Responsibilities:

It is College policy that faculties/departments ensure that students have appropriate guidance and opportunities to familiarise themselves with the College Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy and the measures which students should take to avoid plagiarism and collusion in their work.

Accordingly, it is expected that staff will:

- Make use of the this guidance on how to prevent plagiarism
- Provide students with access to the relevant KEATS Self Enrol module on plagiarism and supporting resources;
- Familiarise students with the specific citation conventions required by the Faculty/School/Institute/Department;
- Ensure that students are aware of professional requirements (fitness to practice) should these apply;
- Provide students with access to help on plagiarism and collusion if it is sought (The library provide comprehensive support and guidance for students).

Ways to reduce the likelihood of plagiarism

Encouraging an environment where students enjoy learning and see its benefits may include making clear to students the negative consequences of plagiarism. This should be done at the local level, as this makes the plagiarism discussion more personal and more of a betrayal if this path is taken by the student. The following list provides some suggestions of ways to help students avoid plagiarism.

1. Tutorials may be used to prompt students to act more appropriately. For instance, one academic says:

   “I…give a very strong, forceful talk about plagiarism at the beginning of the course to discourage students from plagiarizing, by explaining the unethical side of it and also the possible penalties if they get caught…I let the students know I’m very serious, very vigilant about detecting plagiarism. I hope, and I think, that makes a difference.”

   1

2. Consider providing fewer summative essays;

3. Avoid common topics and change topics regularly. Possibly refer back to discussions in class in the questions, or to themes in the handouts;

4. Focus on the process as well as the outcome, i.e. get students to:
   i. Give reasons for and to justify their views in the essays;
   ii. Reflect upon their final essay in public, perhaps in a presentation, or poster, done under exam conditions, to spot important differences in phraseology, etc.

5. Make it compulsory for students to send an outline of their work at an earlier date for review and comments and retain for future comparison.

6. Verify and/or observe one or more stages of production of the assessment:

   “You could observe one or more stages of production or verify designated stages by, for example, viewing drafts or setting up peer review between students. - students caught plagiarising often cite leaving things until the last minute as a reason for their decision to fake or buy another's work.”

   3

---
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7. Redesign assessments, for example, to focus on an unusual format for submission such as a critique of a specific resource. The more individualised and unusual the problem, the harder it is for material to be plagiarised and/or for an outsider to replicate:

“to set tasks that do not have an “oven-ready” answer. You might ask for assignments to be submitted in a novel format (such as a radio play, a patient information leaflet, a laboratory book, a book review or a mock submission to a parliamentary inquiry etc) rather than an essay. You could specify the application of a specific theory, or the use of a particular resource, thereby making it more difficult to recycle previously published work or an essay bank document.

8. Consider giving students individualised data, contexts, characteristics or situations, in this way you lessen the chances of them copying from each other. Ask them to rank, justify or otherwise argue for an evidence-based solution, which may not be popular but will enable individualised activity.

Signs of Plagiarism
May include:
   i. Verbiage;
   ii. Does the essay look stitched together?
   iii. Check the references, because a ghost-writer may only have access to the preview pages of online articles (this means that they might not use page numbers in the footnotes, for example).
   iv. Do a Google search of your questions, to see if your question has been put out to tender;
   v. Do a Google search on the text that looks suspicious

Sanctions

The College has revised its guidance so that instances of 'major offences' will be dealt with by the Misconduct Committee. All other offences will be dealt with at Faculty level with the option to refer sufficiently serious cases at the discretion of the sub-assessment board for consideration by the Committee.

