

THE CPA'S POLICY ON PLAGIARISM

The Canadian Philosophical Association strives to demonstrate the highest ethical standards in research and writing. As an integral part of that effort, the CPA has developed the following policy on plagiarism and academic misconduct.

The Definition of Plagiarism

All academic communities and the community of philosophers should be exemplary in this regard, require that writers credit others for their work, and that the source of their material be clearly acknowledged. To fail to do so is to plagiarize. In other words, plagiarism is the intentional or unintentional appropriation of the ideas, language, key terms, or findings of someone else without proper acknowledgment that the material is not one's own. Philosophers have always generously acknowledged their debts to predecessors by giving credit to their sources. This is an essential part of the ongoing process of philosophical discussion. Consequently, this policy assumes that CPA members are already aware of the full scope of plagiarism, which is not limited to literal reproduction of someone else's words, but extends also to paraphrasing sentences or paragraphs without reference to the original work. Plagiarism therefore encompasses a wide range of possible errors and violations. Nevertheless there is a strong consensus among philosophers when it comes to determining what counts as an act of plagiarism: the appropriation, whether deliberate or by oversight, of another's work is clearly revealed by strong parallels in language and argumentation. By contrast, though similar methods and approaches can give rise to similar positions, such cases do not include the strong parallels of content and presentation that indicate derivation—and even here, lack of acknowledgement of related, prior work, though it does not constitute plagiarism, is a flaw in scholarship that should be rectified by adding appropriate references.

Consequences of Plagiarizing at the Canadian Philosophical Association

To commit an act of plagiarism is to commit a grave ethical offence, and this offence must receive an appropriate response from the Canadian Philosophical Association. A philosopher who is held, by the editor of *Dialogue* or by the programme chair, to be guilty of submitting plagiarized work to *Dialogue* or to any academic congress or conference organized, sponsored, or endorsed by the Canadian Philosophical Association shall be reported to the CPA Board of Directors. Such reports shall include the evidence and reasoning that has led the editor or programme chair to conclude that plagiarism has been committed. The Board shall then examine the evidence.

If the board should conclude that the allegation of plagiarism is justified, it would inform the author of the Board's decision and invite the presumed plagiarist to clarify the situation in order to respect the rule "audi alteram partem." If after hearing the author's explanations, the CA should maintain the accusation of plagiarism, it shall inform the philosopher that his or her work has been removed from consideration for publication or presentation. Further, the Board may, based on the severity of the incident and the strength of the evidence:

This paragraph is a new formulation of the initial paragraph: *If the board should conclude that the accusation of plagiarism is justified, it shall inform the philosopher that his or her work has been removed from consideration for publication or presentation. Further, the Board may, based on the severity of the incident and the strength of the evidence:*

1. Issue a formal letter of reprimand warning the author that further acts of plagiarism may result either in his or her being censored from submitting work to the Association's journal and academic conferences or being expelled from the Association, for a period of time from one to 5 years;
2. Decide that no further submissions to *Dialogue* or to any CPA-sponsored conference from the philosopher will be accepted, for a period of time from one to 5 years; or,
3. Notify the philosopher's Dean or academic supervisor of the Board's finding and the evidence which led the board to its conclusion.