



MTU

Ollscoil Teicneolaíochta na Mumhan
Munster Technological University

Academic Integrity Procedure

1st September 2025

Version: 1.0

www.mtu.ie/policies

Table of Contents

1. Purpose	2
2. Scope	2
3. Definitions	3
4. Roles and Responsibilities	5
5. Detecting Academic Misconduct	6
6. Levels of Academic Misconduct	6
7. Procedure for Breach Detected by Department	7
7.1 Stage 1a: Initial Consideration by Department	7
7.2 Stage 1b: Departmental Review	7
7.3 Stage 2: Formal Hearing by University Academic Misconduct Board (UAMB)	8
7.3.1 Notification to student	8
7.3.2 University Academic Misconduct Board (UAMB) Hearing	9
8. Procedure for Examination Breach	9
9. Appeal	9
10. Data Protection	9
11. Compliance	10
Appendix 1 University Academic Misconduct Board (UAMB)	11
Appendix 2 Calculation Tables	12
Appendix 3 Mapping of Academic Misconduct to Sanctions	16

1. Purpose

Munster Technological University (MTU) is committed to fostering and protecting a culture of academic integrity to ensure the validity of all academic endeavours in the University. Academic integrity must be preserved to protect the reliability of the qualifications awarded by the University, and to ensure our graduates have respect for knowledge and ideas, as well as an understanding of their ethical responsibility towards the work and ideas of others.

The security and therefore integrity of academic standards is central to trust and confidence in higher education; a fundamental key to securing standards is the integrity of assessment. Developing strategies, underpinned by institutional policies and procedures, to protect and reinforce academic integrity is even more important as providers and learners adapt to the new realities represented by the move to blended and online learning.

This procedure should be read in conjunction with the MTU Academic Integrity Policy.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all registered students of MTU and to all staff in MTU. This policy applies to all taught programmes of study leading to an award of MTU, including:

1. Joint programmes;
2. Taught modules on postgraduate research programmes; and
3. MTU programmes delivered collaboratively with other providers as may be authorised by the University.

The policy applies to all module credits achieved including those attained through RPL and micro credentials.

Where there is more than one university policy (and/or procedure) applicable to any one matter, the Vice President Academic Affairs & Registrar, in consultation with relevant offices and post holders, shall decide which of the university's policies (and/or procedures) should have priority or be the most appropriate in the circumstances, and may direct the continuation of some procedure(s) (and/or policies) and the suspension of others pending the outcome of the former. It is possible that more than one policy/procedure could be invoked in relation to the same issue, either concurrently or consecutively, as the Vice President Academic Affairs & Registrar may deem appropriate.

3. Definitions

Term/Acronym	Definition
Academic Council (AC)	The statutory body that, subject to Section 17 of the Technological Universities Act 2018, controls the academic affairs of the University. Within this general remit, the particular functions of Academic Council include designing and developing the academic programmes of the University; promoting stakeholder involvement in these programmes; making recommendations to the University on matters relating to research, admission and retention of students, academic regulations including marks & standards and assessment appeals, and the awarding of scholarships and prizes; and discharging any other functions delegated to it by the University. The membership of the Academic Council is appointed in accordance with legislative requirements and the regulations of the University approved by the Governing Body.
Academic Unit	The Academic Unit is a school or department which has responsibility for a suite of programmes in a specific discipline or related disciplines defined by the University.
Academic Integrity Advisor	The Academic Integrity Advisor (AIA) is a member of academic staff that provides advice and support to staff on matters related to academic integrity.
Academic Misconduct Register (AMR)	The Academic Misconduct Register is a database of records on Academic Misconduct.
Approval	The process whereby documents must be approved by the relevant committee or board.
Approval Authority	The appropriate level of governance to approve a document e.g., Governing Body, Academic Council.
Consultation	The discussion with relevant stakeholders to get their advice or opinion on policies.

