TO: The Academic Senate

FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee

SUBJECT: Academic Dishonesty Policy.

PURPOSE: For Action by the Academic Senate

ACTION REQUESTED: That the Academic Senate approve recommended changes in the CSU East Bay Academic Dishonesty Policy; effective Fall 09.

BACKGROUND
INFORMATION: In a memo dated October 7, 2008, Academic Senate Chair Sue Opp informed the FAC that the policy statement regarding Academic Dishonesty in the University catalog was not exactly the same as the Senate-approved Academic Dishonesty Policy. Citing other concerns about the policy, the Chair requested that the FAC “carefully review the entire document for clarity and consistency of language.” The FAC formed the Academic Dishonesty Policy Special Subcommittee in late Fall; on May 6, 2009, two members of the subcommittee, Jessica Weiss (subcommittee chair) and Julie Glass, presented the subcommittee’s recommendations, which were unanimously approved by the FAC. These recommendations consist of a revision of the University’s Policy on Academic Dishonesty and a memo justifying the revision. The explanatory memo to the FAC is presented in its entirely below.

The FAC recognizes that further work must be done to improve implementation of the University’s Academic Dishonesty Policy. First, the University catalog must always accurately present academic dishonesty policies that are in effect. Second, the FAC agrees with the subcommittee that first offenses should be handled directly by course instructors. Finally, the FAC recommends that the University compile data (without individual identifiers) regarding occurrences of academic dishonesty and subsequent penalties. This data should be used to inform subsequent reviews of the University’s policies and practices regarding academic dishonesty.

Note: Formatting and numbering errors due to the proposed modifications will be corrected by the Senate Office after its passage through the Senate.
Appendix: Memo from the Academic Dishonesty Special Subcommittee

To: Faculty Affairs Committee
From: Academic Dishonesty Special Subcommittee (Jessica Weiss, Chair; Norman Bowen, Julia Glass, Richard Makopondo, Cesar Maloles)
Date: April 8, 2009

Re: Explanation of Policy Revisions

Academic dishonesty remains a serious problem at CSUEB. Persistent anecdotal evidence from faculty members all across the campus suggests that cheating and plagiarism remain widespread. Despite current efforts (through lower-division GE, some instructors and departments, SCAA workshops, and the university's subscription to plagiarism detection software, and an annual academic integrity week) students still claim ignorance about what constitutes plagiarism, proper citation practices, and the potential consequences of cheating and academic dishonesty. The university should consider a campus-wide academic integrity campaign to insure that:

1. All students are fully informed about campus academic dishonesty policy, definitions of cheating and plagiarism and their consequences and that students are encouraged to uphold ethical standards and trained to use sources correctly.

2. Faculty shoulder their responsibility to maintain academic integrity in general and to guard against plagiarism in particular

3. Students receive fair and equal treatment in the handling of academic dishonesty

4. Cheating and plagiarism result in appropriate sanctions

5. Remedial and preventative assistance is available and encouraged through SCAA and other programs

In short, addressing the problem of cheating and plagiarism needs to be a shared responsibility that engages the university community as a whole.

Below the major areas of revision are described:
I. Consequences of a First Offense:

Background info:

Over the past year there has been a divergence between policy and practice. The main manifestation of this divergence has been in actions taken by the Director of Student Development and Judicial Affairs (DSDJA) when an Academic Dishonesty Incident Report (ADIR) is filed for the first time against a student. In the senate policy and in the catalog copy, it states that in this instance, the ADIR will be placed on file in the Office of Academic Affairs, and that no action beyond that of the faculty member will be taken, though the faculty member does have the ability to forward a case directly to the DSDJA if they choose. However, with the DSDJA is copied on all letters sent to students against whom an ADIR was filed, in recent practice all such students have been required to meet with the DSDJA. In many/most cases,
additional administrative action is taken, beyond that of the faculty member filing the report. The subcommittee discussed at length the benefits and drawbacks of all students encountering this consequence and considered altering the policy to match the current practice. In the end the subcommittee decided that it was best to keep control of the process for first offences in the hands of the faculty.

Action Taken:

The document has been strengthened to indicate that no action beyond that of the faculty member should be taken in the case of a first offense unless expressly requested by the faculty member. The ADIR now has a box to check if a faculty member would like to forward the case to the DSDJA for possible further administrative action. The wording in Section 4.3 and 4.4 addressing to whom the letters are sent and to whom they are copied is there in order to ensure that no action can be taken for a first offense w/o faculty requesting it.

This decision brought forth a suggestion from committee member Norm Bowen set forth in section V below.

II. Faculty Notification:
Background: The existing senate policy on academic dishonesty stated that faculty would be notified of the outcome of a student encounter with Judicial Affairs. DSDJA reports that this violates student confidentiality as set out in laws governing confidentiality in student conduct cases.

