University of East Anglia

LTC12D129

Title:	**Reflective Overview on 2011/12 Plagiarism Reports from School Plagiarism Officers**
Author:	Dr Adam Longcroft (Academic Director of Taught Programmes)
Date:	For LTC meeting of 15 May 2013
Circulation:	*Learning & Teaching Committee – 15 May 2013*
Agenda:	LTC12A005
Version:	Final
Status:	Open

OPEN

Issue

An overview of reports from Plagiarism Officers relating to the Academic Year 2011/12. The ADTP has provided a covering report which draws attention to common themes and one-off issues.

Recommendation

The ADTP's covering report includes some suggested actions/strategies which may help to address the number of plagiarism/collusion cases in future. This includes a suggestion that LTC establish a broad-based working group which can carry-out work during 2013/14 to determine the future use of *Turnitin* (or other, similar, text-matching resources) at UEA in future. It is suggested that the Working Group should be chaired by the ADTP.

Resource Implications

If LTC establishes a Working Group on the use of *Turnitin*, this is likely to involve time of key staff and officers within UEA, UEA London, INTO and Student Union.

Risk Implications

The Working Group, if established, may not be able to reach agreement on a future strategy for the use of *Turnitin*, or may propose a strategy that is problematic to implement or unsustainable.

Equality and Diversity

It is not envisaged that setting-up a Working Group will have significant equality/diversity implications, though the any proposed strategy which the Group proposes would need to be considered in the light of relevant equality/diversity legislation and University regulations/policies.

Timing of decisions

LTC to endorse establishment of a Working Group which will begin its work in Sept 2013, with a view to proposing a strategy on future use of *Turnitin* that can be considered by LTC in March 2014.

Further Information

Contact: Dr Adam longcroft, Academic Director of Taught Programmes, UEA 01603 592261 a.longcroft@uea.ac.uk

Background

At present *Turnitin* is NOT used routinely at UEA to scan for plagiarism in student coursework. Its use is strictly limited to investigating suspected cases of plagiarism/collusion where concerns have already been raised by a marker and conveyed to a School Plagiarism for further investigation. This policy evolved via an extensive dialogue/discussion within TPPG/LTC in the 2000s, during which a number of 'pilot' studies were undertaken.

UEA is relatively unusual in this respect since many HEIs do use *Turnitin* (or similar text-matching software) to scan student work at the point of submission. Some use a sampling strategy – for example at CCN a random 5% sample of student coursework is passed through Turnitin for each module. The current ADTP and his predecessor share very serious concerns about the use of text-matching software of this kind that have been widely communicated to Plagiarism Officers over the past 2 years, but a number of Plagiarism Officers have stated that they would like to see it used routinely, and believe that the advantages of using it more widely would outweigh the disadvantages. The ADTP believes that it is important that we re-visit the use of Turnitin via a collegial, democratic, and consultative process so that the issues and implications can be teased-out. Given the changes in the structure of the University, the changed HE landscape, and the increasing role of the internet in informing the way students learn and locate information/evidence, it is arguably justified that the University considers the pros and cons in relation to a fast-changing HE environment.

Discussion

LTC is invited to consider the 'actions' highlighted in the ADTP's overview and to approve the establishment of the Working Group to explore the future use of Turnitin.

Reflective Overview on 2011/12 Plagiarism Reports
from School Plagiarism Officers
Prepared by the Academic Director for Taught Programmes (ADTP)

<u>Overview by Faculty</u>

The reports received from Plagiarism Officers and LTS indicate a total of 184 separate cases of plagiarism and/or collusion during 2011/12.

These cases are distributed across Faculties as follows:

SCI	16	8.7%
SSF	105	57.0%
FMH	26	14.1%
HUM	37	20.1%
Totals	184	100%

Of these 184 cases, **106** (57.6%) are <u>international students</u> (classed as 'overseas' in the LTS database). This means that INT students are greatly over-represented in the number of P & C cases recorded, in relation to their numbers as a proportion of the student body (18% in 2011/12).

<u>Level of Offence</u>

Low Level –	40 cases	21.7%
Medium Level –	98 cases	53.2%
High Level –	20 cases	10.8%
	158 cases	
No offence –	26 cases	14.2%
		____
		100%

The majority of cases were therefore Medium Level, which resulted in a reduction of the mark for the assessments concerned. Just over one-fifth were Low Level and resulted in no penalty. In some cases students were allowed to revise and resubmit their assignments as if for the first time.

Common themes:
These are issues which have been flagged by 3 schools or more.

Issue	Impact	Actions/Strategies
Clear action points have merged from the PO's School Reports – a set of actions/initiatives are either in place or in developments which should enhance awareness, students practice, and guidance available to students on P & C. Examples include: 1) Production of DVD/Online Resources by POs 2) Enhanced training during Induction 3) Using POs as a source of expertise to inform staff development/practice at	Collectively these should have a considerable impact – the challenge is to share practice effectively between Schools/Faculties	• Use Annual Meeting of POs in Jane each year to disseminate ideas/initiatives. • Build these into future staff training workshops on P & C.

