



It couldn't happen here ... A workshop to discuss detection and deterrence of plagiarism in social work students' assessed work

Organised by: SWAP, 16 March 2007 – The Resource Centre, London

Introduction

Plagiarism is increasing among students in Higher Education and detection is becoming increasingly difficult and time-consuming. There is no evidence that social work students are any less likely to plagiarise than others and websites selling essays indicate their use of these. It is important to understand the reasons for plagiarism because this enables educators to consider ways to tackle it. Whatever students' explanation for plagiarism, it nonetheless breaches academic regulations, indicates a lack of learning (and possibly poor teaching) and may call into question the integrity of students who are on professional courses. Additionally, as students often resort to plagiarism as a way of coping with conflicting demands/heavy workloads, this would indicate that they may not be learning the skills they need to enable them to cope with similar demands in practice.

The SWAP-funded workshop described in this report therefore offered an opportunity for social work educators to share information and discuss reasons for plagiarism, its detection and deterrence.

Background

There is clear evidence that plagiarism is increasing among students in Higher Education, facilitated by access to Internet sources (Gibelman et al., 1999; Park, 2003). Plagiarism takes various forms including: downloading material from Internet sites, copying from books and other publications, collusion with other students and the purchase of essays either from websites selling ready-written material (often written by students) such as <http://www.academicdb.com/> and websites selling customised essays such as <http://ukessays.com/> (Park, 2004). It seems likely that social work students may be just as tempted to plagiarise as others (Collins and Amodeo, 2005) and that, like other professional students, they do not necessarily view plagiarism as 'cheating' or relate this to how they will behave when in practice (see, for example, Osborn (2000) in relation to medical students). The existence of social work essays on pay websites such as <http://www.coursework.info/> clearly demonstrates students' use of these.

Reasons for the increasing instance of plagiarism are varied and complex and include:

- pressure to achieve high grades and a good degree and viewing a degree as a commercial transaction
- students working and unable to make time to complete course work
- students who are not able to meet academic demands/ have weak study skills including inability to understand how to paraphrase
- poor time management/ feeling overloaded with coursework/ undertaking paid work and so having little time for study
- previous educational experience where submitting work located on Internet sites has been acceptable
- not regarding some assignments as essential to passing the course

- inability to understand what constitutes plagiarism
- not understanding the task or the subject matter
- intent to defraud (Carroll and Appleton, 2001; Park, 2004)

It is important to understand the reasons for plagiarism because this enables educators to consider ways to tackle it. It nonetheless constitutes academic malpractice, indicates a lack of learning (and possibly poor teaching) and, additionally, calls into question the integrity of students who are on professional courses (Collins and Amodeo, 2005; Saunders, 1993). Social work students register with the General Social Care Council (GSCC) and thus agree to its Codes of Conduct (GSCC, 2002). These explicitly state that social workers should be 'honest and trustworthy' (code 2.1). Interestingly, despite a growing body of literature relating to plagiarism in other, related professions such as medicine or nursing (see, for example Burnard (2002), Osborn (2000)), there is a dearth of literature in relation to social work students although it has recently featured in a SWAP newsletter (Carroll, 2006). It has not been a subject for discussion within the Joint Universities Council/Social Work Education (JUC/SWEC) education sub-committee. There may well be assumptions that social work students cannot plagiarise because they write about their own practice but they may fabricate the case studies used and, additionally, they can download material to support case examples or collude with other students. It may also be assumed that, because social work has a strong value base, its students will not cheat (Saunders, 1993).

Detection of plagiarism is time-consuming and complex, not least because staff may not always agree on what constitutes plagiarism (Collins and Amodeo, 2005). It requires markers having a trained eye to notice, for example, incorrect and/or incomplete referencing or changes in style and/or presentation. Detection software, such as 'Turnitin' is available (<http://www.turnitin.com/static/home.html>) but, while this is a helpful tool, its use can be time consuming and it is not foolproof. It cannot, for example, detect material copied from written sources, unless it has identified the same material in other work submitted. It can also generate false positive results because it cannot distinguish between a direct quotation, properly referenced, and a direct quotation which has not been referenced. Further, and most importantly, detection does not do anything to aid the learning process. The emphasis, therefore, needs to be on deterring students from plagiarising (Carroll and Appleton, 2001; Carroll, 2004; JISC, 2005). Deterrence serves the objectives of reducing plagiarism but, most importantly, ensuring students are learning the knowledge and skills required for social work practice.

