

Leadership East

Plagiarism in Assessments

Adapted from Joint Council for Qualifications (JCQ) Guidance 2018

Guidance for Facilitators, Assessors and Moderators

Contents

Defining plagiarism	2
Preventing plagiarism	3
Dealing with plagiarism	4
Keeping watch on content	5
Keeping watch on vocabulary, spelling and punctuation	5
Keeping watch on style and tone	5
Keeping watch on presentation	6
Confirmation	6
Reporting.....	7
Guidance on referencing	7
Bibliography, resources and recommended browsing	8
Form LE/M1 - Suspected candidate malpractice	9

This guidance note is written for Leadership East facilitators, mentors, assessors and moderators who support participants and/or mark participants' tasks and assessments. Plagiarism is a serious issue with serious consequences. The content of this guidance will apply to varying degrees depending on your role, nevertheless we all share a duty to help participants to avoid any accidental or deliberate plagiarism or malpractice, and to detect it and deal with it when it occurs.

1. Further guidance regarding malpractice and how it is treated by Awarding Bodies can be found in our separate policy for Malpractice.
2. Plagiarism calls into question the integrity of examinations and assessments, especially those assessment components such as non-examination assessments where plagiarism can occur most easily. If non-examination assessments are to remain as a viable assessment method, it is the duty of all who are preparing and assessing participants for assessments as well as those who have an interest in the setting, marking and administration of assessments, to do whatever they can to address plagiarism.

Defining plagiarism

3. Before considering what steps can be taken to counter this practice, it is necessary to have a clear understanding of what plagiarism is.
4. There are several definitions of plagiarism, but they all have in common the idea of taking someone else's intellectual effort and presenting it as one's own. The JCQ General and Vocational Qualifications Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments Policies and Procedures define plagiarism as: "unacknowledged copying from or reproduction of published sources or incomplete referencing;" this definition is equally appropriate for the assessment and award of the National Professional Qualifications (NPQs)
5. Mostly, plagiarism refers to copying from published texts whether these are in print or on the internet, but it can also refer to essays or pieces of work previously submitted for assessments by others or manufactured artefacts. Text can be copied by being memorised and reproduced. For this reason, we discourage the indiscriminate sharing of entire assessment write-ups amongst participants.
6. A strict interpretation of the above definition would include the original ideas as well as the actual words or artefacts produced by another. Unless the participant has submitted an extensive and unacknowledged paraphrase (amounting to more than 50% of the total) of another person's writings, however, we would not include paraphrasing under the definition of plagiarism. Instead assessors should reflect the incidence of any paraphrasing in the way they apply the mark scheme/assessment criteria for the relevant NPQ. On the other hand, plagiarism

will cover the direct and unacknowledged translation of foreign language texts into English.

7. It should be noted that plagiarism does not include collusion; that is, working collaboratively with other participants; neither does it include copying from another participant in the same assessment session. Both of these are defined as different forms of malpractice (see LE Policy for Malpractice.)
8. Participants' in-school sponsors verify the impact and authenticity of the work submitted for assessment. As an assessor, you must not accept work which you have reason to believe is not the participant's own. If plagiarism is discovered prior to submission (for example by a mentor or sponsor) the incident should be dealt with internally in accordance with Leadership East procedures. In the event of plagiarism being discovered after submission, the matter must also be reported to the National QAA.

Preventing plagiarism

9. In order to prevent plagiarism, we:
 - a) must ensure that each participant has access to Leadership East policies for plagiarism and malpractice
 - b) must ensure that each participant understands the contents of the policies; particularly the meaning of plagiarism and what penalties may be applied;
 - c) should reinforce to a participant the significance of understanding and following the requirements for their NPQ;
 - d) could require participants to sign a declaration that they have understood what plagiarism is, and that it is forbidden, in the process of booking their assessment window at the start of their NPQ;
 - e) should make clear what is and what is not acceptable in respect of plagiarism and the use of sources, including the use of websites. It is unacceptable to simply state Internet, just as it would be unacceptable to state Library rather than the title of the book, name of the author, the chapter and page reference. It is similarly unacceptable to list search engines such as Google; participants must provide details of any web pages from which they are quoting or paraphrasing. Some suggestions on acceptable forms of referencing can be found at the end of this guide.
 - f) should encourage compliance with the conventions of using footnotes and bibliographies to acknowledge sources. There is no one standard way of acknowledging sources but the use of inverted commas, indented quotations, acknowledgement of the author, line/page number, title