School level.
4) P & C-focused staff development sessions in schools (e.g. what is Low Level?)
5) Repeat inductions on P & C in Jan, and at start of each Year.
6) More emphasis on practical examples (not just rules) in induction (LAW).
7) Enhancements in assessment design (e.g. PSI, LCS)
8) PO meets with all new members of staff to discuss P& C (EDU)
9) Use of a dedicated P & C focused formative assignment early in course – e.g. SWK.

Plagiarism 'screening' or detection – e.g. *Turnitin* – highlighted as a desirable strategy by some POs. Some POs under pressure from colleagues due to increases in workload and lack of time to detect/spot plagiarism.	Considerable – the ADTP has set out a range of reasons why we should not use *Turnitin* routinely. Major implications for re-working coursework submission process.	• *Turnitin* is not a magic bullet, although it is right that we consider how it might be used in future at UEA. Following the Review of Plagiarism, the ADTP believes that there would be value in establishing a broad-based Working Group within the University which explores how its use, for example at CCN, could be mirrored at UEA. In addition to exploring Turnitin as one of the strategies we use to both deter and detect plagiarism, Schools should also consider other strategies which have been used in other HEIs: • Standard Plagiarism Test for all students at start of course (e.g. as at Bath) • Enhanced, more consistent training/induction around plagiarism, reference, good practice – induction on P & C may happen <u>after </u>normal 'Induction' period, as in PHA. • Use of formative assessment linked to summative – e.g. essay plans, rough notes, study logs. • More regular up-dating on best practice at start of each Year as in PHA or mid-Year (Jan) as in BIO. • Re-designed, more creative/imaginative and regularly updated assessments

		and assessment strategies.
Excellent support from LTS staff before, during and after the plagiarism meetings – noted by MED, AMS, ART, LCS, EDU	Considerable – ensures that POs are properly supported, and that the process works smoothly for the student. One PO notes: "The administrative support has been exemplary – all cases have been dealt with efficiently and effectively".	N/A
Students arrive at UEA with varying levels of understanding and/or awareness of plagiarism and collusion	Considerable – especially in Schools with high numbers of international students exposed to many different study cultures.	• More consistent cross-University approach to Induction, subsequent training/awareness raising, and enhanced School-based, Faculty-based and University-level training/CPD for tutors/lecturers on best practice etc.
Relapses by students who have been provided with support packages following Plagiarism Meetings are rare – noted by ART	Considerable – suggests that Plagiarism Meetings and subsequent support are effective in reducing repeat offences. Good for students, good for Schools – an excellent outcome.	
Major reductions in number of plagiarism cases over last few years - Examples include LAW, AMS, DEV (at PGT level), EDU (down from 29 in 2010/11 to 13 in current year), NBS (UG only), SWK.	Considerable – reduces staff workloads in Schools and LTS, and means fewer students are subject to the procedures associated with the Policy.	• This is to be welcomed. However, Schools do need to reassure themselves that reductions are real, and not due to reduced effectiveness in detecting infringements.
Emergence of 'soliciting' and 'commissioning' a major concern – noted by LAW	Considerable – new websites appear all the time and it is much harder to 'spot' plagiarism if work is commissioned/bespoke.	• Address as part of Induction/training – emphasis on what it means to be a 'professional' – e.g. honesty and integrity.

One-off issues:
These are issues 'flagged' by a single school. This doesn't mean that they are unimportant or less deserving of careful attention – sometimes problems highlighted by one school have wider implications and value.

Issue	Impact	Possible solution(s)
Serendipity in plagiarism detection – staff member recognising scripts submitted by a different student the previous year – noted by MED	Considerable - if undetected, it is likely that student would have been awarded an MSc.	Solution – changes to assignments each year to make 're-cycling of student coursework more difficult.
Students struggle to understand the notion of 'paraphrasing effectively' – noted by DEV	Can be considerable for students -	
Differences in interpretation of the P & C Policy by POs – noted by DEV	Considerable – since it results in unequal treatment of students and unfair outcomes.	Enhance P & C Policy and Guidance for POs to ensure more consistent treatment of students.

