

Policy Identifier:

Policy Title:	Academic Integrity Procedure
Description:	Procedure for Responding to Suspicions of or Confirmed Breaches of Academic Integrity Among Students.
Author (Position):	Registrar and Vice President (Academic Affairs)
Version:	2
Approved By:	Governing Body
Policy Approval Date:	May 2024
Date of Next Policy Review:	June 2027 (or as required)

Revision History		
Previous Version no.	Summary of Amendments <i>Inc. date of approval of the update</i>	Reviewed Version no.
1	Appendix 3: minor change to the length of viva voce, approved by Quality Committee, April 2025	1.1
1.1	Updated to reflect changes for Academic Integrity guidelines, approved by Quality Committee May 2025	2

Academic Integrity Procedure

1. Context

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

2. Purpose

This procedure is designed to support the Academic Integrity Policy by outlining a process to follow when suspicions of or confirmed breaches of academic integrity arise.

3. Scope

This procedure applies to all registered MIE students at undergraduate and postgraduate level. Where a breach of academic integrity by a staff member is suspected or confirmed, the Staff Disciplinary Policy will be invoked.

4. Procedure

4.1 In general, students will be asked to acknowledge supports used while completing an assignment. Appendix 1 to this procedure provides a template which can be used for this purpose and Appendix 2 provides an example of a completed template.

4.2 Any suspected breach of academic integrity should be fully investigated. AI scanners should not be used to make decisions about breaches of academic integrity until further notice. A lecturer may become suspicious for several reasons, for example:

- Work that is submitted is identical to or similar to other work that was submitted by the student (self-plagiarism) in the past or present.
- Work that is submitted is identical to or similar to work that was submitted by other students in the past or present.
- They recognise the work from a familiar source (e.g. a published article, book or website).
- The style differs from the student's usual work.
- References cited do not exist or are difficult to access.
- A high level of plagiarism has been detected by plagiarism-detecting software.
- Metadata in the assignment document contains anomalous information.

Policy Identifier:

- Content is not related to the assigned topic.

4.3 The lecturer sets up an initial meeting, face-to-face or online, with the student to discuss their concern. The discussion should take into consideration the criteria for classifying breaches of academic integrity used in the Academic Integrity Calculation Tool in Maestro, outlined in Table 1, page 6-10 i.e. the:

- Level of programme
- Stage of programme
- Extent of breach (i.e. the amount of work that is deemed not to be original or acknowledged as being created by someone else)
- Student acknowledgement of academic misconduct.
- Number of previous offences
- Available evidence
- Student intent
- Mitigating/extenuating circumstances.

4.4 If the lecturer determines as a result of the meeting that no breach of academic integrity has occurred, no further action is taken, and nothing is recorded on the student's record. The student is notified of this by the lecturer.

4.5 If, before or during the meeting, the student admits that a breach of academic integrity has taken place, the lecturer uses the Tool for Academic Integrity Calculation on Maestro to estimate the extent of the suspected breach (see Table 1, pages 6-10).

The Tool assigns points against each of eight criteria, which in turn allow the calculation of the level of the breach – Minor, Moderate, Serious and Very Serious¹. When the level of the breach has been determined, the appropriate sanctions and supports to be applied are determined using Table 2 (page 11-12).

Minor or moderate breaches are dealt with by the lecturer at local level, who selects an appropriate outcome from the Supports and Sanctions Table 2, page 10. The student is notified of the outcome of the meeting, the level of severity identified and of the

¹ Minor breach = 5 to 12 points; Moderate breach = 13 to 24 points; Serious breach = 25 to 36 points; Very Serious breach = 37 to 48 points.

Policy Identifier:

sanction/s or supports that are being applied. This is recorded on the student's record on Maestro even though the decision is made at local level.

- 4.6 If, after the initial meeting, the lecturer continues to have suspicions of an alleged breach of academic integrity, the lecturer may hold a viva voce assessment with the student(s) involved (see Appendix 3 for details about the conduct of the viva voce). Alternatively, if a student is not in agreement with the decision made by the lecturer in relation to a breach of academic integrity, the student may request the holding of a formal viva voce. Following the viva voce assessment, the lecturer uses the Academic Integrity Calculation Tool on Maestro to estimate a value for the extent of the suspected breach, as outlined in section 4.5

Minor or moderate breaches are dealt with by the lecturer at local level, who selects an appropriate outcome from the "Supports and Sanctions" menu below (Table 2, page 10) and notifies the student. The proposed outcome may be appealed by the student or their Tutor to the Registrar. The outcome and chosen support or sanction is submitted to the Registrar's Office to be noted on the student's record.

- 4.7 Where the breach is potentially Serious or Very Serious, an appropriate outcome is selected by the lecturer in consultation with the Registrar or the Registrar's nominee from among the available supports and sanctions (see Table 2).

The Registrar's Office will then set up a meeting with the student, their tutor (or other representative, such as a Student Union member), the module lecturer, the course leader and the Registrar/Assistant Registrar or their nominee. The purpose of this meeting is to convey to the student the decision that has been reached in relation to the breach of academic integrity, the consequence of the decision and guidance as to the next steps the student needs to take. Where a proposed sanction is grave in nature (e.g. expulsion from the Institute or withdrawal of an award), legal advice may be sought before communicating the outcome to the student. A record of the meeting is kept by either a member of the Registrar's Office or the Education Office. Informal meetings about breaches of academic integrity may take place at any time a lecturer has concerns about submitted work, subject to the usual records retention policy.

