#### Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) Annual Report Summer Quarter, 2008 – Spring Quarter, 2009

Prepared by:
Dr. Gerald Greenberg, COAM Chairperson, 2008-2009
Dr. Tim Curry, COAM Coordinator

The University's Code of Student Conduct defines academic misconduct as "any activity that tends to compromise the academic integrity of the university, or subvert the educational process" (Faculty Rule 3335-23-04[A]). The Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) is charged with maintaining the University's academic integrity by investigating and adjudicating "all reported cases of student academic misconduct, with the exception of cases in a professional college having a published honor code, and [in instances where a student has violated the University's Code of Student Conduct] deciding upon suitable disciplinary action" (University Rule 3335-5-487[B]).

COAM is composed of 18 faculty members, seven graduate students (appointed by CGS), and seven undergraduate students (appointed by USG). The work of COAM is facilitated by the Coordinator who (1) receives and processes allegations of academic misconduct, (2) notifies students of allegations of academic misconduct, (3) consults with students and faculty regarding allegations of academic misconduct, (4) schedules hearings to resolve allegations of academic misconduct, and (5) notifies students and faculty of the outcomes of these hearings.

Every student accused of academic misconduct has the right to a hearing before a panel of COAM. A panel consists of at least four members of COAM, and the rules require that each panel have at least two faculty representatives and one student representative. The panel serves as an impartial hearing body that hears evidence and determines (1) if a student has violated the University's *Code of Student Conduct* and (2) an appropriate sanction in cases where a student is found "in violation." If a student agrees with the allegations of academic misconduct and waives his/her right to a hearing, he/she may have the allegations resolved as an administrative decision. For an administrative decision, a member of COAM serves as a hearing officer and determines the sanctions.

#### I. SUMMARY OF CASES RESOLVED

During the 2008-2009 academic year, COAM resolved 435 cases of alleged academic misconduct. Of the cases resolved, 217 (50%) were resolved as administrative decisions and 218 (50%) were resolved as panel hearings (**Table 1**). Females and males represented 37% and 63%, respectively, of the cases resolved (**Table 2**).

Table 1.
Committee on Academic Misconduct
Summary of Total Cases Resolved and Method of Resolution
2008-2009 Academic Year

	Number of Cases	% of Total Cases
Administrative Decisions	217	50
Panel Hearings	218	50
Totals	435	100

Table 2.
Committee on Academic Misconduct
Summary of Total Cases Resolved and Student's Gender
2008-2009 Academic Year

Gender	Number of Cases	% of Total Cases
Female	162	37
Male	273	63
Totals	435	100

Of the 435 cases resolved by COAM this past year, 56 (13%) and 379 (87%) resulted in verdicts of "not in violation" and "in violation," respectively, and the rates at which males and females were found "in violation" of the *Code of Student Conduct* were approximately equal (**Table 3**).

Table 3.

Committee on Academic Misconduct

Distribution of Cases Resolved Based on Students' Gender and Verdict

2008-2009 Academic Year

Gender	Students Found "Not In Violation"	Students Found "In Violation"	Total Cases	% In Violation (% of Total for Gender)
Female	20	142	162	88
Male	36	237	273	87
Totals	56	379	435	87

#### II. SUMMARY OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT CHARGES

When allegations of academic misconduct arise, a student often does not know or understand what he/she has allegedly done wrong. Since COAM desires that the hearing process be an educational process, the Coordinator charges the student with violating the *Code of Student Conduct* using terminology that explains the nature of the behavior that led to the allegations. **Table 4** summarizes information on academic misconduct charges for the 2008-2009 academic year. The left column is a list of the charges used most commonly by COAM. The "Number of Students" column lists the total number of students charged with a particular violation, and the "% of Total" column lists the "Number of Students" as a percentage of the total charges (885). The last two columns list the number of students found "in violation" (Number IV) of each charge and the number of students found "in violation" of each charge as a percentage of the total number of students charged. For example, of 169 students charged with plagiarism, 157 (93%) were found "in violation."

Students are often charged with and found "in violation" of more than one charge. Thus, the total number of charges (885) exceeds the total cases resolved by COAM (435), and the total for "Number IV" (700) exceeds the actual number of students found "in violation" (379).

