

PLAGIARISM CONTROL REGULATIONS OF TRANSPORT AND TELECOMMUNICATION INSTITUTE

1. EXPLANATION OF TERMS USED

Antiplagiarism system – an information system for checking the content of documents and identifying texts and parts thereof borrowed from published sources.

Reference – a reference to a fragment of another author's work or another fragment of his work.

Quotation – any phrase from the source that contains 10 or more consecutive words.

EULA (end-user license agreement) – user license agreement.

FEW – final examination work.

Final work storage portal – Internal information system of the Transport and Telecommunication Institute, which ensures storage of students' FEW in electronic format.

Self-plagiarism – a type of plagiarism, the repeated use of own work, pretending it like an original work.

Plagiarisms – deliberate use of another author's work, part thereof or ideas and inventions without appropriate reference to that author. Plagiarism can be implemented as a verbatim representation of the text and as a paraphrase of the text - the presentation of someone else's text, replacing individual words or phrases without significantly changing the content of the text used.

Level of similarity – anti-plagiarism indicator describing the similarity of the working text with other sources.

TSI LMS (Learning Management System) – Information resources of the Transport and Telecommunication Institute, which are used to ensure the study process.

2. GENERAL CONDITIONS

- 2.1. Plagiarism Control Regulations - hereinafter referred to as the Regulations, of Transport and Telecommunication Institute, hereinafter referred to as TSI, determines the procedure for identifying plagiarism, including self-plagiarism, in the TSI student works, violation assessment criteria and applicable sanctions. The term "plagiarism" used in the rules also implies "self-plagiarism".
- 2.2. The rules are binding on all TSI students, academic and research staff.

- 2.3. TSI's official anti-plagiarism system is the Turnitin system, which is outsourced. Only the results of the analysis of this system shall be considered as official test results for further use.

3. PLAGIARISM EVALUATION COMMISSION

- 3.1. The Plagiarism Evaluation Commission hereinafter referred to as the Commission, is a commission established by the order of the Rector, which:
 - 3.1.1. provide an objective analysis of the originality of the FEW and decide on the applicable sanctions.
 - 3.1.2. considers applications from students in connection with the application of sanctions for detecting plagiarism in the works specified in paragraph 5.2.
- 3.2. The Commission composed of:
 - 3.2.1. Vice-Rector for Academic and Scientific Work - Chairman of the Commission;
 - 3.2.2. The deans of the faculty, from which composition the dean is invited to consider the case, at the faculty of which the corresponding student is studying, in whose work plagiarism was detected.
 - 3.2.3. Directors of educational programmes, from which the director of the programme is invited to consider the case, who manages the programme in which plagiarism was detected;
 - 3.2.4. One representative of Student Self-Governance;
 - 3.2.5. Head of the Academic Quality Assessment Board;
 - 3.2.6. Leading lecturers or researchers of the faculty may be invited to work as members of the commission as experts.
- 3.3. The commission has a quorum if at least 50% of the members of the commission participate in it.
- 3.4. The commission makes decisions by open voting; the meetings of the commission are recorded in the protocols.

4. SIGNS OF PLAGIARISM

- 4.1. The presence of plagiarism is indicated by certain signs listed below:
 - 4.1.1. rewriting another person or one's work or part of work using insignificant paraphrased elements, passing it off as one's own;
 - 4.1.2. quoting ten or more consecutive words, or concepts or conclusions, without referring;
 - 4.1.3. a citation to which the author of the work has not referred;
 - 4.1.4. providing misleading information about a source cited in the work;
 - 4.1.5. word sequence changes, direct copying of the source sentence structure and idea without reference;
 - 4.1.6. copying of a volume of words and ideas from a source that makes up more than 15% of the main text of the one source, whether or not references are made.
- 4.2. The procedure for drawing up references is specified in the relevant TSI regulations.