Effective Date	The date that a document comes into effect following approval by the relevant approval authority.
Governing Body (GB)	The authority established by law to govern the University which manages and controls the affairs of the University.
Module Coordinator	The coordination of a module will remain with a single Academic Unit. The Academic Unit responsible will be best suited, in the opinion of the Academic Council, on the recommendation of the Registrar to coordinate all instances of delivery of the module. The Head of the Academic Unit will act as Module Coordinator.
Munster Technological University (MTU)	A Technological University established on the 1st of January 2021 through the merger of Cork Institute of Technology and the Institute of Technology, Tralee. It is a multi-campus technological university, contributing to the region through the provision of academic programmes that support student development and opportunities, education and research.
National Academic Integrity Network (NAIN)	Network established by Quality and Qualifications Ireland (QQI) to support Higher Education Institutions (HEI)s in matters of academic integrity.
Policy	A written statement that clearly indicates the position and values of the University on a given subject.
Policy Author	The person(s) responsible for drafting, consulting, and submitting a draft of the final policy version to the Policy Owner.
Policy Owner	The appropriate individual(s), department(s) or support unit(s) of the University who is responsible for oversight of the policy development steps across the full policy lifecycle. This includes responsibility for finalising the policy prior to consideration, recommendation and/or initial approval/final approval.
Policy Working Group	A group of stakeholders collaborating on policy development, consultation and review of policies which are deemed to be multi-disciplinary and have a wider impact on multiple functional areas.

Procedure	A series of interrelated steps or step by step instructions to implement the policy.
Records	The information created, received, and maintained as evidence and information by an organisation or person, in pursuance of legal obligations or in the transaction of business.
Regulations	The rules governing specific operations within the University.
Respondent	A person(s) who replies to something or defends a position in relation to something.
Review	An in-depth look at existing policies or other documents such as procedures, standards, guidelines to determine if a policy is still needed, whether the purpose and goal of the policy is still being met, determine if changes are required to improve the effectiveness or clarity of the policy and procedures, ensure that appropriate education, monitoring and ongoing review of the policy is occurring.
Review Date	The date that a document (e.g. policy, procedure, standard, guideline, protocol) will be reviewed.
Status	The various stages that documents (e.g. policy, procedure, standard, guideline, protocol) go through i.e., draft, review, approval.
University Academic Misconduct Board (UAMB)	The University Academic Misconduct Board is a standing board of the University which is appointed by the Academic Council and is responsible for investigating and adjudicating allegations of Academic Misconduct.

4. Roles and Responsibilities

Responsible Office/Person(s)	Role
Academic Council and Governing Body	Approval of this procedure is the remit of MTU Academic Council and Governing Body.
Vice President Academic Affairs & Registrar (VPAAR)	Executive level responsibility for oversight and implementation of the policy and procedure. Responsibility for maintaining the Academic Misconduct Register (AMR).

Academic Integrity Officer (AIO)	Leading role in collaboration with staff and student body in cultivating, embedding and safeguarding academic integrity and dealing with allegations of academic misconduct.
Academic Integrity Advisor (AIA)	Academic role that provides advice and support on matters related to academic integrity.
Module Coordinator/Head of Department	Notification of the student. Establishing if the student is on the AMR. Convene the Departmental Review Panel for the initial review. Attending of the UAMB if required.
Internal Examiner	Notification of alleged misconduct. Participating in the Departmental Review. Attending the UAMB.
Examination Officer	Operation of examinations in accordance with the University's policies and procedures, including, inter alia, processes for detecting, dealing with and reporting breaches of examination regulations and code of conduct.

5. Detecting Academic Misconduct

It is the duty of all those involved in academic work to uphold academic integrity and report suspected cases of academic misconduct. Typically, instances of suspected academic misconduct will be initially dealt with by the relevant internal examiner. However, if anyone in the MTU community (such as invigilators, students, etc) has reason to suspect an instance of academic misconduct, they should bring it to the attention of the internal examiner in the first instance.

The procedure to be followed depends on whether the suspected misconduct was detected at departmental level or during an invigilated examination organised by the Examinations Office. The University will provide specialised support at all stages as appropriate.

