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Please note that this document is for guidance purposes only and the University’s formal policy, arrangements and procedures are contained in the document Code of Practice on Assessment Appendix L – Academic Integrity Policy which takes precedence over these Guidelines.
INTRODUCTION

For the majority of students the coursework that they submit throughout the year is as important as the formal examinations taken at the end of modules. These coursework assessment tasks or assignments enable a student to demonstrate their true understanding of a topic, their ability to reflect their evaluation of the ideas of others and their ability to express their own original thoughts or conclusions. These are the kind of general academic skills and abilities that examiners/markers are looking for and students will do well in assessments if they have developed good academic practice.

Academic misconduct is not always a deliberate act. For example, inexperienced students might not properly reference information that has been obtained from another source, without any deliberate intent to deceive. Early advice on the nature of plagiarism and training in citation and referencing is important to help students avoid committing plagiarism. ‘A Handbook for Deterring Plagiarism in Higher Education’ by Jude Carroll identifies a number of recommendations for good practice that may help lessen the number of instances of plagiarism.

Some students, particularly international students, might come from academic backgrounds where plagiarism (as it is known in the UK) is not considered wrong and can even be considered a mark of respect to the original author. Some students for whom English is a second language may not feel sufficiently confident to assimilate and represent the views of the original author and so lift wording directly from the text. Sometimes students can plagiarise without being aware that they are quoting another source. For example, students may repeat ideas from a textbook or a lecture without even being aware that they are doing so, and so do not reference the source. However such circumstances would not be regarded as an excuse for more experienced students who are suspected of plagiarism.

Unfair and dishonest practice occurs when a student intends to gain an advantage over other students by wilfully seeking to deceive assessors and/or examiners. Such acts are often but not always premeditated and would include offences subsequent to a prior written warning of academic misconduct.

DEFINITIONS

Definitions of the types of misconduct are detailed in Appendix L to the Code of Practice on Assessment. The definitions below apply to all types of work submitted by students, including, for example, written work, diagrams, designs, charts, musical compositions and pictures.

---

The intent of the Academic Integrity Scheme is to create a clear, effective and easily explained categorisation, in which poor practice is distinguished from unfair and dishonest practice, and in which the former attracts a largely remedial response.

### POOR PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Definition and examples</th>
<th>Determined by</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Minor error (missing quotation mark, minor mistakes in referencing)</td>
<td>Internal examiner</td>
<td>Mark penalty (up to 10% of maximum mark), as laid out in the marking scheme, with clear feedback on how to avoid error in the future.</td>
<td>It would be possible for the mark penalty to take the mark below the pass threshold but not below the compensation threshold.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Poor academic practice (poor paraphrasing, inadequate referencing)</td>
<td>Internal examiner, Reported to Board of Examiners</td>
<td>Assignment mark is capped at minimum pass grade for assignment (40 for UG, 50 for PGT), Advisory on-line tutorial on poor academic practice (Tutorial 1), Normal re-assessment regulations apply</td>
<td>This category covers a range of poor practices in which there is no clear intention to deceive. It can be repeated, as the mark penalty is imposed for each subsequent example of poor academic practice; this creates a strong incentive to avoid further penalty and should encourage students to benefit from the remedial effect of the tutorial. Completion of the online tutorial is registered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Plagiarism, copying, collusion or dishonest use of data</td>
<td>Internal examiner and investigation</td>
<td>First written warning issued with student’s copy of the investigation report, 0% for the assignment applied by the Board of Examiners, Advisory remedial on-line tutorial on plagiarism, collusion and fabrication of data (Tutorial 2)</td>
<td>This category is intended to capture first offences in which academic misconduct has occurred but intent to deceive cannot be established because the student has not received a prior written warning of misconduct. It is possible for multiple and concurrent category C offences to take place, and in each instance the mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat</td>
<td>Definition and examples</td>
<td>Determined by</td>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>After seven calendar days from the date of the first written warning the stronger Category D penalties will automatically apply to any work subsequently submitted in which plagiarism, collusion, copying or dishonest use of data have occurred. Normal re-assessment regulations apply.</td>
<td>penalty for the assignment would be applied, until the student has received their first written warning at which point the next offence would become Category D. The date of the first written warning about the offence is recorded, and the student’s completion of the online tutorial 2 is registered. Students would be advised in the warning letter that failure to take the opportunity to improve their academic practice by completing the tutorial could put them at risk of a recommendation of a category D penalty for a subsequent offence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## UNFAIR AND DISHONEST PRACTICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat</th>
<th>Definition and examples</th>
<th>Determined by</th>
<th>Consequences</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>A second or subsequent Category C offence following the first written warning (thereby an intent to deceive)</td>
<td>Internal examiner and investigation</td>
<td>Second written warning 0% for the module applied by the Board of Examiners Normal re-assessment regulations apply</td>
<td>It is possible for multiple and concurrent category D offences to take place, and in each instance the mark penalty for the module would be applied. If a student accumulates sufficient modules with 0% due to multiple Category D offences then the Board of Examiners could exercise its right to terminate studies due to a lack of satisfactory progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Serious malpractice (a clear intent to deceive and gain unfair advantage, such as the use of commissioned or purchased coursework, clear fabrication and falsification of data, the attempt to pass off another person’s dissertation or thesis as one’s own, or highly organised collusion)</td>
<td>Internal examiner and investigation</td>
<td>Board of Examiners applies either suspension of studies or termination of studies (with recognition of academic credit already passed without unfair and dishonest academic practice) A mark of zero for the module will be applied regardless of any other assessment component marks for the module.</td>
<td>The practices in this category are defined as those serious enough even as a first offence to warrant termination, and do not depend upon prior actions. Some practices, such as coercion, would invoke other University disciplinary procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic misconduct is suspected in a student’s work and the category of offence is determined. For categories A and B the mark penalty is applied by the examiner and the student is advised to complete the first on-line tutorial.

