

WYCLIFFE HALL

- OXFORD -



Plagiarism Policy

1. Scope

1.1 *Defining Terms*

For the purpose of these procedures, “student” includes any person studying on an undergraduate programme supplied by or in connection with Wycliffe Hall. It also includes Visiting Students following an undergraduate course of study at Wycliffe Hall.

1.2 Wycliffe Hall offers courses which are validated by the University of Oxford and Durham University. Procedures for investigating suspected plagiarism and operation of any resulting disciplinary proceedings will align with frameworks and regulations mandated by the validating university for the student’s or students’ course of study.

2. Procedures Followed if Plagiarism is Suspected

2.1 Boards of Examiners for different degrees have their overarching plagiarism policies. The procedures below apply to academic work submitted for evaluation internally within the college. The procedures followed will depend upon validating university and whether the plagiarism is deemed, by the course director and examiners, to be intentional or inadvertent.

3. Procedure for Students on Courses Validated by the University of Oxford

3.1 The University of Oxford takes seriously the offence of plagiarism and its policy states that:

3.2 No candidate shall present for an examination¹ any part, or the substance of any part, of another person’s work, as if it were the candidate’s own work. Candidates must provide a declaration with every assignment that the work submitted is their own work. Any alleged offence of deliberate plagiarism will be reported to the Proctors, via the Registry Officer.

3.2.1 No candidate shall cheat or act dishonestly, or attempt to do so, in any way, whether before, during, or after an examination, so as to obtain or seek to obtain an unfair advantage in an examination.

3.2.2 No candidate shall present for an examination as his or her own work any part or the substance of any part of another person’s work.

¹ ‘examination’ includes where the context so permits the submission and assessment of a thesis, dissertation, essay, practical work, or other coursework which is not undertaken in formal examination conditions but counts towards or constitutes the work for a degree or other academic award.

- 3.2.3 No candidate shall submit a text that has already been submitted in full or in part as part of the material submitted for another paper, certificate or degree.
- 3.2.4 In any written work passages quoted or closely paraphrased from another person's work must be identified as quotations or paraphrases, and the source of the quoted or paraphrased material must be acknowledged.
- 3.2.5 No person shall dishonestly give help to a candidate before, during, or after an examination so as to give, or attempt to give, that candidate an unfair advantage in an examination.
- 3.3 The above examples of dishonest practice are viewed as a breach of University Regulations and the consequences may be severe.
- 3.4 Written assignments are uploaded to a plagiarism detection system to check for possible academic offences via the WebLearn Virtual Learning Environment at the discretion of Wycliffe Hall.
- 3.5 Students will be required to sign declarations during their studies authorising the uploading of their work onto plagiarism detection systems and asserting the authorship of their submitted work.

a) [Procedures for Dealing with Inadvertent Plagiarism](#)

- i) Plagiarism detected especially in the first one or two assignments by students with little or no recent experience of higher education in the UK may be deemed inadvertent. Students who unintentionally plagiarise are normally those students who are new to higher education in the UK or are returning to higher education after a long absence.
- ii) Cases of suspected plagiarism or collusion should be reported by Subject Tutors immediately, there should not be any delay over taking action since the consideration of such allegations at the end of the academic year can give rise to additional complications.
- iii) If the marker feels that the assessment has been plagiarised, but that the plagiarism is likely to have been inadvertent, a meeting with the student is arranged to determine whether the student was aware that their work was inappropriately referenced. The student should normally be informed of the need for a meeting within three weeks of the assignment submission. Typically, this meeting may include the Course Director and Senior Tutor. This meeting should provide the student with feedback about their assignment writing techniques and offer support and guidance. During the meeting, the student should be warned that should s/he continue to fail to make proper use of references their work may be referred to the Proctors. It may be considered appropriate to proceed by telephone/e-mail/online video call communication in the case of an international student.

The Senior Tutor may recommend that:

- The student receives advice on assignment writing; and/or
 - The student resubmit the piece of work properly referenced for reassessment; or
 - The student resubmit the piece of work with the unreferenced sections removed for reassessment; or
 - The assessment mark be reduced.
- iv) If the student fails to attend (or, in the case of an on-line or overseas student, to respond)* or does contest the examiners' judgement then the case is referred to the Proctors and in the case of ordinands their Diocesan Director of Ordinands is informed.
- v) The student must be informed in writing of the Senior Tutor or Vice Principal's decision and be provided with constructive written feedback by the examiners and Course Director. The Course

Director should ensure the student is given guidance to improve referencing and assignment writing skills.