Action taken: This sentence was removed and the section revised. See 4.3., 4.4.4

Action Suggested:
While not included in the policy revisions, it is the opinion of the committee that reporting and accountability in the DSDJA office are important, although not necessarily to individual faculty on individual cases. We have learned that there is currently no formal tracking system and reporting of types of visits and settlements made. There is no breakdown by type of offense or nature of settlement.

We encourage the FAC or Academic Senate to recommend that Academic and Student Affairs prioritize funding and staffing in order to develop the means for systemized record keeping (by adding support staff and/or developing software) in the DSDJA office so that in the future the scope of the problem of Academic Dishonesty, areas of high concern, and the types of resolutions can be tracked by these divisions and reported to the Senate without violating individual student confidentiality. This would provide a measure of the problem and provide for accountability from this office, which currently sends only a vague report to Student affairs (The office reports only x number of visits, x number of settlements, not broken down for type of incidents).

III. Departmental Policies
Departments may draft individual policies with regard to Academic Integrity and Academic Dishonesty. The subcommittee presumes such policies must meet with Academic Senate approval and has not addressed them specifically in the revision with one exception:

Departments that may wish to keep plagiarism reports on file:
4.4.2. Academic Dishonesty Incident Report(s) will be kept on file in the Academic Affairs office for five years or until the student completes his or her course of studies (whichever occurs first). The ADIR is not part of the student’s official transcript. An ADIR is filed in order to determine whether multiple reports have been filed against a student.

Programs have the right to keep the ADIR on file for students in their program that are filed based upon dishonesty in a course within their major/program. These programs may inform potential employers or institutions about the ADIR if they are asked to provide professional reference for the student. Programs that choose to use the ADIR in this manner should inform their students of this fact and the length of time that these files are retained.

IV. Alignment of catalogue copy with Academic Senate Academic Dishonesty Policy.

The committee determined that the proposed revisions needed to be approved before revision of the catalogue could occur. Once the revision occurs the policy section of the catalogue should be updated to reflect the updated and revised policy. This should involve close consultation with the Academic Senate.

Other revisions are minor and clarify, update, or organize the policy document.

V. First Offenses, Consistency, and Accountability
Norm Bowen raised an objection to the revision as it stands. His concern is that with the revision, individual faculty members are left without guidelines for either the severity of an offense or appropriate academic sanctions and, in a first offense, have exclusive say in the severity (or lack thereof) of the penalty. Such guidelines are necessary to avoid a) divergent penalties for similar infractions b) severe infractions receiving only minor penalties (a lowered grade or F on an assignment for example) when more stringent sanctions are called for (failing a course or disciplinary action). Norm asks whether a first offense such as purchasing a paper or organizing a cheating ring is not referred for further action by a faculty member—as our policy now stands, could Judicial Affairs respond? He suggests that a future faculty committee might provide a list of various infractions ranked for severity and provide a suggested range of responses including “refer to judicial affairs.” The recommended use of such guidelines might then be incorporated into the Senate policy at a later date. Such guidelines could help a faculty member to determine when to check the new box on the ADIR form or enable the campus generally to ‘standardize’ responses to academic dishonesty.

Jessica adds: It could also be argued that as it stands, the only ‘check’ on the appropriateness of a penalty on a first offense is if a student were to request a fairness hearing.
CSUEB Policy on
ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

The University, like all communities, functions best when its members treat one another with honesty, fairness, respect and trust. Students should realize that deception for individual gain is an offense against the members of the entire community, and it is their responsibility to be informed of University regulations on Academic Dishonesty by reading the catalog. It is a duty of faculty members to take measures to preserve and transmit the values of the academic community in the learning environment which they create for their students and in their own academic pursuits. To this end, they are expected to instill in their students a respect for integrity and a desire to behave honestly. They are also expected to take measures to discourage student academic dishonesty, to adjust grades appropriately if academic dishonesty is encountered, and, when warranted, to recommend that additional administrative sanctions be considered. Grading policies are the exclusive prerogative of the faculty; administrative sanctions are under the authority of the Student Disciplinary Officer (SDO). This document provides policies and procedures to be followed when academic dishonesty is encountered.*

1. Examples of Academic Dishonesty (not exhaustive)

1.1. Cheating

1.1.1. Possessing unauthorized notes, crib sheets, additional sources of information, or other material during an examination.
1.1.2. Copying the work of another student during an examination; or permitting another student to copy one's work during the examination.
1.1.3. Taking an examination or any portion of a course for another student; writing a paper, lab report, computer program, or other assignments for another student.
1.1.4. Submitting material written or produced by someone else; or having an examination taken by someone else.
1.1.5. Preparing a written answer to an exam question outside of class and submitting that answer as part of an in-class exam.
1.1.6. Altering or falsifying a graded work after it has been evaluated by the instructor, and re-submitting it for re-grading.
1.1.7. Possessing term papers, examinations, lab reports or other assignments which were supposed to be returned to the instructor.
1.1.8. Submitting the same paper for two different classes without the explicit permission and approval of the Instructors involved.
1.1.9. Inventing data in a piece of work or providing a false account of the method by which data were generated or collected.

