

## AGENDA ITEM 11 Report of the Learning and Teaching Committee

### 11.2 Report of the Learning and Teaching Committee meeting held on 12 April 2005

The Committee met on 12 April 2005 when there were present: The Chair (Professor P Gay) presiding, Professors J Carter, M Jackson and J Sachs, Associate Professors D Airey, D Dragovich, M Freeman and B Sutton, Drs M Bebawy, M Boughton, D Collins, M Edmond, C Groenlund, D O'Connor, A Poulos, P Russell, G Ryan and C Taylor, Ms R Jackson, Mr S Lojewski, Mr P O'Carroll and Mr I Trevena. Ms M Kemmis was in attendance.

#### 11.2.1 Receipt of Report

The Committee **recommends** that the Academic Board receive and note the following report of the meeting held on 12 April 2005.

#### 11.2.2 Academic Board Faculty Review Visits

##### (1) Faculty of Education and Social Work 66-68

The Board is asked to note that the Committee received and noted the Final Report and Recommendations from the Academic Board Phase Two visit to the Faculty of Education and Social Work. It should be noted that this report is the last of the faculty reports under Phase Two of the Academic Board reviews.

##### **Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board note the report of the Phase Two Academic Board Visit to the Faculty of Education and Social Work.*

#### 11.2.3 Special Arrangements for Assessment and Examination

69-71

At its meeting of 9 November 2004, the Learning and Teaching Committee noted that the current special consideration procedures did not cover unforeseen events such as jury duty. It was agreed that a separate policy be developed regarding consideration for such matters, and that section 5.4.1.10 of the Academic Board Resolutions: *Assessment and Examination of Coursework* be amended to make reference to the existence of a separate policy.

The new policy "Special Arrangements for Assessment and Examination" was considered and endorsed by the Committee and is referred to the Academic Board for approval.

##### **Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board approve the new policy "Special Arrangements for Assessment and Examination" with effect from 5 May 2005, as set out in the report presented.*

#### 11.2.4 Faculty Reports on Cases of Academic Dishonesty

72-77

At its last meeting of 16 March 2005, the Academic Board received reports on cases of academic dishonesty from all but two faculties. These remaining reports are now submitted to the Academic Board for noting.

##### **Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board note the faculty reports on cases of academic dishonesty.*

#### 11.2.5 Academic Board Resolutions: *Academic Honesty in Coursework*

At the Academic Board meeting of 16 March 2005, the Board had noted the introduction of the policy "Plagiarism: Student Coursework" which had been approved by the Vice-Chancellor. The alignment of the Academic Board Resolutions: *Academic Honesty in Coursework* with the new policy had been discussed at the Academic Board meeting, and the Board had resolved to refer the meeting to the Learning and Teaching Committee.

The Committee noted the proposed amendments to the Academic Board resolutions and also raised a number of issues regarding the "Plagiarism: Student Coursework" policy. After some

discussion it was agreed that the Committee should form a Working Party (to comprise the Chair, Professor J Carter, Associate Professor D Airey and a student representative) to address the issue of aligning the two documents and to develop a set of implementation guidelines for the plagiarism policy and the amended Academic Board resolutions. The Chair of the Committee undertook to contact members of the Academic Board, members of the Committee and faculty managers for comments on the two documents.

In addition, it was agreed that the Committee would write to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic and International) to raise the following concerns regarding the plagiarism policy:

- there is a general lack of information as to how faculties are to implement various sections of the policy (particularly Section 8);
- the collection and retention of compliance statements is not addressed; and
- the Committee suggests the adaptation of a statement similar to that used in conjunction with the University's ICT Conditions of Use, which could be submitted by students at regular intervals during their study.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board note the report of the Learning and Teaching Committee on the formation of a working party, as set out in the report presented.*

**11.2.6 Report of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning)**

**(1) Principles of Learning and Teaching**

78-79

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) noted the contributions of the working party members who had helped draft the principles, and particularly noted the work of Ms B McLean (Executive Officer, Teaching and Learning).

She advised the Committee that the principles would provide a central platform for all learning and teaching activities at the University, and a means for differentiating the University's approach to learning and teaching from that used by other institutions. She also advised that the definitions would be open to amendment.

The Committee endorsed the document and suggested some amendments, including revising the title of the document from "quality teaching, creative learning" to "creative teaching, quality learning". The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) asked the Committee to highlight this amendment in its report to the Academic Board, and to include a recommendation from the Board to the Senior Executive Group that a similar amendment be made to the new University Strategic Plan.

**Recommendation**

*That the Academic Board:*

- endorse the principles "Learning and Teaching – creative teaching, quality learning"; and*
- recommend to the Vice-Chancellor and the Senior Executive Group that the term "quality teaching and creative learning" in the University Strategic Plan be amended to "creative teaching and quality learning"*

*as set out in the report presented.*

**(2) Review of the Scholarship Index**

80-85

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) advised the Committee that the Scholarship Index had been reviewed following feedback from academic staff. In particular she drew attention to the revised criteria for the index.

During discussion the following requests were made:

- that the index be extended to cover academics working for the Learning Centre and the Institute for Teaching and Learning; and

- that the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) request expenditure reports from colleges and faculties on monies distributed via the Scholarship Index.

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) agreed to investigate both requests. She also requested that the amended criteria be accepted for use in 2005, but welcomed any comments and suggestions for further review of the index for 2006.

***Recommendation***

*That the Academic Board endorse the revised Scholarship Index and associated criteria, as set out in the report presented.*

**11.2.7 Proceedings of the Committee**

**(1) Report of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning)**

The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) also reported to the Committee on:

- the review of the Teaching Improvement Fund; and
- the anticipated review of the “Guidelines for Good Practice in Teaching and Learning.

**(2) Report of the Library Sub-Committee**

The Committee noted the following items from the report of the Library Sub-Committee:

- the successful introduction of the postgraduate borrowing form (for postgraduate students who had submitted a thesis but not yet been awarded their degree);
- the 2004 client survey of the Library which produced positive results; and
- continuing issues regarding collection management and space.