It is important to invest energy in detecting plagiarism for reasons beyond disciplinary proceedings because it probably indicates needs for both learners and educators. Educators may need to consider whether their current learning and teaching approaches are appropriate and adequate both for enhancing learning and for deterring plagiarism. Students may need to consider whether they have the necessary skills and understanding regarding both what is expected during the learning process and for their practice.

The workshop

A workshop for approximately 35 social work educators was proposed. This was based on the author's experience of a similar, highly successful and thought-provoking event, held across faculties, in her own institution. Broadly, the aims were that participants would receive information about plagiarism and then share and discuss their ideas about its detection and deterrence.

Deterrence of plagiarism should be viewed within a wider strategy of assessment (Carroll and Appleton, 2001) and so the workshop also planned to cover ways to design assessments where students must 'make' rather than 'fake' their answers. This is important because students are far more likely to be learning and retaining what they have learned if they undertake the work themselves rather than simply copy it.

Assessment alone cannot address the reasons why and ways in which students plagiarise. An effective approach combines other actions besides rethinking assessment. Educators may also need to review student induction, develop students' skills, introduce varied detection strategies and perhaps review their institution's policies and the application of these to social work students.

In summary, the workshop aimed to:

- Highlight awareness of the possibility of plagiarism among social work students

- Provide expert input on current issues concerning plagiarism
- Provide a forum for the sharing and discussion of information concerning detection and deterrence of plagiarism with a view to ensuring greater consistency in how plagiarism is treated across Higher Education Institutions (HEIs)
- Provide a forum for considering creative assessment strategies which deter plagiarism
- Provide a forum for considering how to help students to learn how to avoid plagiarism

The intention was that, from attending the workshop, participants would be able to:

- Define plagiarism clearly
- Understand why students plagiarise
- Describe ways of detecting plagiarism, including making a critique of their institutions' current policies
- Evaluate and analyse strategies for induction, teaching and assessment which are more likely to deter plagiarism with a view to implementing these as part of their own learning and teaching strategies
- Disseminate information and material among their colleagues

The workshop was organised by the author who is a 'plagiarism officer' within her School and facilitated by Jude Carroll who is Deputy Director of ASKe, a Centre for Excellence in assessment standards based at Oxford Brookes University

<http://www.business.brookes.ac.uk/learningandteaching/aske/?err404=/learningandteaching>

[/aske/](#)). She has spent many years investigating student plagiarism and is the author of *A Handbook for Deterring Plagiarism in Higher Education*, currently published by the Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development. Jude Carroll runs workshops nationally and internationally on a range of topics linked to deterring student plagiarism.

The workshop was held in London as it was thought that this would be the easiest place for most people to reach. It was fully funded, with refreshments provided and so participants' institutions only needed to meet travel costs. Despite wide advanced publicity, 16 of the 35 workshop places were filled and, as two people were unable to attend at short notice, there were 14 participants on the day. It is impossible to know whether this low response rate was due to the numerous conflicting demands which social work educators have on their time or whether, which would be worrying, plagiarism is not seen as a sufficiently important or relevant issue. Participants came from a variety of HEIs in England and Scotland.

Despite the low numbers, the workshop was very successful and, in fact, the small number of participants meant that discussions could easily take place across the whole group; something which would not have been possible in a larger group. The programme for the workshop is given at Appendix 1, a summary of the evaluation forms completed on the day is given at Appendix 2 and a summary of evaluations completed six to eight weeks after the workshop is given at Appendix 3.

Key issues arising

1. Participants' concerns about detecting and deterring plagiarism were met by the workshop

Participants were clear about the issues which they considered important in relation to plagiarism and identified these at the outset of the workshop as:

- Detection
- Fitness to practice
- Investigating plagiarism and issues related to this such as amount of proof and fairness
- Prevention/deterrence
- Issues in inter-professional learning
- International students

- Why students plagiarise

- Helping students learn to read and understand, rather than copy
- Students with weak study skills
- Use of the Internet

The focus for the workshop was on detection and deterrence and, within those broad headings, the issues which participants wanted to address were all covered apart from the specific issue of inter-professional learning. This topic could easily be addressed by online discussion and relevant material at a later point. The participants' evaluations (Appendices 2 and 3), given at the end of the day and six to eight weeks later, clearly show that the workshop met the objectives outlined above. In summary, participants all found the workshop well-presented, thought-provoking and informative. There were positive comments about the presenters' styles and delivery and the range and quality of materials used. Participants' comments demonstrate that they have gained:

1. Insight into the complexities presented by detecting and deterring plagiarism
2. Information about detection and deterrence which they can disseminate to colleagues
3. Ideas for ways they can work with students to facilitate their learning strategies and thus deter plagiarism
4. Knowledge about how they can devise assessment strategies to deter plagiarism
5. Greater awareness in detecting plagiarism
6. Greater confidence in dealing with plagiarism, including an opportunity to critically examine their own institution's procedures

This highlights the need, as evidenced by participants' responses, for further workshops and for the ready availability of materials to assist academic staff in the detection and deterrence of plagiarism

2. Key points from discussions/input

- Defining plagiarism is not straightforward and staff in HEIs need to reach a level of agreement about this
- Students need to be helped to understand what constitutes plagiarism and to realise that commencing study at an HEI means, as Jude Carroll puts it, 'New game. New rules'. This should start at induction and be ongoing
- There are a range of means of detection and these were explored and discussed. The importance of using the test of 'balance of probabilities' rather than, 'beyond reasonable doubt' was stressed
- The Internet has greatly facilitated plagiarism, due to both the ability to copy material and the use of the sites selling essays. When we looked at examples of these, one participant immediately recognised an essay title which has been set every year by an HEI among the titles for sale!
- Procedures vary considerably from one HEI to another
- Issues of fitness to practice are complex
- There is an inextricable link between plagiarism, learning and practice
- The last three of these will be briefly considered in greater detail.

3. Procedures for dealing with plagiarism vary considerably from one HEI to another

In an exercise looking at how plagiarism is handled across HEIs, workshop participants looked at their own HEI's plagiarism procedures and then commented on the following:

- i) Who is responsible for saying, 'Perhaps this is plagiarism'? This was usually the person marking the assignment but could also be the unit leader in one HEI and the markers plus course director in another.
- ii) Who is responsible for saying, 'Yes, definitely plagiarism'? This varied considerably across HEIs. Sometimes it was people within the student's school/faculty such as a Dean or Head of

iii) What is the mechanism for getting from 'perhaps' to 'yes'? Again there were a variety of strategies including discussions between markers, plagiarism committee and an interview with the course director and tutor

iv) How is evidence collected?

Procedures were not always clear about this but, where specified, they included searching documentation and using electronic tools, meetings between markers and then with the student and tutor interviewing student

v) What constitutes 'enough' evidence?

Again this varied with some HEIs needing a specific percentage (eg 20%), some saying 'enough' and some relying on the student admitting they had plagiarised or having a document which had been copied

vi) Who sets penalties?

This was sometimes the HEI's conduct committee/offences board and sometimes delegated to a Head of School. Sometimes it was decided by the meeting held to investigate plagiarism and in one HEI it would be referred to a 'suitability panel' where a student was on a professional course. Penalties also varied across a considerable range including; deduction of marks, award of zero grade, being set a new task, insistence on 100% attendance, re-writing, no resubmission allowed, expulsion and deferral of award

vii) How are students informed?

This was generally in writing but not clear in all HEIs

viii) What records are kept and how?

Some kind of formal record was usually kept but the nature of this varied between HEIs. It was not always clear who had access to this record

Considering the widespread nature of plagiarism and the implications for students undertaking professional courses, this variation in most aspects of procedures is worrying. The exercise led to a helpful discussion about good practice, including issues such as what was regarded as sufficient evidence. As participants' evaluations show, they have been able to feed this back to their HEIs but it does call into question the need for greater consistency across HEIs to ensure that students undergoing a professional training can expect to have suspected plagiarism treated in the same way. Such policies need to encompass a sliding scale of penalties which takes into account issues such as the student's year on the course (a new student could be expected to have less understanding of plagiarism than a final year student), whether they have previous instances of plagiarism and the professional nature of their course.

4. Issues of fitness to practice are complex

The issue of plagiarism was seen by the author as being of particular relevance to social work educators because, as outlined above, they are preparing students for a professional role. This raises concerns in three areas:

i) Will students who are prepared to plagiarise have the integrity to become social Workers?

ii) If students are plagiarising because they cannot cope with workloads, does this call into question their ability to perform this crucial task when they are in practice?

iii) If students are plagiarising are they learning (see 5 below)?