The relatively low values for the percentages of students found "in violation" of unauthorized collaboration and copying are misleading. They result because COAM often treats the charges of "copying" and "unauthorized collaboration" as mutually exclusive. In many of the cases where COAM receives information alleging that one student may have copied the work of another student, it's not clear which student (if

any) copied and whether or not there was collusion (working together in an unauthorized manner). Thus, in many of these cases, all of the students involved are charged with copying <u>and</u> unauthorized collaboration, but, if found "in violation," they are found "in violation" of only copying <u>or</u> unauthorized collaboration.

Table 4.

Committee on Academic Misconduct

Summary of Charges for Which Students Were Found

"In Violation" of the University's Code of Student Conduct

2008-2009 Academic Year

Charge	Number of Students	% of Total	Number IV	% IV
Plagiarism (submitting plagiarized work in fulfillment of an academic assignment)	169	19	157	93
Copying (attempting to copy) the work of another student in an unauthorized manner and misrepresenting (attempting to misrepresent) it as one's own work	127	14	68	54
Unauthorized collaboration (any instance where two or more students work together and/or share information in a manner that is unauthorized)	129	15	84	65
Failure to comply with course/program policies and/or guidelines	343	39	299	87
Submission of work not performed in a course	42	5	33	79
Possession and/or use of unauthorized materials during an examination or other course activity	18	2	16	89
Forgery	9	1	9	100
Alteration and resubmission of course materials in an attempt to change the earned credit or grade	17	2	15	88

Charge	Number of Students	% of Total	Number IV	% IV
Serving as or enlisting the assistance of a substitute during the completion of an academic assignment or other course activity	4	0	2	50
Other charges	27	3	17	63
Totals	885	100	700	

#### III. SUMMARY OF CASES BASED ON STUDENT'S COLLEGE OF ENROLLMENT AND REFERRING DEPARTMENT

Over 20 enrollment units on campus were represented by the cases resolved by COAM during the past year **(Table 5)**, but the students from four enrollment units (College of Engineering [ENG], Undergraduate Student Academic Services [USAS], College of Social and Behavioral Sciences [SBS], and College of Business [BUS]), when combined, accounted for nearly 51% of all cases.

Table 5.

Committee on Academic Misconduct

Distribution of Cases Based on Student's Enrollment Unit

2008-2009 Academic Year

Enrollment Unit	Total for Enrollment Unit	% of All Cases
AGR (College of Food, Agriculture and Environmental Sciences	13	3
AHR (School of Architecture)	2	0
AMP (School of Allied Medical Professions)	10	2
ART (College of Art)	5	1
ASC (Colleges of the Arts and Sciences)	12	3
ATI (Agricultural Technical Institute)	13	3

Enrollment Unit	Total for Enrollment Unit	% of All Cases
BIO (College of Biological Sciences)	32	7
BUS (College of Business)	57	13
CED (Continuing Education)	4	1
DHY (Dental Hygiene)	1	0.2
EHE (College of Education and Human Ecology)	30	7
ENG (College of Engineering)	57	13
EXP (Exploration Program)	29	7
GRD (Graduate School)	25	6
HUM (College of Humanities)	17	4
MPS (College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences)	12	3
MUS (School of Music)	1	0
NUR (College of Nursing)	3	1
PHR (College of Pharmacy)	3	1
SBS (College of Social and Behavioral Sciences)	55	13
SWK (College of Social Work)	2	0
USAS (Undergraduate Student Academic Services)	52	12
Totals	435	100

The cases heard by COAM during the past year originated from over 68 departments across the University **(Table 6)**, with the combined cases from Computer Science and Engineering (6.4% of all cases), Chemistry (10.8%), History (6.7%), and English (4.8%) accounting for nearly 30% of the total cases.