**(3) Other Matters**

The Committee also noted and discussed the use of Unit of Study Evaluation forms.

### **11.2.2 (1) Academic Board Visit to the Faculty of Education and Social Work – Executive Summary**

Since the Phase 1 Academic Board Review the Faculty of Education and Social Work has been focussing internally on establishing enabling structures and policies. A great deal of activity has taken place within the Faculty in the areas of:

- Faculty structure and staffing
- Strategic Planning and processes to include staff in the development of these plans
- Analysis and regularising existing courses and Units of Study and developing new interdisciplinary ones
- Refocussing away from pre-service towards professional development and post-graduate studies
- Analysis of its links with the professions and the community
- Establishing the Research Centre in Computer-supported Learning and Cognition (CoCo Lab) and redesigning the Faculty web presence

Externally, the Faculty has self-assessed that it must work hard and strategically to position itself as a leader in the fields of Education and Social Work. Benchmarking, including the selection of appropriate international benchmarking partners, provides the Faculty with opportunities for quality improvement. Research productivity also offers the Faculty with opportunities for improvement. The fall in numbers of research students is of particular concern.

However the Review Team found indications that the Faculty has laid a solid foundation for growth. Research leadership has been enhanced by the appointment of three new professors. Projects with both the Koori Centre and the Institute for Teaching and Learning are yielding benefits. The establishment of Research Clusters and the strengthening of the Postgraduate Education and Social Work Student Association (PESSA) have the potential to assist in the growth of a scholarly community. The CoCo Lab provides the foundation for exciting new developments in the ICT in Teaching and Learning area.

The Faculty has made a strong start on exploring the opportunities presented by the unique combination of Education and Social Work, which has yet to be consolidated.

#### ***Commendations***

1. The Review Team commends the Faculty on its responsiveness to the Phase One Review. (3.2.2)
2. The Review Team commends the Faculty on its active response to Phase One Review Recommendations dealing with Generic Graduate Attributes. (4.5.4)
3. The Review Team commends the Faculty plan to link learning outcomes, generic attributes and assessment criteria. This work may serve to allay student concerns regarding discrepancies in workload. (4.5.6)
4. The Review Team commends the Faculty plans to work on Graduate Attributes of Information Literacy and Communication. (4.5.8)
5. The Faculty is commended for the development of the Mentoring Scheme for first year Education students and the communication of relevant policies to students via the Blue Book. (4.6.4)
6. The Review Team commends the move to establish an Equity Committee. (5.1.5)
7. The Review Team commends PESSA for its valuable work in contributing positively to the postgraduate student experience. (5.2.7)

8. The Review Team commends the Faculty for its audit of units of study to review the content and treatment of indigenous issues and for sharing this best practice with the University community. (5.3.2)
9. The Review Team commends the Faculty for its development of the Pathways to Doctoral Programs. (6.5.2)
10. The Review Team commends the Faculty for developing and making available to other University faculties the English in Academic Settings unit of study. (7.2.4)

### **Recommendations**

1. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty develop feedback loops and evaluation into its planning and strategies. (3.2.4)
2. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty investigate establishing some international benchmarking partnerships. (3.4.6)
3. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty initiate discussions with ITL and the EQA Working Group to devise a means of capturing appropriate student feedback from students undertaking double degrees. (3.5.4)
4. Access to, and support during Practicum continues to be an issue for the Faculty. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty continues to analyse ways to improve practicum support and suggests that this include an assessment of the opportunities offered by Internet technologies. (4.2.5)
5. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty continue to support its staff to develop skills in the pedagogic use of learning management systems. (4.3.4)
6. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty undertake research in the use of ICT in Teaching and Learning for community building and that the outcomes of this research be communicated with the University's ICT in Teaching and Learning Coordinator. (4.3.6)
7. The Review Team recommends that staff in the CoCo Lab liaise with the Library to ensure processes developed around digitisation comply with the University's digital Copyright legislative requirements. (4.3.8)
8. The Review Team recommends that further consideration be given to the role of RHD students, including part-time students, in the research clusters, bearing in mind the potential of cluster activities to assist in the incorporation of postgraduate students into the learning community. The Review Team considers that in general students should be allocated to the research cluster of their supervisor. (4.6.6)
9. The Faculty explore means of providing part-time RHD students with access (particularly out of hours), accommodation and facilities paralleling that of the full-time students. (5.2.4)
10. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty's International initiatives have interim evaluation mechanisms to provide the Faculty with feedback on their effectiveness during the program, providing opportunities to both achieve interim rewards and to modify initiatives to increase the chance of their success. (7.1.7)
11. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty critically assess its engagement with industry and the two professions to ensure Community Engagement is more strategic and focussed on Faculty strategic directions. (8.2.2)

12. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty monitor the new Workload Guidelines to ensure that there are no unintended consequences and that they align with University promotions and research guidelines. (9.3.2)
13. The Review Team recommends that the Faculty pursue opportunities for combining the strengths of the two disciplines in both research and practice at the Children's Centre. (10.1.2)



# The University of Sydney

## Special Arrangements for Examination and Assessment

**Approved by:** Academic Board on 4 May 2005

**Date of effect:** 5 May 2005

### 1. Introduction

1.1 In August, 2003 the Academic Board approved amendments to Part 5 of the Academic Board Resolutions: *Assessment and Examination of Coursework*. These amendments restricted the use of special consideration to cases of serious illness or misadventure only. It was intended that Deans would use their own powers of discretion to deal with cases which did not meet the criteria set out in the amended resolutions.

1.2 Following a review of the implementation of the new Special Consideration procedures it was determined that there was a need for codified arrangements for dealing with students who did not meet the Special Consideration criteria.

1.3 This policy outlines other forms of special arrangements for examination and assessment which may be available to students in addition to Special Consideration as described in Part 5 of the Academic Board Resolutions: *Assessment and Examination of Coursework*.

