

5.2 Assessment Policies

Please refer to ICD QA Policy section 4 and its subsections for more information about assessments, quality control in assessments, External Examination, internal verification, exam boards and related.

5.2.1 Examination and Assessment Regulations

Application of these Regulations:

These regulations refer to:

- Written final examinations
- In-class tests
- Assignments (also known as coursework or continuous assessment)
- Oral examinations (e.g. presentations or viva voce)
- Project work
- Essays
- Reflective diary assessments
- Primary and/or secondary research assignments
- Dissertations or theses
- Any other form of assessment used to assess a learner's achievement of module or programme learning outcomes

5.2.1.1 Expectations of Learners Regarding Assessment

Learners are expected to:

- Demonstrate Awareness of Assessment Guidelines*
- Demonstrate Academic Integrity*
- Complete and Submit Assessments/Assignments Before the Relevant Deadline*
- Attach Declaration of Authorship Sheet to all Submitted Assignments*
- Make Digital (e.g. Moodle or email) Submission and Hard-copy (printout) Assignment Submissions as Required*
- Be Available for Viva Voce*

*More detail on each of the above points is contained in the below subsections

5.2.1.1.1: Demonstrate Awareness of Assessment Guidelines

Learners are responsible for making themselves aware of:

- Learning Outcomes of the Module
- Types of assessments for each module undertaken
- Due dates for assessments
- Tasks to be undertaken for assessments
- Guidelines for assessments
- ICD Examinations and Assessment Regulations before attending examinations or completing assignments
- ICD Plagiarism and academic dishonesty/misconduct regulations
- Learners should consult the relevant lecturer to clarify any of the above

5.2.1.1.2: Demonstrate Academic Integrity

According to QQI (2013b, section 2.1.1) Assessment and Standards guidelines (revised 2013): “each learner is expected to strive for academic integrity, and to undertake assessment tasks honestly and truthfully, shunning plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty or impropriety.” See section 5.2.1.6 of the ICD Quality Assurance Framework for more detail.

5.2.1.1.3: Complete and Submit Assessments Before the Relevant Deadline

- Students must complete assignments according to deadlines set out by ICD and by ICD staff (e.g. relevant lecturers for modules).
- Deadline extensions will not be granted unless students have extenuating circumstances officially recognised by ICD staff and/or lecturers)
- Excerpt from ICD Student Handbook: “All assignments must be completed by the appointed deadline. You must keep a copy of any assignment submitted. It is college policy not to

grant assignment extensions other than in exceptional circumstances. This ensures the fairness of the challenge set for all students on the programme...From September 2017, ICD will be implementing the Moodle system for assignment submission, students will be given training/instruction on same...Failure to submit an assignment by the due date, except in the case of extenuating circumstances, **will result in your grade being less than would be the case if submitted on time.**"

5.2.1.1.3.1 Late Assignment Penalties Policy

A lecturer may refuse to accept late assignments. This depends on the specific lecturer and they should notify students of the late assignments policy via the dedicated module Moodle page. Example cases where lecturers may refuse to accept late assignment (except in cases of extenuating circumstances) include (but are not limited to):

- In-class tests/exams (due to scheduling difficulties)
- Presentations (due to scheduling difficulties)
- Moodle tests
- Any lecturer may refuse to accept late assignments for any assessment element [provided all students are treated equally in this regard] (in such cases, students will be afforded an opportunity to repeat the assignment or the module or to sit the repeat examination, but will be considered as a repeat candidate, **not** as a first sitting candidate [unless they have extenuating circumstances officially approved])

In the absence of a specific policy for a module regarding assignment lateness, the following rules apply by default:

- **Default Penalty for Lateness:** For each day late, or part thereof, late assignment grades will be reduced by a penalty of 10 percentage points (for each day).
 - o This means that if an assignment is submitted 1 day late and is graded as a 55% performance, then the penalty (of 10 percentage points) reduces the grade for this assignment to 45%. Please note, this is not 10% of 55%; it is a 10 percentage point

reduction. If penalties are applied as percentage reductions rather than percentage point reductions, then better performing grades would receive higher penalties than lower performing grades, which is counter to student equality and goes against the principle of consistency in assessment.

- **Lecturers may alter the lateness policy for their specific module** (such that it is different to the official ICD default lateness policy), provided they notify students via Moodle in advance of the submission dates. However, it is intended that lecturer changes should not apply less severe penalties unless there is a specific rationale for doing so.
- **Students may apply for extenuating circumstances** in order to be granted official assignment submission date extensions. As a smaller institution, ICD also operates an 'open door' policy at its reception and administrative office, and actively encourages to learners to approach staff members about any matter pertaining to their study or personal circumstances.

5.2.1.1.3.2 Policy on Learner Absence from an Assessment or Non-Submission

What will happen if a student does not submit an assignment or does not attend an examination?

The policy is very clear regarding this issue. If a student does not submit an assignment, it is **not** the lecturer's responsibility to 'follow-up' with this student. If a student does not attend an examination, it is **not** the lecturer's responsibility to 'follow-up' with this student. It is the student's responsibility to make contact with ICD and/or a lecturer if they fail to submit an assignment or if they fail to attend an examination, and wish to query what to do next. In the interest of pastoral care, ICD staff **may** contact such a student, potentially to discuss retention or failure to progress in their programme. However, while ICD takes its pastoral duties very seriously, it also expects students to be autonomous, independently learning and completing assessments, and following the principle of student-self-directed education as much as possible.

5.2.1.1.3.3 Extenuating Circumstances Policy

Students who fail to attend for examination, or who fail to submit an assignment on schedule, are advised to notify the college Registrar of any extenuating circumstances that might apply to their situation. Such exceptional circumstances are limited to:

- certified illnesses,
- family bereavement
- Involvement in an accident
- Victim of a crime
- Serious family illness
- Bereavement of a partner
- Domestic emergency (e.g. fire, burglary)
- or other similar significant adverse influences (which will be dealt with compassionately, confidentially, and on a case by case basis).

In such cases, the college may permit the student to resubmit the assignment(s) or retake the examination at the next available sitting as a first attempt. Supporting documentation must be submitted where applicable (e.g. illness certificate from a medical practitioner).

Circumstances that are unlikely to be approved as extenuating circumstances:

- Exam stress
- Stress or standard anxiety relating to completing assignments
- Disrupted sleep patterns due to worry about assessments
- Relationship difficulties
- Financial difficulties
- Going on holidays
- Travelling of any kind
- Transportation issues (e.g., ones which make a student late for an exam)
- Getting mixed up about the exam timetable or the submission date for an assignment
- Loss of data (relating to an assignment) on a computer
- Being in work or having to work when an assignment is due (or at exam time)
- Sporting commitments of any kind
- Weddings or other similar social events

- Forgetting about an assignment
- Not knowing about an assignment
- Being busy
- Delaying an assignment submission to improve it
- A printer 'breaking' while printing an assignment 'at the last minute'

The process to apply for extenuating circumstances:

- i. **the student should contact the Registrar**
- ii. **the student may be requested to provide supporting documentation:** The Registrar will assess the case and may request supporting documentation for verification purposes (e.g. illness certificate from a medical practitioner).
- iii. **Approval or rejection of extenuating circumstances application:** The Registrar will decide whether extenuating circumstances apply in each case. While ICD wishes to protect all learners who find themselves in difficult personal circumstances, and this will typically lead to reasonable accommodations, it is important to note that extenuating circumstances applications will not be approved lightly. This is in order to maintain consistency in assessment and to provide every learner with equal treatment in assessment (equal opportunity and time [no greater or lesser]) to demonstrate learning outcome achievement. Equal and consistent treatment of all learners is paramount. Therefore, extenuating circumstances applications will be treated confidentially but will, as appropriate, be carefully considered before approval to protect learner equality. Extenuating circumstances applications will be rejected if the learner's circumstances are not deemed to be extenuating.
- iv. **Notification of approval or rejection to the student:** The Registrar will inform the student that their application has been approved, or rejected with a reason for same
- v. **Notification of approval to ICD Staff:** If the Registrar verifies and approves a learner's extenuating circumstances application, it is the Registrar's responsibility to inform the relevant lecturers/assessors, confidentially. Learners are advised that they may choose to contact specific lecturers about their extenuating circumstances application, in confidence, but only if they so choose. Doing so will ensure that a lecturer can maintain awareness of the situation.