5. CRITERIA FOR SIGNIFICANCE OF THE VIOLATION

- 5.1. Particularly serious violations are the cases when:
 - 5.1.1. the student, as his own, has submitted a fully written work of another person;
 - 5.1.2. the plagiarism was re-identified from the same student;

- 5.1.3. manipulations with the text or the internal structure of the file or other manipulations aimed at cheating the anti-plagiarism system to hide the plagiarism.
- 5.2. The significance of the violation is also assessed by the importance of the work in which plagiarism is identified in the context of the study process. The most significant (in order of importance) is the violation in:
 - 5.2.1. PhD theses;
 - 5.2.2. in the final examination works of the study programme - qualification, diploma, bachelor, master theses;
 - 5.2.3. course papers, practice reports and final examination papers of a separate study course;
 - 5.2.4. in works that have been submitted within the study process of a separate study course (tests, reports, presentations, etc.).

6. INSPECTION PROCEDURES

6.1. Examination of PhD theses:

- 6.1.1. PhD theses are subjected to a mandatory examination in the anti-plagiarism system within 3 (three) working days after their submission to the doctoral council of industry;
- 6.1.2. the Secretary of the Promotion Council, based on the results of the examination, prepares the checking protocol (Appendix 1), and in case of reasonable suspicion of the existence of plagiarism, the relevant Promotion Council shall make a decision on the presence of plagiarism and not directing/ advancing the doctoral thesis for defence;
- 6.1.3. the author of the dissertation and the supervisor of the dissertation are introduced to the decision of the promotion council within 3 (three) working days.

6.2. Examination of the final examination works of the study programmes:

- 6.2.1. FEW are subject to mandatory testing in the anti-plagiarism system;
- 6.2.2. students have the right to check their work in the anti-plagiarism system once to avoid unintentional plagiarism in their work; this possibility is provided and controlled by the faculty;
- 6.2.3. official FEW inspections are performed within 2 (two) working days after their uploading to the *Final Work Storage Portal* with the status that the uploaded work is final;
- 6.2.4. the official examination is conducted centrally at the faculty implementing the study programme;
- 6.2.5. examination of works in the anti-plagiarism system is performed by the responsible person, who is determined in each faculty, hereinafter - Responsible Person;
- 6.2.6. the results of the paper inspection are recorded in the checking protocol (Appendix 1), which is prepared by the Responsible Person and signed by the Dean of the Faculty;
- 6.2.7. the signed protocol is kept at the relevant faculty following the nomenclature of the case;
- 6.2.8. signs that raise a reasonable suspicion of the presence of plagiarism in the paper:
 - 6.2.8.1. the total level of similarity of the text is higher than the threshold defined by the faculty, and/or
 - 6.2.8.2. the level of similarity from one source is higher than the threshold defined by the faculty, and/or
 - 6.2.8.3. some signs may indicate manipulation with the file to hide the plagiarism issues,
 - 6.2.8.4. the threshold level set by the faculty, which is indicated in the FEW guidelines, has been exceeded.

