School of Computer Science: Academic Integrity Policy & Procedures

This document should be read in conjunction with UCD's [Academic Integrity Policy](#) and the [Student Academic Misconduct Procedure](#) as well as the relevant sections of UCD's [Student Code of Conduct](#).

According to the UCD Academic Integrity Policy, **academic misconduct** (also known as academic dishonesty or academic malpractice) "is any attempt by someone to seek unfair advantage in relation to [an] academic activity or which facilitates others to gain an unfair advantage, or to profit from the sharing or selling of your own or others' work without permission". Examples of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to:

- **Plagiarism** (presenting work/ideas taken from other sources without proper acknowledgement)
- **Contract cheating** (using someone else to do your work, whether for pay or not)
- **Collusion** (undisclosed collaboration which is not permitted in the assignment / task)
- **Facilitating academic dishonesty** (helping another student to obtain an unfair academic advantage)
- **Inappropriately using digital or information technology**
- **Inappropriately publishing, uploading or sharing an assessment**
- **Inappropriately publishing or uploading University teaching or course material**
- **Impersonation** (pretending to be another student on an assignment or in an exam)
- **Copying or cheating in written examinations**
- **Advertising cheating services or publishing advertisements for cheating services**

If a module coordinator suspects academic misconduct in (or associated with) work submitted by a student or students:

1. The module coordinator will exercise their judgement in deciding whether the incident will be dealt with directly, or referred to the School Academic Integrity Committee (SAIC) for consideration. Incidents that are deemed to be minor infringements or evidence of poor academic practice are likely to be characterised by some or all of the following:

- Apparent unintended misuse of source materials;
- Inadequate citation such as poor referencing or inappropriate paraphrasing, demonstrating the student's need for further guidance on referencing and citation;
- Over-reliance on sources without sufficient contribution of the student's own work;
- The suspected academic misconduct represents only a small proportion of the work and/or an element in a piece of work which makes a small contribution to the grade for the assessment component.

Such instances of poor academic practice and minor infringements may be reflected in the grade awarded by the module coordinator using an appropriate grade from the Component Grading Scale.

However, where a module coordinator decides to refer the incident to the SAIC:

2. The submission(s) should be marked (or graded, as appropriate) as normal and the matter then referred to the SAIC. The module coordinator contacts the SAIC with full details of the incident e.g. students' names, stages, programmes, and student numbers; the module and the assessment component; the nature of the academic misconduct; and any evidence supporting the suspicion.

3. The SAIC reviews the material relevant to the alleged academic misconduct and may discuss the matter with the module coordinator. If it determines there is a case to answer, the

SAIC will request an interview with the student(s), usually individually. The student will be provided with the details of the alleged academic misconduct in advance, and should note that this is an investigative meeting **not** a disciplinary hearing.

- The SAIC will try to arrange an interview time/date that suits the student. However, if a student does not make themselves available for interview in a timely manner, the SAIC will normally make a decision in their absence;
- The module coordinator alleging academic misconduct is not normally invited to attend these interviews;
- The student is entitled to be accompanied by e.g. a Student Advisor, a Students Union representative, a Class representative, a family member, or a friend. Any such person is entitled only to observe the interview, not to actively participate.

4. The outcome of the SAIC investigation will be one of the following:
- there is **insufficient evidence of academic misconduct**: the mark (or grade, as appropriate) is unchanged.
- there is **sufficient evidence of academic misconduct** but the matter can be handled within the School: the student will receive a verbal or written warning, be directed on where and how to receive advice about academic integrity, and the case will be recorded in UCD's Plagiarism Record System. Any prior instance of academic misconduct by the student, and the Stage of their studies, may be taken into account. In addition, the SAIC may:
  - permit the student to re-submit the assessment component, incurring a late submission grade penalty;
  - permit the student to re-submit the assessment component and direct that the grade be capped. The capped grade is selected from the set of passing grades of the Component Grading Scale as deemed appropriate;
  - direct that the grade for the assessment component be reduced without an opportunity to resubmit the assessment. In this case, the SAIC may select the reduced grade from the set of passing grades of the Component Grading Scale as deemed appropriate.
- there is **sufficient evidence of academic misconduct** and the matter cannot be handled within the School: the SAIC will refer the student to UCD's student disciplinary process without a resolution of the case.
  - Any prior instance of academic misconduct by the student, and the Stage of their studies, may be taken into account. Students presenting for a second or subsequent time to the SAIC, regardless of the degree of academic misconduct, may be referred to UCD's student disciplinary process.

5. The student(s) and module coordinator involved will be informed of the outcome of the SAIC investigation (normally by email).

Notes

- Module coordinators should present the issue of academic integrity in the **first lecture of every module delivery**, alerting students to School and University academic integrity policies and informing them of the consequences of confirmed instances of academic misconduct. Students should be advised that CS staff use a range of tools and techniques to check for plagiarised material in submitted work.

- UCD's Academic Integrity Policy prohibits students from representing work as their own that they did not write, code or create. Accordingly, **submission of AI-generated content without explicit permission and attribution is not allowed**. In

each module it should be indicated clearly whether generative AI will form any part of the learning experience, and if so, what uses of generative AI are permitted.

- Module coordinators should try to alert the SAIC to suspicions of academic misconduct **as soon as reasonably possible** and no later than one week before any deadline for grade submission to UCD.

- Students taking a module **cannot post their work publicly in any way** until the module is completed, unless the module coordinator gives permission to post it earlier. In particular, students cannot make their work accessible to other students in the module before the module is completed unless the module coordinator has given them permission to do this. Note that when and if this permission is given is likely to vary from one module to another, so there is no single School-wide rule on this issue.

- In cases where a student makes their own work (or the work of others) available to another student, who then copies some or all of it in their own submission, the student who makes their work available is **equally responsible** for the academic misconduct with the student(s) who did the copying.

- The UCD Library has resources and advice for students to avoid unintentional academic misconduct (e.g. by not citing or quoting from other sources correctly). For example **https://libguides.ucd.ie/academicintegrity**