5.2.1.1.4: Attach Declaration of Authorship Sheet to all Submitted Assignments

See Appendix 5.2.1.1.4 for a copy of the official ICD Declaration of Authorship Sheet.

- The official ICD Declaration of Authorship sheet must be attached (stapled or bound) to or within every piece of assessment work submitted by the learner (except for examinations, Moodle tests, or in-class tests)
- It is the learner's responsibility to download, print, fill in, sign, and attach this sheet
- Assignments will not be graded unless the Declaration of Authorship sheet is properly attached, filled in, and signed by the student
- In cases of group-assignments, all students must fill in and sign the Declaration of Authorship sheet (multiple sheets can be used if necessary)

5.2.1.1.5: Make Digital Submission and Hard-copy Assignment Submissions as Required

- Students may be required to submit an assignment in multiple formats e.g.:
 - o Hard copy printout
 - o Online (e.g. Moodle or email)
 - o Verbal (e.g. PowerPoint and/or viva voce) presentation
- The nature of assignment submission format is at the discretion of individual lecturers
- Where practical, students will be required to submit assignments to plagiarism checking software (e.g. via Moodle)
- Lecturers reserve the right to:
 - o Request a resubmission of an assignment from a learner (e.g. if a learner has submitted a printout, a lecturer may subsequently also request a digital copy submission to assist in the grading process)
 - o Check any learner's assessment submissions for the presence of plagiarism
 - o Invite a student for a viva voce

5.2.1.1.6: Be Available for Viva Voce

Viva voce:

- For any assignment, a learner may be invited to attend a viva voce in order to discuss the assignment, as a requirement for completion of the marking/grading process
- A viva voce is a meeting between at least one member of ICD staff and at least one student to discuss their performance and/or contribution towards completion of an individual or a group assignment (in any module, on any programme)
- The decision to hold a viva voce is at the discretion of the individual lecturer or examiner, who may consult with other members of staff on the need for a viva voce in a given case or may invite other members of staff to attend a viva voce to discuss a given assignment with a student
- If a lecturer intends to invite a student to a viva voce at which plagiarism will be discussed (i.e. that the lecturer suspects that plagiarism may be present in the assignment submission) then that lecturer must be accompanied by a second member of academic staff. If the lecturer does not intend to discuss plagiarism, then the lecturer may organise a viva voce to meet with the student to discuss the assignment, at which there is no requirement for a second member of staff to be present

5.2.1.2 Grading of Assessments

The guidelines within section 5.2.1.2 of this document (and subsections) also refer to QA Policy section 4.3 and its subsections (Moderating Assessment Instruments and Results) and section 4.4 and subsections (ICD's External Examination Policy).

In completion of grading/marking of any assessment (e.g. assignment, examination, coursework, presentation, continuous assessment) an Examiner or other member of staff may request further information from a student about their completion of the assessment. This information request may take the form of:

- Verbal discussions about the assessment
- Meeting(s)
- Emails
- Moodle messages
- Viva voce (see section 5.2.1.1.6)

If an examiner has concerns relating to plagiarism and/or academic misconduct (or any other breach of examination and assessment regulations), the examiner has the right to withhold the learner's grade (for the entire module and/or for a specific assignment) until the learner has communicated with the examiner to remove these concerns. In the event that these concerns persist, the examiner should refer to sections 5.2.1.1.2 and 5.2.1.6 (and its subsections) of the ICD QA Policy.

5.2.1.2.1 Assessment Grading – QQI Honours Degrees (Level 8) & Masters (Level 9)

Grading of Assessments at ICD follows QQI (2013b, section 3) guidelines regarding sectoral conventions for assessment: "the sectoral conventions for assessment comprise a set of regulations and benchmarks, which in the interest of fairness and consistency, are agreed at the sectoral level by QQI and all associated providers."

For every QQI module, assessment must be designed to test the student's knowledge and understanding of the module outcomes. The module outcomes represent the knowledge and skills that the student is required to master to pass the module. QQI (the awarding body) provides a set of assessment criteria designed to test the student's competence regarding each outcome. Assessment

is designed in such a way as to be transparent. This means that it should be clear to the student what is expected of him or her to achieve the various grades.

A module that is completed satisfactorily can be graded at Pass 40-49, a H2.2 50-59, a H2.1 60-69 or H1 70+ for level 8 Honours Degree programmes. See Table 5.2.1.2.1a.

| Classification of Honours Bachelor's degrees (Level 8) and Higher Diplomas (Level 8) | GPA boundary values | PPA boundary values | Description 2009 - 2010 and following |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| First-class honours | 3.25 | 70% | Indicative descriptor: Achievement includes that required for a Pass and in most respects is significantly and consistently beyond this |
| Second-class honours Grade 1 | 3.0 | 60% | Indicative descriptor: Achievement includes that required for a Pass and in many respects is significantly beyond this |
| Second-class honours Grade 2 | 2.5 | 50% | Indicative descriptor: Achievement includes that required for a Pass and in some respects is significantly beyond this |
| Pass | 2.0 | 40% | Definitive descriptor: Attains all the minimum intended programme learning outcomes |

Table 5.2.1.2.1a: Classification of Honours Bachelor's Degrees (Level 8) and Higher Diplomas (Level 8)

Source: QQI 2013b Section 3

A module that is completed satisfactorily can be graded at Pass 40-59, a Second-Class Honours 60-69, a First Class Honours 70+ for level 9 Masters programme. See Table 5.2.1.2.1b.

| Classification of Taught Master's degrees (Level 9) | GPA boundary values | PPA boundary values | Description 2009 - 2010 and following |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---|
| First-class honours | 3.25 | 70% | Indicative descriptor: Achievement includes that required for a Pass and in most respects is significantly and consistently beyond this |
| Second-class honours | 3.0 | 60% | Indicative descriptor: Achievement includes that required for a Pass and in many respects is significantly beyond this |
| Pass | 2.0 | 40% | Definitive descriptor: Attains all the minimum intended programme learning outcomes |

Table 5.2.1.2.1b: Classification of Taught Master's Degrees (Level 9)

Source: QQI 2013b Section 3

Grading/assessing group (or team) based assessment tasks:

As per QQI (2013b section 2.2.5) *Assessment and Standards* guidelines, all “individuals undertaking team-based assessment tasks [must be] assessed [i.e. graded] as individuals” at ICD. Grading of group-work assessments takes account of the fact that not all learners may contribute equally to group work. Where practical, team-based assignments, at ICD, should incorporate peer evaluation whereby students report their evaluation of their own work/contribution to an assignment task and also evaluate the contribution of other team members. These evaluations should be used as evidence when making grading decisions. However, the assessor will seek further evidence, as and when appropriate and/or necessary.