### 2. Coverage

2.1 It is intended that the special arrangements described in this policy may be made available to any student enrolled at the University of Sydney who is unable to meet assessment requirements or attend examinations because of one or more of the following situations:

- 2.1.1 religious commitments or beliefs (including indigenous cultural and ceremonial commitments);
- 2.1.2 compulsory absence (e.g. jury duty, court summons, etc);
- 2.1.3 sporting or cultural commitments where the student is representing the University, state or nation;
- 2.1.4 defence force or emergency service commitments (including Army Reserve); and
- 2.1.5 work commitments (this last situation may not be deemed an acceptable reason for making special arrangements by all faculties or departments).

2.2 Personal commitments, such as travel or family matters (which may be deemed by some faculties or departments to include work commitments) will not be covered by this policy.

### 3. Types of Special Arrangement

3.1 Special arrangements for assessment or examination may include the following:

- 3.1.1 late submission of assessments;
- 3.1.2 provision of alternative assessment tasks; and
- 3.1.3 alternative examination times/arrangements.

3.2 Faculties are encouraged to deal with each application for special arrangements on a case-by-case basis and to provide a flexible response to applications. In cases of an extended absence, faculties should discuss the option of withdrawal without failure with students. Unit of study and course co-ordinators would be best placed to determine when a student's absence from the University would reach the point of making it improbable, if not impossible, for the student to

meet the requirements of the unit and/or course even with special arrangements for assessment and examination.

#### **4. Faculty Responsibility**

- 4.1** All faculties are required to provide their students with faculty-specific information on the types of special arrangement which may be available to students. This information is to contain any restrictions imposed by the faculty on special arrangements (e.g. specifically stating that work commitments will or will not be considered in student applications), information on who to contact within the faculty for information on special arrangements, and any faculty-specific timetabling dates (in addition to the timeframes and dates detailed in this policy). Information on special arrangements is to be issued with unit of study information.

#### **5. Timelines for Applications**

- 5.1** Any student who wishes to seek special arrangements for assessment or examination is to advise the faculty which administers the unit of study affected by the request:

- 5.1.1 at the time of enrolment with regard to religious beliefs or commitments relating to moveable feasts, prayer or worship times, or with regard to other requirements of their religion which may have an impact on the types of assessment and/or examination they can undertake; and
- 5.1.2 as soon as possible after being notified of a requirement to be absent from the University in the case of other types of commitment.

- 5.2** Faculties will advise students of the cut-off dates for lodgement of requests for special arrangements with regard to assessment due-dates and examination times. It is expected that faculties will consider late requests for special arrangements where the student's attendance is affected by a compulsory absence or late notification of cultural or sporting representational commitments.

- 5.3** With regard to examinations held during University-wide examination periods, the following may be used as guide by faculties for cut-off times:

- 5.3.1 Notice of intent to apply for special arrangements with regard to an examination to be received within 2 weeks of the publication of the examination timetable.
- 5.3.2 Full application and all supporting documentation to be lodged within 1 week of submitting notice of intent to apply for special arrangements.

#### **6. Supporting Documentation**

- 6.1** Faculties have the right to expect students to provide sufficient and relevant supporting documentation with any application for special arrangements. Such documentation may include, but is not restricted to:

- 6.1.1 in the case of religious beliefs or commitments, a supporting letter from the student's mullah, pastor, rabbi or equivalent religious or indigenous leader;
- 6.1.2 in the case of a compulsory absence, a copy of the summons, subpoena, court order or notice of selection for jury duty (faculties may ask to sight the original document);
- 6.1.3 in the case of sporting or cultural commitments, supporting documentation from the organising sporting or cultural body;
- 6.1.4 in the case of defence force or emergency services commitments, supporting documentation from the student's brigade or unit; and
- 6.1.5 in the case of working commitments, supporting documentation from the student's employer.

- 6.2** Students must also provide contact details to enable the faculty to seek further advice from the person or body which issued the supporting documentation used in the application.

- 6.3** Any student who is found to have provided forged documents in order to obtain special arrangements for assessment or examination will be subject to the University's procedures for

dealing with cases of misconduct as set out in Chapter 8 of the University of Sydney By-law 1999 (as amended).

**7. Further Information**

**7.1** Faculties may wish to seek further information with regard to applications for special arrangements. It is recommended that such advice be sought from the following units/agencies:

Indigenous Matters                      Koori Centre

Sporting Commitments                  Sydney University Sport

**8. Related Policies:**

**8.1** Student Code of Conduct

**8.2** Assessment and Examination of Coursework

**8.3** Discrimination Prevention Policy

## **Faculty Reports of Cases of Academic Dishonesty**

### **Faculty of Engineering**

#### **School of Electrical and Information Engineering**

1. *Protocol – procedures for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty in dept/school. Different approaches for different types and scale of academic dishonesty? Approaches for instructing, explicitly instructing students on how to use source material in a correct academic fashion?*

#### **Minor Cases**

If a unit co-ordinator (UC) believes that a particular student has acted without the intention to deceive, the UC advises the student about what constitutes academic dishonesty, legitimate group work versus plagiarism, and/or proper referencing practices.

#### **Serious Cases**

When a UC believes that a student has deliberately committed an act of serious academic dishonesty (be it in the form of plagiarism, forgery, cheating in an exam, etc), the UC reports the circumstances to the Head of School.

The student is then advised in writing that an allegation of academic misconduct has been made against him/her, with advice about the nature of the allegation. The student is invited to attend an interview at which he/she has the opportunity to respond to the allegation. The Head of School usually chairs the meeting, at which the relevant UC and the Director of Undergraduate Studies are also present.

If the interviewing committee believes the allegation to be proven and:

- the student admits to the offence, the Head of School determines a penalty\*;
- the student denies the allegation, the Head of school refers the matter to the Registrar for determination under Chapter 8 of the By-law.

\* In serious cases of academic dishonesty, the School's normal policy is for the student to be awarded 0 FAIL in the relevant unit of study. (A fail in just the assessment component in which the academic dishonesty occurred would be no penalty for misconduct if the student had been going to fail in that component in any event.)

