



UNIVERSITY
OF TASMANIA

Plagiarism Detection Implementation Plan

By

Flexible Education Unit
University of Tasmania

Version Control

May, 2003	Draft	initial
July 22, 2003	Draft	final Draft

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	2
1.1	Background and context	2
1.2	The Proposal	3
1.3	Stakeholders.....	3
1.4	Key Performance Indicators	3
1.5	Critical success factors.....	3
2	The Project.....	4
2.1	Scope.....	4
2.2	Organisation.....	4
2.2.1	Project team	4
2.3	Timeframe.....	5
2.4	Resources and Budget.....	5
2.5	Risk management.....	7
2.6	Communication and Information management	8
2.7	Evaluation	8

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and context

In recent years universities have reviewed and extended their strategies for managing issues to do with plagiarism. The University of Tasmania is no exception.

The Centre for Study for Higher Education at the University of Melbourne suggests in their 2002 report ¹that academic integrity can be managed through the introduction of and commitment to four strategies, all of which are underpinned by the central principle of ensuring fairness:

1. A collaborative effort to recognise and counter plagiarism at every level from policy, through faculty/division and school/department procedures, to individual staff practices;
2. Thoroughly educating students about the expected conventions for authorship and the appropriate use and acknowledgment of all forms of intellectual material;
3. Designing approaches to assessment that minimise the possibility for students to submit plagiarised material, while not reducing the quality and rigour of assessment requirements;
4. Installing highly visible procedures for monitoring and detecting cheating, including appropriate punishment and re-education measures.

The University of Tasmania has implemented strategies in all four areas as an outcome of a 2001 – 2002 Working Party on Academic Misconduct.

- A statement on Plagiarism was developed and is included in all unit outlines (approved by Academic Senate at its October 2001 meeting)
- A generic University assignment cover sheet was introduced to include an attestation that the work presented is the student's own.
- Resources have been developed to assist students and staff manage issues relating to academic integrity and plagiarism, both unintentional and intentional. This includes information on how to acknowledge sources. These resources can be found on the University website at <http://www.utas.edu.au/tl/supporting/academicintegrity/students.html>.
- Current sanctions were reviewed.

This working party also supported the introduction of an auditing mechanism in the form of plagiarism detection software. The introduction of software of this kind can assist in ensuring that the work submitted by students is their own work. There is a wide range of “solutions” to plagiarism currently available. They range from using search engines such as Google to identify offending papers to PC and internet-based options. Applications such as web-based search engines like Google, Web Wombat and Answers have been a no-cost solution used by individual teachers to check suspicious essays. While these have provided some results, they come with serious limitations and the University has decided to implement the application, Turnitin. Turnitin detects instances of text which appear to have been copied from a range of sources but requires the lecturer to decide whether plagiarism has occurred. Its use can act as a deterrent as well as assisting in detecting cases of plagiarism.

¹ James R, McInnis, C and Devlin, M (2002) *Assessing Learning in Australian Universities*, Centre for the Study of Higher Education - University of Melbourne, Viewed 29 December 2002

1.2 The Proposal

This plan details an implementation strategy for the use of plagiarism detection software, Turnitin. The system is designed to trawl the Internet for similar or same passages freeing up the lecturer from this work. It allows lecturers to submit their student's work for review, using powerful online tools and detect the proportion of plagiarism within a student's work, identify the sources of plagiarism whether from other students' work, Internet sites or commonly referred to literature, and prepare detailed reports. Turnitin software can also be used for peer review.

The implementation of this product will require the development of strategies in the areas of policy, management, support, communication and evaluation.

The University will join the CAVAL Plagiarism Detection Consortium, established across Australia and New Zealand to achieve better educational outcomes in the area of plagiarism reduction. Membership is free and the consortium provides discounts on services and software and will provide software support through its Turnitin Help Desk and initial training. Turnitin software will be licensed by the end of 2003 and trialled with self selected schools in first semester, 2004, prior to its wider promotion and implementation. Policy, training and communication resources will be developed in time for the trial in early 2004.