Determination of Award Classification:

Following QQI (2013b) *Assessment and Standards* guidelines (Sectoral Convention 3 on Determination of Award Classification), at ICD, “calculation of the award classification shall be based on the credit-weighted mean value of the allowable grades (i.e. those that contribute to the classification) for modules...[undertaken by the student on] a specific programme which has been validated by QQI...for the purposes of making the award.” The percentage point average (PPA) for a stage is defined at ICD

as the credit-weighted mean of the percentage point values for the modules at that stage, as recommended by QQI (2013b). No credit is allocated to a learner in respect of modules that are failed outright (by that learner) (QQI 2013b).

To achieve a Pass a student must have a satisfactory knowledge and understanding of all the outcomes included in that particular module.

A grade above a pass (e.g. H2.2 (level 8), H2.1 (level 8), H2 (level 9), or H1 (level 8 or 9)) would indicate a level of achievement beyond what is required to pass the module. The module lecturer has the primary responsibility for grading students' work. However, all grades are subject to approval by an examination board meeting chaired by the Programme Director or Registrar and agreed by an External Examiner. Grades must also be internally verified (second marked).

Outright fails:

In line with QQI's (2013b) *Assessment and Standards* guidelines, at ICD, an outright fail (or fail outright) is defined as follows. An outright fail in a module occurs when a learner's combined assessment grade for that module is below 35%. If a learner receives 35% (or more), but less than 40%, they may qualify for a pass by compensation, as described later in the ICD QA policy, and pending reference to the programme document to ensure that pass by compensation can be applied to the specific module (or is not precluded from applying the pass by compensation rule).

It may be the case that a learner must pass specific assessment elements in a module in order to pass a module. If this is the case, then the learner must:

- Pass all assessment elements in the module that they are required to pass (as described in the specific module descriptor)
- **Also** receive 40% or greater as their combined grade for the module

Whether or not learners can fail some assessment elements but still pass a module (provided they achieve an overall grade of 40% or greater in the module) will be indicated in the programme manual and module descriptors. In cases where this is not specified, the rule is that the learner's overall grade for the module must be 40% or greater (to pass), **but** they can fail any assessment elements (within a module) and still pass the module overall (again, provided their overall grade for the module is 40% or greater).

Repeat Strategy:

Students who fail an end of semester examination or a phased test have a right to repeat. Students also have a right to resubmit coursework which is considered below Pass standard. The grade for a second sitting or resubmitted coursework will be limited to a Pass grade. In the case of repeat assessments, a student will incur a repeat fee of €150.

Learners who fail a module will typically be offered three repeat attempts. Following QQI (2013b section 2.2.5) guidelines, "for an unseen examination (e.g. an examination paper which is not seen by learners until handed out at the time of examination), the repeat tasks" will not be the same as the original task.

Repeat for Honours:

ICD follows QQI (2013b) *Assessment and Standards* guidelines (Sectoral Convention 3 on Determination of Award Classification) with regard to its repeat for honours strategy: "the existing approach to repeat for honours...[is that] it is not be offered."

Honours Classification:

Following QQI (2013b) *Assessment and Standards* guidelines (Sectoral Convention 3 on Determination of Award Classification), at ICD, “honours classification, or any classification higher than ‘Pass’, shall be made based on first-attempt grades. Necessary procedures to allow consistent treatment of a repeat grade as a first-attempt grade, where exceptional mitigating circumstances exist, shall not compromise this principle.” A learner who repeats a module during the award stage of a programme will not be eligible for an award classification higher than a pass classification (unless that learner is repeating with approved extenuating circumstances).

Pass by Compensation:

Procedure and policy to apply compensation to pass modules is supervised and coordinated at ICD by the Registrar. ICD policies on this matter follow QQI (2013b e.g. section 4.4.1) *Assessment and Standards* guidelines: “a module can be passed by compensation (using passes in other modules from the same stage) unless this is specifically precluded in the programme assessment strategy.”

Passing by compensation requires a learner to achieve 35% in the respective module where compensation is being applied. Passing a module by compensation enables a learner to pass a stage on the respective programme. Passing by compensation is applicable (where relevant in modules that are not precluded from pass by compensation rule applications) when a learner’s grade in a module is “greater than or equal to 35% but less than 40% in the percentage system” used at ICD (QQI 2013b section 4.4.1). A grade of 35% or more, but less than 40%, indicates that “a learner has nearly (but not quite) demonstrated attainment of the relevant minimum intended learning outcomes” (ibid). For a pass by compensation to be applied, “the results of all modules in the stage...[must be] from first attempts” (ibid). “Performance at the first attempt [that receives a grade of 40% or higher] in modules in a given stage ([a stage] of at least 30 credits) may be used to compensate [for other modules] in the same stage, provided no module in the stage has been failed outright [which means a module grade of below 35%]” (ibid). If a student passes a module by compensation, their grade is classified as a pass by compensation and is credit bearing.

For pass by compensation to be applied, at ICD, QQI (2013b section 4.4.1) guidelines require that:

The overall...stage-aggregate of credit-weighted excesses of percentage marks (over 40) is greater than or equal to twice the stage-aggregate of credit-weighted deficits of marks (under 40) and the potentially compensatable results account for no more than one-third of the credit for the stage: i.e. 20 credits in a 60-credit stage or 10 credits in a 30-credit stage.

Learners who pass a module by compensation remain eligible for honours at the award stage, as per QQI (2013b) guidelines. However, compensation (where applied) does not change the result of the module (e.g. 35%) that has been passed by compensation. If a learner has passed a module by compensation, at ICD, they are offered the opportunity to repeat the module assessment(s), if they so wish, in order to improve their grade to a pass, rather than a pass by compensation. If the learner's repeat grades are lower than the first attempt grades, the first attempt grades will still stand. Where a learner's module grade is 35-39% and they pass by compensation, their transcript of results (and the Diploma Supplement) will show the actual result (e.g. 35%) along with an indication that the module has been passed by/with compensation applied. All students who qualify for a pass by compensation will receive a pass by compensation automatically, pending their receipt of an offer to reattempt the assessments as a repeat in the hope of improving their grade to a pass. If compensation cannot be applied in a specific module, this will be identified in the respective programme manual or module descriptor. Decisions to preclude modules from qualifying for pass by compensation, at ICD, must be based on reference to the minimum intended programme learning outcomes (MIPLOs) and ensuring that these MIPLOs are achieved for a candidate to receive an award. Examination board meetings and the Registrar are the primary parties/processes responsible at ICD for overseeing this procedure.

5.2.1.3 Setting of Assessment Instruments

The guidelines on setting assessments at ICD are contained within ICD QA Policy section 4.3 and subsections (Moderating Assessment Instruments and Results), section 4.4 and subsections (ICD's External Examination Policy), and section 5.2 and subsections.