In some cases, however, students have been given a lesser penalty in the form of 0 marks, or a deduction of marks, in the relevant component. This lesser penalty has been imposed in cases:

- where, after investigation, it was considered that the student's plagiarism was based on carelessness, rather than deliberate intent to deceive, or
- where the UC had already returned a final result for the student (usually with no mark for the component in which the misconduct was alleged to have occurred) and that result had already been sent to Student Records – with the allegation details being forwarded too late for the student's final result to be returned as 0 INCOMPLETE.

#### **Instructions to students on use of source material**

The School's Academic Policy Advisory Committee agenda that it is the responsibility of individual UCs to advertise the principles of academic honesty (and dishonesty), as relevant to the unit, in their unit outlines.

2. *Detection Methods – How is academic dishonesty detected?*

Academic dishonesty is usually detected by:

- professional officers and tutors in laboratory reports, assignments and during quizzes, etc;
- UCs in assignments, and thesis markers in theses;
- exam invigilators during examinations.

In one instance, a student complained – to both the examination invigilator and to staff in the School – about a group of students cheating (copying from one another) during an end-of-semester examination.

In some cases software has been used to identify plagiarism; in other cases the marker has recognised/identified work that has been copied.

3. *Treatment of cases – Number of incidents in 2004. Outline how each case was dealt with. What processes were put in place to minimise chances of repeat offences.*

Nineteen students have been dealt with formally by the Head of School.

The Academic Policy Advisory Committee has discussed the need for UCs to:

- make explicit in each unit of study what constitutes legitimate co-operation versus plagiarism; and
- inform students on correct referencing practices.

Students found guilty of academic misconduct are advised about the importance of ethical practice in engineering and are warned that they must become familiar with, and adhere to, University standards in academic honesty and what constitutes acceptable practice in each of their units.

4. *Assessment and Examination – Has the Faculty's current assignment and/or examination system been amended as a result of Item 3? If so, outline how.*

The replacement of assignments by quizzes in a number of units of study has reduced the opportunity for plagiarism.

The opportunity for academic misconduct in mid-semester quizzes/tests has been addressed by individual unit co-ordinators in various ways.

Some UCs prepare different versions of their test papers and give them out in such a way that no student has the same paper as the student sitting next to, or in front of, him/her. Different strategies have been used in the setting of these test papers:

- some UCs order the same questions differently in the various versions of the test paper;
- other UCs prepare papers with similar questions but different number values or papers with similar, but different, multi-choice answers;
- one UC uses a system where the location for a student to put the answer will depend on the student's SID.

While these strategies are considered to cut down on the opportunity for students to copy from one another, they are time-consuming for members of staff. It is frequently observed that copying in mid-semester tests, etc, would be reduced/eradicated if students were seated much further apart, with no ability to look at each other's work. Unfortunately there are no large venues available for UCs' use for *ad hoc* tests during semester.

Little can be done about copying in end-of-semester exams, as students attempting the same paper are seated, for the most part, together. The obvious presence of exam invigilators appears to be the only deterrent.

5. *Any other comments*

Plagiarism in laboratory/tutorial reports and assignments is of some concern to members of staff. It is recognised that some of it goes undetected, or, if suspected, is not blatant enough for action to be taken, beyond re-iteration of what constitutes academic honesty/dishonesty. Unit co-ordinators frequently observe that such academic dishonesty would be avoided if the assessment in units of study were based totally on final examinations.

#### School of Aerospace, Mechanical and Mechatronic Engineering

1. *Protocol – procedures for dealing with cases of academic dishonesty in dept/school. Different approaches for different types and scale of academic dishonesty? Approaches for instructing, explicitly instructing students on how to use source material in a correct academic fashion?*

The School of Aerospace, Mechanical and Mechatronic Engineering's protocol is based firmly in Sydney University's policy on Academic Honesty in Coursework. The policy is quite prescriptive, and details very clearly the rights and responsibilities of each of the interested parties.

In general, the bulk of the cases are handled at the level of individual units of study. It is expected by the school that once academic dishonesty has been detected that the Unit of Study Co-ordinator will assess the "degree" of dishonesty (as defined by the University Policy). If the case is serious, it will be referred to the head of school, and handled according to the University policy. In lesser cases, the Unit of Study Co-ordinator will attempt to resolve the issue directly (and in-person) with the student(s) involved.

Students are informed in several of their first year units of study as to what the School expects with regards to academic honesty. This is also mandated by the University policy.

There are definitely areas for possible improvement. It is recommended that in all cases of academic dishonesty (whether handled by the UoS co-ordinator or the Head), that written documentation of the case be produced detailing the circumstances and the resolution of the case. This document should be signed by both the UoS co-ordinator, and the student(s) involved. A second area for improvement is for the topic of academic honesty to be addressed, and thereby reinforced in the School's 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, and 4<sup>th</sup> year Units of Study.

2. *Detection Methods – How is academic dishonesty detected?*

Academic dishonesty is usually detected by the tutors or co-ordinator of a Unit of Study. The School leaves this issue at the discretion of the UoS co-ordinator to use whatever tools they see fit. For example document differencing software (often used to assess computer code) or simply by observation combined with a detailed knowledge of the field are used in the School.

The tutors used in the School all attend a mandatory training session which includes information on plagiarism and academic honesty.

3. *Treatment of cases – Number of incidents in 2004. Outline how each case was dealt with. What processes were put in place to minimise chances of repeat offences.*

In the School, there was only a single incident of academic dishonesty in 2004 that was considered serious enough to refer to the Head of School. This case was raised by John Currie and involved a student whose entire assignment (essay) was a word for word extract from a document written for former UN secretary general Boutros Boutros-Ghali.

In this case, the student was given a mark of zero for the assignment, but given the option of submitting a "redo" assignment (for no credit) which the student readily accepted. A written record of this exchange was kept in the School's records.

