

POLICY AND PROCEDURE

UNIT/DEPARTMENT: **DEANSHIP, QUALITY & ACADEMIC ACCREDITATION**

TITLE: POLICY ON PLAGIARISM

PREAMBLE

Plagiarism is a complex issue. It can be defined simply as taking work done by somebody else and passing it off as one's own. The requirements of NCAAA concerning plagiarism includes the following, specified at three different reference points.

"(1) AREA 2: GOVERNANCE & ADMINISTRATION

"2.3. The institution must meet high ethical standards of honesty and integrity including avoidance of plagiarism in its teaching, research and service functions, and, take action to ensure that these standards are met by staff and students.

"2.5.1 Codes of practice for ethical and responsible behavior have been developed that require that teaching and other staff and students, and all committees and organizations, act consistently and avoidance of plagiarism in the conduct and reporting of research, in teaching, performance evaluation and assessment.

"(2) AREA 5: STUDENTS ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT SERVICES

"5.1.1. Policies and procedures are in place to deal with academic misconduct, including plagiarism and other forms of cheating

(Source: Revised Self Evaluation Scales - February 2010; Pages 19 & 47)

"(3) CHAPTER 4: ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES OF EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL

"4.5.3. Assessment: Are there safeguards against cheating or plagiarism?"

(Source: NCAAA Hand Book 3 External Reviews for Accreditation and Quality Assurance, March 2010; Page 40)

PURPOSE: To

1. Enhance awareness of faculty and students of UoD to the natural link between mission of the University and avoidance of plagiarism.
2. Guide the development of a consistent, fair, and, pragmatic approach to plagiarism which is appropriate to our stage of academic development.
3. Sensitize UoD about appropriate referencing and the citing of others' work
4. Minimize the risk of others' work, which is not properly cited, appearing in handouts given to students.

SCOPE

The policy deals with three aspects of Plagiarism

1. Developing deeper understanding of Plagiarism
2. Detecting Plagiarism
3. Accepting that all stakeholders namely, faculty and teaching staff, as well students and administration must be involved in dealing with plagiarism,.

DEFINITIONS

Terms which require to be defined for the purposes of this Policy include these ten.

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| a. Aiding & Abetting | g. Obtaining an Unfair Advantage |
| b. Academic Dishonesty | h. Plagiarism |
| c. Cheating | i. Recycling |
| d. Collusion | j. Unauthorized Access to academic or administrative records or systems |
| e. Fabrication | |
| f. Falsification | |

TERM	DEFINITION
Aiding and Abetting	(a) "Providing material, information, or other assistance to another person with knowledge that such aid could be used in any of the violations stated above, Or
Academic Dishonesty	(b) Providing false information in connection with any inquiry regarding academic integrity" (Source: North Western University)
Cheating	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Seeking to obtain an unfair advantage in an examination or in other written or practical work required to be submitted or completed for assessment". (Source: Monash University) Examples of cheating: "Using unauthorized notes, study aids, or information on an examination; altering a graded work after it has been returned, then submitting the work for regarding; allowing another person to do one's work and submitting that work under one's own name; submitting identical or similar papers for credit in more than one course without prior permission from the course instructors". (Source: North Western University) <ul style="list-style-type: none">• "Cheating is any action before, during or after an assessment or examination which seeks to gain unfair advantage or assists another student to do so. Examples of cheating are:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Gaining access to, or using, unauthorized notes or other material relating to an assessment• Introducing any information, including electronically stored information, into the examination room (whether belonging to yourself or another person) unless expressly permitted by the examination or programme regulations.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicating during an examination with any person outside the examination room or with other students within the examination room. • Copying the work of another student with or without their knowledge or agreement whether in examinations or in other assessments. • Allowing another person to impersonate you, or impersonating another person, with the intention of gaining an unfair advantage for yourself or the other person. <p>Ghosting; that is, submitting as your own work a piece of work produced in whole or part by another person on your behalf (eg: the use of 'ghost writing' services), or deliberately seeking to make available material to another student with the intention that the other student should present the work as his or her own'. (Source: University of Southampton)</p>
Collusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unauthorized collaboration on assessable work with another person or persons. • Persons come together to produce work to be submitted for assessment without the consent or knowledge of the assessor. <p>(Source: Durban University of Technology)</p>
Fabrication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Falsifying or inventing any information, data or citation; presenting data that were not gathered in accordance with standard guidelines defining the appropriate methods for collecting or generating data and failing to include an accurate account of the method by which the data were gathered or collected". <p>(Source: North Western University)</p>
Falsification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Falsification is any attempt to present fictitious or distorted data, evidence, references, experimental results or other material and/or knowingly to make use of such material. <p>Examples of falsification are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presenting data based on controlled investigations, experiments, surveys or analysis falsely claimed to have been carried out by you. • The invention of references and/or false claims. • Including data etc. in your work which you know to be false or incorrect, whether or not this has been created by you. <p>In connection with programmes leading to a professional qualification, falsely claiming to have completed non-academic requirements such as hours in practice or to have achieved professional competencies". (Source: University of Southampton)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Falsification of Records and Official Documents: Altering documents affecting academic records; forging signatures of authorization or falsifying information on an official academic document, grade report, letter of permission, petition, drop/add form, ID card, or any other official University document. <p>(Source: North Western University)</p>