5.2.1.4 Feedback on Grades for Students

5.2.1.4.1 Formative Assessment Feedback

It is every lecturer's responsibility to ensure all students are invited to participate in formative feedback mechanisms within modules. Given the variety of assessment methods used at ICD, there is no single formative assessment mechanism. However, the standard approach may include (but is not limited to):

- Allowing students to provide drafts of assignments to the lecturer for formative feedback (which will not contribute towards the final module grade)
- Allowing students to provide drafts of model exam answers to the lecturer for formative feedback (which will not contribute towards the final module grade)
- Setting in-class tests for formative feedback (which will not contribute towards the final module grade)
- Setting Moodle tests for formative feedback (which will not contribute towards the final module grade)
- Lecturer meetings with students during (or outside of) class time to discuss progress on assignments (which will not contribute towards the final module grade)
- In-class discussions about how to approach assignments or examinations (which will not contribute towards the final module grade)
- Formative feedback may be provided verbally or in writing
- It is important to note that summative feedback provided to learners (after a piece of summative assessment is graded) is also considered to be a form of formative assessment:
 - o Especially when provided in advance of other assessments (e.g. feedback on assessment 1 may help the learner improve their approach to assessment 2)
 - o Given the inter-related nature of modules within programmes, summative feedback in one module should be designed and delivered to help a learner to improve their approach in other future modules. This is confirmed in QQI (2013b, section 4.9)

guidelines. See quote in section 5.2.1.4.2 of the ICD QA Policy for elaboration on this.

5.2.1.4.2 Summative Assessment Feedback

All lecturers are required to give summative feedback to students regarding the grade they have received for a piece of assessment. This takes direction from QQI (2013b, section 4.9):

“Following the issue of results, assessors involved in the specific assessment tasks should normally be available to meet individual learners to review their scripts etc. Such consultations aim to:

- Give formative feedback to learners, especially to those who need to repeat.
- Explain the basis of the learner’s grade/mark against the assessment criteria, especially where the learner believes that the assessor may have made an error in grading the work.

Such a consultation is distinct from a formal re-check or review of results”

Verbally or in Writing:

Summative assessment feedback may be provided verbally or in writing. The feedback should be designed and delivered to (but not guaranteed to) satisfy the student that the grade they have received is appropriate and fair.

General feedback:

A lecturer may provide general feedback on the performance of the overall cohort in the first instance, then encourage any individual student to contact the lecturer directly if further individual feedback is required.

Two-week time-limit:

If a student requires feedback, they are required to contact the lecturer within two (2) weeks of receiving their grade. If contact is made after that time, it is at the discretion of the individual lecturer(s) whether they can offer further feedback.

Students have the option to seek feedback, a recheck, or a review of grades received.

5.2.1.5 Grade Appeals Policy

Following QQI, ICD adopts the QAA definition of ‘appeal.’ According to the UK’s QAA (2013 p. 4) an academic appeal is “a request for a review of a decision of an academic body charged with making decisions on student progression, assessment and awards.”

There are invalid grounds for a learner appeal of a grade. Students have a right to be assisted/advised by their class representative in relation to the appeals policy should they so wish.

Invalid grounds for a learner appeal of a grade:

Following guidance from QQI, as provided by the independent QQI Reengagement Panel during 2019, ICD will not allow learner appeals of grades on the following grounds:

- i. Dissatisfaction with the grade received by the student in an assessment or module (this is not grounds for an appeal)
- ii. Disagreement with the academic judgement of examiner(s)/assessor(s) (this is not grounds for an appeals)

Any appeals lodged on either of the two above grounds will be disregarded/rejected. However, students are entitled to feedback on an assessment grade, a recheck of the marks calculation for an assessment, or a review of an assessment grade, as described below.

Grade Feedback, Rechecks, and Reviews Procedure:

While a learner cannot appeal a grade on the basis of a disagreement with the judgment of the assessor/examiner, the learner is entitled to feedback, for a grade recheck, and to a review, on request, according to the following stages:

Stage 1 – Feedback: The student should ensure they have received feedback on their grade from the examiner (e.g. the module lecturer). The student should contact the examiner within two (2) weeks of receiving their grade(s) for feedback. If the student is not satisfied with the feedback, they can move to stage 2.

Stage 2 – Recheck: “Re-check means the administrative operation of checking (again) the recording and combination of component scores for a module and/or stage” (QQI 2013b section 4.10.3). If a student wishes to have their mark rechecked, they should in the first instance contact the examiner (e.g. module lecturer) within one (1) week of receiving feedback. The outcome of a recheck may lead to the student’s grade increasing, decreasing, or remaining the same. If the student is not satisfied with the outcome of stage 2, they may choose to move to stage 3.

Stage 3 – Review: A student who is not satisfied with the outcome of stage two has the option to request a review. Each time a student requests a review, they will incur a fee of €50 (payment process managed and recorded by the Registrar). If the review results in an increase in the student’s grade/mark, the review fee will be refunded. “Review means the re-consideration of the assessment decision, either by the original assessor or by other competent persons. Learners are required to state the grounds for the requested review” (QQI 2013b section 4.10.3). The student should indicate to the relevant lecturer and the Registrar that they wish for their grade to be reviewed. The student must contact the lecturer and Registrar within one (1) week of the completion of stage 2 to request a review. The lecturer is obliged, on request, to re-examine the work and reconsider the grade. The lecturer does have the power to change the grade having reassessed the work. The outcome of a review may lead to the student’s grade increasing, decreasing, or remaining the same. The outcome will be communicated by the lecturer to the Registrar who will communicate the outcome to the student. A student can only request a review of an assessment decision once. Students are disallowed from requesting a second review of the same assessment decision/grade.

Valid Grounds for a Learner to Make a Complaint Relating to Academic Process or Opportunities:

If a student has an issue that is different to a specific disagreement over a grade, they should consult ICD's complaints procedures (section 7.2.1 of ICD's Quality Assurance Policy). Students may lodge an official complaint relating to the assessment process, the assessment criteria, the relevance of the assessment tasks to the intended programme learning outcomes, or other learning opportunities issues. However, students may not lodge a complaint specifically due to a difference of opinion regarding the grade received for an assessment.

5.2.1.6 Breach of Examination and Assessment Regulations

When completing assessments, learners are expected to demonstrate academic integrity. This means that learners should:

- Make themselves aware of how to avoid plagiarism (e.g. referring to plagiarism avoidance materials provided by ICD and attending citation, referencing, and plagiarism avoidance workshops provided by ICD) and demonstrate this awareness by shunning plagiarism in all its forms
- Independently make themselves aware of how to avoid plagiarism through referring to reputable sources on the subject
- Complete assignments themselves (e.g. not outsourcing the work to other students or other organisations, except in cases where there is an element of group-work)
- Complete exams within exam regulations (e.g. not bringing notes on paper or on devices or any other type of notes to be used when completing examinations (except when specifically instructed to do so))
- Complete assignments according to assignment guidelines provided by ICD and by ICD staff and lecturers

The college offers a specially-tailored academic induction which is aimed at explaining key academic regulations – such as those which relate to plagiarism and referencing – in a way which is accessible to learners from diverse nationalities. It is expected that all learners who are new to ICD should attend these induction sessions as a mandatory part of completing stage 1 of all programmes. Continuing learners are also invited to attend induction sessions or refresher sessions about plagiarism, citing, referencing, and academic integrity, which are held every year on various occasions.

Breaching examination regulations (academic misconduct):

During examinations, an invigilator or other member of ICD staff reserves the right to inspect the possessions of an exam candidate. If a student refuses to allow this without reasonable grounds they are in breach of examination regulations.

