

PROVIDER NAME: CCT College Dublin			
POLICY AREA: Standard 5: Student-centred learning, teaching and assessment			
Policy and Procedure Title:	<i>CCTP508: Academic Integrity & Academic Misconduct Policy</i>	Policy No: CCTP508	Version: 1.0
<p><i>Purpose of the Policy</i></p> <p>The reputation of CCT College and of its graduates depends on upholding standards in teaching, learning, assessment, research and scholarly activity. The College recognises that a culture of academic integrity is dependent upon the demonstration of ethical practice in all areas of College life, not limited to academic and scholarly activity and prioritises academic integrity culture as an institutional strategic priority. CCT College recognises that embarking on third level education is a learning journey in terms of the subject matter but also the development of academic skills. A proactive, supportive and developmental approach to the cultivation of academic integrity and the prevention of academic misconduct is promoted. The purpose of this policy is to set clear expectations and requirements for all College stakeholders in upholding and promoting academic integrity and managing suspicions of academic misconduct in student work.</p> <p><i>Scope and Applicability</i></p> <p>This policy underpins all aspects of College life in terms of driving a culture of Academic Integrity in all areas of College life. It is particularly applicable in practice to all academic and scholarly activity in CCT College related to accredited programmes.</p> <p>Legal, Regulatory and Best Practice Context:</p> <p>The following key statutory and system wide information is particularly relevant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NAIN (2021) Academic Integrity Guidelines • Academic Integrity National Principles and Lexicon of Common Terms • NAIN Generative AI Guidelines for Educators • NAIN Framework for Academic Misconduct Investigation and Case Management • University at Buffalo Undergraduate Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures • Rules, access, familiarity, and trust – A practical approach to addressing generative AI in education <p>Key Terms</p> <p>CCT College adopts the following key definitions as defined in NAIN Academic Integrity Guidelines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Integrity - Academic integrity is the commitment to and demonstration of honest and moral behaviour in an academic setting. • Academic Misconduct - Any action, or attempted action that undermines academic integrity and may result in an unfair advantage or disadvantage for any member of the academic community or wider society. 			

Types of Academic Misconduct:

CCT College has adapted definitions of Academic Misconduct from [Academic Integrity: National Principles and Lexicon of Common Terms \(NAIN, 2021\)](#) and [University at Buffalo Undergraduate Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures](#).

Types of academic misconduct include, but are not restricted, to:

- Advertising or selling cheating services (contract cheating) - Advertising the provision, or selling, assignments to learners where this has not been authorised by the provider.
- Aiding in academic dishonesty - Actions that allow another student to engage in an act of academic dishonesty, including completing an examination or assignment for another student, failing to protect academic work by leaving it unattended, or collaborating without instructor permission.
- Alteration or Misrepresenting documents - Altering, fabricating, forging, or submitting any official College documents.
- Cheating- Use of unauthorised resources, including sources not permitted by the course instructor, or tools such as calculators, artificial intelligence (e.g. GenAI tools), smart watches, phones, or other students' work.
- Falsifying academic material - Altering, fabricating, forging, or submitting: any course-related materials, including laboratory reports, notes, or any forms of data; an instructor's name or initials; an examination or assignment for re-evaluation; an assessment (in whole or in part) prepared by any person or technology (e.g., artificial intelligence) other than the student responsible.
- Impersonation - Undertaking in whole or in part any work required as part of a programme in the place of an enrolled learner, without permission from the provider; Sitting an exam, or having someone else sit an exam in place of an enrolled learner, without permission of the provider.
- Plagiarising - Representing the ideas or work (e.g., written text, computer code, artwork, audio, video) of another as one's own or improperly referencing original authors.
- Purchasing academic assignments (contract cheating) - Buying assignments intended for submission in fulfilment of any course or academic program requirement.
- Submitting previously submitted work (self-plagiarism) - Also called self-plagiarism, re-submitting academic material (in whole or in part) that has been previously submitted by the same student without prior and expressed consent of the instructor.
- Unauthorised collaboration (collusion)- Undisclosed collaboration of two or more people on an assignment or task, which is supposed to be completed individually
- Unauthorised dissemination of CCT materials - dissemination of official CCT College documents or assessment submissions to other students or third parties without explicit consent, directly or through third parties including file sharing websites.

