

## ANNUAL REPORT: COAM SUMMER 2000 - SPRING, 2001

Prepared by Carol Bininger, Chair, 2000-2001  
Katherine Kisker, Coordinator, COAM

The Committee on Academic Misconduct has worked hard to uphold the standards of the University by serving as an impartial hearing body in cases of alleged academic misconduct. Hearings are conducted using hearing panels comprised of 3 faculty and 2 student members. These panels receive information about hearings just prior to the hearing to assure that members of the hearing panel are not entering hearings with preconceived ideas about the case(s) in question.

The work of the Committee is facilitated by the Coordinator who arranges hearings, consults with students and faculty, communicates hearing outcomes to students and the faculty bringing charges, and interfaces with the larger University. With the approval of the Revised Code of Student Conduct, the coordinator was able to conduct administrative hearings for selected cases.

### FINDINGS

During the 2000-2001 academic year, the committee heard 287 cases, 34 more than last year. These hearing outcomes are summarized in **Table 1** (all numbers are rounded to the nearest whole number). Of the 287 cases heard, 225 (78.4%) students were found to be in violation of the code of academic conduct; 62 (21.6%) students were found NOT to be in violation of the code of academic conduct. As can be observed in **Table 4**, in descending order the majority of cases of alleged misconduct heard by COAM originated from the 100 level courses (n=150, 52%), followed by the 500 level courses at 16.4% (n=47), 200 and 300 level courses were next with 11% (n=32) and 9% (n=25) respectively. There were no reports of alleged academic misconduct from the 000, and 900 level courses.

The college of enrollment and rank of students accused of academic misconduct is displayed in **Table 6**. As demonstrated in **Table 6**, 276 of the students were enrolled in 11 colleges 11 students (4%) were enrolled in the graduate school. Of the cases heard from academic units (see **Table 5**), 48 (17%) of the cases heard were from Computer and Information sciences, 37 (13%) were from History, followed by 34 (12%) from Industrial Engineering; 27 (9%) were from Chemistry; 17 (6%) were from Physics, 12 (4%) from Engineering, and 9 (3%) from Biology. The remaining cases heard originated from 38 other academic units.

In **Table 2** are the charges upon which students were found to be in violation of the academic code, Summer, 2000 - Spring, 2001. Finally, in **Table 3** are the University sanctions imposed upon students found in violation of the Code of Academic Conduct. Of the 225 sanctions applied, 109 (48%) involved disciplinary probation and a recommendation of "O" on the assignment; 43 (19%) consisted of conduct probation and a recommendation of "O" on the assignment; 26 (12%) were formal reprimands only; 16 (7%) were formal reprimands and a grade sanction; and 10 (4%) resulted in suspension. The Committee also made grade recommendations to faculty in 187(83%) of the cases where a finding of "in violation" was reached.

### SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF COAM: 2000-2001

During the 2000-2001 academic year, COAM held one general meeting during the Autumn quarter and one during Spring Quarter. COAM members elected its chair and discussed the effects on COAM of the proposed changes in the code of student conduct.

Due to schedule conflicts, a general meeting was not held during the Winter quarter. As much as feasible, time was spent following hearings to debrief panels and answer questions. There is diversity of opinion within COAM membership about the severity of sanctions imposed. It is assumed that this diversity of opinion is reflective of the diversity that would be found within the Campus community. Within panels, once a student was found to have been in violation of the academic code of conduct, much effort was devoted to making sanctions congruent with the panel's view of the seriousness of the behavior presented. COAM worked diligently to achieve consistency across panels.

A trend noted this year was the rise in cases involving plagiarism. With increasing use of the internet, this trend will most likely continue. The rise in the reporting of cases of plagiarism has most likely resulted from teachers becoming better at detecting instances of plagiarism with increasing skill at using search engines to find the sources from which students derive work. With the rising use of internet sources by students, it becomes increasingly important for teachers to educate students in the proper use of internet sources and the mechanism for citing these sources.

## **SUMMARY**

This committee views its function within the University as vital to maintenance of the integrity of the degrees awarded by The Ohio State University. Therefore COAM carefully weighs the circumstances presented in each case to reach a just decision based on the evidence available during a hearing and assure due process to each student against whom allegations have been made.

Academic misconduct remains a problem at The Ohio State University. Cases forwarded to the Committee on Academic Misconduct most likely reflect only a fraction of the actual incidences of academic misconduct. COAM has worked diligently to provide students with due process and to assure as much as possible consistency across hearing panels.

The Committee remains available to serve as a resource to educate the academic community about how to deal with alleged academic misconduct and the procedures for referral if needed. The committee views the education of new faculty and TAs about academic misconduct and the procedure for reporting suspected instances as vital to maintaining the academic integrity of the University.