A learner should be deemed to have breached these regulations if they are found to have attempted to engage in any of the following during examinations:

- Students are not permitted to enter the examination venue after the examination has commenced
- Students are not permitted to leave the examinations hall during the first hour of the examination
- Students are not permitted to leave the examinations hall during the final thirty (30) minutes of the examination
- Cheating (e.g. bringing notes or other materials to an exam (in any form e.g. on a device or written on the learner's person or on paper), which are not permitted)
- Talking or otherwise attempting to communicate with anybody (e.g. other students) at an examination (except for examination invigilators, lecturers or other ICD staff in attendance at the examination)
- Learners cannot move any of the papers on their designated desk before an examination, or until advised to do so by the invigilator
- Learners cannot bring bags or large coats to examinations (a cloakroom is provided at ICD)
- Learners cannot have any computing equipment (e.g. a mobile phone, smartwatch, tablet computer, laptop computer, electronic organiser, recording device, radio or similar device) in their possession at their desk during an examination
- Learners cannot have any notes, books, reference material, or computing equipment (e.g. a mobile phone, smartwatch, tablet computer, laptop computer, electronic organiser, recording device, radio or similar device) in their possession during comfort breaks (e.g. visits to the bathroom) during an examination
- Learners must have their student ID card available for inspection before, during, and after all examinations
- Learners must read the instructions for every exam before they begin to complete the exam
- Learners must comply with ICD Examination Invigilator's and ICD Staff directions at all times
- Learners, during examinations, may not use dictionaries, reference documents, reference books, or mathematical tables unless expressly permitted for that specific examination
- Learners are not permitted to borrow or loan materials from other learners during examinations
- Learners are not permitted to leave the exam venue (room) unless they have received permission from an invigilator
- Bribery (of a member of staff)
- Impersonation (e.g. a student completes an assignment for another student or a student uses the work of somebody else in the completion of an assignment without specifically

giving credit to that other party) (OR e.g. a student [person 1] knowingly allows another person [person 2] to complete their [person 1's] assignment or examination)

- Learners cannot remove answer books from the exam room

Breaching assessment regulations (academic misconduct):

A learner should be deemed to have breached these regulations if they are found to have attempted to engage in any of the following during assessments:

- Plagiarism (defined in section 5.2.1.6.1)
- Falsification (e.g. claiming to have collected primary data for an assignment, when the learner has not in-fact collected this primary data, or has not used the methods the learner claims to have used)
- Untrue/inaccurate claims to have carried out secondary research
- Misrepresentation (e.g. the learner provides something (e.g. a fact, theory, figure, statement, research finding, opinion) along with a citation or reference that is irrelevant to it [e.g. the assignment contains a sentence along with a citation to back up this sentence, but the cited source does not validate or back up this claim in any substantial way] [or citations are irrelevant to the passages they appear within or alongside])

5.2.1.6.1: Plagiarism

The purpose of ICD's Plagiarism Policy is to

1. **Prevent plagiarism:** this requires ICD staff to:
 - a. Actively build a culture that values and supports good academic conduct
 - b. Provide students with plagiarism training for students throughout academic years at all levels to inform students about academic integrity, academic misconduct, and plagiarism.
 - c. Ensure all students complete an induction module that covers plagiarism, academic misconduct, academic integrity and a variety of other important issues during stage 1 of all

programmes. The aim of this endeavour is to help students to avoid plagiarism and to prepare students for third level education in general.

d. Ensure that lecturers regularly alert students to the importance of avoiding plagiarism and where appropriate to recommend that students use the Harvard Style of citation and referencing in order to credit all sources used in their assignments.

1. Detect plagiarism: This requires ensuring:

- a. Plagiarism detection software is used (e.g. through Moodle digital assignment submission systems) by lecturers (and students) to receive assignments
- b. Lecturers report any concerns they may have to colleagues and Programme Directors in order to deal with any issues that may arise.
- c. No assignment at ICD is knowingly graded by an examiner if it contains plagiarism.

When can plagiarism arise?

Plagiarism is not limited to text and can be found to arise in assessments of all types, which includes but is not limited to:

- Written final examinations
- In-class tests
- Assignments (also known as coursework or continuous assessment)
- Oral examinations (e.g. presentations or viva voce)
- Project work
- Essays
- Reflective diary assessments
- Primary and/or secondary research assignments
- Dissertations or theses
- Any other form of assessment used to assess a learner's achievement of module or programme learning outcomes

What is plagiarism?

Plagiarism arises when a learner (in completing an assessment) displays any of the following (but is not restricted to these examples):

- **Poor scholarship (Lack of Citation/Referencing):** A learner uses extracts from some other party's work (published or unpublished) without specific acknowledgement that the other party's work has been used (e.g. citation and referencing). This includes the paraphrasing of another work without adequate attribution (citation and referencing).
- **Unattributed quotations:** A learner quotes another party's work (published or unpublished) without specific acknowledgement that the other party's work has been used (e.g. citation and referencing)
- **Substantial similarity to another work (including paraphrasing without adequate referencing):** A learner structures their assignment submission (or sections of it) in a substantially similar fashion to another party 's work (published or unpublished) without specific acknowledgement that the other party's work has been used (e.g. citation and referencing). Sections of an assignment that contain high degrees of similarity to sections of another work (e.g. another assignment, a journal article, website, book, thesis or dissertation, YouTube video content, and more) are likely to be judged to contain plagiarism unless adequate credit is given through specific citation and referencing to the correct source(s) (even when paraphrasing is used [without adequate citation and referencing])
- **Presents the work of others as their own:** A learner presents the findings (secondary or primary research) or opinions of another party as their own without specific acknowledgement that the other party's work has been used (e.g. citation and referencing)
- **Self-plagiarism:** A learner submits the same or substantially similar work in multiple assignments (in multiple modules and/or within the same module). The previous/original assignment(s) may have been submitted at the current or a previous institution in a case of self-plagiarism.

In cases where parts of an assignment are plagiarised, these parts may include:

- Text
- Graphics (e.g. figures, tables, charts)
- Photographs/images

- Videos
- Audio files
- PowerPoint or similar presentations
- Computer code
- Tables

Policy on Intentional or Unintentional Plagiarism:

It is important to note that, particularly in cases of plagiarism, if a student is found to breach regulations, their intention or lack of intention to cheat is not a centrally important matter. For example, if a learner submits an assignment that is found to be substantially similar to the work of another party, whether or not they intended this level of similarity (i.e. plagiarism) is not a centrally important matter. Deliberate intent to cheat or plagiarise is a breach of regulations. However, deliberate intent is not a requirement for a sanction to result. Accidental or unintentional plagiarism is still plagiarism nonetheless and appropriate sanctions will result.

Policy on a Learner's Lack of Knowledge about Plagiarism:

If plagiarism results from lack of learner knowledge regarding citation and referencing, then this is the learner's responsibility and sanctions may still result. ICD provides supports to students for them to familiarise themselves with how to avoid plagiarism. Equally, there are plenty of reputable sources available for students to consult in this regard. It is a student's responsibility to make themselves aware of how to avoid plagiarism. This includes seeking support and assistance from ICD staff. However, if a learner engages in plagiarism, knowingly or unknowingly, then sanctions may result. These sanctions may include the student needing to attend plagiarism awareness sessions and the completion of an assignment on how to avoid plagiarism, in order to ensure they improve their knowledge on how to avoid plagiarism.