- vi) A detailed report of the outcome including a record of the meeting with the student must be held in the student's file. Students should be asked to sign a formal report of the meeting summarising the academic deficiency and outcome and as evidence that they acknowledge the error. This may be used as evidence should the student fail to take advice given and plagiarise further assessments.

Note * Student may be given up to two opportunities to attend (or to respond).

b) Procedures for Dealing with Deliberate and Persistent Plagiarism

- i. Students who are suspected to have deliberately plagiarised will normally have received the above guidance and support and have submitted up to two pieces of work, and/or already have recent experience of higher education in the UK and should therefore be familiar with UK referencing systems.

- ii. If the examiners agree that the work is deliberately plagiarised then the case will be referred to the Proctors, via the Registry, or to the Diocesan Director of Ordinands in case of a piece that is not written as part of a university course, but for ordination training. In the case information is sent to the Proctors, accompanying material will include:

- The assignment(s) alleged to be plagiarised;
- Evidence of the student's acceptance of the department's regulations (their offer and acceptance letter);
- The student's declaration(s) of authorship;
- A letter by the Senior Tutor outlining the case and giving examples of work which the student has not cited and has portrayed to be his or her own work. Where possible, examples of texts (books, periodicals, web pages, etc) which have been used but not cited should be given;
- The information provided to the student on the department's policy on plagiarism, and guidance provided to the student on referencing their work.

- iii. If this procedure takes longer than five weeks, the Academic Administrator will inform the student in writing that, because of suspected irregularities, a mark cannot be given until their work has been considered by the Proctors.

- iv. If the Proctors decide that there is a case to answer on grounds of deliberate plagiarism, the student will be formally charged with an offence and a university disciplinary process will follow. The outcome will depend on the severity of the case and may range from a reduction in marks to expulsion from the course. If the Proctors decide that there is no case to answer on grounds of deliberate plagiarism, the student will be referred back to the Department to be dealt with under (a) above.

c) Appeals

- i. Students wishing to appeal against the decision of the Senior Tutor or Vice Principal on inadvertent plagiarism must do so in writing to the Principal within two weeks of being notified of the decision. The Principal may refer the appeal to the Proctors.

- ii. Students wishing to appeal against the Proctors' decisions should do so in accordance with the applicable university statements and regulations.

4. Procedure for Students on Courses Validated by Durham University:

- 4.1 Durham University considers the following assessment irregularities to be major disciplinary offences which have the potential to incur severe penalties under the University's General Regulation IV. The University defines several forms of assessment irregularity, including:
- 4.1.1 **Plagiarism** – the unacknowledged use, including quotation and close paraphrasing of other people's writing and ideas, amounting to the presentation of other person's writings or thoughts as one's own. This includes using material which is available on the internet, and in any other electronic form, and 'contract cheating' i.e. obtaining an essay from an essay writing site, or equivalent source, and submitting it for marking, as if it were your own work.
 - 4.1.2 **Multiple submission** - the inappropriate submission of the same or substantially the same work of one's own for summative assessment, in connection with an academic award.
 - 4.1.3 **Collusion** - working with one or more other student(s) to produce work which each student then presents as their own in a situation in which this is inappropriate or not permitted and/or without acknowledging the collaboration of the other student(s). **Please note – an allegation of collusion is always made against two or more students.** The submission by one student of another student's work as if it were their own (without the other student's knowledge) constitutes plagiarism rather than collusion.
 - 4.1.4 **Impersonation** - presenting work on behalf of someone else as if it were the work of the other individual.
 - 4.1.5 **Cheating** - using any inappropriate or unauthorised means to achieve credit for a piece of coursework or an examination answer.
 - 4.1.6 **Use of inadmissible material** - using material which is not permitted to achieve credit for a piece of coursework or an examination answer.
 - 4.1.7 **Facilitation** - it is also an offence for a student to provide work such as essays to facilitate plagiarism, for example, by placing work on a website.
- 4.2 Procedures are based upon the principle that teaching staff with subject-specialist expertise should exercise their academic judgement as to the extent to which the alleged misconduct amounts to plagiarism/collusion/multiple submission in the context of the given case.
- 4.3 The facilitation of plagiarism through publication may also be classed as a dishonest practice under Durham University's General Regulation IV, 5(a) (x) and may lead to expulsion from the Common Awards programmes. See also General Regulation XI, Intellectual Property Rights.
- 4.4 In line with Ministry Division requirements, written assignments are uploaded to a plagiarism detection system to check for possible academic offences via a Virtual Learning Environment at the discretion of Wycliffe Hall. All students are therefore required to sign a declaration at the start of their programme of study, authorising the uploading of their work onto such systems.
- 4.5 Students will also be required to sign declarations during their studies asserting the authorship of their submitted work.