4. *Assessment and Examination – Has the Faculty's current assignment and/or examination system been amended as a result of Item 3? If so, outline how.*

For the case outlined in item 3 above, a restructuring of the assessment system used was not considered necessary.

Department of Chemical Engineering

During 2004, several students were found to be copying assignments from each other (one student on several occasions). Our response was to give both zero marks for that assignment. In another case, the student involved actually failed the unit of study (CHNG4003) due to academic dishonesty.

In our Department we have procedures in place to deal with academic dishonesty. Please refer to the excerpt from our: "INFORMATION BOOKLET FOR NEW STUDENTS" which every student enrolled in our Department receives.

## **PLAGIARISM**

### **What is plagiarism?**

Plagiarism can be broadly defined as knowingly representing another person's ideas, findings or written works as one's own by copying or reproducing them without due acknowledgement of the source.

Within this general definition, plagiarism may take several different forms. At its worst, plagiarism is theft. Plagiarism may involve copying the work of another student, or it may involve paraphrasing or copying a published author's text or argument without giving a reference.

### **What happens if I am caught plagiarising?**

In the first instance that a student is found to have plagiarised they will be given a grade of "F" and a mark of "0" for their piece of assessment.

If the student is found to have plagiarised for the second time then they will be given a grade of "F" and a mark of "0" for the final result in the particular Unit of Study.

In some cases, the student has plagiarised due to lack of training or understanding in academic writing skills and referencing conventions. In these cases, students will be referred to the University's Learning Centre to attend an appropriate course on writing skills. This will be deemed compulsory and part of the penalty.

### School of Civil Engineering

All significant cases of academic dishonesty (e.g. cheating in a major assessable component such as mid-semester test, or copying large amounts of a major assignment) are notified to the Head and a note placed on the student's record. Students are interviewed by the Head and action taken.

In 2004 there were two major cases:

One involved a thesis which was almost entirely copied from material on the web. The student made a partial admission. A mark of 0 FAIL was recorded for the unit of study.

One involved a Master's student in Project Management. Again, blatant copying was involved. A mark of 0 FAIL was recorded for the unit of study.

### **Sydney College of the Arts**

Most cases of academic dishonesty occurred in the Theories of Art Practice discipline, with the exception of one case in the Jewellery and Object Studio. Noted below is the standard protocol for dealing with cases of suspected academic dishonesty.

### **PROTOCOL:**

The standard protocol followed in is that if plagiarism is suspected or detected the student is:

1. asked to have a meeting with the year co-ordinator or studio coordinator.
2. The co-ordinator shows the student where in the essay they believe plagiarism has occurred either by explaining the change in essay style; asking for more references or showing them a hard copy of what they have plagiarised.
3. If plagiarism is confirmed by the student or if the student has quoted without referencing and has not recognised it as plagiarism, the co-ordinator arranges a meeting with Assoc. Dean U.G. studies.
4. The co-ordinator, student and Assoc. Dean U.G. Studies discuss the issue – and, generally, the student is given another opportunity to re-write the essay – or in some cases write another essay on another question.
5. The re-submitted essay is marked on a Pass or Fail basis without comment.

**DETECTION:**

Marked change in style; recognition of text quoted; internet or reference search; lack of references supporting the text.

**TREATMENT OF CASES:**

**1<sup>st</sup> YEAR REPORT FROM CO-ORDINATOR**

No plagiarism was directly detected in Year 1 essays, but a number of essays did not have references as footnotes or as endnotes. Using the guidelines of the Academic Honesty policy, we have awarded Incomplete results, and are expecting those students to resubmit their essays with proper referencing.

**2<sup>nd</sup> YEAR REPORT FROM THAP CO-ORDINATOR**

There were seven suspected cases of plagiarism amongst the final essay assignments for second year THAP. These were collected by the year co-ordinator for further investigation after the markers' meeting. Staff marking essays are required to stop when they consider they may have a case of plagiarism – this may mean that an essay is partially or fully marked by the time it reaches the year co-ordinator's hands.

Generally, I allow a 30 minutes search per suspected essay; this may involve an internet and/or library search.

Essays may be suspected of plagiarism for several reasons:

1. The marker recognises a passage of text because of their familiarity with the material
2. There is a distinct change in writing style – often from a lucid, logical argument to incoherent, grammatically incorrect language
3. There is inadequate use of bibliographical information and/or citation
4. The standard of essay seems incongruent in light of the student's performance throughout the semester (in this case this is usually only detected if the marker is also the tutor)

All seven cases were marked as incomplete for the final year official assessment record. Of the students concerned three have made contact and their cases have been dealt with on an individual basis.

**Case 1 THAP**

A substantial level of plagiarism was found. Student attended meeting with year co-ordinator and then with the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The student was asked whether they realised that this was inappropriate use of research material. Student did not seem to understand that this was improper. The student was asked to write another essay on a different question using suitable research methodology. To be submitted by the 27 February. A pass/fail mark will apply.

**Case 2 THAP**

Small amount of plagiarism found (one long paragraph), student unaware that this was plagiarised and the rest of the essay was of a very high standard. Discussion with student revealed a lack of consistent research methodology. This was discussed with the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies and it was decided to Pass the essay. The student was also asked to attend a consultation to review the use of research methodologies at the beginning of new academic year.

**Case 3 THAP**

Essay found to contain a small amount of intermittent paraphrasing rather than direct quotation. During discussion it was revealed that the student did not understand that this required formal citation. Student will receive a lower mark than normal for this essay and attend consultation to improve research methodology in new academic year.

Of the remaining cases that have not yet been dealt with one is a full direct lift of an internet essay, one is not a case of plagiarism and two have some plagiarism and poor language skills (it will be recommended that the last two resubmit)

**Additional Comments**

Dealing with cases of suspected plagiarism is a slow, laborious, unpleasant process that is not a productive use of staff's time. There should be a University pro-forma that each staff member has a

copy of for their own reference and that can be shown to the student so they can see the process as transparent. The submission of essays through a search engine that detects plagiarism would be beneficial

REPORT FROM JOD CO Coordinator

#### **Case 4 JOD Studio theory**

Student has successfully completed the other requirements of the program, seminar presentation etc, and clearly has a grasp of the issue she was meant to be writing about, but has misunderstood the presentation of this material.