Staff responsibilities:

- **All Staff and Faculty** - Familiarising themselves with the requirements and expectations of upholding academic integrity in CCT College, including employment of strategies to deter and identify academic misconduct and unethical practice in all areas of College life.
- **Academic Faculty Responsibilities** - Providing students with a right of response to an allegation.
- **Academic Standards Board** - Providing oversight of all academic misconduct processes, ensuring a fair, consistent and transparent investigation process is adhered to in all cases of suspected academic misconduct, including students' right of response to allegation.
- **Academic Integrity Committee** - Cultivating academic integrity culture across the College community.
- **Dean of Academic Affairs** - Educating staff and students in respect of academic standards and expectations.
- **Dean of Teaching and Learning** - Promoting and embedding institutional teaching, learning and assessment practices that uphold and promote academic integrity.

Student Responsibilities and Academic Integrity Code:

Students carry personal responsibility in relation to academic standards and Academic Integrity. Support information for students can be found in the Student Handbook and in this Quality Assurance Manual.

Each Student is Responsible for:

- Upholding academic integrity in and for CCT College.
- Familiarising themselves with the requirements and expectations of CCT College Dublin.
- Engaging with guidance, support and education in relation to academic integrity and the avoidance of academic misconduct.
- Taking responsibility for the integrity of their own work.
- Honestly and completely acknowledging the work of others or content produced by technology including generative artificial intelligence platforms within their work.
- Conducting themselves with respect and honesty in all academic activities.
- Ensuring all work submitted for assessment or for feedback is their own work or includes the appropriate citations, references or acknowledgments.
- Reporting activities within the CCT community which may compromise academic integrity, including approaches from outside parties.
- Acting legally, ethically and in accordance with CCT policies, code of conduct and academic regulations.

Policy Statements – Part A: Academic Integrity Principles

Academic Integrity Values

CCT College adopts the six fundamental values of academic integrity defined by the International Centre for Academic Integrity (ICAI, 2021), recognising that the work of educators, learners, and researchers loses value and credibility without them.

These values must be demonstrated at the organisational level to all College stakeholders to set a tone of integrity throughout the College. The reputation of the College and all awards rely on shared commitment to these values that underpin academic integrity.

The six values are as follows:

- **Honesty**
- **Trust**
- **Fairness**
- **Respect**
- **Responsibility**
- **Courage**

Academic Integrity Principles

We adopt the following academic integrity principles to bring the six values of academic integrity into practice:

- **Academic integrity culture-** The College community is committed to fostering and upholding a culture in which academic integrity is valued and protected.
- **Prevention first approach-** This policy is built on the assumption that prevention of academic misconduct is always preferable to identifying and applying penalties for academic misconduct.
- **Student-centred-** Poor academic practice can arise for a variety of reasons including lack of understanding of academic standards, external pressures and vulnerabilities faced by students in their studies. We are committed to maintaining both academic standards and pastoral care standards to all students.
- **Contribution to society-** When schools and other institutions are honest and ethical, they help build a stronger and more trustworthy society.
- **Assessment security-** Measures are taken to assure the security of assessment methods, always balancing with the need to have pedagogically sound assessment in all delivery modes including blended learning.

Principles of Education, Awareness and Upholding Academic Integrity

A robust system of education and awareness for both students and staff is critical to upholding academic integrity in CCT College and discouraging academic misconduct.

Training and awareness for both staff and students aims to sets clear expectations of:

- CCT College academic integrity policies, procedures and guidelines.
- What constitutes good academic practice and the kinds of poor practice that may lead to academic misconduct.
- Critical thinking and making good decisions.
- Sanctions that are applied to academic misconduct; and
- The implications of academic misconduct for both individuals and the College.

Upholding Academic Integrity Practices

Academic integrity is promoted and upheld through a range of activities including:

- Student introduction to academic integrity during induction, with further awareness building mid-semester.
- Ongoing student support resources for academic writing, referencing, and research skills.
- Promoting and raising awareness of key student supports for vulnerable students.
- Classroom-based academic integrity training.
- Implementing a Student Honour Code.
- Training and support for staff on preventing, detecting and managing academic misconduct.
- Academic professional development to support assessment design that promotes academic integrity.
- Frequent communication of updated policies and best practices in managing academic integrity and misconduct for staff.
- Staff support for academic integrity focused assessment design.

Policy Statements – Part B: Academic Misconduct Principles

Classifying Academic Misconduct

CCT recognises that the severity of academic misconduct infringements must be judged in consideration of a learner's individual circumstances. Factors that influence the classification of academic misconduct include the nature of the offence, the stage a learner is at in a programme, the type of assessment undertaken, previous instances of academic misconduct, and any other relevant factors. The levels of academic misconduct are assigned on a case-by-case basis and are not necessarily sequential, i.e. a learner's first instance of academic misconduct could be at any level relative to the severity of the misconduct.

