

# 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Superseded Version: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 Management Committee</b>	V 1.0 approved 29.01.15
<b>Originator</b>	Academic Registrar
<b>Date for Review:</b>	July 2028

Target Audience	
People who need a detailed knowledge of the Code of Practice	PVC Education; Academic Registrar; Programme Directors
People who need a broad understanding of the Code of Practice	Academic staff involved with marking assignments; Professional services staff in the Education Faculty; 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 or Breaches of Academic Integrity 6**
- 7 The Academic Integrity Panel 8**
- 8 Right of Appeal 9**

---

## 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 B4: Assessment and Awards.
- 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 serious alleged breaches of academic integrity and make decisions on penalties to be applied.
- 3.2 The Academic Registrar will:
  - 3.2.1 Chair the Academic Integrity Panel and make decisions on actions to be taken.

- 3.2.2 Appoint the Secretary to the panel.
- 3.3 The Student Experience Team will:
  - 3.3.1 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.
- 3.4 The Programme Operations Manager will:
  - 3.4.1 Decide whether a suspected breach of academic integrity warrants escalation to the Academic Registrar, or whether alternative action can be taken, and advise markers accordingly.
  - 3.4.2 Advise markers on appropriate wording for feedback to students.
  - 3.4.3 Act as the first point of contact for markers suspecting a breach of academic integrity.
- 3.5 Programme Directors will:
  - 3.5.1 Minimise the likelihood of breaches of academic integrity taking place through appropriate assessment design.
  - 3.5.2 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.
  - 3.5.3 Serve as members of the Academic Integrity Panel as required.
  - 3.5.4 Agree with Module Leaders appropriate re-submission deadlines where required and inform the Academic Registrar or their representative.
- 3.6 Markers will:
  - 3.6.1 Review similarity reports and alert the Programme Operations Manager if they suspect that a breach of academic integrity has taken place
  - 3.6.2 Give developmental feedback to students prior to any resubmission.

---

## 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 Self-plagiarism, when a student submits a piece of work (or part thereof) for assessment on more than one occasion
  - 4.1.3 The uncritical use of AI-generated text (e.g. from tools such as ChatGPT or other AI text generators) without appropriate acknowledgement, where it is unclear how the student has engaged with, evaluated, or integrated the content into their own academic work

- 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. This also includes submitting content generated by artificial intelligence (AI) tools where AI is used as an undeclared third party to produce assessed work.

---

## 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 All written assessments (essays, reports, dissertations, posters or presentations) should be submitted using the assignment cover sheet. An Artificial Intelligence declaration section will be available to declare use or non-use of AI. If AI tools have been used, when it is acceptable to do so, they should be referenced as with any other source (e.g. literature) and further detail must be provided in the AI-declaration section. Failure to declare the use of Artificial Intelligence may be investigated as breach of Academic Integrity.
- 5.3 Turnitin's AI detector may be used as a prompt for further investigation but is not, on its own, evidence of academic misconduct. Markers will be trained to interpret the AI score in context and consider it alongside other indicators, such as the quality of academic writing, student performance in other assessments, and evidence of engagement with learning.

- 5.4 Training will be provided to markers on the application of academic judgement in interpreting originality reports.
- 5.5 Repeatedly making the same type of error within an assignment should not necessarily incur a higher marking penalty.

---

## **6 Dealing with Poor Academic Practice or Breaches of Academic Integrity**

---

- 6.1 Markers who have concerns regarding poor academic practice or breaches of academic integrity should notify a member of the Programme Operations Team as soon as possible and suspend marking pending an investigation.
- 6.2 The Programme Operations team will inform the marker(s) whether the suspected breach can be dealt with satisfactorily through the marking rubric by a deduction of 5% of the total mark, whether the student should be asked to re-submit the assignment, or whether an investigation should take place. Cases where intentional plagiarism, collusion, copying or commissioning is suspected will be referred to the Academic Integrity Panel.
- 6.3 If a breach is considered to be unintentional and minor, the Programme Operations Team will deduct 5% of the total marks available and insert text into Feedback Studio alerting the student that this action has been taken and directing the student to academic integrity training resources.
- 6.4 If a breach is considered to be more serious/extensive in nature, the student will be notified of the concerns and asked to respond.
- 6.5 Following the student's response, if the judgement of the Programme Operations Manager is that the breach was unintentional, markers will be asked to consider whether, notwithstanding the academic integrity issues, the assignment contains enough original material to justify a pass mark. In such cases a mark of 50% will be given for the assignment, and the submission will be counted as a first attempt. This action can only be taken if the student has not received feedback relating to academic integrity in a previous assignment.
- 6.6 In the case of 6.5 above, the student will be given feedback to reflect the action taken and will be directed to the academic integrity training resources. The student will be warned that any subsequent breaches are likely to result in resubmission of the assignment.
- 6.7 If it is considered that the breach of academic integrity was unintentional, but that the copied material is so extensive that there is not sufficient original material to justify a pass mark for the assignment, the Programme Operations Manager will inform that student by email that this is the case. In consultation with the Programme Director/Module Leader, the Programme Operations Manager, or their representative, will set a deadline for re-submission. This may be within a short timeframe, or within a