of source, indicate that the participant is using a source. Assessors, sponsors, mentors and participants should be aware that when acknowledging sources clarity ensures that there is no suspicion of plagiarism;

g) should encourage the use of quotation marks when sources are quoted directly (a suggested guideline for the need to put items in quotation marks would be the use of more than six words in unchanged form);

h) should set reasonable deadlines for submission of work and provide reminders;

i) should introduce “live” activities in face-to-face sessions that use the level of knowledge/ understanding achieved during the coursework thereby making the Leadership East team confident that the participant understands the material;

j) could ask participants to make a short verbal presentation to the rest of the group on their work;

k) when appropriate, should explain the importance of the participant producing work which is their own and stress to them the penalties of malpractice;

l) must take care to ensure that work undertaken in previous years’ assessments by other participants is not submitted as their own by participants for the current assessment. The safe keeping of such earlier work is of great importance, and its issue to participants for reference purposes should be carefully considered and monitored;

m) must not accept, without further investigation, work which you suspect has been plagiarised; to do so encourages the spread of this practice.

Dealing with plagiarism

10. There are three steps in the process for dealing with plagiarism:

- keeping watch
- confirmation
- reporting

11. There are a number of clues that point to the possibility of plagiarism, and you should remain alert to the possibility of spotting these.

Keeping watch on content

12. You should check a participant's work for acknowledgement of sources as any work is being completed in face to face sessions.
13. Varying quality of content is one of the most obvious pointers. Well-written passages containing detailed analyses of relevant facts alternating with poorly constructed and irrelevant linking passages ought to give rise to suspicion. In the context of NPQ assessment, where there is not the same scope for extended pieces of writing, this may be less apparent. This, and following guidance applies equally to annexes and supporting documents which the participant is submitting as their own work, such as Communications and Budget Plans, Risk Logs.
14. Another practice is for participants to write the introductory and concluding remarks to a section to make it fit the criteria, and then fill in the middle with work which has been lifted from elsewhere.
15. If the work is not focused on the criteria, but presents related content, this could be a sign that it has been used elsewhere.
16. Particular care should be taken when participants submit work without relevant supporting material. When participants submit completed work without relevant required/supporting documents this can be an indication that the work is not the participant's own.
17. Dated expressions, and references to past events as being current can also be indications of work which has been copied from out-of-date sources.

Keeping watch on vocabulary, spelling and punctuation

18. The use of a mixture of English and American vocabulary or spellings can be a sign that the work is not original.
19. If the piece contains specialised and unexpected terminology (i.e. not usually encountered in schools and related contexts), jargon, obscure words, the assessor should ask if this is typical of this level of participant and reasonable, or if it is because the participant did not write the passage.

Keeping watch on style and tone

20. Look for differences in the style or the tone of writing. If a participant uses material from textbooks alongside items from popular websites the change of tone between the two should

be marked.

21. Look at level of sophistication of the sentence structure. Is this the sort of language that can be expected from the participant? Is the use of language consistent, or does it vary? Does a change in style reflect a change in authorship at these points?

Keeping watch on presentation

22. Look at the presentation of the piece. Are the size and style of font uniform? What about any additional use of headers and sub-headers? Are the margins consistent throughout? Does the text employ references and if so is the style of referencing consistent? Are there any references, for example, to figures, tables or footnotes, which don't make sense (because they have not been uploaded)?
23. Lack of references in a longer, well-written section could indicate that it had been copied from a website such as Wikipedia or similar general knowledge source – and a quick internet search using part of the text submitted will form part of any investigation.
24. Look out for any quotations that run on beyond the part which has been acknowledged.

Confirmation

25. If you suspect that an assignment has been plagiarised, the next step is to report your suspicions, with reasons to The Director. The following guidance outlines the investigation process that will be undertaken by Leadership East.
26. Identifying a source: The easiest method is to type a four to six-word phrase from the text (preferably one with an unusual phrase in it) directly into a search engine such as Google and perform an “exact phrase search”. If the article was copied from the free, visible web there is a good chance this approach will find it, particularly if a few search engines are tried.
27. Another method is to look through the websites that participants use, as these are common sources of content – including our own online library on the LMS. Assessors should be aware that some social media platforms contain discussions where successful NPQH and NPQSL submissions, for example, are offered in the public domain. If it does not come up through such searches, the piece may have been taken from the “invisible web”, that is, from articles which are not separately indexed to a search engine, although the site itself is. Sites run by newspapers, magazines, online encyclopedias, subject specific sites, and those sites providing help with essays tend to fall into this category, and would have to be searched individually, but again the use of a few well-chosen words in a “find” tool could produce results.