# Table 6. Committee on Academic Misconduct Distribution of Cases Based on Referring Department 2008-2009 Academic Year

	Number of	
Course (Department)	Number of Cases	% of Total
ACCT&MIS [Accounting and Management Information Systems]	9	2.1
ALLI MED [Allied Medicine]	2	0.5
ANIM SCI [Animal Sciences]	4	0.9
ANATOMY	2	0.5
ANTHROP [Anthropology]	3	0.7
ARCH [Architecture]	1	0.2
ART	1	0.2
ARTS&SCI [Arts and Sciences]	5	1.1
ARTS&SCI&BUS [Arts and Sciences and Business]	2	0.5
AVIATION	2	0.5
BIOCHEM [Biochemistry]	4	0.9
BIOLOGY	4	0.9
BIZRESEARCH	1	0.2
BUS ADM-MGT [Business Administration: Management Science]	3	0.7
BUS-M&L [Business Administration: Marketing and Logistics]	5	1.1
CENTER FOR LIFE SCIENCES	26	6.0
CHBE [Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering]	8	1.8
CHEM [Chemistry]	47	10.8
C&R PLAN [City & Regional Planning]	2	0.5
CEEGS [Civil, Environmental Engineering & Geodetic Science]	6	1.4
COMM [Communications]	9	2.1

Course (Department)	Number of Cases	% of Total
COMP STD [Comparative Studies in the Humanities]	2	0.5
CS&E [Computer Science and Engineering]	28	6.4
CONSUMER SCIENCES	1	0.2
DANCE	4	0.9
DENT HYG [Dental Hygiene]	1	0.2
ECE [Electrical and Computer Engineering]	10	2.3
ECON [Economics]	6	1.4
EDU P&L [Education: Educational Policy and Leadership]	2	0.5
EDU PAES [Education: Physical Activity and Education Services]	5	1.1
EDU T&L [Education: Teaching and Learning]	7	1.6
EEIC [Engineering Education Innovation Center]	10	2.3
EEOB [Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology]	3	0.7
ENGINEER [Engineering]	4	0.9
ENGLISH	21	4.8
EXP [Exploration Program]	3	0.7
FCOB [Fisher College of Business]	3	0.7
FRENCH	2	0.5
GEOG [Geography]	22	5.1
GERMAN	4	0.9
GREEK	3	0.7
HUMN NTR [Human Nutrition]	2	0.5
HDFS [Human Development and Family Science]	1	0.2
HISTORY	29	6.7
HORT TECH [Horticulture Technology]	11	2.5
IND ENG [Industrial and Systems Engineering]	1	0.2

Course (Department)	Number of Cases	% of Total
INT STDS [International Studies]	1	0.2
JOHN GLENN SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS	2	0.5
LINGUIST [Linguistics]	11	2.5
MATH [Mathematics]	5	1.1
MICROBIOL [Microbiology]	5	1.1
MUSIC	7	1.6
NELC [Near Eastern Languages and Cultures]	2	0.5
NURSING	1	0.2
PHARMACY	1	0.2
PHILOS [Philosophy]	5	1.1
PHYSICS	11	2.5
POLIT SC [Political Science]	11	2.5
PSYCH [Psychology]	7	1.6
RESEARCH EXPERIENCE PROGRAM	1	0.2
SOC WORK [Social Work]	4	0.9
SOCIOL [Sociology]	14	3.2
SPANISH	6	1.4
STAT [Statistics]	4	0.9
THEATRE	3	0.7
WOM STDS [Women's Studies]	3	0.7
TOTALS	435	100

### IV. SUMMARY OF CASES BASED ON STUDENT'S RANK AND COURSE LEVEL

Nearly 45% of the cases resolved by COAM during the past year were the result of allegations of misconduct in 100-level courses, and nearly two-thirds of the cases stemmed from 100 and 200 level courses. Progressively fewer cases resulted from allegations in progressively higher-level courses (**Table 7**).

## Table 7. Committee on Academic Misconduct Distribution of Cases Based on Course Level (Number) 2008-2009 Academic Year

(N/A in the following table refers to those cases in which the alleged academic misconduct did not take place while the student was enrolled in a formal course.)

Course Level	Cases	% of Total
000	0	0.0
100	192	44.1
200	86	19.8
300	41	9.4
400	23	5.3
500	46	10.6
600	31	7.1
700	11	2.5
800	1	0.2
900	3	0.7
N/A	1	0.2
Totals	435	100

**Table 8** summarizes the cases resolved for <u>undergraduate students only</u> (i.e., ranks 1 through 4). The data demonstrate that students in progressively higher class ranks tended to be charged with academic misconduct in progressively higher level courses. For example, almost all cases involving rank 1 students occurred in 100 and 200-level courses (92 of 97 cases = 95%), while 64% of the cases involving rank 4 students occurred in courses at the 300-level and above (89 of 139 cases = 64%).

