

# Code of Practice on Academic Integrity

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Code of Practice number:</b>                          | LT COP 12  |
| <b>Version:</b>  | 3.1  |
| <b>Superseded Version:</b>                               | 3.0  |
| <b>Date approved by Learning and Teaching Committee:</b> | V 1.0 approved 29.01.15<br>V 3.1 approved 14.11.22 |
| <b>Originator:</b>                                       | Academic Registrar                                 |
| <b>Date for Review:</b>                                  | 14.11.23   |

| <b>Target Audience</b>  |  |
|---|--|
| People who need a detailed knowledge of the Code of Practice  | Dean of Education; Academic Registrar; Programme Directors   |
| People who need a broad understanding of the Code of Practice | Academic staff involved with marking assignments; Administrative staff in the Faculty of Education; Students |
| People who need to know that the Code of Practice exists      | All Academic Staff   |

---

## Contents

---

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Introduction and Context  | 3 |
| 2 | Scope   | 3 |
| 3 | Roles and Responsibilities                                      | 3 |
| 4 | Definitions   | 4 |
| 5 | Submission of Written Work and Interpreting Originality Reports | 5 |
| 6 | Dealing with Poor Academic Practice                             | 5 |
| 7 | Dealing with Breaches of Academic Integrity                     | 6 |
| 8 | Penalties   | 7 |
| 9 | Right of Appeal   | 8 |

---

## 1 Introduction and Context

---

- 1.1 The Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM) is committed to maintaining the highest academic standards. LSTM students are expected to operate within the ethical code of academic integrity that applies to the wider academic community. It is important that students understand that they must produce their own work, acknowledge explicitly any material that has been included from other sources or legitimate collaboration, and present their own findings, conclusions or data based on appropriate and ethical practice.
- 1.2 LSTM seeks to develop good academic practices by supporting students in understanding and avoiding breaches of academic integrity and by designing assessment activities that reduce the opportunities for such breaches.
- 1.3 This Code of Practice explains what constitutes a breach of academic integrity and sets out how alleged breaches will be investigated and the penalties that may be applied. It is set within the context of the UK Quality Code for Higher Education Chapter B6: Assessment of Students and the Recognition of Prior Learning (Oct 2013).
- 1.4 Related documents are:
  - Procedure for the Conduct of Examinations
  - Procedure for Dealing with Academic Appeals (Taught Programmes)
  - Guidelines for Staff on Academic Integrity
  - Guidelines for Students on Academic Integrity

---

## 2 Scope

---

- 2.1 This Code of Practice applies to written assignments submitted for all LSTM's taught programmes that lead to an award. It does not apply to short courses where a certificate of attendance only is issued. Academic integrity relating to research programmes is covered in the *Procedure on Academic Integrity for Postgraduate Research Programmes*. Academic misconduct relating to examinations is covered in the *Procedure for the Conduct of Examinations*.

---

## 3 Roles and Responsibilities

---

- 3.1 The Academic Integrity Panel will conduct investigations into alleged breaches of academic integrity and make decisions on penalties to be applied.
- 3.2 The Dean of Education will:

- 3.2.1 Ensure that students are provided with training on how to avoid breaches of academic integrity and information on the penalties that will be applied in the case of such breaches
  - 3.2.2 Ensure that staff are made aware of academic integrity issues that they may encounter when marking assignments and know what action to take
  - 3.2.3 Decide whether a suspected breach of academic integrity warrants investigation by the Academic Integrity Panel
  - 3.2.4 Chair the Academic Integrity Panel
- 3.3 The Academic Registrar will:
- 3.3.1 Act as the first point of contact for markers suspecting a breach of academic integrity
  - 3.3.2 Discuss with the Dean of Education whether a suspected breach of academic integrity warrants investigation by the Academic Integrity Panel
  - 3.3.3 Act as Secretary to the Academic Integrity Panel and inform the student of the outcome and any penalty to be applied
  - 3.3.4 Advise markers on appropriate wording for feedback to students
- 3.4 Directors of Studies will:
- 3.4.1 Minimise the likelihood of breaches of academic integrity taking place through appropriate programme design
  - 3.4.2 Wherever feasible, provide students on the programme with the opportunity of submitting a formative written assignment as a training exercise on how to avoid breaches of academic integrity
  - 3.4.3 Serve as members of the Academic Integrity Panel as required
- 3.5 Markers will:
- 3.5.1 Review similarity reports and alert the Academic Registrar if they suspect that a breach of academic integrity has taken place
  - 3.5.2 Adjust marks appropriately to reflect poor academic practice and give developmental feedback