Dangers of collusion during 'practical' assessments – need to raise awareness and disseminate best practice. Noted by BIO		
Formal meeting often feel excessive and counter-productive – noted by DEV	Can cause unnecessary stress for students in very minor cases.	POs should be free to determine whether the offence is sufficiently minor to justify a more informal 'chat' rather than a formal meeting. However, this could again result in unequal treatment!
Who should produce Turnitin Report? – PO or LTS staff? Noted by DEV	Impact on time of PO can be considerable if there are lots of cases. At present it is a PO task, but in past practice has varied with admin staff sometimes being involved.	Revised Policy for 2013/14 places role squarely with the PO as the Turnitin 'expert' in the School.
Negotiated coursework topics 'vulnerable' – where students negotiate a topic and do something 'of interest to them' it is more difficult to monitor whether scripts are work of a previous student. Noted by MED		
Do students go to DOS when referred at Plagiarism Meetings? – query from PSI	We do need to close this loop – can DoS report to POs when students who have been 'referred' as part of a package of support actually make an appointment in DoS?	Simple reporting mechanism from DoS to LTS to POs?
Students claim guidance provided by INTO is inconsistent with that at UEA – point from PSI		Review of Plagiarism/Collusion in 2012-13 will produce new Policy – needs to be consistent with that in INTO, as does guidance provided to students in induction/etc.

What follows in **Appendix A** are reports received from School Plagiarism Officers to date (3 May 2013). Names of staff and information which might enable individual students to be identified have been deleted/edited-out.

Dr Adam Longcroft (ADTP), 3 May 2013

Appendix A

Reports from School Plagiarism Officers for 2011/12

AHP-PLAGIARISM/COLLUSION REPORT 2011-12

Plagiarism/Collusion Data	
Plagiarism Cases (What kinds of plagiarism cases have resulted in formal meetings?)	• More extensive sections of matched text (more than 1 or 2 sentences) • Inability to provide electronic copy of submitted text • High level plagiarism
Collusion Cases	No collusion cases this year

What learning lessons have emerged for the School?
(e.g. need to enhanced induction, enhanced training in use of referencing, enhanced assessment design etc.?)
	• School uses many synoptic assessments which discourages plagiarism
	• Low detection rate or good training?
	  o all 1st yr UG students attend 'study skills' learning block which incl. amongst others plagiarism and collusion, and referencing
	  o sessions co-developed with DoS, Learning Enhancement Team
	• Usually more cases of plagiarism on MSc programmes

Actions/strategies? (What actions or strategies are being put in place to address these learning lessons?)	• Presented a new session 'Intro to plagiarism and collusion' to new intake of pre-reg. MSc students in Jan. 2013 • Staff development session – what is low level plagiarism? • Involvement in CSED Plagiarism/Collusion staff development sessions for POs
Reflections on the 2011/12 Academic Year? (e.g. did you received a satisfactory level of support from LTS, did processes work efficiently etc.)	• On the UG programme, we have had only one formal meeting which had some considerable teething problems with LTS support following the meeting (everything before was fine). • On PGT programme only had a recurring case from Ac.Yr. 10-11 which was dealt with by previous administrator excellently. Given complexity of this case processes were confirmed at higher levels as well

MED PLAGIARISM/COLLUSION REPORT 2011-12

Plagiarism/Collusion Data	Number of collusion cases 0
	Number of plagiarism cases 4
	Number of
	        Low Level, 0
	        Medium Level, 2
	        High Level offences, 2
	Penalties imposed:
	• Level-2 cases: one had already failed so no further penalty was applicable. The other one failed after marks reduction. Both required to re-sit their assignment
	• Level 3 cases: I think that one was given mark of 0 and required to re-sit in order to pass degree, and the other one also got mark of zero but voluntarily withdrew from UEA. I was not given any direct feedback from SSDC about the penalties so do not know details.
	• Number of cases that progressed to Faculty Plagiarism Meeting: 0
	• Outcome(s) of Faculty Plagiarism Meetings: N/A

Plagiarism Cases	Copying sections of other students' work or published material into assignments, unacknowledged, and in one case submitting another student's assignment from the previous year with almost no changes made
Collusion Cases	None in this year
What learning lessons have emerged for the School?	(1) Serendipity of detection mechanism – one serious case of student submitting a friend's assignment without their knowledge and leading to SSDC hearing depended on the marker having marked that same assignment in the previous year and recognising the subject material. Otherwise we would have given this person an MSc degree from UEA. (2) Claim by another student in a plagiarism meeting that trading of assignments among students across cohort and calendar years was commonplace. For assignments that are set with free choice of topic for students to 'study something of interest to them' it requires a high degree of organisation of marking to detect students who are merely serving up a previous student's work.
Actions/strategies? (What actions or strategies are being put in place to address these learning lessons?)	We are assiduously supporting some degree of screening of submitted work using software such as Turnitin to detect, and act as a deterrent, submission of previous students' work . We offer staff training sessions about plagiarism and collusion, but there is no requirement of staff members to attend them and attendance is low. We ask colleagues who set assignments to change them each year and make them individualised as much as possible so that answers cannot simply be copied from other sources. (This will not prevent plagiarism or collusion in those assignments which are totally 'free choice'.)
Reflections on the 2011/12 Academic Year?	Excellent support from local LTS colleagues. Organisation of, and communication about, cases referred to SSDC was very poor. There does not seem to be any mechanism or consideration for communication of outcomes of SSDC hearings back to the Plagiarism Officer.