<p>Obtaining an Unfair Advantage</p>	<p>(a) "Stealing, reproducing, circulating or otherwise gaining access to examination materials prior to the time authorized by the instructor;</p> <p>(b) Stealing, destroying, defacing or concealing library materials with the purpose of depriving others of their use;</p> <p>(c) Unauthorized collaborating on an academic assignment</p> <p>(d) Retaining, possessing, using or circulating previously given examination materials, where those materials clearly indicate that they are to be returned to the instructor at the conclusion of the examination;</p> <p>(e) Intentionally obstructing or interfering with another student's academic work or (f) otherwise undertaking activity with the purpose of creating or obtaining an unfair academic advantage over other students' academic work".</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Source: North Western University)</p>
<p>Plagiarism</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'To take and use another person's ideas and or manner of expressing them and to pass them off as one's own by failing to give appropriate acknowledgement. This includes material from any source, staff, students or the Internet – published and unpublished works'. <p style="text-align: right;">(Source: Monash University)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Submitting material that in part or whole is not entirely one's own work without attributing those same portions to their correct source". <p style="text-align: right;">(Source: North Western University)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "The reproduction or paraphrasing, without acknowledgement, from public or private (ie: unpublished) material (including material downloaded from the internet) attributable to, or which is the intellectual property of, another including the work of students. <p>Examples of plagiarism are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including in your own work extracts from another person's work without the use of quotation marks and crediting the source. • The use of the ideas of another person without acknowledgement of the source. • Paraphrasing or summarizing another person's work without acknowledgement. • Cutting and pasting from electronic sources without explicit acknowledgement of the source of the URL or author and/or without explicitly marking the pasted text as a quotation. • Submitting a piece of work entirely as your own when it was produced in collaboration with others, and not declaring that this collaboration has taken place (this is known as 'collusion'). • Submitting appropriated imagery or creative products without indicating the source of the work. <p>As one means of detecting plagiarism, some Schools now use software to check assignments for evidence of plagiarism".</p> <p style="text-align: right;">(Source: University of Southampton)</p>
<p>Recycling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "A piece of work which has already been used in one context is used again (without declaration) in another context. <p>Examples of recycling are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-submitting work which has already been assessed and

	<p>marked in full or in part for another assessment in the same or in a different course.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to disclose that a piece of work was submitted for assessment and has been or will be used for other academic purposes. • Publishing essentially the same piece of work in more than one place without declaration. <p>In some instances it may be acceptable to use work previously submitted for a written assignment as the basis for an examination answer or to further expand and develop such work at a higher level; eg: Developing the ideas formulated in your third year dissertation into a Master's level thesis. Such situations would be governed by the specific regulations of the appropriate programme of study.</p> <p>There may be other breaches of academic integrity which are not specifically referred to here, and some breaches may fall into more than one category".</p> <p>(Source: University of Southampton)</p>
<p>Unauthorized Access to computerized academic or administrative records or systems</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Viewing or altering computer records, modifying computer programs or systems, releasing or dispensing information gained via unauthorized access, or interfering with the use or availability of computer systems or information". <p>(Source: North Western University)</p>