For categories C, D and E the case is investigated. The student’s record is checked for previous cases. For Category C offences the student is advised to complete the second on-line tutorial. For Category D offences the student is advised to complete the second on-line tutorial.

The student will be invited to provide an explanation of the circumstances.

The case should be evidenced and documented by staff and the appropriate procedure instigated and the penalty recommended to the Board of Examiners.

The appropriate penalty is applied by the Board of Examiners and a note placed on the student’s records.
Part A: Guidelines for Students

Please note that these guidelines apply to undergraduate and postgraduate taught provision only; there is a separate policy document for postgraduate research programmes.

1. MINOR ERRORS

1.1. If an examiner\(^2\) finds that you have made a minor error in the presentation of your academic work, as defined in Appendix L to the Code of Practice on Assessment, they will point out that error to you so that you can learn from it and they will give you feedback on how to improve your practice. The mark penalty that can be applied to the assessment task for such an error will be set out in the marking criteria for the module which will have been provided to you. The maximum mark penalty is 10% of the total marks available for the assessment task.

1.2. It is possible that the mark penalty could reduce your mark below the pass threshold but should not take it below the compensation threshold.

1.3. Your re-assessment entitlement if you fail the module will not be affected.

2. POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE

2.1. If an examiner finds that you have exercised poor academic practice, as defined in Appendix L to the Code of Practice on Assessment, they will point out the fault(s) to you and they will give you feedback on how to improve your practice. The penalty that can be applied to the assessment task for such a fault is the capping of the mark at the pass grade (usually 40% for undergraduate modules and 50% for postgraduate modules).

2.2. The examiner will recommend that you take an on-line tutorial on academic practice as this will help you to improve. Your completion of this tutorial will be electronically registered.

2.3. The incident itself will be reported to the Board of Examiners for confirmation. Your re-assessment entitlement if you fail the module will not be affected.

3. PLAGIARISM, COPYING, COLLUSION OR DISHONEST USE OF DATA

3.1. The University takes very seriously attempts by students to gain an unfair advantage by breaking the rules on academic assessments. If an examiner finds that you have committed an offence of plagiarism, copying, collusion or dishonest use of data, in accordance with the definitions of these terms in Appendix L to the Code of Practice on Assessment, an investigation will be carried out.

3.2. You will be informed of an allegation of plagiarism, copying, collusion, or dishonest use of data and you will be given the chance to explain the circumstances of the alleged offence and to make any representations you wish. You may provide this in writing or at any meeting called by the Assessment Officer\(^3\). If a meeting is held, it will be conducted by the Assessment Officer for the department or school that owns the module and the examiner who raised the allegation will normally be present; if you wish, you may bring another member of the University to attend this meeting with you,

---

\(^2\) In respect of this and all other references in these guidelines it should be noted that the ‘examiner’ is the person responsible for marking an assessment.

\(^3\) In respect of this and all references to the Assessment Officer in these guidelines it should be noted that the corresponding officer for on-line programmes is the Director of On-line Studies
such as a fellow student or a representative of the Liverpool Guild of Students. The Guild Advice Service (guildadvice@liv.ac.uk) can also provide you with independent advice and support with this process.