PLAGIARISM/COLLUSION REPORT – BIO 2011-12

Plagiarism/Collusion Data	I collusion case (2 students), level 2, penalised mark (-10%)
Plagiarism Cases (What kinds of plagiarism cases have resulted in formal meetings?)	No formal meetings
Collusion Cases (What kinds of collusion cases have resulted in formal meetings?)	Microbiology Practical Report (2B28) Two students working together during the practical. A substantial part of the report was identical. Students admitted collusion immediately
What learning lessons have emerged for the School? (e.g. need to enhanced induction, enhanced training in use of referencing, enhanced assessment design etc.?)	We need to increase awareness of plagiarism and collusion, particularly with respect to working together during practicals
Actions/strategies? (What actions or strategies are being put in place to address these learning lessons?)	We have instigated a repeat compulsory induction event in January, aiming to improve awareness of P&C (as well as other information) alongside existing plagiarism and collusion training that is undertaken as part of the 'Skills for Biologists' module taken by all BIO students
Reflections on the 2011/12 Academic Year? (e.g. did you received a satisfactory level of support from LTS, did processes work efficiently etc.)	My first year in the role, and I was not fully aware of the LTS service and the support for P&C. Since then the support has been very good, and I have received all the support I need.

PHA PLAGIARISM/COLLUSION REPORT 2011-12

Plagiarism/Collusion Data	There were no reported cases of Plagiarism or Collusion in the School of Pharmacy 2011/12
Plagiarism Cases (What kinds of plagiarism cases have resulted in formal meetings?)	N/A
Collusion Cases (What kinds of collusion cases have resulted in formal meetings?)	N/A
What learning lessons have emerged for the School? (e.g. need to enhanced induction, enhanced training in use of referencing, enhanced assessment design etc.?)	In this academic year, the P&C lecture was not given during the induction period as it was felt that it would be better at a time when the students were more settled and were not being given a lot of new information at the same time. This may have improved understanding of P&C issues, contributing the lack of incidences in Year 1.
Actions/strategies? (What actions or strategies are being put in place to address these learning lessons?)	- To continue giving the introductory P&C lecture outside of Induction Week. - That year leads give introductory lectures at the start of each year, including a reminder of P&C issues, policy and procedures.
Reflections on the 2011/12 Academic Year? (e.g. did you received a satisfactory level of support from LTS, did processes work efficiently etc.)	

AMS PLAGIARISM/COLLUSION REPORT 2011-12

Plagiarism/Collusion Data	0 collusion cases 1 plagiarism case (low level (Level 1), essay marked in its original form without penalty, mark of 45% awarded) 0 cases progressed to Faculty Plagiarism Meeting
Plagiarism Cases (What kinds of plagiarism cases have resulted in formal meetings?)	AMS had only one low level (Level 1) plagiarism case.
Collusion Cases (What kinds of collusion cases have resulted in formal meetings?)	N/A
What learning lessons have emerged for the School? (e.g. need to enhanced induction, enhanced training in use of referencing, enhanced assessment design etc.?)	N/A – our plagiarism cases were negligible for 2011-12 (and indeed remain negligible), due in large part to a robust programme that we began designing in 2005 and have been developing and improving ever since. This programme has been introduced into all our degree schemes for all first year undergraduate students, who receive detailed and ongoing training and support. Our programme has resulted in a dramatic and demonstrable reduction in plagiarism cases since 2005.
Actions/strategies? (What actions or strategies are being put in place to address these learning lessons?)	N/A. See above.
Reflections on the 2011/12 Academic Year? (e.g. did you received a satisfactory level of support from LTS, did processes work efficiently etc.)	Where required, the support from LTS was highly satisfactory and all processes worked well.