Saunders (1993) takes a clear line that plagiarism is cheating and demonstrates dishonesty. He contends that students who operate in unethical ways are likely to become unethical practitioners. This is contested by, for example, Osborn (2000) and Ashworth et al (1997) who indicate that students' and staff's perceptions concerning what constitutes 'cheating' can vary considerably so that something which academic staff consider to be dishonest may not be seen in that light by students. This emphasises the need for training students in what constitutes plagiarism and how it will be viewed so that there are common understandings. It also emphasises the need for clear procedures because a first instance of plagiarism in a first year student will be viewed differently from, for example, a repeated instance in a second or third year student.

In the workshop discussions we looked at students' reasons for plagiarising which included all of those given above on page 1 and, additionally, considered that social work students might not see some assignments as relevant to social work. While none of these excuse what students do, they do offer

some explanation and give pointers for the kinds of support which students need. Students need to understand why instances of plagiarism will call their integrity into question. It cannot be assumed that they will automatically appreciate this and make the connection between something possibly seen as 'everyone does it' and their need for integrity in practice.

Similarly, where students are using plagiarism as a means of coping with a high workload, they need clear guidance about why this may call into question their suitability for practice. Again, unsuitability cannot be an automatic assumption because students may not be fully unaware of help or support available to them or may have reasons for choosing not to seek support. These are areas which need investigating before any assumptions can be made about how a student will behave when in practice.

5. There is an inextricable link between plagiarism, learning and practice

In considering students' fitness to practice it was clear from the workshop discussions that academics want to ensure that students have learned enough to enable them to become competent, safe and effective practitioners. What becomes very apparent is that students who plagiarise are minimising their learning and this is very worrying indeed in social work students. Teaching and assessment strategies which help to deter plagiarism will therefore inevitably be helping to facilitate students' learning.

As part of the workshop input, Jude Carroll introduced Bloom's Taxonomy of Learning (Bloom, 1956). This ranks skills in order as follows (lowest first):

1. Knowledge
2. Comprehension
3. Application
4. Analysis
5. Synthesis
6. Evaluation

Competent social work practitioners will obviously need to have acquired the full range of skills. We discussed the importance of helping students to progress through the stages of learning rather than assuming that they can synthesise and evaluate from the outset. Further, assessment design needs to take account of the level of learning being tested. Assessment which only requires students to 'know' for example, is much more open to plagiarism (because they can easily locate the facts needed) than that which requires them to 'apply' knowledge or, even further, to 'evaluate'.

Conclusions and recommendations

From our observations on the day as workshop leader and facilitator and from participants' comments on their evaluations, it is clear that the workshop met its aims and was successful. The author therefore makes the following recommendations:

1. Further workshops to be held in locations which maximise attendance. Hopefully the publication of this report will go some way towards highlighting the relevance and importance of plagiarism as an issue for social work educators and this would be reflected in better attendance. However, it is important to note that a smaller workshop facilitated good discussion
2. Plagiarism to be a dedicated part of the SWAP website, easily located and accessible from the main pages. Within this part of the site, materials about detection and deterrence could be made available subject to authors' agreement. These materials could include:
 - i) Articles about plagiarism and helpful references to follow up
 - ii) Exercises in understanding, detecting, deterring and dealing with plagiarism which can be used with academic colleagues
 - iii) Exercises in understanding plagiarism which can be used with students

- iv) Copies of handouts used in workshops (where not already encompassed by ii) or iii) above)
- v) A demonstration of Turnitin software and articles relating to its use

- vi) Links to material about study skills
- vii) Links to other relevant professional sites
- viii) Material relating to the specific needs of international students in relation to understanding plagiarism
- ix) Examples of assessment strategies which deter plagiarism
- x) Examples of effective plagiarism procedures
- xi) Examples of extracts from student handbooks
- xii) This report and any other relevant reports

There could also be a discussion forum

3. Copies of this report to be made available to:

- i) Course participants
- ii) Members of JUC/SWEC Education committee
- iii) GSCC

Implications of the project for learning, teaching and assessment

Detection of plagiarism is not solely a matter of disciplinary proceedings, rather, it should indicate needs for both learners and educators (Carroll, 2004). For example, learners may need appropriate help with learning how to research material for assignments and how to paraphrase appropriately. Educators may need to consider whether their current learning and teaching approaches are appropriate and adequate both for enhancing learning at all levels (Bloom, 1956) and for deterring plagiarism.

Similarly, deterrence of plagiarism should be viewed as part of the whole assessment strategy (Carroll, 2004). While the alternative of exams is always available, careful consideration needs to be given to whether and to what extent these test the knowledge and skills areas which social work students require and they may also disadvantage some students (Brown, 2001).