3.3. After considering your representations and the evidence from the examiner, if the Assessment Officer finds plagiarism, copying, collusion or dishonest use of data have been committed, the Assessment Officer will produce a report for the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners. The report will explain the circumstances of the offence; the investigation undertaken; the representations made by you; the findings of the Assessment Officer and his/her recommendation on mark penalties. You will receive a copy of this report along with a written warning and a recommendation that you complete the on-line tutorial on plagiarism, copying, collusion and dishonest use of data. A copy of the report will also be sent to the Assessment Officer for your department or school if the module concerned belongs to another department or school.

3.4. The Chair of the Board of Examiners will consult the other Board members to decide whether the Board deems the findings of the Assessment Officer appropriate and acceptable. If the Chair and the Board are satisfied with the findings, they will then confirm the mark penalty to be applied as follows:

a. **First offence** – mark of zero for the assignment or assessment task. This will be applied even if the module has only one assignment weighted at 100% of the assessment.
   
b. **Second or subsequent offence** – a mark of zero for the module.

3.5. If it is your first offence, the recommendation of a mark penalty for the assessment task will be made and you will get a written warning when you receive the copy of the investigation report. The fact that plagiarism, copying, collusion or dishonest use of data has been found in your work and that you have been issued with a warning will be noted in your student records, including your SPIDER records.

3.6. After a period of seven calendar days from the date of the first written warning any subsequent offences will be considered more severely. Each allegation will be investigated as outlined in paragraphs 3.2 - 3.4 above and a report to the Chair of the Board of Examiners made by the Assessment Officer with a recommendation for the more severe penalty of zero for the module. You will receive a further written warning with the copy of the investigation report. Mark penalties for the module will be recommended for each and every subsequent offence.

3.7. If a Category D offence is found then you should continue to complete the remaining assessments in the module as the penalty will not be decided until the Board of Examiners meets at the end of the assessment period.

3.8. If you have colluded with another student or students, and this includes one student allowing another to copy his/her work and submit it as his/her own, each of you will be awarded a mark of zero for the assessment or module.

3.9. Your entitlement to be re-assessed in failed modules is not affected. If, as a result of receiving zero for an assessment task you fail the module as a whole, or if you receive zero for the module as a whole, you may be required to re-sit the assessments unless you are in the final year of an undergraduate degree programme, in which case you will only be permitted to re-sit the assessment if failing the module would result in you being awarded a pass degree or being awarded no degree. You should note that if

---

4 In respect of this and all references to SPIDER in these guidelines it should be noted that for on-line programmes an alternative records system may be used.
there is no re-sit opportunity provided for the assessment for which you are awarded zero and you have failed the module, you may have to retake the assessment with attendance and your progression to your next year of study may be delayed. You should also note that if you accumulate a number of failed modules then the Board of Examiners can exercise its right to terminate your studies due to a lack of satisfactory progress.

### 4. UNFAIR AND DISHONEST ACADEMIC PRACTICE

4.1. The academic malpractices in this category are those considered to be the most serious even as a first offence and are those clearly intended to deceive and to gain a student an unfair advantage. If an examiner finds that you have committed unfair and dishonest academic practice an investigation will be carried out. You will be informed of the allegation and given the chance to explain the circumstances of the alleged offence and to make any representations you wish. You may provide this in writing or request a meeting. The meeting will be conducted by the Assessment Officer for the department or school which owns the module and the examiner who raised the allegation will be present; if you wish, you may bring another member of the University to attend this meeting with you, such as a fellow student or a representative of the Liverpool Guild of Students. The Guild Advice Service (guildadvice@liv.ac.uk) can also provide you with independent advice and support with this process.

4.2. After considering your representations and the evidence from the examiner, if the Assessment Officer finds that unfair and dishonest academic practice has been committed, the Assessment Officer will produce a report for the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners. The report will explain the circumstances of the offence; the investigation undertaken; the representations made by you, the student; and detail the findings of the Assessment Officer. You will receive a copy of this report. A copy of the report will also be sent to the Assessment Officer for your department or school if the module concerned belongs to another department or school.

4.3. At the Board of Examiners the Chair will consult the members to decide whether it deems the findings of the Assessment Officer appropriate and acceptable. If the Chair and the Board are satisfied with the findings, they may arrange for other work submitted by you for assessment to be scrutinised to determine if there are any previously undetected instances of unfair and dishonest academic practice. The Board of Examiners can only scrutinise other work by you that is from the year of study in which the unfair and dishonest academic practice occurred; the Board cannot review work from a previous year (or years) of study which you have already passed. The Board will ensure that details of the offence are noted in your student records, including the SPIDER records.