6. Levels of Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct will normally be classified into three levels, based on the number of points arising from the relevant instance of misconduct as detailed in Appendices 2 and 3:

Level 1: Poor academic practice/conduct (0-200)

Level 2: Academic Misconduct (Minor Infringement) (201-400)

Level 3: Severe Academic Misconduct (Major Infringement) (over 400 points)

7. Procedure for Breach Detected by Department

7.1 Stage 1a: Initial Consideration by Department

- (a) The internal examiner¹ will notify the relevant module coordinator once an instance of academic misconduct is suspected to have occurred.
- (b) The module coordinator will arrange for an initial review of the alleged misconduct to be completed, normally within seven working days of the initial notification. The initial review will be conducted by the module coordinator (or nominee) and the internal examiner².
- (c) If the initial review determines that no case of academic misconduct has taken place, the module coordinator will consider what (if any) is the appropriate communication to the student.
- (d) If the initial review determines a case of possible academic misconduct, then the module coordinator will establish if the student is on the academic misconduct Register (AMR).
 - If the student is on the AMR, the case will be immediately escalated to **Stage 2** of this procedure - **Formal Hearing by the University Academic Misconduct Board (UAMB)**. The module coordinator will notify the student in writing in relation to the allegation(s) and of the referral of the matter to the UAMB.
 - If the student is not on the AMR, the case will proceed to **Stage 1b- Departmental Review**.

7.2 Stage 1b: Departmental Review

- (a) The module coordinator will notify the student in writing in relation to the allegation(s) of academic misconduct.
- (b) The module coordinator will arrange for the student to meet the Departmental Review Panel (DRP) (internal examiner, Academic Integrity Officer (AIA) and/or Academic Integrity Advisor (AIA)), normally within seven working days from the completion of Stage 1a.

¹ In certain instances, the suspected breach may be identified by a member of staff other than the internal examiner. In that case, the member of staff will notify the internal examiner in the first instance.

² In the event of a disagreement during the initial review, the case will be referred to the UAMB.

- (c) The student may bring a student colleague of their choice, or a sabbatical officer of the Students' Union. However, the student may not bring any other person to the meeting, whether connected or unconnected with MTU³⁴.
- (d) If the student does not participate in the departmental review, the case will be escalated to Stage 2 - **Formal Hearing by the UAMB**.
- (e) The DRP will conduct an informal discussion ("courageous conversation") with the student in regard to the allegation(s).
- (f) Following the conclusion of its meeting with the student, the DRP will decide, by consensus, and per Appendices 2 and 3 of this procedure:
 - if the allegation of misconduct is upheld, and, if so, if it constitutes a Level 1 or a Level 2 offence.
 - in the case of a Level 1 offence, an appropriate Level 1 penalty.
 If the DRP decides that a Level 2 offence has occurred, or if consensus cannot be reached, the module coordinator will then escalate the case to Stage 2 - **Formal Hearing by UAMB**.
- (g) The module coordinator will notify all the relevant parties, including the student, AIO, AIA and Module Examination Board (MEB) of the outcome of the departmental review within seven working days of the meeting.
- (h) If the student disagrees with the outcome of the Departmental Review, the student can refer the matter to the UAMB within five working days of receiving the notification.

7.3 Stage 2: Formal Hearing by University Academic Misconduct Board (UAMB)

The University Academic Misconduct Board (UAMB) is appointed by the Academic Council to investigate and adjudicate on allegations of academic misconduct.

7.3.1 Notification to student

- (a) The Chair of the UAMB will write to the student within seven working days following receiving the reporting of the alleged misconduct, setting out the allegation(s), and informing them of the entitlement to present a response to the allegation.
- (b) If the student wishes to avail of this entitlement, they must do so within five working days of the receipt of the notification of the allegation from the UAMB Chair.

³ The purpose of this person is as a support to the student, not to speak on the student's behalf.

⁴ Additional considerations apply to a student under 18 and they may be accompanied by a parent or guardian at any meetings the student is asked to attend under this procedure.

- (c) If the student declines to respond to the allegations within the allocated timeframe, the UAMB will proceed with the hearing as outlined in 7.3.2.