- 6.2.8.5. the threshold level in each faculty is approved by the Rector, upon the recommendation of the Dean of the Faculty. An exceptional threshold may be determined for an individual study programme if the dean of the responsible faculty justifies such a decision.
- 6.2.9. in case of reasonable suspicion of the existence of plagiarism, the paper is referred to *the Plagiarism Evaluation Commission* for further review and decision-making. The Study Department informs the student about such fact within 1 (one) day;
- 6.2.10. *The Plagiarism Evaluation Commission* selects an expert (maybe a member of the commission) from among the lecturers of the corresponding faculty, who prepares an opinion within 2 (two) working days (Appendix 5);
- 6.2.11. Within 3 (three) working days after the receipt of the verification certificate, *the Plagiarism Evaluation Commission* reviews the expert opinion and FEW, and also makes a decision on the presence of plagiarism and applied sanctions (Appendix 3). Within 1 (one) the working day the decision is presented to the dean of the faculty, director of the study programme, supervisor, student, secretary of the State / Final Examination Commission;
- 6.2.12. if due to lack of time the Commission cannot consider and make a decision on a specific paper, the expert opinion is sent to the secretary of State / Final Examination Commission, and the decision on the application of sanctions is made by the State / Final Examination Commission;
- 6.2.13. the applicable sanctions are referred to in paragraph 7.1 of these Regulations.
- 6.3. Examination of the course work, practice report and the final examination work of a separate study course (including in the form of distance learning):**
- 6.3.1. works are subject to mandatory automatic examination in the anti-plagiarism system after the student has uploaded the final version of the work to the *TSI LMS*;
- 6.3.2. the lecturer, based on his / her experience and the specifics of the work, determines the maximum allowable level of similarity for the work, after which there are reasonable suspicions about the existence of plagiarism. The lecturer includes the permissible level of similarity of the examination work in the common performance requirements and informs the students about this condition;
- 6.3.3. the exam results are assessed by the lecturer, and in case of reasonable suspicion of plagiarism (the specified percentage of similarity exceeds the established level), the lecturer informs the director of the study programme and the dean of the faculty within 3 (three) working days;
- 6.3.4. the dean of the faculty, the director of the study programme and the lecturer within 5 (five) working days review the work and decide on the existence of plagiarism and applicable sanctions, drawing up a work examination protocol and a decision which the Study Department introduces to the student (Appendix 2);
- 6.3.5. the applicable sanctions are referred to in paragraph 7.2 of these Regulations;
- 6.3.6. the final examination papers of individual study courses, in which the existence of plagiarism must be verified, are determined by the director of the study programme together with the lecturer of the study course;
- 6.3.7. if the student refuses to accept antiplagiarism systems *EULA* downloading work to *TSI LMS*, the work is not evaluated and is considered incomplete. The lecturer has to include the content of paragraph 6.3.7. to the common performance requirements and inform students of this condition.
- 6.4. Examination of works submitted within the study process of a separate study course (tests, reports, presentations, etc.):**

- 6.4.1. the tests of the training course subject to plagiarism check are determined by the lecturer, but those works or a set of works, the share of which in the final grade of the training course is more than 20% are subject to mandatory check;
- 6.4.2. for each determined examination paper, the lecturer, based on his / her experience and the specifics of the specific work, defines the maximum permissible level of similarity, after which there is a reasonable suspicion of the existence of plagiarism. The lecturer includes the acceptable level of similarity in the general requirements for the performance of the work and informs the students about this condition;
- 6.4.3. works are tested automatically in the anti-plagiarism system after the student uploads the final version of the work in the *TSI LMS*;
- 6.4.4. In the form of distance learning studies, all written tests of study courses are checked in the anti-plagiarism system;
- 6.4.5. the lecturer evaluates the exam results and, if there are reasonable suspicions of plagiarism (the specified percentage of similarity exceeds a certain level), decides on the presence of plagiarism and the applicable sanctions, and also informs the student about this in writing using the *TSI LMS* functionality, e-mail or other official means of communication;
- 6.4.6. the applicable sanctions are referred to in paragraph 7.3 of these Regulations;
- 6.4.7. if the student refuses to accept the EULA of the anti-plagiarism system when uploading the work to the *TSI LMS*, the work is not evaluated and is considered unfinished. Lecturer includes in the general requirements for the performance of work the information on the content of paragraph 6.4.7. and informs students about these conditions.

7. APPLICABLE SANCTIONS

7.1. Checking of the final examination works of the study programmes:

- 7.1.1. the decision on the applicable sanctions shall be made by the *Plagiarism Evaluation Commission*;
- 7.1.2. possible sanctions:
 - 7.1.2.1. to reduce the FEW defence marks (indicate the reduction value) in case the plagiarism is detected in the work, but the identified plagiarism is not significant and does not affect the results obtained in the work, or
 - 7.1.2.2. to recommend to the Rector to expel the student with the right to resume studies no earlier than after 1 year,
 - 7.1.2.3. do not apply any sanctions to the student, since the similarity found during the checking was not recognized as plagiarism;
- 7.1.3. if a student admits a significant level of plagiarism in his work and submits an application addressed to the Rector before the meeting of the Commission, the student has the right to defend the work after 6 months (in the next period of the defence).