POLICY

1. The mission statement of UoD opens with “a commitment, in the context of Islamic value, ethics, morality and culture, to deploy our resources to attain academic accreditation.”
 - 1.1. This mission informs our policy on plagiarism and all types of academic misconduct.
2. UoD accepts that, throughout all institutions of tertiary education, unintentional plagiarism is, probably, not uncommon.
3. Furthermore, UoD accepts that the deeper understanding of plagiarism involves a developmental process.
 - 3.1. For the development of faculty and staff, UoD will
 - a. Promote the development of a consistent university-wide understanding of plagiarism including the definitions of terms to be used in UoD.
 - b. Support strategies for learning, teaching and assessment which minimize the chances of students plagiarizing, perhaps unknowingly.
 - 3.2. For development of students,
 - a. Each academic department will introduce students to avoid plagiarism.
 - b. Students will also be made aware of consequences of Plagiarizing.
4. Faculty will continue to be role models to students in developing the generality of professional behavior expected of them.

I. STUDENTS

1. Any academic or administrative member, or, official of the University who has reason to believe that academic misconduct has occurred shall immediately notify the Chairman of the Department in writing. Where the academic misconduct occurs in connection with a course, the Chairman of that department will be the investigating authority.
2. Upon receiving notification, the department Chairman shall investigate the alleged academic misconduct immediately; the process will include the following:
 - 2.1. Give the student an opportunity to explain the incident.
 - 2.2. Conduct any further investigation necessary to ensure fairness.
 - 2.3. The Chairman will also notify the Dean of the student's faculty of the alleged misconduct.
 - 2.4. If the academic misconduct has been established, the Chairman may take the appropriate academic action, and impose the appropriate penalty with respect to that course.
3. The Chairman will make the disciplinary decision on the academic misconduct and will advise the student of the disciplinary decision in writing. A copy of the disciplinary decision will be provided to the Dean.
4. Where a student commits academic misconduct in two or more courses in the same semester or there is a record of previous misconduct, the Dean of the particular program may assign a penalty additional to those assigned by the Chairman who has investigated the current allegation.
5. For misconduct by graduate students, the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies & Research is the students' Dean.

II. FACUTLY, TEACHING, OR, RESEARCH STAFF

1. Alleged plagiarism Committed by any of the above can be reported by internal or external sources
2. The receipt of the report in the University can range from H.E. the President through Vice Presidents, Deanship of colleges, Deanship of QAA, and, others.
3. An official committee is set up by the authority of H.E. The President of the University. The committee is set up to function as an internal enquiry to
 - a. Look in to issues raised in a letter dated..... from addressed to and
 - b. Make recommendations within two weeks from the date of receipt.
- 3.1. The President names the Chairman/ Convener of the Committee.

3.2. The Committee appoints among one of members as secretary. The Chairman writes to the faculty or personnel involved to submit, in writing, pertinent documents called 'Depositions'.

4. The committee meets urgently.

- a. The chairman explains the seriousness of the assignment by stating an outline of the situation.
- b. He submits to articles, letters etc, with full referencing.
- c. He specifies actual words on the alleged plagiarism: e.g. "After having examined the two papers, COPE (Committee on Publication Ethics) responded that this appears to be a serious case of *plagiarism* and *fabrication* and that it could be serious enough to constitute *fraud*. We very much hope that you and your co- authors can come up with a decent explanation of this”.

4.1. The committee's initial decisions can include:

4.1.1. Seek urgent audience with Dean for further clarification

4.1.2. Complete this important assignment as soon as possible in view of three things

- a. The seriousness of the situation.
- b. All concerned working feverishly on should be in a position to submit any required documents
- c. The probability that the Dean may consult the highest University Authorities, including the University Legal Advisor.

4.1.3. Seek additional audience with the Dean, formal and informal, for briefing

4.2. MINIMUM REQUIRED DOCUMENTS

4.2.1. Letter containing the Alleged Plagiarism

The Committee should note a summary of issues raised in allegation letter: E.g. Serious case of (a) plagiarism and (b) fabrication and (c) [which] could be serious enough to constitute fraud.

The Committee should address the issues in the sequence presented.

5. PLAGIARISM

Documents Required:

- a. The two articles in question (Appendix X & Y)
- b. Depositions:

Drs ABC, EFG, and HIJ were to submit individual written statements in response to the issues raised in allegation letter, and to assist with the work of the Committee.

6. FABRICATION

In order to establish whether there was fabrication, the Committee would require at least the following documents submitted in evidence by Dr ABC.