Her final submission consisted of one paragraph of her own words and the rest was all cut and paste from websites she identifies in her bibliography. She was given an incomplete mark and has recently been to see me. Academic adviser has made it very clear to her why she received an incomplete and she has gone away to rewrite the essay component of this course in her own words. In this particular case the student is an international student with barely passable English & a demonstrable lack of confidence of using English & have given her benefit of the doubt especially as her attendance and other requirements were fulfilled.

#### **3<sup>rd</sup> YEAR REPORT FROM THAP CO-ORDINATOR**

3 cases of plagiarism in 3<sup>rd</sup> Year followed the protocols outlined at the beginning of this report..

1, 3<sup>rd</sup> Year case was more complex in that the plagiarism was discovered after the 1<sup>st</sup> Semester essay was marked and recorded by the board of examiners. It so happened, that the student had admitted plagiarism in her 2<sup>nd</sup> semester and not collected her 1<sup>st</sup> semester essay. (which had not been marked by the year co-ordinator. The year co-ordinator checked the 1<sup>st</sup> semester essay and found that it, too, had been plagiarised.

Since the student had received a mark for 1<sup>st</sup> semester, the issue was raised at the Teaching and Learning Committee. It was advised that the Institute of Teaching and Learning be contacted to ascertain University policy on such a case. This in turn was referred to the acting P.V.C. of Teaching and Learning. It was determined that that retrospective detection of plagiarism after marks had been awarded, still constituted academic dishonesty and as such, the student was asked to re-submit another essay. This essay was not satisfactory and the student has enrolled in Summer School in order to complete her units of study.

**ASSESSMENT AND EXAMINATION:** There has been no change to assessment procedures (THAP does not have exams), however academics are increasingly alert to the possibility of plagiarism and spend much more time conducting searches on the net and hard copy references.

**OTHER COMMENTS:** It should be noted that University policy on academic dishonesty and what constitutes it is thoroughly covered in all Course Outlines. It is also discussed in the 1<sup>st</sup> lecture of each course, each semester and it is also covered in tutorials.

It would seem, however, that access to the net and the increase in those who either do not have English as a first language or are otherwise challenged by essay writing means that plagiarism has become more common.

Student and Staff access to a search engine to detect plagiarism would save much time and stress for both parties.

Principally compiled by  
**Dr Eril Bailly**  
**February 2005**



# The University of Sydney

AUSTRALIA

## Learning and Teaching - creative teaching, quality learning

For more than 150 years, the charter of the University of Sydney has been 'to promote liberal education and useful knowledge ... for the benefit of all'. During that time the profile and reach of the University has grown nationally and internationally with an expanding network of partner institutions and the exchange of ideas, research and disciplinary advances. Our students are participants in a global culture of research at the University. This in turn shapes in unique ways their experience of learning - which means the act, process and experience of gaining knowledge and skills.

The University of Sydney is an international research and teaching institution which values:

- Excellence - of students, learning environment and learning experiences
- Intellectual inquiry
- Academic freedom
- Diversity of defensible opinions and values
- Integrity and ethical practice in academic endeavours

Seven major principles support learning and teaching at the University of Sydney:

1. [The University promotes research-led teaching](#)
2. [The University fosters lifelong learning](#)
3. [The University offers a complete student experience](#)
4. [The University promotes student-centred](#) learning and teaching
5. [The University offers an exciting and stimulating environment](#) for learning and teaching
6. The University recognises and celebrates the diversity of its students
7. The University is committed to continuous improvement in its learning and teaching

### 1. The University promotes research-led teaching

The University's research ethos and strengths infuse all undergraduate and postgraduate learning and teaching. Our research-led teaching emphasises the partnership of academics and students as they engage in the critical challenge of open exploratory inquiry. It points to learning and teaching that encourages active learning, critical creative thinking and lifelong learning.

We value and reward creativity and inquiry and we support students in developing critical perspectives on existing theories, approaches and wisdom. We expect staff and students to be active both active risk-takers, comfortable with the continuous testing of ideas, and active collaborators, refining and expanding together our domain of knowledge.

### 2. The University fosters lifelong learning

Infused with the highest ethical values and the challenge to make a difference to their society, our students will become global citizens and lifelong learners. Our students learn how to access, use, evaluate and add to knowledge during their lives and professional careers. To this end, the University provides students with an effective knowledge base of language, concepts, technical skills and learning structures to both assimilate and create new knowledge.

### **3. The University offers a complete student experience**

We support students' intellectual, emotional and social well-being by providing a broad spectrum of personal, health and welfare and academic student support services, including student-led facilities and services. The variety of student clubs and societies offers rich experiences to students: a 'second curriculum' that complements their formal study, contributing to a vibrant on-campus society and to education for life.

### **4. The University promotes student-centred learning and teaching**

We value both individual and collaborative student effort. In a student-centred and campus-based learning environment, we emphasise growth through the innate desire of students to learn; reward student's achievements with the enhancement of their inherent sense of self-worth and competence; and encourage student collaboration with peers and mentors.

### **5. The University offers an exciting and stimulating environment for learning and teaching**

The intellectual engagement and passion of students finds support, inspiration, and direction in the knowledge and experience of our teachers. Teaching at Sydney explores new ideas; tests received knowledge and questions conventional wisdom. Programs of study are designed to challenge students to learn collaboratively from each other and in partnership with their teachers. Our students become participants in the creation of new knowledge through their access to and participation in research.

### **6. The University recognises and celebrates the diversity of its students**

The diversity of cultures, ethnicity, values, gender, age, life experiences, socio-economic status, disabilities and religions of our students and staff reflects the larger community of which the University is a part. Diversity strengthens the learning experience of all students, especially the opportunity to learn about social justice and fairness in a complex and continually changing world. Our learning and teaching has an international focus; values and expresses diverse views; ensures that beliefs and values are contested; and explicitly rejects racism and prejudice.