---

## 4 Definitions

---

- 4.1 Poor academic practice is a failure by the student to fully appreciate the rules of academic writing. Examples include:
- 4.1.1 Minor errors, such as missing quotation marks, mistakes in referencing or citation, gaps in the bibliography or reference list or poor paraphrasing
  - 4.1.2 Material that is appropriately referenced but has been copied extensively from other sources, either verbatim (word for word) or with minor re-wording

- 4.1.3 Self-plagiarism, when a student submits a piece of work (or part thereof) for assessment on more than one occasion
- 4.2 Breaches of Academic Integrity include plagiarism, collusion, copying, falsification of data and commissioning.
  - 4.2.1 Plagiarism is when a student misrepresents, as their own work, work in the public domain, written or otherwise, of any other person (including another student) or of any institution. Examples include:
    - 4.2.1.1 Material that has been copied from other sources, either verbatim (word for word) or with minor re-wording without appropriate referencing
    - 4.2.1.2 The deliberate presentation of another's ideas as one's own
  - 4.2.2 Collusion is when, unless with official approval, (e.g. in the case of group projects), two or more students collaborate in the preparation and production of work and then present it for assessment in an identical or substantially similar form as the product of their individual efforts.
  - 4.2.3 Copying is when a student presents work for assessment that has been copied from a student or other person without their knowledge.
  - 4.2.4 Falsification of data is when a student presents data based on work purported to have been carried out by the student that has been invented or altered.
  - 4.2.5 Commissioning is when a student presents for assessment work that has been procured (by financial or other inducement means) for this purpose. This includes requesting another party to prepare all or part of an assignment (with or without payment) on the student's behalf.

---

## 5 Submission of Written Work and Interpreting Originality Reports

---

- 5.1 All assignments at LSTM are submitted electronically through 'Turnitin'. By uploading their assignments, students are deemed to have signed a declaration that they are submitting their own work, they have not plagiarised, copied material, falsified data, colluded in producing the work, nor submitted commissioned work.
- 5.2 Training will be provided to markers on the application of academic judgement in interpreting originality reports.

---

## 6 Dealing with Poor Academic Practice

---

- 6.1 Poor academic practice is not a disciplinary offence but can result in the mark being penalised through judicious use of the marking rubric. Feedback to students should reflect the fact that marks have been deducted for poor academic practice and should include advice on how students can avoid such mistakes in future work.

- 6.2 Repeatedly making the same type of error within an assignment should not necessarily incur a higher marking penalty.
- 6.3 Markers who are in doubt whether an assignment should be dealt with under the category of poor academic practice or as a breach of academic integrity should seek advice from the Academic Registrar, who can also give advice on appropriate wording for feedback.

---

## 7 Dealing with Breaches of Academic Integrity

---

- 7.1 Markers who suspect that a breach of academic integrity has taken place should notify the Academic Registrar as soon as possible and suspend marking pending an investigation.
- 7.2 After discussion with the Dean of Education, the Academic Registrar will inform the marker(s) whether the suspected breach can be dealt with satisfactorily through the marking rubric or whether an investigation should take place.
- 7.3 Investigations will involve an Academic Integrity Panel comprising the Dean of Education, the relevant Director of Studies and another member of academic staff who is not involved with the marking or teaching of the assignment. The Academic Registrar will act as secretary to the Panel and keep a formal record of meetings.
- 7.4 A student or students (in cases of collusion/copying) who is suspected of having breached academic integrity shall be given the opportunity to explain their view of the situation and/or to offer any defence of their actions. Where possible, the student(s) should meet with the Panel to make representations in person and is/are entitled to be accompanied by another member of LSTM staff, a fellow student, or a friend. If it is not possible to attend in person, the student(s) may submit a written explanation.
- 7.5 The Academic Integrity Panel will determine whether a breach of academic integrity has taken place and if so, will take a view on whether it was intentional (i.e. with intent to deceive the marker) or unintentional.
- 7.6 The Dean of Education will issue a report to the student(s) on conclusion of an investigation outlining what action, if any, will be taken. A student or students who are deemed to have committed an unintentional breach will be informed that any subsequent breach will automatically be classed as intentional.
- 7.7 Students who are found to have colluded shall be penalised equally, whereas students who have had their work copied without their permission or knowledge will not normally be penalised. Students are advised not to make their work available to others to avoid being penalised for collusion.
- 7.8 Breaches of academic integrity will be reported at the appropriate meeting of the Board of Examiners. This does not include instances of poor academic practice.

