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1 Executive summary

1.1 Structure of the report
The report is structured to help the busy reader. Following the introduction, the key findings from the review are summarised as numbered points (subsections 1.3-1.6). We then present recommendations in Section 2, summarising the rationale and the implications for each. This part forms the main conclusions of the report. The subsequent sections report the more detailed analysis of the literature, benchmarking and student surveys. Finally, the terms of reference, academic references, benchmarking and survey data are appended in annexes.

1.2 Introduction
The Academic Integrity and Misconduct Working Group was tasked in the academic year 16/17 with reviewing the current internal guidelines and regulations regarding academic integrity, with particular focus on plagiarism.

The main purpose of the group was to develop a set of proposals aimed at reducing the incidence of plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct that results from ignorance, and to deter those tempted to engage in wilful misconduct. On reviewing the University’s practice against current best practice, the group aimed to make recommendations for change to guidelines and regulations.

To this end, a literature review was conducted to understand current thinking and best practice. This was accompanied by a desktop benchmarking comparison of Russell Group institutions and other universities known for their excellence in teaching. This enabled the mapping of institutions according to their approach to plagiarism, as described in the literature. Student views were elicited through a survey of opinions, which was facilitated by the UG and PG Sabbatical Officers. An internal data gathering exercise was carried out to elicit information on the incidence of plagiarism across all Faculties and student groups, for the last three academic years.

1.3 Key Findings from the Literature review: Academic Integrity (refer to p.11)
1. Academic integrity is based in values of honesty, trust, fairness and respect. Although there is some variation across cultures, most would accept these.
2. Academic integrity is an institutional concern relevant to the whole community of scholars and support staff, so includes academics, students, librarians, policy makers and so on.
3. Emphasising a positive approach to academic integrity through learning and practice is considered to offer a more sustainable environment than a negative one of ‘police action’ (Bretag, 2016).
4. It is not reasonable to expect students to have a common understanding of academic integrity and its implications prior to arrival at university, or to absorb it in a short space of time. This places responsibility on universities to incorporate academic integrity development into the curriculum.
1.4 Key Findings from the Literature Review: Plagiarism (refer to p.12)

1. Definitions of plagiarism can be ambiguous and confusing. It is important that an explicit definition helps to provide consistency in its interpretation.

2. A useful framing of perspectives of plagiarism is provided by Karposi and Dell (2013) which, broadly, describes a continuum from moralism through proceduralism, to development and intertextuality. One end emphasises the ethico-legal aspects of plagiarism; the other the student learning aspects. The broad trend in recent years has been a shift towards the developmental/intertextual end of the spectrum.

3. Student learning is associated with developing skills in paraphrasing which may involve a phase of ‘patchwriting’, this being common amongst those learning to write in a second language, particularly where language skills are marginal.

4. Students’ perspectives encompass both the moralistic and developmental, with an emphasis on fairness which includes both the impact on the student who plagiarises and on those who feel others may be ‘getting away with it’; fairness works both ways.

5. Students report confusion about: what is and is not plagiarism; mixed messages from staff; different expectations from different members of staff. Confusion leads to anxiety and loss of confidence in their voice and incorrect referencing.

6. While there is little doubt regarding intentional plagiarism at the extreme, such as that involving purchasing essays, or ‘contract cheating’, elsewhere the lines between degrees of plagiarism and poor academic practice remain blurred for both staff and students.

7. Doctoral students are no less likely to struggle with the concept of plagiarism and so institutions should not assume they are better able at the outset to understand and avoid it.

8. The act of representing one’s own work is erroneously described as ‘self-plagiarism’ as it does not fit with any definition of plagiarism. The concept of self-plagiarism is not well understood by staff or students. Students struggle to accept this is an offence, or what the actual offence might be. Transparency is important in the use of published work in doctoral dissertations.

9. Detecting plagiarism in students’ work is often based around text matching software. There is considerable inconsistency in the use of such software between units, programmes and disciplines. Detecting the use of ‘essay mills’ is more complex, but should not be abandoned.

10. Institutions should aim to reduce the opportunities or motivation to plagiarise through a number of means including: establishing a culture of integrity; designing assessment that deters plagiarism and encourages engagement; developing appropriate institutional structures and responsibilities.

1.5 Key Findings from the UK Benchmarking Exercise (refer to p.27)

1. Several universities frame their practices and procedures within an academic integrity framework. Those that do, generally adopt a less ‘ethico-legal’ and more developmental approach to plagiarism, and tend to present information to students in an accessible manner.

2. A range of support is offered to students to help them understand academic integrity and avoid plagiarism. Support extends beyond information to online
tutorials, skills modules, personalised support, with many universities offering both general and subject specific skills development.

3. Many universities offer a test or quiz for students, and some require good pass rates in these before work is submitted for assessment.

4. Some universities show that they provide a range of support for academic staff, both centrally and locally, and with some specifically offering guidance on assessment designed to deter plagiarism. One university offers guidelines in the use of Turnitin for staff.

5. Most universities state they use text matching software, with some indicating formative use as part of plagiarism awareness work. Several universities have adopted formative use of Turnitin for doctoral theses.

6. Most universities employ some form of categorisation to indicate the severity of academic misconduct offences; some extend this to include associated penalties.

7. A qualitative – and subjective – summary of the relative position of each of the universities along a continuum of approach drawn from the benchmarking exercise is presented in Figure 1 on page 27. It is notable that the Russell Group universities are broadly towards the ethico-legal end of the spectrum.

1.6 Key Findings from the Survey of University of Bristol Students (refer to p.29)

1. While most had a clear understanding of plagiarism, generally, a number of responses indicated some confusion or inaccuracy, particularly at postgraduate levels.

2. Around half the students indicated that they had no training or were unsure if they had received training.

3. Approximately a third of respondents considered the training they received to be insufficient in some degree. Slightly more considered it more than sufficient and the remainder, about right. Undergraduates scored training most highly; postgraduate taught students scored it least.

4. Students suggest improvements to training would include: more workshops and skills provision; greater clarity in definitions, in what is acceptable, and in penalties; and practice in and information on the use of Turnitin.

5. There was a spread of opinion in how the University should deal with plagiarism from taking a hard-line position to one emphasising learning and support, although a clear majority favour a learning or intermediate approach. Undergraduates largely express a more supportive position, postgraduate research students take a harder line, with postgraduate taught students least supportive of a hard-line.
2 Key principles in the proposed University of Bristol approach

The following represent the key principles upon which the recommendations are based. For each of the principles, the rationale and implications are set out in the sections below. It is recognised that it will be necessary to set out more detailed recommendations for each principle, extending to detailed policies, procedures and practices once agreement on the principles have been reached by the relevant University committees.

The six core principles are:

1. Adopt an Academic Integrity approach within which to subset plagiarism, as well as exam cheating, falsification of data and so on
2. Adopt a ‘developmental’ approach to plagiarism where the focus is at least as much on developing students’ writing skills as it is on detection and penalty
3. The approach should apply to all students at whatever level; there should be no assumption of prior knowledge and understanding.
4. The University policies and definitions are transparent, clear and understandable.
5. Adopt practices that help to reduce the incidence of plagiarism through assessment design, timing, student engagement and helpful feedback
6. Ensure there is consistency in the approaches taken, the preparation given, the standards expected, detection practices, and in dealing with misconduct.

2.1 Recommendations

2.1.1 Adopt an Academic Integrity approach

Rationale:
- Based upon values of honesty, trust, fairness, equity, respect and responsibility
- Emphasises developing good practice rather than avoiding wrongdoing
- Broadens the issues to cover cheating, fabrication of data, falsification of data, impersonation, as well as plagiarism, re-use and ‘contract cheating’
- Applies to all in the University, including academic and professional service staff
- Provides a context for learning and a common understanding of expectations that does not assume prior knowledge
- A values-based approach provides context for thinking through grey areas around misconduct, such as the re-use of work and the boundaries between poor practice and plagiarism
- Establishes a desired culture of learning for the University and links directly to the Bristol Skills Framework.

Implications
- Applies to all within the University, including all staff.
- Inclusion in staff handbooks etc., and as a subject area for CREATE.
- May have implications for addressing those practices such as ‘double dipping’, ‘salami slicing’ (see page 17) and so on by academic staff.
- Will require some revision to University codes of practice and examination regulations, mostly involving reframing, and most likely alongside revisions resulting from changes in approach to plagiarism (see below)
• Involves retitling Faculty and School ‘plagiarism officers’ to a more inclusive and less negative title
• Involves a broader definition of ‘Academic Misconduct’ to include any of the following:
  ➢ Cheating in an examination
  ➢ Fabrication of research never performed
  ➢ Falsification of data such as the results of an experiment, survey data etc.
  ➢ Plagiarism
  ➢ Substantial re-use of one’s own work for additional credit, including near or exactly the same piece of work, submitted at Bristol or elsewhere
  ➢ Contract cheating through essay mills and other purchased work
  ➢ Impersonating or having another impersonate in an examination or test.

2.1.2 Adopt a ‘developmental’ approach to plagiarism.
Rationale:
• Does not presume incoming students have prior knowledge and understanding of acceptable practice
• Appropriate for an International University that attracts students from around the world
• Balances support in learning student voice with recognition that repeated and intentional plagiarism contravenes values of academic integrity
• Places responsibility more clearly on the University to provide comprehensive support for students and for staff
• Should reduce the number of cases of plagiarism overall.

Implications
• Requires a step-change in the support provided to students so they develop the skills and understanding required to find their ‘authorial identity’
• Support will need to involve both generic study skills that might be provided through the Bristol Skills Framework, and continuing contextual support within Schools and programmes
• Requires commensurate training and development work with academic staff to enable continuing support within programmes.