### **7. The University is committed to continuous improvement in its learning and teaching**

Our teachers are committed to innovative practice and continuous improvement in their teaching, the design of curriculum and the feedback and interaction with their students. Systematic feedback is sought from a variety of sources, none more important than from our own students. Our teachers are active researchers and ensure that curriculum content is current and relevant, reflecting both changes in the corpus of knowledge and changes in student needs.

## Review of the Scholarship Index

The Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) undertook a review of the Scholarship Index in consultation with the Evaluation and Quality Assurance Working Group (EQA).

The following recommendations for change are a result of that Review:

1. Faculties must use Scholarship Index funds for either:
  - Recognising and rewarding good teaching, or
  - Supporting and improving the scholarship of learning and teaching

Scholarship Index funds must not be used for items of recurrent expenditure.

2. Applications and supporting evidence from the Faculties will be returned to the Faculties to increase understanding about Scholarship Index Criteria and for the re-use of evidence such as educational qualifications in the Scholarship of Teaching and National and State Teaching Awards.
3. Criterion B be changed to bring it into line with Criteria A, i.e. both Qualification in University Teaching and National Teaching Awards are “perpetual” as long as the lecturer remains teaching at the University (previously a 5 year limit).
4. Criterion D be changed to recognise winners of all Vice-Chancellor’s Awards (Teaching, Research Supervision and the Student Experience). The 5 year limit remains. Joint winners only receive a total of 5 points (not 5 points each).
5. Criterion E be changed to recognise both Faculty and College Awards (again in Teaching, Supervision and the Student Experience). The 5 year limit remains. Joint winners only receive a total of 2 points (not 2 points each).
6. Criterion F be changed to include the statement:

“Where a book has been written jointly by more than one member of staff of the University, the 10 points will be divided equally amongst all joint authors.”
7. Criterion G be changed to include refereed chapters in publications on university teaching *and commercially published textbooks for university students*. Again, where there are joint authors within the University, the 2 points will be divided equally amongst all joint authors.
8. Criterion H be amended to read where a refereed article has been written jointly by more than one member of staff within the University, the 2 points will be divided equally amongst all joint authors.
9. Criterion I be amended to read that where a non-refereed chapter, article or published conference paper has been written jointly by more than one member of staff of the University, the 1 point will be divided equally amongst all joint authors.
10. Criterion J be amended to read that where a presented conference paper or poster on university teaching has been jointly authored by more than one member of staff of the University, the 1 point will be divided equally amongst all joint authors/presenters.
11. Criterion J relates to papers and posters about university teaching at conferences/seminars external to the University, or at the level of ITL or College.

## SCHOLARSHIP INDEX 2005 (Reference Year 2004)

### Criteria and evidence requirements

*Note: Applications submitted without supporting documentary evidence will automatically be discounted. There will be no follow-up requests to supply the evidence.*

Criterion	Weight	Evidence requirements and notes
A. Qualification in university teaching	10	<p><b>Evidence:</b> Copy of certificate. In cases where it is unclear from the certificate that the qualification is in teaching in university/higher education, the transcript must also be provided with the relevant sections highlighted. If the certificate is written in a foreign language, a certified translation must be provided. Courses must be the equivalent of one year's part-time study or more.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> This criterion refers very specifically to qualifications in <u>university teaching/higher education</u>. All other qualifications are not eligible, including teaching qualifications in school, adult, further, tertiary or language education, unless transcripts are supplied showing that a significant proportion of the work undertaken was in the area of university teaching. Qualifications awarded in 2004 or anytime before 2004 may be claimed and continue to be claimed each year while the staff member remains teaching at the University. Please note, however, that qualifications undertaken in 2004 but awarded in 2005 may not be counted until the 2005 reference year.</p>
B. National or state teaching award (AAUT or ACE <b>winner</b> )	10	<p><b>Evidence:</b> Copy of AAUT or ACE award letter.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Awards achieved in 2004 or anytime before 2004 may be claimed and continue to be claimed each year while the staff member remains teaching at the University. AAUT Awards include the Prime Minister's Award, Teaching Awards, Neville Bonner Award and Institutional Awards.</p>
C. National teaching award <b>finalist</b>	5	<p><b>Evidence:</b> Copy of letter showing finalist status.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Only awards made in 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001, and 2000 can be claimed.</p>
D. Vice-Chancellor's Award winner (includes awards for Outstanding Teaching, Excellence in Research Higher Degree Supervision and Support of the Student Experience)	5	<p><b>Evidence:</b> Copy of award letter, including names of all recipients.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> This criterion includes excellence in teaching awards, excellence in research higher degree supervision awards and support of the student experience awards. TIF projects and other grants are not eligible. Where a single award has been made jointly to a number of recipients in a school or faculty, it can only count once in that school or faculty. Only awards made in 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001, and 2000 can be claimed.</p>
E. College or Faculty award winner for Outstanding Teaching, Excellence in Research Higher Degree Supervision and Support of the Student Experience	2	<p><b>Evidence:</b> Copy of award letter, including names of all recipients.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Where a single award has been made jointly to a number of recipients in a School or Faculty, it can only count once in that School or Faculty. Only awards made in 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001, and 2000 can be claimed.</p>