A further important, broader issue is the consideration of how plagiarism procedures, which differ between and even within institutions, should be applied to social work students where there are also considerations of professional suitability (Saunders, 1993). It is essential that these procedures, as well as learning and teaching strategies, take full account of the specific needs of International students.

Above all, the workshop brought home to all participants the clear link between deterring plagiarism and ensuring that learning is taking place. For students to progress to become effective practitioners, this is clearly essential.

The author is grateful to SWAP for funding this workshop, to Jude Carroll for leading it and to the participants for their enthusiasm and contributions.

Contact details:

Dr Karen Postle
School of Social Work and Psychosocial Sciences
University of East Anglia
Norwich
NR4 7TJ

Tel. 01603 591437

e: k.postle@uea.ac.uk

References

- Ashworth, P., Bannister, P. and Thorne, P. (1997) Guilty in whose eyes? University students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment, *Studies in Higher Education*, **22** (2) 187-203
- Bloom, B. (Ed.) (1956) *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The classification of educational goals: Handbook I, cognitive domain*. New York, Longmans
- Brown, G. (2001) *Assessment: A Guide for Lecturers*, Assessment Series 3, Learning and Teaching Support Network Generic Centre, accessed at: <http://www.swap.ac.uk/docs/ltsn/assess/03Lecturers.pdf> 12/9/06
- Burnard, P. (2002) All Your Own Work? Essays and the Internet, *Nurse Education Today*, **22**, 187-188.
- Carroll, J. (2004) *Institutional issues in deterring, detecting and dealing with student plagiarism*, Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC) website, accessed at: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/plagFinal.doc 12/9/06
- Carroll, J. (2006) Plagiarism: Do national statistics and discussions have anything to offer social workers and social policy lecturers? *SWAP news*, **Spring 2006**, pp. 11-13 accessed at <http://www.swap.ac.uk/docs/swap/newsletter10.pdf> 12/9/06
- Carroll, J. and Appleton, J. (2001) *Plagiarism: A Good Practice Guide*, Oxford, Oxford Brookes University/ JISC, accessed at: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/uploaded_documents/brookes.pdf#search=%22plagiarism%20a%20good%20practice%20guide%22 12/9/06
- Collins, M. and Amodeo, M. (2005) Responding to Plagiarism in Schools of Social Work: Considerations and Recommendations, *Journal of Social Work Education*, **41**, (3)527-543.
- General Social Care Council (2002) *Codes of Practice for Social Care Workers*, London, GSCC, accessed at: <http://www.gsc.org.uk/> 12/9/06
- Gibelman, M., Gelman, S. and Fast, J. (1999) The Downside of Cyberspace: Cheating made easy, *Journal of Social Work Education*, **35**, (3) 367-376.
- JISC (2005) *Deterring, Detecting and Dealing with Student Plagiarism*, accessed at: http://www.jisc.ac.uk/index.cfm?name=pub_plagiarism 15/9/06
- Osborn, E. (2000) Punishment: A Story for Medical Educators, *Academic Medicine*, **75**, (3), 241-244.
- Park, C. (2003) In Other (People's) Words: plagiarism by university students - literature and lessons, *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, **28**, (5), 471-488.
- Park, C. (2004) Rebels Without a Clause: towards an institutional framework for dealing with plagiarism by students, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, **28**, (3), 291-306.
- Saunders, E. (1993) Confronting Academic Dishonesty *Journal of Social Work Education*, **29**, (2), 224-231.
- Stefani, L. and Carroll, J. (2001) *A Briefing on Plagiarism*, Assessment Series No. 10, Learning and Teaching Support Network Generic Centre, accessed at: <http://www.swap.ac.uk/docs/ltsn/assess/10Plagiarism.pdf> 12/9/06

Appendix 1

It couldn't happen here... A workshop to discuss detection and deterrence of plagiarism in social work students' assessed work

Programme

Friday 16th March 2007

Time: 10am - 4.30pm

Venue: The Resource Centre, 356 Holloway Road, London (fully accessible. For details of venue and transport, please see:

http://www.theresourcecentre.org.uk/map_directions.html

| | |
|--|--|
| 10 am | Welcome and introductions |
| 10.10- 10.40 | Defining the problem: what is plagiarism? |
| 10.40-11.10 | What we already do: detection |
| 11.10-11.25 | Coffee |
| 11.25-12.05 | Good practice in deterrence |
| 12.05-12.30 | Essay sale sites and detection software |
| 12.30-1.15 | Lunch |
| 1.15-2.00 | What we already do and what works: procedures |
| 2.00-2.30 | Plagiarism and fitness to practice |
| 2.30-4.15 with a tea break 3.15-3.30 | Sharing ideas about: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Detection• Procedures• Deterrence |
| 4.15-4.30 | Summarising the day |