*Portions of the opening statement are reprinted by permission from the "Statement of Principles" appearing in the catalogue of the University of North Carolina, Charlottesville. Portions of the definitions are reprinted by permission from the "College of Arts and Sciences Statement of Academic Dishonesty," University of Colorado, Boulder.
1.2. Plagiarism

Students are expected to do their own work. Plagiarism consists of taking the words or specific substance of another and either copying or paraphrasing the work without giving credit to the source. Some examples are:

1.2.1. Failure to properly cite give credit in a footnote for ideas, statements of facts or conclusions derived from another.
1.2.2. Failure to use quotation marks when quoting directly from another whether it is a few words, a sentence or a paragraph.
1.2.3. Failure to reference close and/or extended paraphrasing of another.

1.3. Other Forms of Academic Dishonesty

1.3.1. Providing material or information to another person with knowledge that these materials will be used improperly. It is students’ responsibility to protect the integrity of their work.
1.3.2. Possessing another student's work without permission.
1.3.3. Selling or purchasing examinations, papers, computer programs, or other assignments.
1.3.4. Altering another student's examination, term paper, laboratory work, computer program or other assignment.
1.3.5. Knowingly furnishing false or incomplete academic information.
1.3.6. Altering documents affecting academic records.
1.3.7. Forging a signature of authorization or falsifying information on an official academic document, election form, grade report, letter of permission, petition, or any document designed to meet or exempt a student from an established University academic regulation.

2. Prevention of Academic Dishonesty: Faculty are expected to maintain the academic integrity of the educational process and to take active measures to prevent academic dishonesty. Faculty are strongly encouraged to include on their syllabi the following statement: “By enrolling in this class the student agrees to uphold the standards of academic integrity described in the catalog at http://www.csueastbay.edu/ecat/current/i-120grading.html#section12.”

2.1. The University’s policy on academic integrity is described at http://www.csueastbay.edu/ecat/20092010/i-120grading.html#section12. In general, students should be made aware of the standards of academic integrity and the consequences of academic dishonesty.

2.1.1. Students should be provided with a clear definition of academic dishonesty and with a clear set of expectations and standards.
2.1.2. Students should be informed of the seriousness of instances of academic dishonesty and of the possible consequences.
2.1.3. Students should be informed that it is their responsibility to protect the integrity of their work.
2.1.4. Faculty are encouraged to take measures that insure that students understand these
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2.3. Faculty are expected to systematically apply their methods of discouraging and detecting academic dishonesty.

2.2. Discouraging Cheating on Exams:

2.2.1. Exams should be kept in a secure location.
2.2.2. The use of multiple or scrambled versions of exams in large classes or among sections of the same class is encouraged.
2.2.3. The development of an exam question pool will help prevent too frequent repetition of questions.
2.2.4. Exams should be proctored.
2.2.5. The use of standard exams from instructors' manuals is to be discouraged.
2.2.6. Instructors should provide space on exams for students' responses or provide official exam books.

2.3. Discouraging Plagiarism:

2.3.1. Instructors might meet periodically with students to review students' topics and their progress.
2.3.2. Submission of a preliminary draft might be required.
2.3.3. The term project components may be assigned in sequence; e.g., proposal, progress report, oral presentation, discussion with instructor, and so on throughout the quarter.
2.3.4. Instructors should seek appropriate opportunities to become familiar with students' capabilities; e.g., by giving in-class writing, frequent quizzes, and the like.
2.3.5. Instructors are encouraged to utilize plagiarism detection software such as Turnitin for papers, presentations and take home exams, informing students of this practice in their classes.
2.3.6. Instructors should acquaint students with proper research methods and citation practices in their disciplines and resources for academic support on campus.

3. Dealing with Instances of Academic Dishonesty.

3.1. Cheating. The student should be informed promptly, in private if possible, that he/she is suspected of cheating. If an exam is in progress, unauthorized materials should be confiscated, and the student be allowed to finish. If relevant, the names of students in adjoining seats should be noted.

3.2. Plagiarism. Documentation supporting the charge of plagiarism should be assembled, and the student promptly informed of the charge in private.