The levels of academic misconduct are as follows:

- **Level 1- Academic Naivety/ Poor Academic Practice** - academic misconduct arising from not having enough knowledge, good judgement or experience of academic practice. CCT College recognises this can and does arise, but the College provides initial and continuing guidance and educational supports to promote good academic practice and therefore will only accept misconduct as arising from naivety in limited cases where lack of knowledge and inexperience is easily identifiable. Repeated instances of academic naivety will automatically be classified as minor or major academic misconduct.
- **Level 2- Minor Academic Misconduct** - Minor Academic Misconduct refers to lower-level academic misconduct. A second minor academic misconduct infringement in the knowledge of a first infringement, or multiple concurrent minor academic misconduct infringements, will be treated as major academic misconduct. Minor academic misconduct may include plagiarism, self-plagiarism, cheating or unauthorised collaboration.
- **Level 3- Major Academic Misconduct:** Major Academic Misconduct refers to flagrant cases of any form of academic misconduct (even those occurring for the first time) including all cases of use of essay mills, contract cheating, fraud, impersonation, bringing unauthorised materials in any format (including digital) into an exam, and cheating.

Academic Misconduct Investigation Principles:

- **Right to be heard-** All individuals have the right to respond and be heard in relation to a suspicion of academic misconduct before any decisions are taken that could adversely impact them.
- **Communication of outcomes and implications-** All outcomes of academic misconduct processes must be communicated clearly including implications for future study and implications for future cases of academic misconduct if they arise.
- **Balance of probabilities-** In all cases of academic misconduct, the threshold for determining validity of evidence to prove a case of academic misconduct is made on the balance of probability. This means that the evidence must show it is more likely than not that academic misconduct took place.
- **Proportionality-** Penalties applied to cases of academic misconduct need to be proportionate to the severity (level of misconduct) of the offence as determined by the relevant decision-maker.
- **Remediation-** CCT College uses remedial approaches when academic misconduct is identified to support learner development and prevent future recurrence.

Identifying a Suspicion of Academic Misconduct

A suspected case may be identified through a variety of means and at any point, including after a learner has left the college or been issued with an award. In all cases an investigation will be undertaken.

An investigation will commence at any point where a suspicion of academic misconduct is identified. This may be during or after an assessment or examination, including after marks, credit or qualifications have been awarded.

In cases of suspected academic misconduct in real time during an examination, class or lab-based assessment, it is the responsibility of the faculty member / invigilator to:

- Immediately bring to the learner's attention the suspicion of academic misconduct and request the learner to sign the incident form which summarises the activity which has given cause for suspicion.
- Ensure that the learner is prevented from continuing the actions of concern by confiscating or removing access to any unauthorised materials or moving the learner to a different location in the exam venue.
- Permit the learner to complete the examination.
- In the case of an invigilator, the report must then be submitted to the Academic Affairs and QA Office who will forward this for the faculty member responsible for the examination to commence an investigation.

Evidencing a Suspicion of Academic Misconduct

Evidence of Academic Misconduct that can prompt further investigation ([adapted from NAIN Framework for Academic Misconduct Investigation and Case Management](#)) includes:

- Very low similarity score (e.g. text matching) on similarity detection tool (0 – 5%)
- High similarity score (e.g. text matching) on similarity detection tool (>30%)
- High similarity match (other learner's work)
- Document properties e.g. author / creation date / editing time / version number
- Not appropriate to discipline area
- Quality different to or above expectations
- Language use and ability
- Sources inappropriate/ irrelevant/ excluding key content
- References are falsified
- Unreadable language, including jargon-filled sentences and misuse of words
- Reference list anomalies (No in-text citations, Mismatch with in-text citations, Access dates for internet sources predate enrolment, References do not meet criteria/requirements, Min/max required references, Date range of references, Referencing style)
- Unable to speak about subject matter or address questions about work
- Text in a document that has been inserted as an image
- Anything else that seems unusual or concerning.

Evidence cannot include the use of AI detection tools, or other digital tools, that are not sanctioned by the College.

Sanctions for Academic Misconduct

The following sanctions can be applied to academic misconduct related to each level of academic misconduct.