Appendix 2

Workshop evaluation summary: participants' views given on the day or soon after the workshop

Of 14 people attending the workshop, 12 returned evaluation forms. Any missing numbers in the summary are where people did not complete that section of the form. Halves are where people ticked between boxes outstanding very good good OK poor

| | outstanding | Very good | good | ok | poor |
|--|-------------|-----------|------|----|------|
| The workshop as a whole | 4 ½ | 3 ½ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| The consultant's presentation skills | 6 ½ ½ | 4 ½ ½ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| The consultant's facilitation skills | 7 ½ | 4 ½ | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| The consultant's expertise on the workshop topic | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pre-workshop administration | 3 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Facilities and accommodation | 1 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 |

The best things about the workshop were:

- The opportunity to discuss and share ideas (mentioned by most people)
- Gaining a lot of very useful information (mentioned by more than one person)
- The exercises, tools and methods used (mentioned by more than one person)
- Clear presentation
- Versatile approach
- Presenter's expertise and commitment
- Chance to think about policies and procedures
- Learning about IT resources
- Learning about designing out plagiarism
- Size of the group

Anything which should be changed

- Most people who made a comment here thought that nothing should be changed and future workshops should be the same
- One person commented that they would like more on fitness for practice

How likely are you to change some aspect of your practice as a result of this workshop?

- 10 people said, 'Very likely'

- One person said, 'Possibly', explaining that this was due to constraints in their working context

People wanted follow up on the following:

- Building up deterrence
- Dealing with plagiarism in practice
- How to implement procedures and chart their development in their workplace
- Something on inter-professional learning
- More workshops like this, including one held locally

Appendix 3

Workshop evaluation summary: participants' views given six to eight weeks after the workshop

Of 14 people attending the workshop, 11 returned evaluation forms. People's views were as follows:

1. Any further comments which you have on the workshop (in addition to those you gave us on the day) in relation to:

a) Content

- Comprehensive/thorough
- Up to date
- Useful
- Very good/excellent
- Thought-provoking
- Tailored to the audience

b) Delivery

- Interesting/held attention
- Trainers knew their material
- Varied/good range of activities/good balance of input and participation
- Accessible/clear
- Good materials and good range
- Well-delivered
- Drew out people's expertise
- Good pace
- Good/very good/excellent

2. I have been able to put what I learned from the workshop into practice in the following way(s):

List as many as you want

- Discussed with key colleagues in relation to developing assessment policy and practice
- Held/planned departmental seminars
- Examined design of assessments to determine whether these are plagiarism proof
- Helped own detection of plagiarism/impact on marking/more alert and confident about detection (own departments and as an external examiner)

- Suggested changes in plagiarism procedures/actually changed these
- Held tutorials for students/supported students in their learning about how to avoid plagiarism

- Contributed to plagiarism panel meetings/dealing with ongoing case
- Encouraged use of Turnitin and supported colleagues in using this
- Realising value of tutor's judgment
- Checked own writing

3. I plan to put things I learned from the workshop into practice in the following ways:

List as many as you want

- Passing on information to colleagues in workshops/awaydays and a paper
- Using Turnitin
- Developing a staff training programme
- Checking how students are currently taught about plagiarism/review and revise student handbooks in relation to what they say about plagiarism
- Review strategy for international students
- Look at the study skills material on the Oxford Brookes site
- Pay attention to assessment topics and format
- Be more upfront with students concerning assumptions about their work
- Be more confident in a forthcoming plagiarism panel
- Use in own studies for HE Cert.
- Consider possibility of consistent response in social work schools

4. Do you think it would be a good idea to hold similar workshops?

Yes/~~No~~

One person added that it should be part of induction for all new staff

5. If you answered 'Yes' to question 4, do you think these should be held:

In London/regionally?

London 0

Regionally 6

Both 4

General comment was that such workshops should be as accessible as possible to maximise attendance

6. Please give any further comments on the workshop or the use you have made of it

- Raises issues about fitness to practice
- Each HEI should have a plagiarism champion
- Workshop opened my eyes to the complex issues
- Very thought-provoking in relation to issues concerning international students
- Enjoyed the day – good opportunities for networking and participation
- Workshop could have been longer

