

**Academic Dishonesty Proposal  
History, Proposal, and Implementation Plan  
September 15, 2006**

**Office of Academic Affairs**

**The Issues**

**1. There is a need to clarify the GCSU processes associated with charges of academic dishonesty so that students and faculty alike are familiar with them.**

Currently, in the Georgia College & State University Catalog there are three sections that apply to academic dishonesty:

Students Rights and Responsibility and Honor Code  
(<http://catalog.gcsu.edu/4DCGI/Catalog/Under/SubHeadingDetail/1572>)

Student Academic Dishonesty  
(<http://catalog.gcsu.edu/4DCGI/Catalog/Under/SubHeadingDetail/107>)

Academic Appeals Process Policy  
(<http://catalog.gcsu.edu/4DCGI/Catalog/Under/SubHeadingDetail/108>)

There are several ways in which incidences of academic dishonesty may be brought forward for University consideration. A faculty member may charge a student with cheating and assign a grade of F for the work or for the course; a student or faculty member may bring incidents of cheating to the attention of the Student Judicial Board for sanctions; and/or a student who has received a grade as a result of academic dishonesty may appeal the grade using the Academic Appeals Process.

**2. The timelines currently associated with appeals of decisions regarding academic dishonesty are too long to be efficient and effective.**

In the current structure for Student Academic Dishonesty there are at least four and in some schools five levels of review before the matter can be officially resolved. The time between each of these levels ranges between five and ten class days, all of which add up to a very long period of time. Often, the charge of cheating occurs at the end of the academic semester which further complicates the timelines since faculty and students involved in the reviews may not be readily available to meet.

**3. There is a need to educate students and faculty about academic dishonesty and the process in place to prevent and deal with such incidences.**

Currently, the one source of information to students and faculty concerning academic dishonesty is the GCSU catalog. There is a need to provide more information about ways

to detect, prevent, and deal with incidences of academic dishonesty. While this issue is discussed in core English 1101 courses, there needs to be a website available that provides information and resources to guide informed decision making on matters of academic dishonesty. The University of Georgia offers an excellent example of such a website: [http://www.uga.edu/honesty/ahpd/culture\\_honesty.htm](http://www.uga.edu/honesty/ahpd/culture_honesty.htm). Once there is clarity regarding the processes, such a website can be developed here at GCSU.

### **Short History of the Academic Dishonesty Proposal**

2/8/05	VPAA requests review and recommendations for clarity on process associated with academic dishonesty
3/25/05	AVPAS (John Sallstrom) submits report with recommendations for Academic Governance review
8/26/05	VPAA presents report to Academic Governance for consideration Subcommittee established
3/31/06	Academic Governance considers and approves subcommittee recommendations VPAA and VPSA asked to reconcile recommendations with current procedures Discussion tabled until procedural issues are resolved

### **The Proposal Under Consideration**

**Institutional Review Panel for Academic Dishonesty (IRPAD)** The proposal approved by Academic Governance recommends the establishment of a university review panel to hear issues concerning student academic dishonesty. The membership would include: deans (or designees), faculty from each school, and student representative (No number specified). This panel would replace the review of cases of academic dishonesty currently handled by the Student Judicial Board. The Student Judicial Board would still consider cases involving violations of the Honor Code that do NOT include academic dishonesty.

The responsibility of this panel would be to review cases of academic dishonesty that may be submitted by a student, instructor, chair, or dean. The panel would also provide information to students and instructors about definitions of plagiarism and suggest mediation interventions when appropriate.

The establishment of the Institutional Review Panel for Academic Dishonesty allows for a clear distinction between the Academic Appeals Process which handles academic petitions not associated with cases of academic dishonesty. The process for Academic Appeals remains the same (i.e., review by instructor, chair, dean, VP). The committee proposal suggested that a review of this process be conducted once the Institutional Review Panel for Academic Dishonesty has been implemented.

### **Possible Implementation Plan for IRPAD**

1. *Establish the IRPAD* I suggest that the membership of this panel be expanded to include more faculty (perhaps 6 from SOLAS, two from each school), the Vice President for Student Affairs, and a specified number of students (suggest 4 students). This will allow for more viewpoints and flexibility. This panel would eliminate the need for department/school committee's deliberation of cases of academic dishonesty.

2. *Charge IRPAD* This panel would be initially charged with establishing the procedures for referring a case to the panel. The panel will establish levels of recommendations based on ratings of plagiarism and establish a rubric to guide them in their deliberations. This may also include submitting the student's name to the Dishonesty database currently kept by the Vice President of Student. The panel will establish operating procedures for itself including the minimal number of people present to be able to consider a case.

3. *Process of Review* The recommendation of IRPAD will be communicated to the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs as well as to all parties involved. The AVPAA will consider the recommendation of the panel and render the final decision. There will be no appeal to the President.

4. *Timeline* The establishment of IRPAD would facilitate a faster review of cases of academic dishonesty since the typical layered review would be eliminated. This will facilitate an earlier resolution and allow for the posting of grades in a timely manner.

5. *Website on Academic Dishonesty* The Office of Academic Affairs would provide assistance to this committee and would create a website for Academic Integrity that would publicize the existence, procedures, and information related to IRPAD. Additional resources concerning academic dishonesty (e.g., Turnitin.com, mediation resources, information on how to prevent plagiarism) would also be posted on this website.