Level of misconduct	Authority to Apply	Types of Sanctions
Academic naivety (1)	<p>Faculty for first instance or instances when occurring in the same semester.</p> <p>All instances should be notified to QA Office at the beginning of process.</p>	<p>Mandatory academic integrity training and a formally recorded warning kept on the learner's record for the duration of the learner's enrolment on the programme of study.</p> <p>One or more of the following sanctions is applied:</p> <p>a) Grade reduction – the work should be graded, but the mark may be reduced on either a section or entire piece of work.</p> <p>b) Mark of zero- a mark of zero may be applied to either a section or entire piece of work.</p>
Minor academic misconduct (2)	<p>Faculty for first instance only, or first instances if occurring concurrently in the same semester.</p> <p>All instances should be notified to QA Office at the beginning of process.</p>	<p>Mandatory academic integrity training and a formally recorded warning kept on the learner's record for the duration of the learner's enrolment on the programme of study.</p> <p>One or more of the following sanctions is applied:</p> <p>For assignments worth less than 50% of the total module marks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Require re-examination/assessment within the semester as a first sitting if appropriate and feasible. - A mark of zero is applied to the relevant section of an assessment - A mark of zero is applied to the full assessment component. <p>For assignments worth greater than 50% of the total module marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A mark of zero is applied to the component only requiring re-examination/assessment of the component within the repeat window with the original assessment counting as an attempt. • A mark of zero is applied to the full module requiring re-examination/assessment of all components within the repeat window with the original assessment counting as an attempt.

<p>Major academic misconduct (3)– first, second, third incident</p>	<p>Academic Standards Board</p>	<p>Mandatory academic integrity training and a formally recorded warning kept on the learner’s record for the duration of the learner’s enrolment on the programme of study.</p> <p>One or more of the following sanctions is applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A mark of zero applied to the relevant module in the semester and required to resit within the next available sitting. - A mark of zero applied to all modules in the semester and requires re-examination/ assessment of all semester modules within the repeat window with module results capped at a pass result. - Award zero for the module mark and remove all credits achieved through illegitimate means - The learner is suspended from the programme but may be awarded a lower NFQ level award (e.g. an embedded award) in recognition of other learning outcomes achieved during the programme where such an option exists. - The learner is suspended from the programme until the next semester in which those modules are running. All future attempts at these modules and their components to be capped at a maximum mark of 40%. - Annotation of academic misconduct on transcript of results for relevant module(s) may also be applied. <p>One or more of the following, in addition to those listed previously, can be applied in severe cases of academic misconduct as identified by the Academic Standards Boards, including but not limited to the use of contract cheating services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recession/withdrawal of award, in line with HEI policies – where an offence is proved after the conferring of the award. - The learner is expelled from the College and shall not be permitted to re-enrol for a five-year period (pending outcome of a re-entry admissions meeting between the learner, the programme leader, and Head of Admissions). A permanent record of the offence is placed on the learner's file and may be included on the statement of results and / or within any academic reference provided. <p>The ASB has the discretionary authority to impose a financial penalty up to €200.00 in addition to the sanctions specified for minor or major misconduct. In such cases the financial penalty must be settled before CCT will issue final results, transcripts, parchments or references.</p>
--	--	---

Monitoring

- Central records are maintained by the Quality Assurance Office for all academic misconduct.
- The Academic Standards Boards maintains oversight of the implementation of academic misconduct processes and oversight of all academic misconduct investigation decisions and outcomes, including faculty-level investigations.
- The Academic Standards Boards is accountable to the Academic Council.

Right of Appeal

Students have the right to appeal a decision on an outcome of an academic misconduct process in line with the College's (CCTP509: Recheck, Review, Appeal Policy). The appeal must be submitted in writing to the Quality Assurance Office within 5 working days of communication of the outcome being communicated using the standard College form. The process is then conducted in line with the normal process for appeals.

Part C: Procedure for Managing Faculty-Level Investigation of Suspected Academic Misconduct in Student Work:

Responsibility for Investigation

- A desk-based investigation is normally undertaken by the faculty member responsible for the assessment in question.
- Where multiple assessments are involved, the investigation may be immediately assigned to the Programme Leader.
- In all other cases an investigator will be assigned by the Academic Affairs and QA Office.

Step 1 Faculty Member Identification and Informal Exploration of, Suspicion of Academic Misconduct

There are two key factors for faculty members to consider in identifying a suspicion of academic misconduct:

- Identify the type of suspected academic misconduct.
- Identify appropriate evidence to support the suspicion- Evidence may not be conclusive on its own, but sufficient to prompt further exploration with the relevant student.

