

FALLIBROOME SIXTH FORM
PLAGIARISM POLICY 2011

Ofqual in partnership with plagiarismadvice.org, has published three new guides to give teachers, students and parents/carers a greater understanding of how to produce honest, authentic and correctly referenced work. The Students' Guide describes how sources can be checked for authenticity, authority and accuracy using a range of techniques including specific advice about popular wiki resources, such as Wikipedia - which the guide highlights as an excellent starting point for research - so long as the material is verified using authoritative sources! The guides are available for download from <http://www.ofqual.gov.uk/plagiarism> but all students in the Sixth Form will receive one during the tutorial session and sign to say that they have read and understood the information contained.

The Parents' Guide includes additional background information on the subject of plagiarism and will be distributed to all Sixth Form parents following the tutorial session.

The Teachers' guide is distributed with this policy. It looks at "how teachers can build good practice amongst students ensuring that bad habits do not become ingrained. It provides a framework for building upon the concepts of authenticity and attribution at the secondary education level to help equip students with the educational foundations required for further study". (ofqual)

This should therefore help students to produce authentic work at University where www.plagiarismadvice.org have introduced a plagiarism tariff to be used across all HE institutions (full report available from August 2010) assigning penalty points on a sliding scale according to the extent of the plagiarised work.

Finding plagiarism

FSF will follow the JCQ(2008) policies and procedures document in the case of suspected plagiarism. The awarding body will not be informed as long as the student has NOT signed the declaration of authenticity that accompanies the coursework

- Arrange a meeting with the DTL/teacher/student – **inform Head of Sixth Form**
- Have the original source of the material with you if this has been found
- As the most likely explanation is that the student simply hasn't understood how to correctly acknowledge the ideas of other authors in their work, this meeting should be viewed as a learning opportunity for the student. Ask them to expand on their thoughts or explain where the material originated from to identify a missing acknowledgement.
- Explain that there is nothing wrong with quoting from/paraphrasing other people's work but that sources must be cited appropriately.

The student can then amend their work accordingly or can be given a different assignment to do. The new piece can then be authenticated and submitted.

If the student refuses to revise or replace the suspect piece of work, you should warn the student that if they sign the declaration of authenticity and the work is not their own, they risk being disqualified from this and other exams. **THE HEAD OF SIXTH FORM SHOULD RECEIVE A COPY OF A WRITE UP OF THIS MEETING WHICH SHOULD BE SIGNED BY THE DTL/TEACHER and STUDENT.** (A copy should be placed on file and sent home.)

If after taking these measures, the candidate insists on submitting the original piece of work and you still doubt the authenticity, further steps should be taken to determine whether the work is the candidate's own eg a viva or a short test under exam conditions to provide evidence that they have produced the work themselves.

If you are ultimately unable to sign the declaration of authenticity with confidence the student, DTL, (teacher), the Head of Sixth Form will meet to discuss the case which at the very least will result in zero marks for the component and possible withdrawal from the course. A decision will be taken as to whether a malpractice investigation by the EXAM BOARD will be triggered. **The Head of School will be informed.** This could lead to the imposition of other penalties.

Accurate records of all meetings including copies of any work suspected of plagiarism must be kept and signed by the appropriate parties.

Appendices 1 and 2 taken from the JCQ document - Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments Policies and Procedures -contain examples of malpractice and penalties as imposed by the Exam Board. These can be found on the staff drive/Sixth Form /plagiarism policy.

It is important that the final submission of coursework is only made by the student after a series of coursework review meetings (recorded and dated) and that the declaration of authenticity is only ultimately signed by the student after the final review meeting has taken place. The student must be aware of this.

APPENDIX 1

Examples of malpractice in coursework (JCQ Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments Policies and Procedures)

Collusion: working collaboratively with other candidates, beyond what is permitted;

- copying from another candidate (including the use of ICT to aid the copying);
- allowing work to be copied;

Making a false declaration of authenticity in relation to the authorship of coursework or the contents of a portfolio;

- allowing others to assist in the production of coursework or assisting others in the production of coursework;

Plagiarism: unacknowledged copying from published sources or incomplete referencing;

- theft of another candidate's work;

Illustrations of malpractice

GCE A Level English

The moderator reported that the candidate had copied extracts from a website into one of her two pieces of work, and had not acknowledged this in the bibliography. The centre investigated and reported that the website had been plagiarised, and the bibliography had not been included by the candidate, but had been added by the teacher, after the work had been submitted.

Outcomes:

- (a) The candidate was disqualified from the unit for plagiarism.
- (b) The teacher was severely censured for interfering with the work of a candidate and barred from involvement with the awarding body's examinations for a period of one year.

GCSE Information Studies

The moderator reported that the coursework of all 6 candidates from one centre contained identical material. The tutor stated that although some students had shared a computer, he was confident that all had worked individually. He suggested that the tasks were tightly prescribed and therefore inevitably produced identical results. Each candidate denied wrongdoing. The awarding body agreed that the identical material found in the candidates' work was probably the result of candidates sharing their work on disks over a period of time, during the various stages of its production. As the work submitted did not permit the examiner to form a judgement on the individual abilities of the candidates; it could not be accepted.