ART PLAGIARISM REPORT, Academic year 2011-12

Plagiarism/Collusion Data	• Number of plagiarism cases **(1 Medium) + (2 minor Low Level cases)** • Number of Low Level, Medium Level **(1)** & High Level offences • Penalties imposed **(Medium Level, 0 marks)** • Number of cases that progressed to Faculty Plagiarism Meeting **(0)** • Outcome(s) of Faculty Plagiarism Meetings **(0)**
Plagiarism Cases (What kinds of plagiarism cases have resulted in formal meetings?)	During 2011-12, we had three cases of suspected plagiarism. One was in the Autumn Semester, and two were in the Spring Semester. In all cases, careful deliberation was first given to the piece of work under examination. When the extent of the plagiarism was assessed, as evidenced through the *Turnitin* index, manual comparison and/or by the context of incorrectly used passages, individual consultations were arranged with the students and the PO and Instructor(s). These were to notify the students and also to discuss the respective pieces of work as part of their learning package; LTS were also consulted for Turnitin use and procedural queries, and for one Formal meeting held with an LTS member present (Medium). The other two were minor cases processed without a Formal meeting (as per UEA guidelines). In all the cases, the result was to provide a 'learning pkg' consisting of: direct discussion with PO and instructor about the offending passages in the assessment; a decision on how to proceed with redoing/marking or penalising the work per case; discussion about good referencing practice; provision of referencing exemplars; recommendations for better practice (in ART, UEA) and clear statement by PO to avoid any future similar difficulties; and a firm recommendation to view the Dean of Students Office plagiarism video, if not viewed already.
Collusion Cases	None
What learning lessons have emerged for the School? (e.g. need to enhanced induction, enhanced training in use of referencing, enhanced assessment design etc.?)	With the increased use of electronic resources to produce and reference coursework, students are increasingly turning to them to help with their coursework. On occasion, we have found that they fail to reference properly. In many ways, it is also easier for instructors and PO to detect cases of potential plagiarism because of the same ubiquity of electronic resources. We are finding that students often come in with unclear or inconsistent knowledge about plagiarism (and its implications).
Actions/strategies? (What actions or	Enhanced information during Induction.

strategies are being put in place to address these learning lessons?)	Students are directed to UEA website, Dean's Office, and PO.

DVD is made available directly from PO.

Students are also made aware that should a potential plagiarism case emerge, Turnitin software may be employed to advance resolution of the case (in handbooks)

Module instructors also provide guidance during initial course introductions.

Some module instructors are also diversifying forms of assessment (quizzes, journals, outlines) where need for content that can be plagiarised or result from collusion is minimised, if not done away with completely. |
| **Reflections on the 2011/12 Academic Year?** (e.g. did you received a satisfactory level of support from LTS, did processes work efficiently etc.) | In the main, the cases ART saw over 2011-12 followed patterns of minor plagiarism prevalent in previous years. These were offences due to circumstances of poor planning, small passages of dubious text, and lack of attention to proper referencing, rather than more serious offences showing willful or serial acts aimed to deceive. There was one Level 2 offence.

I am not certain whether it is a pattern, given the small sample, but there were more offences this past year than in 2010-11. Given the infrequent numbers however, it remains unclear whether this is due to a structural trend, variability in the year's cohort/ performance, or increased vigilance on the part of instructors and PO.

Happily, it is worth mentioning that we have not seen a relapse from any of the students for whom there were cases and learning packages were administered.

Overall, the processes worked well and efficiently, and LTS was helpful for all levels with which I had interaction, from Turnitin advice and processing. Thanks are owed to those at LTS, especially Nick Garforth, Caroline Rose and Jessica Cheau, for help with cases in the recent past. |

LCS PLAGIARISM/COLLUSION REPORT 2011-12

Plagiarism/Collusion Data	Number of collusion cases **3**
	Number of plagiarism cases **4**
	Number of Low Level, Medium Level and High Level offences **6**
	
	Penalties imposed
	    Collusion – 2 cases- only the student's own work marked & points deducted as penalty
	    Plagiarism – 2 cases student requested to re-submit with correct referencing
	    Remaining 2 cases students were Erasmus & had already left UK work given fails
	Number of cases that progressed to Faculty Plagiarism Meeting **1**
	Outcome(s) of Faculty Plagiarism Meetings **unknown**

Plagiarism Cases (What kinds of plagiarism cases have resulted in formal meetings?)	Cases in which student included text that is apparently from published/other sources, without acknowledgement of those sources
Collusion Cases (What kinds of collusion cases have resulted in formal meetings?)	Cases in which language work submitted is at native speaker level
What learning lessons have emerged for the School? (e.g. need to enhanced induction, enhanced training in use of referencing, enhanced assessment design etc.?)	Greater attention given to informing students of plagiarism/collusion policy & guidance in study skills Enhanced assessment design for language modules
Actions/strategies? (What actions or strategies are being put in place to address these learning lessons?)	PO regularly reminds teaching staff of need to make students aware that proof reading for language modules is not allowed PO has prepared information for lecturers to put on their modules sites on BB to draw students' attention to UEA policy
Reflections on the 2011/12 Academic Year? (e.g. did you received a satisfactory level of support from LTS, did processes work efficiently etc.)	Yes, LTS very supportive

PSI PLAGIARISM/COLLUSION REPORT 2012

Plagiarism Cases
• Concerns about the high standard of English language used
• Concerns about uneven nature of competence in English throughout the work
• Concerns that the level of answer to questions is beyond the sophistication typical of an undergraduate student
• Significant sections of essay taken from online sources
• Concerns about the types of sources used

Lessons/Actions/Strategies
There is a feeling that more could be done in induction week and dedicated sessions will be given next year by the PSI plagiarism officer Given that these cases are very time consuming, especially for the LTS staff,
we feel that more use of the non- panel route could be taken in future for low level offences
We would like to be made aware of whether students actually do go to see the Dean of Students Office as part of their learning support package. Presently this information is difficult to obtain. It is clear from our figures that there is a high proportion of these cases where the student is ethnically Chinese. Many of these students have been through INTO on their way to PSI, where they often say that the advice they were given conflicts with our policies. Can this be addressed? We would not like assessment design to be unduly influenced by the issue of plagiarism, but some assessments may be adapted to make plagiarism more difficult.