7.3.2 University Academic Misconduct Board (UAMB) Hearing

- a) The Chair of the UAMB will notify the student of the date, time, mode and venue (if appropriate) for the UAMB hearing which will be convened in a timely manner.
- b) The Chair will inform the student that they may bring a student colleague of their choice or a sabbatical officer of the Students' Union who is not a member of the UAMB. However, the student may not bring any other person to the hearing, whether connected or unconnected with MTU.
- c) The student shall be required to notify the Chair not less than one working day in advance of the hearing if they will attend.
- d) The Chair will identify the relevant parties, (such as the module coordinator, internal examiner, etc.) to be requested to make themselves available for the hearing and all will be provided with guidance on any additional information required to assist the hearing. At the discretion of the Chair, these parties may be provided with the student's response in advance of the hearing.
- e) The UAMB will consider all submissions, and based on the balance of probabilities, reach a majority decision on the allegation(s). The UAMB will determine an appropriate penalty to be applied, per Appendices 2 and 3 to this procedure.
- f) Following the decision of the UAMB, the Chair shall notify the student, the relevant module coordinator, programme coordinator and the internal examiner in writing of the outcome. The student will also be advised of their entitlement to appeal the decision of the UAMB within ten working days of the notification of outcome.

8. Procedure for Examination Breach

Academic misconduct detected during a formal invigilated examination will be reported to the Office of Vice President Academic Affairs & Registrar (VPAAR) in the first instance.

9. Appeal

A student may challenge the decision of the UAMB by initiating an appeal to the President on the grounds as outlined in the policy document within ten working days after the decision has issued.

10. Data Protection

Records will be retained in the accordance with MTU's data protection and retention policies.

11. Compliance

Compliance with this procedure extends to MTU students and MTU staff.

Responsibility for overseeing and enforcing compliance with this procedure rests with the Vice President Academic Affairs & Registrar (VPAAR). The Vice President Academic Affairs & Registrar will ensure that the necessary regulations, procedures and processes are in place and that they are implemented in accordance with this policy. In addition, the necessary compliance checks and reviews will be carried out periodically and at a minimum once per academic year.

A breach of provisions of this policy by a student may render them subject to disciplinary action under MTU's Student Disciplinary Procedure.

Appendix 1 University Academic Misconduct Board (UAMB)

- a) The UAMB will be a sitting board of the University appointed by the Academic Council to investigate and adjudicate on allegations of academic misconduct.
- b) The term of the UAMB will normally be three years.
- c) The UAMB will consist of 14 members and will ensure gender balance and cross campus representation.
- d) A senior academic (or nominee⁵) will act as Chair of the UAMB.
- e) The Chair will nominate a Vice Chair⁶.
- f) The UAMB will consist of:
 - Chair;
 - Vice Chair;
 - Academic Integrity Officer (ex officio);
 - 5 Academic Integrity Advisors (one per faculty, ex officio);
 - One student union representative; and
 - Five members of academic staff (one per faculty).
- g) The UAMB will have a quorum of five members to include the Chair or Vice Chair and the AIO⁷.
- h) All board members will be entitled to sit on every hearing. Where there is a conflict of interest on the part of any member of the UAMB in relation to a specific case, the member will exclude themselves from the hearing.
- i) Secretariat will be provided by the Office of Vice President Academic Affairs & Registrar.

⁵ Member of academic senior staff

⁶ Member of academic senior staff

⁷ If AIO is not available for the hearing, the Chair/Vice Chair will nominate one AIA to attend.