2.1.3 The approach should apply to all students at all levels
Rationale:
• It should not be assumed that students new to Bristol at undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research have prior knowledge and understanding to the expected standard
• It ensures that matters of academic integrity and plagiarism are specifically addressed as part of induction and orientation in all programmes
• It helps to ensure consistency and fairness.

Implications
• Requires provision of support for all new-to-Bristol students, including postgraduate research
• Some thought will need to be given to the best ways to ensure that all students engage with the support provided, at least to the point of demonstrating full understanding
• This, in turn, implies that a comprehensive test should be introduced that all students new to Bristol have to pass before submitting any work for assessment or review (See University of Bath policy on this issue).

2.1.4 The University policies and definitions are transparent, clear and understandable

Rationale:
• Fair and equitable treatment of plagiarism for students
• Reduction in ambiguity in definitions and distinctions
• Minimal confusion regarding what is and what is not plagiarism
• Provide the basis for consistency in dealing with transgressions.

Implications
• The University should consider a more complete definition of plagiarism, such as that offered by the International Centre for Academic Integrity:
  “Plagiarism occurs when someone uses words, ideas or work products attributable to another identifiable person or source, without attributing the work to the source from which it was obtained, in a situation in which there is legitimate expectation of original authorship, in order to obtain some benefit, credit, or gain”.
• It should distinguish plagiarism from a) ‘contract cheating’ (the use of essay mills, engaging another to write an assignment), and b) self-plagiarism (see below).
• It should clarify distinctions between poor academic practice which indicates a student struggling to find their voice, unintentional plagiarism that requires further development work, and intentional plagiarism that requires penalty.
• Replace the concept of ‘self-plagiarism’ with clarity over what constitutes acceptable or unacceptable reuse of one’s own work, and set out expectations for citing re-used work.

2.1.5 Adopt practices that help to reduce the incidence of plagiarism

Rationale:
• Assessment can be designed to reduce the opportunity for plagiarism and ‘contract cheating’
• Research indicates that students may be more inclined to plagiarise when they do not see the relevance of the assessment, or when they perceive the tutor to be uninterested in their work
• Multiple assessment submissions on the same deadline date can place students under greater pressure to take short cuts
• Engagement with students as they work on assignments increases student commitment and reduces the opportunity for contract cheating
• The formative use of text matching software, such as Turnitin, can help students understand referencing and paraphrasing problems, and can help students develop their ‘voice’, particularly when reports are discussed with tutors.
Implications

- Clearly, there are resource implications for staff in the regular re-design of assessments.
- Staggering assessment submission can be problematic, particularly within the current AY structures; programme-level assessment may help here.
- Engagement with students has time implications and may cut across anonymity principles, but research indicates it both reduces plagiarism and improves feedback more generally.
- The formative use of Turnitin may have cost implications for the University, and will require greater staff understanding of how it works and what it does, and does not do.
- Establishing procedures for remedial support where a student is identified as clearly struggling to find their voice, reference or understand good practice.

2.1.6 Ensure consistency in the approaches taken

Rationale

- It is fair.
- It ensures equitable treatment for transgression and the application of penalties across the Faculties and Schools.
- Once established, it should help to ensure consistent evolution of principles and practices.
- It provides a common basis for comparisons and for establishing standards.
- From a compliance perspective, consistency reduces institutional risk.

Implications

- Appropriate structures need to be put in place within Schools and Faculties; these may build on current ‘plagiarism officers’.
- The responsibilities for providing appropriate skills and development at University, Faculty, School and Programme levels need to be determined.
- Responsibilities for ensuring standards are met and practices for detection and dealing with misconduct need to be established.
- Communities of practice around Academic Integrity generally, and plagiarism in particular should be established within Schools and Faculties, and across the University to ensure continued consistency.
- Appropriate practices for detection, reporting, action and escalation to be reviewed and established.
- An appropriate range of penalties that is applied consistently, including the consideration of ‘administrative-light’ penalties (such as fixed mark reductions) in straight-forward cases.
- Appropriate recording of cases at School, Faculty and University levels, together with regular compliance reporting and auditing to be established.
3 Literature Review on academic integrity and plagiarism

3.1 Introduction
Academic Integrity is a complex and multidimensional concept involving cultural, philosophical and practice differences. There has, however, been a gradual coalescence of views about institutional responsibilities away from an emphasis on policing and towards one on education and scholarly study. This part of the report aims to provide an overview of the recent literature on academic integrity in general, and plagiarism in particular in order to set out the academic context for a contemporary framework for University policy. A brief exploration into the notion of academic integrity is followed by a focus on plagiarism. We finish with a summary of the principles and key points to carry forward into developing recommendations for future policy.

Please note: References for the literature review are in Annex 2 at the back of this report.

3.2 Academic Integrity
There is no clear and generally accepted definition of academic integrity although most recent attempts tend to draw out values that underpin research and education. The Exemplary Academic Integrity Project (EAIP) defines academic integrity as “acting with the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in learning, teaching and research” (EAIP, 2013). The Asia-Pacific Forum on Educational Integrity adopts ‘educational’ over ‘academic’, but defines it similarly: “a commitment to the key values of honesty, trust, fairness, equity, respect and responsibility, and the translation of these values into action” (Bretag, 2016). The US-based International Center for Academic Integrity (2016) takes a similar, values based perspective, while all make the point that academic integrity involves academic staff as well as students, and extends to professional support staff, including librarians and administrators (Bretag, 2016; Fishman, 2016).

Perspectives vary, however, in the emphasis and underlying philosophical stance when it comes to academic integrity. The US educational institutions, for example, have historically viewed academic integrity as a moral issue rather than a pedagogical one (Fishman, 2016). Early universities were largely concerned with developing future ministers of the church, thus a moral underpinning for ‘proper values’ that transferred across the expanding university system as it responded to a growing and increasingly diverse population. The continuing emphasis on the moral basis for academic integrity means that transgression often equates to moral weakness, and the stance taken is largely prohibitive. It also underpins the widespread adoption of ‘honor codes’ that reinforce the moral basis and act as the standard from which transgressions are judged. More recently, there is a developing movement towards reframing academic integrity more as an issue of learning, albeit with the honour code principal remaining (Fishman, 2016).

Honour codes have been suggested for UK universities, but have stumbled in execution where tried for reasons, Thomas and Scott (2016) argue, to do with cultural variation in values in an internationally diverse student body. This may be the case, although scepticism for such overt practices amongst UK students and staff might also play a part. Concern for academic integrity has increased in UK universities as the incidence of misconduct has been
seen to increase, particularly with regard the adoption of text-matching software such as Turnitin, and the rise of internet based ‘essay mills’ where students are able to purchase essays that are guaranteed to avoid detection (Thomas & Scott, 2015), and so undermine the threat and penalty approach. Consequently, there is a greater acceptance that instilling a culture of integrity is the way forward, although not without some recognition that universities are not always consistent in requiring – and enforcing – the same standards on academic staff (Luke & Kearins, 2012).

Increasing internationalisation, particularly of postgraduate taught programmes where there is little time between enrolment and the first summative submissions, complicates the issue. Variation in perspectives on integrity, often deeply subsumed in cultures, mean students arrive at UK universities with differing concepts of academic integrity, particularly plagiarism, and of its importance. India, for example, has really only recently begun to address issues of academic integrity as a necessity for academic legitimacy in an international context following some high-profile cases and reports of widespread cheating and plagiarism. Attempts to address the issue are being made, but are also meeting resistance from stakeholders (Mohanty, 2016). Meanwhile, cultural norms of respect, courtesy and reciprocity in Chinese cultures, together with a poorly paid academic profession lead to breaches of integrity amongst Chinese academics including plagiarism, falsification of data, ghost authorship and the ‘double dipping’ (submitting one paper to different journals) of articles (Chen & Macfarlane, 2016), making it difficult to uphold standards of integrity amongst the student body. Cinali (2016) suggests that the traditions of oral societies and collectivist values in middle eastern societies mean that memorisation by rote is common. Moreover, respect for tradition and authority makes critical thinking problematic and repeating the words of teachers safer.

Academic integrity, therefore, remains a somewhat contested area although there are a number of conclusions that can be drawn from the literature:

1. Academic integrity is based in values of honesty, trust, fairness and respect. Although there is some variation across cultures, most would accept these.
2. Academic integrity is an institutional concern relevant to the whole community of scholars and support staff, so includes academics, students, librarians, policy makers and so on.
3. Emphasising a positive approach to academic integrity through learning and practice is considered to offer a more sustainable environment than a negative one of ‘police action’ (Bretag, 2016).
4. It is not reasonable to expect students to have a common understanding of academic integrity and its implications prior to arrival at university, or to absorb it in a short space of time. This places responsibility on universities to incorporate academic integrity development into the curriculum.
3.3 Defining Plagiarism

A typical definition of plagiarism might read “Plagiarism is defined as submitting someone else’s work as your own” (Carroll, 2007). While on the surface, such a definition may appear simple and clear, in practice it is open to question and raises concern and doubt in minds of both students and academic staff (Gilmore et al. 2010; Halupa & Bolliger, 2013; Newton, 2016).

A number of academics working in the field of academic integrity and plagiarism cite the US based International Center for Academic Integrity’s definition: Plagiarism occurs when a ‘work product’ is submitted having the following characteristics:

\[
\text{It is work of a named or identifiable source, submitted in a situation where original work is expected, without sufficient acknowledgement of the original source, and for credit or benefit. (closely paraphrased from Carroll, 2016).}
\]

Carroll argues that an explicit definition helps in providing consistency in its interpretation application, and that academic institutions need to ensure that a common interpretation is reached. ‘Work products’ include computer programmes, projects, dance choreography as well as text. She goes on to argue that ‘sufficient acknowledgement’ requires academic judgement and will depend on level and context, while originality may not be the requirement of a piece of submitted work and so not to source it may be poor practice but not plagiarism. Similarly, if it is not for credit or benefit a work product should not be deemed plagiarism (Carroll, 2016). These interpretations mean that a continuum of plagiarism can be identified, where at one end there is a clear and knowing intent in the person to deceive for personal gain, and at the other, what is typically described as ‘poor academic practice’ (Bretag, 2016; Thomas & Scott, 2016); the challenge is in determining where along this continuum any line has been crossed.