- a. Clinical Data (From the patients’ actual hospital records, to include, Physician’s orders,)
- b. Data collection forms (“Proforma”)

- c. **At College Level:** was the modulating role of the College-wide Research and Ethics Committee in evidence?
 - c1. Was protocol processed through the normal channels required by UoD to the College-wide Research Committee (e.g. Written protocol submitted through the department of the principal investigator.
 - c2. Was Research Funded or Non-Funded?
 - c3. Input received from the Research Committee, if any.
 - c4. Did the study feature in the Annual Report of the Committee?
 - c5. Was informed consent specific to the research protocol obtained.
 - c6. **At Departmental level,** was the research featured in any of the required documentation of “work-in-progress”?
 - c6.1 Minutes of scheduled department meetings
 - c6.2 Annual Report
 - c6.3 Presentations to the department at the planning stage, during and at the end of the study
 - c6.4 Any other supporting documents
- d. Levels of Robustness of Evidence in Relation to Fabrication

The Committee might put in place levels of robustness of evidence relation to fabrication. Three documents could be considered robust

- a. Clinical data from patients’ actual hospital records
- b. The original set of data collection forms (“Proforma”)
- c. Input from the College-wide Research Committee.

7. FRAUD

If the allegation letter contained the word " fraud', care is required. Fraud is considered beyond the Committee’s sphere of competence for at least three reasons:

- 7.1. The professional nature of the words of allegation should be noted: “... and that it *could* be serious enough to constitute fraud.”
- 7.2. None of the Committee members was a lawyer.
- 7.3. The words of Goodstein: “The federal government [United States of America], in all its gyrations, has to this day studiously avoided using the word “fraud” in connection with scientific misconduct, because in civil law that word has a specific meaning.” (Goodstein 2002).
- 7.4. Confidentiality
 - 7.4.1. The confidential nature of the work will be enhanced if all required documents are provided directly through the office of the Dean, and there is no need to meet the individuals concerned.
 - 7.4.2. However, if there arose need to interview any of the involved party, or parties, the Committee should do so without hesitation.
- 7.5. References on the Issues Raised

The Internet should be explored, and, suitable publications accessed. These should be cited at the end of the Report.

8. RESULTS

8.1. Work on Schedule

- 8.1.1. Submit the required are submitted within the stipulated time.
- 8.1.2. The Dean can meet members of the Committee as often as needed.
- 8.1.3. The Committee can fulfill its commitment and hold meetings, including briefing sessions with the Dean, and complete the assignment.

8.2. Documents required in relation to fabrication

8.2.1. Depositions

All authors – Dr ABC, DEF, and XYZ must produce individual written depositions (*Appendix 00*).

8.2.2. Clinical Records (*Appendix 00*)

- 8.2.2.1. The work may be done in separate locations. It may first began in from..... and be continued in our Hospital: King Fahd Hospital of the University (KFHU).
- 8.2.2.2. Whereas actual clinical data cab be available for all KFHU patients (N=00), there may be none for the patients studied in another country ARX (N=00).
- 8.2.2.3. Hospital notes submitted for the 00 KFHU patients consisted of (a) the actual Computer Print-out of the Admission record (or, Face Sheet), (b) other records, and (c) notes.

8.2.3. Data Collection Forms (Proforma)

These were produced for all 00 patients in KFUH. None was original.

8.2.3.1. The Table below shows the breakdown

Subset	Data Collection Forms (N=)	Clinical Records (N=)	Total Clinical Records (N=)
Group1	00	0	0
Group 2	00	0	0
Group 3	00	0	0
Group 4	0	00	0
Total	000	000	000

8.2.4. Involvement of College-Wide Research and Ethics Committee

No document was available to indicate involvement of the College-wide Research and Ethics Committee at any stage of the research project.

8.2.5. Departmental level of Involvement.

A copy of the minutes of one scheduled meeting of Departmental Faculty Board of was made available to the Committee. (*Appendix 00*)

8.2.6. Informed Consent

Informed consent forms specific for the research were not produced in evidenced.