Appendix 2 Calculation Tables

Calculation Table:

Criteria	Points
Criterion 1: Previous Misconduct	
Criterion 2: Stage	
Criterion 3: Module Value	
Criterion 4: Assessment Value	
Criterion 5: Conduct	
Criterion 6: Additional Considerations	
Total	

Criterion 1: Previous Misconduct

Previous Misconduct	Points
First Violation ⁸	20
Second Violation	100
Third or Subsequent Violation	150

Criterion 2: Stage

Stage	Points
Undergraduate	
Year 1 (First year of an undergraduate degree)	25
Year 2	50
Year 3	100
Year 4+	150
Postgraduate	
Level 9	200
Level 10	250

Criterion 3: Module Value

Module Value	Points
The module carries up to 5 credits (or equivalent)	15
The module carries more than 5 credits but less or equal to 10 credits (or equivalent)	30
The module carries more than 10 credits (or equivalent) but less than 25 credits	45
The module carries 25 credits or over	60

⁸ A violation is determined to have occurred when a learner previously accepted responsibility of academic misconduct and/or was sanctioned for an academic integrity misconduct.

Criterion 4: Assessment Value

Assessment Value	Points
The assessment is worth less than 25% of the total marks possible for the module	20
The assessment is worth between 25% and 50% of the total marks possible for the module	50
The assessment is worth over 50% of the total marks possible for the module	100
The assessment is the main part of the academic work (undergraduate or master's thesis, dissertation)	110

Criterion 5: Conduct

Conduct by student (add points from all sections)		Points
1. Basic Violations/Poor Academic Practice	Basic violations include, but are not limited to, poor academic writing (such as poor referencing), violation of instructor policies, giving your own work to others etc.	20
2. Plagiarism	Plagiarised components constituting up to 5% of the assessment task.	20
	Critical aspects plagiarised. Plagiarised components constituting 5% and over but less than 20% of the assessment task.	40
	Critical aspects plagiarised. 20% and over but less than 50% of the assessment task plagiarised.	60
	50% and over of the assessment task plagiarised.	150
3. Contract Cheating	Writing part or whole of an assessment for another student.	80
	Engage a third party to produce work for academic credit (with or without payment).	160
4. Collusion	Undisclosed and unauthorised collaboration on an assessment task that was supposed to be completed individually.	100
5. Falsification	Altering an existed assessment and resubmitting.	150
	Lying or giving a false excuse to miss or receive unfair accommodation in an assessment or exam.	150
	Forging or inaccurately representing any educational content such as data, images, processes, etc.	150
6. Fabrication	Fabricating data for a lab or research assignment.	125

	Making up data, experiments or other significant information.	125
7. Impersonation	Allowing another person to complete the assessment or examination in the student's place.	250
	Impersonating another student during an assessment or examination.	200
8. Fraud	Create or provide false documentation in relation to assessment requirements or deadlines including falsifying assessment task submission receipts and medical certificates.	80
	Create or provide false documentation in relation to: • Admission to the university • Assessment outcomes • Academic progress	80
9. Cheating occurring during timebound assessment other than end-of-semester examination (e.g. class test)	Intentional action that violates the set-out rules and gives one student an unfair advantage over another. It includes but is not limited to copying from another student or allowing another student to copy, having an unapproved aid (cheat sheet, notes, textbooks, etc.,) accessing or attempting to access an unauthorised smart technology aid.	80
10. Cheating occurring during end-of-semester examination (centrally administered by the Examination Office)	Having smart technology (phone, smart watch etc.,) in their possession in the examination centre.	50
	Intentional cheating that includes, but is not limited to: • Accessing or attempting to access a smart technology aid. • Copying from another student or allowing another student to copy. • Having an aid such as cheat sheets, notes, textbooks etc., (hard or soft copy) in the examination centre.	200
11. Self-Plagiarism	Re-submitting work previously submitted and graded in any other unit or course without acknowledgment.	20
12. Use of file-sharing sites	Uploading content from a module to a third-party site regardless of whether there was any visible benefit to the student involved.	40

13. Promoting ways to breach academic integrity	Sharing information with other students about ways to breach academic integrity or facilitating a breach of academic integrity.	100
14. Use of GenAI (unauthorised)	Submitting all or part of an assessment item which has been produced using Generative Artificial Intelligence and claiming it as student's own work.	200
15. Other Breaches of academic integrity	Calculated relative to issues of similar significance as appropriate.	20-300

Criterion 6: Additional Considerations

	Points
Department provided academic integrity education/guidance/training	25
Student previously completed academic integrity training as a result of a previous violation(s)	50
Failure to complete academic integrity training assigned as a result of a previous violation(s)	75
Admission of misconduct ⁹	As appropriate

⁹ Reduction in the overall score will be considered in the event of admission of misconduct, apology, or mitigating circumstances.

