This is sent to the Senior Examinations Officer at the end of the examination.

- iii. The Senior Examinations Officer will discuss the incident with the complainant, gather all available information and/or documentation about the incident, and refer the case to the appropriate Programme Director, Head of Faculty, Year Head and/or Faculty nominee.
- iv. If an item to be confiscated is something other than documentation e.g. a mobile phone, programmed calculator etc. the invigilator refers this to the Senior Examinations Officer. The Senior Examinations Officer documents how the item could have contributed to the alleged academic misconduct, sign the document and ask the invigilator to co-sign the document. The item in question is normally returned to the learner at the end of the examination.
- v. The faculty nominee will discuss the suspected case of academic misconduct with the Senior Examinations Officer and, if necessary, with the complainant and review all information and/or documentation available. The faculty nominee will make a determination as to whether they consider that the suspected breach of academic conduct can be substantiated.
- vi. Where the Programme Director, Head of Faculty, Year Head and/or Faculty nominee determines that the suspected case of academic misconduct cannot be substantiated, no further action is taken, and no record is retained. In addition, the first marker is asked to mark the learner's examination script(s) on its own merit, and without prejudice.
- vii. Should the suspected academic misconduct be assessed by the faculty nominee as a potential breach of academic conduct, the procedure for academic misconduct meetings will be followed.

6.10.12.3 Multiple Assessment Submissions

Should a learner complete and submit a number of pieces of coursework, and in respect of more than one of which academic misconduct as defined in sub-section 6.10.6, is alleged to apply, the faculty nominee has the discretion to treat all incidents of academic misconduct as individual incidents of academic misconduct or as a single incident of academic misconduct. In general, if this is the learner's first offence of minor academic misconduct, all instances will be treated as one incident of academic misconduct. In the case where the learner has progressed from minor to major academic misconduct, the faculty/programme team can opt to treat each instance as a separate incident.

6.10.13 Conducting Academic Misconduct Meetings

- i. If the faculty nominee determines that there is a case to be answered, a statement summarising the alleged academic misconduct will be prepared and sent to the learner summoning the learner to an academic misconduct meeting to answer the allegation of academic misconduct. This statement also identifies:

- the learner's rights as set out in section 6.9.11 above

- informs the learner that they will be requested at the academic misconduct meeting to confirm whether they have received sufficient notice of the meeting, that they have read and understood their rights as detailed to them and to confirm their intentions in relation to the exercise of these rights.
 - The academic misconduct meeting is held no less than 5 working days from the date of the notice to the learner unless the learner agrees to a shorter period.
- ii. The hearing of an academic misconduct meeting is attended by the faculty nominee, the complainant or a second academic staff member, any expert the faculty nominee wishes to participate on the day, the learner and the learner's representative where the right of representation is exercised. The members of staff in attendance at the meeting will determine the outcome of the investigation.
 - iii. If the Faculty nominee is the complainant, another member of the Faculty/Programme team or another Faculty Programme Director, Head of Faculty, Year Head and/or Faculty nominee can adjudicate at the academic misconduct meeting.
 - iv. Should the suspected academic misconduct be properly defined as Gross Academic Misconduct, two further members from outside the faculty team will adjudicate the case together with Faculty nominee.
 - v. At the commencement of the academic misconduct meeting the faculty nominee requests the learner to confirm the position as regards notice of the meeting and the learner's rights as referred to in section 6.9.10 above and will offer the learner an adjournment of no less than 5 working days in the event that the learner requires this for the purposes of further consideration of the exercise of their rights.
 - vi. If having regard to the evidence presented at the academic misconduct meeting and the submissions made by or on behalf of the learner, the faculty nominee considers that a case of academic misconduct has been proven, they will notify the decision to the learner in writing and the notification will state:
 - That a finding of academic misconduct has been made
 - The penalty which is to be imposed
 - The learner's right of appeal
 - The period (5 working days) within which an appeal (if any) may be lodged by or on behalf of the learner. Please see the [Appeals Procedure](#).

6.10.14 Application of Penalties

The penalty applicable to confirmed cases of academic misconduct is determined by whether the incident constitutes a first or subsequent case of minor or major academic misconduct, or gross academic misconduct. The gradation of penalties aims to ensure that a consistent approach is adopted across all academic programmes.

6.10.14.1 Minor Academic Misconduct

There are two instances of Minor Academic Misconduct recognised in this policy:

- those which occur for the first time, and
- those which occur for the second time in the knowledge of the first infringement.

A third or further minor academic infringement in the knowledge of the second infringement is deemed to be major academic misconduct. Escalation will be considered where prior educational interventions have not resulted in demonstrable improvement.