Examples of major offences include but are not limited to:

- Where there are serial occasions of academic misconduct offences;
- All plagiarism offences submitted at level 3 unless there is evidence of plagiarism amounting to less than 49% of the totality of the work and/or it is a repeat offence;
- Where a student has inserted the writing or thoughts of others into their written work without the correct referencing (omitted from reference list) unless there is evidence that this constitutes less than 49% of the totality of the work and/or it is a repeat offence;
- A student who substantially copies (49% or more of the totality of the assignment) someone else's work or thoughts and clearly attempts to pass this off as their own including using images and audiovisual presentations without acknowledgement;
- A student who copies text verbatim (49% or more of the totality of the assignment) and clearly attempts to pass this off as their own, without using quotation marks and citing the original source;
- Undergraduate Level 6 or Postgraduate taught level 7 essays containing work undertaken at a previous institution;

• Where a student submits an MA, MSc or MPhil thesis containing work previously submitted in support of pursuit of the subject of the thesis (such as from an undergraduate or postgraduate taught research project);
• Where a student makes up or falsifies data for a final year assignment such as a research project;
• Where a student takes unauthorised material into the examination hall/room;
• Where a student takes and uses unauthorised aids (e.g. a calculator or an iPhone) during an examination when not expressly permitted;
• When students collaborate, without permission, to produce individual assignments/portfolios at level 6 or level 7 that when compared significantly overlap in content, order, structure and/or format;
• When a student submits a summative assignment that has been written by a third party or obtained from a professional writing 'service';
• When medical conditions or evidence are falsified to gain an advantage (e.g. deadline extension);
• Where a student allows another student to submit their work (in part or as a whole) as their own.

Examples of other offences include but are not limited to:

• All plagiarism offences submitted at level 3 unless there is evidence of plagiarism of 49% or more of the totality of the work and/or it is a repeat offence;
• Where a student has inserted the writing or thoughts of others into their written work without the correct referencing (omitted from reference list) unless there is evidence that this constitutes 49% or more of the totality of the work and/or it is a repeat offence;
• Where a student closely paraphrases small sections of someone else’s work (e.g. by changing the words or the order of the words slightly) without using the appropriate citation conventions.\(^5\)
• When students collaborate, without permission, to produce individual assignments/portfolios at level 3 or level 4 that when compared significantly overlap in content, order, structure and/or format;
• When undergraduate level 3-5 and postgraduate taught assignments (that contribute 25% or less of the mark for the module) are submitted containing work undertaken at a previous institution, including A-Level work unless there is evidence that this constitutes 49% or more of the totality of the work and/or it is a repeat offence;
• When the student does not comply with the instructions given in the examination hall on an examination paper;
• When a student does not comply with the instructions of an invigilator in the examination hall/room;
• When a student copies someone else’s work during a level 3 or 4 examination unless there is evidence that this constitutes 49% or more of the totality of the work and/or it is a repeat offence;
• When a student talks to other students whilst under examination conditions;

Faculty Investigation of Academic Misconduct
If you think that there has been cheating then bring this to the attention of the module/programme leader and programme sub-assessment board chair.
You may wish to contact the student and speak to them about your concerns.
If concerns are not addressed an email should be sent to the student requiring attendance at a meeting to be arranged between the student and the assessors/examiners.

\(^5\) Citation conventions vary according to discipline
1. The point of the meeting will be made clear to the student before they attend
2. The student will be asked to defend the assignment.

The student will be asked to produce preparatory documents, such as drafts of the essays, the articles that they have relied upon, and other workings, etc. A contemporaneous record must be taken of this process.

The current guidelines for examiners: plagiarism and related forms of cheating state:
“All students are required to sign a statement at the start of their programme of study agreeing to abide by the principles of the Academic honesty and integrity policy. In addition, when submitting individual pieces of coursework, students should be required to sign the statement again confirming that the work they have submitted is their own.”

One of the more difficult forms of plagiarism to spot is the third party essay. It cannot be picked up by Turnitin, unless the third party has plagiarised the essay. Even experienced examiners can find it hard to identify, because it can be an original piece of work.

As one recent article in the ‘THE’ says:
“Custom essays, usually bought through websites known as essay mills, are in some ways an academic’s worst nightmare. Unlike standard examples of copy-and-paste plagiarism, they cannot be detected using software because they are “original” pieces of work - just not the student’s. They also arguably represent an even more cynical form of cheating than, for example, regurgitating unattributed passages in a piece of submitted work.”