7.2. Checking of the course work, practice report and the final examination work of a separate study course (including in the form of distance learning):

- 7.2.1. The decision on the application of sanctions is made jointly by the dean of the faculty, the director of the study programme and the lecturer;
- 7.2.2. 7.3.2. possible sanctions:
 - 7.2.2.1. reduce the mark if the level of plagiarism detected is not significant and does not affect the results of the work,
 - 7.2.2.2. require the student to resubmit the work. The maximum mark in this case for the work is 6 (almost good). If plagiarism is re-identified - the maximum mark

for the work, in this case, is 4 (almost average), if plagiarism is also identified for the third time submitted, the lecturer has the right to refer the matter to the dean of the faculty for further decision-making,

7.2.2.3. do not apply any sanctions to the student, since the similarity found during the checking was not recognized as plagiarism.

7.3. Checking of works submitted within the study process of a separate study course (tests, reports, presentations, etc.):

7.3.1. the decision on sanctions is made by the lecturer;

7.3.2. possible sanctions:

7.3.2.1. reduce the mark if the level of plagiarism detected is not significant and does not affect the results of the work,

7.3.2.2. require the student to resubmit the work. The maximum mark in this case for the work is 6 (almost good). If plagiarism is re-identified - the maximum mark for the work, in this case, is 4 (almost average), if plagiarism is also identified for the third time submitted, the lecturer has the right to refer the matter to the dean of the faculty for further decision-making,

7.3.2.3. do not apply any sanctions to the student, since the similarity found during the checking was not recognized as plagiarism.

8. APPEALS PROCEDURE

8.1. The student has the right to appeal against the decision on the application of sanctions in connection with the revealed plagiarism in the works listed in paragraph 5.2 preparing an appeal (Appendix 6).

8.2. The appeal application is prepared in electronic form, printed out, signed and submitted to the Study Department.

8.3. Deadline for filing an appeal:

8.3.1. doctoral thesis - the term is indicated in the decision of the doctoral council;

8.3.2. the final examination paper of the study programme - within 3 (three) working days after the decision of the Commission;

8.3.3. the final examination work of the study course - within 5 (five) working days after the decision is made;

8.3.4. work within the study process of a separate study course (test, report, presentation, etc. test works) - within 10 (ten) working days after the decision is made.

8.4. When writing an appeal, it is mandatory to describe the essence of the appeal, indicating the facts and objective reasons that, in the student's opinion, influenced the decision made. All documents confirming the student's opinion must be attached.

8.5. When submitting an appeal to the Study Department, it is not permitted to correct the text of the appeal and attach appendices.

8.6. The student may withdraw the appeal application before the meeting of the Commission by submitting a written application to the Study Department.

8.7. Students have the right to appeal only once for each work.

8.8. The Commission considers the appeal considering:

8.8.1. documents that were used for decision making;

8.8.2. the text of the essence of the appeal of the submission and the attached documents.

8.9. The Commission's decision on the appeal is final and cannot be re-appealed.

8.10. The commission shall review the appeal within 5 working days after receipt of the application. The study department informs the student about the result of the appeal within 5 working days.

8.11. The Commission has the right not to explain the decision on the appeal.



Plagiarism Checking of the Final Examination Work of the Study Course

PROTOCOL AND DECISION No. FEW-_____

Riga

Date

<i>Student code:</i>		<i>Name, Surname</i>	
<i>Study course code :</i>		<i>Title of the study course :</i>	

<i>Works (mark X):</i>		<i>Course work</i>	
		<i>Practice Report</i>	
		<i>Final work of the course</i>	
		<i>Other, specify</i>	

<i>Overall similarity level found in the work, %:</i>			
<i>Manipulation with the text, mark X</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>The permissible level of similarity, %</i>			
<i>The work is submitted for re-examination, mark X</i>		<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>