In academic institutions, there has been an historical tendency to frame plagiarism as a moral issue where transgression is a weakness in the person’s integrity and where punishment is the principal means of control (Hu & Lei, 2016; Kaposi & Dell; 2012). The recent trend is much more towards framing plagiarism as primarily an educational issue which requires learning and understanding (Kaposhi & Dell, 2013; Lea & Street, 1998). This move has been driven by a wider appreciation of Academic Integrity as a scholarly subject (Bretag, 2016), and by the increasing internationalisation of academic institutions which has forced them to review assumptions implicit in the moral perspective.

In the following sections of the report, we first explore discourses of plagiarism as seen from academic and from student perspectives, before examining particular contexts and concepts including self-plagiarism, intentionality, learning and policing. Finally, we consider strategies

---

1 The full definition on the International Center for Academic Integrity (2016) website [http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/integrity-1.php](http://www.academicintegrity.org/icai/integrity-1.php) is given as:

Plagiarism occurs when someone:
1. uses words, ideas or work products
2. attributable to another identifiable person or source
3. without attributing the work to the source from which it was obtained
4. in a situation in which there is legitimate expectation of original authorship,
5. in order to obtain some benefit, credit, or gain which need not be monetary.
that academic institutions might adopt to reduce the incidence of plagiarism. We summarise this part of the report by drawing together the key points and their implications.

3.4 Plagiarism discourses
Kaposi and Dell (2012) identify four discourses from the academic literature that they argue constitute plagiarism: moralism, proceduralism, development and writing/intertextuality. They assess each according to the role of student intent, the interpretations given to incidence of what may be called plagiarism, and the academic traditions and principles underpinning each. The discourses are widely cited as providing a framework for understanding approaches to plagiarism, and are summarised here.

3.4.1 Plagiarism as moralism
From this perspective, plagiarism is an epidemic problem of cheating and theft of intellectual property. The discourse is in decline but has had supremacy historically. Underlying the moralism perspective is the notion that plagiarism “is an act of pure will that speaks transparently through the text” and accidental plagiarism, if acknowledged, is ‘marginalised’ (Kaposi & Dell, 2012: 816). The perspective is based upon the unchallenged link between what appears in the text and the ‘dark intention’ in the writer’s intent; plagiarism ‘threatens’ the values of the academic community. It “presupposes a perfectly unambiguous field in which the act of plagiarism occurs”. From this perspective, institutions might warn students of the dangers of plagiarism, but its avoidance is not something that is actively taught.

3.4.2 Plagiarism as proceduralism
A somewhat more forgiving position, seeing plagiarism as ‘inappropriate and unacceptable’ rather than ‘criminal’ behaviour, the procedural perspective frames plagiarism as rule breaking, but not necessarily a wilful act. The onus is on the academic institution to make clear the rules and to provide adequate information and support so that students are aware of them. Clear procedures for detection and dealing with rule breaking are in place. Transgressors, however, are still breaking the rules and their actions “branded as dishonesty and an affront to principles” (Kaposi & Dell, 2012: 820). The rules themselves are underpinned by the unquestioned principles of academic tradition and values that students are required to assimilate. The procedural discourse shifts plagiarism from a matter of student morals towards institutional practice but transgressors remain stigmatised.

3.4.3 Plagiarism as development
In a further step from the moralistic position, plagiarism as development is seen as part of a process of learning the skills of academic writing. This view, which has gained increasing traction in the past 20 years, does not presume students’ awareness of academic integrity and instead sees this as part of students’ development. Karposi and Dell (2012) identify two approaches: the ‘holistic’, which focuses at least as much on developing writing skills ‘interwoven’ through course design – a part of education – as on detection and punishment; and a more radical ‘authorial identity’ approach that argues for “the very subject position that students take in the context of the academy” (p. 822). This latter position appears to bridge the developmental with the inter-textuality perspective, of which more below. The ‘plagiarism as development’ discourse accepts that some plagiarism is unintentional and
raises the issue of determining the line between that and intent, which is an act of interpretation.

3.4.4 Plagiarism as writing/inter-textuality
The inter-textuality discourse questions the notion of plagiarism itself. Text with ‘plagiarism’ is no longer “the simple product of straightforward intent, and becomes the complex outcome of various sorts of inter-textual practices” (Kaposi & Dell, p 824). Rather than a simple dichotomy between intentional vs intentional, the issue becomes that of “various intentions and identities negotiated in writing” (p 825). From this perspective, plagiarism is not ignored or considered unimportant and to be avoided, but is understood to arise as students develop skills in writing and interpretation, and so calls for the term to be substituted for ‘textual borrowing’ or ‘transgressive intertextuality’. In this view, writing is “a complex social practice where negotiation of identities and values takes place” (p 826) – thus needs to be socialised into as well as taught. Disciplinary procedures should only be retained for ‘extreme acts’, while the great majority of incidents should be recognised not as dishonest, but as students’ attempts to develop academic writing and to learn their authorial identity. Plagiarism in the inter-textuality discourse is not seen as a threat to the academic community, but “an opportunity for the academic community to understand and transform itself” (p 827).

3.4.5 Plagiarism Summary
Internationality, and a greater awareness of student transition and learning, together with the experiences of working with plagiarism over the past few years, have together reduced the prevalence of the ‘hang ‘em high’ view. It is also fair to suggest that the University may not yet as a whole feel able to embrace a discourse of inter-textuality and its ‘radical re-conceptualisation’ and our position may be somewhere between this and the development perspective.

3.5 Paraphrasing, patchwriting and cryptomnesia
Practices related to, and at times considered to be example of plagiarism include poor paraphrasing, patchwriting and cryptomnesia. Jamieson (2016) traces the history of ‘textual borrowing’ and shows how instructions on summarising and paraphrasing have tended to emphasise the use of the students’ own voice while providing accompanying text that clearly includes original phrases. It reinforces a general confusion concerning paraphrasing, summarising and citation and the extent to which ‘poor’ summarising or paraphrasing that includes a citation can be considered bad practice.

‘Patchwriting’ is defined by Howard (1993, p.235) as “copying from a source text and then deleting some words, altering grammatical structures, or plugging in one-for-one synonym substitutes”, i.e. patchwriting is the action the student undertakes with the text, not the text itself (Jamieson, 2012). Howard argued that while patchwriting can be described as intentional in the sense that students are aware of the actions they are undertaking, it is not intentional plagiarism – students continue to patch write even when plagiarism is explained and understood. Patchwriting is recognised as a stage in novice writers learning voice (see 2.2 above), and in which research involving both textual analysis and student interviews
concludes an absence of intention to plagiarise (Pecorari, 2008), although this is not a position universally held (e.g. Weber-Wulff, 2014, cited in Jamieson, 2016).

Patchwriting is an issue particularly for international students (and others, including academics) writing in a second language with which they are still becoming familiar. Pecorari (2016) points out that UK universities typically accept students with IELTS scores between Band 6 (competent user) and Band 7 (good user) and notes that the descriptors within each band suggests there will be some whose level of English, together with unfamiliarity with their university setting means that they “will still find the discoursal challenges of studying through the medium of English to be substantial” (p. 545), and that some of these will adopt patchwriting in response.

A third grey area, cryptomnesia, sometimes described as ‘unconscious plagiarism’ occurs when material is reproduced as original and is not, but the author has no recollection of seeing or hearing the original. Sometimes such instances come to the attention of the courts, involving well-known names such as George Harrison, Led Zeppelin and Radiohead. Significant examples of cryptomnesia are more likely to be found in work products that involve music and choreography, short strings of words may also be unconsciously plagiarised (Jamieson, 2016).

These examples illustrate some of the difficulties that can arise in attempting to draw a line that demarcates plagiarism from ‘poor academic practice’, and one that will be blurred further according to the perspective taken.

3.6 Student perspectives
Adams et al. (2017) explores student perspectives through qualitative interviews of 21 undergraduates at the University of Otago drawn from a variety of backgrounds. Open questions probed students’ framing of plagiarism, reasons for it and its consequences, and analysis revealed four distinct discourses. From an ethico-legal discourse perspective, students focus on the rules and procedures, seeing offenders as intentional and ‘dumb’ and explain plagiarism as stealing by dishonest students. Referencing is seen as conforming to rules. One consequence of the ethico-legal discourse is in its relevance to those who see themselves as honest and the paper quoted one interviewee who “tuned out in lectures when warnings against plagiarism were voiced, as she had ‘no intention’ of plagiarism” (Adams et al. 2017: 24). A second discourse considers plagiarism in terms of fairness. Some students expressed the view that is not fair to plagiarise, and so it is fair that there should be sanctions and penalties; gaining advantage through plagiarism is unfair. For others, however, it is the policy that is not fair: it takes time to learn to cite; it is the university’s responsibility to ensure they are taught properly; some penalties are too severe; markers are not consistent. Those who saw unfairness in the process appeared, according to the authors, to be struggling with conforming to rules when unsure of what they constituted, as one quote suggests: “… you will just get something by mistake or something that you don’t know, and you will just do it wrong and then you will be penalised or expelled” (p. 26). Confusion formed a third discourse – confusion about what plagiarism is, how to avoid it, having tutors give mixed messages and different expectations, and of the distinction between paraphrasing and plagiarising. Confusion creates anxiety and loss of confidence in
writing extending to “voiceless-ness ... a sense of fearfulness” and students “seemed mindful that it was their responsibility to avoid plagiarism, but ... were unsure of how to avoid unintentionally plagiarising” (2017: 27-28). The final discourse concerns learning – that avoidance of plagiarism is part of students’ learning as they develop skills in their academic discipline. Adams et al. (2017) noted that it was mostly framed in terms of how plagiarism should be dealt with, so as an aspiration. Students considered the university needed to take greater responsibility and understood that as their learning in a subject develops, so does their own voice, or as one student put it: “If you can understand it, you can write about it” (p 29). It is interesting to note that following this study, the University of Otago made considerable changes to its plagiarism policy, renaming it Academic Integrity Policy rather than Dishonest Practice Procedures, and designing support around good academic practice.