The Faculty-level Investigator can determine one of two outcomes of an informal investigation:

- **No case to answer-** If at any stage in the desk-based investigation the faculty member is satisfied that there is no case to answer, the case can be dismissed at this point and no learner specific record is retained.
- **Refer to Programme Leader-** Refer the case, with summary of evidence, to the Programme Leader if the investigator believes there is a case to answer, or if it is not clear whether there is evidence to support the suspicion of academic misconduct.

Step 2 Referral to Programme Leader

On receipt of a case referral, the Programme Leader will determine whether there is potentially a case to answer and will either dismiss the case or proceed with it. The initial decision to be made is whether there is:

On receipt of a case referral, the Programme Leader will determine whether there is potentially a case to answer and will either dismiss the case or proceed with it. The initial decision to be made is whether there is:

- **No case to answer**- If the Programme Leader dismisses the case, all records are deleted, and no further action is required.
- **Sufficient evidence to proceed with investigation**- If proceeding, in the first instance, the Programme Leader must check the student record and notify the Academic Affairs and QA Office to determine whether there is a record of previous academic naivety or misconduct.
- **Previous academic misconduct**- Where a student has had a previous case upheld for academic misconduct, the Programme Lead immediately refers the case to the Academic Standards Board and the Faculty Level Investigation concludes.
- **No previous academic misconduct**- if it is the first investigation of academic misconduct for the student, the programme lead will proceed with the following:
 - **Student Notification and right to respond**- The student should be notified of the allegation and provided with or directed to the relevant policy. The Programme Leader will then contact the student and invite them to respond to the case. The student's right to respond can take place in writing through email, with the option to conduct an online or in-person meeting if deemed necessary by the Faculty Level Investigator or requested by the student. The Faculty Level Investigator may be invited to this meeting if it is requested. The right to respond process normally takes place within 5 working days barring exceptional circumstances.
 - **Student Notification of Viva/Interview/Q&A**- If a Programme Leader determines that a viva / interview / Q&A session with the student testing knowledge of the subject matter within the assessment is appropriate, it can be conducted as part of the meeting. The student must be informed in their meeting notification that this will constitute part of the session.

Step 3 Referral to Programme Leader

Meetings regarding suspected academic misconduct are convened by the Programme Leader undertaking the following steps:

- At the start of the meeting, attendees are asked to introduce themselves.
- Attendees are advised that a written record of the meeting will be kept summarising the key points discussed.
- The Programme Leader, or nominee, summarises the allegation and the supporting evidence.
- The learner is invited to respond to the allegation.
- The Programme Leader facilitates a discussion to explore the matter raised and whether there is any additional information that the student can provide that would mitigate the allegation.
- A summary of the key points discussed will be read back to the learner at the end of the meeting and the Programme Leader will ask the learner to confirm the accuracy, completeness and any disputes of the record; and
- The learner is informed that the decision of the meeting will be communicated in writing, normally within 5 working days.

Step 4 Determining an Outcome of the Faculty Level Investigation

On conclusion of the right-to-respond process, the Programme Leader will consider the evidence and determine an outcome for the case.

The Programme Leader can determine one of three outcomes:

- **No case to answer**- the case is dismissed. The Programme Leader informs the relevant faculty member(s), deletes all student-specific records and informs the QA Office to ensure central repositories are up to date.
- **Inconclusive**- no penalty can be applied, and no specific record of the allegation is retained on the learner record. In such cases the learner must be reminded of their obligations in respect of academic conduct.
- **Case upheld**- student is advised of the concerns and referred to complete the library class on academic practice in all instances. Additional actions are taken and sanctions applied in accordance with the misconduct policy. Sanctions for different types of academic misconduct are outlined under 'Sanctions for Academic Misconduct' in Part B of this policy.

Step 5 Communicating the Outcome of the Faculty-Level Investigation

Within 5 working days of the meeting, the Programme Leader will:

- Write to the learner and advise them of the outcome of the meeting including:
 - Level of academic misconduct
 - Penalty applied if relevant
 - Referral of the case to the Academic Standards Board where there has been a finding of major academic misconduct, or where the student disputes the outcome of the meeting.
 - Consequences for assessment.
 - Future implications (e.g. all future suspicions of academic misconduct will be directed to the Academic Standards Board).
- Notify relevant faculty and other relevant parties in the College
- Inform the Academic Affairs and QA Office so that learner and College records can be updated.