4.4. If the Board of Examiners finds that you have committed unfair and dishonest academic practice the penalties to be applied are either suspension of studies or termination of studies. In the event of suspension of studies the category D penalty and conditions will be applied to the affected module. In the event of termination of studies the Board of Examiners will determine whether any award should be made to you.

### 5. FITNESS TO PRACTISE

5.1. Some vocational and/or professional programmes may require students to meet specified standards in respect of their fitness to practise in the relevant vocation or
profession. This could mean that any finding of plagiarism, copying, collusion and/or dishonest use of data or any finding of unfair and dishonest academic practice may call into question your fitness to practise. If this is the case, it will be stated in the programme information provided to you.

6. CAN YOU APPEAL?

6.1. You may only appeal against the findings of the examiner or the Assessment Officer on the grounds of a procedural irregularity in the conduct of the investigation into the offence.

You may not appeal against the decision of the Board of Examiners other than in accordance with the Code of Practice on Assessment, Appendix E Guide on the Progress of Students on Taught Programmes of Study or Appendix F, Assessment Appeals Procedure; available via the following link: https://www.liv.ac.uk/student-administration/student-administration-centre/policies-procedures/appeals/
**Part B – Guidelines for Staff**

*Please note that these guidelines apply to undergraduate and postgraduate taught provision only; there is a separate policy document for postgraduate research programmes.*

1. **YOUR RESPONSIBILITIES**

   1.1. Take actions to **minimise the opportunity** for academic misconduct or malpractice, for example by:
   
   1.1.1. Changing assessments regularly – if you use the same essay titles or topics regularly or set the same case studies or practical, this increases the opportunity for students to copy or plagiarise the work of others.
   
   1.1.2. Where relevant, ensuring that the assignment and examination rubric/instructions indicate clearly to students that resubmitting work that has previously been assessed for academic credit within the module or the programme is unacceptable and could result in a mark penalty (up to zero for the assignment). This would not be a breach of the Academic Integrity policy but would be a breach of the assessment brief/instructions.
   
   1.1.3. Review learning outcomes – you should review the learning outcomes of the module/programme so that students are required to demonstrate analysis, evaluation and synthesis rather than simply knowledge and understanding. If students are required to demonstrate their own thoughts and ideas, they will find it more difficult to plagiarise the ideas of others. This should also be explicit in the marking criteria provided to students.
   
   1.1.4. Citation and referencing skills – it is helpful if you can add citation and referencing skills to the list of learning outcomes of some modules. This is particularly useful in the early stages of a student’s academic career, in order to help them to understand plagiarism and how to avoid it. These should also be explicit in the assessment marking criteria provided to students.
   
   1.1.5. Record keeping – it is useful to develop a system for keeping records of instances of academic misconduct in relation to specific assessment tasks or modules in order to monitor whether it is particularly prevalent in certain areas of the syllabus, and whether particular strategies and initiatives are effective in combating the problem.
   
   1.1.6. Plagiarism detection software – there are various software packages available that can help to detect instances of plagiarism. Departments should consider the appropriateness of using such software and the assessments to which it can be applied. However, if you are using this type of software, academic judgement must still be exercised in order to determine whether an offence has been committed.

   1.2. **Prompt investigation** - if an offence is suspected in relation to work submitted by a student, in the interest of helping students to improve their academic practice, cases should be investigated as promptly as possible.

   1.3. **Student declaration** - all departments\(^5\) or schools should require students, when submitting work for assessment, to provide either a signed hard-copy declaration or an equivalent acknowledgement where electronic submission is used, to confirm that they have not:

   - a. plagiarised material, nor
   - b. copied material, nor

---

\(^5\) The departmental responsibility referred to here should fall to the relevant body in the case of on-line programmes.
Appendix 1 to these guidelines may be used for this purpose, but departments may use their own procedures/forms to obtain the necessary declaration. Where anonymous marking of assessments is carried out, departments should establish procedures for the declarations to be separated from the work to be assessed before being passed to the examiner(s).

1.4. **Fitness to practise requirements** - for some vocational and/or professional programmes there may be requirements for students to meet specified standards in respect of their fitness to practise in the relevant vocation or profession. Where a finding of plagiarism, collusion and/or dishonest use of data against a student may call into question the student’s fitness to practise, this must be clearly stated in the programme information provided to students.

2. **EXAMINER’s WHAT TO DO IF YOU SUSPECT ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT**

2.1. If you suspect academic misconduct in a student’s work, you should ensure that it is evidenced and documented in order to be able to proceed further.

2.2. Having collated evidence of the suspected offence, you should determine the likely category in accordance with the definitions above.