Major or Minor Plagiarism Decisions:

A finding of plagiarism being present in a learner's assessment includes:

- An entirely plagiarised assignment
- Parts of an assignment may be plagiarised, and other parts may be original
- In either of the above cases, plagiarism may be found, and sanctions may result

The distinction between minor plagiarism and major plagiarism depends on the specific assignment and the nature of plagiarism displayed. ICD entrusts the judgment to what constitutes minor and major plagiarism in specific cases to its academic staff. Decisions regarding major or minor plagiarism must involve careful consideration (by the decision-makers) regarding the following:

- **Are sections of the student's assessment submission plagiarised (yes or no)?** The qualitative nature of the plagiarism (e.g. is it poor scholarship, or any of the types of plagiarism outlined earlier in this document (above)). First and foremost, the judgment here is that plagiarism is plagiarism, where detected. Whether it is major or minor plagiarism depends **somewhat** (but not entirely [see below]) on the proportion of the assessment submission that is found to contain plagiarism (see the next question below)
- **What proportion of the document (assessment submission) is plagiarised?** The quantity of plagiarised sections within an assignment submission should be analysed. High percentage similarity between an assessment submission and another source does not automatically constitute plagiarism; where similarity is detected, similar sections must be analysed by the assessor to clarify whether plagiarism exists, then moving on to clarifying roughly what proportion of the document contains plagiarism. The assessor is **not** required nor expected to provide an exact percentage analysis of the amount of plagiarism present. This quantitative analysis can be carried out by a combination of plagiarism detection software and manual plagiarism checking (e.g. by an experienced staff member or lecturer). There is no definitive percentage of a submitted assignment that must be plagiarised to amount to 'major' or 'minor' plagiarism. However, if greater than 50% (approximately) of an assignment shows evidence of plagiarism, then it is likely that this submission can be decided to contain major plagiarism. However, such a decision must be based on qualitative analysis of the relevant sections found to be similar to other work, to be certain they contain plagiarism. Equally, it is possible for an assignment containing less than 50% similarity to be judged to contain major plagiarism (e.g. if a research thesis containing 100 pages, contains a 10 page chapter that is predominantly plagiarised by being almost verbatim copied from

another source – while this is only a 10% similarity, it is almost certainly major plagiarism to entirely reproduce a chapter from another source (or sources)). There is no definitive percentage for an assessment submission to be defined as major or minor plagiarism.

Therefore, ICD trusts the professional judgements of assessors in this regard. The greater the proportion of an assessment submission that contains plagiarism, the greater the likelihood that it constitutes major plagiarism (provided the sections containing similarity are qualitatively analysed by the assessor / decision-maker to ensure they do constitute plagiarism). The lesser the proportion of an assessment submission that contains plagiarism, the greater the likelihood that it constitutes minor plagiarism (provided the sections containing similarity are qualitatively analysed by the assessor / decision-maker to ensure they do constitute plagiarism).

- **It is essential to note the following:** plagiarism software can provide percentage similarities. These similarity percentages are **not** definitive indicators that plagiarism is present. Similar sections **must** be qualitatively analysed by the lecturer/assessor to make a decision as to whether similarity is plagiarism or whether similarity is not plagiarism. For example, a short student assignment may contain various quotations that are correctly attributed (cited and referenced) to their sources. Urkund plagiarism detection software may therefore indicate that this assignment contains high similarity because it contains quotes. However, if these quotes are correctly attributed, it is highly unlikely that plagiarism is present. For any further advice regarding plagiarism avoidance, learners and lecturers are advised to contact the Head of Academic Development at ICD.

5.2.1.6.2 Plagiarism Detection Handling Process

If a student or staff member wishes to find more information about plagiarism, they should refer to section 5.2.1.6.1 of the ICD QA policy. If a lecturer suspects that there may be a problem with a student's submission relating to plagiarism, they should follow this process. Before stage 1 the lecturer has the right to (but not the requirement to) communicate with the student about their concerns and to consult with colleagues. If the lecturer still has concerns, they should follow the process outlined below. Students have a right to representation (e.g. student rep) at stage 2 and stage 3 below:

Stage 1: Contact Registrar: The lecturer should contact the Registrar to discuss the issue. If as a result of this (and any related) discussion, plagiarism is still suspected, the staff member should proceed to stage 2 of this process. Another point of contact and consultation at this

stage is the Head of Academic Development (but this is not a requirement). It is not a requirement to contact the student at this stage.

Stage 2: Viva Voce Consultation Meeting regarding Plagiarism: A viva voce may be called for any assessment submitted by any student in order to discuss the contents of the student's/students' submission for grading purposes and this may (but is not required to) include discussion about any plagiarism concerns that an examiner(s) may have.

- Plagiarism related viva voce: If an examiner(s) has concerns about plagiarism specifically and wishes to call a viva voce, then it is a requirement that a viva voce, at which plagiarism will be discussed, will be attended by at least two members of ICD staff (e.g. two lecturers (one of whom may be the examiner)). **The Registrar cannot attend this meeting.**
- Viva voce not related to plagiarism: If a viva voce is not called to discuss plagiarism, then only one staff member need attend (to meet with the student).

Before calling for a viva voce to discuss plagiarism, the staff member in question must complete the Academic Integrity Referral Form (see Appendix 5.2.1.6.2) and submit this form to the Registrar, who will organise a second member of staff to attend this plagiarism related viva voce, and will invite the student to attend. It is not a requirement that the student is informed of the purpose of the viva voce meeting because they will be informed at the viva voce meeting itself. However, it is a requirement that the Registrar informs the student that they have a right to request the presence of a student representative to attend any viva voce. The student(s) in question must be invited to any viva voce meeting. However, if they choose not to attend, a decision will be made in their absence, which will then be communicated to them by the Registrar. The aim of such a viva voce will be an evidence gathering meeting for the staff and will provide the learner with an opportunity to formally hear the concerns of two academics (one of whom may be the examiner of the specific assignment in question) and also provide the learner with an opportunity to explain/respond. The outcome of this plagiarism related viva voce meeting may be:

- **No plagiarism / inconclusive:** Plagiarism concerns are unfounded (or there is inadequate or inconclusive evidence) and the assignment should be graded as normal. Staff will report the outcome of the meeting to the Registrar. The Registrar will inform the student of the outcome.

- **Student agrees with staff that there is plagiarism present:** Plagiarism is agreed to be present between the student and the staff members present at the meeting. If this is the case the student may be offered the opportunity to resubmit the assignment (either in full or with parts altered to remove plagiarism concerns). Staff will report the outcome of the meeting to the Registrar. The Registrar will send the student a letter (or email) outlining the decision of the staff members present at the meeting. This letter will contain a possible sanction (see section 5.2.1.6.3 of the ICD QA Policy). The student will have one (1) week to respond whereby they either accept the outcome letter or they request a review (appeal) of the decision regarding plagiarism (see stage 3 of the present process). If the student does not respond within the required time-frame, the decision stands and the student cannot later appeal this decision.
- **Student disagrees with staff regarding presence of plagiarism:** In this case, staff conclude that plagiarism is present within a submission, but the student does not agree. The outcome in this scenario depends on the level of staff agreement as follows:
 - **Unanimous staff agreement:** If all staff present at the meeting are unanimously agreed regarding the level of plagiarism (i.e. that there is minor plagiarism; or that there is major plagiarism), they report this decision to the Registrar along with a recommended sanction (see section 5.2.1.6.3 of the ICD QA Policy). The Registrar will send the student a letter (or email) outlining the decision of the staff members present at the meeting. This letter will contain a possible sanction (see section 5.2.1.6.3 of the ICD QA Policy). The student will have one (1) week to respond whereby they either accept the outcome letter or they request a review (appeal) of the decision regarding plagiarism (see stage 3 of the present process). If the student does not respond within the required time-frame, the decision stands and the student cannot later appeal this decision.
 - **Staff not unanimous:** If staff are not unanimously agreed regarding the level of plagiarism or the sanction, then staff must recommend (to the Registrar) stage 3 of the present process. The Registrar will send the student a letter (or email) outlining the decision of the staff members present at the meeting to refer the matter to a plagiarism review meeting (stage 3 of the present process).