28. If plagiarism is suspected, conducting an oral assessment of the participant may help us to assess whether the work is that of the participant.
29. Such an investigation will also involve discussions with the participant's sponsor and Headteacher to verify the submitted work and their signature and knowledge of the submission.
30. If an investigation is inconclusive the work in question could be removed and replaced by alternative work whose authenticity is not in doubt. This must still be completed within a given reasonable deadline.

Reporting

31. If suspicions are confirmed and the participant has not confirmed authentication, Leadership East will resolve the matter ourselves. We must not accept work which is not the participant's own. Ultimately the Director has the responsibility for ensuring that participants do not submit plagiarised work.
32. If plagiarism is detected and the authentication has been declared by the participant, the case must be reported to the Awarding Body – which in the context of the NPQs is the National QAA on behalf of the DfE. The procedure is detailed in Leadership East's policy for suspected malpractice in assessments.
33. If plagiarism is suspected by a NPQAA moderator or has been reported by a participant, colleague or member of the public, full details of the allegation will be reported to The Director. The Director will be asked to conduct an investigation into the alleged malpractice and to submit a written report to a committee from the Strategic Board. The form contained in the document LE M1 Report of suspected participant malpractice (Appendix 1) should be used as a basis for this report.
34. The Malpractice Committee will then consider the case and, if necessary, impose a sanction in line with the penalties given in the Leadership East policy for Suspected Malpractice in Assessments. The sanctions applied to a participant committing plagiarism range from a warning regarding future conduct to the participant being barred from entering for assessment for one or more NPQ with Leadership East for a set period of time.

Guidance on referencing

The tasks and write-up for any of the NPQs does not necessitate a particular style and assessment does not include the extent to which academic conventions for writing have been complied with. However, participants will often ask facilitators and other LE team members for guidance regarding acceptable formats for referencing.

A useful guide to referencing can be found online at:

https://weblearn.ox.ac.uk/access/content/group/cd464c28-e981-4dcc-af89-945b50a3ef48/Referencing%20and%20plagiarism/SHU_Guide_to_referencing%20NEW%20TO%20USE.pdf

a) A reference in the text, or as a footnote, should show at least the name of the author, the year of publication and the page number: For example: (Goldsworthy, 2010, pg.29.)

b) Participants may also include a bibliography at the end of their work, which is not included in the word allocation and which lists details of publications that have been used to research their project; this must be concise and relevant. For example: Goldsworthy, A. (2010) “Anthony and Cleopatra”, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.

c) For material taken from web pages, the reference must show the precise web page, not the search engine used to locate it. This can be copied from the address line. For example: (<http://www.bbc.co.uk/schools/16/sosteacher/history/49766.shtml> [accessed 24-11-2018])

d) For individual works found on the internet, the reference should show the details as in (b), above, plus the URL and the date accessed. For example: Airey, C. (2004). The State of Play Today [Online] 6th Edition. Available: <http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/republic.html> [20th September 2011].

Bibliography, resources and recommended browsing

J Barrie Thompson and Simon Stobart: University Research, Plagiarism and the Internet: Problems and Possible Solutions; Published in the proceedings of the Sixth International Conference ETHICOMP 2002; Lisbon: ISBN 972-839, pp607-710.

Oxford University Department of Education: Guide to Referencing and Citations. Available: https://weblearn.ox.ac.uk/access/content/group/cd464c28-e981-4dcc-af89-945b50a3ef48/Referencing%20and%20plagiarism/SHU_Guide_to_referencing%20NEW%20TO%20USE.pdf [7 August 2017].

Other useful sites are:

<http://libguides.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/reference-management/referencing-styles>

<http://virtualsalt.com/antiplag.htm>

<http://www.plagiarism.org>

<http://www.turnitinuk.com>

Form LE/M1

Suspected candidate malpractice

Confidential

This form is to be used by centres to report instances of suspected candidate malpractice.