The issue of student confusion leading to anxiety in writing was picked up earlier in a study by Lea and Street (1998) which found that students struggled with referencing conventions and with the concept of authority. Meanwhile, Newton (2016) used classroom ‘clickers’ to explore new students’ understanding of and attitudes towards plagiarism. He found that while there was a good understanding of what plagiarism is, students were less confident about referencing and the need to cite. He further found that as student confidence improved so did their support for penalties for plagiarism.

3.7 Intentional plagiarism
Regardless of discourse, there are some forms of plagiarism that fall into the category of ‘intentional’, although even here it can be argued that there is a distinction between intentional for personal gain in the full knowledge of the implications of the action, and intentional with ignorance and misunderstanding of the implications and consequences. So, for example, Lines (2016) examined the motivation of 47 students (50% ‘English as a Second Language’ students) who used her editing service and who admitted intentional plagiarism. The reasons identified include financial pressures, poor language skills and poor supervision, suggesting that students accept the risks involved, or are perhaps blind to them. Newton (2016) found that in the case of a purchased essay being submitted, almost 90% considered expulsion too harsh a penalty, and 42% thought that assignment failure more appropriate a sanction.

Determining what constitutes intentional plagiarism is often open to interpretation (Kaposi & Dell, 2012). While the purchase of fully customised writing of academic papers that are very hard to detect through tools such as Turnitin (Newton & Lang, 2016) would be categorised by almost all as intentional (and described as ‘Contract Cheating’ by Lancaster and Clarke, 2012), shades of grey are introduced as one considers other plagiarising activities. These include use of essay sharing sites, ‘substantive editing’, where proof-reading or editing services offer ‘premium’ or substantive editing that may extend beyond correction of grammar to the re-organisation of work and help with developing arguments (Lines, 2016), help from friends and family, and copy and paste.

Some studies provide an insight into why students plagiarise, which in addition to issues of time pressure include a perceived lack of concern by staff. Chuda et al. (2012), for example,
consider reasons for software plagiarism amongst computing students. They found that, inter alia, lack of checking for plagiarism, poor assessment design – either in the lack of opportunity for students to engage, or in lack of information provided – and mild penalties were all cited by students as reasons that led them to copy others’ work.

3.8 Plagiarism in doctoral studies

The implications of plagiarism in doctoral studies are significant not only because of the potential impact on the originality of the work in question but also because of the risk for the institution and supervisory team. There is some suggestion that the internet has increased the incidence of plagiarism in doctoral dissertations although this is challenged by Ison (2015) who studied dissertations written before and after 1994 and found no significant difference.

Doctoral students are no less likely to struggle with the concept of plagiarism at the outset of their studies (Berg, 2009). In a study of research proposals by STEM subject doctoral students across three universities, Gilmore et al. (2010) found several cases of plagiarism but concluded that these appeared unintentional and the result of a lack of enculturation in the students’ respective disciplines. The study found a relation between poor levels of primary literature in the proposal and a tendency to plagiarise, exacerbated by language difficulties. It concluded with a warning that universities cannot assume postgraduate students know enough about plagiarism to understand and avoid it, and that generic training at the start of the programme is not sufficient. Enculturation to the discipline is important, particularly for those students who lack language skills and who have been used to a culture of learning by ‘rote’.

3.9 Self-plagiarism

The term is a misnomer and an oxymoron; it does not fit with any definition of plagiarism that includes the concept of presenting the ideas of another as one’s own, as it involves the re-presenting of ideas that are one’s own. Moreover, it raises the issue that by naming it in the same bracket as plagiarism the disapproval can be essentially the same as that heaped upon the plagiarist, when the offence is not in the same category (Andrescu, 2013).

Self-plagiarism may involve practices such as ‘double dipping’ – the submission of one paper to two publications or for two assignments, and ‘salami slicing’ – the carving up of one piece of research in slightly different ways to maximise the number of publications that can be squeezed from the research (Andrescu, 2013). Bretag and Mahmud (2009) observe that it is quite common practice for academics to present a paper at conference and later submit a near-identical paper for publication without referencing the first. They observe that this is not considered an act of self-plagiarism but question the extent to which there may be intention to deceive involve. Such cases bring to light a distinction between self-plagiarism, which suggests the work is original when it is re-used, and plagiarism, which suggests that the work is that of the author, when it is not (Andrescu, 2013).

Halupa and her colleagues have carried out three related studies on self-plagiarism (Halupa & Bolliger, 2013; Halupa & Bolliger, 2015; Halupa, Breitenbach & Anast, 2016). In the first,
Halupa and Bolliger’s (2013) studied faculty members in two US universities and found that little over one-third of respondents (35.9%) thought instructors understood self-plagiarism; far fewer (4.5%) thought students did. Despite this, there was stronger support for reporting cases and following disciplinary procedures. There was also strong agreement in the survey that using the same piece of work for two or more assessments constituted self-plagiarism. The second study confirmed confusion about self-plagiarism amongst students and found that most (63.5%) did not consider it an academic offence on the basis that it was their work. Of those that did see it as wrong (22.5%) some framed it as dishonesty while others saw it as a missed opportunity for learning. In a more recent qualitative study Halupa et al. (2016) explored perceptions of self-plagiarism amongst health science doctoral students. In this small-sample study, a similar view was expressed: they were unclear about what constituted self-plagiarism; unsure why or when it was an offence; and mostly did not consider it dishonest as they saw it as their intellectual property. The study also found that students’ understanding of self-plagiarism improved after intervention through training, although there remained a strong view that while recycling an assignment in full was wrong, most considered using parts of one in another assignment acceptable. The point at which re-use is considered plagiarism is not clear, so while most would agree it is wrong to resubmit a whole paper for credit on another unit, few institutions make clear where a line might be drawn (Roig, 2016).

A particular category of self-plagiarism concerns the reuse of material in doctoral theses. Student may publish work alone, or with co-authors as part of their studies and then incorporate them in the final thesis. Roig (2016) argues that this should be acceptable provided there is ‘full transparency’ with both examiners and readers, and that examiners “are able to establish that the student’s contribution are sufficiently substantive” (p. 665) and that the co-authors accept that the work can be included in the dissertation.

3.10 Policing plagiarism
A common finding in the literature is the variation in academics’ adherence to plagiarism policies and reporting of cases (Adams et al. 2016; Bruton & Childers, 2016; Halupa & Bolliger, 2013). In part, this can be because of academic staff confidence in using text-matching software such as Turnitin (Bruton & Childers, 2016) although Borg (2009) identified variation in the views of academics from different disciplines, and argued for flexibility in definitions to accommodate this and reduce confusion among students. Pecorari (2016) calls for more informed use of text matching software.

Detecting the use of essay mills or other forms of contract cheating is particularly difficult because providers are alert to text-matching software and their output is often guaranteed not to show up. One suggestion from Lancaster and Clarke (2016) is to use ‘Google Alerts’ to identify and inform whenever a web page makes use of an assignment title, a practice made more useful when the details are unique. Some patterns in Turnitin are also indicators for some types of essay mills, although it requires a level of understanding of the results provided and some willingness to carry out detection not normally expected of academic staff.
3.11 Strategies for reducing plagiarism

Policing plagiarism and dealing with those caught is unlikely alone ever to be an effective means of reducing plagiarism. A more comprehensive approach would include awareness ‘training’ for students and staff, together with a range of measures to reduce motivation amongst students to plagiarise.

Serviss (2016) suggests three broad approaches that institutions might introduce in developing strategies to reduce plagiarism. The honour code approach (McCabe & Teviño 1993) is based around creating, establishing and following an honour code that is intended to encourage a moral based adherence to a code of honour that abhors cheating and plagiarism. McCabe and colleagues find support for the practice, claiming that institutions with honour codes report lower levels of student dishonesty, and that academic staff are more likely to report incidents of plagiarism.

The second approach identified by Serviss (2016) is the promotion of ‘best practices’ covering syllabus, assignment-setting, assessment and so on. She cites Carroll (2007) as an example of the best practice approach, which covers course design and assessment practices to deter plagiarism as well as best practice in informing and preparing students and staff, and in detection and penalties that may be applied. Carroll provides helpful guide of institutional responsibilities from that of marker, through programme director to ‘named convenor’.

For Serviss (2016), the best practice approach can be too abstract and so may miss important distinctions at more local levels, and she suggests a more ‘holistic’ approach is required without providing much helpful detail about what this might involve. One way of considering such an approach is provided by Stephens’ (2016) three-level model of intervention for creating cultures of integrity (Table 1., below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Individual Remediation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate and consistent responses to academic dishonesty; ethical and effective procedures for adjudicating contested cases of misconduct; ‘development’ sanctioning aimed at strengthening understanding and commitment to academic integrity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students and Teachers</th>
<th>Context-Specific Prevention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom or course-based, subject area-specific discussions about the importance of integrity and what constitutes dishonesty; fair and caring instruction and assessment; real-time, in-situ reminders of academic integrity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students, Teachers, Administrators etc.</th>
<th>Institution-wide Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First year orientation programme, student assemblies, student handbook, honour code reading and signing ceremony; student led honour boards and councils; institutional culture that promotes academic engagement and honesty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Creating cultures of integrity: A three-level model of intervention (Adapted from Stephens 2016)*

The model provides a useful basis for considering the roles at institution, programme and individual levels that integrates Serviss’s (2016) first and second approach, and the principles of which could be adapted to non-US institutions. It emphasises a broad orientation during the first year, or time period, which is followed by a more context-
specific and continuing interaction that relates more closely to students’ lived experience. Finally, at the uppermost level, the model conveys the importance of clear procedures where instances of transgression occur.