There are two possible outcomes of the Local Response:

If the student is able to convince the module leader and sub-assessment board chair (and the external examiner) that the work is their own, then no further action will be taken;
If serious concerns remain the matter will be referred to the Faculty Assessment Board Chair who will report this to the Misconduct Committee.

---
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### Common Examples of Plagiarism and How to Avoid Them – Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plagiarism</th>
<th>How to Avoid</th>
<th>Common Sanctions</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism in essays,</td>
<td>Formative essays</td>
<td>* Formative: no sanctions, but individual and/or group feedback</td>
<td>* Where a case is considered minor by a Department but also wilful or malicious, the Department may make the case that the matter should be referred to the Misconduct Committee. *Where a component of a module or the module itself may be awarded a mark of 0. Any resit attempt of the component/module will automatically result in the overall module mark being capped at the pass mark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More thorough guideline and support of overseas students and/or those who have never written essays</td>
<td>* Summative – first offence would usually be dealt with at faculty level through expedited procedure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More information on- and demonstration of- antiplagiarism software</td>
<td>* Summative – second offence or major plagiarism: dealt with by Examination Misconduct Committee – sanction: 0 and resit to expulsion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism of computer code</td>
<td>Better education: students often claim to be unaware that “lifting” some computer code from the internet constitutes plagiarism.</td>
<td>* Formative: no sanctions, but individual and/or group feedback</td>
<td>* When detected, it would depend on the proportion of code copied and of its importance within the assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Summative – first offence sanction: 0 and resit capped at the pass mark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Summative – second offence or major plagiarism: dealt with by Examination Misconduct Committee – sanction: 0 and resit to expulsion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>How to Avoid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct copying or paraphrasing of source material. Not referenced. Running out of time is the main factor.</td>
<td>Proactively teach students about note taking. Discourage extensive paraphrasing of material dire. Explain and demonstrate the use of Turnitin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Formative: no sanctions, but individual and/or group feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* May be considered poor scholarship if borderline and non-extensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Summative – first offence: usually dealt with at faculty level sanction: 0 and resit capped at the pass mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Summative – second offence or major plagiarism: dealt with by Examination Misconduct Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Things a Committee would take into account in determining the charge/penalty:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Guidance on academic writing and reference provided to the student by the Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Any mitigation provided by the student, including evidence of circumstances covered by the Equality Act (2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Intent/lack of intent to deceive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material copied from websites/paper</td>
<td>Clear information to students on avoiding plagiarism, and referencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Mark of 0 for minor expedited, major cases referred to EMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material ‘bought’ or procured from a third party (essay mills, or privately engaged individuals)</td>
<td>Clear information to students about how unacceptable the College deems this practice to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Expulsion from the College with all marks normally cancelled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Clarity of evidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Intent/lack of intent to deceive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material copied from previous students work</td>
<td>Clear information to students on what is plagiarism/collusion. Ensuring assessments are reviewed annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Mark of 0 for minor expedited, major cases referred to EMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Such cases may be merely plagiarism, or collusion AND plagiarism. In some instances both students may be investigated depending on the circumstances of the case.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collusion</td>
<td>How to Avoid</td>
<td>Common Sanctions</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students submitting essays with a substantial amount of overlap</td>
<td>* Better education of what collusion is</td>