a) [Procedures in Respect of Inadvertent Plagiarism in Formative Assessment](#)

- i. Plagiarism detected especially in the first one or two assignments by students with little or no recent experience of higher education in the UK may be deemed inadvertent. Students who unintentionally plagiarise are normally those students who are new to higher education in the UK or are returning to higher education after a long absence.
- ii. If the marker feels that the assessment has been plagiarised, but that the plagiarism is likely to have been inadvertent, a meeting with the student is arranged to determine whether the student was aware that their work was inappropriately referenced. The student should normally be informed of the need for a meeting within three weeks of the assignment submission. Typically, this meeting may include the Course Director and Senior Tutor. This meeting should provide the student with feedback about their assignment writing techniques and offer support and guidance. During the meeting, the student should be warned that should s/he continue to fail to make proper use of references their actions may result in disciplinary action (see Academic Discipline policy for further details). It may be considered appropriate to proceed by telephone/e-mail/online video call communication in the case of an international student.
- iii. The Senior Tutor may recommend that:
 - The student receives advice on assignment writing; and/or
 - The student resubmit the piece of work properly referenced for reassessment; or
 - The student resubmit the piece of work with the unreferenced sections removed for reassessment; or
 - The assessment mark be reduced.
- iv. If the student fails to attend (or, in the case of an overseas student, to respond)* or does contest the examiners' judgement then the case is referred to Durham University as a possible offence under the University's discipline regulations and the relevant Diocesan Director of Ordinands is informed.
- v. The student must be informed in writing of the Senior Tutor's decision and be provided with constructive written feedback by the examiners and Course Director. The Course Director should ensure the student is given further guidance to improve referencing and assignment writing skills.
- vi. A more detailed report of the outcome including a record of the meeting with the student must be held in the student's file. Students should be asked to sign a formal report of the meeting summarising the academic deficiency and outcome and as evidence that they acknowledge the error. This may be used as evidence should the student fail to take advice given and plagiarise further assessments.

Note * Student may be given up to two opportunities to attend (or to respond).

b) [Plagiarism and Collusion in Summative Assessment](#)

- i. It should be noted that in the case of plagiarism and collusion in summative assessment, the first stages are part of the examinations process and not a disciplinary procedure.
- ii. If it is suspected that a student has breached the regulations, a report detailing the evidence should be made immediately to the chair of the Board of Examiners. Wycliffe Hall will automatically check the student's work for the year, to see whether there is other evidence for similar behaviour. Where two examiners have been appointed to examine a piece of work the examiners should consult over the matter before the submission of a report. In the event of one of the examiners being the chair of the Board of Examiners, a deputy will act in his/her place.