Approaches involving student skills development, discussion around integrity and contextual implications are widely encouraged as one means for reducing the incidence of plagiarism (Carroll, 2007; Howard, 1993; Pecorari, 2016). This also applies to reduction of ‘contract cheating’ where Lancaster and Clarke (2016) advocate instilling the benefit for students of doing their own work through discussion and engagement, to which Newton and Lang (2016) would encourage practices that involve closer attention to students’ developing work. Alongside this is the need to ensure that institutions are consistent in their approach, both in prevention and in dealing with cases. This requires a parallel development, discussion around integrity and contextual implications involving all academic staff teaching and assessing students. Carroll (2007) suggests a multi-level institutional responsibility for culture and policy, including clear roles and responsibilities, which she specifies as:

- **The marker’s responsibility**: including strategies for detection, providing evidence
- **The programme director’s responsibility**: ensuring all students are supported in study skills and aware of requirements; ensuring all markers are consistent in approach and actions.
- **A named convenor** (at Faculty level): to bring together (School) specialist officers to meet, exchange ideas, and to share practice, and to ensure consistency is maintained. In larger institutions, a similar function should periodically repeat this at inter-faculty levels.
- **A named person**, perhaps the above convenor, to induct newly appointed specialists.
- **A system and person** responsible for informing and consulting staff and students about policies and procedures.
- **A system and person** responsible for collecting and making sense of data that should include incidents, penalties, evolving practice etc., as part of quality compliance.

### 3.12 Literature Review Summary

The key point from this review of the literature in plagiarism (a substantial and growing literature which we have attempted to cover with reasonable thoroughness) are as follows:

1. Definitions of plagiarism can be ambiguous and confusing. It is important that an explicit definition helps to provide consistency in its interpretation.
2. A useful framing of perspectives of plagiarism is provided by Karposi and Dell (2013) which, broadly, describes a continuum from moralism through proceduralism, to development and intertextuality. One end emphasises the ethico-legal aspects of plagiarism; the other the student learning aspects. The broad trend in recent years has been a shift towards the developmental/intertextual end of the spectrum.
3. Student learning is associated with developing skills in paraphrasing which may involve a phase of patchwriting, this being common amongst those learning to write in a second language, particularly where language skills are marginal.
4. Students’ perspectives encompass both the moralistic and developmental, with an emphasis on fairness which includes both the impact on the student who
plagiarises and on those who feel others may be ‘getting away with it’; fairness works both ways.

5. Students report confusion about: what is and is not plagiarism; mixed messages from staff; different expectations from different members for staff. Confusion leads to anxiety and loss of confidence in their voice and in correct referencing.

6. While there is little doubt regarding intentional plagiarism at the extreme, such as that involving purchasing essays, or ‘contract cheating’, elsewhere the lines between degrees of plagiarism and poor academic practice remain blurred for both staff and students.

7. Doctoral students are no less likely to struggle with the concept of plagiarism and so institutions should not assume they are better able at the outset to understand and avoid it.

8. The act of representing one’s own work is erroneously described as self-plagiarism as it does not fit with any definition of plagiarism. The concept of self-plagiarism is not well understood by staff or students. Students struggle to accept this is an offence, or what the actual offence might be. Transparency is important in the use of published work in doctoral dissertations.

9. Detecting plagiarism in students’ work is often based around text matching software. There is considerable inconsistency in the use of such software between units, programmes and disciplines. Detecting the use of ‘essay mills’ is more complex, but should not be abandoned.

10. Institutions should aim to reduce the opportunities or motivation to plagiarise through a number of means including: establishing a culture of integrity; designing assessment that deters plagiarism and encourages engagement; developing appropriate institutional structures and responsibilities.

3.13 Literature Review Conclusions

The literature on academic integrity and on plagiarism is extensive and has developed considerably over the past twenty years. An overview of this literature suggests that plagiarism sits within the broader context of academic integrity but also tends to dominate it, largely because it is the area that is most contested and complex. Issues such as exam cheating, data falsification or fabrication, and impersonation are largely clear cut. By contrast, plagiarism covers a wide range of activities from, at one end, contract cheating through to patchwriting and sloppy referencing. At all points between these extremes, perspectives differ amongst academics, institutions and students, even amongst students, and in different contexts and situations. Within this complexity, however, there is an emerging consensus in the literature that reducing the incidence of plagiarism requires institution-wide policy and culture that provides comprehensive support to all students so that they are equipped with the necessary skills, knowledge and understanding to avoid accidental or unintentional plagiarism, and that this is coupled with a consistent, well communicated and effective procedures for dealing with transgressions.
4 Benchmarking UK university approaches and practices

A comparison of a sample of UK universities shows a range of approaches taken with regard to academic misconduct and plagiarism. This range is consistent with the academic literature, and within the sample chosen there were examples that conformed in whole or in part with each of the four approaches identified by Karposi and Dell (2012). Variation in the information provided, support for students, information for staff, use of text matching software, and so on was evident from this survey.

The initial survey included a sample of Russell Group universities for direct comparison, together with a sample of other universities selected for reputational and geographical reasons. The University of Bath was added to the survey at a later date.

Russell Group: University of Birmingham, Cardiff University, University of Exeter, University of Leeds, and Newcastle University.

Others: University of Bath, Loughborough University, Aston University, De Montfort University, Swansea University, University of Kent, University of the West of England, and Oxford Brookes University.

The comparison is based upon what is available for a member of the public to access through the internet. In most cases, universities make available a good amount of information including policies, procedures, support, and resources, although details of the latter two are typically limited with detail in sign-on areas of websites. It is important to note that the information may therefore be incomplete or contain some inaccuracies.

General information taken from websites for each university was recorded on a spreadsheet (see Annexe 3). In addition, documentation downloaded and made available to the core group and analysed in greater detail. In support of the benchmarking survey and for further comparison, websites of a number of other universities including University of Leicester, University of Manchester and University of Otago were reviewed for support or specific enquiries.

4.1 Approach and presentation of information

There is some variation in the general approach taken with regard to academic integrity and plagiarism. Some universities (e.g. Cardiff, Bath, Swansea, Kent and Oxford Brookes) frame their practices and procedures clearly within an academic integrity framework, placing governance within support services and extending training and preparation to focus on integrity as a whole. Other universities appear to take a more procedural, ethico-legal stance that focuses more clearly on plagiarism in isolation (e.g. Birmingham, Leeds, Aston), with an emphasis on regulation and governance in academic registry. The remainder lie between these two.

Broadly, the approach taken tends to be reflected in the presentation of information about academic misconduct and plagiarism available to the outsider. Several universities simply make available relevant sections of the regulations and code of practice, while some, including De Montfort, Kent, and Swansea, represent information in a way that is more accessible to students. Across these and some other universities (e.g. Bath, Newcastle)
relevant general information was located in one document or web area, while for others, the regulations and the procedures for dealing with misconduct were located in different areas of the university website.

4.2 Student support
Across the universities surveyed there was a variation in the support provided for students, both in terms of what is provided and in terms of the quality and accessibility of the material presented. As before, what is accessible for an outsider may not reflect the full range of support and so the findings need to be treated with some caution. Table 2. below summarises the publicised range of support and training for students across the benchmarked universities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Online resource</th>
<th>Tutorials/</th>
<th>School/</th>
<th>Referencing guide</th>
<th>1:1 Support</th>
<th>Handbook</th>
<th>Test/Quiz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughborough</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Montfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Declared plagiarism support and training for students across benchmarking sample*

Most universities provide online resource material, although this can range from online information sheets to professionally produced online video skills. Many also provide specific tutorials or skills modules and either school or subject based specific guides, with greater or lesser detail about what might be available – so, some might simply state ‘guidance in college handbooks’ (Swansea) or ‘subject specific guidance from schools’ (Leeds, Newcastle), others such as Exeter and Loughborough indicate more thorough preparation will be given. Not included in the overall exercise, but worth noting, is the University of Leicester’s online support which has interactive resource (‘Don’t cheat yourself) for 20 specific subject areas (see: [http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld/resources/study/plagiarism-tutorial](http://www2.le.ac.uk/offices/ld/resources/study/plagiarism-tutorial)). Handbooks are only specified by two universities (Swansea and UWE).

Several universities specify an online test or quiz, either as a guide or a requirement or both. The University of Bath requires all students new to the university (including research students) to take and pass a test provided by Epigeum, for which they must achieve an 85% mark before they ‘reach a progression point’ (submit any work for assessment). The test
can be taken at any time but usually following a mandatory academic integrity skills training module, and it “ensures that students are provided with a common minimum baseline of skills and knowledge of good educational and academic practice at an early stage” (UoBath, QA53 p.6). It also allows the University of Bath to state that ‘inadvertence or ignorance’ cannot be a basis for mitigation.

4.3 Staff Support
The survey showed rather fewer universities provide rather less support for staff, although only three did not indicate any staff support on their websites (Cardiff, Aston, Swansea), and Exeter appears to devolve responsibility to schools (see Table 3). The same caution as before applies: what is visible to the outsider may differ from actual provision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Centrally provided support</th>
<th>Local responsibility</th>
<th>Handbook / codes of practice</th>
<th>Staff forum/ advice</th>
<th>Assessment design guidance</th>
<th>Online guidance / training</th>
<th>Training in use of Turnitin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bath</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loughbor’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Montfort</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Brookes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Declared plagiarism support and training for staff across benchmarking sample

Approximately half those surveyed provided support for staff centrally, and a number also provided assessment design guidance or made training available online. Two universities (Birmingham, De Montfort) indicated they provided opportunities for staff to share good practice and provide support and Kent offered specific training for Turnitin.