Criterion	Weight	Evidence requirements and notes
F. Publication on university teaching - <i>book</i>	10	<p><b>Evidence:</b> Copy of publication data (please highlight date) and contents pages.</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> This criterion refers specifically to books <u>about university teaching</u>, or, <u>commercially published textbooks for university students</u>. In the latter case, additional evidence of the text's status as a university textbook must also be provided (for example the book's foreword); non-university textbooks are not eligible. Where a book has been written jointly by more than one member of staff of the University, the 10 points will be divided equally amongst all joint authors.</p> <p>Only books published in 2004 can be claimed.</p>
G. Publication on university teaching – <i>refereed chapter</i>	2	<p><b>Evidence:</b> This criterion refers specifically to chapters in books <u>about university teaching</u>, or, <u>commercially published textbooks for university students</u>. In the latter case, additional evidence of the text's status as a university textbook must also be provided (for example the book's foreword); non-university textbooks are not eligible. Copy of:</p> <p>(i) publication data (please highlight publication date);</p> <p>(ii) contents page;</p> <p>(iii) the first page of the chapter (please do not submit the full chapter); and</p> <p>(iv) highlighted section indicating that the chapter is refereed</p> <p><b>Notes:</b> Where a chapter has been written jointly by more than one member of staff of the University, the 2 points will be divided equally amongst all joint authors. Only chapters published in 2004 can be claimed.</p>
H. Publication on university teaching – <i>refereed article</i>	2	<p><b>Evidence:</b> Copy of:</p> <p>(i) journal publication data (please highlight date);</p> <p>(ii) contents page;</p> <p>(iii) the first page of the article (please do not submit the full article); and</p> <p>(iv) evidence of the refereed status of a journal, includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Photocopy of journal listing from the DEST Register of Refereed Journals (<a href="http://www.dest.gov.au/highered/research/documents/register.rtf">http://www.dest.gov.au/highered/research/documents/register.rtf</a>)</li> <li>• Photocopy from Journal listing in <u>Ulrich's Periodicals Directory</u> (or equivalent) showing refereed status</li> <li>• Photocopy from journal's own publishing details, with "refereed" statement highlighted.</li> </ul> <p><b>Notes:</b> This criterion refers specifically to refereed articles <u>about university teaching</u>. Articles on other issues, such as a member of staff's research, are not eligible.</p> <p>Only articles published in 2004 can be claimed.</p> <p>Where a refereed article has been written jointly by more than one member of staff of the University, the 2 points will be divided equally amongst all joint authors.</p>

Criterion	Weight	Evidence requirements and notes
<p>I. Publication on university teaching – <i>non-refereed chapter, article or published conference paper</i></p>	<p>1</p>	<p><b>Evidence:</b> Copy of:            (i) publication data (please highlight date);            (ii) contents page;            (iii) the first page of the chapter/article (please do not submit the full article).  <b>Notes:</b> This criterion refers specifically to non-refereed chapters/articles <u>about university teaching</u>. Chapters/articles on other issues, such as a member of staff's research, are not eligible. Only chapters/articles published in 2004 can be claimed. Where a chapter, article or published conference paper has been written jointly by more than one member of staff of the University, the one point will be divided equally amongst all joint authors.</p>
<p>J. Presented conference paper or poster on university teaching</p>	<p>1</p>	<p><b>Evidence:</b> Copy of:            (i) conference details;            (ii) abstract (please highlight date and time).  <b>Notes:</b> This criterion refers specifically to papers/posters <u>about university teaching</u>. Papers/posters on other issues, such as a member of staff's research, are not eligible. Papers and posters must be at conferences/seminars external to the University or at the level of ITL or College. Only papers/posters presented in 2004 can be claimed. Where a conference paper or poster has been written jointly by more than one member of staff of the University, the one point will be divided equally amongst all joint authors/presenters.</p>

**Further notes:**

- Claims cannot be submitted for staff covering years after they have left the University. Thus, for example a member of staff holding a Diploma of Higher Education who resigned with effect from November 2004 would be eligible for 10 points towards the 2004 reference year, but not beyond that.
- Claims cannot be submitted for staff who are not members of staff of the School or Faculty. Thus, for example, claims are not eligible for the achievements of individuals such as casual lecturers or visiting scholars.
- Claims must be submitted by a Faculty and must be co-ordinated by the Dean's office. Worksheets for claims should not be submitted for anything smaller than a School (no separate worksheets for departments or individual members of staff please).
- All claims must be submitted in hard copy (no faxes, emails or discs please)
- Please make your claim as clear and easy to follow as possible. It is helpful if you highlight relevant names and dates. Please make it clear which Criterion each award or publication is being claimed under. Supporting documentary evidence should be grouped according to criterion (clipped or stapled)
- Please check that all documentary evidence is enclosed before submitting your claim. Unfortunately we do not have the staffing allocation to chase-up missing documentation. Claims without supporting documentation will automatically be invalidated without further correspondence being entered into.
- Please be careful to ensure that the date of award/publication is included.
- Please check that you have filled in the name of your Faculty and, if appropriate, School as well, at the top of the page.
- Please check that the name of the person co-ordinating this application is also provided at the top of the page; so that we can return your documentation.
- Please check that you have provided the Faculty Account Code where Scholarship Index monies may be transferred into at the conclusion of this process

## **SCHOLARSHIP INDEX 2005: WORKSHEET for Reference Year 2004**

**FACULTY:** \_\_\_\_\_ **SCHOOL:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Faculty Account Code for S.I. monies:** \_\_\_\_\_

Name and contact details of person co-ordinating this submission: \_\_\_\_\_

*(Office Use only)*

Criterion	Weight	Outcomes claimed please indicate both the number of claims and the number of points (in brackets) eg “3 (30 points)”	Evidence attached Please indicate for each piece of evidence attached: the <u>name</u> of the member of staff the <u>title</u> of the award/book/chapter/presentation refereed status highlighted, for G and H  N.B. Applications without supporting documentary evidence will not be considered	Evidence sighted/ allocation
A. Qualification in university teaching	10			
B. National or state teaching award (AAUT or ACE <b>winner</b> )	10			
C. National teaching award <b>finalist</b>	5			
D. Vice-Chancellor’s Award winner (includes awards for Outstanding Teaching, Excellence in Research Higher Degree Supervision and Support of the Student Experience)	5			
E. College or Faculty teaching, supervision or student experience award winner	2			
F. Book on university teaching	10			
G. Refereed chapter on university teaching	2			
H. Refereed article on university teaching	2			
I. Non-refereed chapter, article or published conference paper on university teaching	1			
J. Presented conference paper or poster on university teaching	1			