

UCD School of Philosophy

Academic Integrity Protocol

1. Overview

The School of Philosophy reserves the right to use the following ‘light touch’ process to investigate suspected violations of academic integrity due to the use of generative AI, or other forms of academic misconduct.

The policy is intended to ensure fairness and to encourage honesty about the use of generative AI in assessed work, as well as providing students with a route to obtaining a passing grade where minor errors or misunderstandings have occurred. It provides Module Coordinators the opportunity to talk with students about their submitted work and, by mutual agreement, allow assessment of a revised version of the work for a reduced grade where this would be appropriate.

In cases where there is clear evidence of a violation of academic integrity, or if there is disagreement about whether generative AI has been used in a problematic way, the matter should be referred to the School’s Academic Integrity Committee in the first instance. The Committee will decide, on the balance of the evidence, whether the original submission should be graded without penalty or receive a minimum passing grade (D–) after submission of a revised version of the work in accordance with UCD’s Academic Integrity Policy (May 2024).

In all cases, students have the right to appeal their assigned grade, as set out in UCD’s Assessment Appeals Policy. In this case, all relevant information including previously submitted work and evidence of previous or suspected violations of academic integrity (if any) will be taken into account.

2. Procedure

1. If the Module Coordinator has concerns about the quality of the student’s work, or suspects that it may violate UCD’s Academic Integrity Policy, the Module Coordinator may contact the student via email and arrange to meet to discuss their work either in person or online.
2. For the avoidance of bias and accessibility reasons, students may request that another faculty member be present for this meeting. In this case, the module lecturer will conduct the meeting with the additional member of the faculty serving as an impartial witness.
3. If, after the meeting, a violation of academic integrity is no longer suspected—for example, because the student’s use of generative AI is deemed consistent with the guidance for that assignment—the originally submitted work will be graded upon its merits. Alternatively, if the Module Coordinator continues to suspect that the student has violated academic integrity, the matter will be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee for further consideration.
4. If the suspected violation is relatively minor, or the evidence remains unclear after the meeting, the student may, at the Module Coordinator’s discretion, be given the option of resubmitting the assignment up to **one week** after the meeting has taken place. This will lead to one of the following outcomes:
 - 4.1. If the resubmitted work is deemed acceptable by the Module Coordinator, the resubmitted work will be graded on its merits with the assigned grade being reduced by

two grade points (i.e. a B grade would be returned as a C+). Where the assigned grade is a D or less, this will result in a failing grade.

- 4.2. Where the resubmitted work still shows evidence of a suspected violation of academic integrity, or the student fails or declines to submit a revised version of the work by the agreed deadline, the originally submitted work will be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee as per point 3 above.
5. A list of consultation meetings will be held securely by the Academic Integrity Committee, and will not be made generally accessible to other members of staff. This information will be used by the Academic Integrity Committee solely for the purpose of investigating suspected violations, including providing relevant information to Module Coordinators before or after a student meeting for the purpose of identifying repeat offenders. This will not, however, affect a student's grades or academic record in any way other than through the process set out here.
6. All information recorded for this purpose will be retained for a maximum of one year after the student has graduated, after which it will be deleted.
7. Module Coordinators who make use of this policy may wish to include a note in their module handbook or on Brightspace stating that a confidential record of academic integrity meetings will be kept by the School and may be shared with other lecturers if necessary, such as when a violation of academic integrity is suspected. They may also wish to advise students that they could be invited to such a meeting to discuss their submitted work. Alternatively, Module Coordinators may choose to invite students to attend such meetings as a routine part of the assessment process or during random sampling of assessed work.

UCD School of Philosophy
29 November 2024