Provider

--

Date of incident

Time of alleged incident

--	--

Qualification

Provider address

N	PP	Q		
---	----	---	--	--

Director's e-mail address

Director telephone number

--	--

Preferred method of communication

By post	<input type="checkbox"/>
By e-mail	<input type="checkbox"/>
By telephone	<input type="checkbox"/>



Candidate name(s)

Assessment details

Date submitted	Content area/Criteria concerned

Name(s) of assessment personnel or other witness/witnesses

Name	Role



Complete Sections A, B, C and D as indicated.

Section A (All qualifications)

Describe the nature of the suspected candidate malpractice including details as to how it was discovered, by whom and when.



Section B

Had the candidate(s) checked the declaration of authentication stating that all work completed was the candidate's own?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

Section C

If the incident involves plagiarism, is the plagiarised material enclosed?

YES	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input type="checkbox"/>

If the answer to the above question is no, please give details below of the nature of the plagiarism; provide full details (i.e. title, author, edition, website, etc.) of the material plagiarised and include copies if possible.

If there are any other details you feel are relevant to this allegation, including mitigating circumstances, please give further information below.

Section D

Supporting evidence

Please indicate below the supporting evidence submitted with this report. All relevant information and materials **must** be submitted at this time. Evidence submitted subsequently may not be considered.

If submitting this form by e-mail, please ensure that all supporting documents are scanned and attached (preferably as PDF documents) to the same e-mail.

Evidence submitted with this form	
Statement(s) from assessor/moderator	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statement from facilitator	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statement from sponsor	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statement(s) from candidate(s)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Statement from employer	<input type="checkbox"/>
Copies of sources of plagiarised material	<input type="checkbox"/>
Assessment and Internal Verification or Moderation records	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please give details)	<input type="checkbox"/>

If statement(s) from the candidate(s) is/are not enclosed, please put a cross in this box to indicate that the candidate(s) has/have been given the opportunity to make a statement, but has/have chosen not to do so.

To be completed by the head of centre

Name (please print)		Tel No.	
Signature*		Date	

* Submission by e-mail from a registered e-mail address will be accepted in place of a signature.

NOTES ON THE COMPLETION OF FORM LE/M1

This form **must** be used by the head of the centre to notify the awarding body of an instance of suspected candidate malpractice in the conduct of NPQ assessments. It can also be used to provide a report on investigations into instances of suspected malpractice.

In order to prevent the issue of erroneous results and certificates, it is essential that the awarding body (NPQAA) is notified immediately of instances of suspected candidate malpractice.

Reports on investigations **must** include:

- a detailed account of the circumstances surrounding the suspected candidate malpractice;
- the procedures for advising candidates of the regulations concerning the conduct of assessments;
- a report of any investigation carried out subsequently by the centre;
- signed and dated statements from the staff concerned (e.g. assessors, moderators, facilitators, sponsors, etc.) on the centre's official letterheaded paper;
- signed and dated statements from the candidate(s) concerned or a clear indication that they have been given the opportunity to make a statement; (In circumstances which make it inappropriate to interview the candidate, the centre should discuss the case in confidence with the awarding body.)

This form is intended to be used as the basis for the report.

This form may be submitted either by post or by e-mail. When submitting the form by e-mail, all supporting documents should be scanned and attached (preferably as PDF documents) to the same e-mail, and the originals retained within the centre.

Report of suspected candidate malpractice

This checklist is intended to assist centres when completing a report of suspected candidate malpractice.

It is the responsibility of the head of centre to ensure that these requirements have been met.

Please indicate by putting a cross in the appropriate box for the following points:

		Yes	No
1.	The candidate(s) has/have been informed of their individual responsibilities and rights.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2.	A candidate or candidates accused of malpractice:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has/have been informed (preferably in writing) of the allegation made against him or her; 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has/have been advised that a copy of the LE policy for Malpractice can be found on the website and on the Learner Management System; 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> know(s) what evidence there is to support the allegation; 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> know(s) the possible consequences should malpractice be proven; 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has/have had the opportunity to consider their response to the allegations (if required); 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has/have had an opportunity to submit a written statement; 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has/have had an opportunity to seek advice (as necessary) and to provide a supplementary statement (if required); 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has/have been informed of the applicable appeals procedure should a decision be made against him or her; 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has/have been informed of the possibility that information relating to a serious case of malpractice may be shared with the awarding body. 	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This form must be enclosed with the report of your investigation.