Reflections on the 2011/12 Academic Year
The level of support from LTS was extremely good, very competent and efficient.
Plagiarism Officer, PSI

DEV Plagiarism & Collusion Report 2011/12

Numbers and detection
Over the past year, I estimate to have been working on formal investigation of fifteen individual cases (possibly a few more), with about 70 per cent of these at the post-graduate level. All are now closed. Each case involved alleged plagiarism by students in their coursework. Plagiarism was confirmed in all cases, with penalties varying from a mark of zero to a mark that was based on the non-plagiarised sections of the coursework. Minutes of every meeting and decision are recorded and filed by LTS along with a copy of the coursework. Students are notified by letter of decisions, and have the right to see all reports.

Issues and trends
• Misunderstanding of what "paraphrasing effectively" means. In literally all cases, the plagiarism was a matter of unacknowledged copying and pasting from sources followed by a botched editing job. I'm almost certain that this reflects a common essay-writing practice among students: search the web and electronic journals for potentially useful passages of text; deposit these in a document; put these passages in a logical order; and then work on the text (replace some phrases, move some about) until the text is (in the students' arguably misguided perception) "their own words". One student claimed that this is what she had learned at INTO. I hope this is not true!
• Potentially different standards across Schools arising from ambiguity in the UEA's Plagiarism Policy. On two occasions, I stood in for ECO's plagiarism officer, because she herself had been the marker. I noticed that her interpretation of the policy was stricter than mine. On reflection I thought that this was because there is quite a lot of ambiguity in the UEA's Plagiarism Classification Guide and/or unhelpful examples. For instance, a Medium Level plagiarism case is one in which the extent of plagiarism is "extensive", a High Level one in which it is "substantial". Not every Plagiarism Officer would find it easy to distinguish "extensive" from "substantial" plagiarism. The Guide does not make that job easier by giving as the (single) example of extensive plagiarism, "two to three paragraphs or a segment of the work". Very frequently, plagiarism is more extensive than that, but I daresay that most Plagiarism Officers (including myself) would shy away from classifying the majority of those cases as High Level ones, because of the draconian implications of doing so.
• Payoffs from teaching good writing practice. My impression is that the number of plagiarism cases are down at the PGT level (they were always relatively infrequent among UG, let alone PGR students). I think this could well be because we now have dedicated and well-attended academic writing sessions, in which students learn that practices such as the one described above are inappropriate.
• Sometimes a formal investigation feels excessive. I've pursued two or three cases where I felt that the harm done by the investigation probably exceeded the benefits: relatively minor offences, and students who because of shame, guilt, fear and/or sleepless nights had been unable to focus on the academic work they ought to be doing while the plagiarism meeting, or after the meeting the decision, were pending. In such cases, I would have preferred to invite students to an informal meeting, and in future I would like to do so if the policy allows it.
Some extremely brief reflections on the new policy
• Apart from some changes in the language (medium level instead of level 2, etc.) and passages about self-plagiarism, I haven't been able to detect many changes in the policy, nor any in my practice, with one exception (next point). I hope that's ok.
• The exception is that I now produce my own *Turnitin* reports: people at the HUB told me they hadn't minded at all doing them in the past; an efficient practice had been established (in my perception); instead of people who do this routinely, I do this from time to time (it's still slow and cumbersome). I'm not wildly enthusiastic about this change, and from my perspective I can't see the rationale; but I don't particularly mind – it's not that much more work.

ECO Plagiarism and collusion report 2011/12

1.   Overall cases of plagiarism and collusion dealt with in 2011/12.
Overall 39 cases were dealt with by the School during 2011/12, of which 12 were for postgraduate students and 27 were for undergraduates. This is up on last year, where 31 cases (11 postgraduate and 20 undergraduate) were recorded.
Of these cases, 13 were collusion cases, compared with 10 cases detected in 2010/11.
Cases are identified as levels one, two or three. A level three case is very serious and the student is referred to the Senate Disciplinary committee.
The following sections deal with undergraduate and postgraduate levels separately.

2.   Undergraduate courses

2.1   Of the 13 collusion cases, 5 students were deemed not guilty and 4 were referred to SSF for further consideration. Of these, the two second-year students were found to be guilty. (See Table 1).