9. DECISIONS

9.1. Plagiarism

- 9.1.1. The Committee agrees with Dr.and COPE: plagiarism has not occurred. There was verbatim copying by DR.ABC. COPE defined plagiarism in plain words as “passing off another person’s work as one’s own” (Philip Fulford in The COPE Report 1998).
- 9.1.2. In their written submissions, Dr ABC and Dr XYZ accept this as fact, offer apologies and show remorse.
- 9.1.3. The first author, Dr., had no satisfactory explanation for plagiarism. He stated that he had cited as reference (number 0).
- 9.1.4. However, the Committee found this view naïve. It was NOT sufficient as citation, does not detract from the fact that plagiarism has occurred, and does not constitute defense.
- 9.1.5. On ‘Authorship’, COPE recommends: “There is no universally agreed definition of authorship... As a minimum, authors should take responsibility for a particular section of the study” (COPE 2003).
- 9.1.6. The third and last co-author, denied responsibility for all other sections of the study, except reviewing the final manuscript just before it was submitted.
- 9.1.7. Similarly, the second co-author, accepted responsibility for the statistical design and review of the manuscript.
- 9.1.8. The Committee formed the opinion that it was through lack of judgment rather than malicious and premeditated act that both Drs. and failed to detect the plagiarism, and, its extent. The Committee acknowledged that this view can be taken as an explanation but not an excuse.

10. FABRICATION

- 10.1 Three sets of documents were taken as robust in relation to fabrication: (a) Clinical data from patients’ actual hospital records, (b) the original set of data collection forms (“Proforma”), and, (c) input from the College-wide Research and Ethics Committee.
 - 10.1.1. Of these, only data from KFHU patients’ actual hospital records were available.

- 10.2. Fabrication was defined as “making up results” (Cook County Bureau of Health Services Grants handbook: MISCONDUCT IN SCIENCE” www.cookcountyresearch.net.miscon.html 7/18/2004).
- 10.3. The Committee failed to substantiate full blown fabrication of data.

11. GOOD RESEARCH

11. In a definition, COPE wrote “Good research should be well justified, well planned, appropriately designed and ethically approved” (<http://www.publicationethics.org.uk/cope1999/gpp/gpp.phtml> 7/18/2004).
- 11.2 The Committee found evidence of “violations of “good research” (COPE) and of “good scientific practice” (The Lancet, COPE report 1999) on four counts, among others:
 1. In general, the research plan was poor.
 2. The College-wide Research and Ethics Committee was not involved at any stage.
 - a. There was evidence that the research featured as work-in-progress at Departmental level (Minutes of department meeting -- Appendix 00)
 3. There was no evidence of randomization.
 4. There was no evidence that informed consent specific for the research had been obtained.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The article in question should be retracted. (Name: Authors, Title , J - Appendix 00)
2. The contract of the first author, Dr, should be reviewed.
 - a. He should be barred from conducting research for a period not exceeding two academic years.
3. All three authors should offer written apologies.
4. All articles which they submit within the next two years should be scrutinized by
 - a. The College-wide Research and Ethics Committee to ensure that they are free of plagiarism.
 - b. Plagiarism is a serious form of publication malpractice. However, when the final reckoning is made in this instance, we believe there will be room for a demonstration of humanity and magnanimity created by a combination of the authors’ unreserved apologies and remorse as well as the hitherto unblemished record of their character.

RESPONSIBILITIES

ATTACHMENT FORMS

- Form 1 : Plagiarism Declaration to be Signed by Student
 Form 2 : **Option 1** - Standard Warning Letter to Students
 Option 2 - Letter of Notification to Students
 Form 3 : Warning Letter of Next Plagiarism Offence
 Form 4 : Notification of Disqualified Assignment / Project

DISTRIBUTION/FLOWCHART

Prepared by: Prof. Lade Wosornu Mr. S. Arun Vijay	Issued: 18 Nov 2010	PP No.: []
Reviewed by Prof. Lade Wosornu	Effective:	
Concurred by: Prof. Lade Wosornu	Replaces	
Approved by:		Page _____ of _____

DRAFT



DEANSHIP, QUALITY & ACADEMIC ACCREDITATION

PLAGIARISM DECLARATION TO BE SIGNED BY STUDENT ON SUBMITTING ASSIGNMENT TO BE EVALUATED BY FACULTY

1. I know and understand that plagiarism is the use of another person's work and pretending it is one's own, which is wrong.
2. This essay/report/project is my own work.
 - 2.1. It is in connection with the Course title....., Course ID
 - 2.2. The instructor(s) name(s)
3. I have properly cited references for the work of other people which I have used.
4. I have not allowed, and will not allow, anyone to copy my work with the intention of passing it off as his or her own work.