   A. **Minor errors** - follow the procedures outlined in section 3 below

   B. **Poor academic practice** - follow the procedures outlined in section 3 below

   C. **Plagiarism, copying, collusion or dishonest use of data (first offence)** - follow the procedures detailed in section 4 below

   D. **Plagiarism, copying, collusion or dishonest use of data (subsequent offences)** - follow the procedures detailed in section 5 below

   E. **Unfair and dishonest academic practice** - follow the procedures detailed in section 6 below

2.3. If you suspect that one or more students have copied the work of another student in any form without his/her knowledge, the resulting warning or penalty (as applicable) should apply only to the student(s) that copied the work.

2.4. If you suspect that a student has allowed another student to copy his/her work it should be dealt with as collusion committed by all the students involved.

3. **EXAMINERS’ PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH MINOR ERRORS AND POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE (CATEGORIES A & B)**

3.1. You should use your academic judgement in determining an appropriate mark for the assessment task or assignment, in accordance with the relevant marking criteria and taking into account matters such as the quality and accuracy of the referencing and citations, the quality of data presented, etc.

---

6 In respect of this and all other references in these guidelines it should be noted that the ‘examiner’ is the person responsible for marking an assessment.
3.2. A mark penalty of up to 10% for the assessment task can be imposed for minor errors, where these are not specifically addressed in the marking criteria. This penalty can take the mark below the pass threshold but should not take it below the compensation threshold.

3.3. For poor academic practice the assignment mark should be capped at the minimum pass grade (normally 40% on undergraduate modules and 50% on postgraduate modules). The capping of the mark should be reported to the Board of Examiners for confirmation.

3.4. The student should be advised to complete the on-line tutorial on poor academic practice (Tutorial 1). Appendix 2 to these guidelines may be used for this purpose. Completion of the tutorial will be registered automatically.

4. EXAMINERS’ AND ASSESSMENT OFFICERS’ PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH PLAGIARISM, COPYING, COLLUSION OR DISHONEST USE OF DATA (CATEGORY C)

4.1. If as an examiner you have evidenced and documented a suspected offence in a student’s work and determined that it is plagiarism, copying, collusion or dishonest use of data, you should inform the Assessment Officer for the department/school that owns the module.

4.2. The Assessment Officer will investigate the offence and will invite the examiner to provide his/her evidence and reasons for making the allegation and will invite the student(s) to provide an explanation of the circumstances for the academic misconduct. The student(s) must be afforded the opportunity to make any representations that they may wish to make. If the Assessment Officer holds a meeting between the examiner, the Assessment Officer and the student(s), then the student(s) will be entitled to be accompanied by another member of the University, e.g. a fellow student or a representative of the Liverpool Guild of Students. (A template for notifying a student of an investigation into an alleged offence is at Appendix 3 to these guidelines.)

4.3. If the Assessment Officer concludes that a Category C offence has taken place, the Assessment Officer must provide a report to the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners, detailing his/her findings, the circumstances of the alleged offence, the investigation undertaken, the representations made by the student(s) and the recommended penalty. A copy of this report must also be made available to the student(s), attached to which should be:

   a. a written warning and
   b. a recommendation that the student(s) should complete the on-line tutorial on plagiarism, copying, collusion and dishonest use of data (Tutorial 2) (see Appendix 4 to these guidelines for a template that can be used for these purposes).

4.4. Neither the Assessment Officer nor the examiner can take part in the decision taken by the Board of Examiners.

4.5. Having issued a warning in accordance with 4.3 above, the Assessment Officer should place a note on the student’s records, including their records in SPIDER, detailing the

---

7 In respect of this and all references to the Assessment Officer in these guidelines it should be noted that the corresponding officer for on-line programmes is the Director of On-line Studies.

8 In respect of this and all references to SPIDER in these Guidelines it should be noted that for on-line programmes an alternative records system may be used.
nature of the offence, the action taken and the date of the issue of the written warning. If necessary the Assessment Officer for the student’s department/school (if it does not own the module) should be informed of the offence committed and the action taken.

4.6. Under the University’s Policy on Academic Integrity a mark of zero for the assignment/assessment task that has been subject to the academic misconduct should be recommended by the Assessment Officer to the relevant Board of Examiners.

4.7. If two or more students are found to have colluded in producing a piece of assessed work, then each student should be given a mark of zero for the assessment. If the mark of zero is to be applied to a taught dissertation or project, the Board shall also determine whether the student can re-submit a revised and corrected version of the dissertation or project, or whether the student must complete and submit a whole new dissertation or project.

4.8. Previous offences noted on the student’s records – if the examiner or the Assessment Officer find that the student’s records show a previous warning for plagiarism, copying, collusion or dishonest use of data dated more than seven calendar days earlier, then the procedure for Category D offences detailed in section 5 below should be instigated.