Table 1: Collusion Cases Undergraduate by stage

Stage	Outcome			Not guilty	SSF	Total
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3			
1		1				1
2		3		1	2	6
3				4	2	6
Total		4		5	4	13

2.2   Of the 14 plagiarism cases, 2 students were deemed not guilty. (See Table 2).

Table 2: Plagiarism Cases Undergraduate by stage

Stage	Outcome			Not guilty	SSF	Total
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3			
1	2	1				3
2	2	3		2		7
3		4				4
Total	4	8		2		14

2.2   The following tables show cases of plagiarism and collusion by module.

Table 3a: Collusion cases by module

Module Level	Collusion			Not guilty	SSF	Total
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3			
ECO-1		1				1
ECO-2		3		1	2	6
ECO-3				2		2
ECO-3					2	2
ECO-3				2		2

Total		4		5	4	13

Table 3b: Plagiarism cases by module

Module Level	Plagiarism			Not guilty	SSF	Total
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3			
ECO-1	1	2				3
ECO-2	1	2		2		5
ECO-2	1					1
ECO-2		3				3
ECO-3		1				1
ECO-3		1				1
Total	3	9		2		14

2.3 **All the plagiarism cases identified in Table 3b related to Chinese students.**
The collusion cases were as follows:

Table 4: Collusion cases – Home and Overseas

Module Level	Collusion			Not guilty	SSF	Total
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3			
ECO-1		1 Overseas				1
ECO-2		3 Overseas		1 Overseas	2 Overseas	6
ECO-3				2 Overseas		2
ECO-3					2 Home	2
ECO-3				2 Visiting		2
Total		4		5	4	13

3. **Postgraduate courses**
A total of 12 students were penalised for plagiarism at postgraduate level. All were Chinese students.

Table 4: Postgraduate by module

Module Level	Plagiarism			Total
	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	
ECO-M (dissertation)		10	2	12
Total		10	2	12

The two level 3 cases were referred to the Senate Disciplinary Committee.

EDU Plagiarism and Collusion Report for 2011/12

During the academic year 2011/12, the number of cases that were presented to the EDU PO for consideration totalled 13 (previously 29 cases presented for 2010/11 and 18 cases for 2009/10). Of the 2011/12 cases eight came from Emergency Medical Care students and five from Education students. Five cases were considered during panel meetings where students were invited (four cases where they attended whilst one declined the offer of a meeting). The other eight cases were considered between PO and CDs and level 1 letters with associated action plans sent (one of the reasons for level 1 letters being sent is due to the wide geographical area for EMC students and difficulty in attending meetings). All the students receiving a level 1 letter were entitled to panel meetings which none requested. All cases have been closed with no sanctions being contested.

Individual cases that require particular comment.

> EDU Year 3 Plagiarism was referred to SSDC which gave her the opportunity to submit again as first submission although unfortunately she didn't do so.
> EDU Year 1 Collusion were two students who lived together and had seen each submission working from a similar template. The panel was convinced that there was no intent and there was sufficient evidence of individual work. However significant time was spent discussing plagiarism and collusion with these year 1 students.
> EDU Year 2 Plagiarism (EMC programme) was a particularly difficult case to consider as university policy had not been followed during original marking. The student in case very much appreciated the support given to him during the panel meeting although had been frustrated by previous inconsistency in dealings with other departments.

<u>Comment</u>

The administrative support has been exemplary and needs comment on. All cases have been dealt with efficiently and effectively all leading to a consensus in outcomes by all parties involved.
The number of cases for this year has been reduced in part due to the reduced number of EMC students enrolled. There remains some concern over marking (a few markers have deducted marks which is not university policy) and assessment design for EMC courses (many of the EMC level 1 cases are down to questions related to drug definitions) although this has been discussed between PO and CD. It must be noted that the EMC course is winding down over the coming year.
The EDU cases are all unique in circumstance and do not reflect any trend.
Future developments for 2012-13 involve more developmental opportunities with CDs. PO will have opportunity to meet with all new lecturers to highlight plagiarism awareness support.

LAW Plagiarism and Collusion Report for 2011/12

Plagiarism and Collusion cases during 2011/12
During the academic year 2011/12, no cases of Plagiarism were brought to the attention of the Plagiarism Officer for the School of Law. One case of Collusion was brought to the attention of the Plagiarism Officer concerning reassessments from a student in the 2011/2012 PG cohort. Following a formal meeting with the student involved, the Plagiarism Officer found the student to have engaged in collusion. As the student denied collusion, the matter was referred to Faculty level in line with UEA policy.

Comparison with previous years
In previous years, the Law School saw a number of reported cases of plagiarism. These mainly involved PGT overseas students who claimed not to understand the University's policy, or reported that they had not read it. Some were from academic cultures where plagiarism appeared to be defined very differently to UK higher education institutions. In some cases this made it difficult for the student to understand why their work was being called into question.