- i. Penalty for Minor Academic Misconduct, which has taken place for the first time:
 - In cases where a portion of the assessment is determined to have resulted from academic misconduct, the assessment will be graded excluding those portions.
 - In cases where the majority of the assessment is determined to have resulted from academic misconduct, or where grading the partial assessment results in a fail, the learner must resubmit the entire assessment within a prescribed timeframe. Faculties/Programme teams have discretion on the timeframe and may opt to have learners resubmit within the same assessment period or repeat the assessment at the next available sitting. Consideration should be given to allow learners adequate time to complete any re-assessment.
 - The mark awarded for the repeat assessment is capped at the pass mark.
 - If the learner does not resubmit the assessment within the prescribed timeframe, they will receive a fail grade for the assessment.
 - A record of the offence is placed on the learner's file and is removed on programme completion
 - The learner is required to attend mandatory Academic Integrity Training.
- ii. Penalty for Minor Academic Misconduct, which has taken place for the second time:
 - The learner is given zero for the entire piece of assessed coursework.¹¹

¹¹ Where a learner is awarded a zero mark for an assessment as a result of an academic misconduct determination, this will be recorded on the learner's academic record and transcript as 1%. This convention is applied for administrative and system-recording purposes only and does not alter the substantive outcome of a fail/zero grade classification.

Section F: Assessment of Learners

- The learner must resubmit the entire piece of coursework. The total mark in respect of all coursework in the related module(s) is capped at a pass mark.
- If the learner does not resubmit the piece of coursework within the prescribed timeframe they receive a fail result for the entire piece of coursework.
- A record of the offence is placed on the learner's file and is removed on programme completion.
- The learner is required to attend mandatory Academic Integrity Training.

6.10.14.2 Major Academic Misconduct

There is one instance of Major Academic Misconduct recognised in this policy:

- that which occurs for the first time, or is the result of 3 minor academic misconduct incidents

A second or further major academic infringement in the knowledge of the first infringement is deemed to be gross academic misconduct. Escalation will be considered where prior educational interventions have not resulted in demonstrable improvement.

- i. Penalty for Major Academic Misconduct, which has taken place for the first time:
 - The learner is given zero for all assessment elements of the module (coursework and examination).¹²
 - The learner is registered for a another sitting on the module and their total results arising from this sitting is capped at a pass mark.
 - A record of the offence is placed on the learner's file and is removed on programme completion should this be the only case of major academic misconduct committed.
 - The learner is required to attend mandatory Academic Integrity Training.

6.10.14.3 Gross Academic Misconduct

Gross Academic Misconduct includes any offence classified as Gross Academic Misconduct or the result of a second major academic misconduct.

- ii. Penalty for Gross Academic Misconduct:
 - The learner is expelled from the College and is not permitted to re-enrol for a period of five years.

¹² Where a learner is awarded a zero mark for an assessment as a result of an academic misconduct determination, this will be recorded on the learner's academic record and transcript as 1%. This convention is applied for administrative and system-recording purposes only and does not alter the substantive outcome of a fail/zero grade classification.

Section F: Assessment of Learners

- A permanent record of the offence is placed on the learner's file.

6.10.14.4 Subsequent findings of academic misconduct

In cases where a learner has a record of major academic misconduct, and then subsequently has a further finding of academic misconduct that is due to negligence rather than intent, the faculty/programme team can determine a finding of minor academic misconduct without progressing to the next classification.

For example, a learner is determined to have used AI to generate a large portion of an assignment and receives a major academic misconduct. They subsequently submit an assignment, where they miss several citations but have otherwise completed the work themselves. In this case, a determination of minor academic misconduct can be made, without progressing to a second major academic misconduct.

6.10.15 Appeals

A learner wishing to appeal against a finding of academic misconduct or penalty of such finding may do so by invoking the [College's Appeals Procedure](#).

6.10.16 Records and Follow Up

All allegations of academic misconduct are managed and progressed by the relevant Faculty/Programme teams in accordance with the procedures outlined in this policy.

Individual cases are recorded as identified in section 6.10.13 (iv).

The Faculty is responsible for ensuring that the outcome of the academic misconduct process is accurately recorded. This includes updating the learner's record on the College learner information system (Themis), recording the classification of the misconduct and the associated outcome, and ensuring that any amendment to grades arising from the decision is processed and reflected on the learner's academic record.

A record of all confirmed instances of academic misconduct is maintained by the Faculty team to provide an accurate institutional record and to support the determination of appropriate outcomes in the event of subsequent incidents.

Where a sanction requires that a record of academic misconduct be retained for a specified period or removed upon programme completion, the Faculty team shall ensure that such action is undertaken in accordance with the decision of the academic misconduct process, the requirements of this policy, the College's record retention schedule and GDPR requirements.

6.10.17 Confidentiality

Where the College is satisfied at any stage within these procedures that academic misconduct has not taken place, no documentation relating to the alleged misconduct and the associated investigations is retained in the learner's file except as required by law or court order.

Where an incident relates to minor academic misconduct, or first time major academic misconduct, no documentation is retained on the learner's file following the completion of their programme of study, and the incident is not referred to in any personal reference provided by the College.