5. EXAMINERS’ AND ASSESSMENT OFFICERS’ PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH SECOND OR SUBSEQUENT CATEGORY C OFFENCES (CATEGORY D)

5.1. If as an examiner you have evidenced and documented a suspected offence in a student’s work and determined that it is plagiarism, copying, collusion or dishonest use of data, and that the student’s records show a previous warning for such a category of offence dated more than seven calendar days earlier, you should inform the Assessment Officer for the department which owns the module of the likelihood of a Category D offence.

5.2. The Assessment Officer will investigate the offence and will invite the examiner to provide his/her evidence and reasons for making the allegation and will invite the student(s) to provide an explanation of the circumstances for the academic misconduct. The student(s) must be afforded the opportunity to make any representations that they may wish to make. If the Assessment Officer holds a meeting between the examiner, the Assessment Officer and the student(s), then the student(s) will be entitled to be accompanied by another member of the University, e.g. a fellow student or a representative of the Liverpool Guild of Students. (A template for notifying a student of an investigation into an alleged offence is at Appendix 3 to these guidelines.)

5.3. If the Assessment Officer concludes that a Category D offence has taken place, the Assessment Officer must provide a report to the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners, detailing his/her findings, the circumstances of the alleged offence, the investigation undertaken, the representations made by the student(s) and the recommended penalty. A copy of this report must also be made available to the student(s).

a. a further written warning and
b. a further recommendation that the student(s) should complete the on-line tutorial on plagiarism, copying, collusion and dishonest use of data if they have not yet done so (see Appendix 5 to these guidelines for a template that can be used for these purposes).
5.4. Neither the Assessment Officer nor the examiner can take part in the decision taken by the Board of Examiners.

5.5. Having issued a warning in accordance with 4.3 above, the Assessment Officer should place a note on the student’s records, including their records in SPIDER9, detailing the nature of the offence, the action taken and the date of the issue of the written warning. If necessary the Assessment Officer for the student’s department (if it does not own the module) should be informed of the offence committed and the action taken.

5.6. Under the University’s Policy on Academic Integrity a mark of zero for the module that has been subject to the academic misconduct should be recommended by the Assessment Officer to the relevant Board of Examiners, irrespective of any existing module component marks.

5.7. The student should be advised to complete any remaining assessments in the module.

5.8. If two or more students are found to have colluded in producing a piece of assessed work, then each student should be given a mark of zero for the module. If the mark of zero is to be applied to a taught dissertation or project, the Board shall also determine whether the student can re-submit a revised and corrected version of the dissertation or project, or whether the student must complete and submit a whole new dissertation or project.

6. EXAMINERS’ AND ASSESSMENT OFFICERS’ PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH UNFAIR AND DISHONEST ACADEMIC PRACTICE (CATEGORY E)

6.1. If as an examiner you have evidenced and documented a suspected Category E offence in a student’s work you should inform the Assessment Officer for the department/school that owns the module.

6.2. The Assessment Officer will investigate the offence and will invite the examiner to provide his/her evidence and reasons for making the allegation and will invite the student(s) to provide an explanation of the circumstances for the academic misconduct. The student(s) must be afforded the opportunity to make any representations that they may wish to make. If this involves a meeting between the examiner, the Assessment Officer and the student(s), then the student(s) will be entitled to be accompanied by another member of the University, e.g. a fellow student or representative of the Liverpool Guild of Students. (A template for notifying a student of an alleged offence is at Appendix 3 to these guidelines.)

6.3. If the Assessment Officer concludes that a Category E offence has taken place, the Assessment Officer must provide a report to the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners, detailing his/her findings, the circumstances of the alleged offence, the investigation undertaken, the representations made by the student(s) and the recommended penalty. A copy of this report must also be made available to the student(s).

---

9 In respect of this and all references to SPIDER in these Guidelines it should be noted that for on-line programmes an alternative records system may be used.
6.4. When the Chair of the relevant Board of Examiners receives the report described in 6.3 above, s/he should consult with the other members of the Board to determine whether the findings of the Assessment Officer are appropriate and acceptable.

6.5. Neither the Assessment Officer nor the examiner can take part in the decision taken by the Board of Examiners.

6.6. In exceptional circumstances and if the Chair and the Board are satisfied with the findings detailed in the report, the Board can arrange for other work submitted by the student(s) for assessment to be scrutinised for other instances of unfair or dishonest academic practice. The Board of Examiners can only scrutinise other work by the student that is from the year of study in which the offence took place; the Board cannot review work from a previous year (or years) of study which the student has already passed.