defined re-sit period, depending on the needs of the programme. The assignment may be on the same topic as the original submission.

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 failure and there are other failed assessments in addition to the assessment in question. In this case, standard reassessment rules will apply, and the student will be offered re-sits for all failed assessments and can choose (on the advice of the Board of Examiners) which ones to re-sit in order to achieve an overall pass mark.

- 6.8 A re-submitted assessment under 6.7 above will have the assessment mark capped at 50%, but provided it is free of academic integrity issues, it will be counted as a first attempt.
- 6.9 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 *assessment* 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 assessment (and/or other failed assessments) on a new topic during the next reassessment period. The mark will be capped at the pass mark in line with standard procedure.
- 6.10 If the marker considers that the re-submitted assessment still contains academic integrity issues, a mark of zero will be awarded. The student will then be offered a re-sit opportunity either during the next defined reassessment period or at a time appropriate to the needs of the programme. The assessment 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.
- 6.11 Where a further assessment has been submitted by the student before feedback has been given to that student regarding issues of academic integrity, and the subsequent assessment(s) is/are found to have the same issues, that student will be invited to have that assessment disregarded. Such assessments will be removed from Brightspace, and the student will be given a deadline for submission as a first attempt. Provided the resubmission is free of academic integrity issues, the mark for that assessment will not be capped.
- 6.12 A student who has had the benefit of feedback regarding an assessment but subsequently submits an assessment with some minor academic integrity issues, showing a substantial improvement on previous submission(s) will have a 5% mark penalty applied and referred again to training materials. Where a penalty of 5% is applied, this refers to a deduction of five percentage points from the total mark available (i.e., 5% of 100%).

- 6.13 A student who has had the benefit of feedback regarding an assessment, but subsequently submits an assessment with similar issues, (i.e. has not shown a substantial improvement) will be referred to the Academic Integrity Panel or will be required to submit the assessment on a new topic as a re-sit. In such cases the student's module mark will be capped at 50% in line with the normal re-sit policy.
- 6.14 Breaches of academic integrity will be reported at the appropriate meeting of the Board of Examiners. Breaches of academic integrity are defined as where students have been requested to provide an explanation for a high level of matching material. This does not include instances of poor academic practice, which are defined as where students have received feedback and received mark deductions for minor referencing errors.

---

## **7 The Academic Integrity Panel**

---

- 7.1 Students who are suspected of a deliberate attempt to deceive the examiners, or of copying, collusion or commissioning, will be referred to the Academic Integrity Panel.
- 7.2 The Academic Integrity Panel will normally comprise the Pro Vice Chancellor for Education, the relevant Programme Director and another member of academic staff who is not involved with the marking or teaching of the assignment. The Academic Registrar will appoint the Secretary to the Panel who will keep a formal record of meetings.
- 7.3 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.
- 7.4 The Academic Integrity Panel will determine whether a deliberate attempt to deceive the examiners has taken place and if so, will decide what action should be taken.
- 7.5 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.
- 7.6 Penalties to be applied will be determined by the seriousness of the breach of academic integrity.
- 7.7 If the Panel considers the alleged breach to have been unintentional, steps from 6.4 to 6.13 above will apply.
- 7.8 If the Panel considers the alleged breach to have been intentional:



- 7.8.1 The assignment will normally 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.
  - 7.8.2 In the case of a Master's dissertation which receives a mark of zero as a result of academic integrity issues, 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.
  - 7.8.3 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.
- 7.9 All students who are found to have breached academic integrity will be directed towards appropriate resources and mandatory training to avoid recurrence.
- 

## **8 Right of Appeal**

---

- 8.1 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.

Annex of Modifications		
Version	Date of issue	Details of modification from previous version
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	29.01.19	Replacement of references to Director of Education with Dean of Education
3.0	15.07.19	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	05.09.25	Explicit mention of AI-related offenses added. Roles and responsibilities updated. Terminology and titles updated.