<td>* Formative: no sanctions, but individual and/or group feedback Either, poor scholarship; or mark of 0 for minor expedited Major cases referred to EMC Admonishment, if no intention to cheat. 0 for the assignment (UG), 0 for module and right to resit may be withdrawn depending on level of offence</td>
<td>*Department/Committee will consider clarity of assessment brief, including whether group work was encouraged/permitted at any stage in the production of the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students submitting computer lab reports / code with a substantial amount of overlap</td>
<td>* Better education of what collusion is and on the eventual sanctions * Develop the use of assessed group projects</td>
<td>** Formative: no sanctions, but individual and/or group feedback If the Department considers it to constitute collusion: Either, poor scholarship; or mark of 0 for minor expedited Major cases referred to EMC first offence: usually dealt with at faculty level sanction: 0 and resit capped at the pass mark second offence or major plagiarism: dealt with by Examination Misconduct Committee – sanction: from 0+resit to expulsion</td>
<td>*Department/Committee will consider clarity of assessment brief, including whether group work was encouraged/permitted at any stage in the production of the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collusion</td>
<td>How to Avoid</td>
<td>Common Sanctions</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students work collaboratively in practical classes or group projects but collude to produce individual work</td>
<td>Include explicit statements on expectations in coursework instructions and on coursework coversheets. Be very clear where/if collaboration is permitted and the extent of this.</td>
<td>* Either, poor scholarship; or mark of 0 for minor expedited Major cases referred to EMC *Summative – first offence: usually dealt with at faculty level through expedited procedure – sanction: 0 and resit capped at the pass mark * Summative – second offence or major plagiarism: dealt with by Misconduct Committee – sanction: from 0+resit to expulsion</td>
<td>Department/Committee will consider clarity of assessment brief, including whether group work was encouraged/permitted at any stage in the production of the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Borrowing' coursework from friends in higher years or even in the same year.</td>
<td>Include explicit statements on expectations in coursework instructions and on coursework coversheets. Vary coursework assignments from year to year and between groups,</td>
<td>* If the Department considers it to constitute collusion: Either, poor scholarship; or mark of 0 for minor expedited Major cases referred to EMC *Summative – first offence: usually dealt with at faculty level through expedited procedure – sanction: 0 and resit capped at the pass mark * Summative – second offence or major plagiarism: dealt with by Examination Misconduct Committee – sanction: from 0+resit to expulsion</td>
<td>Such cases may be merely plagiarism, or collusion AND plagiarism. In some instances both students may be investigated depending on the circumstances of the case. Where, for example, the assessment brief is ‘bespoke’ (i.e. particular to the student and therefore cannot feasibly be ‘copied’), no sanctions would normally be applied to the student who has lent the work, if it is deemed they did so in good faith for guidance on structure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Self Plagiarism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>How to Avoid</th>
<th>Common Sanctions</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*UG/PGT essay containing work undertaken at a previous institution; *PhD upgrade report containing sections from previously submitted MA/MSc project report; * PhD thesis containing sections of upgrade report and/or MSc project report</td>
<td>Better education on what self-plagiarism is. Clarify terminology of 'self-plagiarism' as this is not always clear to students. Include an explicit statement about this issue in coursework instructions and on coursework coversheets.</td>
<td>*Admonishment, with the requirement that the examiners assess the student on the basis of such of their work that is unaffected by the offence; *Summative – first offence: usually dealt with at faculty sanction: 0 and resit capped at the pass mark * Summative – second offence or major plagiarism: dealt with by Examination Misconduct Committee – sanction: from 0+resit to expulsion</td>
<td>*Committee would take into account in determining the charge/penalty: Guidance on academic writing and reference provided by the Department / Faculty, including any gaps in guidance Consider clarity of assessment brief, including whether or not it was clear the student wished to pursue the topic as their thesis at an earlier juncture and any relevant instructions/agreements Intent/lack of intent to deceive/cut corners Any mitigation provided by the student, including evidence of circumstances covered by the Equality Act (2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Re-cycling' work that has already been submitted for credit at King’s or previous institution.</td>
<td>Clarify terminology of 'self-plagiarism' as this is not always clear to students. Include an explicit statement about this issue in coursework instructions and on coursework coversheets.</td>