6.7. If the Board of Examiners finds that a student has committed unfair or dishonest academic practice it shall determine, based on the severity of the case, whether the student’s studies shall be suspended for a period up to one academic year or terminated. In this event the category D penalty and conditions should be applied to the affected module.

6.8. If a student is found to have committed unfair and dishonest academic practice and the Board of Examiners has determined that the student’s studies should be terminated, the student will be deemed to have failed to satisfy the requirements of the programme. In such circumstances, the Board should approve any appropriate exit award to be made to the student, based on credits gained without the use of unfair or dishonest academic practice.

6.9. The Board of Examiners should ensure that the minutes of the Board’s meeting accurately record the decision making process and it is responsible for ensuring the decision is noted in the student’s record, including their records on SPIDER.

7. PROCEDURE IN RELATION TO RESEARCH DEGREES

7.1. The policy for dealing with breaches of academic integrity in research degrees is addressed in a separate policy document.

TECHNICAL NOTES FOR STAFF – for entering incidents of plagiarism, copying collusion and dishonest use of data on SPIDER

I. When a student has been found guilty of a Category C, D or E offence, staff in academic departments should record this against the student’s record in SPIDER. Access to the appropriate screen in SPIDER is restricted so Heads of Department are required to nominate an individual to whom special access will be granted by the Student Spider Manager based in the Student Administration and Support Division. Requests for deletion of any such record once committed to the database have to be referred to the Director of Student Administration and Support.

II. Detailed technical instructions on how to record the information in SPIDER are available from SAS. There are facilities within SPIDER to record the specific contravention (e.g. the nature and category of the offence, the academic session the incident relates to, the actual date, the relevant module code and the person reporting the incident). There is provision for free text entry to provide details of the incident.
III. Data stored in SPIDER relating to academic misconduct is available for report and monitoring using Business Objects. Advice on this can be obtained from SAS.
APPENDIX 1

DECLARATION OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

| NAME (Print) |  |
| STUDENT NUMBER |  |
| MODULE TITLE/CODE |  |
| TITLE OF WORK |  |

This form should be completed by the student and appended to any piece of work that is submitted for summative assessment. Submission of the form by electronic means by a student constitutes their confirmation of the terms of the declaration.

Students should familiarise themselves with Section 9 of the Code of Practice on Assessment and Appendix L of the University’s Code of Practice on Assessment which provide the definitions of academic malpractice and the policies and procedures that apply to the investigation of alleged incidents.

Students found to have committed academic malpractice are liable to receive a mark of zero for the assessment or the module concerned. Unfair and dishonest academic practice will attract more severe penalties, including possible suspension or termination of studies.

STUDENT DECLARATION

I confirm that I have read and understood the University’s Academic Integrity Policy.

I confirm that I have acted honestly, ethically and professionally in conduct leading to assessment for the programme of study.

I confirm that I have not copied material from another source nor committed plagiarism nor fabricated, falsified or embellished data when completing the attached piece of work. I confirm that I have not copied material from another source, nor colluded with any other student in the preparation and production of this work.

SIGNATURE…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

DATE……………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………..
APPENDIX 2

CATEGORY B OFFENCE

RECOMMENDATION TO COMPLETE THE ON-LINE TUTORIAL (1) ON POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE

| NAME (Print) |  |
| STUDENT NUMBER |  |
| MODULE TITLE/CODE |  |
| TITLE OF WORK |  |

To be completed by the examiner

I have found evidence of poor academic practice in your work and have indicated on the returned assessment where this has occurred.

The poor practice will be reflected in the mark you will be awarded for the work and the penalty is in accordance with the University’s policy on Academic Integrity.

To avoid such poor practice in future assessments you are very strongly advised to complete the on-line Tutorial 1 on Poor Academic Practice which can be found at [http://www.liv.ac.uk/ilearn/](http://www.liv.ac.uk/ilearn/)

Completion of this tutorial does not in itself constitute an admission of guilt of deliberate academic misconduct but your completion of the tutorial will be electronically registered.
## APPENDIX 3

### UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL

### NOTIFICATION OF AN INVESTIGATION UNDER THE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Print)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT NUMBER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODULE TITLE/CODE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To be completed by the Assessment Officer*

It has been reported to me, as Assessment Officer, that you are suspected of having committed *(delete as appropriate)*

- Plagiarism
- Copying
- Collusion
- Dishonest use of data
- Unfair and/or dishonest academic practice

in the preparation of the following assessment:

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………....

The attached document contains details of the alleged offence.