Stage 3: Plagiarism Review Meeting: this is a possible outcome of stage 2, as outlined above. A plagiarism review meeting will consist of two members of academic staff (or more). **Staff members present at the meeting at stage 2 are not allowed to attend the meeting at stage 3. The Registrar cannot attend this meeting.** They may be consulted as part of the overall review evidence gathering process but are not given a vote in the decision-making process at stage 3. The student in question must be invited to this meeting and be informed that they can bring a student representative if they so choose. However, if the student chooses not to attend, a decision will be made in their absence, which will then be communicated to them by the Registrar. During this meeting, the student can hear the concerns of the staff and respond. As a result of the meeting, staff must come to a unanimous decision regarding:

- Whether or not plagiarism is present
- The level of plagiarism (major or minor) (if any)
- The sanction (if any)

a) **If staff are not unanimously agreed**, then the outcome is inconclusive and the student must receive their assignment grade without any sanction (excepting sanctions relating to possible lateness penalties, which are a separate matter). The staff present at stage 3 must inform the Registrar of the outcome/decision of the meeting. The Registrar will inform the student.

b) **If staff are unanimously agreed**, they communicate this to the Registrar and recommend a sanction where appropriate. The Registrar will send the student a letter (or email) outlining the decision of the staff members present at the meeting. This letter will contain a possible sanction (see section 5.2.1.6.3 of the present document). The outcome of stage 3 cannot be appealed by the student.

The outcome(s) of plagiarism meetings at stage 2 or stage 3 above will be communicated, by the Registrar, to the Academic Council and the Head of Academic Development, who are responsible for reviewing policy and procedures surrounding plagiarism prevention, detection, and sanctions.

5.2.1.6.3: Sanctions Due to Breach of Examination and Assessment Regulations

Sanctions will result from any learner breach of Examination and Assessment Regulations (including academic misconduct during examinations or assessments or plagiarism). Sanctions are decided upon on a case by case basis and include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Repeat of a specific assignment (or assignments) or assessment(s) or examination(s)
- Repeat of a module in full beginning at the next available opportunity (as indicated by ICD)
- Suspension of the student's studies at ICD for one semester or more
- Expulsion (removal of the student from the programme(s) and/or module(s) in question)
- Any requirements to repeat assessments or examinations or modules may carry fees
- In any of the above cases, the student's result may be listed as a fail for an assessment and/or module for the relevant attempt (depending on how severe the breach of regulations is)
- In minor cases, the sanction for a breach of regulations may be a penalty applied during the grading/marking process
- In the case of repeat assessments, a student will be required to pay a repeat fee of €150
- In cases where a student is found to have demonstrated plagiarism, the sanction (as well as any sanction above listed) may include an additional requirement that a student attend or reattend plagiarism prevention and academic integrity classes and may also include an additional requirement to complete a mandatory assignment regarding plagiarism to ensure they demonstrate their understanding of what plagiarism is, why to avoid it, and how to avoid it

If the sanction results from a plagiarism detection handling process (section 5.2.1.6.2 of the ICD QA Policy), then the decision of the staff to apply a sanction during that process will not require a disciplinary committee. If the sanction possibility results from academic misconduct other than plagiarism, then there must be a disciplinary committee formed to review the matter. **A disciplinary committee is formed as follows:**

Please note: the disciplinary committee (stage 1 below) and the disciplinary review (stage 2 below) are not to be used in cases of plagiarism. In cases of plagiarism, please refer to the Plagiarism Detection Handling Process in section 5.2.1.6.2.

- **Stage 1 – Disciplinary Committee:** Any staff member who suspects a student has engaged in academic misconduct (including breach of assessment and examination

regulations [other than plagiarism]) must contact the Registrar and submit the Academic Integrity Referral Form (see Appendix 5.2.1.6.2). The Registrar will invite two academic staff (or more) to meet to discuss a possible case of academic misconduct. The student will be invited to this meeting (and has the right to representation [e.g. a student rep]). If the student does not attend the meeting, then the matter will still be reviewed by the staff in the student's absence and a sanction may result. If the student does attend the meeting, they will hear the staff concerns regarding possible misconduct and can respond. Staff must unanimously agree an outcome. Otherwise, no sanction can result. The list of sanctions is outlined above. Staff will report the outcome of the meeting to the Registrar. The Registrar will send the student a letter (or email) outlining the decision of the staff members present at the meeting including a possible sanction. The student will have one (1) week to respond whereby they either accept the outcome letter or they request a review (appeal) of the decision/sanction (see stage 2 of the present process). If the student does not respond within the required time-frame, the decision stands and the student cannot later appeal (or seek review of) this decision.

- **Stage 2 – Disciplinary Review:** The Registrar will invite two academic staff (or more) (none of the staff members present during stage 1 can be present at this meeting) to meet to discuss a possible case of academic misconduct and to consider the outcome of stage 1, above. The student will be invited to this meeting (and has the right to representation [e.g. a student rep]). If the student does not attend the meeting, then the matter will still be reviewed by the staff in the student's absence and a sanction may result. If the student does attend the meeting, they will hear the staff concerns regarding possible misconduct and can respond. Staff must unanimously agree an outcome. Otherwise, no sanction can result. The list of sanctions is outlined above. Staff have the option to either:
 - Uphold the decision from stage 1
 - Or apply a different sanction from the sanctions list
 - Or to remove all sanctions

Staff will report the outcome of the meeting to the Registrar. The Registrar will send the student a letter (or email) outlining the decision of the staff members present at the meeting including a possible sanction. The student cannot appeal the decision of stage 2 (a disciplinary review).

If a student receives a sanction, they will receive a letter (or email) from the Registrar. The outcome(s) of disciplinary meetings at stage 1 or stage 2 above will be communicated to the Academic Council, who are responsible for reviewing policy and procedures surrounding examination and assessment regulations and sanctions for breaches of these regulations.

Appendix 5.2.1.1.4: Declaration of Authorship Sheet

To be submitted by all learners along with all assignment submissions (except examinations).



Declaration of Authorship

I hereby certify that this material, which I now submit for assessment on the programme of study leading to the award of (insert course title here:)

_____ is entirely my own work, and that I have exercised reasonable care to ensure that the work is original, and does not to the best of my knowledge breach any law of copyright, and has not been taken from the work of others save and to the extent that such work has been cited and acknowledged within the text of my work.

I also certify that all primary and secondary research (where applicable) has been carried out by I (the undersigned) as described within this document.

I have made myself aware of how to avoid plagiarism and how to ensure academic integrity with regard to research and completing assessments.