## Table 8. Committee on Academic Misconduct Distribution of Cases Based on Student Rank and Course Level 2008-2009 Academic Year

(The following table includes data for only ranks 1, 2, 3, and 4 students who were charged with academic misconduct in a formal course. Thus, the data in this table represent 390 of the 435 total cases resolved during the past academic year.)

		Class Rank			
Level	1	2	3	4	Totals
000	0	0	0	0	0
100	70	50	28	28	176
200	22	28	13	22	85
300	0	7	12	22	41
400	5	2	2	15	24
500	0	2	9	31	42
600	0	0	1	15	16
700	0	0	0	6	6
Totals	97	89	65	139	390

#### VI. Summary of Disciplinary and Grade Sanctions

When COAM finds that a student has violated the University's *Code of Student Conduct*, COAM imposes sanctions. The sanction always includes a disciplinary component, and, in a majority of cases, the sanction also includes a grade-related component.

The disciplinary sanctions imposed by COAM and the numbers of cases involved are summarized in **Table 9**. As these data demonstrate, most students found in violation of the *Code of Student Conduct* received a sanction of "disciplinary probation."

## Table 9. Committee on Academic Misconduct Summary of Disciplinary Sanctions 2008-2009 Academic Year

(Of the 435 cases heard during the 2008-2009 Academic Year, 379 resulted in a finding of "In Violation," and only these resulted in a disciplinary sanction.)

Disciplinary Sanction	Number of Cases	% of Cases
Formal reprimand	68	18
Disciplinary probation (range = 1 quarter to "until graduation")	287	76
Suspension (range = 1 to 3 quarters)	20	5
Dismissal	3	1
None	1	0
Totals	379	100

The grade sanctions imposed by COAM and the numbers of cases involved are summarized in **Table 10**. As these data demonstrate, the modal grade sanction for students found "in violation" of the University's *Code of Student Conduct* is an authorization for a final grade of "E" in the course.

# Table 10. Committee on Academic Misconduct Summary of Grade Sanctions 2008-2009 Academic Year

(Of the 435 cases heard during the 2008-2009 Academic Year, 379 resulted in a finding of "In Violation." In 24 of these cases, no grade sanction was authorized.

Grade Sanction	Number of Cases	% of Cases
None	24	6
Authorization for a "0" on the assignment	109	29

Grade Sanction	Number of Cases	% of Cases
Authorization for a "0" on the assignment and then a reduction in the student's final grade by one full letter grade	97	26
Authorization for a final grade of "E" in the course	121	32
Other	28	7
Totals	379	100

As noted above, when a student is found "in violation" of the University's *Code of Student Conduct*, COAM imposes both disciplinary and grade-related sanctions. Thus, by using various combinations of these two sanctions, COAM can impose sanctions that are commensurate with the severity of the academic misconduct. **Table 11** contains a summary of all of the disciplinary and grade-related sanctions imposed by COAM during the previous year.

Table 11.
Committee on Academic Misconduct
Disciplinary and Grade Sanctions, Combined Summary
2008-2009 Academic Year

Disciplinary Sanction	Grade Sanction	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 3	Rank 4	Rank M	Rank P	Other Ranks	Totals
	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the								
None	assignment(s) in question	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Subtotals		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Subtotals		<u> </u>	U	U	ı	l 0	0	U	
Formal Reprimand	None [the panel or hearing officer did not authorize a grade sanction for the course in question]	5	3	0	2	2	3	1	16
	Final grade of one-half letter grade lower for the assignment in question	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question	8	4	2	6	3	0	3	26
	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question and then a further reduction in the student's final course grade by one full letter grade	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	10
	Authorization for a reduction in the student's final course grade by one full letter grade in the course in question	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
	Authorization for a final grade of "E" in the course in question	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	9