Part D: Procedure for Managing Academic Standards Board Investigation of Suspected Academic Misconduct in Student Work

Step 1: Academic Misconduct Case Referral to Academic Standards Board

There are a number of reasons an academic misconduct case would be referred to the Academic Standards Board including:

- A student is under suspicion of a second or additional case of academic misconduct at any level.
- The suspected academic misconduct is major academic misconduct regardless of previous number of instances.
- There are multiple known first instance suspicions of academic misconduct relating to a student's work in the same semester.
- The complexity of the case is beyond the scope of the faculty-level investigation as determined by the Programme Lead in conjunction with the Chair of the ASB.

Step 2: Student Notification of ASB Meeting

When a case is referred to the ASB, the QA Lead will contact the student to advise them of:

- The details of the allegation and the evidence.
- The date and time of the ASB meeting, with not less than 5 working days' notice.
- Confirmation that the case will proceed even without learner attendance or input.
- The right to be accompanied in a supportive and non-participant capacity by another learner or independent person including a member of CCT staff (not a legal representative or advocate); no person attending in a supporting capacity is permitted to participate or act on behalf of the learner.
- The requirement to confirm attendance, and details of any accompanying party, not less than one day prior to the meeting; and
- The right to make a written submission instead of attending.

Step 3: ASB Meeting Conduct

Meetings of the ASB are facilitated by the Chair implementing the following steps:

- At the start of the ASB meeting, all attendees are asked to introduce themselves.
- Attendees are advised that a written record of the meeting will be kept summarising the key points discussed.
- The Chair, or nominee, summarises the allegation and the supporting evidence.
- The learner is invited to respond to the allegation.
- ASB members are invited to ask questions, and the learner is given an opportunity to respond.
- The learner is asked if they have any further information that they feel the ASB needs to be aware of.
- A summary of the key points discussed will be read back to the learner at the end of the meeting and the Chair will ask the learner to confirm the accuracy and completeness of the record by signing and dating the minute. The learner has the right to decline to do so. In this case it will be noted in the record that the student so declined; and
- The learner is informed that the decision of the ASB will be communicated in writing, normally within 5 working days.

Step 4: Determining an Outcome of the ASB

After the learner has left the meeting, the ASB members will consider the evidence and determine an outcome for the case in line with the agreed outcomes for the ASB.

The ASB can determine one of three outcomes:

- **No case to answer**- the case is dismissed. The ASB communicates the requirement for all records of the allegation to be destroyed.
- **Inconclusive**- no penalty can be applied, and no specific record of the allegation is retained on the learner record. In such cases the learner must be reminded of their obligations in respect of academic conduct.
- **Case upheld**- student is advised of the concerns and referred to complete the library class on academic practice in all instances. Additional actions are taken and sanctions applied in accordance with the misconduct policy and summarised in the following section.

Step 5: Communicating Outcomes of and Reporting on ASB

Within 5 working days of the meeting, the secretary of the ASB will:

- Write to the learner and advise them of the outcome:
 - Level of misconduct
 - Penalty applied
 - Consequences of penalty for programme
 - Future implications of outcome
 - Right of appeal
 - Timeframe within which the appeal must be made (normally 5 working days)
- Update the learner record in the Virtual Learning Environment
- Notify relevant parties in the College (e.g., Programme Lead, Faculty Coordinators, Librarian)

POLICY CONTROL SHEET

Policy Title	Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy
Responsible Officer(s)	Dean of Academic Affairs
Issuance Date	June 2025
Effective Date	June 2025
Last Review Date	New Policy
Supersedes	Replaces CCTP511 and CCPT 511A
Next Review Date	August 2024
Designated Reviewer(s)	Dean of Faculty
Scope	Internal staff (full and part time); Learners; Programme Boards; Academic Standards Board; Appeals Board

Revision History

Revision	Approval Date	Revision Description	Originator	Approved By
New Policy	June 2025	Complete review and rewrite of CCTP511 and CCPT511A to amalgamate into one Policy	Dean of Academic Affairs	Academic Council

References upon which the Policy section is based

CCT Policy area	Student centred teaching, learning, and assessment
Statutory & System Wide Basis	The Irish Qualifications and Quality Act (Education and Training), 2012; European Standards and Guidelines for QA in the European Higher Education Area, QQI Assessment and Standards
Related CCT Policies / Forms	CCTP509 – Recheck, Review, Appeal Policy