Signed: _____ (Candidate) ID No.: _____

Date: _____

Print name: _____

Appendix 5.2.1.6.2: Academic Integrity Referral Form



Academic integrity (plagiarism OR academic misconduct [breach of assessment and examination regulations]) referral form (please submit to college Registrar)

| | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|-----------|
| Referrer | | Programme director | |
| Programme | | Module | |
| Assessment/examination | | | |
| Learner | | Date alleged | |
| Narrative (detailed description of concern or incident) (e.g. plagiarism, or other form of academic misconduct) | Please note: in cases of plagiarism, please refer to section 5.2.1.6.2 of ICD's QA policy. In cases of academic misconduct <u>not including plagiarism</u> please refer to the disciplinary committee procedure in section 5.2.1.6.3 of ICD's QA policy. | | |
| Have you met with the learner? (this is not a requirement before or after submitting this form) | Yes | | No |
| If yes, what was the purpose/outcome of this meeting? | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|------------|-------------|------------|--|
| | | | | |
| Is this a repeat 'offence'? If so, please explain below | | | Yes | |
| | | | | |
| Has the learner been informed of this referral? (it is not a requirement that you inform the learner, but, you, or other ICD staff may need to contact (or meet) this learner after you submit this form to discuss the matter) | Yes | | No | |
| Please list and describe any attached documents | | | | |
| *If you need any assistance with this or any other section of this form, please contact the Head of Academic Development and/or the Registrar | | | | |
| Signed | | Date | | |

REFERENCES

Andrews, J. and Higson, H. (2008) Graduate employability, 'soft skills' versus 'hard' business knowledge: A European study. *Higher education in Europe*, 33(4), pp. 411-422.

Baker, J. Wesley (2000) *The classroom flip: becoming the guide by the side*. Council for Christian Colleges & Universities (CCCU) Annual Technology Conference, June 23. Available from: http://classroomflip.com/files/baker_2000_06_23_classroom_flip_CCCU.pdf

Bowl, M. (2001) Experiencing the barriers: Non-traditional students entering higher education. *Research papers in Education*, 16(2), pp.141-160. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Marion_Bowl/publication/248995300_Experiencing_the_barriers_Non-traditional_students_entering_higher_education/links/55b7539508ae9289a08be032.pdf

CEDEFOP (2009) *European Guidelines for Validating Non-Formal and Informal Learning*. European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training, Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Available from: https://www.cedefop.europa.eu/files/4054_en.pdf

Durden, G. C., & Ellis, L. V. (1995) The effects of attendance on student learning in principles of economics. *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, 85(May), pp. 242-346

European Committee on Culture, Science and Education (2003) *Council of Europe Contribution to the Higher Education Area Report*. European Parliamentary Assembly, Doc. 9880, 16 July. Available from: <http://assembly.coe.int/nw/xml/XRef/X2H-Xref-ViewHTML.asp?FileID=10237&lang=en>

Grand-Clement, S. (2017) *Digital Learning: Education Skills in the Digital Age*, Cambridge; Santa Monica, CA.

HEA (2016) Enhancing Student Engagement in Decision-Making. Report of the Working Group on Student Engagement in Irish Higher Education, Higher Education Authority, April. Available from: <http://www.iua.ie/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/HEA-IRC-Student-Engagement-Report-Apr2016.pdf>

Karakaya, Fahri, Ainscough, Thomas L., and Chopoorian, John (2001) The effects of class size and learning style on student performance in a multimedia-based marketing course. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 23(2) August pp. 84-90

Lamdin, D. J. (1996) Evidence of student attendance as an independent variable in education production-functions. *Journal of Educational Research*, 89(3), pp. 155-62.

Martin, A. & Grudziecki, J. (2006) DigEuLit: Concepts and Tools for Digital Literacy Development. *Innovation in Teaching and Learning in Information and Computer Sciences*, 5(4), pp. 249-67.

NQAI (2005) Principles and Operational Guidelines for the Recognition of Prior Learning in Further and Higher Education and Training. National Qualifications Authority of Ireland. Available from: <https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Principles%20and%20Operational%20Guidelines%20for%20RPL%202005.pdf>

OECD (2016) Skills for a Digital World: Policy Brief on the Future of Work., Paris. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/employment/future-of-work/>

OECD (2017) OECD Digital Economy Outlook 2017, Paris: OECD Publishing.

QAA (2013) UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Part B: Assuring and Enhancing Academic Quality, Chapter B9: Academic Appeals and Student Complaints. Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education, UK. Available from: https://www.qaa.ac.uk/docs/qaa/quality-code/chapter-b9 - academic-appeals-and-student-complaints.pdf?sfvrsn=c002f781_8

QQI (2013a) Protection of Enrolled Learners: Protocols for the Implementation of Part 6 of the 2012 Act. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from:
<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Policy%20for%20Protection%20of%20Enrolled%20Learners%20V2%20Sep%202013.pdf>

QQI (2013b) Assessment and Standards, Revised 2013. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin.
Available from:
https://www.qqi.ie/Publications/Publications/Assessment_and_Standards%20Revised%202013.pdf

QQI (2015a) Code of Practice for Provision of Programmes of Education and Training to International Learners. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin.
<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Code%20of%20Practice.pdf>

QQI (2015b) QQI Policy Restatement: Policy and Criteria for Access, Transfer and Progression in Relation to Learners for Providers of Further and Higher Education and Training. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin.
<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/ATP%20Policy%20Restatement%20FINAL%202018.pdf>

QQI (2016a) Core Statutory Quality Assurance Guidelines. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin.
Available from:
<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Core%20Statutory%20Quality%20Assurance%20Guidelines.pdf>

QQI (2016b) Sector-specific Quality Assurance Guidelines for Independent/Private Providers. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from:
<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Sector%20Specific%20Quality%20Assurance%20Guidelines%20V2.pdf>

QQI (2016c) Policy on Quality Assurance Guidelines. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin.
Available from:
<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Policy%20on%20Quality%20Assurance%20Guidelines.pdf>

QQI (2017a) Policies and Criteria for Validation of Programmes. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from:

https://www.qqi.ie/Publications/Publications/Initial_Validation_policy_7_10_13.pdf

QQI (2017b) Quality within Higher Education 2017: A Summary Report. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from: <https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Quality%20within%20Higher%20Education%202017%20Summary%20report.pdf>

QQI (2018) Notice to Voluntary Providers of Education and Training Programmes Leading to QQI Awards regarding the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and the use of the Personal Public Service Number (PPSN). Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from: [https://qhelp.qqi.ie/providers/gdpr-additionalresponsibilities/Provider%20DP%20Letter%2001082018%20\(002\).pdf](https://qhelp.qqi.ie/providers/gdpr-additionalresponsibilities/Provider%20DP%20Letter%2001082018%20(002).pdf)

QQI (2019a) Re-engagement with QQI: Process Guide for Independent and Private Providers. Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from:

<https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Reengagement%20Application%20Guide%20may%202019.pdf>

QQI (2019b) Access, Transfer, and Progression. QQI Website, Quality and Qualifications Ireland, Dublin. Available from: <https://www.qqi.ie/Articles/Pages/Access,-Transfer-and-Progression.aspx>

Qualifications and Quality Assurance (Education and Training) Act (2012, Revised 2014) Government of Ireland. Available from

[https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Qualifications%20and%20Quality%20Assurance%20\(Education%20and%20Training\)%20Act%202012%20-%20Revised%20November%202014.pdf](https://www.qqi.ie/Downloads/Qualifications%20and%20Quality%20Assurance%20(Education%20and%20Training)%20Act%202012%20-%20Revised%20November%202014.pdf)

StudentSurvey.ie (2018) The Irish Survey of Student Engagement (ISSE): Results from 2018. Available from <http://studentsurvey.ie/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/ISSE-Report-2018final.pdf>