Outcomes:

- (a) The candidates were not awarded any marks for this component (penalty 3).
- (b) The awarding body expressed its disappointment that the teacher had signed a declaration of authenticity when there were clear instances of identical work being submitted.

GCE A Level Design and Technology

A moderator reported similarities between two candidates' coursework. The centre discovered two identical files in the candidates' computer folders but, in the opinion of the Head of Technology, any similarities were not evidence of malpractice in this case. When interviewed, both candidates admitted working closely together but with no intention to cheat. The awarding body agreed that the candidates had collaborated on this project to an inappropriate extent.

Outcomes:

- (a) It was not possible to award a mark which discriminated between the abilities of the candidates, as a result of which no marks could be awarded to either candidate for this unit (penalty 4).
- (b) The awarding body required the centre to contact the subject officer for advice on the permitted level of collaboration.

Copying from another candidate (including the use of ICT to aid the copying)

Word Processing

In a Word Processing examination the examiner noted that two candidates had produced identical errors in a document. The candidates and the centre denied any malpractice. The awarding body decided that the evidence clearly pointed to the fact that copying had taken place between the candidates.

Outcomes:

- (a) Both candidates were disqualified from the qualification (penalty 7).
- (b) The centre was required to review its procedures relating to the conduct of examinations.

GCSE Design and Technology: Product Design

The centre reported that, after the candidate had signed the authentication form, his coursework was found to contain practical and written/graphic work that had not previously been seen by a teacher. The candidate admitted to copying his sister's work.

Outcome: The candidate was disqualified from the qualification (penalty 7).

GCSE Biology

The moderator discovered similar and identical passages in the coursework of two candidates which led him to suspect that candidate A had copied the work of candidate B. Candidate B admitted he had showed his work to candidate A to 'help him to see how to approach the problem'. Candidate A had promised not to copy the work but, in the event, had copied much of the content and submitted it as his own work.

Outcome:

Candidate A was disqualified from the whole qualification (penalty 7).
Candidate B lost all his marks for the component (penalty 3) for assisting the copying.

APPENDIX 2 (JCQ Suspected Malpractice in Examinations and Assessments Policies and Procedures)

Sanctions and penalties applied against candidates

Awarding bodies may, at their discretion, impose the following sanctions and penalties against candidates found guilty of candidate malpractice.

□ Penalty 1 - Warning

The candidate is issued with a warning that if the offence is repeated within a set period of time, further specified sanctions will be applied.

□ Penalty 2 - Loss of marks for a section

The candidate loses all the marks gained for a discrete section of the work. A section may be part of a component, or a single piece of coursework if this consists of several items.

□ Penalty 3 - Loss of marks for a component

The candidate loses all the marks gained for a component. A component is more often a feature of linear qualifications than a unitised qualification, and so this penalty can be regarded as an alternative to penalty 4. Some units also have components, in which case a level of penalty between numbers 2 and 4 is possible.

□ Penalty 4 - Loss of all marks for a unit

The candidate loses all the marks gained for a unit. This penalty can only be applied to qualifications which are unitised. For linear qualifications, the option is penalty 3. This penalty usually allows the candidate to aggregate or request certification in that series, albeit with a reduced mark or grade.

□ Penalty 5 - Disqualification from a unit

The candidate is disqualified from the unit. This penalty is only available if the qualification is unitised. For linear qualifications the option is penalty 7. The effect of this penalty is to prevent the candidate aggregating or requesting certification in that series, if the candidate has applied for it.

□ Penalty 6 – Disqualification from all units in one or more qualifications

If circumstances suggest, penalty 5 may be applied to other units taken during the same examination or assessment series. (Units which have been banked in previous exam series are retained.) This penalty is only available if the qualification is unitised. For linear qualifications the option is penalty 8.

□ Penalty 7 - Disqualification from a whole qualification

The candidate is disqualified from the whole qualification taken in that series or academic year. This penalty can be applied to unitised qualifications only if the candidate has requested aggregation. Any units banked in a previous series are retained, but the units taken in the present series and the aggregation opportunity are lost. If a candidate has not requested aggregation the option is penalty 6. It may also be used with linear qualifications.

□ Penalty 8 - Disqualification from all qualifications taken in that series

If circumstances suggest, penalty 7 may be applied to other qualifications. This penalty can be applied to unitised qualifications only if the candidate has requested aggregation. Any units banked in a previous series are retained, but the units taken in the present series and the aggregation opportunity are lost. If a candidate has not requested aggregation the option is penalty 6. It may also be used with linear qualifications.

□ Penalty 9 - Candidate debarral

The candidate is barred from entering for one or more examinations for a set period of time. This penalty is applied in conjunction with any of the other penalties above, if the circumstances warrant it.