Appendix 3 Mapping of Academic Misconduct to Sanctions

Level 1 Poor Academic Practice	Points	Sanctions Mandatory academic integrity training, fine ¹⁰ (not exceeding €200), reprimand (formally recorded warning kept on the record) and one or more of the following actions:
	0-100	Notify and educate
		Assessment mark reduced to zero – resubmission allowed as a first attempt with no cap on the mark.
		Assessment mark reduced to zero - resubmission allowed as a first attempt with an assessment cap at 40% Assessment mark reduced to zero – no resubmission allowed
	101-200	Assessment mark reduced to zero – no resubmission allowed
		Assessment mark reduced to zero – no resubmission allowed -- module mark capped at 40%
		Module mark reduced to zero, reassessment allowed within the current academic year

¹⁰ Only applicable in cases of centrally invigilated examinations

Level 2 Academic Misconduct (Minor)	Points	Sanctions Mandatory academic integrity training, reprimand (formally recorded warning kept on the record) and one or more of the following actions:
	201-350	Assessment mark reduced to zero – no resubmission allowed - module mark capped at 40%
		Module mark reduced to zero, reassessment allowed within the current academic year
		Module mark reduced to zero, reassessment not allowed within the current academic year
		Module mark reduced to zero, reassessment not allowed within the current academic year and progression to the next stage not permitted until the module is successfully completed
	351-500	Module mark reduced to zero, reassessment not allowed within the current academic year and progression to the next stage not permitted until the module is successfully completed
		Failure of the stage (requirement to repeat the stage in full)

Level 3 Academic Misconduct (Major)	Points	Sanctions Mandatory academic integrity training, reprimand (formally recorded warning kept on the record) and one or more of the following actions:
	501 and over	Module mark reduced to zero, reassessment not allowed within the current academic year and progression to the next stage not permitted until the module is successfully completed
		Failure of the stage (requirement to repeat the stage in full)
		Temporary suspension from the programme without restriction of final award classification
		Temporary suspension from the programme with restriction of final award classification
		Restriction of final award classification
		Permanent suspension of study (termination)

A. Document Details

Title:	Academic Misconduct Procedure
Owner(s):	MTU Vice President Academic Affairs & Registrar
Author(s):	Regulations, Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee
Version Number:	1.0
Status:	Approved
Effective Date:	1st September 2025
Review Date:	1st September 2030
Data Classification:	☒ Public ☐ Restricted/Internal Use ☐ Confidential/Strictly Confidential

Note: If the 'Status' of this document reads 'Draft', it has not been finalised and should not be relied upon. An existing approved procedure is deemed relevant until such time as an updated procedure has been approved by the relevant approval authority and becomes the new binding procedure.

B. Revision History

Version Number	Revision Date	Summary of Changes	Changes tracked?	Proposed Revision Date
0.1	27/02/2025	Working Group of the Regs., QAE Committee of Academic Council	Yes	
0.1	07/03/2025	Regs., QAE Committee of Academic Council approval	Yes	
1.0	21/03/2025	Academic Council approval	Yes	01/09/2030

C. Relevant/Related Existing Internal/External Documents

Academic Integrity Policy MTU Data Protection Policy MTU Data Retention Policy Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedure

Note: Any existing approved documents that require referencing must be listed above.

D. Consultation History

This document has been prepared in consultation with the following bodies:

Regulations, Quality Assurance and Enhancement Committee of Academic Council
--

E. Approvals

This document requires following approvals (in order where applicable):

Name	Date	Details of Approval Required
Academic Council	01/09/2025	Version 1.0

F. Responsible for Communication and Implementation

The Manager/Functional Area responsible for communication and implementation:

Title	Functional Area	Date Implemented
Vice President Academic Affairs &Registrar	Office of Vice President Academic Affairs & Registrar	01/09/2025