---

## 8 Penalties

---

- 8.1 Penalties to be applied will be determined by the seriousness of the breach of academic integrity and on whether the Academic Integrity Panel considers it to have been intentional or unintentional.
- 8.2 If the Panel considers the alleged breach to have been unintentional, the marker will be asked to consider whether, notwithstanding the academic integrity issues, the assignment still shows sufficient academic merit to qualify for a pass.
- 8.2.1 If the marker considers that the assignment is of a pass standard, the mark will be capped at the pass mark for the assignment and the submission will be counted as a first sit.
- 8.2.2 If the marker considers that the assignment is not of a pass standard, a mark of zero will be given. Normally, the student will be required to re-submit the assignment on the same topic, taking into account the feedback given. The re-submission must take place during the normal reassessment period for that programme.
- Exceptions to this would be in the case that:
- There are multiple assessments for a module and an overall pass mark is achieved for the module notwithstanding the mark of zero awarded to the assignment in question. In such circumstances, the standard reassessment rules will apply and a re-sit will not be offered.
  - The overall mark for the module is a fail and there are other failed assignments in addition to the assignment in question. In this case, standard reassessment rules will apply and the student will be offered re-sits for all failed assignments and can choose (on the advice of the Board of Examiners) which ones to re-sit in order to achieve an overall pass mark.
- 8.2.3 If the marker considers that an assignment resubmitted under 8.2.2 is now free of academic integrity issues and has improved sufficiently to qualify for a pass, the module mark will be capped at the pass mark and, provided this was the only failed assessment, this will be counted as a first sit.
- 8.2.4 If the marker considers that the re-submitted assessment is now free of academic integrity issues but is not of a sufficient standard to qualify for a pass mark, the actual *assignment* mark achieved will be awarded as the first sit mark. In the case of an MSc programme, this means that a student may still pass the module if it contains more than one assessment. If the resulting *module* mark is a fail, the student will need to re-submit the assignment (and/or other failed assignments) on a new topic during the next reassessment period. The mark will be capped at the pass mark in line with standard procedure.
- 8.2.5 If the marker considers that the re-submitted assignment still contains academic integrity issues, a mark of zero will be awarded. The student will then be then offered a re-sit opportunity during the next reassessment period.

The assignment must be on a different topic and will be counted as a second sit. The mark will be capped at the pass mark in line with standard procedure.

8.3 If the Panel considers the alleged breach to have been intentional:

8.3.1 The assignment will receive a mark of zero and students will be offered a re-sit opportunity during the reassessment period. The assignment must be on a different topic and will be counted as a second sit. The mark will be capped at the pass mark in line with standard procedure

8.3.2 In the case of a Masters' dissertation which receives a mark of zero as a result of 8.3.1, the Board of Examiners will be asked to decide whether the student should be asked to submit the original dissertation, revised and corrected, or whether the student should be asked to submit a dissertation on an entirely new topic

8.3.3 Where a breach of academic integrity is particularly serious in nature (such as commissioning of an essay or in the case of repeated intentional breaches), the Panel will have the option of recommending to the Board of Examiners that the student's registration is terminated. In cases where the Board of Examiners endorses the recommendation, the student may be awarded credit already gained where no unfair/dishonest academic practice has taken place

8.4 All students who are found to have breached academic integrity will be directed towards appropriate resources and mandatory training to avoid recurrence.

---

## 9 Right of Appeal

---

9.1 A student may invoke the *Procedure for Dealing with Academic Appeals (Taught Programmes)* in relation to a decision to cap an assignment mark or award a mark of zero but only on the grounds that there was a procedural error in conducting the investigation.

| <b>Annex of Modifications</b> |                      |   |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|---|
| <b>Version</b>                | <b>Date of issue</b> | <b>Details of modification from previous version</b>  |
| 1.1                           | 30.01.15             | Minor edits following review by Management Committee 28.01.15   |
| 1.2                           | 10.04.15             | Minor amendments following University of Liverpool accreditation visit 02.03.15   |
| 2.0                           |                      | 4.2 Clarification on definition of breaches of academic integrity   |
| 2.0                           |                      | 7.4, 7.7 Clarification on dealing with cases of collusion and copying   |
| 2.0                           |                      | Reformatting of Section 8   |
| 2.1                           | 29.1.19              | Replacement of references to Director of Education with Dean of Education   |
| 3.0                           | 15.7.19              | Changes to section 8 to remove the option to re-submit an assignment within 3 weeks if academic integrity breach is unintentional. This will now take place during the normal re-sit period. Clarifications around the consequences of the resubmitted assignment still containing academic integrity issues. |
| 3.1                           | 14.11.22             | Minor edits to reflect changes to Target Audience. Updated reapproval date.   |