Policy Identifier:

- 4.8 The decision may be appealed, within seven working days of receipt of decision, by the student (with the support of their tutor) to a subcommittee of the Academic Council. The appeal should be presented to the Assistant Registrar (as secretary of the Academic Council). A sub-committee of three members will be established by the President (who chairs Academic Council) one of whom will be a student and one of whom will be a lecturer. The grounds for appeal will be that (a) there was a breach of the Policy on Academic Integrity in how the case was handled or (b) there was a breach of this Procedure in how the case was handled or (c) bias was shown in the process of arriving at the original decision. The subcommittee may decide to uphold the decision of the lecturer/registrar's office, assign an alternative consequence without meeting the student or to repeat the evaluation process,(i.e. involving a viva voce with the student) with a course leader, a Dean or a Vice President who was not involved in the original evaluation/decision.
- 4.9 In all circumstances where a breach of academic integrity is found to have occurred, a record of the breach is kept for 13 months following the final programme Court of Examiners at which a student's award marks have been considered. Where a student is found to have a breach that is serious or very serious, the record will remain on their file indefinitely. However, there is no time limit on when a suspected breach of academic integrity can be investigated.

5 Responsibility

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

6 Related Documents

MIE Academic Integrity Policy

[MIE Staff Disciplinary Policy](#)

MIE [Disciplinary Procedures in Respect of Students](#)

Policy Identifier:

Table 1: Points are assigned as follows against the eight criteria below, and the total number of points accumulated is used to determine the level of the breach::

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

Level of programme

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

Stage of programme

Points range 1 - 5	1-2	3-4.5	5
Stage of programme	First quarter of programme, where marks do not contribute to award grade.	After first quarter and in first half of course where marks do not contribute to award grade.	Stage of course where marks contribute towards award grade.

Policy Identifier:

Extent of breach

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

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

Student acknowledgement

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

Policy Identifier:

Number of previous offences

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

Available evidence

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

Policy Identifier:

Student Intent

Points range 1 – 5	1-2	3-4	5
Category	Minor	Moderate	Serious
Student Intent	<p>Students working as a group and the same work is submitted by more than one student.</p> <p>Poor citation.</p> <p>Student did not know how to acknowledge work taken from a large language model.</p>	<p>Self-plagiarism.</p> <p>Used material from a large language model in a module where it was not permitted.</p>	<p>Take work of a previous student (or another person) or pay someone to do work and submit it as their own.</p> <p>Submit work from a large-language model as their own work with no acknowledgement.</p>

Mitigating/extenuating circumstances

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

Policy Identifier:

	student did not know that self-plagiarism is an offence.	accomplice to plagiarism by another student.	
--	--	--	--

Policy Identifier:

Table 2: Sanctions and Supports

The following table provides a list of the potential sanctions and supports that may be applied. In practically all cases, a student will be required to take an online course. Other than in trivial cases (e.g. inadvertent plagiarism) at least one additional sanction will be applied based on the calculated score (including stage of programme, extent of offence and previous offences). More than one may be used. In all cases a record of the breach of academic integrity will be kept on Maestro. This list will be updated on an ongoing basis.

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

Policy Identifier:

Minor (5 – 12)	Moderate (13 – 24)	Serious (25 – 36)	Very Serious (37 – 48)
	<p>the student's overall mark for the assessment is a failing one).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student is asked to resubmit work for next examination session (i.e. supplemental or annual) with a cap of 40% on the mark. 	<p>with a cap of 40% on the module (in the case of modules with more than one assessment component)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student disciplinary procedures* is instituted in the case. 	

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

Policy Identifier:

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

Sample completed templates are included below.

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

Policy Identifier:

Other			

Policy Identifier:

Appendix 2 Examples of Completed Templates:

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

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

Policy Identifier:

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

Policy Identifier:

Appendix 3: Guidelines for conducting a viva voce examination

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

- Viva Voce assessments are held if a student needs to satisfy an assessor that the student is ready for placement or to determine whether the student has attained the learning outcomes of a particular module or programme. Alternatively, a viva voce may take place if a student's performance in an assessment raises questions about the integrity of the work done.
- A student should be given at least 48 hours' notice of a viva voce assessment. The student should be told what the purpose of the viva voce is (e.g. to assess their knowledge of the module learning outcomes or to investigate a suspicion of a breach of academic integrity).
- The student should be told why they are being assessed orally and informed about the format the oral examination will take.
- The criteria for assessment should be as close as possible to the criteria for a written assessment and should be communicated to the student along with the invitation to attend the viva voce.
- A viva voce will typically last between 10 and 20 minutes.
- The viva voce should be conducted in person.
- Where a possible academic integrity breach relates to a final-year dissertation, two academics should be present at the viva voce.
- If it is for a supplemental examination, two examiners should be present (at least one of whom should be the same sex as the student) and each marker should mark the student independently. Only one of the examiners will ask questions of the student at a time and this will typically be the module lecturer. Following the assessment the assessors compare marks and agree a final mark. If a mark cannot be agreed, each assessor writes a report and the relevant Dean attempts to reconcile the reports, with reference to the external examiner if necessary. If a mark can still not be agreed, in exceptional circumstances, the student might be invited back for a second viva voce assessment.
- A set of questions should be compiled in advance of the viva voce. The first few questions should be designed to put the student at ease. Where relevant, an early question should ask the student how they went about doing the work in as much

Policy Identifier:

detail as is relevant. Subsequently, the complexity of questions can be graded so that the most difficult questions will be asked only if a student successfully answers less difficult/searching questions.

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