1.3 Stakeholders

Academic staff

Students

Schools and Faculties

Flexible Education Unit

IT Resources

Academic Administration

Senior executive

1.4 Key Performance Indicators

- Appropriate policies and procedures to support use of Turnitin and to address cases of plagiarism
- Implementation of user administration processes prior to the trial
- Attendance at training and usage of resources and support services
- Usage levels of Turnitin by stakeholders and assessments of usefulness.

1.5 Critical success factors

- Approval for the introduction of an amendment to the University Statement on Plagiarism to reflect the fact that student work might be submitted to Turnitin.
- The timely development of training and support services for staff to use the software.
- Easy to use system to register and use the software.

- The support of the senior executive and academic committees for the use of plagiarism detection software.
- Student acceptance of the use of plagiarism detection software, for plagiarism detection and peer review of assignments.

2 The Project

2.1 Scope

- To review policies, procedures and statements on plagiarism and update them as necessary, with reference to equity issues. This will involve the following:
 - Update the University Statement on Plagiarism to inform students that assignments might be submitted to Turnitin.
 - Inclusion of a guarantee of the privacy of peer essays submitted to Turnitin to form a body of student work for analysis against the essays of future students.
 - Clarification of the status of evidence from Turnitin in disciplinary proceedings.
- Development of administrative processes for registration and management of users.
- The development of training resources and to provide training for staff and students in how to use the software, using CAVAL Plagiarism Consortium to provide a train the trainer session for the trial. For staff this will also include training in strategies to discourage plagiarism in University disciplinary procedures. For students this will include reference to resources available to encourage academic integrity in the writing of their assignments.
- The running and evaluation of a trial in self-selected schools for use of the software and associated resources.
- The promotion of the multiple uses of Turnitin to staff and students.
- The development of reports to the Teaching & Learning Committee and heads of schools and associate deans T&L on trends and issues in the use of Turnitin, for multiple purposes.
- The evaluation of the full implementation of Turnitin and its usefulness for managing academic integrity and plagiarism.

Any proposed change to the scope will be accompanied by an impact analysis statement and forwarded to the Steering Committee for approval.

2.2 Organisation

The Project Sponsor is the Pro Vice-Chancellor (T&L) and the Project Owner is the Director of the Flexible Education Unit.

2.2.1 Project team

The Project Team is charged with the execution of appropriate tasks so that the objectives of the project are achieved. The Project Team made up of following staff:

- Director, FEU (Chair)
- FEU representative - Sue Mulcahy (Project leader)

- ITR representative
- Academic Administration representative
- Graduate studies representative
- Two academic staff
- Two student representatives

It will have day-to-day responsibility for:

- Management of the Project;
- Appropriate liaison with other areas of the University community;
- Ensuring that the tasks identified in the Project Plan are appropriately planned, resourced and executed;
- Determining and recommending appropriate changes to University policy/procedures that may be required;
- Management of the major Project plans:
 - Project Timeline;
 - Communications & Information;
 - Risk Management;
 - Project Budget.

The Project Team will meet as required during the Project and the Project Leader will report regularly to the Project Owner.

2.3 Timeframe

This project will be divided into the following stages.

Review policies and procedures	Second semester, 2003
Turnitin presentation with key stakeholders, jointly with CAVAL	Second semester, 2003
Establish Turnitin administration & support procedures	Second semester, 2003
Training of participants and run trial	Pre first semester, 2004
University wide deployment of Turnitin, including training	Second semester, 2004
Evaluation of software in use	First semester, 2005

2.4 Resources and Budget

The resources required will be for the purchase of software as well as the staffing of the Project Team. As detailed earlier the Project Team would include and Flexible Education Unit staff member, one from IT Resources, and advice from an Academic Administration staff member, two academic staff and students.

Training will be performed in two parts: by CAVAL for the trial, with a train the trainer component and for the full deployment of Turnitin, by FEU staff.

Recurrent costs as a result of the software license are included in the table to indicate the ongoing licencing/maintenance costs.