- iii. If an external examiner suspects that a student has breached the regulations, they should consult with the internal examiner(s). The internal examiner should then prepare a preliminary report detailing the evidence; the report should be submitted immediately to the Chair of the Board of Examiners.
- iv. If, in the view of the Chair of the Board of Examiners, the report of the examiner(s) provides sufficient detailed evidence of an offence, a sub-group panel of the Board of Examiners, appointed by the Chair, shall be formed comprising the Chair and two other members of the Board (but excluding the reporting examiner(s)) to consider the case.
- v. The student(s) concerned are required to meet the panel together with the reporting examiner(s). The student should normally receive at least 5 working days' notice of the date of the meeting and should be told of its purpose. The student will be offered the opportunity to be accompanied at the panel by a member of staff from Wycliffe Hall (for example, the student's Fellowship Group tutor or similar).
- vi. If the allegation is collusion both students should normally be seen together, to enable them to hear the other student's evidence against him/herself. Each student may say his/her mitigation in private before the panel, with the proviso that the other student will be given the opportunity to respond to any reference to him/her in the mitigation statement. In the case of final year students where the case of alleged plagiarism or collusion is brought to light at the end of the degree programme it may be necessary to hold a meeting without the 5 days notice, provided that the student concerned agrees in writing to this procedure. This course of action may be necessary in order to permit the Board of Examiners the opportunity of considering the case without necessarily causing any delay to the normal process of consideration for the award of a degree to the student concerned.
- vii. Cases of suspected plagiarism or collusion should be reported by Subject Tutors immediately, there should not be any delay over taking action since the consideration of such allegations at the end of the academic year can give rise to additional complications.
- viii. The evidence of alleged plagiarism or collusion will be shown to the student, and the student must be asked to account for the work that they submitted.
- ix. A written record of the meeting must be made immediately.

c) [Possible Outcomes](#)

- i. After the meeting the panel (but excluding the reporting examiner(s)), in the light of the evidence and the account given by the student including any mitigation offered, must decide upon the quantitative and qualitative extent of alleged plagiarism or collusion and come to a view as to the appropriate action.
- ii. At this stage the student must be informed in writing by the Chair of the Board of Examiners, that the panel's recommendation is:
 - that no further action be taken, because, on the balance of probabilities, plagiarism or collusion or multiple submission had not taken place; or
 - that the Board apply for a concession or grace period on the student's behalf, because, whilst there is clear evidence of plagiarism/collusion/ multiple submission, due to exceptional mitigating factors, a punishment is inappropriate; or

- that there is clear evidence of plagiarism/collusion/multiple submission and that the Board apply one of the following punishments:
 - A. mark only the student's own contribution to the work, or in the case of multiple submission, mark only the proportion of the work which complies with Wycliffe Hall's guidance. (This may be most appropriate where the plagiarism/collusion/multiple submission is not extensive or it is a first-offence, or a first-year student; or the Board accepts the student's mitigation);
 - B. award a mark of 0 for the work (this may be appropriate where the plagiarism/collusion/multiple submission is more extensive, the work makes a significant contribution to the module/programme as a whole, or it is a repeat offence or there is clear evidence of dishonesty);
 - C. award a mark of 0 for the entire module in which the plagiarism/collusion/multiple submission occurred (this is the most severe punishment open to the Board of Examiners which will require the student to resit the entire module if s/he is in the penultimate Level of their programme and may result in him/her failing their programme if they are in the final Level of the programme. The punishment should be used only in the most serious cases just falling short of referral to the University).
 - D. that the level of misconduct goes beyond the examples cited in A – C above and it therefore should be referred to the University as a possible major offence under the University's discipline regulations.
 - iii. Where one of the above recommendations is applied, a written report of the work submitted together with the student's explanation and the Panel's recommendation should be presented to a meeting of the Board of Examiners for consideration. The Board should consult the external examiner(s) before making a decision about cases involving work submitted for final honours.
 - iv. In all cases in which the student is not in the final Level of their programme of study or has other summatively assessed work to complete, an appropriate member of teaching staff at Wycliffe Hall must arrange a meeting, preferably in person, to counsel the student on how to avoid infringing the assessment regulations in future. A note of the date and time of the meeting is to be kept in the student's file.
- d) [Appeals](#)
- i. Students wishing to appeal against the decision of the Senior Tutor on inadvertent plagiarism must do so in writing to the Principal within two weeks of being notified of the decision. The Principal may refer the appeal to Durham University.
 - ii. Students wishing to appeal against the Board of Examiners and/or University's decisions should do so in accordance with the applicable university statements and regulations.

VERSION CONTROL					
Version Number	Policy Gatekeeper	Date of Approval	Committee	Date to Take Effect	Date of Next Review
V.3	JER	24.11.14	Education	24.11.14	Hilary 2017

It is the responsibility of the Gatekeeper of each policy to check annually whether there have been any legislative and/or University policy changes that are relevant to Wycliffe Hall.