

# Student Academic Misconduct Procedure Process Map

## Abbreviations

MC (Module Coordinator)  
SAIC (School Academic Integrity Committee)  
SAIA (School Academic Integrity Adviser)

An Examiner / Module Coordinator (MC) identifies possible academic integrity issues with a student's assessment. If Examiner is not MC they must consult the MC

**Decision: Should the case be referred to the School Academic Integrity Committee?** MC will exercise their judgement when deciding whether incidents can be dealt with directly or require referral to the School Academic Integrity Committee (SAIC). MCs may consult with the School Academic Integrity Adviser (SAIA), where such a role has been appointed.

Yes

**Referral:** MC decides to refer the case as suspected **academic misconduct** incident to the SAIC and advises the student that their assessment is under scrutiny for suspected academic misconduct.

No

**Decision:** MC determines that the incident is very minor and constitutes '**poor academic practice**' and deals with the matter directly. For definition and examples of poor academic practice see 3.6 and 5.1 of the [Procedure](#).

\*MC arranges a meeting with the student to discuss the issue, or highlights the issue in written feedback. MCs advise about correct citation/ academic integrity and may refer students to appropriate resources

The SAIC reviews the report and supporting materials and takes one of the following actions:

- 1) Decides that the reported incident is very minor and constitutes poor academic practice, and refer the case back to the MC to deal with the matter directly.
- 2) Decides to proceed with the case and invites the student to attend a meeting.
- 3) Decides that due to the nature and extent of the reported incident the case will be referred to the University level under the [Student Discipline Procedure](#), without decision/application of any penalty.

**1. Poor academic Practice** - referred back to MC to follow the steps above\*

## 2) Meeting with Student

The student is invited by the SAIC to discuss the allegation, and relevant documentation is shared with the student in advance. Based on the information before the Committee a decision is made whether academic misconduct has taken place, or whether the case should be referred under the Student Discipline Procedure.

**3) Referral:** Direct referral (without decision) under the Student Discipline Procedure

**Decision:** Academic misconduct has taken place and the SAIC will decide on an appropriate penalty, taking into consideration any mitigating or aggravating factors. Penalties will be applied in accordance with 5.3.6 of the Student Academic Misconduct Procedure and in consultation with the UCD Plagiarism Tariff for incidents of plagiarism.

**Decision:** SAIC decides academic misconduct has not taken place.

Referral

The SAIC

- refers the alleged instance, **without decision or penalty**, for resolution under the University Student Discipline Procedure. Reports should be submitted to [student.conduct@ucd.ie](mailto:student.conduct@ucd.ie) using the [Student Misconduct Incident Report](#) and submits all material that it relied upon to make its decision. Please refer to the [Guide to completing the report](#).
- informs the student of referral via their UCD email address copying the MC
- records "referred to the Student Discipline Procedure" in the Academic Misconduct Record System.
- see Student [Discipline Procedure Process Flowchart](#) for next steps.

The student and MC are informed of the outcome (the decision ± penalty\*\*) and their right to appeal\*\*\* the decision by the SAIC. The Academic Misconduct is recorded on the Academic Misconduct Record System

\*\*If a penalty results in a change to a grade that has already been approved by a Programme Examination Board, the Chair of the SAIC should request that the MC submits an Exceptional Change of Grade Form to the Chair of Academic Council Committee on Examinations.

\*\*\* Students may appeal a decision of the SAIC under the University's [Student Appeal Procedure](#) on specified grounds for appeal: Procedural irregularity which may have impacted on the decision; new evidence, which for good reason was not available to the original decision-making body, and disproportionate outcome or penalty.