STUDENT:	
..... Full Name (IN CAPITALS)	ID #.....
..... Signature	Date.....

DRAFT
**PLAGIARISM: STANDARD WARNING LETTER TO STUDENTS
(OPTION 1)**

Dear (student's Name)

(Insert title of course /assignment)

This letter records that on (insert date) (insert name of lecturer) discussed with you the nature of plagiarism and the system of referencing used in the Department of (insert name of Department).

A copy of this letter will be kept on a file while you are still enrolled in any course in this University may be recalled by the Chairman in any other Department in which you are studying.

If you are charged in the future with cheating under the University's Policy on Discipline, a copy of this letter will be brought up in evidence.

Yours sincerely,

Chairman, Department of

CC: 1. Dean, College of

2. Vice Dean, Quality & Academic Accreditation, College of

3. UoD, Deanship / Unit, Quality & Academic Accreditation

DRAFT

**PLAGIARISM: LETTER OF NOTIFICATION TO STUDENTS
(OPTION 2)**

Dear (name of student)

You are hereby informed that plagiarism has been found in (title of piece of work) submitted for assessment on..... (date) in (name of Course). The details of the plagiarism are outlined below:

We have been unable to organize a meeting to discuss this matter in person. To begin with, kindly respond in writing within 10 days of receipt of this letter.

Your response will be considered when determining whether plagiarism was done intentionally in order to gain an unfair advantage.

If it is found that plagiarism was intentional, and, cheating has occurred, I can either disallow the piece of work from assessment or report the matter to the Dean. He may convene a disciplinary committee. A Faculty Discipline Committee will give you a hearing.

If it finds that cheating has occurred, it may impose other penalties such as a warning, disallowance of the essay, failure of the Course, suspension, or dismissal from the University.

If you fail to respond to this letter, you do yourself a disservice. This because the department will have no option but to proceed to the next steps of investigating plagiarism.

Yours sincerely,

Chairman, Department of

CC: 1. Dean, College of

2. Vice Dean, Quality & Academic Accreditation, College of

3. UoD, Deanship / Unit, Quality & Academic Accreditation

DRAFT



WARNING LETTER OF NEXT PLAGIARISM OFFENCE

Date:

To:

ID..... STUDENT NAME.....

WARNING REGARDING FURTHER PLAGIARISM

This serves to confirm that:

1. You have been found to have infringed the University's Policy on Plagiarism and have received structured feedback on your plagiarism errors; and
2. If there is any further suspected infringement, the matter will automatically be referred to the Dean for disciplinary action.

Chairman,
Department of

- CC: 1. Dean, College of
2. Vice Dean, Quality & Academic Accreditation, College of
3. UoD, Deanship / Unit, Quality & Academic Accreditation

Kindly read, and, sign below to show that you are aware of this letter.

STUDENT'S SIGNATURE

Date Signed:

DRAFT

PLAGIARISM: NOTIFICATION OF DISQUALIFIED ASSIGNMENT/PROJECT

Dear

RE: FINDING OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

On, you were interviewed by and me regarding suspected plagiarism in your assignment submitted on (date) for (name of course).

During that interview, you admitted to copying into direct quotes from other authors without properly citing or acknowledging the sources. This amounts to plagiarism according to the definition in the University policy. In the cover sheet attached to your assignment, you signed an acknowledgment that you had read the university policy on plagiarism and certified that you had not plagiarised the work of others.

Thus, you submitted the assignment knowing that it included material copied from other authors that should have been properly acknowledged.

Conclusion

Your plagiarism was done with the intent to obtain an unfair advantage. This is academic misconduct under the University Discipline Statute 4.1, para 1.1 — available at <http://www.monash.edu.au/pubs/calendar/statutes/statutes04.html#Heading110>

Penalty

This assignment has been disqualified from assessment. This means that it will not be assessed; you will not be given an alternative assessment.

Appeal

You have the right to appeal to Faculty Discipline Committee within 20 working days of this decision. If you wish to appeal, submit written notice of your appeal, and, the reasons for your appeal to the manager within this time limit.

Thank you.

Chairman, Department of

CC: 1. Dean, College of

2. Vice Dean, Quality & Academic Accreditation, College of

3. UoD, Deanship / Unit, Quality & Academic Accreditation