4.4 Use of Text Matching Software
Most universities informed students that they used text-matching software, usually specified as Turnitin. The frequency of use is not normally specified, although some universities indicate that it may be used to check for plagiarism. In some instances (e.g. Bath, Cardiff) universities indicate they provide information for students although this is typically within the university’s intranet so cannot be explored.

The formative use of Turnitin is specified as an example of good practice at Bath for students at all levels, and is required by others (e.g. Kent) if it is to be used to check for
plagiarism. Several universities specify the formative use for research students writing doctoral theses (e.g. Birmingham, de Montfort).

The University of Kent was alone in indicating that it provided Turnitin training for staff, although a number highlighted the importance of correctly interpreting Turnitin reports, see below:

Table 4: University of Kent guidelines for using Turnitin (source: https://www.kent.ac.uk/ai/students/guidelines.html)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidelines for Using Turnitin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following Guidelines (approved by LTB, 16 October 2006) have been drawn up with particular consideration being given to the following objectives:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to ensure student equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to ensure that students have a clear understanding of the issues and procedures involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to promote academic integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to encourage the development of good academic practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to support the development of good academic scholarship and learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• to avoid a punitive, policing approach to the improvement of student academic writing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guidelines

1. Module Preparation
   a. if you intend to use Turnitin, ensure all student information is updated accordingly
   b. your module(s) documentation is valid if not, seek revalidation
   c. ensure you are familiar with the Turnitin service and University academic misconduct procedures.

2. Student Induction
   a. notify your students that you intend to use the Turnitin service
   b. explain to students what "Turnitin" is, how it operates and why you wish to use it
   c. ensure your students understand that Turnitin will not be used at an individual, per student, basis
   d. ensure that students are aware of their rights under the Data Protection Act and IPR
   e. ensure that your students are familiar with University academic misconduct procedures.

3. Using the Turnitin Service
   a. do not use the Turnitin originality report or its percentage value as an indicator of plagiarism; use your academic judgement when determining an incidence of plagiarism after careful consideration of the originality report and sources of matched text
   b. do not use Turnitin in isolation. Turnitin is one tool to use in the detection and detection of plagiarism. It should be used in conjunction with a holistic approach to plagiarism as per LTb paper 30/2006
   c. do not use Turnitin as a random sampling tool; Turnitin should be used on a per assignment/module basis; assignments should not be selected on a per student basis – the whole cohort should be put through the service if plagiarism is suspected even if only in one paper
   d. ensure that your students have at least one formative experience with Turnitin before using the service on summative assignments.

4. Dealing with Suspected Plagiarism
   a. Ensure you follow University academic misconduct procedures as per General Regulation V.3 Academic Discipline, in Annex 10, Academic Discipline: Procedures. See Academic Policies

JCoher2006

4.5 Penalties for academic misconduct

The University of Leeds takes the hardest line of all surveyed in declaring the penalties for plagiarism, and their position is the closest to that of ‘moralist’ of all. From their point of view, there is no distinction in the degree of offence, or categories of offence, although on close inspection the detail on the application of penalties suggests a degree of ‘wriggle room’ that one suspects is employed more often than the general tone of their website suggests.
Most other universities employ some form of categorisation of serious of academic misconduct or of plagiarism specifically. It is perhaps worth noting that plagiarism is typically more nuanced than other forms of misconduct – exam cheating is almost always of the most serious order, as is data falsification, contract cheating, and impersonation in an exam room. Several universities set out the categories of offence and associated penalties in a way that permits students and staff to distinguish between them. These are typically presented in 3-5 categories, with poor academic practice at one end and a high degree of severity at the other. Some place exam cheating, contract cheating and fabrication of results in a highest order category that leads directly to University Disciplinary procedures. Some universities present the penalties associated with academic misconduct in a transparent form. The University of Bath, for example has three categories, listed as:

- **Group 1: Minor or Technical Misconduct** – essentially poor academic practice, poor referencing, small amounts of copied work.
- **Group 2: Moderate Academic Misconduct** – includes lab reports identical to another student, unacknowledged ideas and concepts, unreferenced copying, minor exam infringements.
- **Group 3: Severe Academic Misconduct** – extensive plagiarism or cheating, clear evidence of intent to deceive. Includes almost all exam cheating, impersonating, extensive and significant plagiarism; second offences, use of essay mills, fabrication of laboratory results, plagiarism in doctoral theses, deliberate attempts to avoid detection through Plagiarism.

For each of the above groups, the University of Bath publicises a range of penalties in tabular form as set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Penalty</th>
<th>Group 1 Offence Type</th>
<th>Group 2 Offence Type</th>
<th>Group 3 Offence Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Require the student immediately to undertake or re-take and successfully complete the mandatory skills training and test, or any other form of training and test of understanding that the Head of Department may determine as appropriate in the circumstances.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Issue a strong verbal warning to the student, and place a note of the warning on the student's file.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Require the student to resubmit the affected item of work as if it were a first attempt.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Reduce the mark for the affected item of work according to the seriousness of the offence.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Assign the minimum pass mark for the unit.</td>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Where the offence is committed in the first assessment attempt cap the mark between 0% and 34% and require the student to retrieve failure at supplementary assessment if permitted by the Programme Regulations.</td>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Assign a mark of zero or 'fail' grade with no credit for the unit or units, the Board of Inquiry acknowledging that retrieval may require retaking the units or year according to the assessment regulations pertaining to the particular programme of study.</td>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>In relation to an undergraduate final award, downgrade the degree classification of an undergraduate award, where available.</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>In relation to an undergraduate final award, award an unclassified honours degree, an ordinary degree (where permitted by the programme regulations) or a lower award (QatHE or CwirHE).</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>In relation to a taught postgraduate final award, downgrade the level (e.g. from MSc to PGDip or PGCert), or the grade (e.g. from a Distinction to Merit or Pass).</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Terminate the programme with no award.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Refer the case for consideration under the Disciplinary procedures as set out in University Regulations 7 &amp; 8, in particular in a case where the appropriate penalty may be severe. The Hearing may include a recommendation of a specific penalty. OR in relevant cases, refer the case for a hearing by the Fitness to Practise Panel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: University of Bath academic misconduct penalty table (source: UoB website: http://www.bath.ac.uk/quality/documents/QA53.pdf)

### 4.6 Benchmarking Exercise Summary

Across the universities surveyed for the benchmarking exercise, there was variation in the overall position adopted with regard to academic misconduct, and the information provided to staff and students. A number of relevant points emerged from the survey:

1. Several universities frame their practices and procedures within an academic integrity framework. Those that do, generally adopt a less ‘ethico-legal’ and
more developmental approach to plagiarism, and tend to present information to students in an accessible manner.

2. A range of support is offered to students to help them understand academic integrity and avoid plagiarism. Support extends beyond information to online tutorials, skills modules, personalised support, with many universities offering both general and subject specific skills development.

3. Many universities offer a test or quiz for students, and some require good pass rates in these before work is submitted for assessment.

4. Some universities show that they provide a range of support for academic staff, both centrally and locally, and with some specifically offering guidance on assessment design to deter plagiarism. One university offers guidelines in the use of Turnitin for staff.

5. Most universities state they use text matching software, with some indicating formative use as part of plagiarism awareness work. Several universities have adopted formative use of Turnitin for doctoral theses.

6. Most universities employ some form of categorisation to indicate the severity of academic misconduct offences; some extend this to include associated penalties.

7. A qualitative –and subjective – summary of the relative position of each of the universities along a continuum of approach drawn from the benchmarking exercise is presented in Figure X below. It is notable that the Russell Group universities are broadly to the ethico-legal end of the spectrum.

---

* A subjective interpretation of the approach taken by each university based upon a) published regulations and procedures, b) content and tone of web-based communication to students, and c) evidence of provision of plagiarism avoidance support.

**Figure 1: Mapping university plagiarism approaches to Kaposi & Dell (2012) discourses**
5 Survey of University of Bristol students

As part of the review, Bristol Student Union carried out an online survey in June 2017. Ideally, the survey would not have coincided with an exam period and with many undergraduate students already having left for the summer, and the timing clearly affected the profile of those who completed the survey as the graphical display below indicates. Despite this, the review revealed a range of views and provides a useful insight into the student perspective on the University’s plagiarism policy. Overall, the range of view is consistent with those presented in recent academic studies (e.g. Adams et al, 2017; Newton, 2016). The questionnaire can be seen via this link.

5.1 Sample and responses

The survey was promoted through the normal Bristol Student Union pathways, and involvement was both voluntary and self-selecting. A total of 62 students responded to the survey, a little over half of respondents were PGT students, just over a third PGR students and the remaining 8 from undergraduates:

![Figure 2: Response rates by degree level](image)

All Faculties were represented, with the larger number from Social Sciences (20 respondents), Science (17) and Arts (10). The lowest representations were from Health Sciences and Biomedical Sciences, each with 4 each.

![Figure 3: Responses by Faculty](image)
5.2 Students’ understanding of plagiarism

Students responded to the question ‘what does plagiarism mean to you’ largely in ways that would be expected, so included phrases such as ‘passing off someone else’s work as your own’, ‘copying’, ‘not referencing properly’ and ‘cheating’.