The University’s procedures require me to investigate this matter and to make a report to the Board of Examiners, including a recommendation on the penalty to be imposed. You now have an opportunity to provide an explanation of the alleged offence and to make any representations you wish to.

If you wish to provide me with a written explanation of the alleged offence, you must let me have this by *[date]*.

If the allegation is that you have committed unfair and/or dishonest academic practice, then you may make a written request to me by *[date]* for a meeting. If you request a meeting, or if I invite you to one, *[name of examiner]* who reported the alleged offence to me may also be present and you will be entitled to be accompanied by another member of the University, e.g. a fellow student or a representative of the Liverpool Guild of Students. The Guild Advice Service ([guildadvice@liv.ac.uk](mailto:guildadvice@liv.ac.uk)) can also provide you with independent advice and support with this process.

NAME OF ASSESSMENT OFFICER:………………………………………………………………………

DEPARTMENT:………………………………………………………………………………………….

DATE:……………………………………………………………………………………………………..
To be completed by the Assessment Officer

The investigation recently conducted by me, as Assessment Officer, into the allegation of your academic misconduct found evidence to suggest that (indicate as applicable):

- Plagiarism
- Copying
- Collusion
- Dishonest use of data

had taken place and exceeded poor academic practice; I have indicated on the returned assessment where the affected material is. Definitions of these terms can be found in the Code of Practice on Assessment Appendix L and in the Student and Staff Guidelines on the Academic Integrity Policy.

The University views all academic misconduct seriously. On this occasion to avoid any future similar allegation and potential penalties, I am issuing you with this written warning about the need to observe the University’s Academic Integrity Policy. A copy of this warning will be placed on your records and sent to your departmental Assessment Officer (if relevant).

You are very strongly advised to complete the on-line Tutorial (2) on Plagiarism, Copying, Collusion and Dishonest Use of Data which can be found at http://www.liv.ac.uk/ilearn/.

Completion of this tutorial does not in itself constitute an admission of guilt of academic misconduct. Failure to complete the tutorial however could put you at risk of a second or subsequent allegation being automatically investigated and penalised as a Category D offence. Your completion of the tutorial will be electronically registered.

If a second or subsequent instance of plagiarism, copying, collusion or dishonest use of data is proven a mark of zero will be awarded for the whole module in which the academic misconduct occurs and any further incidents will be dealt with according to procedures for unfair and dishonest academic practice.

The penalty for proven plagiarism, copying, collusion or dishonest use of data is for a mark of zero to be awarded for the assessment task. I will be making this recommendation to your Board of Examiners.
APPENDIX 5

CATEGORY D OFFENCE

SECOND/SUBSEQUENT WRITTEN WARNING

| NAME (Print) |                     |
| STUDENT NUMBER |                   |
| MODULE TITLE/CODE |                 |
| TITLE OF WORK |                   |
| DATE OF NOTIFICATION |           |

To be completed by the Assessment Officer

The investigation recently conducted by me, as Assessment Officer, into the allegation of your academic misconduct found evidence to suggest that (indicate as applicable):

- Plagiarism
- Copying
- Collusion
- Dishonest Use of data

had taken place and exceeded poor academic practice; I have indicated on the returned assessment where the affected material is. Definitions of these terms can be found in the Code of Practice on Assessment Appendix L and in the Student and Staff Guidelines on the Academic Integrity Policy.

The University views all academic misconduct seriously. On this occasion to avoid any future similar allegation and potential penalties, I am issuing you with this written warning about the need to observe the University’s Academic Integrity Policy. A copy of this warning will be placed on your records and sent to your departmental Assessment Officer (if relevant).

Our records show that this is not your first recorded offence. If you have not already done so you are very strongly advised to complete the on-line Tutorial (2) on Plagiarism, Copying, Collusion and Dishonest Use of Data which can be found at [http://www.liv.ac.uk/ilearn/](http://www.liv.ac.uk/ilearn/).

Completion of this tutorial does not in itself constitute an admission of guilt of academic misconduct. Your completion of the tutorial will be electronically registered.

The penalty for proven second or subsequent cases of plagiarism, copying, collusion or dishonest use of data is that a mark of zero will be awarded for the whole module on each and every occasion that the offence is committed. I will be making this recommendation to your Board of Examiners.

You may be required to retake the module(s) with attendance and your progression to your next year of study may be delayed or your ability to complete your degree may be compromised. You should also note that if you accumulate a number of failed modules then the Board of Examiners can exercise its right to terminate your studies due to a lack of satisfactory progress.

NAME OF ASSESSMENT OFFICER…………………………………………....................................

DEPARTMENT…………………………………………………………………………………………...