TABLE 1  
 COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT  
 HEARINGS AND OUTCOMES  
 SUMMER, 2000- SPRING, 2001

QUARTER OF HEARING	NUMBER FOUND IN VIOLATION	NUMBER FOUND NOT IN VIOLATION	TOTAL NUMBER OF HEARINGS
SU'00	42	6	48
AU'00	38	15	53
WI'01	62	27	89
SP'01	83	14	97
TOTAL	225	62	287

TABLE 2  
 CHARGES UPON WHICH STUDENTS WERE FOUND TO BE IN VIOLATION  
 OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT  
 SUMMER, 2000- SPRING, 2001

CHARGE*	NUMBER FOUND IN VIOLATION
Giving and/or receiving aid in an unauthorized manner	68
Submission of another's work as one's own	63
Plagiarism	60
Copying the work of another	55
Unauthorized collaboration	39
Possession and/or use of unauthorized materials	11
Alteration of an examination and resubmission in an attempt to change the earned grade or credit	10
Fabrication or falsification of data of information for an assignment	7
Submission of work not performed in lab	6
Alteration of administrative paperwork, forgery	4
Submission of work previously submitted for a grade	2
Other forms of academic misconduct	12

\*Students are frequently found in violation of more than one charge therefore the total number of charges exceeds the number of cases heard.

TABLE 3  
Hearing Outcomes and Sanctions Summarized by Class Rank  
Summer, 2000 - Spring, 2001

SANCTION / RANK		1	2	3	4	M	P	Other	TOTAL
Warning (Formal Reprimand)		6	6	4	8	1		1	26
Warning (Formal Reprimand) Recommend Grade Reduction on Assignment		1	3	2					6
Warning (Formal Reprimand) Recommend "0" on Assignment		4	4				1	1	10
Conduct Probation	3 qt.		1						1
	4 qt.		1						1
Conduct Probation Recommend "0" on Assignment	2 qt.	2	3						5
	3 qt.	8	13	3	2			1	27
	4 qt.	1			1				2
	Grad.				9				9
Disciplinary Probation	3 qt.	2	8						10
	8 qt.		1						1
	Grad.					1			1
Disciplinary Probation – Recommend "0" on Assignment	1 qt.		1	2	2				5
	2 qt.			3	12				15
	3 qt.	19	17	16	11	2		1	66
	4qt.	1							1
	Grad.			1	20	1			22
Disciplinary Probation Recommend "E" in Course	3 qt.	2	1	1	3				7
	Grad.				1				1
Suspension in Abeyance – Recommend "0" on Assignment	3 qt.					1			1
Suspension – Recommend "0" on Assignment	1 qt.			1					1
	3 qt.			1					1
SUSPENSION RECOMMEND "E" IN COURSE	1 qt.				3				5
	2 qt.		1		2				3
NOT IN VIOLATION		8	13	9	28	4			62
TOTAL		54	73	43	102	10	1	4	287

TABLE 4

Course Numbers of Cases of Alleged Misconduct Heard by COAM  
Summer, 2000 – Spring 2001

Course Number	SU'00	AU'00	WI'01	SP'01	Total
000	0	0	0	0	0
100	18	23	51	58	150
200	1	9	12	10	32
300	4	0	5	16	25
400	0	1	9	0	10
500	19	16	5	7	47
600	6	0	6	4	16
700	0	4	1	0	5
800	0	0	0	2	2
900	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	48	53	89	97	287

TABLE 5  
Departments from which Cases of Alleged Misconduct Were Heard Bu COAM  
Summer 2000 – Spring 2001

Department	SU'00	AU'00	WI'01	SP'01	TOTAL
Acct&MIS	1		2		3
Agr Comm				1	1
Alli Med			1		1
Ani Sci	1			2	3
Anthrop		1			1
Arch				2	2
Art			2		2
Astron			3	2	5
Biology		1	3	5	9
Bus-Mgt				2	2
Bus-MHR		2			2
CBN&Anat	1				1
Chem	8	4	10	5	27
Cir Tech			3		3
Cptr/Inf	4	5	19	20	48
Comp Std	1				1
EEOB			2		2
Edu T&L	2	3		2	7
Engineer			2	10	12
English	2		1	4	7
Fm Res M			2		2
French			1		1
Geog		3			3
German				1	1
Hist Art			1		1
History	1	1	13	22	37
HDFS			1		1
JCom				3	3
Ind Eng	17	11	6		34
LARCH			1	1	2
MBA				2	2

Math	2			1	3
Mech Eng			2	3	5
Music				2	2
Philos		1	2		3
Physics	5	11		1	17
Polit Sc			1		1
Psych			4	2	6
SBS Col		2			2
Spanish		4	1	1	6
Sph/Hrng	1	1			2
Sociol	2	3			5
Txtl&Clo				1	1
Univ Col			4	2	6
Wom Stds			2		2
TOTAL	48	53	89	97	287

TABLE 6

College of Enrollment and Rank of Students Accused of Academic Misconduct  
Summer, 2000 - SPRING, 2001

COLLEGE OR SCHOOL	RANK 1	RANK 2	RANK 3	RANK 4	OTHER RANKS	COLLEGE TOTAL
AGR		1	2	7		10
AHR			2	1		3
AMP			1	2		3
ART		1		1		2
ASC	6	13	8	30	2	59
BUS		5	6	16		27
EDU			1			1
ENG	9	15	16	28		68
HEC			1	8		9
NRE				2		2
UVC	39	38	6	7	2	92
TOTAL UNDER-RADUATE	54	73	43	102	4	276

College	Rank M	Rank P	TOTAL GRADUATE STUDENTS
GRD	10	1	11

GRAND TOTAL 287