<i>Resource</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Note</i>	<i>Recurrent costs</i>	<i>Funding source</i>
Software	Annual license fee	Approx.	\$15,000	Computer Maintenance licencing fund
Hardware		None required		
Staff	Sue Mulcahy –5% of HEO7	In-kind, 18 months	\$6,000	FEU
	Turnitin admin – 1% of HEO5	In kind – continuing	\$1500	FEU
	Academic Admin, academic staff and students on project team– 1% 2%	In kind – 12 months (2004)	\$6,000	Section/school
Support	CAVAL Help Desk	15% annual license fee – ongoing from 2004	\$2,500	Computer Maintenance licencing fund
Training	Trial and Train the trainer by CAVAL	2004	\$5,000	FEU
Pre trial presentation	CAVAL	2003	\$3,000	FEU
Evaluation	FEU project leader – 10%	In kind – Sem 1, 2005	\$4,000	FEU

Summary of costs on an annual basis.

Year	Item	Cost	Source
2003	license	15,000	Computer Maintenance licencing fund
	In-kind staffing for project	2,000	FEU
	Pre trial presentation/information sessions	3,000	FEU – CAVAL consultancy

2004	license	~15,000	Computer Maintenance licensing fund
	In-kind staffing for project	6,000 5,000	Sections/schools for project team mtgs FEU for project team work and administration of users
	training	5,000	FEU, for CAVAL consultancy
	support	2,500	Computer Maintenance licensing fund
2005	Administration, training and evaluation	5,000	FEU, in kind
	License & support	~17,500	Computer Maintenance licensing fund
Ongoing up front costs	License & support	~17,500	Computer Maintenance licensing fund

The Budget estimates are based on the following assumptions:

- The Project will run for up to 18 months;
- The other staff involved in the testing will be funded from their respective section/school.

2.5 Risk management

Every Project has areas of risk that may create major problems or failure. This plan has been developed in order to highlight what are perceived to be the major exposures that may affect the implementation. It will be reviewed regularly for accuracy and completeness. Each risk has been given a rating of High, Medium or Low in terms of the impact upon the Project should the risk be realised and similarly a High, Medium or Low rating on its likelihood of happening.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Possible consequences	Risk mitigation strategies
Insufficient personnel allocation for implementation	Med	High	Project fails to complete Time slippage	Provide for backup for key roles Ensure resource and task allocation undertaken with due care
Time allocations are below actual time	Med	High	Timelines slip	Ensure adequate contingency in timelines
Lack of support (from	Med	High	Implementatio	• Develop

faculties, schools, staff and students).			n strategies fail	communication plan which is monitored and reviewed •introduce Turnitin features for student peer work and staff evaluation of articles for publication.
Working relationships and team harmony	Low	High	Miss deadlines	Ensure team members selected on basis of team skills as well as ability Spread ownership across the team
Poor dissemination of information	Med	High	Fail to gain stakeholder support	Develop communication plan Review this plan

2.6 Communication and Information management

In order for this project to meet its desired outcomes it will be important to identify key stakeholders and to communicate effectively with them. Interested parties will need to recognise the importance of the project and its outcomes to the student experience, to the quality of first year programs and to the interests of the University. Good communication will be promoted through:

1. A governance structure that includes key stakeholders
2. Maintenance of a network of staff interested in using plagiarism detection software
3. Timely promotion and publicity (through print, e-mail, web and other appropriate channels) about the uses of the software, the availability of resources, materials and training offered to support the project.

2.7 Evaluation

In the first part of 2005 an evaluation of the implementation of Turnitin will be undertaken with regard to the key performance indicators described in 1.4 above.

This evaluation should coincide with a review of the implementation of the revisions to Ordinance 9 – ‘Student Discipline’ with regard to academic misconduct in the form of plagiarism, focussing on the following factors:

- Consistency of penalties applied across the three categories of misunderstanding, misuse and misconduct
- An analysis of data on reported cases of academic misconduct across the University involving plagiarism, with reference to national trend data on the incidence of plagiarism across discipline areas
- An examination of the implementation of Part 3 of the Ordinance 9 ie levels of reported versus unreported cases of plagiarism and whether there are any issues with regard to unreported cases
- A review of the role of the head of school as the responsible officer for dealing with cases of academic misconduct.