

# Policy for Convention Submission Plagiarism Allegations

---

Approved by Executive Committee: June 2013

Periodically a convention submission reviewer or planner alleges plagiarism. We do not currently have a policy for addressing such allegations. To ensure fairness and discretion with respect to investigation and possible response, the EC is asked to consider approving a formal policy.

One of the difficult practical issues that needs to be considered with this policy is the very short time frame within which a review must be made to ensure that a submission is given full consideration if an allegation is found to be unwarranted. The relevant time frame follows:

Deadline 1: submission deadline

Deadline 2 (28 days after deadline 1): deadline for reviews to be submitted to interest group and affiliate planners

Given that reviewers often wait until the last minute to do their work, it is possible that an allegation of plagiarism would not be made until deadline 2.

Deadline 3 (33 days after deadline 2): Submitters are notified of acceptance/rejection

Review of a plagiarism allegation must be completed in advance of this deadline so that planners will know whether to include the submission in the list of those considered for inclusion in the program.

The EC is asked to approve the policy proposed below:

This policy will be used if a convention planner or submission reviewer alleges plagiarism in a submission paper. If such an allegation is made, the following steps will be taken:

1. The allegation will be brought to the relevant interest group or affiliate planner if not initially identified by the planner. If the allegation was initially brought to someone else, it should be redirected.
2. The interest group or affiliate planner will inform the National Office staff, including the Director of Convention and Meetings and the Executive Director. The report to the National Office should not include the name of the person whose submission is being investigated unless the allegation is one of self-plagiarism.
3. Leadership of the interest group or affiliate will do background research to determine whether there is a legitimate problem.
  - a. The latest the results of this review can be submitted is five days after the deadline for reviews to be submitted to planners. If the allegation has been made far before the deadline, the review committee can take up to two weeks for review, provided that that period does not extend beyond the final deadline.
  - b. The review must be done by a committee of three people which includes the interest group or affiliate chair or acting chair, immediate past chair, and program planner. If

any of these three roles overlap or if one of these people has a conflict of interest, the interest group or affiliate chair or acting chair will appoint appropriate people to the committee from the interest group or affiliate leadership.

- c. The identity of the person whose submission is being investigated will not be shared with the full review committee unless the allegation is one of self-plagiarism. Only the planner will have identifying information.
4. If the allegation is made before the other reviews of the submission have been completed, the review process will continue in parallel with the investigation.
5. The findings of the interest group or affiliate review committee will be given to the National Office. If the review committee believes there was plagiarism, the committee will provide the National Office with a written account of the allegations with supporting arguments and relevant documentation.
6. The Executive Director will call the submitter, explain that an allegation has been made, and provide the details of the allegation. The submitter will then be given two options: withdraw the submitted paper or request an appeal.
7. If the paper submitter requests an appeal, he/she will have three days from notice from the ED to decide whether to provide evidence for why the allegation is false and seven days from notice from the ED to submit such evidence.
8. If an appeal is requested, a standards body composed of the Director of the Publications Board, the Director of the Research Board, and the President or other officer at the President's discretion will convene to do a formal review.
  - a. The group may begin its work three days after the submitter requests an appeal if the submitter chooses not to provide evidence to support his/her case. If the submitter decides to compile evidence for his/her case, the standards body will begin its work as soon as the evidence is received, which will be no longer than seven days after the submitter requests an appeal.
  - b. The standards body will have 48 hours to complete its review.
  - c. The identity of the submitter will not be known to the standards body unless the allegation is one of self-plagiarism.
9. If the standards body determines that there is a case of plagiarism, the submission will be removed from consideration for the convention.