<td>*Admonishment, with the requirement that the examiners assess the student on the basis of such of their work that is unaffected by the offence; first offence: usually dealt with at faculty level – sanction: 0 and resit capped at the pass mark second offence or major plagiarism: dealt with by Examination Misconduct Committee – sanction: from 0+resit to expulsion</td>
<td>*Things a Committee would take into account in determining the charge/penalty: - Guidance on academic writing and reference provided to the student by the Department / Faculty, including any gaps in guidance - Whether the work in question forms part of a larger subsequent body of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>How to Avoid</td>
<td>Common Sanctions</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Re-cycling’ work that has already been submitted for credit at previous institutions | Increase staff awareness and clarity on this issue as there are instances of staff misadvising students. Clarify terminology of ‘self-plagiarism’ as this is not always clear to students. | *Admonishment, with the requirement that the examiners assess the student on the basis of such of their work that is unaffected by the offence; first offence: usually dealt with at faculty level through expedited procedure – sanction: 0 and resit capped at the pass mark Second offence or major plagiarism: dealt with by Examination Misconduct Committee – sanction: from 0+resit to expulsion | *Things a Committee would take into account in determining the charge/penalty:  
- Guidance on academic writing and reference provided to the student by the Department / Faculty, including any gaps in guidance  
- Intent/lack of intent to deceive/cut corners  
- Any mitigation provided by the student, including evidence of circs covered by the Equality Act (2010) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Fitness to Practice</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Examples</strong></td>
<td><strong>How to avoid them</strong></td>
<td><strong>Common Sanctions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty, integrity, probity and trustworthiness are obviously requirements for professional programmes to sign off students as qualified practitioners. Falsification of documentation (e.g. signatures, clinical/practice hours completed, medical evidence, reflective patient reports) within an assessed submission, is occasionally an issue</td>
<td>Clear guidance on professional behaviour and requirements of entering a profession. Explicit correlation drawn between the required professional standards for trainees and the university’s expectations</td>
<td>Dealt with by local FTP, may be referred to College for major cases. Where a student is deemed by a Faculty to be unfit for registration and practice, the Faculty must refer the student to the College Fitness to Practise Committee (B5 Regulations). Where College Committee finds a student is unfit for registration and practice, either: Termination of studies (consider academic-only award is appropriate/possible) OR -Suspension/other sanctions/remedial action</td>
<td>Such cases may need to be referred to EMC, (if actions fall under the B3 Misconduct Regulations and the facts need establishing. Where a student contests the reported offence, cases should be referred to the EMC/DC as appropriate (refer to EMC if the case affects academic element of the programme). However, where a student fully admits and does not contest the misconduct, to avoid multiple Hearings the Faculty can deal with the case wholly under FTP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism committed by a registrant may have practice implications.</td>
<td>As well as clear information to students on what is plagiarism, guidance on the professional implications of committing an offence.</td>
<td>Sanctions applied either via Expedited Procedure or EMC. Registrants are employed elsewhere and record of an offence would be reported to the employer. Any university referee may be required to disclose the offence to the requisite professional body, at the point of registration if not before.</td>
<td>Such cases may need to be referred to EMC/DC, if the student’s actions fall under the B3 Misconduct Regulations and the facts need establishing. Where a student contests that they have committed the reported offence, cases should be referred to the appropriate EMC/DC (refer to EMC if the case affects academic element of the programme).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness to Practice</td>
<td>How to avoid them</td>
<td>Common Sanctions</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to disclose criminal offence which has occurred since the original criminal records Disclosure check and student’s embarkation on the programme.</td>
<td>Clear information to students about the need to disclose any changes to their circumstances in this regard.</td>
<td>Sanctions may be applied via DC, or Faculty may determine the matter can be wholly dealt with via FtP. Where the College Committee finds a student is <strong>unfit</strong> for registration and practice, either: - Termination of studies (consider whether academic-only award is appropriate/possible) OR - Suspension/other sanctions/remedial action</td>
<td>Such cases may need to be referred to DC, if the student’s actions fall under the B3 Misconduct Regulations and the facts need establishing/university has potentially been brought into disrepute.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>