<i>The decision, mark X:</i>		<i>Sanctions are not appropriate</i>	
		<i>Decrease the mark by a specific value (to specify)</i>	
		<i>The paper must be resubmitted, maximum mark 6 (almost good)</i>	
		<i>The paper must be resubmitted, maximum mark 4 (almost average)</i>	

Course lecturer:

_____ (signature) _____ (name, surname)

Study Programme Director:

_____ (signature) _____ (name, surname)

Dean:

_____ (signature) _____ (name, surname)

I have been acquainted with the content and decision of the protocol:

_____ (Student's name, surname) _____ (signature) _____ (date)

TSITRANSPORTA
UN SAKARU
INSTITŪTS

Plagiarism checking of the Study programme Final Examination Work

DECISION No. FEW-_____

Riga

Date

Student code:		Name Surname	
Title of the work:			

Work (tick X):		Master's Thesis
		Bachelor's Work
		Diplomas, Qualification Paper

Overall similarity level found in the work (Crit.1), %:				
Maximum similarity level from one source (Crit.2), %:				
Manipulations with the text of the work (Crit.3), mark X		Yes		No

Expert recommendation, mark with X:		Do not apply sanctions
		Decrease the mark by a certain value (to specify) _____
		Recommend to expel the student with the right to resume studies after 1 year.

Commission decision, mark with X:		Do not apply sanctions
		Decrease the mark by a certain value (to specify) _____
		Recommend to expel the student with the right to resume studies after 1 year.

Members of the Commission:

(signature)

(name, surname)

(signature)

(name, surname)

(signature)

(name, surname)

Chairman of the Commission:

(signature)

(name, surname)

I have been acquainted with the decision:

(Student's name, surname)

(signature)

(date)



TRANSPORTA
UN SAKARU
INSTITŪTS

Consideration of the Appeal

PROTOCOL AND DECISION No. PEC-_____

Riga

Date

<i>Student code:</i>		<i>Name, Surname</i>	
----------------------	--	----------------------	--

<i>Work (mark with X):</i>		<i>Master's Thesis</i>
		<i>Bachelor's Work</i>
		<i>Diplomas, Qualification Paper</i>
		<i>Final examination work of the course</i>
		<i>Work within the study course</i>

<i>Overall similarity level found in the work (Crit. 1), %:</i>					
<i>Maximum similarity level from one source (Crit.2), %:</i>	<i>{only a FEW}</i>				
<i>Manipulations with the text of the work (Crit. 3), mark with X</i>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Yes</td> <td></td> <td>No</td> </tr> </table>		Yes		No
	Yes		No		

<i>Commission decision, mark with X:</i>		<i>Reject the appeal</i>
		<i>Approve the appeal with the following decision:</i>

Members of the Commission:

(signature)

(name, surname)

(signature)

(name, surname)

(signature)

(name, surname)

Chairman of the Commission:

(signature)

(name, surname)

I have been acquainted with the decision:

(Student's name, surname)

(signature)

(Date)



**TRANSPORTA
UN SAKARU
INSTITŪTS**

Expert Report Riga

Date

<i>Student code:</i>		<i>Name, Surname</i>	
<i>Title of the work:</i>			

<i>Work (mark with X):</i>		<i>Master's Thesis</i>
		<i>Bachelor's Work</i>
		<i>Diplomas, Qualification Paper</i>

The results of the analysis

<i>Recommended, mark with X:</i>		<i>Do not apply sanctions</i>
		<i>Decrease mark to a specific value (specify)</i>
		<i>Recommend to expel the student with the right to resume studies after 1 year.</i>

Expert:

(signature)

(name, surname)



TRANSPORTA
UN SAKARU
INSTITŪTS

Appeal Against Plagiarism Decision

Riga

<i>Student's code:</i>		<i>Name, Surname</i>	
------------------------	--	----------------------	--

<i>Work (mark with X):</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Master's Thesis</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Bachelor's Work</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Diploma, Qualification Paper</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Final examination work of the study course</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Work within the study course</i>

The Essence of Appeal

Attachments

(Student's name, surname)

(signature)

(Date)