Action to combat Plagiarism/Collusion
The Law School responded to these cases by increasing the profile of Plagiarism/Collusion training as part of student induction programmes. These began making better use of practical examples, beyond simply setting out what the rules were. Postgraduate students are now required to complete a Plagiarism seminar that records their attendance. They are then assessed on their understanding of Plagiarism as part of the induction programme course test. These induction sessions, in conjunction with written material on Plagiarism and Collusion, make it harder for students to claim that serious breaches of the Plagiarism rules have come about as a result of ignorance or misunderstanding. We believe the very low number of reported Plagiarism/Collusion cases during the academic year 2011/12 is to a significant extent down to the measures outlined above.

Collusion and Soliciting in Coursework
Like many other Law Schools, we are increasingly relying on Coursework as a means of assessment in our Postgraduate degree programmes. Although we had no reported cases of Collusion and Soliciting in 2011/12, these practices are of great concern to the law school, as they tend to be harder to spot than Plagiarism. In addition to the induction measures outlined above, colleagues within the School are pro-active in encouraging students to ensure all submitted work is their own and has been completed independently of third parties.

NBS Plagiarism and Collusion Cases 2011-12

Overall, 49 plagiarism and collusion hearings were held in 2011-12, of which 41 were PGT and 8 were UG students. This represents a slight increase on the previous year, when there were around 40 cases. In three of these cases no offence was found to have been committed. Four cases were found to be high level and referred to Senate (one of these was a student from ECO). There were 2 cases in UEA London.

Undergraduate courses
It is very reassuring to see that the number of UG students found guilty of plagiarism this year had reduced substantially this year. Of the 8 hearings conducted, two found no offence had been committed, so only six offences were recorded. Three of these were low level and two were medium level. The only high level offence was a student from ECO.

Hopefully these improved results reflect the impact of our improved induction and study skill sessions.

Taught PG Courses
At first sight, the number of hearings this year is very alarming, representing a significant increase on the previous year. However, the figures were somewhat skewed by multiple collusion on one MSc module involving 30 students accused of colluding in an online business test. Of these 30 students 29 were found guilty of medium level collusion and/or plagiarism and one was found not guilty. This assessment is being reviewed for next year.

Of the remaining 11 cases, 2 were low level, 6 were medium level, and 3 were high level.

General comments
It is interesting to observe that not one of this year's cases involves home students. One was an EU student and all others were international students.
On a positive note, the improved induction seems to be a having a positive impact on reducing the numbers of low level cases, particularly for UG students, where we have a longer time-frame to support them. However this remains a challenge with MSc students, who are only with us for a short time.
Given the high numbers of students in NBS and shorter turnaround times for marking, lecturers have been finding it increasingly difficult to devote time to detecting plagiarism. As Plagiarism Officer I am facing increasing calls for routine use of plagiarism detection software to assist in this task.

SWK Plagiarism and Collusion Report for 2011/12

This report has been written by the outgoing Plagiarism Officer for the School Social Work and Psychology.   As from 1st August 2012, the Schools of Psychology and of Social Work are now separate entities.   The School of Social Work has a new Plagiarism Officer who took up this role in August 2012.

1.   Overall cases of plagiarism and collusion dealt with in 2011/12.
No new cases of Plagiarism and Collusion were brought to the attention of the Plagiarism Officer for the School of Social Work and Psychology in the academic year 2011 – 12.
This is in contrast to the academic year 2010 – 11, when a total of 8 cases were dealt with (3 Post-Qualifying Social Work, and 5 B.Sc. Psychology. All but one of these were recorded as Level 1 offences, being concerned primarily with referencing errors. In the other case there was prima facie evidence of serious plagiarism, but the student was overseas at the time the case was brought to my attention, and having subsequently failed further modules on his course, was withdrawn from the University, resulting in no further action on the plagiarism allegation.

2.   Comment
The absence of any new cases in 2011 – 12 appears surprising. Looking at the profile of 2010 – 11 cases, it is noticeable that in all but one case, the referrals were made by just two markers (one each from Psychology and Social Work). This may indicate that these two markers were particularly attuned to plagiarism issues. Again with one exception, the cases all involved failures to adhere referencing protocols; in these cases it was adjudged that no intention to cheat had been alleged or proved. In the social work cases, they all involved students who were distance learners, with degrees from other institutions, who may not have familiarised themselves with the level of scholarship expected at UEA.
3.   Issues for 2012 - 13
The new Plagiarism and Collusion Officer has indicated that he wishes to become proactively involved in ensuring that all students are familiar with academic requirements and regulations at UEA. He has met the first year BA and MA Social Work students to explain his role, and the BA students are also given a formative assignment on the topic of plagiarism to ensure they familiarise themselves with the concept. Post-qualifying social work students will be given guidance by their module leader on referencing conventions.