3.3. The instructor should review these procedures and initiate the appropriate action.

4. Actions Available to Faculty

4.1 Whenever an instructor encounters an instance of academic dishonesty, some appropriate action should be taken and a report must be filed (see below). Depending
upon the circumstances of the situation, one or more of the following actions is considered appropriate:
1) a warning; 2) a requirement that work be resubmitted under qualified conditions and with a possible grade penalty; 3) a requirement that an exam be retaken under qualified conditions and with a possible grade penalty; 4) an adjustment in the grade of an assignment; 5) an adjustment in the grade for a course. Grade adjustments include, of course, the possibility of assigning an F. The use of grades to address questions of academic dishonesty is at the sole discretion of the faculty.

4.2. Academic Renewal procedures may not be applied to any grade modified as a result of the imposition of academic dishonesty policies.

4.3. If the instructor feels the nature and severity of the offense warrant it, the instructor should refer the case to the Director of Student Development and Judicial Affairs (DSDJA) or equivalent administrator by checking the appropriate box on the Academic Dishonesty Incident Report (ADIR). Upon such a referral, the SDO will determine if the instructor knows that this is not the first instance of academic dishonesty involving the student, or if the nature and severity of the offense warrant it, the instructor should consider direct referral to the Student Disciplinary Officer (SDO), who will determine if further action beyond the instructor's action should be taken. Available administrative sanctions include warning, probation, suspension, and expulsion. The imposition of such sanctions is at the sole discretion of the Director of Student Development and Judicial Affairs or equivalent administrator.

4.4.1. Any time an instructor takes action under the provisions of Section 4.1, an Academic Dishonesty Incident Report must be completed. This report (attachment 1) describes the details of the infraction and the action taken by the instructor. The report is filed with the Academic Affairs Office, and a copy given to the student.

4.4.2. Academic Dishonesty Incident Report(s) will be kept on file in the Academic Affairs office for five years or until the student completes his or her course of studies (whichever occurs first). The ADIR is not part of the student’s official transcript. An ADIR is filed in order to determine whether multiple reports have been filed against a student.

4.4.3. No action beyond that of the faculty member shall be taken for a first offense unless explicitly recommended by the faculty member. This includes but is not limited to notifying the Director of Student Development and Judicial Affairs or equivalent administrator. Departments and programs may develop their own policies regarding forwarding first offenses to the Director of Student Development and Judicial Affairs or equivalent administrator. Should the Academic Affairs Office receive two or more Academic Dishonesty Incident Reports on a particular student, the office shall notify the Director of Student Development and Judicial Affairs or equivalent administrator for possible initiation of administrative sanctions.

4.4.4 After an Academic Dishonesty Incident Report is filed in the Academic Affairs Office the student will be sent a letter informing them of the filing. This letter will include as an attachment a copy of the original report. In the case of a first offense this letter will be copied to faculty member (without enclosure), the chair of the Department (without enclosure), Presidential Appointee of the Fairness Committee (with enclosure), and the Vice President of Planning and Enrollment Management (w/o enclosure). For a second offense will also be copied to the Director of Student Development and Judicial Affairs (with enclosure).

5. Appeal Procedures Available to the Student.

5.1. Appeal of an Instructor’s Action (See Section 4.1): A student appeal of an instructor’s action is governed by the “Fairness Document” (http://www.csueastbay.edu/senate/documents.htm, click on “Fairness Document”). Consult the current catalog under “Fairness Committee” for information on initiating an appeal.

5.2. Appeal of an Administrative Sanction.

The imposition and appeal procedures for administrative sanctions are governed by Title 5, Section 41301 and 41304, and Chancellor's Executive Order No. 148, "Revised Student Disciplinary Procedures" (1972).
**ACADEMIC DISHONESTY INCIDENT REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Student:</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>NetID (Required)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Instructor:</th>
<th>Last</th>
<th>First</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name &amp; Number:</th>
<th>Date of Incident:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Location of Incident: ______________________________________________________________

Brief Statement of Incident (use attachment if necessary): _________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________

Was the Student Informed? (see 3.1, 3.2)___________________________________________

If so, how and when? _____________________________________________________________

Please select which action is being taken as a result of this incident (check all that apply):

- Student has been issued a warning.
- Student is required to resubmit work or retake an exam under specified conditions and with a possible grade penalty.
- Grade has been adjusted for the assignment. The grade has been changed to _________.
- Grade for the course has been adjusted. The grade has been changed to ___________.  
  Please note if the course grade is adjusted, academic renewal will not be permitted.
- Other__________________________________________________________________________

I recommend that this incident be reported to the Director of Student Development and Judicial Affairs for further possible further action. (If this is a not a first offense, this form will automatically be forwarded.)

Instructor’s Signature: ___________________________ Date: _________________

Department Chair’s Acknowledgement: _______________________ Date: _______________
Dean's Acknowledgement: ________________________________ Date: ________________