Undergraduates in the sample generally provided a consistent understanding of the concept, used words such as ‘copying without acknowledgement’. There was a greater variety in the terms used by postgraduate students, with a small number associating plagiarism with the action of copying and pasting, or simply ‘cheating’ without further explanation. One did not respond to the question, and stated they were, ‘not familiar at all’. Postgraduate research students used the term ‘copying’ frequently but with some variation of context, so one stated it was copying ‘published work’ and other it was copying ‘without citation’ and for another, copying ‘the exact same words’ or ‘other people’s ideas. Stealing appeared in one instance.

It is noteworthy, albeit with acknowledgement of the relatively small sample sizes, that undergraduates revealed greater consistency in their understanding of plagiarism than did either the postgraduate taught or postgraduate research students.

5.3 Training

Students were asked if they had training to avoid plagiarism, when they considered the best time for training, and how training might be improved. It is somewhat concerning that half the students in the survey answered either ‘no’ or ‘unsure’ to the question on training to avoid plagiarism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When you started, did you have training on how to avoid plagiarism?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Student recall of plagiarism training

Approximately half the students overall either said they did not have training or were unsure if they did. Slightly more PGT students and slightly fewer PhD students thought they had training. This may reflect variation plagiarism talks and the emphasis given to assisting students avoid plagiarism through correct referencing and paraphrasing, or to warning students of the consequences.

When asked if the training was sufficient, the overall response followed a normal distribution on a five-point scale from ‘insufficient’ to ‘really sufficient’. 34% rated training below the midpoint, and 37.5% above, with 28.6% picking out the midpoint in the scale. The average score was higher for undergraduates (3.4) and lowest for postgraduate taught (2.9) with research students recording an average score of 3.0. Two research students and
three postgraduate taught students rated the training at the lowest point of 1; none of the undergraduates did.

In general, students thought provision of initial training should be early in their course, some saying ‘immediately’ while others suggested a few weeks into the year once things had settled.

In response to the question of how training might be improved, a significant number of respondents at postgraduate taught (9) and research (7) levels called for workshops, either online or delivered while a number (13) across all levels asked for greater clarity about definitions, distinctions between what is and is not acceptable, and penalties. Of those, five specifically asked for greater clarity around self-plagiarism and one around collaboration. There was a significant call for information and practice in the use of Turnitin, particularly from postgraduate taught students. Across all levels only five students thought there was no need to improve current training.

5.4 Attitudes to dealing with plagiarism.

The survey asked students how they thought the University should deal with plagiarism. The responses were qualitative (n= 53, 9 non-responses), with answers ranging from the hard-line (‘expulsion’, ‘zero tolerance’, ‘severely’, ‘harshly’), through a more intermediate response (‘proportional to the problem’, ‘be strict … but use discretion’, ‘case by case’), to one of helping students to learn (‘proper training’, ‘education is the best approach’, ‘giving leniency’, ‘understand why it happens’). One repeated theme is the sense of fear that warnings about plagiarism induce and how this can create anxiety and so stifle student performance.

To develop an overall picture, the responses were categorised as either hard-line, intermediate or learning in approach, and presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you think the University should deal with plagiarism?</th>
<th>Hard-line</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PGR</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PGT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Hard-line</th>
<th>Intermediate</th>
<th>Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences &amp; Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Student views on dealing with plagiarism
The overall range of responses is similar to studies found in the literature, in particular Newton (2016), with just under a third advocating a hard-line approach to dealing with plagiarism and half advocating a learning approach. It is interesting to note that PGR students tend to take a more hard-line approach while the opposite is the case for PGT and UG, a position that might reflect their greater assimilation into the academic community. Arts and Social Science students preferred a learning approach.

5.5 Student Survey Summary

Students carrying out the survey at the University of Bristol responded in similar ways to reported studies of students at other universities. In summary, the key points raised were:

1. While most had a clear understanding of plagiarism, generally, a number of responses indicated some confusion or inaccuracy, particularly at postgraduate levels.
2. Around half the students indicated that they had no training or were unsure if they had received training.
3. Approximately a third of respondents considered the training they received to be insufficient in some degree. Slightly more considered it more than sufficient and the remainder, about right. Undergraduates scored training most highly; postgraduate taught students scored it least.
4. Students suggest improvements to training would include: more workshops and skills provision; greater clarity in definitions, in what is acceptable, and in penalties; and practice in and information on the use of Turnitin.
5. There was a spread of opinion in how the University should deal with plagiarism from taking a hard-line position to one emphasising learning and support, although with a clear majority favouring a learning or intermediate approach. Undergraduates largely express a more supportive position, postgraduate research students take a harder line, with postgraduate taught students least supportive of a hard-line.
6 Review of practices across UoB Faculties and Schools

An internal data gathering exercise was carried out to elicit information on the incidence of plagiarism across all Faculties and student groups, for the last three academic years.

Faculty Education Managers were asked to compile Faculty and School level data. The intention was to use the data to inform an understanding of issues such as: whether plagiarism cases were increasing year on year; differences between Home and International students; the number of ‘repeat offenders’ and the distribution of penalties used.

Unfortunately, plagiarism is not recorded within the student record system, and the data collection was therefore a manual process involving local spreadsheets and databases within Schools and Faculties. The result is a fragmented and incomplete data set, which is unable to provide the answers hoped for.

The failure of the internal gathering exercise to provide useful information regarding the incidence of plagiarism and the distribution of penalties applied reveals an issue that has implications for the University.

The academic literature points to importance of recording incidents, penalties, practices and so on, as part of quality compliance. For this to be useful both internally and in communicating policies and procedures, recording needs to be carried out in a way that allows for comparison, trend analysis and so on. At present, it is clear that the University does not have standard procedures in place that would allow for this.

Related to the above, the academic literature identifies students’ concerns with regard to consistency and fairness in the approaches taken with regard to academic misconduct, a finding that is supported by the student survey carried out for this report. Consistency in processes and procedures is not evident in the way that faculties currently record incidences of plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct. This does not mean the information is absent, but simply states that the current position is that it is not easily available in forms that permit comparison and trend analysis.

Had the group had more resource or more time, it would have carried out a qualitative survey of faculties and schools to understand better the variation and to record examples of good practice that could be carried forward. It is unlikely, however, that such an exercise would have changed any of the conclusions and recommendations made in this report, but it may be of value in later implementation work.
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Main purpose
• To reduce the incidence of plagiarism resulting from accident or ignorance, and to deter those from engaging in wilful plagiarism.
• To review the current internal guidelines and regulations regarding plagiarism, including a review of its definition.
• To make recommendations for change, including practical steps the University can take to increase students’ understanding of plagiarism.

Intended steps
Analysis of the current situation, by:
1. Reviewing the present state of knowledge and understanding of plagiarism through an examination of:
   ● QAA standards and reports
   ● the current academic literature on the subject,
   ● practices followed by a selection of Russell Group and other Universities
   ● Turnitin support documents
This review will form the basis by which current definitions and practices are assessed and recommendations for change are made.
2. Collecting data on current practice across the University on the plagiarism training and support provided by Schools and Faculties, the occurrence of minor and serious
cases of plagiarism, and the experience of students and staff engaged in plagiarism panels.

3. Reviewing current UoB definitions and concepts of intentional and unintentional plagiarism, self-plagiarism and poor academic practice. Within this, to consider any distinctions arising from level and year of study, and from home and international students.

It is anticipated that recommendations will be made for the following:

1. Any revisions to the current definitions of plagiarism employed by the University (including intentional/unintentional plagiarism and self-plagiarism by PGR students). This would include recommendations for ensuring that staff are informed of and understand any revised definitions.

2. The obligations that the University, Faculties and Schools have in ensuring that students are made aware of and appropriately prepared to avoid unintentionally plagiarising/poor academic practice.

3. The form and extent that training and support is provided for all students, and any support that may need to be provided at different stages/levels of study and/or for students from different cultural backgrounds (this may also refer to essay-writing skills).

4. The use of Turnitin as a means of learning about plagiarism as well as a means of policing plagiarism.

5. The design of coursework assessment to discourage students from plagiarising or using essay writing services.

6. The adoption of learning support where appropriate in addition to, or instead of disciplinary processes.

Cross-party working
This working group will be informed by and will inform the Academic Development Skills Provision project, and the PGR e-Thesis Submission Working Group.

Other Academic Misconduct
The focus of the working group is on plagiarism. At the end of the review this group, or another, may consider the extent to which its conclusions may assist in other forms of academic misconduct, in particular exam cheating.

Humphrey Bourne & Louise Chambers. January 2017
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### Annex 3