	The Committee on Academic Misconduct will re-enroll the student in								
	the course in which the academic misconduct occurred and the student								
	will be given a final failing grade [i.e., "E", "U", or "NP", whichever is								
	appropriate] in the course.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Subtotals		32	8	3	10	6	3	6	68
Gubiolaio		<u> </u>			10				
Disciplinary Probation (1 quarter)	Authorization for a reduction in the student's final grade on assignment by			_		_	_	_	_
· robalion ( r quartor)	one full letter grade	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Subtotals	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Gubtotais					<u> </u>				<u> </u>
Disciplinary									
Probation (2	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the	_		_		_	_		_
quarters)	assignment(s) in question	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Subtotals	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Subtotals		U	U	U	<u> </u>	U	l 0	<u> </u>	
Disciplinary									
Probation (3	None [a grade sanction was not								
quarters)	applicable in this situation]	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	None [the panel or hearing officer did not authorize a grade sanction for the								
	course in question]	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Reduction in student's final grade by	•							•
	25%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question	7	12	6	5	1	0	0	31
	Authorization for a reduction in the	•	·						
	student's final course grade by one full								
	letter grade	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2

		Т	Т	1					
	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question and then a further reduction in the student's final course grade by one-half letter grade	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question and then a further reduction in the student's final course grade by one full letter grade	11	16	6	4	0	0	1	38
	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question a final grade of "E" for the course in question	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Authorization for a final grade of "E" in the course in question	8	4	7	1	0	0	0	20
Subtotals		28	35	23	10	1	0	1	98
Cubicials						•		•	
Disciplinary Probation (4 quarters)	None [a grade sanction was not applicable in this situation]	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
quarters	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question	7	4	4	3	0	1	1	20
	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question and then a further reduction in the student's final course grade by one full letter grade	7	15	7	2	0	0	0	31
	Authorization for a final grade of "E" in the course in question	9	15	10	3	0	0	3	40
	The Committee on Academic Misconduct will re-enroll the student in the course in which the academic misconduct occurred and the student will be given a final failing grade [i.e., "E", "U", or "NP", whichever is appropriate] in the course.	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	40
	рарргорнатеј ин ше сош зе.	0	2	1	0	0	0	U	70
Subtotals		23	38	23	8	0	1	4	134

Disciplinary Probation (until graduation)	None [a grade sanction was not applicable in this situation]	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
	None [the panel or hearing officer did not authorize a grade sanction for the course in question]	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question	0	0	1	26	1	1	0	29
	Reduction in the student's final course grade by one full letter grade	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question and then a further reduction in the student's final course grade by one full letter grade	1	0	1	14	0	0	0	16
	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question and then a further reduction in the student's final course grade by two full letter grades	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
	Authorization for a final grade of "E" in the course in question	0	0	5	29	1	1	0	36
	The Committee on Academic Misconduct will re-enroll the student in the course in which the academic misconduct occurred and the student will be given a final failing grade [i.e., "E", "U", or "NP", whichever is appropriate] in the course.	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Subtotals		1	0	8	75	2	3	0	89
Suspension (1 quarter)	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question and then a further reduction in the student's final course grade by one full letter grade	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

						1	1		
	Authorization for a final grade of "E" in						_		
	the course in question	0	2	1	4	2	1	1	11
Subtotals		0	2	2	4	2	1	2	13
Jubiolais		0							13
Suspension (2	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the								
quarters)	assignment(s) in question	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
	Authorization for a final grade of "E" in								
	the course in question	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	5
Subtotals		2	1	1	2	0	1	0	7
	A 11 1 11 6 1 1 6 10 11								
5	Authorization for a grade of "0" on the assignment(s) in question and then a								
Dismissal	further reduction in the student's final								
	course grade by one full letter grade	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Authorization for a final grade of "E" in								
	the course in question	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Authorization for the College of Arts &								
	Sciences to reinstate the original								
	grades student previously earned for all								
	courses in question that were changed								
	to "W"s based upon documentation								
	proved to be false for all quarters		•		•				
	applicable	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Subtotals		0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
	-							-	<u> </u>
Total "In Violation"		86	84	61	114	11	9	14	379
								·	
Total "Not In									
Violation"		8	17	5	25	1	0	0	56
Total Cases		94	101	66	139	12	9	14	435
		<b>V</b> T	. • •	-	. 50			• •	