



Royal Australasian College
of Dental Surgeons
Let knowledge conquer disease

PLAGIARISM POLICY

July 2018

Document Information

Nature of Document:	Amended Policy
Document Number:	COU_180615_10.4.2a
Version:	2.0
Policy Area:	Education
Contact Officer:	Director of Education
Authorised:	Education Policy Board
Approved:	Council
Date Effective:	1 July 2018
Date of Next Review:	1 July 2023
Policy Status:	Current
Related Policies:	MRACDS (GDP) Assessment Policy Reconsideration, Review and Appeals Policy

1. Purpose and scope

This is a guideline for candidates and examiners in relation to preventing plagiarism and ensuring academic integrity and honesty.

2. Background

The College conducts assessments and examinations at Membership and Fellowship level in General and Specialist Dental Practice and the training program in Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery. The College at all times strives to maintain fair, valid and consistent assessment and examination processes. The core expectation of the College underpinning all candidate work is that of academic integrity and honesty.

Plagiarism, whether inadvertent or intentional, for the purpose of this policy is defined as the use of another's work without use of appropriate referencing. It can manifest as:

- The use of ideas, sentences, paragraphs or images belonging to another without formal acknowledgement;
- Copying a segment of text and reproducing it within a candidate's work as if it is that candidate's own.

According to "The Reality and Solution of College Plagiarism" ¹ created by the Health Informatics department of the University of Illinois at Chicago, there are 10 main forms of plagiarism that students commit:

- 1) Submitting someone's work as their own
- 2) Taking passages from their own previous work without adding citations
- 3) Re-writing someone's work without properly citing sources
- 4) Using quotations, but not citing the source
- 5) Interweaving various sources together in the work without citing
- 6) Citing some, but not all passages that should be cited
- 7) Melding together cited and uncited sections of the piece
- 8) Providing proper citations, but fails to change the structure and wording of the borrowed ideas enough
- 9) Inaccurately citing the source
- 10) Relying too heavily on other people's work. Fails to bring original thought into the text.

In addition, in the RACDS context, plagiarism extends to the copying of another candidate's work in an open book assessment.

The College acknowledges that the majority of candidates exercise great care to appropriately acknowledge the sources of their work. Sources may include the internet, published articles or texts, clinical material, or the work of another candidate in any piece submitted or examination.

¹ University of Illinois at Chicago. *The Reality and Solution of College Plagiarism*. Retrieved April 2015
<http://healthinformatics.uic.edu/resources/infographics/the-reality-and-solution-of-college-plagiarism-infographic/>

3. Policy Statement

1. The College is committed to supporting candidates and trainees to develop an awareness of correct procedures when using source material, in order to avoid any inadvertent or intentional plagiarism.
2. Standard academic practice requires the use of sources to be formally acknowledged. This is through an approved referencing system and included in the bibliography of written submissions and research papers.
3. Guidelines for referencing conventions and the structure of a bibliography are available on the College website.
4. A cover statement must be signed by all candidates acknowledging that the work presented is their own and that any sources have been acknowledged.
5. The College will conduct audits on written submissions across all programs, and when requested by examiners, using plagiarism detecting software.
6. Where a candidate/trainee has been found to breach the requirements to acknowledge sources used, they will be contacted by email and advised that they need to explain this breach.
7. Each case of suspected plagiarism will be investigated by the relevant Board of Studies to determine the seriousness of the breach. Findings presented to the relevant Registrar.
8. A recommendation will then be made by the Registrar in relation to the outcome of the finding.
9. Possible outcomes include a:
 - warning that the work is found to have breached this policy and that any further breach will be treated as a serious offence;
 - requirement to resubmit that portion of the work in question with the required acknowledgement;
 - requirement to resubmit the entire work;
 - recording of a fail against the piece of work;
 - recording of a fail against that portion of the examination;
 - recording of a fail for the entire examination
 - removal from study program in the case of a serious offence and documented fail
10. Any deviation from the above clauses requires approval of the relevant Registrar.
11. All instances of breaches of the policy and the recommended outcomes will be advised to the Education Policy Board.