**Bench-marking comparison of Academic Integrity, Misconduct and Plagiarism policies across a sample of UK universities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Approach taken/framing</th>
<th>Locus of responsibilities</th>
<th>Communication of penalties</th>
<th>Training for students</th>
<th>Training for staff</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Tariffs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Birmingham</strong></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>Moralist/Proceduralist</td>
<td>Academic Registry holds central guidance/regs - unclear on role of Schools/Depts</td>
<td>Overview on Academic Registry website, full details in Code of Practice on Plagiarism (Code of Practice on Misconduct &amp; Fitness to Practice Committee for serious cases)</td>
<td>1- Online plagiarism study skills resources for prospective &amp; news students via the Library 2- Interactive course via the Library 3- Library referencing guide</td>
<td>1- Regulations and Codes of practice, and templates for outcome letters/referrals 2- Plagiarism forum for staff to share best practice &amp; encourage consistency</td>
<td>Plagiarism meeting (School level)</td>
<td>College Misconduct Committee</td>
<td>PAP= not yet familiar with practice Moderate= collusion 'moderate' level copying, self-plagiarism Serious= 2nd offence, 'reasonably' extensive, essay mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cardiff University</strong></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>Proceduralist/Developmental</td>
<td>Academic Registry owned with advice &amp; guidance from Schools</td>
<td>Contained within the Academic Regulations Handbook</td>
<td>1- Online Epigeum quiz, plus tutorials, quizzes and videos via the Library</td>
<td>1- Links to external resources (eg HEA and JISC papers)</td>
<td>Unfair Practice Committee (UG and PGT). Unfair Practice Committee (Research Degrees)</td>
<td>Formative work: report sent to Exam Board Summative work: Chair of Exam Board or University Committee of Enquiry depending on severity, history, year of study</td>
<td>Study skills training 1- no action 2- study skills training 3- reduce mark to 0 4- reduce unit to 0 5- refer to University Cttee of Enquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Exeter</strong></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>Moralist</td>
<td>Secretariat, with Schools able to apply for justifiable local variations</td>
<td>Contained within the 'Cheating, plagiarism, fraudulent or fabricated coursework &amp; malpractice in university exams &amp; assessment' procedure</td>
<td>1- Online academic integrity quiz for all new taught students 2- Provision of subject-specific guidance from Schools 3- online tutorial via the Library on academic integrity, note-taking skills, academic writing and referencing</td>
<td>1- The Learning Services Team deliver subject-specific skills activities to support the delivery of teaching</td>
<td>School meeting Committee on Applications</td>
<td>(All do plagiarism tutorial) 1- warning 2- resubmit for mark 0-pass 3- submit new work for 0-pass 4- repeat the unit 5- repeat the teaching block, with unit mark 0 for plagiarised unit 6- repeat year, with unit mark 0 for plagiarised unit 7- expulsion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Approach taken/framing</th>
<th>Locus of responsibilities</th>
<th>Communication of penalties</th>
<th>Training for students</th>
<th>Training for staff</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Tariffs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Leeds</strong></td>
<td>Russell Group</td>
<td>Moralist</td>
<td>Education &amp; Student Experience Directorate</td>
<td>Contained within the Teaching Quality Assurance Manual</td>
<td>1- Online resources available in the VLE 2- Colleges provide training &amp; guidance inc. subject-</td>
<td>1- Colleges responsible for delivering staff training</td>
<td>For UG and PGT.Academic Misconduct Officer</td>
<td>Poor academic practice 1- warning 2- reprimand &amp; resubmit uncapped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PAP = appropriate instruction
Moderate = capped resub, reduced mark
Serious = referred to College of Misconduct
<p>| Newcastle University | Russell Group | Proceduralist/Moralist | Student Services, with Schools to provide subject-specific guidance | Contained within the 'Procedure for Assessment Irregularities' | 1- Subject-specific guidance from Schools 2- Online plagiarism guidance specifically for OS students 3- Right-Cite webpage containing guidance &amp; resources (incl. case histories with outcomes) 4- Writing Centre provides 1:1 tutorials, workshops &amp; online resources 5- Online plagiarism tutorial | 1-Learning &amp; Teaching Development Service provides plagiarism prevention workshops, sharing good practice 2- Right-Cite webpage containing guidance &amp; resources | School/Chair of Exam Board | Academic misconduct Panel | As above, plus 3- resubmit capped 4- formal reprimand, mark of 0 Negligible 2- formal warning 3- final warning 4- mark reduced&gt;0 5- unit mark 0 6- resubmit for reduced&gt;0 7- fail year, retake unit 8- disciplinary suspension 9- deferred expulsion 10- expulsion Minor 1- warning and plagiarism tutorial 2- formal warning 3- final warning 4- mark reduced&gt;0 5- unit mark 0 6- resubmit for reduced&gt;0 7- fail year, retake unit 8- disciplinary suspension 9- deferred expulsion 10- expulsion Major |
| University of Bath | Formerly 1994 Group | Developmental/Inter-textual | Academic Registry | Examination &amp; Assessment Offences doc. | 1- online tutorial, video &amp; test | Online guidance via web | Department (HoD) for Group 1/2 offences Board of enquiry for Group 3 | Group 1= minor or technical academic misconduct Group 2= moderate academic misconduct Group 3= severe academic misconduct | Grid arrangement: Group 1/2= retake training, warning, resub as 1st, reduce marks or assign min. pass for unit Group 3= capped resub, to termination |
| Loughborough University | Formerly 1994 Group | Proceduralist/Developmental | Academic Registry holds central policy, and details school/dept responsibilities | Central Student Handbook | 1- Plagiarism &amp; citation workshops run by Library Services 2- Guidance &amp; top-up training to be provided by Schools/Depts 3- Support for OS students provided in Pre-Sessional training 4- All new students to do an MCQ plagiarism test &amp; formative TB1 assessment run through Turnitin | 1-CPD training on teaching to avoid plagiarism, run by the Centre for Academic Practice 2- Courses on dealing with plagiarism run by Teaching Centre &amp; Library for academic &amp; support staff 3- Access to the University of Derby’s PLATO (plagiarism teaching online) resource | School meeting | Academic Misconduct Committee | Minor 1- formal reprimand 2- reduce marks by any amount to 0 As above, plus 3- reduce marks for any unit in year, by any amount to 0 4- not allowed any resits for any unit in year 5- cap any resit in any unit in year 6- terminate studies Major |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Formerly Group</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Regulations &amp; Procedures</th>
<th>Academic Offences Officer</th>
<th>School Academic Offences Officer</th>
<th>School/College meeting</th>
<th>Academic Practice Officers</th>
<th>Academic Disciplinary Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aston University</td>
<td>Moralist/Proceduralist</td>
<td>Undetermined-information behind single-sign on</td>
<td>Undetermined-information behind single-sign on</td>
<td>1- Learning Development Centre offers 1:1 study skills tutorials, and online study guides</td>
<td>0= not offence, warning 1= half the mark 2= 0% (resubmit) 3= disciplinary board</td>
<td>APO= Resubmit as 1st or capped at pass mark</td>
<td>AOP: fail year, suspend, reduce class, expel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Montfort University</td>
<td>Formerly Alliance Group</td>
<td>Proceduralist/Developmental</td>
<td>Academic Support Office</td>
<td>Contained within the General Regulations &amp; Procedures Affecting Students, plus an overview published of the statistics detailing the proportion of students given the various penalties, including expulsion</td>
<td>0= unintended 1= lesser quantity or importance 2= greater quantity or importance 3= repeat offender, commissioned</td>
<td>Poor academic practice (hold academic integrity viva)</td>
<td>As above, plus 6- reduce unit mark to 0, with no resit until next year 7- reduce all unit marks to 0 for the year 8- reduce all unit marks to 0 for year and not allow to sit future exams 9- discretion to decide on appropriate penalty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swansea University</td>
<td>Formerly University of Wales</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
<td>Academic Services holds central policy, and details school/dept responsibilities (*Note: the regulations do not include self-plagiarism)</td>
<td>1- Guidance in College Handbooks 2- Induction sessions 3- Study skills module 4-Online plagiarism training module 5-Online study skills guide 6-Support from subject librarians</td>
<td>School/College meeting</td>
<td>University Committee of Enquiry meeting</td>
<td>Academic misconduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kent</td>
<td>Proceduralist</td>
<td>Unit for the Enhancement of Learning &amp; Teaching</td>
<td>General regulations for students</td>
<td>1- Guide for staff, including use of Turnitin as a formative tool. 2- Plagiarism Handbook, including guidance on setting assessment to reduce incidence of plagiarism</td>
<td>Chair of School Disciplinary Committee</td>
<td>Poor academic practice (hold academic integrity viva)</td>
<td>As above, plus 6- reduce unit mark to 0, with no resit until next year 7- reduce all unit marks to 0 for the year 8- reduce all unit marks to 0 for year and not allow to sit future exams 9- discretion to decide on appropriate penalty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Disciplinary Committee</td>
<td>First offence/PAP Minor Serious</td>
<td>First offence/PAP Minor Serious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1- Formal warning 2- Exclude plag.sections & recalculate mark, or resubmit with no penalty 3- Cap work at pass, or reduce unit mark (down to pass) 4- Fail for work 5- 0 for work(resits possible) 6- terminate registration/not eligible for award/not allowed to resit exams
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Alliance Group</th>
<th>Proceduralist/Developmental</th>
<th>Academic Services holds central policy, and details school/dept responsibilities</th>
<th>Contained within the Academic Regulations &amp; Procedures</th>
<th>1- Plagiarism induction session for new students. 2- Faculties/Depts provide guidance in Handbooks. 3- Guidance on Study Skills webpage. 4- Plagiarism &amp; academic integrity quiz via the Library. 5- Library workshops. 6- 24/7 Live Chat available from the Library, for help &amp; guidance.</th>
<th>Guidance from Academic Services that staff should aim to 'design out' plagiarism, through good teaching and assessment practices.</th>
<th>Assessment Offence Adviser</th>
<th>First offence/PAP Offence Adviser</th>
<th>1- Guidance and training 2- reduce work to 0 3- reduce work to 0 with no resit opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UWE</td>
<td>Alliance Group</td>
<td>Proceduralist/Developmental</td>
<td>Academic Conduct Regulations &amp; Procedure (for students), Academic Conduct Officers Handbook &amp; Guidance Notes (for staff)</td>
<td>1- Information skills web guide 2- Online tutorials 3- Good academic practice workshops 4- department induction</td>
<td>1- Brookes eJournal of Learning &amp; Teaching (academic resources) 2- Oxford Centre for Staff Learning &amp; Development online resources 3- Academic Conduct Officers Handbook &amp; Guidance Notes doc</td>
<td>Academic Conduct Officer</td>
<td>Academic Conduct Officer</td>
<td>University Conduct Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford Brookes</td>
<td>Alliance Group</td>
<td>Developmental/Inter-textual</td>
<td>Directorate of Academic &amp; Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1- no action 2- formal warning 3- resubmit for reduced/capped mark 4- reduce marks or 0 mark for work 5- reduce unit mark to pass or fail 6- award fixed penalty fine As above, plus 7- award lesser degree 8- withhold credit or an award 9- reduce class of award 10- temporary withdrawal 11- expulsion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>