

## PLAGIARISM POLICY

### Introduction

The AACP views honesty and integrity as essential components to the Stage Two Accreditation Assessment process. Candidates are required to submit their own work, with the exception of AACP approved mentors, they must not seek the assistance of others when completing the Clinical MCQ assessment or the four case study scenarios. Plagiarism is defined as:

- Word for word copying of sentences or whole paragraphs from one or more sources or presenting substantial extracts from books, articles, and other published material without clearly indicating their origin
- Submitting another candidate's work in whole or is not part as your own work
- Submitting work which has been written by someone else on your behalf.

### Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to prevent plagiarism by explaining the two distinct types of plagiarism recognised by the AACP:

1. **Negligent Plagiarism:** *Negligent plagiarism* means innocently or carelessly presenting another person's work as one's own without acknowledgement of the source. This situation can arise when a candidate is apprehensive of paraphrasing or writing in their own words, and/or a lack of awareness of this policy. It also arises from:
  - failure to follow appropriate referencing processes, and
  - failure to determine or verify and acknowledge the source of the work.
2. **Dishonest Plagiarism:** *Dishonest plagiarism* means **knowingly** presenting another person's work as one's own without acknowledgement of the sources. Plagiarism will be considered to be *dishonest plagiarism* where:
  1. Substantial proportions of a candidate's work have been copied from the work of another person, in a manner that clearly exceeds the boundaries of legitimate cooperation or collaboration.
  2. A candidate's work contains a substantial body of copied material (including from the Internet) without acknowledgement of the source and in a manner that cannot be explained as *negligent plagiarism*.

3. There is evidence that the candidate engaged another person to produce or conduct research for the work, either partly or wholly, for payment or other consideration.

## Policy

All candidates for accreditation are required to submit a signed declaration of compliance with the work submitted to the AACP for assessment. This signed declaration states that no part of the work submitted constitutes a breach of this policy.

**Non-compliance penalties:** In situations where there appears to be plagiarism, the AACP Chief Executive Officer (CEO) will formally write to the candidate/s stating the reasons why the AACP believes there may be non-compliance with this policy. The candidate/s will be asked to explain, in writing, how the non-compliance occurred.

The candidate/s explanation/s, together with documentation of the alleged instance of plagiarism will be forwarded to an AACP Review Committee (the Committee), comprising two academic members of the National Advisory Group and a member the AACP Board of Directors, who will assess the information and make a decision regarding the alleged plagiarism.

If the Committee upholds the AACP Secretariat's view that **dishonest plagiarism** has occurred, the Committee will decide on a penalty and the candidate/s will be advised. Penalties may include additional cases being issued in place of the cases which have been deemed to contain plagiarism (candidate/s will be required to make a \$100 (GST exclusive) payment to the AACP to cover the marking costs of the new case studies). Alternatively, the Committee may recommend discontinuing the candidate/s application for accreditation, rescinding their associate status of the AACP and advising the relevant State or Territory pharmacy board of the incident.

**Appeals provision and process:** A candidate for accreditation who has been found by the Committee to have plagiarised another person's work has the right to dispute that decision. The candidate/s may apply to the AACP's Chief Executive Officer to have the decision reconsidered.

The appeal may be made to the AACP Board of Directors (the Board) and any appeal must follow the procedure outlined below:

- A candidate may submit an appeal in writing to the Chief Executive Officer within 14 days of receiving the decision of the AACP Board of Directors.
- The written appeal should include the grounds for the appeal and must be accompanied by a non-refundable fee, made payable to AACP.
- The AACP will convene a hearing as soon as possible after the submission of the appeal. The hearing may occur in such a manner as the Board decides, including

telephone conferencing. The Board is not bound by the rules of evidence but must observe the principle of procedural fairness.

- The Board will provide a decision in writing within 10 working days of the hearing including a statement outlining the reasons for its decision. A copy of the Board's report will be forwarded to the Chief Executive Officer.
- The Chief Executive Officer will forward the Board's written report to the appellant.
- The decision of the Board is binding and the appellant must agree that he/she will not institute or maintain proceedings in any court or tribunal.
- All information regarding the appeal will be kept confidential.

This document has been adapted from the University of Sydney's *Student Plagiarism: Course Work* policy document and the Pharmacy Guild of Australia's *Plagiarism Policy*. The AACP has adapted the work with the kind permission of the University and the Guild.

## **Related Documents**

*PSA Code of Ethics.*

## **Authorisation**

Grant Martin  
April 2012